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A compendious letter which Jhan. Pomerane curate of the congregation at Wittenberg sent to the faythfull Christen congregation in England, 1536.
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The subject of the present study is St. Thomas More's letter to John Bugenhagen, written in response to a short letter of the German reformer entitled Epistola ad Fideles in Anglia. More's extensive answer to Bugenhagen represents an important stage in his reaction to Lutheranism, both in its progress on the continent and in its infiltration into England. Its careful study results in a better understanding of the impact of events abroad on the man who became the chief lay defender of Catholic orthodoxy in England against the heretics. The letter has not hitherto been translated into English, and therefore it has been largely ignored in the consideration of More's controversial works. E. F. Rogers, in a brief article in The Modern Churchman, calls attention to it.


2 Bugenhagen's letter also appears under the title of Epistola Joannis Bugenhagi Pomerani ad Anglos, Wittenberg, 1525.

She assigns the date 1526 to it on internal evidence.

More's letter shows on every page how closely he was following the complex events which were taking place in Germany. To understand the religious situation of those turbulent times, it is necessary to go back more than a decade. The dispute concerning indulgences which popularly is supposed to be the outward occasion of the break with orthodoxy dates back to an indulgence granted by Pope Leo X in 1514 and entrusted in the dioceses of Mayence and Magdeburg to Archbishop Albert of Brandenburg. The terms of that indulgence, as locally proclaimed by Albert and preached by John Tetzel, were such as to cause widespread objections on the part of even loyal defenders of the Church, such as Eck and Cochlaeus; but these fully respected the rights of the Papacy. Luther and his associate, Andreas von Carlstadt, on the other hand, chose this occasion to deny altogether the right of the Pope to grant indulgences. Luther was also evolving his own peculiar

---

4 Ibid. 354. See also Elizabeth Frances Rogers, "A Calendar of the Correspondence of Sir Thomas More," English Historical Review, XXXVII, October, 1922, 546-564.


7 Grisar, Luther, I, 329-330.
notions regarding justification by faith and man's total depravity, to be crystallized in his Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, delivered at Wittenberg as a series of lectures, April, 1515, to October, 1516, and existing only in manuscript until the present century. 8

After the posting of his famous ninety-five theses on the door of the Castle Church in Wittenberg, October 31, 1517, events moved rapidly. 9 He followed up the theses with a written defense, Resolutiones dispositionis de virtute indulgentiarum, which appeared the following spring. 10 In July, 1518, he was summoned to appear in Rome, but through the instrumentality of the Elector Frederick of Saxony, he was permitted to appear, instead, before Cardinal Cajetan in Augsburg. The cardinal demanded the withdrawal of two of Luther's propositions; Luther refused to recant, and followed his refusal by a secret flight from Augsburg. 11 In the following summer, when Carlstadt was drawn by Eck into a Disputation at Leipzig, Luther appeared to defend his friend and denied in his defense all authority of either Pope or Council. As he

8 Ibid., I, 190.
9 Ibid., I, 330.
10 Ibid., I, 335.
11 Poulet, History of the Catholic Church, II, 9. See also Grisar, Luther, I, 355-369.
said in the spring of 1520: "The dice is cast; I have no desire to be reconciled with Rome for all eternity." Looking for support in another quarter, he made an appeal to the German princes in May-June, 1520, in his Address to the Nobility of the German Nation on the Reformation of the Christian State, restating all his errors. Rome pronounced sentence in the Bull Exsurge Domine, September 1, 1521, listing forty-one "Errores Martini Luther"; and on January 3, 1521, Pope Leo X finally excommunicated Luther.

In the meantime, political events were shaping in a way to favor Luther's cause. Charles V was on the point of waging war with Francis I of France. Not wishing to risk angering the German princes, he merely summoned Luther to the Diet of Worms, instead of executing the Bull. Refusing again to recant, Luther was put under the ban of the Empire; but he had in the meantime received assurance of support.

12 Poulet, History of the Catholic Church, II, 10.
13 Grisar, Luther, II, 26-27
14 For the text of these, see Henrici Denzinger, Enchiridion Symbolorum, ed. Carl Rahner, S. J., 29th. ed., Barcinone, 1953, 275-277.
15 Poulet, History of the Catholic Church, II, 11.
16 Ibid. See also Grisar, Luther, II, 61-69.
from the Elector Frederick of Saxony. However, on his way back to Wittenberg, and he was forcibly detained in the Castle of Wartburg for ten months. There, and afterwards in Wittenberg, he was actively engaged in writing. He was pushing forward his translation of the New Testament (1522), writing his Babylonian Captivity (1520), answering Henry VIII in his Contra Henricum (1522), opposing the De Libero Arbitrio of Erasmus with his De Servo Arbitrio (1525), to mention a few of his earlier works. More's letter to Bugenhagen shows how closely he was following the early Lutheran polemics. He referred by title to the Babylonian Captivity, the De Servo Arbitrio, and Luther's Sermon on the Cross. He

17 Poulet, History of the Catholic Church, II, 11.
18 Ibid.
19 Martin Luther, De captivitate babylonica ecclesiæ praeludium, in D. Martin Luthers Werke, Kritische Gesamtausgabe, Weimar, 1888, VI, 497-573. This edition will hereafter be referred to as Werke.
20 Martin Luther, Contra Henricum regem Angliae, Werke 1891, X, ii , 180-222.
22 Martin Luther, De servo arbitrio, Werke, 1908, XVIII, 600-787.
quoted or alluded unmistakably to a number of other works: for example, the *Heidelberg Disputations* (1518),

24 *The Preface to the New Testament* (1522),

25 and *The Address to the German Nobility.*

26

The year 1525 was in many ways a crucial one in the development of the Lutheran heresy. Factions were beginning to appear, and the Lutheran leaders were turning on one another. Carlstadt, who had become infected with some of the tenets of the Anabaptists, became the leader of a radical group in Wittenberg that developed iconoclastic tendencies.

27 In 1524 he was exiled from Wittenberg for his activities by the Elector Frederick. Luther negotiated his return, but the unstable Carlstadt, whose *Wittenberg Disputations* (1516) were in advance of Luther in their radically heretical cast, published in 1524 *Die Himm-

24 Martin Luther, *Disputatio Heidelbergae habit.1518,* Werke, 1883, I, 354.


lischen Propheten, which drew forth from Luther the answer:
Wider die Himmlischen Propheten in 1525. 28 More's letter takes
cognizance of this controversy, showing familiarity with both
Carlstadt's statement and Luther's reply. A rift was also widen-
ing between Luther and his group in Wittenberg and the Zwinglian
movement in Zurich. The latter had been developing along lines
of its own, summed up in Zwingli's Sixty-Seven Theses in 1523,
which were embodied in a series of "reforms" put through in 1524-
1525, abolishing indulgences, the Sacraments of Penance and
Extreme Unction, clerical celibacy, and the use of pictures and
statues in the churches. 29

There was much writing at just this time on the
Blessed Sacrament, regarding which divergent views were appear-
ing. Among these works were Carlstadt's Die Himmlischen Pro-
pheten and Luther's answer; a work by John Bugenhagen entitled
Contra Novum Errorem de Sacramento Corporis et Sanguinis Jesu
Christi (August, 1525); Oecolampadius' De Genuina Verbum Domini
Expositione (September, 1525); and Zwingli's Klare Underrich-
tung vom Nachtmal Christi (February, 1526). 30 Luther and Bugen-

28 Martin Luther, Wider die Himmlischen Propheten

29 See L. Christiani, "Zwingli," Dictionnaire de Thé-
ologie Catholique, Paris, 1950, XV, 11, 3735-3739

30 Cf. Grisar, Luther, III, 387-397, 409, n.3.
Hagen argued for impanation; Carlstadt, Oecolampadius, and Zwingli for a figurative interpretation which essentially denied the Real Presence of Christ in the Blessed Sacrament. More's letter comments upon this rift. He rightly accused Luther of taking a more conservative position, the better to oppose Carlstadt. Luther admitted this, in so many words, in his Wider die Himmlischen Propheten.

Also, More was writing just after the crushing of the Peasants' Revolt (1524-1525), and its tragic events were much on his mind. Contrary to the opinion of More and his Catholic contemporaries, Luther was probably not directly responsible for the outbreak of the revolt. Poulet places responsibility more on Carlstadt and the Anabaptist Thomas Munzer for stirring up the discontent of the peasants. Yet the first three of the Twelve Articles issued by their leaders contained Lutheran doctrines. Whatever Luther's part may have been, he grew alarmed at the proportions the revolt had attained in the spring of 1525 and addressed both sides in his Admonition to Peace (April 16,

---

31 For detailed differences, see Commentary, lines 1627-1630 (below, 209).

32 See Commentary, lines 1630-1632 (below, 209).

33 Poulet, History of the Catholic Church, II, 18-19.
1525). He censured the nobles for their acts of injustice, urged moderation on the peasants, and warned both factions: "[B]oth of you are wrong...both will destroy yourselves, and God will use one knave to flay another." His remarks to the peasants were decidedly sympathetic toward their aims in the Twelve Articles, but in less than a month he completely abandoned their cause in a violent pamphlet Against the Murderous Peasants, and inflammatory appeal to the princes to put down the revolt. In it he wrote: "Stab, smite, slay wherever you can. If you die in doing it, well for you."

More was apparently familiar with these two works, for his remarks on the Peasants' Revolt fastened on this sudden reversal. Luther justified his position in a third pamphlet the following February, which More may or may not have seen. At any rate, More shared the opinion of Erasmus


35 Martin Luther, Against the Robbing and Murdering Horde of Peasants, trans. C.M. Jacobs, Works, IV, 253 (Wider die mordischen und reubischen Rotten der Bawren, Werke, XVIII, 357-361).

36 Martin Luther, Evn Sandebrieff von dem harten Buchlin widder die Bauren [sic], Werke, XVIII, 384-401.
regarding Luther's culpability. Erasmus wrote: "We are now reap-
ing the fruit of your spirit . . . . It is true you have at-
tempted in your grim booklet to allay this suspicion, but never-
theless you cannot dispel the general conviction that this mis-
chief was caused by the books you sent forth . . . ."37

The year 1525 was also the year of Luther's marriage. The marriage of the Lutheran leaders in violation of their vows was a point which More could not consider or discuss without the greatest indignation and horror. As early as 1522, Luther had written advocating the marriage of the clergy in his De Votis Monasticis.38 Bugenhagen was married October thirteenth of that year.39 Carlstadt wrote against monastic and clerical celibacy as early as 1521, and was himself married January 15, 1522.40 Oecolampadius advocated marriage of the clergy in February, 1524.41 Among Zwingli's "reforms" in 1524 was the rejection of clerical celibacy; and he himself was married July 2, 1524.

37 Desiderius Erasmus, Hyperaspistes, Opera Omnia, I, 1032, quoted in Grisar, Luther, II, 212.
38 Martin Luther, De votis monasticis, Werke, 1889, VIII, 564-669.
39 Grisar, Luther, III, 407.
John Bugenhagen, already three years married, wrote *De Coniugio Episcoporum et Diaconorum* in 1525. Luther, despite his advocacy of the marriage of the clergy, did not follow his own advice until June 13, 1525, when he married a former nun from the Cistercian convent in Nimschen, Katherine von Bora.

As factions began to appear among the followers of Luther, one of his most loyal supporters was John Bugenhagen. He was born June 24, 1484 or 1485, in Wallin, Pomerania, a fact which gave him his cognomen, Pomeranus. He studied at the University of Greifswald and devoted himself particularly to humanistic studies. Later he was appointed rector and professor of Humanities at the college of Treptow, where, influenced by his reading of Erasmus, he began devoting himself principally to Biblical studies. In 1509, he was ordained to the priesthood. He was much affected by Luther's Leipzig Dis-

---

42 Grisar, Luther, III, 407.
43 Ibid., II, 173-189.
46 Grisar, Luther, III, 407.
47 Ibid.
putations (1519), and although repelled at first by the Babylonian Captivity, he was soon won over to Luther’s position. He joined Luther at Wittenberg, where he became a member of the faculty of the University. In 1522, he married Eva Rörer, a servant-maid of Hieronymus Schurf, a lawyer. In 1523, the magistrates, acting in union with Luther, appointed Bugenhagen pastor of Wittenberg, and from that center, he was active in organizing Lutheran congregations in Saxony, later in Brunswick, Hamburg, Lubeck, Pomerania, and finally Denmark. He was always a devoted friend and follower of Luther, who ranked Bugenhagen on a par with Melancthon and himself in the spreading of his doctrines.

Bugenhagen seems to have been more important as an organizer and preacher than as a writer. Luther, however, praised him for his Latin Commentary on the Psalms (Wittenberg, 1524), for which Luther wrote the preface. He also wrote, in

48 Hering, Bugenhagen, 18.
49 Grisar, Luther, III, 407.
50 Ibid.
51 For these activities, see Hering, Bugenhagen, Part 3. He devotes a separate chapter to the work in each country.
52 Grisar, Luther, III, 409.
53 Ibid., 408.
addition to the works already mentioned, an address to the people of Hamburg entitled "Von dem Christenloven und den rechten guden Werken." He assisted Luther, also, in his German and Low Saxon translations of the Bible. But his most important contribution was his work of formulating constitutions for the new Lutheran Churches.

The letter of Bugenhagen which called forth More's answer first appeared in Latin in Wittenberg in 1525 for circulation in England. Subsequently it appeared in other Latin editions, in several German versions, and in an English version. Consisting of about ninety-five lines, the letter was addressed Sanctis qui sunt in Anglia. Its aim was apparently to rally support for the Lutheran cause in England. It was slight and flimsy in itself, as a piece of religious controversy, but it had a certain weight because of the reputation of its author and its deceivingly conciliatory tone. Moreover, it was part of a concerted campaign to introduce heretical works into England.

54 See above, 7, 11.
55 Grisar, *Luther*, III, 408.
Such works were circulating in sufficient numbers in England by 1526 so that Bishop Tunstall ordered, in October of that year, that the people in his diocese of London should be warned against them. By 1530, they had increased to the point that the King forbade the reading of some eighty or more works by Luther, Oecolampadius, Zwingli, Bugenhagen, Bucer, and others. 57

Bugenhagen's letter received in February, 1526, a Latin answer addressed by Cochlaeus to one Hermann Rincus, with the aim that the said Rincus could warn the King of England of the danger to English orthodoxy which the letter represented. Cochlaeus concluded the preface to his letter as follows:

Expedit igitur, Prudentissime domine Hermannae, ut primo quoque tempore Regem, . . . super his periculosis insidiis certiorem facias, ne Germaniae incommoda sub falso Evangelii praetextu Angliae quoque regnum . . . inuadant ac perturbent . . . . 58

Cochlaeus expressed a doubt in his answer as to whether Bugenhagen's letter had ever reached England, and whether it might not all be a trick to deceive the Germans into thinking that they could count on more support in England than the facts warranted.

While published editions of Bugenhagen's letter are


58 Cochlaeus, Johannes. Epistola Iohannis Bugenhagii Pomerani ad Anglo. Responsio Iohannis Cochlaei, 1526 [British Museum—-3906. F. 21].
rare, anyone reading More's answer has essentially read the whole letter, because More quoted it almost entire. This gives the reader an unusual opportunity to see More at work, since one can weigh each argument against the statement which called it forth. Incidentally, it is interesting to note that the passages omitted by More occur in Cochlaeus' edition, and are seen to be non-essential.

When Bugenhagen's letter came to More's attention in 1525, he was a man of forty-eight, already high in the King's service, a member of the Privy Council, and recently appointed Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster. His position in the world of letters was established by the publication of the Utopia in 1516, and he had already tried his pen at controversy in several long letters in defense of his friend and fellow-humanist, Erasmus. His first entrance into religious controversy was the Latin answer which he wrote to Luther's Contra Henricum Regem (Wittenberg, 1522), which More published in England in 1523 under the title of Vindicatio Henrici VIII ... a Calumniis Lutheri. More never acknowledged the authorship of this work. The letter

59 Rogers, Correspondence of More, 27-75 (to Martin Dorp), 137-154 (to Edward Lee), 165-205 (to a monk).

60 This is an alternate title for Eruditissimi viri Guilielmi Rossei Opus ... quo ... Retegit ac Refellit Insanias Lutheri Calumnias: Quibus Regem Henricum ... Octavum ... Scurra Turpissime Insectatur, London, 1523.
to Bugenhagen was the second of More's controversial works and the only other one in Latin. An urgent need for a vernacular controversial literature developed in England at about this time, following the appearance in 1525 of Tyndale's translation of the New Testament and in 1526 of his first heretical treatise, The Parable of the Wicked Mammon. These were among the first of a veritable flood of heretical writings in the vernacular. 61 In response to this need, Cuthbert Tunstall, Bishop of London, addressed a letter to More, requesting him to devote his talents to the vernacular defense of Catholic truth, and giving him official license to read heretical books. 62 Perhaps because of this change in emphasis, More did not himself publish the letter to Bugenhagen. It did not appear until 1568, when it was issued by John Fowler in Louvain, probably from a manuscript in the possession of John Harris, father-in-law of Fowler, and formerly More's secretary. 63 It remained in comparative oblivion until its inclusion in The Correspondence of Sir Thomas More, edited by


62 Rogers, Correspondence of More, 386-388.

Elizabeth Frances Rogers, in 1947. 64

This study begins with the translation and annotation of the letter, and proceeds to an analysis of it. In the work of analysis and annotation, it has been necessary to consult other works of More, both in Latin and English, some of which could not readily be obtained except in microfilm. Cochlaeus' letter was also studied, by way of comparison. The Weimar edition of Luther's works was indispensable in locating quotations and allusions, with the chronological list of Luther's works and the extensive index of Grisar's Luther serving as a concordance. For patristic sources, a valuable reference work was the Enchiridion Patristicum; 65 and equally important was the Enchiridion Symbolorum, 66 containing the decrees and canons of the Council of Trent and the listed errors of Martin Luther included in the Bull "Exsurge Domine" (1520). A comparison of the points treated by More and those handled by the Council of Trent gives interesting evidence concerning the completeness with which he isolated and handled pertinent issues.

64 Rogers, Correspondence of More, 323-365.
66 See above, 4, n. 14.
Following the work of translation and annotation, this study attempts to analyze More's letter as a piece of Renaissance prose and as an example of religious controversy. It further inquires into its historical significance in understanding the sequence of events in England just prior to Henry's break with Papal Authority. Finally, it considers the letter in its biographical significance, as a reflection of the characteristic traits of the author as he approached a crucial moment of his career.
DOCTISSIMA SIMUL AC ELEGANTISS. D. THOMAE MORI CLARIS - 
SIMI VIRI EPISTOLA, IN QUA NON MINUS PIE QUAM FACETE 
RESPONDET LITERIS CUIUSDAM POMERANI, HOMINIS INTER 
PROTESTANTES NOMINIS NON OBSCURI.

Redeunti domum ex itinere tradidit e ministris
quidam literas mihi, quas accepisse se dicebat ab ignoto quopiam. Vbi resignaui, reperio, Pomerane, haud
scio cuius manu, sed nomine scriptas tuo: verum ita
5 scriptas tamen, vt neque nominatim, neque in genere
missae viderentur ad me. Inscripteras enim: Sanctis
qui sunt in Anglia. At ego quam procul inuitus ab illis
disto, in quos vere tantus competat titulus: tam longe
libens absun ab iis, qui soli sancti sunt, Pomerane, tibi:
10 cui nihil sanctum esse, praeter Lutherani sectam, video.
CHAPTER II

THE LETTER: LATIN TEXT, WITH ENGLISH TRANSLATION AND COMMENTARY

THE VERY SCHOLARLY AND POLISHED LETTER OF THE MOST ILLUSTRIOUS MAN, BLESSED THOMAS MORE, IN WHICH HE REPLIES NO LESS DEVOUTLY THAN WITTILY TO THE LETTER OF A CERTAIN POMERANUS, A MAN OF CONSIDERABLE RENOWN AMONG THE PROTESTANTS.

On my return home from a journey, one of my servants handed me a letter which he said he received from some stranger. When I opened it, I found, Pomeranus, that the letter was written in a handwriting unfamiliar to me, but in your name. Yet it was written in such a fashion that neither by its form of address nor by its character did it seem intended for me. For you had addressed it: "To the saints who are in England." Really, to my regret, I differ as much from those to whom such a title truly belongs, as to my joy, I differ from those who alone are saints to you, Pomeranus— you, to whom nothing is holy, I see, except the Lutheran sect.
Itaque primum demirabar mecum, quid ei, quic­
quid erat hominis, venisset in mentem, vt epistolam
talem potissimum curaret obtrudendam mihi, qui me
Lutherano negotio nunquam immiscueram. Verum pressius
expendenti rem subiit dubitatio, ne, quod in ea re nil-
hil hactenus me commouissem, id ipsum fortassis in
causa fuerit, vt idoneus existimatus sim, qui tali ten-
tarar epistola. Nam quum omnes hic mortales passim ad
uersus execrables eius haereses clamarent, nec ego ea
de re quicquam fere loquerer, quod neque Theologus eram,
nec villam personam gererem, ad quam eius ulceris cura
pertineret; Lutheranum quempiam spem concepisse reor
fore, vt aequitatem meam facile talis Epistola, tam in
speciem pia, pelliceret in partes suas.

Haec ego mecum reputans, tametsi nihil respon-
si tuae requirebant literae, et ego plane decreueram ab
eiusmodi pestis attactu noxio semper abstinere, tamen
quia mihi res obtrusa est, et fors tacendo forem spem
improbam porrigentis aucturus, statui potius ad literas
Therefore I could not at first imagine what reason that individual had, whoever he was, for taking such pains to force a letter of that sort on me, who have never let myself get involved in the Lutheran business. But then as I considered the matter more carefully, I began to wonder whether the very fact that I had so far taken no action in the business might not have been the reason why I was considered a suitable target for such an epistle. For since everyone here was complaining loudly and indiscriminately about his [Luther's] accursed heresies and since I said practically nothing about the subject because I was no theologian and I would not play the part of the doctor whose business it was to cure his ulcer, some Lutheran, I think, entertained the hope that such a letter, so devout in appearance, would easily win my better judgment over to his side.

After due reflection, I decided to answer your letter, even though it required no reply and though I had definitely resolved to keep myself entirely free from the poisonous touch of that plague. But the matter had been thrust upon me, and perhaps, if I kept silent, I would increase the wicked hope of the one who had sent
30 tuas rescribere, quo testatum reddam omnibus, me quantumuis rudem rei Theologicae, constantius tamen esse Christianum, quam vt sustineam esse Lutheranus. Respondeo igitur singulis Epistolae tuae partibus, quo facilius scire possis, quantum quaque parte profeceris. Hunc ergo
35 in modum incipis:

Gratia vobis et pax a Deo Patre nostro, et
Domino nostro Iesu Christo.

Nihil est his in verbis mali, sed fecisse modestius videreris, si mores Apostoli potius esses imitatus, 40 quam si tibi arrogasses Apostolicum stylum. Nam Apostolicum est propemodum et illud:

Non potuimus non gaudere, quando audiuimus et
in Anglia Evangelium gloriae Dei apud quosdam bene audire.

45 An non haec dum legit, interim lectori subit Apostolus Ecclesiae quondam in cunis adhuc lactenti congratulans? Quem tu, Pomerane, demum quam concinne nunc imitaris, scilicet? Quasi velut olim, tempore Apostolorum, Corinthiis Evangelium praedicari coepit aut
50 Galatis, ita nunc tandem praedicantibus vobis,
the letter. Besides, by my answer, I shall give testimony to all that though I may be somewhat unskilled in theology, nevertheless I am too firm a Christian to endure being a Lutheran. I shall reply therefore to each section of your letter, separately, that you may more easily see how much you have accomplished in each. This is how you begin:

Grace be to you and peace from God our Father and from our Lord Jesus Christ.

There is no harm in these words, but you would seem to have acted more modestly if you had imitated the Apostolic character rather than appropriated the Apostolic style of greeting. Certainly the following is also very much in the Apostolic style:

We could not but rejoice when we heard that in England also, among some people, the Gospel is being well received to the Glory of God.

Would there not come to the mind of one reading this statement the image of the Apostle congratulating the Church, still a suckling babe in the cradle? How suitably, to be sure, do you now imitate him, Pomeranus? Just as formerly, in the days of the Apostles, the Gospel began to be preached to the Corinthians or to the Galatians, so now, as it were, by means of your
Euangelium audiri coeperit et placere Britannis; atque id
tamen tam nuper et parce, vt ne adhuc quidem in Britannia
bene audiat Euangelium Dei, nisi apud quosdam.

Quid tu appelles Euangelium, nescio: verum id
55 scio, si id fateris esse Euangelium quod in mundum protulit
Christus, quod quatuor olim Evangelistae scripserunt, Mat-
thaeus, Marcus, Lucas et Ioannes, sic intellectum quomodo
vetere omnes Ecclesiae Proceres interpretati sunt, et totus
Christianus orbis annos iam plus quam mille et quingentos
60 et intellexit, et docuit: istud, inquam, Euangelium annos
plus minus mille perpetuo bene audiat in Anglia, vsqueadeo
vt illis etiam passim hic placeret ac probaretur Euangelica
fides, quorum fragilitas erat infirmior, quam vt mores pra-
starent Euangelio dignos. Sin Euangelium videri postulas
65 noua ista, perniciosa et perabsurda dogmata, quae velut
Antichristus, nuper Lutherus inuexit in Saxones, quae Carol-
stadius, Lambertus, Oecolampadius, ac tute, non aliter ac
preaching, the Gospel has at last begun to be heard and to be accepted by the Britons; and this, however, so recently and so sparingly that even yet in Britain it is well received only among a few.

What you call the Gospel, I do not know; but this I do know—if you admit that to be the Gospel, which Christ brought forth into the world; which the four Evangelists, Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, then put into writing; which has been so understood as all the ancient Fathers of the Church interpreted it and as the whole Christian world for more than one thousand five hundred years has understood and taught it—that Gospel, I say, has been heard attentively and continuously for a thousand years more or less in England; and it was so heard that everywhere here the faith of the Gospel was accepted and approved even by those who, through the frailty of their human nature, were too weak to lead lives worthy of the Gospel. But if you insist that the Gospel means those new, destructive and extremely absurd doctrines which, like an Anti-Christ, Luther recently forced upon Saxony; which Carlstadt, Lambert, Oecolampadius, and you yourself, like the bearers of
Lutheri Cacangelistae promouetis, ac per orbem spargitis: sunt in Anglia profecto, id quod nos non gaudere non possu-
mus, vix quidam apud quos adhuc bene audiat istud Evange-
lium vestrum.

Caeterum et illud nobis annuntiatum est, multos infir-
miores adhuc auerti, propter rumores nescio quos qui
istic feruntur ab illis, qui Evangelio Dei aduersan-
tur, de nobis. Haec est gloria nostra: tantum abest,
vt mendacia in Evangelii professores iactata refellenda
duxerim: aliqui in quo videretur illa beatitudo? Bea-
ti eritis, quum maledixerunt nobis homines.

Auertuntur a vobis haud dubie non infirmiores,

sed multo firmiores in fide: non propter vila mendacia,
quae iactantur in Evangelii professores (sic enim vocas
Lutheranos) sed propter assidua scelera, quae nimium vere
designatis vos Evangelii peruersores. Nam quaeo te,
quae mendacia feruntur de vobis? Aut quomodo Evangelium
profitemini? An mendacium esse contendes, si quis fac-
tionem vestram dicat bonam Germaniae partem tumultu, cae-
de, rapinis, incendio deuastasse? Audebis eos mendaces
dicere, qui vestram doctrinam impiam, tot scelerum
Luther's bad tidings, promote and spread abroad throughout the whole world—certainly in England there are scarcely any who have as yet received that Gospel of yours—for which we cannot but rejoice.

But it has been reported to us that many weaker souls, because of some rumors about us, are still holding aloof—rumors which have been brought there by the enemies of the Gospel of the Lord. This is our glory. Far be it from me to consider refuting the lies noised abroad against the preachers of the Gospel; otherwise in what would that beatitude consist—Blessed are you when they shall speak all that is evil against you?

Without doubt it is not the weaker souls who are holding aloof from you, but those much stronger in the faith. It is not because of any lies which are uttered against the preachers of the Gospel, for so you call the Lutherans, but because of the innumerable evil deeds which you perverters of the Gospel are all too truly committing. But, I ask you, what lies are told about you? Or how do you preach the Gospel? Will you maintain that the man is lying who says that your faction has laid waste a good part of Germany with violence, slaughter, plundering, fire? Will you dare to call those men liars who testify that your ungodly teaching is the cause of so many evil deeds, so many
tot damnorum, tot vastitatum causam esse testantur? An
seditiones mouere, laicos in Clerum concitare, plebam in
Magistratus armare, populos adversus Principes incendere,
pugnas, ruinas, bella, strages procurare, idem esse pro-
bablis, quod Evangelium profiteri? Dic, obseco, nobis,
egregie professor Evangelii, desmeere Sacramenta Christi,
Sanctos Christi spennere, Matrem Christi blasphemare, Cru-
cem Christi contemnere, vota Christo facta vilipendere,
dicum Christo caelibatum soluere, virginitatem Christo
consecratam polluere, monachos ac velatas Christo virgines
ad coniugium, hoc est, ad perpetuum stuprum hortari, nec
hortari solum verbis improbis, sed exemplo quoque foedis-
simo prouocare: Dic, inquam, praeclare professor Evangeli,
vel tu Evangelista Lutheri, vel Christus tuus Lutherus
ipse, an haec flagitia facere et docere, id demum sit
Evangelium profiteri?

Auertuntur igitur a vobis haud dubie (quod dixi)
non infirmiores, sed multo firmiores in fide: non propter
injuries, so much destruction? Or will you attempt to prove that to stir up discord, to arouse the laity against the clergy, to arm the people against the government, to inflame nations against rulers, to promote fighting, ruin, war, destruction— that is the same thing as to preach the Gospel? Tell us, O most distinguished preacher of the Gospel, whether destroying the sacraments of Christ, scorning the Saints of Christ, blaspheming the Mother of Christ, despising the Cross of Christ, considering worthless the vows made to Christ, releasing from the obligation of celibacy those dedicated to Christ, polluting the virginity consecrated to Christ, encouraging to marriage, that is, to perpetual adultery, monks and virgins espoused to Christ—and not only encouraging them with shameless words but also inciting them with the most abominable example— tell us, I say, O illustrious preacher of the Gospel, either you yourself, the Evangelist of Luther, or your Anointed One, Luther, whether committing and teaching such disgraceful things as these is preaching the Gospel?

Certainly, therefore, not the weaker souls (as I said before) keep aloof from you, but those stronger in the faith. They hold aloof not merely be-
ea tantum, quae vere narrantur de vobis, id est, ob ea quae tam scelerate passim vestra designat factio, propter quae Deus vltione manifesta facinorosam sectam persequitur; verum etiam quod talia vident esse vestra dogmata, quae pugnet exitialiter aduersus doctrinam Christi.

Qua in re quanquam habeant contra conatus vestros in plerisque omnibus aperta Scripturae verba, tamen quo minus dubitent in Scripturae sensu non hallucinari se, habent aduersus inconditos clamores vestros (quibus nimium solis probata vultis haberi, quae dicitis) primum sanctissimos quosque Patres, quotquot olim illustrati divinitus, et Scripturas elucidarunt, et optimorum exemplo morum, Christiani populi promouerunt pietatem. Habent deinde totius Orbis Christiani per tot aetates, quot a Christo passo fluxerunt adusque vestra tempora, perpetuum consensum: quem si contenditis absque Sancto Spiritu conspirasse, qui facit unanimes in domo; si videri vultis Ecclesiam totam per tot secula, seducente Diabolo, in unum consensus potuisse coalescere
cause of those things which are truthfully related about you, namely, the evil deeds which your faction everywhere commits (for which evil deeds God pursues the criminal sect with manifest punishment), but also because they see that your dogmas are such that they are in deadly opposition to the teaching of Christ.

And yet, in almost every instance they have passages from Scripture which are directly opposed to your position. However, to prevent any shadow of a doubt that they are misinterpreting the sense of the Scriptural passages, they also have against those disordered outcries of yours (and it is on the basis of these alone, to be sure, that you wish what you say to be considered as proved) in the first place all the saintly Fathers who in days past, divinely inspired, explained the Scriptures and by the example of their virtuous lives promoted the piety of the Christian people. In the next place, they have the constant agreement of the whole Christian world through all ages since the Passion of Christ even to your very own day. If you argue that they agreed without the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, if you desire to make it appear that the whole Church led astray by the devil could have united for so many centuries in complete accord
aduersus Evangelium Christi; quid aliud agitis, quam vt funditus omnem adimatis Christi Evangelio fiden? Quippe quod (vt ipsi fatemini) nee agnosci quidem posset, nisi commonstraret Ecclesia.

Habent aduersus vos et illud, quod ea quae iam do-
etis vos, pleraque omnia docuerunt ii, quorum errores
iam olim damnarunt Patres, quorum convictum semper ex-
possit Ecclesia, quorum impietatem supplicio detexit De-
us; quum vos e diverso nihil habeatis omnino, quod aduer-
sus beatorum Patrum vitas (quorum memorias tot aetates Ec-
clesia veneratur) prorsus possitis hiscere. Illi ergo
quum uniuersi nostram fiden propugnent, vestraque proster-
nant dogmata, quis non se declaret insanum, qui vestros
velit authores eo sequi, quo suus eos demersit error, ac
non iis malit adiungi, quos cum Christo regnare, nec vos
dubitatis, qui, quoad potestis, per odium illis atque inui-
diam detrahiritis? Nam initio, quum falso vobis esset persua-
sum, vos omnia solos scire, orthodoxae
against the Gospel of Christ, what else are you doing but destroying utterly all faith in the Gospel of Christ? That is obviously the case, since, as you yourselves admit, the Gospel could not even be recognized unless the Church were to point it out clearly.

They have against you this fact that almost all of those doctrines which you are now teaching were taught by heretics whose errors the Fathers condemned long ago, whose society the Church has always rejected, whose wickedness God has revealed by His punishment. You on the other hand, can find nothing at all to criticize in the lives of the blessed Fathers, whose memory the Church has venerated for so many ages. Since all these Fathers defend our faith and overthrow your doctrines, would not anyone prove himself insane who would wish to follow your authorities to that place whither their error has plunged them rather than to associate with those who, and not even you doubt this, are now reigning with Christ—you who in your envy and hatred defame them as far as possible? For in the beginning, you were falsely persuaded that you alone knew everything and that those zealous for the orthodox
fidei studiosis nihil vsquam legi praeter concertationes
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scholasticas, tum freti (vt videbatur vobis) aliena ig-
notantia, profitebamini sanctorum Patrum sententias vos
staturos. At posteaquam vos vidistis vestra spe atque
opinione falli, et iam decreta vestra passim sanctissi-
mororum virorum testimoniis redargui, tum vere vobis e su-
perbia tam immanis natus est liuor, vt dum Superis pudet
cedere, statueritis inferis omnia deouere. Sic ea de-
mum nata est apud vos et impia simul et insanissima blas-
phemia: Non curo decem Hieronymos, non curo centum Cypria-
nos, non curo mille Augustinos, non decies mille Chrysos-
tomos.
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Denique ne quid officeret luminibus vestris
Sanctorum cum Christo regnantium gloriosa maiestas et
splendor, aggressi estis conceptam de illis opinionem
reuellere, dignationem lacerere, autoritatem detrahere,
cultum omnem atque honorem, quoad potuistis, auferre.
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Sed illi, Pomerane, fortes et inuulnerabiles, et iam in
sublimi petra collocati, conatus vestros inualidos, vt
paruulorum sagittas, irrident. Honorantur enim,
faith read nothing except the arguments of the schools. Hence you relied, as it seemed to you, on their ignorance, and professed that you would abide by the opinions of the Fathers. But once you realized that you were deceived in your hope and belief and that your doctrines were everywhere opposed by the testimony of most holy men, then indeed such a wild passion sprang from your pride that, though ashamed to yield to the Saints in heaven, you determined to consecrate everything to the devils in hell. And so among you originated that impious as well as frenzied blasphemy: "I do not care for ten Jeromes, for one hundred Cyprians, for a thousand Augustines, for ten thousand Chrysostoms."

Finally, in order that the glorious majesty and renown of the Saints reigning with Christ might not obscure your glory, you attempted to root out belief in them, to attack their reputation, to destroy their authority, to take away from them, as far as you can, all reverence and respect. But the Saints, Pomeranus, strong and invulnerable, already firmly established on the lofty Rock, laugh at your feeble attempts as at the arrows of children. For the friends
et honorabuntur semper amici Dei, et viuet eorum memoria
in seculum seculi; quam eorum interim omnium, quos vester
error tam multiplex, ab haeretico quisquis erat primo,
per tot aetas habet autores, memoria perierit cum soni-
tu. Nam cum tot orthodoxi libri, per tot saecula sic ser-
uati sint, vt pretium cum tempore creuerit; haereticorum
omnium, paulo post suam cuiusque mortem, sic interierunt
opera, vt hodie nullius antiqui quicquam prorsus extet vs-
quam. Nec tamen olim, quam peribant illa, legibus adhuc
erat cautum, vt addicerentur ignibus: vt plane testatum sit,
ipsius Dei manu factum, vt haereticorum telae velut ara-
nearum casses deciderent, et per se neglectae sordibus et
situ funditus exolescerent. Nec dubium est, quin vestris
quoque laboribus (qui multo maiores moliantur Christianae
pietati perniciem) haud minus pernix instet atque incumbat
interitus, quem sanctorum interim Patrum (quantumuis ringa-
tur inuidia) et venerabilis erit memoria et in manibus
florescent opera [Patrum], e
of God are honored and will ever be honored; their memory will live for ever and ever. Meanwhile, even the remembrance of all heretics, from the very first whoever he was, whom your manifold heresy has held as authorities through the ages, shall perish with a noise. For while the works of countless orthodox writers have been preserved through the ages and their value has increased with the passage of time, the writings of all the heretics perished not long after death. Hence today scarcely a single work of any former heretic is extant anywhere. And yet at the time those works disappeared, no decree had been made that such books be thrown into the fire. This was to be unmistakable proof that it was done by the hand of God Himself, in order that the weapons of the heretics might vanish like spider webs and, thrown aside, crumble away completely in their own dust and dirt. And, without doubt, the threat of a no less speedy destruction overhangs your works which are busy contriving an even greater disaster for Christian piety. The memory of the holy Fathers, meanwhile, will be held in veneration (however much envy chafes) and their works will flourish on all sides; and from these works, the faithful
quibus adversus vestra venena (quibus alium Scripturae fontem inficis) assidue sugat populus fidelis antidotum. Quorum consensus Patrum, ut fortiter adversus vos consistit, ita non minus fortiter vestra vos oppugnat dissensio, qua non singuli solum pugnant inter se, verum etiam quisque passim dissentit sibi. Verum ut ista, quae dixi, multaque itidem alia Catholicos auertunt a vobis, ita procul dubio cordatos viros abstrahunt et illa factionis vestrae plus quam scelerata facinora.

Qua in re rursus ac rursus miror, ita me amet Deus, qua fronte possis scribere, mendacia confiingi de vobis, et eam esse omnem gloriam vestram. Adeo tibi fugit pudor omnis, ut austineas dicere, ea false factionis vestrae sicariis impingi, quae nec ipse nescis, nimium vere passim magno cum Germaniae tumultu, et tot millium internecione patrari? Et quum tam immania sint sacrilega illa facinora, quibus grassatur in praeceps effraenata licentia praetextu libertatis Evangelicae, ut vix vlla sit
shall constantly draw an antidote to the poison by which you pollute the blessed fountain of the Scriptures. Just as the unanimity of these Fathers stands strong against you, no less strongly does your own lack of union work against you. For you not only contradict one another but also each one of you frequently contradicts himself. But just as those points which I have mentioned and many others of like nature estrange Catholics from you, so also those numerous criminal activities of your faction certainly cause prudent men to withdraw.

Therefore I marvel again and again--so help me God--at the effrontery with which you can write that "lies are being made up about you and that is all your glory." Has all sense of shame so left you that you dare to say those crimes are falsely imputed to the cutthroats of your faction--crimes which even you yourself know well enough are being perpetrated everywhere, to the accompaniment of violent tumult throughout Germany and the slaughter of so many thousands? So frightful are those sacrilegious crimes in which your unbridled license riots fiercely, under the pretext of evangelical liberty, that there is scarcely
200 urbs in bona parte Germaniae, vix oppidum vllum, villa, domus, rusculum, vbi non ista vestra factio rapinae, stuprorum, sanguinis, sacrilegii, caedis, incendii, ruinae ac vastitatis tristissima monumenta reliquerit; tu nobis interim, Pomerane, quam Evangelice succinis? Haece est gloria nostra. Nec dignaris refellere, sed beatos praedicatas esse vos, quum vobis maledicunt homines. Recte ista, si mendacia in vos conffingentur. Recte, si ideo vobis maledicerent homines, quia vos bene faceretis. At nunc quid dicere possis ineptius, quum vos vere tanta mala et facitis, et docetis, ut maiora de vobis ne fingere quidem quisquam possit? Et quam praecclare gloriaris, quasi beati sitis, scilicet, quod vobis maledicant homines propter iustitiam: quum re vera propter iniquitates vestras, propter scelera, seditiones, caedes, rapinas, haereses, et perniciososa schismata meritissimo iure vobis et homines maledicant, et Deus?

Sed istud videlicet animos tibi facit, quod ista Wittenbergae non fiat: nam ita videris tibi praecclare moderari sermonem, quum statim ista subiungis:
any city in a large part of Germany, scarcely any town, estate, home, small farm, where that faction of yours has not left grim monuments of plunder, lust, bloodshed, sacrilege, murder, fire, ruin, and devastation. And meanwhile, you Pomeranus, in the true spirit of the Gospel, chime in: "This is our glory." Nor do you condescend to refute these charges, but you proclaim that you are blessed when men speak evil against you. True—if lies were being invented about you. True—if men were reviling you thus because you were doing good. But now, what more ridiculous statements could you make, considering that the evils you commit and teach are so great that no one could even invent greater ones? And how admirably do you boast, as if you were blessed, to be sure, when men revile you for justice's sake: whereas in reality both men and God deservedly and justly condemn you for your injustice, for your evil deeds, seditions, slaughter, plunder, heresies, and destructive schisms?

However the fact that such crimes are not committed at Wittenberg apparently fills you with pride. For you think that you qualify your remarks admirably, when immediately you add the following:
Neque tamen defendimus, si qui alibi prætextu Christianæ libertatis quid designent non Christianum: quandoquidem non omnes Christum induerunt, qui Christi nomen sibi vendicant.

Quam modeste, quam parce moderaris istud, Pomerane? Si qui, Si quid, Si alibi, Si non Christianum: quum intelligas, et ubique ferme, et omnes, qui quidem vestri sint, et omnia, non solum non Christiana, verum etiam passim designare plusquam Diabolica. Quod si Wittenberga sibi temperaret ab istorum societate facinorum, an id satis esse causae censes, unde vestris dogmatibus accrescat autoritas: e quibus videamus reliquam Germaniam totam concuti, periclitari, subuerti? Verum quis credat integrum scelerum Wittenbergam esse, qui videat ex illo fonte profluere totam istam lutulentæ coen colluuiiæ, quæ tam late terra omnes tetra peste perversi?

Integra scilicet Wittenberga sit, in qua Lutherus scelerum caput, malorum machinator et artifex, truculenti Dux exercitus castra sibi fixit; vbi legatis assidentibus vobis in horas initur consilium, quo non aliud quam de mouenda seditione, de
And still we do not defend ourselves if under
the pretext of Christian liberty, some men else-
where act in an un-Christian manner; seeing
that not all who claim for themselves the name
of Christ have put on Christ.

How discreetly, how modestly you qualify that
statement, Pomeranus? If some men—if elsewhere—if
in an un-Christian manner—and yet you know full
well that practically everywhere all who belong to your
party act not only in an un-Christian, but even in a more
than diabolic manner. Even if Wittenberg were to re-
frain from such crimes, do you think that is sufficient
reason why added authority should be given to your doc-
trines—doctrines by which we see all the rest of Germany
shaken, imperiled, overthrown? Yet who could believe
that Wittenberg is free from crimes, when he sees pour-
ing forth from that source a whole flood of vile filth
which has penetrated the countries so widely with its
black pestilence.

But undoubtedly Wittenberg is free from
crime—that city in which Luther, the source of crimes,
the designer and creator of evils, the general of a
murderous army, has made his camp. There, with you his
lieutenants at his side, he makes plans hourly to under-
take nothing less than the stirring up of sedition, the

Hoc certe miramur, cur sacrum Christi Evangelium quidam isthìc veròntur suscipere: propterèa quod de nobis mala dicuntur, ignorantès quod oportet Filium hominis reprobarì a mundo, et stultìtim haberi prædicationem Crucis.

Desine, Pomerane, mirari, et omnes vobis desìnte tam impense placere, quam falsò. Neque sic insanias-tìs, vt velitis e duobus aut tribus Apostatis, et a Christì fide transfugìs, totam aestimare Britanniam. Si minus ti-bi notus est populus (quem si pernosses, aliter sentiáis) si minus noti
undermining of faith, the wiping out of religion, the
profanation of sacrifices, the corruption of morals,
the prostitution of virgins, the destruction of virtue.
Thence, as from a general's tent, the signal is given,
the passwords are sought, the commands are issued, the
auxiliaries are secretly dispatched. You have hurled
a flaming torch into all Germany, and now the whole
world is aflame. With poisonous breath you are still
stirring up the disastrous fire. And although these
matters are too clear to be hidden, too wide spread
to be denied, and too harmful to be endured, how sancti-
moniously nevertheless do you address these words to us:

Certainly we marvel at this, why some in that
place, because evil things are said of us, fear
to receive the Gospel of Christ, being ignorant
of the fact that the Son of Man must be rejected
by the world and the preaching of the Cross be
reckoned foolishness.

Stop wondering at this, Pomeranus. All of
you, stop flattering yourselves so eagerly and so
wrongly. And do not be so foolish as to think you can
judge the whole of Britain from two or three apostates
and deserters from the faith of Christ. If the people
are not known to you (if you were fully acquainted
with them, you would think differently); if the Bishops
Pontificæs, (qui si cuiusmodi sunt, intelligeres, impro-
bam istam spem deposuisses), at vel ex eruditione notior
tibi sit necessæ est, quam vt eius dictiónem debeas tibi
corrumpendam sumere, huius incliti regni Princeps, non
magis inuictus, quam pius, quem sit inuictissimus. Is
quum iam pridem præceptorem tuum Sacramenta Christi op-
pugnantem clarissimis Scripturis et evidenti ratione pro-
strauerit: unde tibi tandem fiducia creuit, vt eius popu-
lum te speres posse seducere? An quod absque manuum impos-
sitio, contra sacras literas, contra Sanctorum dogmata,
contra totius Ecclesiae perpetuam consuetudinem, ausus es
Episcopi tibi nomen arrogare Wittenbergae, ibique, velut
officii sancti doctrinam salutarem, praeter inuictas hae-
reses alias, adiuncta tibi, quum Sacerdos esses, ac vo-
uisses castitatem, libidinis tuae socia, docere sis ausus
homines, Deo dicata vota negligere: idcirco viam tibi
factam consuevisti, qua Pontificis munus obieres apud Anglos,
atque id tam valde magnifice? Tanquam apud nos successus
omnis Evangelici negotii prorsus penderet a
are not known to you (if you understood their character, you would put aside that wicked expectation of yours); surely at least the Prince of this illustrious realm who is as devout as he is invincible ought by reason of his learning to be so well known to you that you would not attempt to corrupt his dominion. For long ago that Prince with very clear quotations from Scripture and with logical reasoning overthrew your leader who was attacking the Sacraments of Christ. What then is the source of your presumptuous hope of seducing his people? Or because, without the laying on of hands, and contrary to the sacred writings, contrary to the teachings of the Saints, contrary to the abiding custom of the whole Church, you have dared to take to yourself the title of Bishop of Wittenberg, and because there, with the companion of your lust beside you (although you are a priest and have vowed chastity), you made bold to teach men to disregard vows made to God, as if that were the life-giving doctrine of your holy office, did you think, therefore, that an opportunity was provided for you to assume the office of Bishop among the English and that in such a very magnificent fashion? As if among us, all the success of the work of the Gospel depended on
vobis, velut si vos hic bene audiatis, prosperet Evangelium: sin laboretis infamia, res Evangelica simul abeat retro.

Nae vos profecto magnifice fallimini. Nam nec Evangelium hic tam parui sit, neque vos tam magni, vt propter vos aut recipiatur, aut repudietur Evangelium. Sed nec Filius Hominis reprobatur a nobis, nec habetur pro stultitia praedicatio Crucis. Imo (quae scandalum Iudaeis est, et stultitia gentibus) ea Christi Crux gloria est Christianis nobis. Sed profecto ridiculum est, quoties audimus Lutheranos magnifice loquentes de Cruce, cum in Crucem ipsam Christi (quae sacrum et venerabile corpus eius in sua Passione, nostra vero redemptione gestavit) ipsorum Christus Lutherus, homo non vna tantum cruce dignus, tam impias passim blasphemias euomat.

Quas ne quis me putet fingere, legat, qui volet, execrandam eius concionem de Cruce. Quae scelerata concio, vna cum aliis eiusdem, et aliorum item et vobis, multo adhuc sceleratioribus libellis, quem nusquam
you, as if the Gospel would prosper if you were well received here, but if you should labor under ill fame, the work of the Gospel would suffer a similar setback!

**Truly you are wonderfully deceived.** For here neither would the Gospel be of such little value nor you of such great worth that it would be received or rejected because of you. The Son of Man is not rejected by us nor is the preaching of the Cross reckoned as foolishness. Nay rather that Cross of Christ, which is a stumbling block to the Jews and to the Gentiles foolishness, is a glory to us Christians. But surely it is laughable, to hear Lutherans speaking so often and so grandly about the Cross, while their Anointed One, Luther, (worthy of more than one cross) pours forth his impious blasphemies against the very Cross of Christ, which for our salvation bore his sacred and venerable body in its Passion.

That no one may think I am making this up, let him read if he wishes, his [Luther's] accursed sermon on the Cross. That villainous sermon, and other still more wicked pamphlets of his own composition and also of others from among your party are offered for
fere non prostant, nusquam non odorem tetrum et tartareum
virus exhalent; tu tamen, perinde ac si codices omnes
vestri dilaberentur e coelo, merum nectar, meram redolen-
tes Ambrosiam, non erubescis hoc pacto scribere:

Quid si verum esset, quod de nobis mentiuntur prop-
ter Christum: ipsi scilicet ideo non suscipserent a
Deo oblatum Evangelium salutis? Quid stultius quam
vt magis curiosus sis ad meam iniquitatem, quam ad
tuam salutem? Ideo tu nolis esse Christianus, quia
ego sum peccator?

Pape, quam praeclare simul et facete, scilicet! Quasi
mentiantur, qui te, cum sacerdos esses, et coelibem cas-
titatem promississes Deo, nunc duxisse dicant vxorem, id
est, quem videri velis Episcopus, publicum et perpetuum
esse acortatorem. Aut quasi mentiantur, qui de Lamberto
vestro, qui Franciscanus erat, ac de multis praeterea
Lutheranis alii idem praedicarent; aut mentiantur deni-
que, qui Lutherum ipsum dicerent, quum Augustinianus erat,
per stuprum iunxisse sibi, velut coniugem, diu iam dica-
tam et Deo direptam Monacham; aut qui vos omnes dicat hae-
reses impias et insanas inueherea, aut vestram factionem
clamitet
sale nearly everywhere; everywhere they breathe forth their disgusting stench and deadly poison. Yet, just as if all your books came down from heaven, fragrant with pure nectar and ambrosia, you do not blush to write as follows:

But even if the lies which they tell about us for the sake of Christ were true, should they for that reason refuse to receive the Gospel of salvation offered to them by God? What could be more foolish than for you to be more anxious to inquire into my sinfulness than to apply yourself to your own salvation? Because I am a sinner, are you on that account unwilling to be a Christian?

Wonderful! How brilliantly and elegantly put, to be sure! As if they are lying who say that you—a priest, who vowed to God a life of celibate chastity—have married; in other words, you who wish to appear a bishop are a public and continual fornicator. Or as if they are lying who say the same things about your friend Lambert, who was a Franciscan, or about many other Lutherans. Finally as if they are lying who say that Luther himself at the very time he was an Augustinian monk sinfully joined to himself as his wife, a nun, vowed long since to God and then snatched away from Him. Or as if he lies who says that all of you introduce wicked and insane heresies, or he who exclaims
multa passim flagitias designare. Quam rem nimmer veram esse; utinam non tot locorum miserae vastitates, non tot millium doctrina vestra seductorum strages miseranda comprobaret.

Sed ista tot scelera vestra tamen obstare non debent, quo minus recipiamus a vobis Evangelium salutis, quasi nunc primum per vos offerat nobis Deus Evangelium salutis. Evangelium ergo Christi, quod Evangelistae scripterunt, quod praedicarunt Apostoli, quod Sanctissimi Patres interpretati sunt, non erat Evangelium salutis? Nec hactenus a Christo passo quisquam seruatus est, quoad nunc demum vos elegit Deus, per quos seruaret mundum, ac miserias, et hactenus per Apostolos et Evangelistas, perditis et seductis mortalibus, offerret Evangelium salutis? Certe, Pomerane, si vera sunt ista (ut sunt profecto verissima) quae tu mentiris, nos mentiri de vobis, haberi non debet absurdum, si respicientes impietatem vestram, non satis fidamus vobis, nec satis credamus idoneos, qui (quum tam foedis vlceribus laboretis ipsi) salutem afferatis aliis. Nam sic hactenus per tot saecula non habuisissent Christiani verum Evangelium Christi
that your faction everywhere commits many crimes. Would that the lamentable destruction of so many places, the pitiable carnage of so many thousands led astray by your doctrine did not prove how true this is.

But doubtless those numerous crimes of yours should not stand in the way of our receiving from you the Gospel of salvation, just as if now, for the first time, God offers to us at your hands the Gospel of salvation! Therefore the Gospel of Christ which the Evangelists wrote down, which the Apostles preached, which the holy Fathers interpreted—was that not the Gospel of salvation? Has no one been saved from the time of Christ's Passion up to the present, when at last God has chosen you through whom He would save the world and offer the Gospel of salvation to wretched mortals, lost and led astray until now by the Apostles and Evangelists? In truth, Pomeranus, if those statements, which you falsely claim to be our lies about you, are true, as surely they are most true, it will not be absurd if, considering your impiety, we have not sufficient confidence in you nor think you sufficiently capable to cure others when you yourselves are afflicted with such dreadful sores. Surely if for so many centuries up to the present time Christians had not had the true Gospel
sed in fide Christi tota tot aetates errasset Ecclesia; non esset dubitandum, quin bonos et pios esset electurus Deus, quibus hoc demandaret negotii, vt in novitatem spiritus a carne reuocarent mundum, additus haud dubie tantae rei, quae fidel facerent praedicationi, miracula. Nec tantam rem tam negligenter ageret, vt quos olim suam fidem praedicare vetuit (quum per Prophetam peccatori dixit Deus: Quare tu enarras iustitias meas, et assumis testamentum meum per os tuum?) eos nunc demum solos, per quos praedicaretur, eligeret. Et cum eis credi vellet ab omnibus, nihil tamen omnino faceret, cur eis credere quisquam aut deberet, aut posset.

Nam quod Lutherus haberipostulat pro miraculo, quod tantum Christiani populi tam breui tempore a Christi fide in ipsius desciscat haereses; facit certe absurditas earum et insania, vt nonnihil monstr siadile video tur, quemquam, cui scintilla sit vlla sensus humani, tantum quanquam posse furiosae persuasionis admittere. Caeterum ad propositam vitae libidinosae licantiam populum
of Christ but if during all those ages the Church had
erred in the whole faith of Christ, there would be no
doubt that God would choose good and devout men to
whom He would entrust this task of calling the world
back from the flesh to the newness of the spirit.
Undoubtedly He would bestow the gift of miracles to
confirm faith in the preaching of such an important
matter. Nor would He carry out such a great task so
carelessly that He would now choose to preach His Faith
only those whom formerly He had forbidden to preach it
(since through the Prophet, God said to the sinner:
Why dost thou declare my justices, and take my covenant
in thy mouth?) And although He would wish all to be-
lieve in them, would He still give no sign at all to
show why anyone either ought or could believe in them?

For as to what Luther demands to be consid-
ered miraculous—the fact that so many of the Christian
people have in such a short time turned away from the
faith of Christ to his heresies—certainly the absurdity
and foolishness of those heresies does make it seem
something like a marvel that anyone who has a spark of
common sense could ever admit such an insane belief.
But that people should rush headlong to accept the offer
praecipitem ruere, id habet tantam miraculi speciem, quam saxa deorsum cadere.


Sed iam operae pretium fuerit, considerare paululum: quam tecte, quam timide doctrinae vstrae vlcus attingis.

Verum aiunt, inquis, rudiores: quis ista tam varia capere poterit? Disputatur enim de libero arbitrio, de votis et
of freedom to live licentiously has as much the appearance of a miracle as that rocks fall down.

Now as to that complaint of yours, Pomeranus: "Why do they not follow the rule of Paul: 'Prove all things; hold fast to that which is good.'" This one word of St. Paul overthrows all your teaching. For since in proving all things, we find that yours have absolutely no value, we hold fast to that which is good, namely, to that which we read was taught by those whose life and faith God Himself testified as pleasing to Himself. We reject your words because they are opposed to the life and teaching of the holy Fathers, and what is still more, they are opposed to the common faith of the whole Church for so many ages. And unless God direct her faith, the authority of the Gospel wavers and there is no real truth in the words in which He promised that He would be with her even to the consummation of the world.

But now it will be worth the trouble to notice briefly, how obscurely, how timidly you touch the sore point of your doctrine, You say:

But some rather ignorantly remark: Who can understand all these various doctrines? For they dispute about free will, about vows and
sectis monasticis, de satisfactionibus, de abusu venerandae Eucharistiae, de cultu Sanctorum, de statu defunctorum, de purgatorio. Alii aiunt: veremur, ne sub ista varietate lateat venenum.

Non recte rem accipis, Pomerane. Neque enim veretur quisquam, ne sub ista varietate lateat venenum. Imo videmus et scimus, verissimum esse et manifestum toxicum, quod vos his de rebus omnibus, non sobrie quidem dissersitatis, sed impie atque arrogantia decernitis. Nam quum nec nomine soleatis insectari Theologiam scholasticam, quod illic cum periculo veritas trahatur in dubium; a vobis falsitas pro indubio adversus verum asseritur, et quod illic pro argumento proponitur, id vnum apud vos pro veritate concluditur.

Quaeritur in scholis, sitne aliqua libertas arbitrii, an omnia temere agantur, an regantur fato: An divinae maiestatis voluntas indeclinabilis ab aeterno sic decreuit omnia, vt in tota rerum natura nihil admittat omnino, quod in vtramlibet partem sese
monastic orders, about satisfactions, about the abuse of the Holy Eucharist, about the veneration of the Saints, about the state of the dead, about Purgatory. Others say: We are afraid lest poison may be concealed under that variety.

You do not understand the situation correctly, Pomeranus. Indeed no one is afraid that poison may be hidden under that variety. Rather we see and we know that the poison is very real and very evident in all that you say on these points, not indeed in wise discussions, but in impious and insolent judgments that you make. For although you are accustomed to attack scholastic theology on the score that there the truth is called into question at great risk, by you the false is stated as certain, in opposition to the truth; and what Scholastics propose for the purpose of debate, that alone you take for the truth.

Many debates are held in the schools on such topics as whether there is any freedom of the will or whether all things are done by chance or are ruled by fate; whether the will of the divine majesty, unchangeable from all eternity, has so determined everything that in the whole nature of creation, the Divine Will admits nothing at all which can incline itself in either
possit convertere: An pugnent inter se humani arbitrii libertas, et Dei praescientia: Nostrae voluntatis libertatem an Adae peccatum peremerit, an perimat Christi gratia. Hae atque huiusmodi talia quum proponuntur in scholis, si sobrie disserantur et proposito pio, non exiguum certe fructum affect disputationio. Conueniunt enim in disceptationem nihil de fine dubii, quippe qui conclusiones earum rerum omnium firmas et inconcussas semper circumferunt secum, impressas videlicet cordibus Fidelium omnium ex fidei Christianae dogmatibus, plerasque etiam publico quodam communis sensus proloquio. Nam quotus-quisque est, qui quidem sensum aliquem habet rationis humanae, qui non sibi persuadeat, et Deum, qui facit omnia praescire omnia, et sese tamen experimento sentiat, actiones suas non aliena vi, sed sua voluntate peragere? Iam quum rationes aut Scripturae proferuntur adversus eam partem, quam illi veram habent atque infallibilem, utiliter exercent ingenia, et
direction; whether the freedom of the human will and
the foreknowledge of God conflict; whether the sin of
Adam took away altogether the freedom of our will, or
whether the grace of Christ annihilates it. When
these questions and others of such a nature are proposed
in the schools, if they are discussed with prudence and
with a devout purpose, the disputation certainly results
in considerable profit. For they assemble for the dis­
cussion with no doubt of the outcome, seeing that they
always carry with them firm and unshakable conclusions
on all these points, impressed, to be sure, on the
hearts of all the faithful in accordance with the dogmas
of the Christian faith, and very many of them from a
certain generally accepted axiom of common sense. For
how few are there with any notion of human reasoning
who are not convinced that God who creates all things
foreknows all things and who nevertheless perceive by
experience that they perform their own actions, not by
another's force, but by their own will. Now when rea­
sons or passages from Scripture are produced in opposi­
tion to the proposition which they hold as true and in­
fallible, they exercise their talents usefully; and by
adspirante Deo, qui pios conatus promouet, multa perspiciue
soluunt, de quibus et Deo gratias agunt, et non ipsi modo
iucundissimam atque honestissimam, addo etiam sanctissimam,
animi voluptatem capiunt, verum aliis etiam doctrinae scitu
dignae salubres fructus afferunt. Scripturas enim in spe-
ciem veritati contrarias clariorum collatione scripturarum
dilucidant. Quod si quis in sacris literis textum alicunde
quempiam ita durum arbitretur ac difficilem, vt ipsi nullius,
neque veteris cuiusquam, neque recentioris interpretatio sa-
tisfaciat, quo minus publico alicui fidei Catholicae arti-
culo videatur occurrere; statim succurrit illi, quod bea-
tissimus pater Augustinus admonuit, aut aliquam librorum
mendam impedire, aut eius loci sensum se non satis asse-
qui. Neque enim quisquam sacrarum literarum locus adeo
me commouere debet, vt si quid adversus ea dicere videatur,
quae pro certis et indubitatis articulis amplexa est Eccle-
sia Christi Catholica, a gnisiis et germanis fidei
the inspiration of God Who prospers devout efforts
they arrive at many clear solutions, for which they
give thanks to God and not only do they themselves re-
ceive therefrom a most sweet, honorable, and, I may
even add, a most holy intellectual pleasure, but also
they bring to others the health-giving fruits of doc-
trine worthy of knowledge. For by comparing clearer
passages of Scripture, they shed light on those Scrip-
tural passages which apparently are contrary to the
truth. But if anyone should think that a certain text
from one place or another in Sacred Scripture is so
hard and so troublesome that no interpretation either
ancient or modern satisfactorily prevents the passage
in question from seeming to oppose some generally re-
ceived article of the Catholic faith, immediately he
recalls the advice of blessed Father Augustine, that
either he has come up against a defect of the manuscript
or he does not sufficiently follow the meaning of the
passage. For no passage in Sacred Scriptures ought to
influence me to such an extent that if it should seem
to contradict those articles of faith which the Catholic
Church holds as established and certain, I would be
separated and turned aside from the legitimate and true
Christianaec dogmatibus dimouear atque depellar. Quippe quae certo persuasum habeam, eundem Spiritum cordibus inscripsisse fidelium, qui affuit scribentibus Evangelia, atque ideo quicquid illi scripserunt, Ecclesiae fidei esse consentaneum: si quale scriptum est, tale perseveret, et quo sensu scriptum est, eodem quest intelligi. Quod si aut vitium literis obuenerit, aut textus ex se sit obscurior, non est cur quisquam debebat minus habere pro certis, quae Christus docuit Ecclesiam suam, quam per Spiritum sanctum docuit omnem veritatem, et se cum ea promisit ad finem vsque seculi futurum: curaturum nimirum (quod precibus impetravit a Patre) ne vllis librorum mendis (quas per studiosorum hominum laborem sanctum repurgat indies) nullis literarum ambagibus (quas, quibus ipsi temporibus visum est, per eruditorum calamos virorum explicat) nullis tyrannorum persecutionibus (quos Martyrum suorum victoriis subiugavit) nullis haereticorum conatibus (quorum ora per
dogmas of the Christian faith. Indeed, I am convinced that the same Holy Spirit, Who inspired the writers of the Gospel, has written these truths on the hearts of the faithful, and therefore whatever the Evangelists wrote is in harmony with the faith of the Church—if it is preserved just as it was written, and if it can be understood in the same sense in which it was written. But if a mistake has occurred in the manuscripts or if the text is somewhat obscure of itself, that is no reason why anyone ought not to hold as true all that Christ has taught His Church, to whom through the Holy Spirit He taught all truth and with whom He promised He would abide even to the consummation of the world. Surely He would take very great care (as He begged from the Father by His prayers) that the faith of the Church should not fail because of any mistakes in the manuscript (which through the holy toil of scholars He is daily removing), nor because of any ambiguities in the words (which He has been pleased in these very days to explain through the pens of learned men), nor because of any persecutions of the tyrants (whom He has conquered by the victories of His Martyrs), nor because of any attempts of heretics (whose mouths He has stopped by the writings
orthodoxorum Patrum libros obstruit) nullis denique ma-
chinatoris Diaboli (quem ipse prostravit in cruce) fi-
des Ecclesiae possit deficere.

Quod si quid humanae rationis inter disputan-
dum videatur oppugnare veritatem, nihil ex ea re deperit
pietati, quando ea quae fidei sunt, certum sit atque ex-
ploratum, vt divina reuelatione fulciri, sic rationem om-
nem mortalium longissime superare. Itaque sicut quaedam
tanto spectamus iucundius, quanto minus eorum causam ra-
tionemque possimus deprehendere. Sic eo magis in suaussi-
mam divinæ maiestatis admirationem subuehimur, quo magis
ea dissidere videntur et inter se pugnare, quae simul ta-
men consistere et consentire sit indubitatissimum. Sic et
sine noxa, Pomerane, et non absque fructu, talia disputa-
ri possunt in scholis, quum vos interim, qui Scholasticas
disputationes tanquam veritatis altercatrices, et mys-
teriorum temeratrices inuaditis, conclusiones absurdissi-
mas, et haereses insanissimas aduersus homines omnes, ad-
uersus Deum ipsum credendas omnibus absque seria vila
disceptatione praescribitis.
of the approved and orthodox Fathers), nor finally be-
cause of any tricks of the Devil (whom He Himself on
the Cross overthrew).

But if in the midst of the discussion any-
thing should seem in the light of human reason to con-
tradict the truth, true piety will suffer no harm from
that since it is absolutely certain that as the articles
of faith are upheld by divine revelation so do they
far surpass all human reasoning. For example we regard
certain things with much more pleasure the less we can
understand their nature and cause. Thus the more those
articles of faith seem to be at variance and to oppose
each other, while at the same time they are most cer-
tainly consistent and harmonious, so much the more are
we elevated to a most agreeable admiration for the Divine
Majesty. Hence, Pomeranus, without harm and not without
profit, such topics are discussed in the schools. In
the meantime, you, who attack the scholastic dispu-
tions on the grounds that they call the truth into ques-
tion and violate the mysteries of faith, order that,
without any serious discussion, all must believe the
most ridiculous conclusions and foolish heresies, in
opposition to all men, in opposition to God Himself.
475 Et quicquid vanitatis asserit Lutherus, illud irrefragabile, et quod Graeci dicunt ἀκίνητον, haberī postulatis; vt rationem poscentibus impii atque insani dogmatis, satis haberī debeat, quod σωτῆς ἐφι, nimirum, quia se certum clamat ipse, dogmata sua se habere de coelo. Et quum praeter ipsius commenta stolidissima, contra perpetuam totius Ecclesiae sententiam nihil habeatis, tu tamen, Pomerane, vt conclusiones istas pulchre videaris adstruere, omnia fingis vobis a pertissimis sacrarum literarum testimoniiis esse comprobata.

480 Quasi vero nos agamus, incuis, persuasibilibus humanae sapientiae verbis, et non manifestissimis Scripturis, quibus ne portae quidem inferorum hactenus praevalere potuerunt; aut quasi aduersarii nostri aliud contra nos producant, quam statuta et traditiones humanas, quas damnat Dominus, Esaiae. 20. et Christus, Matthaei. 15. Quid ergo veneni hic timebis, dum in occulto agimus nihil, et omnia nostra toti mundo propemodum iudicanda?

485 Dixti, Pomerane, pulchre, quasi non Dei traditiones sint, quibus Ecclesia Dei nititur in Sacramentis et Articulis fidei. Quasique non istud vobis et alii praeterea viri docti, et Rex illustrissimus Angliae,
Moreover, you insist that whatever baseless statement Luther makes must be considered irresistible and as the Greeks say, inviolable. Those who ask proofs for the impious and foolish dogmas must be satisfied because "the Master has spoken," undoubtedly because he proclaims that he is certain he has received his dogmas from heaven. And although you have nothing to oppose to the enduring belief of the Church except his very stupid commentaries, nevertheless, Pomeranus, in order that you may appear to draw up your proofs handsomely, you pretend that all your doctrines are supported by the clearest testimony of Sacred Scripture; you say:

As if we would act on the persuasive words of human wisdom and not on the clearest passages from Scripture against which not even the gates of hell were able to prevail thus far; or as if our adversaries could produce against us anything other than human decrees and tradition, which the Lord condemns in Isaiah, 29; and Christ, Himself, in Matthew, 15. What poison therefore will you fear here when we do nothing in secret and set forth all our teachings to be judged by the whole world?

Bravely spoken, Pomeranus—just as if the traditions on which the Church relies in regard to the sacraments and the articles of faith are not from God!

As if the illustrious King of England, and other learned
ratione, scripturis et concordibus orthodoxorum Patrum sententiiis probasset apertissime, ad quae nemo vestrum hactenus verbum respondit vllum. Aut quasi vos Scrip-

500 turis probetis omnia, ac non potius glossematum ves-

orum somniis, aduersus veterum omnium doctissimorum et sanctissimorum sententias, sacrarum literarum Au-

thoritatem ad sacrilega dogmata vestra detorquentibus. Aut quasi non omnes haeretici semper idem fecerint,

505 quod nunc facitis vos; nempe vt venena sua toti propi-
narent orbi, et poculum circumferrent palam Scriptura-
rum melle circumlitum, quas ipsas non minus fiderer,

quam vos, clamabant esse clarissimas. Nam quid aliud

510 olim clamabat Ariani, quam quod nunc clamatis Lutheranis;

Scripturas esse pro se manifestissimas, aduersarios hu-

manis tantum statutis inniti, quae damnaret Dominus?

Quid aliud clamabant et haeretici omnes reliqui, et ip-

515 si cum primis Pelagiani? Quorum vos Lutherani tam stulte Scyllam fugitis, vt recta vos auferat error in Charyb-
dim. Quanquam sicuti vos intelligere non vultis, Dei

traditiones esse, non hominum, quibus Ecclesia nititur in rebus
men besides, had not very clearly proved that to you from reason, from the Scriptures, and from the harmonious opinions of the approved Fathers! To these proofs, not one of you has as yet answered one word! Or as if you would prove everything by Scripture and not rather by the vain imagining of your glosses which twist the authority of the Sacred Scripture to the support of your sacrilegious teachings, in opposition to the opinions of all the ancient and most saintly writers! Or as if all heretics have not acted just as you are now acting, namely, offering their poisonous doctrine to the whole world to drink, and passing around the cup openly anointed with the honey of the Scriptures which they no less boldly than you proclaimed were very evident. For did not the Arians in their day assert just what the Lutherans are now declaring, that in their favor there were the most evident proofs from the Scriptures, while their opponents were relying solely on the decrees of men which the Lord condemned? What else did all the other heretics maintain—and especially the Pelagians? You Lutherans flee the Scylla of these latter so rashly that error carries you straight into Charybdis. Yet just as you refuse to understand that the traditions on which the Church relies in matters
fidei: ita nescio an ipse satis intelligam, quod tu scri-

bis, nempe vos manifestissimis Scripturis agere, quibus

ne portae quidem inferorum hactenus praevalerent potuerunt.

Nam quod non agitis admodum persuasibilities humanae sapi-

entiae verbis, id vero et intelligo satis, et verissimum

esse confiteor. Caeterum illud alterum utram in partem

sumi velis, addubito. Vtrumne sic accipias, ut aduersus

Scripturas ipsas non potuerint hactenus inferorum portae

praevalerent; an aduersus positiones vestras, quas adorna-
tas et Scripturis palliatas a vobis, haberti vultis Evangel-
gelium salutis, quod nunc primum per vos oblatum coelitus,

gaudetis apud quosdam bene audire etiam in Britannia.

Quanquam non admodum magni referit, in utram

partem sumpseris, utrobique certe tantundem profeceris.

Nam si dogmata vestra vera sunt, et apertis firmata Scrip-
turis, quum ea nunquam hactenus Ecclesia Christi credi-
derit, quum ea semper exploserit, damnarit, exusserit, ne-

cesse est fatearis, portas inferorum aduersus Scripturas
of faith are of God, not of men, I too do not know whether I sufficiently understand what you write, namely, that you are acting with the authority of very clear passages from the Scriptures, against which not even the gates of hell were able to prevail thus far. For that you are not acting in accordance with the persuasive words of human wisdom—indeed I understand that quite satisfactorily and admit it to be entirely true. But as for that other statement, I am uncertain in what way you mean it to be taken. Do you mean that the gates of hell were not able to prevail thus far against the Scriptures themselves, or against your propositions, which adorned and cloaked with Scriptures, you wish to be considered the Gospel of salvation, offered now for the first time from heaven through you, and you rejoice, being well received among certain ones in Britain?

And yet it does not matter much in what way you take it, for in either case to be sure you advance just as much. For if your dogmas are true and confirmed by manifest quotations from Scripture, the fact that the Church of Christ has never up to now believed them, that she has always rejected, condemned and destroyed them, compels you to admit that the gates of hell have continuously up to the present prevailed against the Scrip-
Dei, hactenus praeualuisse perpetuo. Sin e diuerno verum est quod dixisti, portas inferorum nunquam prae-ualuisse contra Scripturas Dei, tum tu fateris, Ecclesi- siae fidem semper fuisse consonam Scripturis Dei.

Quam ob rem quum eadem semper fuerit dogma-tibus vestris aduersa, nonne vides, Pomerane, consequi, vestra ista praeclara dogmata Scripturis esse contraria? Alioqui si contendas Ecclesiam hactenus eadem sensisse, eadem credidisse semper, quae iam creditis vos (imo quae iam praedicatis vos: nam credere quae praedicatis, ita me amet Deus, nec vos opinor) ostende quaeo, quae fuit illa Ecclesia? Dic ante vos quando fuit? Dic quibus in terris et eris mihi magnus Apollo. Nam etsi vestrarum Haeresum alios aliae diuersis locis ac temporibus habuerunt authores, tamen qui tam multa simul et tam absurda crediderit, vt vobiscum in fide consenserit, non modo nullus vnquam popu-lus, sed nec vltus vsum homo, aut tam impius, aut tam stolidus ante Lutherum fuit.
tures of God. But if on the other hand that which you said is true, that the gates of hell have never prevailed against the Scriptures of God, then you are admitting that the faith of the Church has always been in harmony with the Scriptures of God.

Therefore since that same faith has always been in opposition to your dogmas, do you not see, Pomeranus, that it follows that your illustrious dogmas are contrary to the Scriptures? Otherwise if you maintain that the beliefs and opinions of the Church have been always the same up to the present as those which you now believe (rather, which you now are preaching; for, God help me, I do not think that you believe what you preach), show me, please, what was that Church? Tell me when it was, before your time? Tell me in what lands, and you will be a great Apollo to me. For although some of your heretical doctrines had some authorities, in different places and times, still who has believed at one and the same time so many and such foolish things, so that he would agree with you in your belief. Not only was there never any nation, but not even a single man, either so impious or so stupid, before Luther.
Quod si contendas fuisse quidem semper alii-quis, quanquam tam paucos, ut orbem latuerint, tam dispersos, ut coetum nullum fecerint, tam illiteratos, ut nihil scripserint, tam infantes, ut nihil dixerint, quorum tamen dispersio, vera semper Ecclesia fuerit; necesse est tamen fatearis, adversus istam Ecclesiam tuam, eos perpetuo scripsisse Patres, quos Ecclesia Chris-ti veneratur in Sanctis.

An tu igitur, Pomerane, speras, adeo stipites esse Christianos omnes, ut eis persuadere possis, quum Deus in Synagoga Iudaeorum curarit, ut sanctissimi alii viri post mortem haberentur in pretio, ne populo suo redderetur ambiguum, quos sibi proponerent imitandos; nunc in Ecclesia Filii sui permetteret, sanctos et fide-les omnes inhonoratos iacere, soli vero pro Sanctis im-pios et haereticos curaret, qui suis scriptis orbem to-tum seduxerint, atque ab Evangelii vero sensu praedica-tione falsa distraherent, eorum aliquot etiam decoraret Martyrio, omnes insigniret integritate vitae,
But if you insist that there always have been some—even though so few that they have been unknown to the world, so scattered that they never held an assembly, so uneducated that they have never written anything, so speechless that they have never said anything—whose scattered numbers nevertheless constituted a true Church, you must still admit that the Fathers, whom the Church of Christ reveres among the Saints, have always written against that Church of yours.

Or do you hope, Pomeranus, that all Christians are such blockheads that you can persuade them that, while God took care in the Synagogue of the Jews that some very holy men would be held in esteem after death so that the people should have no doubt whom they should propose to themselves for imitation, now in the Church of His Son, He would permit all the saintly and faithful souls to lie unhonored, while causing to be venerated as Saints impious and heretical men who have led the whole world astray by their writings, and by false teachings have drawn it away from the true meaning of the Gospel; that He would even honor some of them with martyrdom, would distinguish all by integrity of life,
nullos non illustraret miraculis, ne quis dubitare posset, eorum fidel placuisse Deo, quorum pietatem prodigiis salutaribus orbi declararit. Quid istud, obsecro, fuisset aliquid, quam id egisse Deum, ut ipsius opera sua falleretur Ecclesia? Necesse est ergo, Pomerane, velis nolis, eam fatearis Ecclesiam, cuius pars erant et Doctores illi, quos veneramur, sanctissimi Patres; quos si contendas in fide eunctos errasse, necesse est id concedas etiam, quod ante negasti, adversus Scripturas inferorum portas annos plus mille praeualuisse. Quamobrem si tibi perstandum censes in eo quod ante dixisti, portas inferorum hactenus adversus Evangelium praeualere non potuisse, omnino fatearis oportet, sanctissimos illos Patres recte sensisse de fide; quod ubi semel concesseris, quum et illud negare non possis, illos ista damnasse, quae vos docetis, quantumuis tergiuerseris, tandem tibi fatendum est ista, quae tam obstinate velut Evangelium obtruditis, esse falsissima dogmata.

Sed quam varietate doctrinae belle dogmatum vestrorum late confusam collunuiem cogas et constringas
would make some illustrious by miracles, lest anyone could doubt that their faith had pleased God whose piety He declared to the whole world by marvels of healing. What would that have been, I ask you, other than that God had acted thus in order that His Church would be deceived by her own works? Therefore, Pomeranus, whether you like it or not, you must admit that to be the Church to which those Doctors whom we reverence, those holy Fathers, belonged. If you maintain that all of them erred in the faith, then you must also concede what before you denied, that the gates of hell have prevailed against the Scriptures for more than a thousand years. Consequently, if you think that you must abide by what you said before, that the gates of hell have never up to the present prevailed against the Gospel, then certainly you must confess that those holy Fathers held correct opinions on the faith. Having once admitted this, and it cannot be denied, that they condemned those doctrines which you teach, whatever subterfuges you use, you finally will have to admit that those beliefs which you so obstinately put forward as the Gospel are utterly false.

But it is worth the trouble to notice how neatly you collect and briefly summarize in the words
in arctum, operaepretium est cognoscere, ais enim:

Et ne varietatem doctrinae excuses, breuiter dico; vnum tantum Articulum a nobis doceri, vtcunque quot-
tidie multa praedicemus, multa scribamus contra ad-
uersarios nostros, vt et ipsi salui fiant; est autem
Articulus ille: Christus est Iusticia nostra. Nam is
factus est nobis a Deo sapientia, iusticia, satis-
factio, redemptio. Quisquis hoc non dederit nobis,
non est Christianus: quisquis fatebitur nobiscum, a-
pud eum statim cadit omnis iustitia humana.

O compendium! Nihil igitur omnino scribitis,
nihil omnino docetis, nisi Christus est iusticia nostra?

Hoc vnum Pronuntiatum tam sanctum, omnia dogmata vestra
nam varia, nam inter se dissona, nam absurda, nam impia
complectitur? Sic vt si quis istud concedat vobis, quod
Christus est Iustitia nostra, idem sit necessario conces-
surus, in Eucharistia restare panem? nihil cuiquam pro-
desse Missam? Ecclesiam totam hactenus perperam sacri-
ficasse, hactenus vsam impio et sacrilego Canone, et Or-
dinem inane esse figmentum? Et haec erit bona conse-
quatio, Christus est iusticia nostra, ergo mulier ido-
nea est cui fiat peccatorum sacramentalis
"diversity of doctrine" the vile mixture of your dogmas,
poured out far and wide, for you say:

In order that you may not plead the diversity of doctrine as an excuse, I state briefly: only one article of faith is taught by us, no matter how many other things we may daily preach, no matter how much we may write against our enemies in order that they also may be saved; but that one article of faith is the following: Christ is our justice. For He was made for us by God, wisdom, justice, full satisfaction, redemption. Whoever shall not admit that with us, he is not a Christian; whoever will confess this with us, on his part immediately all human justice disappears.

What a summary! Do you therefore write nothing at all, do you therefore teach nothing at all except "Christ is our justice"? Does this one, holy statement embrace all your teaching, so varied, so discordant, so absurd, so impious? Does it follow that if any one would grant that one point to you, namely, "Christ is our justice," he likewise will necessarily concede that in the Eucharist the bread remains? that the Mass is of no avail to anyone? that the whole Church up to the present has sacrificed falsely? that she has employed an impious and sacrilegious Canon? and that the Sacrament of Holy Orders is a useless creation of the imagination? And will this be a logical conclusion, "Christ is our justice," therefore a woman is suited for hearing the sacramental confessions of
Confessio? Et mulier potest conficere corpus Christi? Et item haec, Christus est iustititia nostra, ergo nullum est Purgatorium? Et nullum est liberum arbitrium? Et nulla lex humana Christianum quenquam obligat? Et, Christus est iustititia nostra, ergo sola fides sufficit ad salutem, et non est opus bonis operibus? Et nihil damnare potest Christianum, nisi sola incredulitas? Et Christus est iustititia nostra, ergo Monachus ducere debet uxorem? Haec omnia dogmata, et multa itidem alia, nihil minus absurda, necessario scilicet consequuntur istam, Christus est iustititia nostra? Quid ne? Nam si is factus est vobis a Deo iustitia, quid opus est vobis iustitiam quaerere et persequii eam? Si factus est vobis sapientia, quid opus est vobis esse prudentes sicut serpentes? Si satisfactio, quid opus est vobis, sicut exibusitis membra vestra seruire immunditia et iniquitati ad iniquitatem, ita nunc exhibere membra vestra seruire iustitiae in sanctificationem? Si redemptio, quid opus est animam redimant viri diuitiae suae? Et tam perspicua rem explicasti, postquam hunc articulum protulisti, vt illico, velut re dilucide probata quibus oportuit iudicibus, subiungas:
siners? And a woman can consecrate the Body of Christ? and likewise, "Christ is our justice," therefore there is no Purgatory? And there is no freedom of the will? And no human law binds any Christian? And "Christ is our justice," therefore faith alone suffices for salvation and there is no need of good works? And nothing can condemn a Christian except unbelief alone? And "Christ is our justice," therefore a monk ought to marry? Do all these doctrines and many others no less absurd necessarily follow from that one, namely, "Christ is our justice"? What else? For if God has made Him justice unto you, what need is there for you to seek justice and pursue it? If He is made wisdom unto you, what need is there for you to be wise as serpents? If He is satisfaction unto you, what need is there that you, as you have yielded your members as slaves of uncleanness and iniquity unto iniquity, so now yield your members as slaves of justice unto sanctification? If Christ is redemption unto you, what need is there that the riches of a man should redeem his soul? And so lucidly have you explained the matter, after you have set forth this article of faith, that immediately you add, as if the statement had been clearly proved by any witnesses needed:
Quis quis autem fatebitur nobis cum, apud eum statim cadit quae cuncta alia iustitia humana. Nihil erit hic Pelagiani haeresis, quae, licet mutatis verbis, infecti sunt, qui vel solos se gloriuntur Christianos, nihil valebit omnis sectorum quae hodie sunt, et operum fiducia, quam (abnegato Crucis Christi scandal) nostri iustitiarii nobis inuexerunt, dum opera pro Christo venditarunt, contra quos et contra totius Sathanae regnum hoc argumentum fortissimum cum Paulo producimus: Si ex operibus et nostro arbitrio iustificamur, ergo gratis Christus mortuus est. Iustitia haec quae Christus est, testimonium habet in lege et Prophetis, ad Rom. 3. Quia autem suam iustitiam sequuntur, ad veram iustitiam, ut Iudaei, non permununt. ad Rom. 9. Iustitiae Dei subiecti non possunt. ad Rom. 10. Haec iustitia Dei tua est, dum per fidem suscipis Christum. Non enim pro se mortuus est, aut pro suis delictis, sed pro te et tuis delictis.

Igitur quicquid aliud tentaueris ad iustitiam, id est, unde justificeris, et liber sis a Dei Judicio, peccatis, morte et inferis; hypocrisia erit, mendacium, et impietas, quacunque pietatis specie fulgeat. Pugna bit enim contra Dei gratiam, et Christi erit abnegatio.

Non dubito, Pomerane, quin tibi videariss oppido quam praeclare dixisse; sed interim non aduertis, quod totus hic speciosus sermo duobus mendaciis mendacissimis innititur, quibus impudenter aspergis Ecclesiam, ut saecrosancta ista praedicatio vestra verum videatur Evangelium.

Nam primo falsissimum est, quod nos fingis haeresi Pela- giana, mutatis verbis,
But whoever will confess this with us, on his part immediately all other human justice disappears. There will be here no taint of the Pelagian heresy with which, though the terms are altered, they are infected who boast that they alone are Christians; not one of the religious orders which are in existence today will avail anything, nor will confidence in good works, which our Pharisees (having denied the stumbling block of the Cross of Christ) have introduced to us, while they have bartered works for Christ, against whom and against the whole kingdom of Satan, with Paul, we bring forth this very strong argument: If we are justified by works and by our own free will, then Christ died in vain. This justice which is Christ is attested by the Law and the prophets, according to Romans 3 [21]. But those who follow their own justice, like the Jews, do not attain to true justice, according to Romans 9 [30-31]. They cannot submit to the justice of God, Romans 10 [3]. This justice of God is yours while you receive Christ through faith. For He did not die for Himself or for His own sins, but for you and for your sins. Therefore whatever else you have attempted for justification, that is, whence you may be justified, and that you may be free from the judgment of God, from sins, death and hell; it will be hypocrisy, a lie and impiety, no matter what appearance of religion it may reflect. For it will oppose the grace of God and will be a denial of Christ.

I am sure, Pomeranus, that you think you have spoken as precisely as possible, but in the meantime you do not notice that the whole showy discourse relies on two of the blackest of lies, by which you impudently cast aspersions on the Church, so that your sanctimonious preaching may seem to be the true Gospel. In the first place, the statement you make that we are tainted with Pelagianism though the terms have been altered,
Deinde, quod nos mentiris, abnegato Crucis Christi scandalo, operum et sectarum inuexisse fiduciam, et opera venditare pro Christo, nos interim nunc appellans pro tua libidine Iustitiarios, nunc eos qui se solos esse Christianos gloriantur. Et profecto quamquam nihil magis abhorret ab Ecclesiae doctrina, quam ut quisquam sibi quicquam tribuat, tamen communi totius Ecclesiae nomine Catholicis Christianis licet verissime sancta quadam superbia gloriari, se solos esse iustos, se solos esse Christianos. Inter mortales enim extra Ecclesiam neque sancti quicquam est, neque Christianus quisquam.

Sed ad rem reuertar: Ecclesia quemadmodum non credit Pelagio, ad bene faciendum naturae vim ac facultatem sufficere cum generali quodam influxu gratiae, sed opus esse fatetur ad actum quenque bonum gratia quadam peculiari; sic vel magis dissentit vobis, qui gratiam Dei subdole studetis attollere, ut penitus auferatis humanae voluntatis arbitrium, dum eius libertatem nihil aliud asseritis,quam (vt vestris verbis utar) rem esse
is absolutely false.

In the second place, equally false is your lying statement that, after we removed the stumbling block of the Cross of Christ, we introduced confidence in works and in the religious orders, and that we barter works for Christ. Meanwhile you call us, according to your unrestrained passion, at one time Self-Justifiers, again those who boast that they alone are Christians. And surely, although nothing is farther from the teaching of the Church than that anyone should attribute anything to himself, nevertheless in the common name of the whole Church it is permitted Catholic Christians to exult with a certain holy pride that they alone are just, they alone are Christians. For among men outside the Church, there is nothing holy, nor is anyone a Christian.

But let me return to the point. As the Church does not believe with Pelagius, that the force and power of nature with a certain general assistance of grace is sufficient for doing good, but confesses that for any good act a certain proper grace is needed, so also she differs even more from you who are plotting craftily to exalt the grace of God in order that you may take away entirely the freedom of the human will, while you declare that its liberty is nothing else than a "matter of
de solo titulo, et nihil agere prorsus, sed duntaxat pati, nec aliter a Deo formari, quam ceram a manu artificis. Qua in re admodum errarunt Pelagiani, sed multo tamen perniciosius erratis Lutherani. Nam illi, quam nimium tribuebant naturae, hominem tamen inde tribuebant Deo, quem agnoscebant naturae conditorem. Praeterea quum faterentur difficulter admodum operari naturam relictam sibi, facilius vero suffultam gratia, necessitatem etiam relinquebant implorandae gratiae. At vos contra nihil relinquitis, quae habeatur Deo gratiae quisquam naturae nostrae gratia; quam, si vobis credimus, habemus talem, ut etiam post Baptismi gratiam satius esset ea caruisse, quippe quae quum hoc habeat, ut assidue labatur et concidat, ad resurgendum porrigenti gratiam Deo nec surgere contra sese, nec committi possit. Deinde dum pati tantum voluntatem nostram, et nihil omnino facere praedicatis: an non humanam omnem industriam, et conatum omnem ad virtutem
name alone" (that I may use your own words), and that
the will does absolutely nothing, but only suffers,
nor is it formed by God otherwise than as wax in the
hands of the artist. In this matter the Pelagians
made a great mistake, but the mistake of you Lutherans
is much more destructive. For although the former at-
tributed too much to nature, they, nevertheless, gave
honor to God whom they recognized as the Creator of
nature. Besides, since they confessed that it was very
difficult for nature left to herself to work but much
easier when supported by grace, they always left the
necessity of asking for grace. But you, on the other
hand, admit no reason at all why any grace should be
had from God for the sake of our nature: and if we be-
lieve you, we have such a nature that even after the
grace of Baptism, it would be better to have been de-
prived of it [grace] inasmuch as it [our nature] has
this characteristic that it continually slips and falls,
and that it can neither rise in opposition to itself nor
exert itself in order to ascend, though God is offering
it the grace to rise up again. Then when you preach
that our will merely endures and does not act at all,
do you not take away all human activity and all effort
tollitis? An non omnia manifeste trahitis ad fatum? Quum
voluntas per se secundum sectam vestram non solum sit male-
fica, verum etiam vertere non possit ad bonum, sed mera vo-
luntate Dei alius fingatur ad bonum, alius relinquatur ad
710 malum, non alio quam naturae merito, quam citra peccatum su-
um talem sortitus est homo, et is qui ad bonum sumitur, ita
fingatur ac formetur a gratia, vt nihil interea faciat aut
cooperetur ipse, sed velut arbor folia producit et fructus,
sic peragente in electis Deo, in reprobis natura, cuius eti-
715 am author Deus est, illi bona, hi mala proferant. Iam quis
non videt consequi, vt hae ratione vestra neque voluntas vo-
luntas sit, sed electione sublata homonihil distet ab ar-
bore, neque scelerum quicquam homini possit imputari, sed
vt bonorum, ita malorum quoque omnium causae necessario re-
720 ferantur in Deum, et clementissima illa natura Dei punire
credatur flagitia quae fecit. Quae opinio tam impia est et
sacrilega de Deo, vt dispeream, ni malim decies
toward virtue? And do you not openly attribute everything to fate? For according to your sect the will of itself not only is vicious but also cannot turn toward the good; but by the will of God alone, one person is formed for good, another is abandoned to evil, not for any reason other than that of the nature which man has been given, without regard to his own sin. He who is chosen for the good is so fashioned and disposed by grace that he meanwhile does nothing himself nor does he even cooperate with grace, but just as a tree produces leaves and fruit, so, when God works in the elect, and nature (of which also God is the Creator) in the reprobate, the former bring forth good fruit, the latter, evil. Now who does not see what follows, namely, that according to this reasoning of yours the will is not free but with all choice being taken away, man does not differ from the tree. Nor can any crimes be charged to a man, but as the cause of all good deeds must by necessity be referred to God, so also must the cause of all evil deeds be referred to Him, and that most sweet nature of God is believed to punish the very crimes which He Himself has caused. This belief about God is so impious and so sacrilegious that, may God help me, I would prefer ten times
esse Pelagius, quam semel ista credere, quae docet Lutherus. Sed Ecclesia quam improbatis, utriusque vitans errorem et vicissim improbans, voluntatem bene facere non credit absque gratia, sed gratiam credit omnibus non aliter ac lumen solis esse propositam, malos oblationem negligere, bonos amplexi, utrosque vero suae voluntatis arbitrio. Sic et per gratiam servatur, quisquis servatur, nec tamen otiosum est interim liberum voluntatis arbitrium, nec enim video quicquam, nisi per lumen. Et tamen aliquid ad id adiuto, dum oculos aperio et intendo aciem. Si quis in puteum demisso fune extra hat eum, qui per se non posset emergere, an non vere dicitur suis viribus non ascendisses de puteo? nec tamen ad id nihil ipsius vires contulerunt, cum et amplexus est funem, et non est passus elabi. Ad hunc se habet modum libertas arbitriui. Nihil enim potest absque gratia, sed cum eam liberaliter offerat Divina beneficentia, in bonis viris arbitrium voluntatis amplexititur, et bene cooperatur cum ea, in malis respuit voluntas, et marcescit in malitia.
to be Pelagius rather than even once to believe those doctrines which Luther teaches. But the Church, which you reject, avoids the errors of each and rejects each in turn. She does not believe that the human will can do good without grace, but she does believe that grace is offered to all just as is the light of the sun, that the evil pay no attention to it when it is offered, the good embrace it, but both by their own free will. So also whoever is saved, is saved by grace, and yet the choice of his will is not indifferent; for I do not see anything except by the light, and yet I give some assistance to the light when I open my eyes and direct my sight. If anyone, having let down a rope into a well, should draw up one who could not get out of the well by his own effort, would it not be true to say that he did not climb out of the well by his own strength? And nevertheless did his strength contribute nothing at all when he caught hold of the rope and did not allow it to slip away? In this way freedom of the will acts. For it can do nothing without grace, but when the Divine Goodness offers grace freely, in good men free will embraces it and cooperates with it in doing good; in evil men the will rejects grace and withers away in its malice.
Hoc est, Pomerane, quod credimus, neque vt tu mentitus es, Pelagio credentes, nec Pelagio deterioribus vobis, sed et divinae gratiae debitum seruamus honorem, et facinorosis hominibus amputamus ansam, quam vos por-rigitis, qua suae voluntatis obstinatam maliciam in Divinae voluntatis reliiciant ineluctabilem necessitatem.

Iam de operibus agemus paululum, in quibus quam impie erras ipse, tam improbe falsa sugillas Ecclesiam, quam docere mentiris, abdicato Crucis Christi scandalo, fiduciam in sectis et operibus esse collocandam, et opera venditare pro Christo. Primum quod ad Religiones attinet, quas vos sectas vocatis et schismata: non op-inor magnum esse flagitium, si sub uno duce Christo, alii sub aliis diversis veluti Tribunis militent, et dum om-nes bene atque ad Evangelicam normam ex praescripto Evangelico viuant, alius tamem aliter tempus transigat, et diversis virtutum generibus unusquisque in suo sensu abundet,
This Pomeranus, is what we believe; neither believing in Pelagius, as you affirm falsely, nor in you who are worse than Pelagius. Besides we preserve the honor due to God's grace and remove the pretext which you offer to evil men under cover of which they may refer the obstinate malice of their own will to the inescapable necessity of the Divine Will.

Now let us briefly take up the question of good works. Concerning this topic you yourself are in error with an impiety equal to the malice and perfidy with which you scoff at the Church. You affirm falsely that the Church having removed the stumbling block of the Cross of Christ, teaches us to rely on sects and works and that she barters works for Christ. First, as to what pertains to the religious orders (which you call sects and schisms)--I think it is not a great crime if under the one Commander-in-chief, Christ, some should fight under one captain, some under another. Provided all live good lives in accordance with the standard of the Gospel and the Evangelical counsels, one may pass his time one way, another, in another way; and each one may abound in different kinds of virtues according to his own capacity.
praesertim quum satis constet, et a sanctissimis viris inuenta et tradita, quae vos improbatis, instituta viuendi; et non solum plurimos insigni sanctitate viros inde prouenisse, verum etiam quantumuis aut aliquot Monachorum suo non satisfecerint Ordini, aut aliquot degenerarent Ordines ad mores circumfusi sibi seculi, tamen purissimam populi Christiani partem perpetue fussisse apud Religiosos. Qui tantum abest, vt alium sequantur pro Christo, vt ii sint potissimum, qui vendentes quicquid habebant et erogantes pauperibus, Crucem tollunt, et sequuntur Christum, dum vigiliis, ieiuniis et orationibus totam dedicantes vitam, et Agnum in castitate sequentes, carnem suam crucifigunt cum vitis et concupiscentiis.

Quod vitae genus si est, vt vos videri vultis, aduersus Euangelium, oportet Euangelicam vitam huic esse contrariam, hoc est, esse talem, vt se curet molliter, bene comedat, bene bibat, bene dormiat, libidinetur, et voluptute diffluat. Quod vitae genus si sit Euangelicum, negare profecto non possimus, quin vestri vitam
Moreover it is well agreed that the manner of living which you blame was founded and handed down by very holy men. Very many men of outstanding sanctity have been the product of that way of life, and even though some monks may be unsatisfactory to their orders and though some orders may degenerate under the influence of the world about them, yet the purest part of the Christian people has always been among the religious. So far are they from following another in place of Christ that it is they above all who, selling all they have and giving it to the poor, take up the Cross and follow Christ while dedicating their whole lives to vigils, fasts and prayers, and following the Lamb in chastity, they crucify their flesh with its vices and concupiscences.

And if this way of life, as you would like it to appear, is not Evangelical, then the Evangelical way of life must be quite different from that just described; in other words, it must be such a life that it cares for its body effeminately, it eats well, drinks well, sleeps well, is lustful and spends itself in pleasure. And if this latter kind of life be Evangelical, surely we cannot deny that your brethren lead a most
vivant Evangelicissimam, nisi quod ad virtutes istas tam praecelaras addunt vim tyrannicam, et plusquam ferinam
feritatem, qua contra Christianos et Deo deditos Fra-
tres ferocius fere quam vili vnquam Gentium Tyranni
saeuiunt.

Sed iam, vt dixi, veniamus ad opera, quae tu
nos fingis venditare pro Christo: nec id te pudet scri-
bere, cum nos et credere scias, et docere, opera nostra
neque bona fieri sine misericordia Dei, neque merere
quicquam sine fide Christi, at ne sic quidem coeli esse
capacita de natura sua. (Neque enim condignae sunt pas-
siones huius temporis ad futuram gloriam quae revelabi-
tur in nobis) sed immense benignitati Creatoris ita pla-
cuisse, vt operibus nostris, suapte natura tam vilibus,
tantum strueret pretio, et operas nostras, qui quem om-
nia fecimus, serui tamen inutiles sumus, neque quicquam
supra quam debuimus facere, fecimus, tam pretiosa mercs-
de conduceret.

Alioqui si nihil omnino valent opera nostra,
quantumuis in fide facta, quantumuis
Evangelical life, except that to such distinguished virtues, they add the force of tyranny and a ferocity more savage than that of wild beasts. They rage against the Christians and the monks dedicated to God almost more savagely than any pagan tyrants ever did.

But as I said before, let us come to the question of works, which according to you we barter for Christ. You are not ashamed to make that statement, although you know that we believe and teach that our works can neither be good without the mercy of God nor merit anything without faith in Christ, and in no way can they be entitled to heaven of their own nature. (For neither are the sufferings of this present time worthy to be compared with the glory to come which shall be revealed in us.) However it has so pleased the boundless goodness of the Creator that for our labors, so worthless in themselves, He prepared such a great reward, and He engaged our services for wages of such great value --and we, when we have done all things are still unprofitable servants and are doing no more than we ought.

Otherwise if our works are worth nothing at all, with however much faith they are done, with however
imbuta charitate, quantumuis adiuuante gratia (nam alio-
qui nihil esse, tute scis nos fateri), verum si ne sic
quidem valent quicquam; cur paterfamilias denario diur-
no otiosorum hominum operas conducit in vineam? Si ni-
hil valent ad homines liberandos ab ira, iudicio, pecca-
tis, morte, et inferis: quorum illud Baptistarum? genimina
viperarum, quis ostendit vobis fugere a ventura ira? Fa-
cite fructus dignos poenitentiae. Quorum illud Sapien-
tis? Sicut aqua extinguit ignem, ita eleemosyna extin-
guit peccatum. Quorum illud Apostoli? Si nosmetipsos
dijudicaremus, non vtique iudicaremur. Quorum illud
eiusdem? Sicut exhibuistis membra vestra seruire immun-
ditiae et iniquitati, ita nunc exhibete membra vestra
seruire iustitiae. Quorum illud Christi? Fac hoc, et
viues. Quorum illud denique quod in finali iudicio coe-
lum daturus est operibus misericordiae et eorundem omis-
sionem ac neglectum reprobis exprobraturus?

Si non sunt ista, Pomerane, mendacia (nec sunt
opinor, si verum sit Euangelium) nunquam potes effugere,
quin istud sit mendacium, quod ipse
much charity they are inspired, with however much grace they are aided (for you know that we admit they are nothing without that), but if they are not even worth anything at all, why did the householder engage unemployed men to work in his vineyard for a denarius? If they are of no avail to free men from wrath, judgment, sins, death and hell, why that word of the Baptist, Ye offspring of vipers, who has shown you to flee from the wrath to come? Bring forth therefore fruits worthy of penance? And that saying of Wisdom, As water quenches fire, so do alms wipe out sin? Or that of the Apostle, If we would judge ourselves, we should not be judged? Or another saying of that same Apostle, As you yielded your members to serve uncleanness and iniquity, so now yield your members to serve justice? Why that word of Christ, Do this and you shall live? Finally, what of the fact that at the Last Judgment He will give heaven for works of mercy, and will blame the wicked for the omission and neglect of those same works?

If these statements are true, Pomeranus, (and they are, I think, if the Gospel is true) you can in no way escape the conclusion that you are lying when you
scribis: hypocrisim esse, mendacium, et impietatem, pugnam contra gratiam Dei, et esse prorsus abnegationem Christi, quacunque sanctitatis specie fulgebant, si quis praeter fidei tentarit aliud: hoc est, si fidei iungat charitatis opera, sine quibus fides mortua est; si per fidei simul et opera conetur ad iustitiam, neque per opera pugnat contra gratiam, qui se fatetur absque gratia bene operari non posse, neque velut Pharisaicus confidit in operibus, qui et ea noui nihil absque fide valere, nec aliunde pretium quam ex mera Dei largitatem sumere. Sed illi plane pugnant contra gratiam, et Christum prorsus abnegant, qui in hoc duntaxat extollunt gratiam, et fidei Christi commendant, vt ablato bonorum operum (non damnosa fidelia, quam nos abunde tolerimus, sed) bonitate prorsus et fructu, reddunt homines ad bene faciendum tepidos. Ex qua segnitie et fidei brevi perdunt et gratiam, praesertim quum (vt nunc mores sunt) magis propemodum inhortandi sint homines ad bonorum operum frugem, quam
write: "It is hypocrisy, a lie and impiety, resistance to the grace of God, and a complete denial of Christ, no matter how holy it may appear, if anyone shall try anything else except faith": that is, if he joins to faith the works of charity, without which faith is dead; if he strives for justice through faith and through works as well. Moreover he who confesses that he could not do good works without grace does not by his works contradict grace; nor, like the Pharisee, does he put his confidence in works, because he knows that they avail nothing without faith and that they do not earn any reward elsewhere than from the bounteous goodness of God. But they openly attack grace and altogether deny Christ who extoll grace and commend the faith of Christ to such an extent that having taken away the merit and fruit of good works (not the accursed presumption, which we sufficiently remove), they make men lukewarm in their purpose of doing good. By means of this slothfulness, they destroy in a short time both faith and grace, especially because (as men's characters are now) they must be incited almost more to the fruit of good works than
ad ipsam, sine qua nihil valent opera, fide, quando non
paulo plures inuenias, qui malint bene credere, quam bene
facere.

Sed hoc in parte quam malam causam foveatis,
vel illud indicat, quod tam nihil omnino constatis vobis,
sed ita perplexe loquimini, vt cauere de industria videa-
mini, ne quis vos intelligat; ita posterius quodque ver-
bumb pugnat priori. Nam paulo post ita subiungis:

At hoc forte interrogabis: Quid de moribus, cultu
Dei, Sacramentis, et huiusmodi sentiamus, et decemus.
Respondeo, Christus est iustitia nostra, factus est
et Doctor noster: quicquid is suo ore nobis prodidit,
hoc docemus, quemadmodum et praeceptit. Matthaei
ultimo.

Et nos idem, Pomerane, fatemur, et docemus idem.

Sed tu, obsecro, nihil docebis alium, imo dedocebis omnia,
quaecunque Christus non docuit ore suo? Ergo quicquid an-
te Christum natum per Moisen et Prophetas docuit Deus, ea
dedocebis omnia, nisi quicquid eorum Christus docuit rursus
ore suo? Ergo dedocebis rursus quae Christus Ecclesi-
am docuit per tot sanctos Patres, Evangelistas, Martyres,
et Apostolos, nisi quicquid docuit ore suo?
to that faith without which works avail nothing, since you find many more who prefer to believe well than to act well.

But what an evil cause you cherish on that point is even shown by the fact that you do not agree at all among yourselves, but you speak with such confusion that you seem to be deliberately cautious lest anyone should understand you. Thus this following statement contradicts the former. For a little further on you add:

But perhaps you will ask this: What do we believe and teach about customs, the worship of God, the Sacraments, and such like matters. I reply, Christ is our justice, and He has been made our Teacher; whatever He proclaimed to us by His own lips, this we teach, as He commanded, in the last chapter of Matthew.

We likewise admit the same, and we teach the same, Pomeranus. But I beg you, tell me, will you teach nothing else, or rather, will you unteach everything that Christ did not teach by His own lips? Therefore whatever God taught before the birth of Christ through Moses and the Prophets, do you unteach all this, except whatever Christ taught again by His own lips? Again, will you unteach what Christ taught His Church through so many holy Fathers, Evangelists, Martyrs, and Apostles, except whatever He taught by His own lips?
Dic igitur, vbi te docuit istud ore suo, nihil aliud esse credendum, quam quod docuit ore suo? Dic, vbi docuit ore suo, dogmata ista, quae vos docetis orbem?

865 Dic vbi docuit ore suo, homini non esse liberam voluntatem? Vbi docuit ore suo, ei ducendam uxorem, qui ante voverat castitatem? Vbi docuit ore suo, amicam Lutheri aequalem esse Matri Christi? Vbi docuit ore suo, Missam nihil prodesse defunctis? Vbi docuit ore suo, nullum esse Pur- gatorium, sed animas etiam mortuorum dormire vsque ad diem extremi iudicii? Vbi docuit ore suo, abiliendam Crucem suam, et in tenebras quolibet abstrudendum, ne videlicet in suum cultum absumat aurum, quod aliqui recta ad pauperes isset, scilicet?

Tell me, then, where did He teach by His lips the doctrine that nothing else must be believed other than what He taught by His own lips? Tell me, where did He teach by His own lips those dogmas which you are teaching the world? Tell me, where did He teach by His own lips that man had no free will? Where did He teach by His own lips that he who had previously vowed chastity must marry? Where did He teach by His own lips that the mistress of Luther was equal to the Mother of Christ? Where did He teach by His own lips, that the Mass could not profit the dead? Where did He teach by His own lips, that there is no Purgatory but that the souls of the dead sleep until the day of the Last Judgment? Where did He teach by His own lips that His Cross should be cast down and hidden away somewhere in the darkness, lest, to be sure, for its veneration any gold be spent which otherwise would doubtless go straight to the poor.

I think that Christ did not teach these doctrines to Luther by His own lips, when He said: The poor you have always with you, but rather Judas, the Brother of Luther, taught them when he said: Why this loss? It could have been sold for much and given to the poor.
Ecce, Pomerane, qui tantum ea credi postulat- 
tis, quae Christus docuit ore suo, caetera tollitis 
omnia, quae Deus Ecclesiam docuit per Spiritum Sanctum, 
tamen ea docetis interea, quae neque Christus docuit, 
neque bonus quisquam homopossit tolerare.

Nam quod subiungis: Primum autem docuit Chris-
tus, hoc esse opus Dei, vt credamus in illum, quem Pater 
nobis misit: fatemur esse verissimum. Sed illud non fa-
temur esse verum, cuius unius causa tu istud allegas in 
medium. Allegas enim, vt occulte persuadeas, solam fi-
890 dem sufficere; verum timide tamen rem attingis, pleraque 
subticens mysticae doctrinae vestrae, quae frustra sub-
tices Magistri vestri libellis totum vulgata per orbem. 
Lutherus hoc scholae vestrae placitum declarat apertius, 
et rem definit aliquanto fortius. Nam is aperte scribit, 
895 quod nullum peccatum damnare potest hominem Christianum, 
praeter solam incredulitatem. Caetera omnia, si stet 
aut redeat fides, qua salui erimus per
Behold, Pomeranus, you who demand that only those things be believed which Christ taught with His own lips, you take away all that God taught the Church through the Holy Spirit; yet you teach meanwhile that which Christ never taught and which no good man can endure.

For assuredly, that which you add next:
"Christ first taught that this is the work of God, that you believe in Him whom the Father has sent to you,"
we grant to be most true. But we do not admit to be true that doctrine for the sake of which alone you introduce that quotation into the midst of your discourse. For you introduce it in order that secretly you may urge that faith alone suffices; but you touch on the matter timidly, keeping silent about a great deal of your mystical doctrines, though your silence is useless, since they are spread all over the world by the books of your master. Luther has declared more openly that this doctrine has been accepted by your school, and he defines the matter somewhat more bravely. For he states clearly that no sin can damn a Christian except unbelief alone. Everything else, if faith remains or returns (faith by which we will be saved according to
promissum Dei, protinus in momento prorsus absorberi a fide; ne quis necesse putet aut peccata confiteri, aut de commissis dolere, aut malefacta benefaciendo rependere, quae omnia manifeste tollit. Tu, quod dixi, timidius attingis rem, et quam callidissime potes, declinas eius assertionis inuidiam, dissimulans, quod ita praedices fidem, ut homines interim animes ad vitiain, virtutem dedoecas, sed tamquam sic intelligas, quod ais solam fidem sufficere, quasi qui fidem habeat, is necessario fugiat viti et amplexatur virtutes. Quae res si sic se haberet, tamen stultissimus esset hic tumultus vester, quo adversus opera bona tumultuineri.

Nam si bona sunt opera, quae necessario producat fides, quid aliud facitis, disputantes adversus opera bona, quam deblateratis adversus fructum fidei? Quod si nullum est bonum opus omnino, id quod plane vestra contendit factio, quomodo consistis tecum, quum dicis eum qui fidem habet, arborem esse bonam, quae non poterit suo tempore non ferre fructum bonum?

Quanquam istud si ita praeclise verum est, ut qui fidem habet, is necessario proferat opera bona; quae
the promise of God), immediately is completely swallowed up by faith. Hence, no one should think it necessary to confess his sins or to grieve for the wrongs he has done or to atone for his evil deeds by doing good, all of which he[Luther] clearly takes away. You, as I have said, touch upon the matter more timidly and as shrewdly as you can, you avoid the ill-will caused by his statement. You conceal the fact that you preach faith in such a way that you spur men on to vice and destroy virtue. When you say that faith alone is sufficient, it is as if you mean it thus, that he who has faith, as it were of necessity avoids vices and embraces virtues. But even if this were so, yet this storm which you are stirring up against good works would be most stupid. For if the works which faith of necessity produces are good, when you argue against good works, what else are you doing but babbling nonsense about the fruits of faith. But if there is no good work at all, as your faction openly contends, how are you consistent with yourself when you say that he who has faith is a good tree which must in its own time bear good fruit?

And yet if that is absolutely true, that he who has faith necessarily brings forth good works, why
ait Apostolus? Si habuero omnem fidem, ita vt montes
transferam, charitatem autem non habuero, nihil sum.
Quur illud ait? si fidem habeam sic, vt dem corpus me-
um vt ardeam, Charitatem autem non habuero: nihil mihi
prodest.

Frustra dicerentur ista, si fides absque chari-
tate non esset. Quod fides absque operibus mortua est,
quod daemones credunt et contremiscunt: frustra vobis al-
legem Epistolam Iacobi, quae quoniam vobis incommoda est,
desit esse vobis Apostolica. At Adam, opinor, Deo cre-
didit, nam, vt ait Apostolus, Adam non est seductus, et
tamen peccavit. Quod si cum fide potest consistere ope-
rari male, potest haud dubie cum fide consistere non ope-
rari bene.

Sed tu fortasse non credis Apostolo, qui nihil
credis aliud, quam quod prodidit ore suo Christus. Age
igitur, an non hoc prodidit ore suo Christus, quod ali-
quando venturi forent multi, qui dicerent ei: Domine, Do-
mine, nonne in nomine tuo prophetauimus, et in nomine tuo
daemonia eiecimus, et in nomine tuo virtutes multas feci-
mus? Et tunc confitebor illis, inquit, quia nunquam noui
vos. Discedite a me, omnes qui operamini iniquitatem.
An non hic locus aperte docet,
does the Apostle say: If I shall have all faith so as to remove mountains, yet do not have charity, I am nothing? Why does he say the following: If I shall have faith so as to give my body to be burned, yet do not have charity, it profits me nothing?

All those statements would be made in vain if there were no faith without charity. As to the fact that faith without works is dead, that the devils believe and tremble, to no purpose do I mention the Epistle of James, which, because it is inconvenient for you, ceases to be Apostolic as far as you are concerned. But Adam, I believe, had faith in God, for as the Apostle says, Adam was not deceived, and yet he sinned. But if it can be consistent with faith to do evil, without doubt it can be consistent with faith not to do good.

But perhaps you do not believe the Apostle, you who believe nothing other than what Christ said with His own lips. Come then, did not Christ say with His own lips, that at one time many would come who would say to Him: Lord, Lord, did we not prophesy in Thy name and cast out devils in Thy name and work many miracles in Thy name? And I will declare to them, He says, that I never knew you. Depart from me, you workers of iniquity. Does not this passage teach openly
fidel, etiam tam ingentem, ut sufficiat ad edenda miracula, tamen in quibusdam hominibus bonum fructum non ferre, nec eos homines propter immensam fideliam esse bonas, sed ficus prorsus aridas, radicitus excidendas, et conciliendas in ignem? Non est ergo, Pomerane, verum, fidel solam sufficere, et quicumque fidel habet, eum necessario producere fructum bonorum operum.

At quid ego tibi allego Christum? Quin allego potius Lutherano Lutherum? Audi igitur quid ille dicit, cuius apud te irrefragabilis est authoritas. Nihil, inquit, damnare potest hominem praeter solam incredulitatem. Nam caetera omnia, si stat aut redeat fides, absorbentur, inquit, a fide.

Si decennium totum meditatus esset, quonam pacto clarissime posset explicare, non aliud sentire se, quam scelerum genus omne patrari posse, salua atque incolum fide, non video profecto, quibus istud verbis potuisset enunciare lucidius. Nam verba illa, si stat fides, alio torquere non potes, quam ut manere fidel sentiat, dum fiunt scelera. Qua ex re facile vides
that faith, even so great as to be able to work miracles, still will not bear good fruit in some men, nor are these men, in spite of their great faith, good trees, but completely barren fig trees, to be torn up by the roots and cast into the fire. Therefore it is not true, Pomeranus, that faith alone suffices and that whoever has faith will necessarily produce the fruit of good works.

But why do I bring forward the testimony of Christ for you? Why do I not rather introduce the testimony of Luther to a Lutheran? Hear then what he says whose authority is supreme with you: "Nothing," he says, "can damn a man except unbelief alone. For everything else, if faith should remain or return, shall be swallowed up by faith."

If for the space of ten years he had meditated how he could explain in the clearest possible way his belief that every kind of evil can be committed if faith is safe and unharmed, truly I do not see with what words he could have stated that more clearly. For these words, "if faith should remain," you can not twist in any other way than that he means to say that faith may remain while evil deeds are done. Therefore, you can easily see that
consequi, non eam necessario bonum opus producere, quae potest cum malo consistere.

Apaeigitur, Pomerane, fucos istos, quibus impium dogma sic adornare studes, vt, dum solam fidem praecipis, bona simul omnia videaris imperare, tanquam habeatis persuasum, fide non arceri solum peccata necessario, sed etiam produci virtutes. Apertissime si-quidem docet, vt audisti, Lutherus, peccata omnia non illaesa tantum fide patrari, sed patranti quoque propter insitum fidei meritum non officere. Nam si stat, inquit, fides, peccata omnia absorbentur a fide.

Quanquam si te fortasse nunc praecceptoris tui pudeat, cuius impiam sententiam tam aperte vides omnibus renudatam involueris, et videri velis ipse sentire sanctius, verba tua profecto, Pomerane, non adeo con- cinnasti callide, quin omni luce clarius eluescat, illius impietatem te vel aequare certe, vel vincere. Nam primum aliquot Scripturae propositionibus aduersus bo-

na opera deblateras nempe illo: si ex operibus et
it follows that faith which can exist in company with evil does not necessarily produce a good work.

Away with those pretenses, Pomeranus! You eagerly adorn your impious dogma with them, so that while you teach faith alone, you may at the same time, seem to commend all good works, as if you hold it as certain that not only are sins necessarily prevented by faith but also virtues are produced. For Luther teaches very openly, as you have heard, not only that every kind of sin may be committed without wounding faith but also that they do not even harm the one committing them because of the inherent virtue of faith, "for if faith should remain," he says, "all sins are swallowed up by it."

And yet if perhaps you are now ashamed of your master whose wicked belief you see so openly laid bare of all its coverings and if you yourself wish to appear to have a holier opinion, you certainly do not order and arrange your words shrewdly enough to prevent their making as clear as daylight that you either equal his impiety or surpass it. First of all, with general passages from the Scriptures you rant against good works, for example, with the following: "If we are justified
nistro arbitrio justificamur, Christus pro nobis gra-
tis mortuus est. Quo in versu illud de libero arbitrio
addidisti ex arbitrio tuo, ne sacris in literis non
ageres sacrilegum falsarium. Quem Scripturae textum
nemo non videt, nihil derogare meritis bonorum operum,
quum nihil velit aliud, quam Christum gratis mortuam,
si ex operibus absque fide iusti redderemur. Neque e-
nim gratis mortuus est Christus, si nihil valent opera
sine fide, etiam si fidei copulata valeant plurimum, vt
ne adiiciam id dictum ab Apostolo de operibus legis Mo-
saicae.

Tum illud adiicisti: quod qui suam iustitiam
sequuntur, ad veram iustitiam, 
vt Iudaei, non perueni-
unt. Et illud: Iusticiae Dei 
subiici non possunt. Vbi
illud, vt Iudaei, de tuo rursus, ne quam Scripturam vi-
deri possis Iudaeo citare syncerius, admiscuisti. Por-
ro Pauli verba quum in his locum habeant, qui aut sola
putent opera legis iustitiam conferre sine fide Christi,
aut qui de suis operibus inani
by our works or our will, then Christ has died in vain for us." In this verse you have added of your own free will that phrase about free will, so that even in the Sacred Scriptures you might act the part of an impious forger. Everyone sees that this text from Scripture takes away nothing from the merits of good works, since it means nothing else than that Christ died in vain if by works without faith the just might be redeemed. For Christ has not died in vain, if works without faith avail nothing, even if works joined to faith are worth a great deal, so that I need not add that saying of the Apostle concerning the works of the Mosaic law.

Then you added the following: that "those who follow after their own justice, like the Jews, shall not arrive at true justice." And further: "They cannot submit themselves to the justice of God." There again you injected on your own that phrase "like the Jews," so that you could not seem to quote any passage from Scripture more sincerely than a Jew. Besides, although the words of Paul have an application in the case of those who think that the works of the Law alone confer justice without faith in Christ or of those who rave with empty boasting
effrarentur gloria; quid faciunt ad Christianos, qui nulla credunt opera quantumlibet bona, quantumlibet multa, compotem quenquam coeli reddere, nisi fiant in fide? Sed ne sic quidem aut fieri posse sine gratia, aut sui natura mereri beatitudinem, sed tam immensum ac supra meritum meritorum humanorum pretium a mera Dei gratuitate largientis et pacisentis proficisci.

Igitur ubi bona opera tam fabrefactis machinis oppugnasti, iam (tanquam expugnaris quae non attigisti) transis ad justitiam Dei, qui Christus est: cui, tanquam id quisquam neget, testimonia corrogas ex Lege et Prophetis. Sed quorum tandem afferas ista? nempe, vt rejectis atque explosis operibus, mortales vniuersos inuitares ad solam fiden.

Haec, inquis, justitia Dei tua est, dum per fidem suscipis Christum. Verum quidem istud est, neque mali haberet quicquam, nisi quod quam solicie commendas fiden, tam solicie repulisses opera.

Iam quod statim subdis: Non anim pro se, aut suis delictis mortuus est Christus, sed pro te, et delictis tuis: fatemur esse verissimum. Sed de te veremur, ne in hoc afferas, vt ex eius
about their own works, how do they apply to Christians who believe that no works, however good, however numerous, give anyone the right to heaven, unless they are done in faith? But not even then can they be done without grace nor can they merit beatitude by their own nature, but the reward so great and so far beyond the worth of human merits, proceeds solely as a free gift of God, Who promises it and bestows it.

Therefore, having attacked good works with such skillfully fashioned tools, now (just as if you had taken by assault what you never even touched) you pass over to the justice of God, Who is Christ; for which, as if anyone would deny this, you assemble proofs from the Law and the Prophets. But what purpose have you in saying this? Is it not that after you have completely rejected works, you might invite all men to faith alone.

"This justice of God," you say, "is yours, while you receive Christ through faith." This indeed is true nor would it be wrong except that as you eagerly commend faith, just as eagerly do you reject works. Now what do you immediately add: "For Christ died, not for Himself nor for His sins, but for you and for your sins." We confess that to be very true. But in your case we fear that you introduce it in order that on account of
fidei fiducia confirmae peccandi licentiam, libidi-
nemque reiicendi seuerioris vitae sanctimoniam.

Non recuso quin curiosus videar ad calumniam, nisi
tua ipsius verba quae sequuntur, non teneum quidem
aliquam suspicionis eius conjecturam insinuant, sed
apertissima documenta proponant. Sic enim subli-
cis:

Igitur quicquid alius tentaueris ad iusticiam,
id est, vnde iustificeris, et liber sis a Dei
iudicio, peccatis, morte, et inferis; hypocris-
is erit, mendacium et impietas, quacunque pie-
tatis specie fulgeat, pugnabit enim contra Dei
iustitiam, et Christi erit abnegatio.

Haec tua verba perspicue te declarant, in
hoc fidem docere, vt opera bona dedoces. Qua in re
perspicuum faciam, Lutherum, qui impietate caeteros
omnes vnum antecellit, abs te tamen vno longe lateque
superari. Nam is (quod ante recensui) ne quis putaret
quicquam sibi curandum quam flagitiosse viueret, fidem
scripsit omnia absorbere peccata. Cui tu sententiae
vt calculo tuo suffragareris, vbi quasdam commemorasti
virtutes, quas vos docere praedicas, (quam rem paulo post
efficiam, vt intelligent omnes, quam
a man's confidence in faith you may establish unrestrained license for sinning and the inordinate desire to reject a virtuous and mortified life. I admit that I may seem to be rather interested in finding fault with you, but your words which follow immediately do not merely imply a certain slight suspicion of this, but they set forth manifest proof. For you continue thus:

"Therefore whatever else you shall have tried for justification, that is, by which you may be justified and be free from the judgment of God, sins, death, and hell, it will be hypocrisy, a lie, and impiety, no matter what appearance of piety it may reflect, for it will attack the justice of God and will be a denial of Christ."

These words of yours clearly show that you teach faith for the purpose of unteaching good works. Therefore I shall make it clear that Luther, who alone surpasses all others in his irreverence, is far and wide surpassed by you. For Luther (as I have shown before) has written that faith swallows up all sins, so that no man might think that he need have any anxiety about how sinfully he is living. In order that you may support this opinion with your vote, after you have mentioned certain virtues which you say that you teach (shortly I shall bring it to pass that all may know how
falso praedicas) ita protinus adiunxisti:

Et quia in carne sumus, quicquid ex iis non fit, aut non satisfit, et quicquid adhuc peccatur, docemus cum Christo, ut iugitur oretur delicti venia, quemadmodum orare praecepit: Dimittte nobis debita nostra. Et propter istam fiduciam in Deum docemus, non imputari peccatum quod est in carne reliquum. Non enim inuenio in me, id est, in carne mea bonum, sed gratia Deo, quod Christus venit, non propter iustos, sed propter peccatores. Et publicani et meretrices praecedent iusticiarios Pharisaecos in regnum coelorum.

His tu, Pomerane, verbis, quod Lutherus ait, nihil hominem damnare posse praeter solam incredulitatem (nam fidem solam caetera absorbere peccata), eandem rem aliter explicas: nempe non imputari peccata, si quis eam habeat fiduciam in Deum, ut credat propter solam fidem suam peccata sua sibi non imputari. Ais tamen vos docere, ut fidei iungatur oratio, videlicet ista: Dimittte nobis debita nostra. In his ergo duabus, nempe sola fide cum oratione breuissima, tota vobis vel non imputandorum, vel
falsely you claim this), at once you added the following:

And because we are still in the flesh, whatsoever is not done in conformity with these virtues does not make satisfaction, and whatsoever sin is still committed, we teach with Christ that immediately pardon for sin should be implored, in the manner in which He commanded us to pray: "Forgive us our trespasses". And because of that confidence in God, we teach that the sin which is left in the flesh is not imputed to us. Indeed I do not find any good in myself, that is, in my flesh, but thanks be to God, that Christ has come not for the just but for sinners. And the publicans and harlots will precede the self-justifying Pharisees into the kingdom of heaven.

With these words, Pomeranus, you state in another way the same thing which Luther says, that nothing can damn a man except unbelief alone (for faith alone swallows up the other sins). You say that sins are not imputed to anyone who has such confidence in God that he believes that because of his faith alone, his sins are not imputed to him. Yet you say that you teach that to faith prayer should be joined, namely, those words: "Forgive us our trespasses." Therefore, in these two points, that is, faith alone, together with a very brief prayer, consists for you the whole sum of all the sins which are either not accounted sins, or
absorbendorum peccatorum omnium summa consistit, ut mortalibus per vos pateat per vitam in terra licentissimum mirum ad coelos compendium: quippe quibus deflendi peccati lachrymas, confitendi taedium, satisfaciendi fastidium, homines perquam benigni sustulistis. Atque in hac re nihil me narrando deprauare, nihil interpretando calumniari, tum verba tua testantur, tum ea, quae de Poenitentiae Sacramento scribit magister tuus in Captivitate Babilonica, liquidius omnini luce demonstrant.

Nomini igitur potest obscurum esse, eam esse non Lutheri modo sententiam, sed etiam, Pomerana, tuam: quod non solum absque bonis operibus, sed etiam cum flagitiis et sceleribus, sola fides sufficiat ad salutem. Caeterum vt coepi paulo ante dicere, tu non hac impetate contentus, ulterior tibi procurendum statuisti, nec ante desistendum, quam docuisses, bona opera non floccifacienda modo, verumtiam velut nocitura nobis et auersura Deum, sedulo cauteque fugienda. Tua enim verba, sicuti commemoravi, sunt ista:
are swallowed up, so that through you there lies open
to men throughout their life on earth a wonderfully
free and easy short cut to heaven; seeing that you
have very kindly taken away from them the obligation
of shedding tears for their sins, the irksomeness of
confessing them, the tedium of making satisfaction for
them. And your own words testify that in this matter
I make nothing worse in the telling, that I am not
guilty of any false statement in interpreting, and be-
sides, those statements which your master wrote in the
Babylonian Captivity on the Sacrament of Penance show
this more clearly than light.

Therefore everyone can see that this opinion
is not only Luther's but yours also, Pomeranus--the be-
lief that not only without good works but even with
criminal and sinful deeds, faith alone is sufficient
for salvation. But as I began to say a little while
ago, you were not content with this iniquity. You deter-
mined that you must go further and you did not stop un-
til you had taught that good works not only must be
made of no account but even considered harmful to us
and hostile to God, and that they must be avoided with
care and caution. Your words, as I have stated, are as
follows:
Haec iusticia Dei tua est, dum per fidem susci-
pis Christum. Non enim pro se mortuus est, aut
pro delictis suis, sed pro te, et delictis tuis.
Quiquid alius igitur tentaueris ad iustitiam,
id est, unde iustificeris, et liber sis a Dei
iudicio, peccatis, morte, et inferis; hypochri-
sis erit, mendacium et impietas, quacunque piet-
tatis specie fulgebil. Pugnabit enim contra Dei
gratiam, et Christi erit abnegatio.

Non utar hic oratorio more, vt in istorum tuo-
rum verborum impietatem inuebar. Neque enim oratione
cuiusquam opus est, vt bono cuiquam viro reddatur inui-
sus, qui tanto spiritu, tanto Serpentis antiqui sibilo,
tanto cum tartareo fremitu caeteras virtutes omnes,
praeter solam fidem, tam aperte, tam impudenter, tam
odiose blasphemat, ut eas vocare atque appellare non
dubitet hypochrisin, et impietatem, quacunque pietatis
specie fulgeant, et eas omnes non modo pugnare conten-
dat aduersus gratiam Christi, sed ipsum etiam Christum
prorsus abnegare.

Quum ista, Pomerane, dicis, quasso te, quid
dicis alius, quam Deum Patrem, vnigenitum suum non ob
aliud in terram destinasse, quam vt doceret mortales,
in hoc venisse se, ut eos omnes ab omni virtutum cura,
et labore liberaret, atque in omne flagitiorum genus
indulgeret impunem atque irrefrenatam licentiam? et
tandem post vitam talem in terris actam,
This justice of God is yours, while you receive Christ through faith. For He died not for Himself or for His own sins, but for you and for your sins. Whatever else therefore you have tried for justice, that is, whence you may be justified, and be free from the judgement of God, from sins, death, and hell, will be hypocrisy, a lie and irreverence, no matter what appearance of piety it may reflect. For it will oppose the grace of God and will be a denial of Christ.

I shall not, in the matter of the orators, rail against the irreverence of those words of yours. There is no need for anyone's words to make hateful to any good man, one who so openly, so impudently, so hatefully, with so much violence, with such a great hissing of the ancient serpent, with such hellish outcry attacks all the other virtues except faith alone, not hesitating to name them hypocrisy and irreverence, "whatever appearance of piety they may reflect," and contends that all these not only "oppose the grace of Christ, but even altogether deny Christ Himself."

When you make such statements, Pomeranus, what else do you say than that God the Father sent His only begotten Son to earth for no other purpose than to teach men that He came to free them from all care for virtue and from effort, and to give them a free and unbridled license for every kind of evil deed; and at length, after such a life passed on this earth,
1115 aeternam daret in coelo beatitudinem; tantum illud contra poscere, ne dubitaret ei quisquam hoc in promissione fiderem, ne forte si minus fideret, aut magis bonus, aut minus malus esset?

Quum haec, Pomerane, non solum tam impia

1120 sint, sed etiam tam absurda, quae sentis, vt nisi clarissimis verbis istam animi tui sententiam declarasses, nemo furturus esset, cui videri posses, quum esses homo, tam plane bellina sentire; adhibui profecto cogitatiorem et studium, si quid forte possem reperire, quod co-

1125 lorem saltem aliquam recuperet, quo putari queas, alius quipiam sensisse; quod tametsi nihil boni haberet aut honesti, at minus tamen aliquanto perniciosum ac sacrilegum videretur.

Quam in rem et tui causa simul et mea, quum

1130 memet diligenter darem (tua, quod me vehementer pudere tui, ac miseret: mea, quod cupiebam omnibus red-
dere testatissimum, illo me animo esse quo semper fui, vt aliorum scripta, quantum possem,
to give them eternal beatitude in Heaven, asking only
one thing, that no one should hesitate to trust Him in
this promise, lest perhaps if he trust less, he might
be more good or less evil?

These doctrines which you hold are not only
so irreverent but also so absurd that if you had not
stated that belief of yours in the clearest words, there
would be no one to whom it would seem possible that
you, a human being, could think and feel so like the
beasts. Therefore I honestly studied your words at-
tentively and carefully to see if I could find any-
thing at all which might at least offer another possi-
ble interpretation of your belief, which, though it
might have nothing good or honorable about it, at
least would seem a little less destructive and sacri-
legious.

To this task I gave all my attention, both
for your own sake and at the same time for my own.
I did it for your sake, because I felt great shame for
you and pitied you; for my own sake, because I wanted
to make it as clear as I could to everyone that I still
had the same spirit that has always been mine, desirous
of giving to all the writings of others, as much as I
omnia in meliorem partem cupiam et benigniorem flec-
tere), nihil tamen profecto nec inuenire quiui, nec
communisci quicquam, quod impietatis tam absurdae
non opinionem quidem aliquam de te conceptam, sed
certissimam hominum ex apertissimis verbis tuis na-
tam scientiam leniret.

Etenim dum tento omnia, dum nullum non saxum
museo, succurrebat istud: Quid si fingamus illum sen-
sisse sic. Quum dicit, hypochrisin esse, si quis aliud
quae r prater fide, non id quidem velle, quod sit
hypochrisis, aliam virtutem vllam cum fide coniungere,
1145 sed si quis aliam sibi sumat loco fidei, in qua sibi
fidat ac spem reponat absque Christi fide.

Sed haec interpretatio statim apparuit im-
pudentior, quam vt eam pudor meas vnum quam sustineret
defendere. Videbam illico vnuersos mihi reclamatu-
ros, improbablem ac nugacissimum effugii genus frus-
tra me esse commentum. Nam quasituros protinus, qui
fieri possit, vt ita, Pomerane, senseris, quam eos
omnes quos reprehendis, idem sentire non nescias.
could, a more favorable and kinder interpretation. But I certainly could find nothing nor recall anything which would serve as a milder interpretation not of that which is merely a preconceived notion of a senseless irreverence attributed to you, but of that which is the absolutely positive knowledge of men, derived from your own unmistakably clear words.

For while I was trying everything, while I was leaving no stone unturned, this thought occurred to me: What if I pretend that his meaning is the following. When he says, "it is hypocrisy, if anyone seek anything else besides faith," he does not maintain that it would be hypocrisy if anyone joins any other virtues to faith, but if anyone takes to himself, in place of faith, any other virtue in which he puts his confidence and places his hope without faith in Christ.

But this interpretation at once appeared too shameless for my modesty ever to attempt to defend. For I saw at once that all would cry out against me that I was contriving in vain a very base and trifling subterfuge. For immediately they would ask how can it be that you believe thus, Pomeranus, when you are not ignorant of the fact that those whom you attack believe the same.
Si quidem quis est eorum, inquient, omnium, aduersus quos ille scribit, quos Iustitiae-rivos appellat, quos pro Pharisaéis insectatur, qui virtutem villam credit sine fide prodesse? Itaque vel inuiti cogamur oportet fateri, nihil te minus quam illud, Pomerane, sensisse.

At fortasse tandem simulabis, hoc voluisse se te: non vetuisse videlicet, nequis praeter fides solam alias praeterea virtutes perseveratur. Sed istud monuisse tantum, ne villam quis caeterarum virtutum omnium, ne quod opus hominis, quantumuis bene factum, quantumuis praeditum et formatum fide, persuadat sibi, vel ad salutem consequendam, vel ad vitandum gehennae supplicium, villius omnino momenti fore; imo si quis eo animo bene statuat facere, quod illud sibi credit vel ad obtinendum coelum, vel ad declinandum gehennae flamam quicquam profuturum, eum non modo sese frustrari prorsus et fallere, verum etiam ob id ipsum, quod ita credit, et foelicitatem perditurum, et ad inferos praecepiitem, velut abnegato Christo, ruiturum.

Si sic te, Pomerane, velis intelligi, quid aliquid quam e fumo (quod aiunt) in
Indeed, they will say, does anyone, of all those whom he attacks, whom he calls self-justifiers, whom he reproaches as Pharisees, believe that any virtue without faith avails anything? And so even against our will, Pomeranus, we are compelled to admit that nothing is farther from your belief than that.

But perhaps finally you will pretend that you meant this: you have not, to be sure, forbidden anyone to pursue other virtues besides faith alone. However, you gave this warning merely to prevent anyone from persuading himself that any virtue among all the rest, that any work of man, however well done, however established and actuated by faith, would be of any worth at all either for achieving salvation or for avoiding the punishment of hell; more than this, if anyone should determine to do well with this intention that he believes his act will assist him either to obtain heaven or to avoid the fires of hell, he not only acts entirely in vain and deceives himself, but also on account of that very belief, he will lose happiness and will rush headlong into hell, as if he had denied Christ.

If you wish to be understood thus, Pomeranus, have you not jumped (as the saying goes) from the frying
flammam incidisti? Nam ego statim, Pomerane, abs te quaeram: si quis bona opera negligat, et committat mala, vtrum ea res ei coelum claudat, vel aperiat inferos? Si negas istud, nemini relinquis ambiguum, quod valde cupias tegere, eum esse te, qui mundum to-tum in vitia, proposita scelerum impunitate, pronouces. Sin illud, sicut est necesse, conserveris, nunquam negare poteris, quin si operum nostrorum malitia demergat ad inferos, eorum bonitas, quae divino opera-mur auxilio, ab inferis nos adiutet, atque aliquatenus reddat idoneos ad coeli promissum praemium. Etenim per- quam absurdum fuerit, ita tibi persuadere de Deo, tan-quam natura tam clemens, quam vitiiis decernat supple-cia, nullo virtutes praemio remuneret.

Verum quam absurda sit haeresis ista, quam aperte repugnet Scripturae sacrae locis aliquot, su- pra demonstramus. Etenim tametsi fatemur, neminem debere de sua virtute superbire, sed agnoscere bonorum operum pretium, non ex operum natura, sed liberalissima Dei aestimatione manare, nec ad ea ipsa facienda po-tuisse quenquam solis naturae
pan into the fire? For at once I shall ask you, Pomeranus: if anyone neglects good works and commits evil ones, does this circumstance close heaven to him or open hell? If you say it does not, you leave nobody in doubt about what you are very eager to conceal, that you entice the whole world to vices, since you take away the punishment of sins. But if you concede this, as is necessary, you could never deny that if the evil of our works plunges us into hell, the goodness of those works which we effect with the Divine assistance helps us to avoid hell, and to a certain extent makes us fit for the promised reward of heaven. And indeed it would be completely absurd so to persuade yourself concerning God, as if He who by His very nature is full of mercy would repay virtue with no reward although He would decree punishments for vices.

But we pointed out above how absurd this heresy is, how openly it contradicts the Sacred Scriptures in a number of places. For we admit that no one ought to pride himself on his own virtue and that he ought to recognize that the reward of good deeds flows, not from the nature of the works, but from God's most liberal reckoning; that no one by the powers of his own nature
suæ viribus absque peculiari gratia sufficere, denique merito quaque posse de suo facto metuere, ne forte latente quopiam vitio sit inf ectum; tamen de bene factis nostris et bene spera re possimus, et semper conari debemus, non ut sola fide seruemur, sed etiam declinando mala, et bona faciendo, ad vitam veniamus aeternam.

Nam infinitum illud et incogitabile praemium, quanquam nemini promisit infidelii Deus, adeo non promisit tamen soli fidei, ut non vno loco non vnum fateatur Apostolus, fidem solam quantumcumque magnum nihil omnino proficere, sed absque bonis operibus prorsus haberi pro mortua.

Porro quod operibus ipsis in fide factis tribuaturo praemium aeternum, an non illud aperte testatur quod ait Scriptura: Redemptio animae viridiuitiae suae? Non illud Evangelicum: Date elemosynam, et omnia munda sunt vobis? Non illud iudicatur quondam Christi, quo se daturum praedicat aeternam beatitudinem, velut mercedem praemiumque praestitiae liberalitatis in pauperes?

Vides ista, Pomerane, tam aperta esse
is able to perform these deeds without a particular grace; and finally that anyone can with justice fear that his own acts may be tainted with some hidden fault. Still, from our own good deeds, we can have favorable expectations, and we ought always to try, not that we may be saved by faith alone, but that by turning aside from evil and by doing good we may come to everlasting life.

For though God has promised that reward infinite and inconceivable to no unbeliever, still He has not promised it to faith alone, so that in several places, more than one Apostle confesses that faith alone, however great, avails nothing at all, but without good works faith is to be considered entirely dead.

Furthermore, does not the following passage from the Scripture clearly testify that everlasting reward is given to works done in faith: The ransom of a man's life is his riches. Does not that other passage in the Gospel prove it also: Give alms and all things are clean to you? And those words of Christ, who will come as judge, in which He declares that He will give everlasting happiness as a payment and reward for generosity shown to the poor?

You see, Pomeranus, so clear are the witnesses
Scripturae sacrae testimonia, ut quantumcumque te torseris, nihil vnumquam inuenturus sis, quod contra possis opponere. At tu fortassis homo sanctus fer-
re non potes nomen mercedes et praemii, sed ita gra-
tis hominem iubes seruire Deo, ut nihil inde pror-
sus retribuendae mercedes expectet, tanquam merce-
narii sit ac non filii, non insereire gratis et li-
bere, sed stipe seruire conductum.

Quis terram coelo non misceat, et mare coe-
lo, quum Lutheranus Episcopus, qui votum rupit, qui
fidelum fregit, qui sacerdotalen castitatem violuit,
qui conjugii nomine perpetuo voluptu voluntatem incestu, qui
de virtute loquutus clunem agitat, subito nobis ve-
lut et coelo demissus grauem istam ac seueram de co-
leando Deo normam edictumque proponat, ne quis bene
factorum suorum vnum expectat aut expectet praemium?
Si quis id optet ac speret, eum Christo non habendum
pro Christiano, nempe mercenarium esse, non filium.

Pudet, ut video, Pomeranum virum supra
communem sanctimonialis sortem sanctulum inter eos
con numerari mercenarios, quos paterfamilias denario
conducit in vineam. Hic vero
of Holy Scripture that however much you twist yourself, you can find nothing which you can offer as an objection. But perhaps you, a holy man, cannot endure the name of payment and reward, but you order a man to serve God without recompense in order that he may expect no return for his service, as if it would be the part of a hireling, rather than of a son, not to serve freely and for nothing, but hired for a fee.

Who would not be aroused and exclaim when the Lutheran Bishop—who broke his vow, who violated his priestly chastity, who wallows in continual incest under the title of marriage, who speaks glibly about virtue while he indulges his lust—as if sent down from heaven, would propose for us that weighty and severe standard and decree for worshipping God, that no one seek or expect any reward for his good deeds? Then he adds that if anyone should desire or hope for this reward, Christ does not account him a Christian; he must be considered a servant, not a son.

As I see it, Pomeranus—quite a holy man, above the common sort of sanctity—is ashamed to be numbered among those hirelings whom the householder hired to work in his vineyard for a denarius. He truly
tam generoso est animo, vt potius quam in vineam sese conducit sinat denario, extra vineam velit perire suspendi. Quis non videt, quam ille sit e sublimi velut illiberalem serum despecturus contempturusque Prophetam, quem non puduerit aperte profiteri, Deo se seruire propter retributionem?

At non videt interea prudentissimus pater, in quas se conicit et compingit angustias. Nam aut nihil praemii sperat atque expectat retribuendum fidei, et fidem iam non minus inutilem infructuosamque praedicat, quam ante praedicavit opera, aut fidei præstolatur mercedem, et in idem iam discrimen incidit. Propter quod ab operum bonorum praemio abhorruit, nempe vt fidem sibi faciat mercenariam.

Quod si respondeat non deberi, ne fidei quidem, beatitudinem ex natura fidei, sed Dei benignitatem sola sequituram, nec sequituram dubitandum quicquam, quum ita pepigit ac promisit Deus, et tamen haud ideo credendum esse Deo, vt praemium quod
is of such a generous nature that rather than allow himself to be hired to work in the vineyard for a denarius, he wished to perish on the gallows outside the vineyard. Who does not see how he from his lofty perch will look down upon and despise as an ungenerous servant the Prophet who was not ashamed to profess openly that he served God for His reward?

But the very prudent father does not perceive meanwhile in what straits he involves himself. For either he hopes and expects that no reward will be given to faith, and is now preaching that faith is useless and unfruitful, as before he preached about works; or he demands a reward for faith and falls now into that same difficulty which caused him to shrink from the reward of good works, namely, that he makes faith a hired servant for himself.

But if he should reply that blessedness is not due even to faith by the very nature of faith, but will follow from the goodness of God alone, and will follow without any doubt about it, since God has so declared and promised it; and yet that our faith in God must not be such that we pursue the reward
credenti promisit consequamur, sed eo animo et cogitatione accedendum, vt etiam si nihil vnquam commodi reportandum esset, nihilo tamen minus et eius dicto fidem haberemus, et ineffabilem eius Maiestatem colere-mus. Haec si mihi respondeat Pomeranus, fatebor illum tam vere sancteque dicere, quam rem nihil attingere.

Siquidem non est, opinor, tam stupidus, vt non intelligat, nihil hoc sermone se de fide loqui, quod non ex aequo competat in opera. Nam nec illa dicimus suapte natura talia, quae coelum sibi possint arrogare, sed liberaliter idem promisisse operibus nostris Deum, quod nostrae promisit fidei, nempe ita demum vtrisque se daturum coelum, si in amborum capacibus ambo coniungenterur. Alioqui qui ipsius adiuti gratia vtrumque possent, altero tantum niterentur, nempe qui vel sola fide, vel solis ingrederentur operibus, eos non in vitae via progredi, sed errore deceptos regredi.

Neque tamen quicquam impedit, si quis ieiunio, castitate, precatione et caeteris se virtutibus exerceat, quas tu, Pomerane, cum Luthero
which He promised to one who believes but we must approach God with such an intention and spirit that even if no benefit ever would be obtained, we would none the less have faith in His word and would worship His ineffable Majesty -- if Pomeranus would answer me thus, I will confess that he speaks so truly and so holily as not to touch the point at all.

For surely there is no one, I think, so stupid as not to understand that everything he says in this discourse about faith applies in an equal degree to works. For we do not say that good works by their own nature can obtain heaven, but that God has generously promised to our works the same reward which He has promised to faith, namely, that He would at length give Heaven to both, if both are united in their full capacity. Otherwise those who, helped by His grace, could do both, would rely only on one; those who would advance either by faith alone or by works alone, would not advance on the road of life but deceived by error would slip back.

But nevertheless if anyone should exercise himself in fasting, chastity, prayers, and other virtues (which you, Pomeranus, together with your friend Luther,
tuo destruere atque demoliri contenditis, quin eo pietatis euadat aliquando, vt sibi videatur ea facturus omnia, etiam si Deum sciret nihil mercedes omnino perpetuis eius laboribus redditurum.

Atque ego quidem vt animum istum pium, et cogitationes eiusmodi sanctas esse confiteor et exoptandas, ita non solum fidei atque operibus communes esse contendo, verum etiam plane confirmo, quisquis id quod tu, Pomerane, facis—operibus bonis praedictat nihil inesse boni, nihil opera bona sequuturum praemii, nihil adversus inferos opera bona prodese, sed per ea oppugnari gratiam, et Christum prorsus abnegari; eum non id conari modo, vt populum ad opera bona, velut rem inutilem atque infrugiferam, frigidum reddat ac segnum, verum etiam vt tanquam pestem aliquam noxiam ac laethiferam, mortalium omnium pectoribus bene faciendi studium reuellat atque reiicat, et quo dogmata sua magis adblendantur plebi, libidinis et licentiae lenocinio, facillimam illis in omne flagittii genus facultatemque indulgeat.

Igitur quam ea quae tu proponis tibi, manifeste, Pomerane, sint eiusmodi, quamque
try to destroy completely), nothing will hinder him
from advancing in time to such a degree of piety that
he would seem to himself ready to do all these things
even if he knew that God would give no reward at all
for his unending exertions.

And just as I for my part do admit that such
a devout spirit and such holy thoughts are to be greatly
desired, so I not only say but openly maintain that they
are common to faith and to works. Whoever preaches
(as you do, Pomeranus) that there is no good in good
works, that no reward will follow good works, that
they are of no avail against hell but that they attack
grace and deny Christ—a man of that type strives not
only to make people indifferent and sluggish toward
good works as useless and fruitless but also to pluck
out and remove from the hearts of all men the desire of
doing good as if it were some deadly and destructive
plague; and in order that by thus pandering to their
lust and licentiousness, his dogmas may entice the
people more, he would grant them the fullest opportunity
and freedom for every kind of vice.

Therefore, since those propositions of yours,
Pomeranus, are manifestly of such a nature, and since
videres istud ex verbis tuis, quae supra commemorauimus, tam aperte clarescere, ut vereri coeperis, ne nimium id liquidum esset, ac foret fortasse tam inuidiosum, ut ne malis quidem atque improbis hominibus ferendum videretur, exoriri quenquam tandem tam absurde nebulonem nequam, ut contra communem omnium tot seculorum sensum audeat, tam acerbe virtutes inuadere, et promouere flagitia; coactus es ipse dissidere tecum, et, quo venenatum spiculum, exertum iam plus satis et conspicuous, aliquo fuco tegeres, tam apertis vitiorum suasionibus et virtutum dehortamentis adiungere vos etiam virtutes, docere.

Quod tu quam false dicis, quanquam et ex sectae vestrae dogmatibus appareat, nec verba tua, quae supra nunc excussimus, ambiguum esse permittant, statim tamen quum ea ipsa verba ventilabimus, magis adhuc euidens atque illustrre reddetur. Interim operaepretium est videre, quam pulchro et spatioso putamine fructuam vestrorum marcidam plane putridamque carnem conuestias.

Ais enim hoc pacto:
according to your own words which I have related above, you saw that matter to be so clear that you began to fear that it would be too clear and perhaps would be so hateful that not even to wicked and shameless men would it seem bearable that there should rise up at length a complete rogue so foolish as to dare, contrary to the common sense of all ages, to attack the virtues with such harshness and to promote vices, you are compelled to contradict yourself; in order that you might cover with a certain pretense the poisoned barb, now more than sufficiently uncovered and conspicuous, you are forced to teach that you also join the virtues to such open incitements to vice and exhortations away from virtue.

And yet how falsely you say this is evident even from the doctrines of your sect. Besides, your own words, which we have discussed above, do not allow it to be ambiguous, yet as soon as we shall air those very words, it will be made still more evident and clear. Meanwhile it is worth while seeing with what a beautiful and handsome rind you cover the bitter and putrid flesh of your fruits, for you continue as follows:
Quisquis in illum crediderit, arbor bona est, et non poterit suo tempore non ferre fructum bonum; non quem fructum hypocrisis fingit, sed quem Spiritus Christi illie sua sponte producit. Qui enim Spiritu Christi aguntur, hi sunt Filii Dei. Soberie, atque pie, et iustc adorabit Deum in spiritu et veritate, non in elementis mundi, cibis et vestitu, aut alia hypocrisi. Sentiet de Sacramentis quod Christus docuit et instituit, formabit proximem doctrina, consilio, oratione, rebus, etiam cum dispendio vitae, nec solum amicos, sed etiam inimicos. Haec docuit Christus, ad haec trahit natura spiritus corda credentium, et nos haec omnium docemus facienda. Et quia in carne adhuc sumus, quicquid ex his non fit, aut non satisfit, et quicquid adhuc peccatur, docemus cum Christo, ut iugiter oretur delicti veniam, quemadmodum orare praecipit: Dnmite nobis debita nostra. Et propter istam fiduciam in Deum non imputari peccatum, quod est in carne reliquum. Non enim inuenio in me, id est, in carne mea bonum, sed gratia Deo, quod Christus venit, non propter iustos, sed propter peccatores, et Publicani et meretrices praeecedant justitiarios Pharisaeos in regnum coelorum, quicquid hic obganniet os iniqum, quod nos alia docemus. Deus per Moysen dicit: Quisquis Prophetam illum, id est, Christum, non audierit, ego vltor existam. Audiant hoc contra se Dei iudicium, Evangelii hostes. Et Pater clamat super Christum: Hune audite. Et Christus: Oues, inquit, meae vocem meam audient, et non alienorum.

Paulo post excutiemus ista, quae sunt in speciem tam sancta, an tam vere
Whoever shall have believed in Him, is a good tree and in his own time must bear good fruit; not the fruit which hypocrisy feigns, but which the Spirit of Christ in him produces of His own will. For whoever are led by the Spirit of Christ, they are the sons of God. Soberly, piously and justly he will adore God in spirit and in truth, not in the elements of the world, in food and in clothing, or with other hypocrisy. He will believe concerning the Sacraments what Christ taught and decreed, he will assist his neighbors with doctrine, counsel, prayer, goods, even at the cost of his own life, not only his friends, but even his enemies. Christ taught these virtues, to these the Spirit draws the hearts of the faithful by their nature, and we teach that all these things must be done. And because we are still in the flesh, whatsoever is not done in conformity with these virtues does not make satisfaction and whatsoever sin is still committed, we teach with Christ that immediately pardon for our sin should be implored, in the manner in which He commanded us to pray: "Forgive us our trespasses." And because of that confidence in God, we teach that the sin which is left in the flesh shall not be imputed to us. Indeed I do not find any good in myself, that is, in my flesh, but, thanks be to God that Christ has come, not for the just but for sinners. And the publicans and harlots will precede the self-justifying Pharisees into the kingdom of heaven however much hostile lips may snarl at us that we teach otherwise. God said through Moses: Whoever does not hear that Prophet, that is Christ, I will be the revenger. Let the enemies of the Gospel hear this judgment of God against them. And the Father says of Christ: Hear ye him! And Christ says: My sheep hear my voice and not the voice of strangers.

In a little while we shall examine those statements which appear so holy, to see whether they are in truth as
sancta sint, quam videntur esse. Nam quod orandum sit pro peccatis, miror id afferre te, tanquam partem hu-
ius nouae Doctrinae vestrae, quasi nos, qui vobis per contumeliam tam falso quam saepe Pharisaei vocamus et Iustitiiarn, non dicamus orationem Dominum, neque nos fateamur esse peccatores. Illud certe magis ad-
huc miror, quod tu vel orare suades, vel eorum quic-
quam facere, de quibus ais, Nos haec omnia docemus fa-
cienda. Nam cur suades quicquam, si nulla est libertas arbitrii? Cur hortaris, vt orem, vt proximos consilio
formem, doctrina promoueam, rebus adiutem, nec vitae me-
ae parcam dum aliis prosim, si mihi nullo modo sit in manu,
vt horum quicquam faciam? Deum duntaxat orare debes, vt
haec in me peragat omnia, non etiam adhortari me, vt in istorum quicquam connitar, si nec adiutus gratia quic-
quam cooperor, sed omnia duntaxat patior.

Quis hortatur lapidem, vt sese formet in sta-
tuam? Quis aerem hortatur, vt pluat? Terram quis horta-
tur, vt germinet? Si fato
holy as they appear. For as to the fact that pardon must be implored for sins, I marvel that you bring this up, as if it were a part of this new doctrine of yours, just as if we, whom you frequently and falsely call in insulting manner Pharisees and Self-Justifiers, do not say the Lord's prayer and do not confess that we are sinners. I certainly marvel still more at those words in which you urge us either to pray or to do any of those things about which you make this statement: "We teach that all these things must be done." For why do you urge anything if there is no freedom of the will? Why encourage me to pray, to assist my neighbors with advice, to help them with counsel, to aid them with material goods, and not to spare my life provided I can be of assistance to others, if I have no way at hand by which I may do any of those things? Surely you ought to beg God that He would accomplish all these things in me but not exhort me to strive toward any of those things, if I do not cooperate at all with the assistance of grace, but am only acted upon in all respects.

Who encourages the stone to form itself into a statue? Who encourages the heavens to let fall the rain? Who encourages the earth to bud forth? If every-
procedunt omnia, neque quicquam prorsus libere sit ab hominibus, id quod mordicus tenetis Lutheran, nihil profecto causae reliquisti tibi, quur aut quenquam ad virtutem commoueas, aut castiges noxium. Nec habes omnino quicquam quod obligationis adversariis, si nihil libere faciunt, sed omnia coacti fato, nisi te fortasse respondeas, nec ista quidem, quae scribis ipse, tua(te sponte scribere, sed instinctu fati.

Sed et hoc, Pomerane, miror, quum ista quae tu facienda suades (si modo suades, vt dicis) eadem pleraque sint, quae suademus et nos, et quae bona sunt opera, cur nominatim toties adversus bona opera deblateras? Nam si contemnis, cur suades? Si suades, quur contemnis?

An fieri quidem talia permiseris, sed eadem vetabis opera bona vocari? At quur tu sic vocari prohibeas, quum sic appellat et Deus? Haec, inquit, mulier bonum opus operata est in me. An ideo displicet, quia quum bonum sit, vocatur opus hominis? At hoc ipsum ipse testatur Christus,
thing proceeds by fate, and absolutely nothing is done freely by men (a doctrine to which you Lutherans hold tooth and nail) surely you have left no reason why you should either rouse up anyone to virtue or chastise evil-doing. And if your adversaries do nothing freely but everything by the compulsion of fate you really cannot blame them at all, except perhaps you will answer that even those things which you yourself write, you write not of your own free will but by the urging of fate.

But I also wonder at this, Pomeranus, since those things which you urge must be done (provided you do urge them as you say) are for the most part the same things which we also urge and which are good works, why do you rave on so often by name against good works? For if you despise good works, why recommend them? If you recommend them, why despise them?

Or do you indeed permit such things to be done but forbid them to be called good works? And why do you prevent their being so called, when even God thus names them. He said: This woman has wrought a good work upon me. And shall it be displeasing that a work of man be called good when it is good? But Christ Himself, in
cui vni te scribis credere. Nonne dixit: Bonum opus operata est mulier? An non idem dixit similibus vestri Iudaeis: Si filii Abrahæ estis, opera Abrahæ facite?


Christus eos dedisse dicit, et collegisse; vos vtrunque negatis. Deum enim fecisse dicitis omnia, ipsos nihil omnino, sed tantum passos in se facientem Deum. Ille crudelitatem exprobrat immittibus, imputans quod esurientem non cibarint, sitientem neglecterint, hospitem sub dio contemptserint. Quam inclementer imputabit omnia, si aut nihil horum facere, ne adiuti quidem gratia queant, aut, ne valeant, citra
Whom alone you write that you believe, bears witness on this very point. Did He not say: The woman has wrought a good work? And did He not say likewise to the Jews who resemble you: If you are the sons of Abraham, do the works of Abraham?

Now why do you, who demand the clearest proof from Scripture in every matter, here turn your back on such clear quotations from the Scripture? In how many places does Christ both order and forbid? If we ourselves do not act, what would be the purpose of the following words? I was hungry, He says, and you gave me to eat. I was thirsty, and you gave me to drink. I was a stranger and you took me in.

Christ says that they gave, and that they took in. You deny both. For you say that God did everything, they themselves did nothing but passively allowed God to act in them. He blames the hardheartedness of the uncharitable, holding it against them that they did not give food to the hungry, that they neglected the thirsty, that they scorned the shelterless stranger. How harsh will He be to hold all these against them, if they would be able to do none of these things, not even when aided by grace, or if, lest they should be able, grace is with-
demeritum sum subtrahatur gratia?

Quid vos ad haec Lutherani? Quid aliud quam
loca quaedam contra congeritis e Scriptura sacra, quae-
cunque libertatis humanae vires videntur adimere, et re-
ferre peccatorum nostrorum causas in Deum? Deinde vel
citatis illis perperam, vel intellectis nequiter, tri-
umphum buscinatis aduersus Pharisaeos et Iustitiarios,
dissimulantes interim tot loca turpiter, quae vestras
acies obruunt atque prostrernunt, et vestra subinde sus-
cinentes, ad ea quae vel soluunt vestra, vel proferum-
tur contra, nihil respondetis omnino. Nisi quis forte sic
insaniat, ut ab Luthero bene putet esse responsum ad
Scripturas illas, quas eruditissimi viri et de Christi
Ecclesia bene meriti Diatribe pro Arbitrii Libertate
protulit. Quibus sic omnino respondit Lutherus in eo
libro quem inscrisit de Servo Arbitrio, ut interim
plane declararit, quam furiouso daemoni, dum illa scri-
beret, ipsius serviebat arbitrium.

1430 Quid enim affert aliud aduersus clarissima
illa verba Scripturae? Si vis ad vitam
drawn without any sin on their own part.

What do you Lutherans answer to these statements? What else than to pile up in opposition any passages from Sacred Scripture which seem to take away the force of human liberty and to refer the cause of our sins to God? Then either quoting them incorrectly or understanding them maliciously, you blast triumphantly against Pharisees and Self-Justifiers. You conceal meanwhile, in a shameful manner, numerous passages which overwhelm your battle lines and lay them low. Then you chime in with your own arguments, though you make no answer to all those passages which either cancel yours out or argue against them, unless anyone would be so insane as to think that an excellent answer was made by Luther to those passages from the Scripture which were quoted in the Diatribe for the Freedom of the Will by a man very learned and deserving well of the Church. To these Luther replied in that book which he entitled The Enslaved Will in such a manner that meanwhile he openly showed what a furious demon his own free will was serving when he was writing it.

For what does he bring forward to refute those most clear words of Scripture: If thou wilt enter into
ingredi, serua mandata, et alia eiusdem generis in-
numera, quibus tam aperte quam passim arbitrii nostri
libertatem sacrum testatur Eloquentium; quam quod illa
ironice dicta sint omnia? Quod Deus ideo scilicet
hominem iussit facere, quia sciebat hominem facere,
quod iussit, non posse, commentum tam insanum, vt (si
hos excipias, qui libenter in istud dogma velut per-
niciosae licentiae viam discedunt, et necessitatis is-
tius opinionem cupide amplexantur in scelerum suorum
patrocinium) neminem sis inuenturus alium, qui non
stolidissimum istud responsi genus irrideat, detes-
tans et subsannans interim vanissimi viri glorias in-
sanissimas, quibus tam assidue Sardonio cum risu ges-
tiens, victorias, trophaea, triumphos buccinat, et se
tam praecclare praedicat respondisse, vt nec Diabolus
nec Angelus possit euincere. Quasi vero difficile
sit nebuloni, vbi meras eblateruit insanias, illico
furiose clamare, tam egregia disseruisse sese, vt nemo
possit dissoluere.

Quin Lutherо ipsi quam
life, keep my commandments and countless other passages of a similar nature in which clearly and frequently the sacred Word testifies to the freedom of our will? He asserts that all these statements are made in irony! That God ordered man to do this, undoubtedly, because He knew that man was not able to do what He commanded—an interpretation so insane that (if you except those who gladly go over to that doctrine as to a way of ruinous licentiousness and for the defense of their own crimes eagerly embrace the belief in that necessity) you will find no one else who does not laugh at that very stupid answer, detesting and deriding meanwhile the frenzied boastings of that empty-headed fellow who exulting continuously, with a sardonic laugh, trumpets forth his victories, his trophies, his triumphs, and proclaims that he has answered so well that neither the devil nor the angel of light could surpass him. Just as if it would be difficult for a scoundrel when he has babbled forth his unadulterated insanities, immediately to shout out furiously that he has produced such eloquent and illustrious arguments that no one could refute them!

Nay more, Luther himself declares most clearly that
absurda videantur ista, quae respondet Diatribae, et
ipsius praedamnata conscientiae, tum quam indigna cen-
seat, quae aliiud quam risum aut stomachum cuiquam mo-
usant alii quam haeresis suae fautoribus, lucidissime
declarat ipse, quum aperte fatetur responso suo, nemi-
nem capi posse, nemini persuaderi quicquam, nisi qui
legendis ipsius libris hausisset spiritum. Quod quid
aliud est, quam ea quae respondet omnia, caeteris, qua-
lia sunt, uninuersis fore conspicua, nempe absurda, in-
sana, sacrilega; eis duntaxat visum iri formosula,
quorum oculis caliginem haeresis Lutheranae studium et
fauor offuderit, quosque ex lectione Lutheranorum libro-
rum spiritus idem, qui Lutherum furii agitat, reiecta
fide Christi, dementauerit?

Ita vides, Pomerane, quam pulchre soluitis
eas Scripturas, quae pro arbitrii libertate proferum-
tur adversus vos. Quibus aut dissimulatis omnino, aut
insanissime refutatis, aliquot vicissim loca pro vobis
aduersus Ecclesiam proponitis. Quorum quum
he considered his answer to the Diatribe very absurd and condemned beforehand in his own conscience, and that he considered unworthy those arguments which to anyone other than the favorers of his own heresy would cause only laughter and vexation, he himself declares most clearly. He openly confesses in his answer that no one can be won, no one can be convinced of anything except he who, from reading his books, had caught his spirit. Does that not mean that to all other persons, it will be clear that his entire reply is stupid, mad, sacrilegious; it will seem enticing only to those over whose eyes the zeal and favor for the Lutheran heresy has spread a mist and to those who, from reading Lutheran books, have been deprived of their senses by the same spirit which torments Luther with its violent passion and have rejected the faith of Christ.

So you see, Pomeranus, how well you explain away those passages from Scripture which are cited against you in behalf of the freedom of the will. You conceal them altogether or you refute them violently. In turn you propose on your side some passages from the Scriptures against the Church. Although some of
quaedam efferantur per hyperbolam, omnia vero (quod ex constanti sanctorum Patrum interpretatione constat liquidissime) nihil aliud velit, quam et quosdam immanni voluntatis praeitute meritos, tandem destituit gratia, (quos obdurare dicitur Deus, quod eis omnino decreuerit gratiam suam nunquam offerre denuo, quae saxe corda remolliat) et neminem prorsus esse mortalium, qui quicquam possit sine Deo; id quod nos plane fatemur.

Quis enim neget quod affirmat Veritas, quae dicet: Sine me nihil potestis facere, et, Nemo potest venire ad me, nisi Pater, qui misit me, transierit eum. At vos eo vesaniae progresimini, vt hominem contendatis nihil omnino facere, ne cum Deo quidem, nec ad Patrem venire cum tractu, sed trahi duntaxat inuitum, non consentem cum trahente conscendere; quum Christus contra manifeste monstrat, se paratum semper trahere, sed non trahere si quis nolit trahi. Quoties, inquit, volui congregare filios tuos, quemadmodum gallina congregat pullos suos sub alas, et
these are statements made by hyperbole, in truth, all (whose meaning is most clear from the constant interpretation of the holy Fathers) mean nothing else than that certain ones, deservedly because of the utter depravity of their wills, have at length been deprived of grace. God is said to harden these because He has decreed finally never again to offer them His grace, which would soften hearts as hard as rocks. They mean that there is no human being who can do anything without God and we openly profess that very belief.

For who would deny what Truth Himself affirms, who says: Without Me you can do nothing, and, No one comes to Me except the Father who hath sent Me draw him. But you reach such a height of madness that you insist that a man does not act at all, not even with God, and that he does not come to the Father with His help but is drawn, in a manner, against his will, that he ascends without any effort on his part to assist God who is drawing him. Yet Christ on the other hand showed clearly that He is always prepared to draw a man to Himself but not if anyone is unwilling to be drawn. How often, He says, would I have gathered together your children as a hen doth gather her chickens under her wing and thou
noluisti?
Quin quo in loco maxime videtur opera nostra deprimere, ut humanam retundat arrogantiam, tamen ibi quoque vires et libertatem nostrae voluntatis ostendit.

Quum feceritis omnia, inquit, quae praecepta sunt vobis, dicite: serui inutiles sumus. Quod debuimus facere, fecimus. Ecce, qui soli Christo credere vos iactatis, iam nec illi creditis. Ille nos ait facere; vos contra quod dicit ille negatis, et vos asseritis duntaxat pati.

I nunc et iacta, Pomerane, vos docere quaecunque prodidit ore suo Christus. Quin et hoc demiror, si formare proximos oratione, consilio, et rebus adiuuare, etiam cum vitae dispendio docetis; quo id consilio docetis: Si non modo nihil valent ista aduersus Judicium, peccatum, mortem et inferos, sed etiam recta deducunt illuc. Sic enim paulo supra scripsisti: hypocrisin esse, mendacium, et impietatem, et impugnationem gratiae, et abnegationem Christi, si quis aliud tentet, quo libertur a peccatis,
wouldst not.

Nay more, in that passage in which He seems to lower the value of works so that He might restrain human arrogance, even there He displays also the strength and freedom of the human will. When you have done all things, He says, which are commanded to you, say we are unprofitable servants. What we ought to have done we have done. Behold you who boast that you believe Christ alone, now you do not believe Him. He says that we act; you on the contrary deny what He says and assert that we only are acted upon.

Go ahead and boast, Pomeranus, that you teach whatever comes from the lips of Christ. I also marvel at this: if you teach men to assist their neighbors with prayer and counsel, and to help them with their goods, even at the price of their own life, for what purpose you do so, if such works are not only of no avail against judgment, sin, death, and hell, but even lead straight to hell. For so you wrote a little before: "It is hypocrisy, a lie, and impiety, and an assault on grace and a denial of Christ, if anyone tries anything else, by which he might be freed from sins,
morte, et inferis, praeter solam fidem.

Quae res, si sic se habet, quurr non solam
doces fidem? Quurr ista simul doces opera, si aut sola
per se sufficit fides, aut haec necessario fidem se­
quuntur? Nam quis eum hortatur, qui stat in sole, quis
hortatur, inquam, vt edat vmbram? quam, velit nolit,
est editurus, quam diu perstat in sole.

Vides ergo, Pomerane, haec doctrina vestra
(quam vos tam constantem videri vultis, et nouum pror­
sus haberi Evangelium) quam multis modis tam foede secum
pugnat, vt alia pars conficiat aliam. Quae res non alia
de causa vobis accidit, quam quod aliiud docetis ex animo,
aliud videri vultis docuisse.

Nam cum serio praedicatis, et quanta potestis
vehementia contenditis, vt mortales cuncti solius fidei
fiducialiberos sese persuadeant ab omni cura et solici­
tudine caeterarum virtutum omnium, tutos item et coeli
certos in omni flagitiorum licentia, tamen quo decline­
tis aliquantulum tam
death and hell, except faith alone."

If this be the case, why do you not teach faith alone? Why at the same time do you teach those works if either faith alone in itself suffices or these things necessarily follow faith. For who encourages him who stands in the sun, who encourages him, I ask, to make a shadow? Whether he likes it or not, he will make one, as long as he stands in the sun.

You see, therefore, Pomeranus, to what an extent this doctrine of yours (which you wish to appear so firm and to be considered a new Gospel) contradicts itself so shamefully that one part destroys the other. This happens to you for no other reason than that you teach one thing according to your intention, while you wish in appearance to teach something else.

For you preach earnestly and contend with as much vehemence as you can that all men should be convinced that through confidence in faith alone they are free from all care and solicitude for all the other virtues, that they are safe likewise and destined certainly for heaven, notwithstanding every kind of license for crimes. Yet, in order that you may turn aside a little
insani dogmatis inuidiam, quaedam interdum obiter in-
terseritis, his quae scripsistis ante contraria, qui-
bus controversum reddatis, an tam insane, quam sunt
illa vobis scripta, senseritis. Quam rem tamen non
ita callide tractasti, Pomerane, quin fucus istarum vir-
tutum, quem tibi cura fuit allinere, facillime possit
abstergi. Quod quo dicto citius factum vides, expende-
mus illico, cuiusmodi fructus isti sunt: quos vestrae
factionis homines, arbores videlicet tam bonae, non pro-
ferre non possunt.

Quisquid, inquis, in Christum crediderit, arbor bo-
na est, et non poterit suo tempore non ferre fruc-
tum bonum. Non quem hypocrisis fingit, sed quem
Spiritus Christi illic sua sponte producit. Qui
enim Spiritu Christi aguntur, hi sunt Filii Dei.

Haec tametsi, Pomerane, pleraque verba sint
Christi, et quae si quis afferret Orthodoxus, nihil non
haberent salubre; tamen quoniam tuis intermixta sunt,
qui omnia trahis et detorques ad Lutherana dogmata, me-
rivo nos ipsa res excitat, ut ipsum etiam mel habeamus,
offerente Lutherano,
the odium aroused by such a foolish dogma, you in-
cidentally insert some statements, contrary to those
which you wrote before, by which you make it question-
able whether your beliefs are as foolish as your writ-
ings are. Nevertheless you did not treat this matter
with sufficient shrewdness, Pomeranus, to prevent the
screen of virtues which you carefully drew around it
from being easily brushed aside. That you may see
this done without delay, we shall consider at once what
is the nature of those fruits which the men of your
faction, who are, to be sure, such good trees, must
bring forth. You say:

Whoever shall have believed in Christ is a good
tree and must in his own time bring forth good
fruit. Not the fruit which hypocrisy feigns,
but that which the Spirit of Christ produces
in him of His own free will. For they who are
moved by the Spirit of Christ are the Sons of
God.

Although these are for the most part the words
of Christ and if any approved writer introduced them,
they would be salutary, still since your own words are
interspersed with them—you who turn and twist every-
thing to the Lutheran dogma—that circumstance arouses
us to suspect even honey, when a Lutheran offers it,
suspectum, ne quod sub melle venenum lateat: veluti id quod ais, fructum bonum in credentibus Christi spiritum sua sponte producere.

Quod quanquam verum fatemur esse, tamen non fatemur esse verum in eo sensu, quo tu videris accipere.

Neque enim in homine credente, bonorum operum fructum sua sponte sic producit Christus, vt eum producat absque sponte et voluntate hominis. Quod vnum sentire te declarat haeresis, qua prorsus aufer arbitrii libertatem.


At hoc illud est, hinc illae lachrymae. Nam vos homines spirituales, consilio, quod Christus prodidit, (qui Deum adorare velit,
lest under the honey poison be concealed, such as that saying of yours, that the spirit of Christ entirely of His own will produces good fruit in those who believe.

Although we admit this to be true, yet we do not accept it in the sense in which you seem to. For Christ of His own will does not produce the fruit of good works in one who believes in such a way that He would produce it without the cooperation and free will of man himself. The heresy, with which you take away altogether the freedom of the will, proclaims that you believe this very thing.

Now that which follows shows sufficiently what fruit you mean. You say, "He will adore God soberly, devoutly and justly, in spirit and in truth." Absolutely correct so far, but continue a little farther: "Not in the elements of the world, not in food and clothing, or other hypocrisy. He shall believe about the Sacraments what Christ taught and instituted."

This is the point, hence those tears. For you have decreed that spiritual men should obey the counsel which Christ gave (whoever wishes to adore God
in spiritu et veritate oportet adorare) sic decrevis-
tis obtemperare, vt Deo prorsus auferatis omne carnis
obsequium. Sed hoc est, Pomerane, sic adorare spiri-
tu, vt non adores in veritate, neque enim vere adorat
Deum, qui sic sibi blanditur oratione spiritus, vt in-
terim carnem negligat lasciuientem subdere et domare
ieiuniis.

Vobis omne corporis obsequium, quod Deo praes-
tatur, hypocrisis est. At Mariae non erat, quae lachry-
mis lauit pedes Christi, et capitis capillis extersit.
Vobis omnis vestitus horridior est hypocrisis: at idem
Baptistae non fuit, qui pilis camelis vestitus est. Hy-
pocrisis est vobis omnis abstinentia ciborum: at illi
non erat, qui tantum vescebatur locustis. Sed nec Pau-
lo quidem, qui se optabat omnem diem posse ieunare.
Vobis sunt hypocrisis omnia, per quae vota sua Deo pie-
tas Fidelium effundit in templis. At non idem sensit
Propheta, quem regia celsitudo non vetuit coram archa
foederis et psallere, et saltare cum populo. Nec im-
pune tulit stulta et superba mulier, quae genus id cul-
tus tunc reprehendit in illo,
must adore Him in spirit and in truth) in such a way that you take away from God all service of the flesh. But this, Pomeranus, is so to adore in spirit that you do not adore in truth, nor does he truly adore God who deludes himself by the prayer of the spirit to such a degree that in the meantime he neglects to subdue his wanton flesh and to tame it with fasts.

To you all service of the body rendered to God is hypocrisy. But it was not so for Mary, who washed the feet of Christ with her tears and wiped them with her hair. To you all rough clothing is hypocrisy; it was not so for the Baptist who was clothed in camel's hair. To you all abstinence from food is hypocrisy; yet it was not so to that same Baptist who ate only locusts, nor even to Paul, who desired that he could fast every day. To you all the means which the piety of the faithful employ to pour forth its prayers to God in the churches are hypocrisy. But the Prophet did not think so, and his royal dignity did not forbid him to sing and dance before the Ark of the Covenant. Nor did that foolish and proud woman go unpunished who at that time blamed him for the very kind of worship
quod vos Lutherani nunc, nec minus stulti, et magis superbi, sugillatis in grege Christiano.

Profecto, Pomerane, si cuius ita pietas te-pet, vt caro eius non efferuescat in cultu Dei; is verissimus erit hypocrita, si sese dicat feruenter adora-re spiritu.

De Sacramentis, inquis, credet quod Christus docuit et instituit. Satis profecto breuiter, verum haud satis dilucide. Nam vos in quaestionem trahitis quid docuerit Christus. Nos non dubitamus Christum docuisses, quicquid Ecclesia Christi credit, in quo sine Christi contumelia non posset errare: aliqui frustratus esset promissum Christus, quo se cum ea promisit futurum vs-que ad consummationem seculi.

Vos omnia negatis praeter manifestas Scrip-turas, et quae sunt manifestae, vocatis obscuras, aut, quod est impudentius, quod clarum est aduersum vos, id clarum clamatis esse pro vobis. Ecclesia demum ipsa quaenam sit, altercamini, et ita redditis ambiguam, vt in terra statuatis omnino nullam. Denique sic tracta-tis, vt nisi, quod magis verisimile est, ipsi sitis impii,
which now you Lutherans no less foolishly and more proudly scoff at in the Christian flock.

Surely if anyone's piety is so tepid that his body does not exert itself in the worship of God, he is really a hypocrite, if he says that he fervently adores God in the spirit.

"Concerning the Sacraments," you say, "he shall believe what Christ has taught and decreed." This is sufficiently brief, but not sufficiently clear. For you question what Christ has taught. We do not doubt that Christ taught whatever the Church of Christ believes, in which there can be no error without insult to Christ; otherwise that promise of Christ would be brought to nought, in which He promised that He would be with her even unto the consummation of the world.

You deny everything except clear passages from Scripture and those which are clear you call obscure, or what is more shameful, that which is clearly against you, you loudly insist is clearly for you. You even argue about the nature of the Church and make it so doubtful that you decide there is no church on earth at all. Finally you act in such a way that, unless you yourselves are wicked, which is more true to
impios fuisset necesse sit, quicunque hactenus a Christo passo habiti sunt vsquam pii.

Nam quis vnquam bonus Ordinem habuit pro figmento? Quis vnquam blateruit aduersus Contritionem?


Quis Eucharistiam in Missa non habuit pro Sacrificio? Quis panem restare sensit cum carne Christi?

Quanquam hoc aliquot e primariis vestrae factionis hominibus Lutherano more iam recantauerunt. Nam

vt is dogmata sua semper mutare solet in peius, quod et de Venis fecit, et potestate Pontificios, et ipsa item Eucharistia; sic Carolostadius et Suinglius, quibus se tandem iunxit Oecolampadius,
life, then all those who to the present from the death of Christ have at all times and at all places been considered holy must of necessity be wicked.

For what good man has ever thought Holy Orders to be a creation of the imagination? Who has ever raved against Contrition? In fact, who has not encouraged sorrow for sins? Who has ever permitted women to hear confessions? Who has ever opposed good works? Who has belittled fasting? Who has despised the prayers of the Church? Who has torn down the ornaments from the Churches? Who has hated the veneration of the Saints? Who has denied the fire of Purgatory? Who has not considered the Eucharist in the Mass as a sacrifice? Who has believed that the bread remained together with the Body of Christ?

And yet some of the leading men of your faction in the manner of Luther have already retracted this belief. For as he [Luther] is accustomed always to change his belief for the worse, as he did in regard to Indulgences and the power of the Pope, and likewise the Eucharist itself, so Carlstadt and Zwingli, whom Oecolampadius at length joined, have taken away
carnem Christi penitus abstulerunt, merum linquentes
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panem. Quod ipsum plane moliebatur olim Lutherus, fecissetque procul dubio, nisi Carolostadius eum praevuenisset et Suinglius.

Nam quorum tendebant illa, quod prius liberum permisit omnibus, vt citra periculum crederent panem cum corpore simul esse in Eucharistia, nihil tamen damnans, si quis panem mutari credat in carnem. Deinde pro haeretico habebat, si quis panem crederet in carnem verti.

Quorum illud, quod Missae mutavit Canonem, Sacrificium aut oblationem vetuit appellari, ceremonias et cultum detraxit, contrectandum permisit Laicis, conficiendum foeminis, in templis honorandam seruari Eucharistiam prohibuit: asserens eam non institutam, vt honoraretur, sed vt recipieretur tantum. Imo ne recipieretur quidem, nisi cuique semel voluit in Babilonica, videlicet e vita migranti, sicut Baptismus duntaxat semel
the Body of Christ entirely, leaving mere bread. This very thing Luther himself at one time was openly planning, and without doubt would have done so, except that Carlstadt and Zwingli forestalled him.

For what was the drift of those statements in which at first he allowed liberty to all to believe without peril that the bread remains in the Eucharist at the same time as the Body of Christ, though he did not condemn anyone who should believe that the bread was changed into the Body. Next he began to consider heretical anyone who believed that the bread was changed into the Body.

What end did he have in view when he changed the Canon of the Mass, forbade it to be called a Sacrifice or oblation, took away the ceremonies and liturgy, permitted the service to be performed by the laity, and even by women, forbade the Eucharist to be reserved in the Church for veneration; for he asserts that it was not instituted to be honored but only to be received, nay, not even to be received, except, as he says in his Babylonian Captivity, he wished it to be received once by a person, that is on his departure from this life, just as Baptism is conferred on him only once, on his
confertur ingredienti.


Verum quid refert, quem is animum habeat de Eucharistia, cuius libri satis ostendunt, quam sacri-legum habeat animum de Christo? Quis enim dubitet, quam impie de Christo sentiat, qui et Sanctos eius blasphemat, et Crucem eius conspurcat, et venerabilem eius Matrem suae meretrici coaequat? At quid refert adeo, quid ei videatur de Christo,
entrance into life.

Were not all these statements advancing gradually toward this goal that some time he might take away altogether from the Eucharist the Body of Christ? And he had so prepared his way that just as he was about to attack the matter openly as he desired to do, then one sin restrained him from a second sin. For envy alone held him back from the hasty and open preaching of that impious heresy. He begrudged to Carlstadt and Zwingli the honor of being considered more impious than he. Nor afterwards did he begrudge that honor less to Oecolampadius. So that teaching, which all see him at one time earnestly promoting, on the other hand he preferred to demolish, rather than allow anyone except himself to be the heresiarch of any impious sect.

But what difference does it make what dispositions concerning the Eucharist may be his whose books show clearly enough what a sacrilegious mind he had toward Christ? For who doubts how wicked are the beliefs about Christ of one who blasphemes His Saints, who defiles His Cross, who puts Christ's Blessed Mother on a level with his own mistress? Yet why does it matter very much what opinions about Christ are held by
cuius animum spurcissimum aduersus naturae Diuinae
sublimitatem foedissima testatur haeresis, qua clem-
mentissimum atque Optimum Deum, adepta voluntatis
libertate, scelerum omnium non vltorem magis facit
quam authorem? Qua vna haeresi vt nulla potest ex-
cogitari magis impia atque sacrilega aduersus sacro-
sanctam Maiestatem Dei, sic nulla potest ad animan-
dos in omne flagitii genus mortales excogitari per-
niciosior. Et cum tam impia et tam absurda doceatis,
non pudeat interim ita loqui, quasi Lutherani soli
sint idonei, qui proximos forment doctrina. Videli-
cet, opinor, quia docet Lutherus, Christianos omnes
omnibus solutos esse legibus: tum autem consilio,
quia sancte et seure consulit, vt qui coelibem vult
continentiam, contempto voto prouolet ad uxorem, et
maritorum si quis est inualidus ad libidinem, consu-
lit, et perquam comiter, vt uxori conducat adulterum.

Nam quod rebus Lutherani iuuent proximos

vsque ad dispendium vitae, idque non amicos modo, sed
inimicos quoque; quis sic audire potest, vt in re
atrocissima simul
one whose detestable heresy foully attacks the sublimity of the Divine Nature; for, having taken away freedom of the will, it makes the most merciful and good God as much the author of all sins as the punisher of them. As nothing could be devised more irreverent and sacrilegious in its attack on the most holy Majesty of God than this single heresy, so nothing could be contrived more dangerous for stirring up men to every kind of evil-doing. And although you teach such a wicked and stupid doctrine, you are not ashamed meanwhile to speak as if the Lutherans alone are fit to instruct their neighbors in doctrine. Truly, I suppose, because Luther teaches that all Christians are freed from all laws; then also, because he admonishes in a holy and strict way that he who vowed celibacy, having despised his vow should fly to a wife and if any husband is impotent, he advises him, and most obligingly, that he hire an adulterer for his wife.

As for the statement that Lutherans should help their neighbors even at the cost of their lives and not only their friends but also their enemies, who can hear this and refrain from laughing in a matter
et miserrima risum tamen queat continere? Quum vi-
deat vestrae factionis facinorosas cohortes passim
conglobari, demoliri pulcherrimas domos, sacratissi-
simas aedes incendere, sanctissima templo diripere,
miseros et innocentes Fratres bonis et fortunis om-
nibus exutos, omni vitae subsidio nudatos, corpore
plerosque male mulctatos elicere. Hoc sine est, Po-
merane, rebus adiuuare, etiam cum dispensio vitae?
Idque non solum amicos, sed inimicos quoque? Sic,
opinor, videlicet, quum eos tractatis ubique pessi-
me, quicunque sunt ubiuis optimi.

Nam si quis leuis sit et inconstans nebu-
lo, paratus vltro seueritatem vitae strictioris ab-
licere, hunc obuiis vlnis amplectimini, hic sanctis-
simus est in Christo Frater, et sceleratis turmis sce-
leratus miles adiungitur. At si quis amplexus veram
pietatem constanter insistat proposito, et abominetur
facinorosam licentiam, hic statim Pharisaeus vobis, et
Iustitiarius, et hypocrita proscinditur non aliter a
Lutheranis, afficitur, exturbatur, affligitur, quam ab
Ethnicis olim Tyrannis
so dreadful and at the same time so sad? When he sees the criminal bands of your faction everywhere gathered together, demolishing beautiful homes, burning holy shrines, plundering sacred temples, casting out helpless and innocent monks, deprived of all their goods and fortunes, despoiled of all means of livelihood, most of them badly mauled physically. How is this, Pommeranlus, "to help with all things even at the price of life?" And "not only friends, but also enemies?" I suppose in this way, because in all places you treat as badly as possible all who are considered the best.

For if anyone is a trifling and inconstant rogue, prepared of his own accord to cast off the harshness of the stricter life, you embrace him with open arms; he is a very holy brother in Christ; and the wicked soldier is joined to your evil squadrons. But if anyone who has embraced true piety stands firm against your proposals and abominates your criminal license, at once in your eyes he is a Pharisee, a Self-Justifier, and a hypocrite; he is reviled, treated harshly, driven away, ill-used by you Lutherans just as the innocent martyrs in former times were wont to

Nam quod ex Mose profers: Quisquis Prophetam illum non audierit, ego ultor existam, dicit Dominus, vobis ipsis minatur exitium. Ecclesia siquidem, quia Christum audit in se loquentem, seruat eandem fidem, quae Christi morte per Apostolos, Martyres, et Confessores sanctissimos ad haec vsque temporae perpetuo Christi flatu deri- uata est, ad finem usque seculi, inuitis haereticis omnibus atque omnibus haereticorum sociis Daemonibus, duratura.

At vos, qui Ecclesiam Christi contemnitis, 1725 quos ob id ipsum tanquam Ethnicos et Publicanos habe- ri iubet Christus, vos estis, inquam, qui in Ecclesia sua Christum spernitis, qui Christum Ecclesiae suae loquentem audire negligentis,
be treated by the pagan tyrants. Yet meanwhile, if it please God, you speak as if you alone were Christians, and you gravely rebuke the Church, as if she does not hear Christ, while you loudly quote out of their context the words of God the Father concerning God the Son: Hear ye Him. But meanwhile notice that the Father did not say: Hear Pomeranus, and He did not say: Hear Luther.

For that passage which you quote from Moses: Whoever does not hear the Prophet, I will be his revenger, the Lord says, threatens destruction to you yourselves. For indeed, the Church, because she hears Christ speaking in her, preserves the same faith, which from the death of Christ to these very times, by means of the Apostles, Martyrs and holy Confessors, has been handed down with the constant inspiration of Christ and which will endure even to the end of the world, despite all the heretics and all the demons, allies of the heretics.

But you who despise the Church of Christ, whom, for that very reason, Christ orders to be considered heathens and publicans, you are they, I repeat, who spurn Christ in His Church, who fail to hear Christ.
atque ideo Deum aliquando sensuri estis vitorem.

Nam etsi divina bonitas interdum per tales Daemonum satellites vel bonorum qui sunt in Ecclesia probet patientiam vel castiget peccata fidelium, tamen fidelis erit, et dabit cum tentatione prouentum, et omnem aliquando lachrymam absterget ab oculis emendarum, sed eius ira atque indignatio vos, vos, inquam, impios et truculentos Fidelium carnifices, spiritu oris sui diffabat in cinerem, ac velut puluerem proiciet a facie terrae.

Cuius vindictae nuper edidit perhorrendum specimen, quum miserrimi nebulous illi rustici doctrina vestra seducti, postquam demoliti sunt tot Religiosorum Coenobia, atque aliquantisper huc illuc caedibus et rapinis impune grassati sunt; quum iam se fere consequutos crederent imperhibitam atque indomabilem scelerum omnium licentiam, ecce autem Deus maiestatis intonuit, et subitus superuenit interitus. Inuoluit eos mare miseriae velut pecora, passim perempti sunt plusquam septuaginta millia;
speaking in His Church, and therefore you will hereafter experience the vengeance of God.

For the Divine Goodness does sometimes by means of such followers of the devil test the patience of the good members of His Church or chastise the sins of the faithful. Nevertheless He will be faithful, and will also make issue with temptation, and at last He will wipe away every tear from the eyes of those who have been purified, but His wrath and indignation will scatter you, you, I repeat, impious and bloodthirsty murderers of the faithful, with the breath of His mouth into ashes, and like the dust He will drive you from the face of the earth.

Recently God showed a terrible example of His vengeance in the case of those miserable and villainous peasants. Seduced by your doctrine, they destroyed numerous monasteries, and for some time slaying and plundering, they roamed everywhere unpunished, but just at the very time when they believed they had attained the license for every crime without let or hindrance, behold the God of majesty thundered and suddenly destruction came upon them. A sea of misery swallowed them up like beasts; more than seventy thousand were
tum reliqui, quotquot erant, omnes in acerbissimam
seruitutem sunt redacti.

Qua in re non vos Lutheri pudet Imperatoris
vestri, qui ex sceleratissimo duce turpissimus factus
transfuga, quos prius unus ad omne nephas accenderat,
armauerat, stimularat; eos, vbi vidit fortuna destitui,
sceleratis suis scriptis truculenter prosidit, ae pro-
scripsit, et lacerandos prodidit Nobilibus, vt nephari-
us adulator miserorum sanguine, quos et excitavit, et
mactavit ipse, suscitatam in se inuidiam restinguaret.
Quis, qui vel guttam haberet humani cruoris in pectore,
non decies potius elegisset mori, quam adulatione tam
foeda et palpatione tam dira vitam Diis et hominibus
inuisam vivere? Et tamen fieri potest, vt non sit in-
uenturus tam parum cordatos Nobiles, vt vnis literis
emolliti statim obliviscantur, per quem effectum est,
vt pene in extremam perniciem sint adducti. Nam rusti-
cis, opinor, omnino nunquam excisurum, per quem bis
perierunt. Hic homo impius et vltione diuina caecus,
dum vtramque partem studuit demereri, nec alteram lu-
erificet, et
destroyed indiscriminately, then all the rest were reduced into the bitterest slavery.

In this matter are you not ashamed of your commander-in-chief Luther? Transformed from a criminal leader into a base deserter, in his own writings he fiercely censured and outlawed the peasants when he saw that fortune had failed them; and then he handed them over to the nobles to be torn to pieces. They were the very ones whom he formerly had inflamed, armed, goaded on to every wrong doing. His purpose was as a shameless flatterer to quench the hostility aroused against him in the blood of those poor wretches whom he himself had stirred up and then slaughtered. Who that has even a drop of human blood in his veins would not have chosen to die ten times rather than by such shameful toadying and cruel flattery to live a life hateful to God and man? And yet it is possible that he will not find the nobles so lacking in wisdom that, made gentle by one letter, they will at once forget who led them almost into the extremity of peril. Indeed I think nothing will ever make the peasants forget him at whose hands they twice perished. This wicked man, blinded by divine vengeance, eager to merit well from both parties, did not help the
alteram plane perdidit.

Quanquam ego profecto et Nobiles illi, et rusticos optem ignoscere, modo ita se statuat gerere, maxime vt ignoscat Deus, id est, si resipiscat ab haeresi, si sine fuco pessima recantet dogmata, si per ignominiam suam quaerat gloriam Christi, nec improbam sinitat superbiam obsistere, quo minus in honorem Dei suam fateatur insaniam.

Quod si Lutherus ita de se desperat, vt salutem negligat suam, tu tuae tamen, Pomerane, consule.


Haec, Pomerane, si feceris (quae Deum precor vt facias) tum demum vere gaudebis de nobis, et nos vicissim, qui te perire dolemus,
one and entirely destroyed the other.

And yet I certainly would wish both the
nobles and the peasants to forgive him, provided only
he would determine so to act that God might forgive
him, that is, if, turning from heresy, he would come
to his senses, if, in all honesty, he would recant his
evil teachings, if, through his own humiliation, he would
seek the glory of Christ and not allow wicked pride to
prevent him from confessing his madness against the
honor of God.

But if Luther so despair of himself that he
neglects his own salvation, do you, Pomeranus, take care
of your own. Abandon that impious sect, the most shame­
ful of all the sects that have ever been. Return and
restore yourself to the Catholic Church. Lastly, correct
in every way as much as you can that which you have for
a long time corrupted by your preaching. Abandon the
bishopric which you wrongfully occupy. Send away that
wretched girl with whom you are sinfully joined under
the name of marriage. And spend in penance for what has
gone before whatever remainder of life shall be given you.

If you do this, Pomeranus, and I pray God you
may do it, then at last you will truly rejoice for us,
and we, for our part, who grieve that you are lost, will
inuentum esse gratulabimur.

Haec Epistola insignis et praeclari Martyris Thomae Mori dignissima mihi videtur, quae imprimatur.
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Cunerus Petri, Pastor S. Petri. 7. Aprilis.

Anno. 1568
give solemn thanks that you have been found.

This Letter of the distinguished and very illustrious martyr Thomas More seemed to me most worthy of being printed.

Cunerus, son of Peter, Pastor of St. Peter's.

April 7, 1568.
COMMENTARY

2-3. ignoto quopiam) The original editor, John Fowler (Fuller), identifies this stranger as William Barlow (d.1569?). He took his doctorate at Oxford, became Canon of St. Osyth's, held several priories, was author first of heretical pamphlets, then, after begging pardon, of an anti-Lutheran pamphlet in 1531. He ultimately joined the side of the Revolt and became Bishop of Chichester under Elizabeth (Thompson Cooper, "Fowler," Dictionary of National Biography, London, [1921], VII, 526-527).


14. Lutherano negotio) More never claimed authorship of the Vindicatio Henrici VIII, written under the pseudonym of William Ross; but there seems to be no doubt that the work is his. Cf. Bridgett, More, 222 n.


46-47. Apostolus . . . congratulans) Cf. 1 Pet. 2, 2; 1 Thess. 2, 7; 1 Cor. 3, 1-2.

66-67. Carolostadius . . . Oecolampadius) Andreas von Carlstadt (1480-1541) studied at Erfurt, Cologne, and Wittenberg. His 151 Theses, dated Sep. 16, 1516, prove that he was in advance of Luther in his heretical views. He denied the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch and attacked the Papacy in 1520. In 1524 he denied the Real Presence. He was the leader of the iconoclastic wing of the Lutheran movement, by which he alienated Luther, later going over to Zwingli ("Carlstadt," Encyclopedia Britannica, IV, 880).

Francis Lambert (1486-1530) was a Franciscan who joined himself with the Reformation and found in the unsettled conditions a sphere of action in Hesse, where he introduced the Reformation at the Synod of Hamburg, Oct. 26, 1526. He became a professor at the University of Marburg ("Lambert," Der Große Brockhaus Handbuch des Wissens, Leipzig, 1932, XI, 52).

Johann Oecolampadius (Heusgen), (1482-1531), was the organizer of the Protestant Revolt in Basle. He was appointed

---

1 The number-references in this commentary are to line-numbers in the Latin text.
preacher at the cathedral of Basle in 1515 and joined the
circle of Erasmus. He resigned from Basle, 1518, and became
preacher at Augsburg, where he corresponded with Luther and
Melancthon. He entered the Brigitine monastery at Altmunster
in 1520, but left the monastery in 1522 and went to Basle. He
defended Luther on Justification by Faith in 1523, advocated
marriage of the clergy in 1524, and wrote against the Real
Presence in 1525 (Lauchert, Friedrich, "Oecolampadius," Catho-

68. Cacangelistae) ἡκακά, ἀγγέλλω --coined in verbal
antithesis with ἐγγέλλω. The same antithesis appears in
the Vindicatio, bk. 1, ch. 13: "neque enim intimior Christo
fuit eius evangelista Joannes quam internus est satanae ipsius
cacangelista Lutherus."

69-71. nos ... vestrum) More quotes ironically
the opening words of the second quotation from Bugenhagen,
lines 42-44.

75. Haec ... nostrō) 2 Cor. 1, 12.
77-78. Beati ... homines) Matt. 5, 11.
86-87. Germaniae ...) Deuastasse) The Peasants’
Revolt, 1524-1525.
97-98. virginitatem ...) polluere) Cf. Luther,
128-129. nec ...) Ecclesia) More here contra-
dicts the words of Luther quoted in the Vindicatio, bk. 2,
ch. 21.

153-155. Non ...) Chrysostomos) These words are not
attributed by More to Luther, but the original editor, Fowler,
so attributes them. Cf. Rogers, Correspondence of More, 329,
marginal note. In the course of the present study, no source
has been located.

163. paruulorum sagittas) Ps. 63, 8.
167-168. perierit ...) sonitu) Ps. 9, 7.
174-175. velut ...) deciderent) Cf. Job 8, 14;
Ps. 38, 12.
204-205. Haec ... nostra) 2 Cor. 1, 12.
205-206. beatos ... homines) Matt. 5, 11-12.
222-223. non ... vendicant) Cf. Gal. 3, 27.
254-255. oportet ... mundo) Mark 8, 31.
255-256. stultitiam ... Crucis) Cf. 1 Cor. 1, 18.
264-270. vel ... prostauerit) Henry VIII, Assertio Septem Sacramentorum, 1521.

274. Episcopi ... Wittenbergae) Luther's instructions in 1523 to newly erected congregations were that they were to choose a "bishop," i.e., "a minister or pastor" ("De Ministris Ecclesiae Senatui Populique Pragensi," Werke, III, 194-196). Since Bugenhagen was the pastor of the church in Wittenberg, this would account for More's calling him bishop. See Grisar, Luther, II, 111.

274-278. velut ... negligere) Bugenhagen's De Conjugio Episcoporum et Diaconorum was recently published (1525) at the time More was writing his letter.

289-290. quae ... gentibus) 1 Cor. 1, 23.


335. miseries) This must be a misprint for miseris.


350-352. quum ... tuum) Ps. 49, 16.

366-367. omnia ... tenete) 1 Thess. 5, 21. More omits here a few lines of Bugenhagen's letter. The omitted passage, as quoted by Cochlaeus, reads as follows: "Si in hominum vel iustitiam vel iniustitiam, respicere coepero, quando queso liderabor [sic] ab errore qua fere perit mundus et agnoscam tandem dei iustitiam."

375-376. cum ... seculi) Matt. 28, 20.

433--437. Neque ... depellar) See St. Augustine, Contra Epistolam Manichae: "Si invenires aliquem qui evangelio nondum credit, quid faceres dicenti tibi: non credo? Ego vero evangelio non crederem, nisi me catholicae commoveret auctoritas" (Journ. Enchiridion Patristicum, 543). The last sentence in this passage was quoted by John Eck in his disputation with Luther. The latter met this statement at the time with evasion, but later retracted. See Grisar, Luther, IV, 400, n. 3, 4.


446--447. se ... futurum) Matt. 28, 20.

484--485. persuasibilibus ... verbis) 1 Cor. 2, 4.

486--487. portae ... potuerunt) Cf. Matt. 16, 18.

488--489. statuta ... Dominus) Isa. 29, 13 and Matt. 15, 1-9. The number 20 is obviously a misprint for 29. It appears as 29 in Coehlaeus' quotation of this passage from Bugenhagen.


514--515. Scyllam ... Charybdis) More here reverses the usual order of the proverb and makes the Lutherans fall into the whirlpool (Charybdis) in order to avoid the rock (Scyllam).

520. ne ... potuerunt) Cf. Matt. 16, 18.
548. et ... Apollo) Vergil, Eclogues iii, 104, P. Vergili Maronis Opera, with commentary by John Conington, London, 1881, I, 49.

562. stipites) More is recorded as being the first to use the English word blockhead. See Joseph Delcourt, Essai sur la Langue de Sir Thomas More d'apres ses Oeuvres Anglaises, Paris, 1914, 245.


599-600. factus ... redemptio) 1 Cor. 1, 30. Bugenhagen, as quoted by More, substitutes satisfactio for the sanctificatio of the Vulgate.

601-602. quisquis ... humana) In the English version of Bugenhagen's letter, this phrase is rendered: "Whoever will confess this with us will soon give over all the righteousness of man." See Appendix, 278.

628-629. prudentes ... serpentes) Matt. 10, 16.

629-632. sicut ... sanctificationem) Rom. 6, 19.

633. animam ... suae) Prov. 13, 8.

637-641. quisquis ... Christianos) Bugenhagen's conception of Pelagianism is defective here. Cf. Pelagius, De libero arbitrio: "Primum illud id est posse, ad Deum proprie pertinet, qui illud creaturas suae contulit; duo vere reliqua, hoc est velle et esse, ad hominem referenda sunt, quia de arbitrii fonte descendunt. Ergo in voluntate et opere bono laus hominis est; imo et hominis et Dei, qui ipsius voluntatis et operis possibilitatem dedit, quique ipsam possibilitatem gratiae suae aedit semper auxilo. Quod vero potest homo velle bonum atque perficere, solius Dei est" (Journal, Enchiridion Patristicum, 508).

647. gratis ... est) Gal. 2, 21.

648-649. lege ... Prophetis) Rom. 3, 21.

649-651. qui ... perueniunt) Rom. 9, 30-31.

651. Iustitiae ... possunt) Rom. 10, 3.

654. pro ... delictis) 1 Cor. 15, 3; 1 Pet. 3, 18.
677-679. extra . . . quisquam) "Salus extra ecclesiam non est" (Thasci Caecili Cypriani, Epistulae, LXXIII, xxi, Opera Omnia, ex recensione G. Hartelii, Vindobonae, 1870, III, ii, 79).

687-688. rem . . . titulo) This reads in full: "Liberum arbitrium post peccatum res est de solo titulo et dum facit quod in se est peccat mortaliter" (Luther, Disputatio Heidelbergae habita 1518, Thesis No. 13, Werke, I, 354). This statement was listed as Error No. 36 in the "Errores Martini Luther" in the Bull "Exsurge Domine." See Denzinger, Enchiridion Symbolorum, 277.

714-715, Sic . . . proferant) For Luther's position, see De servo arbitrio Martini Lutheri ad D. Erasum Roterdanum, in Tomvs Trentvs Omnium Opervm Reverendi Patris D.M.L. . . . Ienae, 1558, especially 189, 195, 214, 222.


809-810. sicut . . . extinguit) Ecclus. 3, 33.

810-811. Si . . . iudicaremur) 1 Cor. 11, 31.

812-814. sicut . . . iustitia) Rom. 6, 19.


886-887. vt ... misit) John 17, 3.
919-920. Si ... sum) 1 Cor. 13, 2.
921-923. si ... prodest) 1 Cor. 13, 3.
925. fides ... est) Jas. 2, 26.
926. daemones ... contremiscunt) Jas. 2, 19.

926-928. frustra ... Apostolica) In his "Preface to the Epistles of St. James and St. Jude" in the 1522 edition of the New Testament in German, Luther states as an objection to the Epistle of St. James: "Flatly against Paul and all the rest of the Scriptures, it ascribes righteousness to works . . . ." (Works, VI, 477-478). In his introduction to the New Testament, he calls the Epistle "really an epistle of straw" (ibid., 444). This statement was omitted in later editions.

929. Adam ... seductus) 1 Tim. 2, 14.
945. ficus ... aridas) Matt. 3, 10.

952-954. Nihil ... fide) Martin Luther, De captivitate babylonica ecclesiae praedium, Works, VI, 529. The sentence reads in context: "Ita vides quam dives sit homo Christianus sive baptisatus, qui etiam volens non potest perdere salutem suam quantiscumque peccatis, nisi nolit credere. Nulla enim peccata eum possunt damnare, nisi sola incredulitas: caetera omnia si redeat vel stet fides in promissionem divinam baptisato factam in momento absorbentur per sandem fidem . . . ."

980-982. Si ... est) Gal. 2, 21.
992-994. qui ... perueniunt) Rom. 9, 31.
994. Iustitiae ... possunt) Rom. 10, 3.

1012. Lege ... Prophetis) Rom. 3, 21.
1050-1051. Dimitte ... nostra) Matt. 6, 12.
1052-1053. non . . . reliquum) Rom. 4, 8.
1207-1209. vt . . . proficere) Cf. I Cor. 13, 2; Gal. 5, 6.
1209-1210. absque . . . mortua) Jas. 2, 17.
1213-1214. Redemptio . . . suae) Prov. 13, 8.
1214-1215. Date . . . vobis) Luke 11, 41.
1246-1247. Prophetam . . . retributionem) Ps. 118, 112.
1326-1327. qui . . . Dei) Rom. 8, 14.
1327-1328. sobrie . . . iustae) Titus 2, 12.
1328-1329. in . . . veritate) John 4, 23.
1351-1352. oues ... audient) John 10, 27.

1352. alienorum) More does not quote the two concluding sentences of Bugenhagen's letter. They read, as quoted by Cochlaeus: "Haec ad vos breuibus scripsi fratres, ut gaudium meum de uobis testarer uobis, et simul rationem redderem de ea quae in nobis est; spe contra illos, qui omnia nostra impudentibus mendaciis apud ignorantes perurentunt. Vos autem orate deum pro nobis et pro omnibus sanctis, et pro adversariis nostris, ut verbum dei crescat et inuulgetur mundo, in gloriam ipsius, et hominum salutem, per Iesum Christum dominum nostrum, Cui gloria et imperium in omnia saecula saeculorum Amen."

1390-1391. Haec ... me) Mark 14, 6.
1396-1397. Si ... facite) John 8, 39.
1402-1403. Esuriui ... me) Matt. 25, 35.
1425. Diatribe ... Libertate) Erasmus, De Libero Arbitrio.

1431-1432. Si ... mandata) Matt. 19, 17.

1475. quos ... Deus) Cf. Rom. 9, 18.
1481. Sine ... facere) John 15, 5.
1481-1482. Nemo ... eum) John 6, 14.
1486-1491. Quoties ... nolusti) Matt. 23, 27;

Luke 13, 34.

1495-1497. Quum ... fecimus) Luke 17, 10.


1567-1568. qui ... adorare) John 4, 24.

1576-1577. lachrymis ... extersit) Luke 7, 38;

John 12, 3.

1579. pilis ... est) Mark 1, 6.
1582. omnem . . . ieiunare) Cf. 1 Cor. 8, 13.
1585-1586. Propheta . . . populo) 2 Kgs. 6, 14-15.
1586-1588. Nec . . . illo) 2 Kgs. 6, 23.

1606-1608. Ecclesia . . . nullam) More quoted in the Vindicatio (bk. 1) fairly extensively the words of Luther on the nature of the Church, as contained in the Contra Henricum regem Angliae (1522). The gist of the whole passage seems to be summed up in the following words: "Sed omnia sunt libera et indifferentia: ita non est necessae certum locum certamque personam habere."


1614. aduersus Contritionem) For a brief statement of Luther's position on contrition, see "Errores Martini Luther," error no. 6: "Contritio, qua paratur per discussionem, collationem et detestationem peccatorum . . . haec contritio facit hypocritam, immo magis peccatorum" (Denzinger, Enchiridion Symbolorum, 275). See also error no. 11 (ibid., 276).

1618-1619. Quis . . . ornatum) Iconoclastic activities were led by Carlstadt rather than by Luther and became a point of contention between them. Cf. Luther, "Wider die Himmlischen Propheten," Werke, XVIII, 62-214.

1619. Sinuidit . . . cultui) See Decrees of the Council of Trent "De invocatione, veneratione et reliquis Sanctorum et sacrar imaginibus," e.g.: "Illos vero, qui ne-gant, Sanctos, aeterna felicitate in coelo fruentes, invocando esse; ut pro nobis etiam singulis orant, invocationem esse idololatriam honoris unius mediaturis Dei et hominum Jesu Christi . . . vel stultum esse, in coelo regnantibus voce vel mente supplicare: impie sentire" (Denzinger, Enchiridion Symbolorum, 343).

1621-1622. Panem . . . Christi) Luther and Bugenhagen argued for impanation. Luther wrote, answering Carlstadt: "Although I too had the intention of doing away with the Elevation, yet now the better to defy and oppose for awhile the fanatical spirit, I shall not do so . . . I intend to call the Sacrament a Sacrifice though it is not really one, but simply the repetition of what was once once" (Luther, Wider die Himmlischen Propheten, Werke, XVIII, 116).

1627-1630. Sic . . . panem) Carlstadt denied the Real Presence as early as 1524 ("Carlstadt," Encyc. Brit. IV, 880). Zwingli abolished the Mass in favor of a memorial service of the Last Supper in 1525 and Oecolampadius repudiated the sacrificial character of the Mass and treated Transubstantiation as of no importance. All three argued for a figurative interpretation of the words of consecration. Carlstadt rooted his metaphorical interpretation in the word hoc, Zwingli in the word est, Oecolampadius in the word corpus, but the difference was largely formal. See Christiani, "Oecolampade," Dictionnaire de Théologie, XI, i, 947-950; Christiani, "Zwingli," Dictionnaire de Théologie, XV, 11, 3738-3739.

1630-1632. Quod . . . Suinglius) Heinrich Zwingli was the principal author of the reformation in Switzerland. He studied in Berne, Vienna and Basle—a humanist rather than a theologian. He was ordained a secular priest and worked (1516-1518) for reform of clerical abuses within the Church. He was elected preacher at Munster, 1518. The idea of theological reforms came to him from Luther's Ninety-Five Theses. As preacher at the cathedral at Zurich, he began to have political influence in 1519. He first clashed with ecclesiastical regulations over fasting. His Sixty-Seven Theses (1523) was his most important work. He affected his protestant reforms at Zurich, 1524-1525, abolishing indulgences and the Sacraments of Penance and Extreme Unction, rejecting clerical celibacy, abolishing the Mass. He married July 2, 1525 (Christiani, "Zwingli," Dictionnaire de Théologie, XV, 11, 141).

1638-1643. Quorum . . . tantum) The Babylonian Captivity seems to underlie most of these points, and most of them are also treated in the Council of Trent. Regarding the
handling of the Eucharist by the laity, Canon No. 10 of the "Canones de sacramentis in genere" of the Council of Trent reads: "Si quis dixerit, Christianos omnes in verbo et omnibus sacramentis administrandis habere potestatem: anathema sit" (Denzinger, Enchiridion Symbolorum, 301). Regarding reservation of the Blessed Sacrament, see Canons 4, 6, 7, of the "Canones de ss. Eucharistiae sacramento" (Denzinger, 309-310).

1643-1646. Imo . . . ingredienti) Luther's words on this point read: "Panis autem vere morientium et excedentium sacramentum siquidem in eo transitum Christi ex hoc mundo memoramus, ut ipsum imitemur, et sic distribuamus haec duae Sacramenta ut Baptismus initio et totius vitae cursui, panis autem termino et morti deputetur, atque Christianus utroque exerceat in hoc corpusculo, donec plene baptizatus et roboratus, transseat ex hoc mundo, natus in aeternam novam vitam . . . ." (Luther, De captivitate babylonica, Werke, VI, 572-573). Other quotations relating to this paragraph are: "Alterum scandalum amovendum est, quod multo grandius est speciosissimum, id est, missa creditur passim esse sacrificium quod offertur deo" (ibid., 523); and "Omnes nos aequaliter esse sacerdotes" (ibid., 566).

1680-1683. vt . . . adulterum) Ibid., 558.
1733. fidelis . . . prowentum) 1 Cor. 10, 13.
1734. omnem . . . oculis) Apoc. 7, 17; 21, 4.
1736-1737. spiritu . . . sui) Isa. 11, 4; 2 Thess. 2, 8.
1737-1738. velut . . . terrae) Ps. 1, 4.
1739-1740. cuius . . . rustici) The Peasants' Revolt.
1745-1746. ecce . . . intonuit) Ps. 28, 3.
1746. subitus . . . interitus) 1 Thess. 5, 3.
1754-1756. eos . . . Nobilibus) More is here referring to Luther's "Wider die mordischen und reubischen Rotten
der Bawren" (Werke, XVIII, 357-361).

1763. vnis literis) Rogers gives as a reference for this Luther's Address to the Christian Nobility (1520), but it seems clearly a reference to his "Ermanunge zum Fride auff die Zwelff Artikel der Bawrschaft ynn Schwaben" [sic] (Werke, XVIII, 291-334), referred to above by its English title, The Admonition to Peace (See above, 8).
CHAPTER III

THE LETTER AS AN EXAMPLE OF RENAISSANCE LATIN PROSE

Since More wrote his letter to Bugenhagen as a Latinist, it is appropriate to measure his style by classical standards. Cicero, building on the foundations of Aristotle and Theophrastus, enunciated four requisites of effective style: correctness, lucidity, ornateness, and appropriateness.¹ The style of More's letter will be considered, therefore, under each of these points. It might be mentioned, however, that in a Renaissance writer, certain deviations from classical standards are likely to be observed, and they would not detract from the correctness and elegance of a writer's style, judged by Renaissance standards. This problem was recognized by Renaissance writers themselves. Thus Erasmus defended the liberty of contemporary scholars to use Latin as a living language, not as circumscribed by rigid classical standards.²

First to be noticed under the general heading of correctness is spelling. An examination of the letter to Bugenhagen


² Desiderius Erasmus, Dialogus cui titulus Ciceronianus sive de optimo dicendi genere, Opera Omnia, I, 913-1026.
shows a good deal of fluctuation in the spelling of certain words, particularly in the substitution of qu for o. The conjunction cum is regularly spelled quum throughout the letter, though occasionally cum is used. This spelling was common in More's time and has a curious history. It first came into use in the fifth century, especially in Africa and Spain, and was revived at the Renaissance. Similarly, cur is spelled quur in the majority of instances, though not with the same uniformity as cum. The only observable distinction between quur and cur is that the former is used both for the relative and the interrogative, whereas the latter is used only in the interrogative. The same substitution is made in the forms of sequur and its compounds, where the classical spelling would be su, as in sequituram (line 1258).

A second deviation from classical spelling occurs in the confusion of ae and o, so that such a word as saeculum is spelled seculum (lines 124, 165, 376, 447, 766-767, 1308). Other examples of this interchange are such spellings as the following: laethiferam (line 1296), tetrum (line 301), effraenata (line 198), and pene (line 1765). Similarly a confusion arises between oe and o, seen in More's spelling, foelicitatem (line 1172).

3 For instances of cum, see lines 736, 739, 1523, in the Latin text included in Chapter II. Line numbers will be henceforth indicated in parentheses after the words to which they refer.

A third type of confusion is between $\acute{\imath}$ and $\phi$. More writes both nephas (line 1753) and nefas (line 1784), and yet again nepharius (line 1756-1757). He substitutes $\phi$ for $\acute{\imath}$ in his spelling, as in prophanandis (line 241). One may also mention examples of palatalization, in which More sometimes substitutes $\acute{\imath}$ for $\acute{\imath}$, when followed by $\acute{\imath}$ and a vowel. He uses fidutia in one instance (line 834), but elsewhere he writes fiducia. Other similar examples are negotii (line 346) and negocii (line 281); malitia (line 1184) and malicia (line 747); iusticia (used once by More, line 604, and in a quotation from Bugenhagen, line 598) and elsewhere iustitia. Two other instances of late spellings are More's constant charitas and a divided use of autores (line 167) and authores (line 549).

These variant spellings in More's letter are all common to late Latin, and they do not bulk large in the general pattern of his spelling.

The second phase of correct usage is diction. In this respect, More seldom departs from classical standards. Except for the necessary inclusion of ecclesiastical and scriptural terms, his letter shows few words of late Latin origin. Three words not included in classical dictionaries occur: facturientem (line 1651); gnisias (line 436); and subticens (line 891). There are two examples of a late Latin change in meaning: demeritum (line 1412), used to denote 'sin', and commentum (line 480),
signifying 'interpretation' or 'commentary.' He also commonly employs the typical late Latin use of *absque* as equivalent to *sine*, though he also uses *sine*.

Passing to syntax, it is interesting to consider More's use of the subjunctive. He does not show the confusion of the subjunctive and the indicative often to be found in late Latin. An analysis of a sampling of typical pages in More's letter and in Cicero's *De Oratore* shows in both an average of one subjunctive to about every two lines. One might note, in this connection, that a similar analysis of More's long quotations from Bugenhagen shows one subjunctive to about every eight lines. This sampling method brought to light no instance in which More departed from classical usage of the subjunctive. It may also be noted that More adheres to classical usage in indirect discourse, nor was any irregularity noted in the use of case forms. He does not exemplify the late Latin tendency to substitute prepositional phrases for relationships classically expressed by the oblique cases. Therefore one may state, by way of generalization, that deviations in vocabulary are few and that no deviations in syntax were observed. Hence it seems valid to conclude that he habitually wrote correct Latin by classical standards. Moreover, since Cicero links his second quality, lucidity, with correctness, More's mastery of the first would therefore imply the second, as Cicero employed the term.
One may pass, then, to Cicero's third point, ornateness, under which he includes words taken separately and words in combination. A fairly constant feature of More's word-patterns in his letter to Bugenhagen is his use of alliteration. Instances of it are easily observed, such as "confusam colluuien cogas et constringas" (line 592); or "ferinam feritatem . . . Fratres ferocius fere (lines 782-784); or "purissimam populi Christiani partem perpetuo" (line 767). Even a cursory glance at More's English style shows alliteration to be a favorite device there too, more prominent even than in the Latin. Thus, in the Apology he put into two consecutive lines: "new-fangled fancyes" and "foly fallen fyreste," and in The Four Last Things he wrote in one sentence: "somewhat sottishlye, then, whyle they seeme sage, in kepyng silence, secretely peraduenture . . . ." This is, of course, a trait which English literature inherited from the Anglo-Saxon and which would be carried to excess in such writers as John Lyly. More seems to use it most conspicuously in passages of invective.

Turning to Cicero's classical conception of ornateness,


one comes first to metaphor, which will be here extended to include analogy, since Cicero himself handles them together. More's letter shows several instances of such devices, though he does not use them with very great frequency. Thus, in lines 236 to 248, he develops the metaphor of Luther as the general of a murderous army -- "truculenti Dux exercitus" who in Wittenberg "castra sibi fixit; ubi legatis assidentibus vobis in horas initur consilium." "Unde velut e Praetorio datur signum, petentur tesserae, mandata mittuntur, et summittuntur auxilia." Similarly, he uses the metaphor of different divisions in Christ's army to refer to the various religious orders: "[N]on opinor magnum esse flagitium, si sub uno duce Christo, alii sub aliis diversis veluti Tribunis militent . . ." (lines 754-756). A man making use of both grace and free will is compared to a man being drawn out of a well by a rope:

Si quis in puteum demisso fune extrahat eum, qui per se non posset emergere, an non vere dicetur suis viribus non ascendisse de putoe? nec tamen ad id nihil ipsius vires contulerunt, curn et amplexus est funem, et non est passus elabi (lines 733-737).

The weapons of heretics are spider-webs (lines 174-175), and the writings of the holy Fathers are an antidote to the poison by which the Lutherans pollute the Scriptures (lines 182-184). Military metaphors enter again toward the end of the letter, where a new adherent of Lutheran doctrines is a wicked soldier: "scleratis turmis sceleratus miles adiungitur" (lines 1702-1703).
More's metaphorical passages add color to his writing, yet they seem chosen less for adornment than for a needed clarification and emphasis.

A consideration of words in combination leads to an examination of More's sentence structure. The most perfect structure classically is the period. Thus Cicero states: "Let your habitual practice in writing and speaking be to make the thoughts end up with the words." But he also says: "[I)t is not necessary to use long sentences all the time." Using again a sampling method, one finds few sentences in More's letter which could be called periods in the most strict sense. Instances, however, can be found. There is, for instance, the following: "Deinde dum pati tantum voluntatem nostram, et nihil omnino facere praedicatis: an non humanam omnem industrias, et constitutionem omnem ad virtutem tollitis?" (lines 702-706). And again, on a more extended scale:

Nam quum eo nomine soleatis insectari Theologiam scholasticam, quod illic cum periculo veritas trahatur in dubium; a vobis falsitas pro indubio adversus verum asseritur, et quod illic pro argumento proponitur, id vnum apud vos pro veritate concluditur (lines 391-396).

He follows Cicero's dictum that discourse should be frequently

---

7 Cicero, De Oratore iii, 190.
8 See also lines 187-190, 197-205, 405-407, 690-691.
divided up into smaller members, and he brings a large measure of variation into his sentence structure.

Demetrius, in his treatise *On Style*, distinguishes three kinds of periods: those proper to history, to dialogue, and to rhetoric. His description of the "period of dialogue" seems particularly appropriate to More:

The members are flung at random, one on another, as though the style were loose . . . . The period of dialogue must be midway between the disconnected and the connected style and possess elements belonging to both.

A large proportion of More's sentences seem to fall into this modified pattern. In some instances the thought is held in suspense through most of the sentence, but there is the addition of a clause or clauses at the very end, thus removing it from the strict rhetorical period. The following is such a passage.

It is all one sentence, yet constitutes a paragraph:

Igitur quum ea quae tu proponis tibi, manifeste, Pomerane, sint eiusmodi, quemque videres istud ex verbis tuis, quae supra commemoravi, tam aperte clarescere, vt vereri coeperis, ne nimium id liquidum esset, ac foret fortasse tam inuidiosum, vt ne malis quidem atque improbis hominibus feren-dum videretur, exoriri quenquam tandem tam absurde nebulonem nequam, vt contra communem omnium tot seculorum sensum audeat, tam acerbe virtutes inuadere, et promovere flagitia; coactus es ipse dissidere tecum, et, quo venenatum spicu-lum, exertum iam plus satis et conspicuum, aliquo fuco

9 Cicero, *De Oratore* iii, 190.

tegeres, tam apertis vitiorum susionibus et virtutum dehortamentis adiungere vos etiam virtutes, docere (lines 1301-1314).

In other instances, there is no attempt to maintain a rhetorical period, but there is a balance and proportion in the sequence of clauses:

Quod si aut vitium literis obuenerit, aut textus ex se sit obscurior, non est cur quisquam debeat minus habere pro certis, quae Christus docuit Ecclesiam suam, quam per Spiritum sanctum docuit omnem veritatem, et se cum ea promisit ad finem vsque seculi futurum: curaturum nimirum (quod precibus impetravit a Patre) ne villis librorum mendis (quas per studiosorum hominem laborem sanctum repurgat indies) nullis literarum ambagibus (quas, quibus ipsi temporibus visum est, per eruditorum calamos virorum explicat) nullis tyrannorum persecutionibus (quos Martyrum suorum victorii subiugat) nullis haereticorum conatibus (quorum oras per orthodoxorum Patrum libros obstruit) nullis denique machinamentis Diaboli (quam ipse prostravit in cruce) fides Ecclesiae possit deficere (lines 1434-1457).

Examples can be pointed out on almost every page.

Perhaps it is germaine to this discussion to recall More's own use of the dialogue form, which presupposes his familiarity with classical examples of it. Also, in a sense, his letter to Bugenhagen has itself resemblances to a dialogue, with the other side of the conversation carried by Bugenhagen's quoted passages. It is therefore not surprising to find More dropping into a sentence-form characteristic of the dialogue.

The matter of balance and antithesis needs special

---

11 See also lines 1256-1266.
consideration, since it is very characteristic of More's writing. Sometimes he achieves his effect by parallel clauses, often grouped in threes, as in the following, where the parallelism is further accented by the repeated 's:

Vos ardentem facem in totam immisistis Germaniam. Vos ingentem flammam, qua nunc ardet orbis, accendistis. Vos adhuc flatu noxio sceleratum promouestis incendium (lines 245-248).12

At other times the balance is carried by a series of questions:


Instances of anaphora are frequent, as in "tot scelerum, tot damnorum, tot vastitatum" (lines 88-89), or the Quorsum repeated six times in lines 806 to 815.14 Chiasmus and antithesis also abound. Sometimes the latter is merely verbal, as in balancing "declinando mala" and "bona faciendo" (lines 1203-1204), or "dubie non infirmiores" and "multo firmiores in fide"

12 See also lines 88-89, 130-134, 248-250, 1070-173.
13 See also lines 625-633, 1371-1373.
14 See also lines 88-89, 245-248, 862-874.
(lines 79-80). Sometimes it involves an extended figure, as in the following quotation, which shows many of More's stylistic traits in combination:

Quid tu appelles Evangelium, nescio: verum id scio, si id fateris esse Evangelium quod in mundum protulit Christus, quod quatuor olim Evangelistae scripserunt, Matthaeus, Marcus, Lucas et Joannes, sic intellectum quomodo veteres omnes Ecclesiae Proceres interpretati sunt, et totus Christianus orbis annos iam plus quam mille et quingentos et intellectus, et docuit; istud, inquam, Evangelium annos plus minus mille perpetuo bene audiit in Anglia, vsqueadeo vt illis etiam passim his placeret ac probaretur Evangelica fides, quorum fragilitas erat infirmior, quam vt mores praestarent Evangelio dignos. Sin Evangelium videri postulas nova ista, perniciosa et perabsurda dogmata, quae velut Antichristus, nuper Lutherus invexit in Saxones, quae Carolostadius, Lambertus, Oecolampadius, ac tute, non alter ac Lutheri Cacangelistae promouetis, ac per orbem spargitis: sunt in Anglia profecto, id quod nos non gaudere non possumus, vix quidam apud quos adhuc bene audiat istud Evangelium vestrum (lines 54-71).

Here parallel constructions are combined with antithesis of thought, echoed by such verbal antitheses as the word-pairs Christus and Antichristus, Evangelistae and Cacangelistae. So also Matthew, Mark, Luke and John are ironically matched with Carlstadt, Lambert, Oecolampadius, and Bugenhagen in the two halves of the sentence. There is a balance of ideas between veteres of the first part and nova of the second, between totus Christianus orbis and Saxones, between annos iam plus quam mille et quingentos and nuper. It is shot through with irony, one of More's most characteristic weapons. Such a quotation illuminates the eminent appropriateness of More's style as an instrument of controversy. Correctness, lucidity and ornateness all have their
part to play in answering Bugenhagen.

It is interesting to note that these same traits appear in More's English style. They appear alike in The Dialogue concerning Tyndale, The Apology, or The Four Last Things. Thus he wrote in the Apology:

And surely myche what after this fashyon in many places play these heretykes and we. For lyke as a few byrdes alway chrykyng and flyyng from bushe to bushe, many times seme a great many: so these heretyques be so besly walkynge, that in every ale house, in every tauerne, in every barge, and almost every bote, as few as they be a man shall always fynde some and there be they so besye wyth theyr talkynge, and in better places also where they may be herd, so fennent and importune in puttyng forth of any thynge whych may serue for the forthersaunce of theyr purpose, that betwene theyr importune preasyng, and the dylygence or rather the neglygenee of good catholyke men, appereth often tymes as gret a dyfference as betwene frost and fyre.15

Or in The Four Last Things, depicting ironically what temptations he devil can put in the mind of a dying man:

And insteede of sorowe for our symmes and care of heauen, he putteth vs in minde of provisyon for somme honorable burying, so many torches, so many tapers, so many black gowns, so many mery mourners laughynge vnder black hodes, and a gay hers, withe delite of goodly and honorable funeralles: in which the folish sicke man is sometyme occupied, as though he thought that he shoulde stand in a window, and see how woorthipfully he shall be broughte to church.16

15 More, Apologye, 181.
16 More, De Quatuor Nouissimis, English Works, I, 79.
He could laugh at such a man; but he could not laugh in his letter to Bugenhagen, for all his irony. Heresy was no laughing matter.

In conclusion, one may pass from the classical definition of style to Buffon's well-known statement that the style is the man himself. This seems particularly true of More's style. Many of his sentences suggest that if his thought overflowed his period, the period rather than the thought was sacrificed. Also in his written Latin, there is an oratorical accent. 17 Behind the lines one feels the spoken word, the rising inflection of the voice as indignation rises, then the deliberate effort to rein in feeling. In short, one is face to face with More the man.

17 The oratorical quality of More's English style has been pointed out by Philip E. Hallett in an article entitled "Blessed Thomas More as an English Prose Writer," The Dublin Review, CXCI, September, 1932, 122.
CHAPTER IV

THE LETTER AS AN EXAMPLE OF RELIGIOUS CONTROVERSY

More's answer to Bugenhagen cannot be taken merely on the level of style. Its chief importance lies obviously in the field of religious controversy. He came to his task with some of his arguments already formulated in his reply to Luther's attack on Henry VIII. But in the letter to Bugenhagen he was for the first time charting his own course. Thus it is his first controversial work to be marked by the stamp of his own individuality.

On first reading, the issues dealt with in More's answer seem to be confined to those expressed or implied in Bugenhagen's letter, and his organization seems dictated by Bugenhagen's order. Yet on closer inspection, this observation is not altogether true. While it is correct to say that he built his reply on a series of quotations taken more or less consecutively from Bugenhagen's letter, he used these quotations to touch on whatever issues seemed most pressing to him, moving beyond the limits of Bugenhagen's subject-matter. More's answer was a broader as well as a deeper piece of controversy than the writing which evoked it.

Moreover, on the surface, More's letter often seems repetitious; yet each time that he returns to a point which he
has treated earlier, it is in a context further advanced in the logic of his whole case. As he himself said, "it is a shorter thyng and soner done to wryte heresyes than to answere them."¹

The result is that whereas Bugenhagen's letter covers only a mere ninety lines, More's runs to about eighteen hundred. More was fully aware that there were repetitions, and he had a reason for them, enunciated later in the Apologye:

I sometyme take the Payne to rehearse some one thyngs in dyuerse fashyons in mo places than one bycause I wolde that the redor sholde in every place where he fortuneth to fall in redynge, haue at his hands . . . as mych as shall seme requysyte for the mater that he there hath in hande."²

Just so, one can find in almost any part of More's letter arguments for the freedom of the will, or a just indignation at the way in which the Lutheran leaders had been flouting their priestly vows. These matters occur again and again. Yet the letter, if studied carefully, has inner organization and a logical sequence. It covers with a fair measure of completeness, not the whole body of theology, but those issues currently challenged. There is hardly a point which received definition in the decrees and canons of the Council of Trent which does not come in for mention in More's letter. The central portion of the letter answers the Lutheran position on Justification by

---

¹ More, Apologye, 7.

² Ibid.
Faith, and discusses such allied topics as grace, good works, and the freedom of the will. These topics occupy a prominent position in the proceedings of the Council of Trent, being the subject of the sixteen chapters and thirty-three canons on Justification. Next in importance in More's letter are the Sacraments, particularly the Eucharist, and the nature of the Mass as a Sacrifice. These too occupy a major section in the proceedings of the Council. The other decrees and canons deal with the Scriptures, Original Sin, Purgatory, the invocation, veneration and relics of the saints, sacred images, and indulgences. These, with the exception of the Scriptures, receive only a passing mention in More's letter; yet all are included, and they receive fuller treatment in More's Dialogue concerning Tyndale. Hence one may say that with a sure touch More put his finger on all the sore points, twenty years in advance of the Council, while the issues were still in the making. Nor did he

3 For the text of these, see Denzinger, Enchiridion Symbolorum, 284-295.
4 Ibid., 320-326, 334-342.
5 Ibid., 279-283, 342-344.
7 The Council first convened in 1545 and closed
often go outside this controversial territory. This was the circumscribed area of his endeavor.

The letter is divided structurally into three sections by the two long quotations from Bugenhagen occurring in lines 637 to 659 and 1323 to 1352. Each section in turn has its own part to play in establishing More’s argument and its own characteristic tone. Taking Bugenhagen’s salutation: "To the saints who are in England," with its apostolic form of greeting, as his springboard, More spends the first part of his letter in considering the credentials on which Catholic truth rests and the very different “credentials” of the Lutheran doctrines. He sets up an antithesis, as it were, between the Gospel of Christ and the Gospel of Luther, which he develops ironically. Bugenhagen’s greeting calls to his mind “the image of an apostle, congratulating the Church” -- but such an apostle, and such a church (lines 45-47)! He shows how the Gospel of Christ rests on a thousand years of faith in England. Bugenhagen says that only the “weaker” souls still adhere to it (lines 72-73); More counters that they are in reality the stronger souls (lines 79-80). Those who preached and transmitted Christ’s Gospel were holy -- but those who preach the Gospel of Luther have only evil deeds as their

its last session in 1565.
guarantee of truth (lines 83-93): "Tell us," he writes, "... 0 illustrious preacher of the Gospel ... the Evangelist of Luther, or your Anointed one, Luther, whether committing such disgraceful things ... is preaching the Gospel" (lines 93-104). Then he looks at the Fathers of the Church "from the Passion of Christ even to your very own days" (lines 120-121) whose doctrines "have the constant agreement of the whole Christian world" (lines 119-121). The writings of past heretics have vanished (line 170); the Lutherans cannot agree among themselves (lines 185-187). He castigates Bugenhagen for speaking in the words of the apostle: "This is our glory" — when men speak evil of him (lines 195-206). It would be true if men reviled him for doing good; instead, they justly condemn him for doing evil (lines 207-216).

He spends some time considering the state of Wittenberg, where Bugenhagen has his sphere of action (lines 236-248). Turning from Bugenhagen's pretenses as apostle of Britain to a consideration of England, he expresses his faith in the British people, and especially in Britain's prince (lines 258-271). "For neither is the Gospel of such little value here nor you of such great worth that it would be received or rejected by us, nor is the preaching of the Cross reckoned as foolishness" (lines 285-289). This gives him an opportunity to comment on Luther's words regarding the Cross (lines 289-299). He digresses to consider again the personal crimes of the Lutheran leaders,
particularly with reference to the violating of their vows (lines 311-320). Yet this is not really a digression, as he comes back to the English by way of this detour: "Yet you say these crimes of yours ought not to prevent our receiving the Gospel from you" (lines 327-328). Luther may regard it as miraculous that so many have come to believe; but the reason is that people readily "accept the offer of freedom to live licentiously" (lines 356-364).

Having shown that the English can hardly be appealed to by a doctrine emanating from a group that is neither apostolic nor holy and that has exchanged Rome for Wittenberg, he points out that it is also not one. He picks up a quotation from Bugenhagen regarding the diversity of the Lutheran doctrines (lines 380-382). He points out the difference between the disputations of the Scholastics, whose purpose is to further establish the truth, and those of the Lutherans whose aim is to overthrow it in favor of new doctrines. The Scholastic method clarifies Scripture; the Lutherans twist it to their own uses (lines 391-396). He discusses the right and wrong appeal to the Scriptures and the relative place of Scripture and Tradition — matters which will occupy him still further in the Dialogue concerning Tyndale. 8

8 More, Dialogue concerning Tyndale, 151-152, 175.
He goes so far as to say: "No passage in Sacred Scripture ought to influence me to such an extent that, if it should seem to contradict those articles of faith which the Church holds certain, I would be separated and turned aside from the legitimate and true dogmas of the Christian faith" (lines 433-437). In this he is following St. Augustine: "Ego vero evangelio non crederem, nisi me catholicae ecclesiae commoveret auctoritas." Any apparent contradiction can be laid usually to a defect in the manuscript or to obscurity because of the profundity of the truth involved (lines 431-433).

He accuses the Lutherans of setting up their own doctrines and then twisting Scripture with "vain glosses" to substantiate them (lines 500-503). The Fourth Century Arians and the Pelagians did just so before them (lines 508-513). Tradition is ruled out by the Lutherans as a guide in interpreting the Scriptures. Bugenhagen affirms that the "gates of Hell"

9 St. Augustine, Contra Epistolam Manichaei in Journal, Enchiridion Patristicum, 543. More paraphrases these words of St. Augustine in the Dialogue concerning Tyndale, 204.

10 The Arians were those who adhered to the heretical doctrines of Arius (250-336), who denied that Christ was of the same nature, substance, and essence as the Father, which was a denial of His divinity. The Son was not always with the Father, but was made by the Father. Arius was answered by Athanasius. The words in the Nicene Creed "Genitum, non factum," and "con-substantalem patri," answer this heresy. See Arius, Fragmenta ex Thalia apud Athan. in Journal, Enchiridion Patristicum, 228-229. For the Pelagians, see Commentary, lines 637-641 (above, 203).
have not been "able to prevail against" the Scriptures thus far (lines 485-487). Since they have also not been able to prevail against the Church, More impales him ironically on the horns of a dilemma (lines 530-539). More's final conclusion to this first part of the letter is straightforward and to the point: "At length you must admit that those beliefs which you put forward as the Gospel are utterly false" (lines 588-590).

As one reads the first section of the letter, one may be conscious chiefly of More's ironical handling of Bugenhagen's opening remarks; but he is really establishing the basis of belief. He has rested it squarely on the Church, which is the custodian of both Tradition and the Scriptures. He has outlined the marks of the Church, which are given in the Nicene Creed as "one, holy, catholic, and apostolic," and in the Tridentine Profession of Faith (1564) as "holy, catholic, apostolic, and Roman." The "Church" of Luther and Bugenhagen has none of these marks: it is not holy, not one, not catholic, not apostolic, not Roman. It has also flouted Tradition and mishandled Scripture. Having thus removed the basis of belief from the Lutheran claims, he is ready for the meat of his argument.

---

11 The Tridentine Profession of Faith is embodied in the proceedings of the Council of Trent (Denzinger, Enchiridion Symbolorum, 346-349). The Nicene Creed comprises the first paragraph of the Profession of Faith.
The central portion of More's letter, introduced by the first long quotation from Bugenhagen, concentrates on the characteristic Lutheran position bound up in the problems of justification by faith, freedom of the will, and the controversy of faith versus works. More's transitional sentence reads: "It is worth the trouble to notice how neatly you summarize in the words 'diversity of doctrine' the vile mixture of your dogmas" (lines 591-593). Then he quotes a short passage from Bugenhagen which proclaims "only one Article of Faith -- 'Christ is our justice'" (lines 594-602). This launches him on his main argument.

Irony is his first approach. If "Christ is our justice," what need is there to seek justice and pursue it? Does this "one holy statement" embrace all of Lutheran teaching -- of the Sacraments, of vows, of the denial of Purgatory, and all the rest? He sets forth a whole list of Lutheran errors (lines 607-633). Then comes the long quoted passage, and the next solid block of More's letter deals with each statement in turn. First he refutes what he calls "two of the blackest of lies" (line 662) -- that the Catholic position is tainted with Pelagianism in the confidence it places on good works, and that Catholics, refusing to accept the "stumbling-block of the Cross," introduced confidence in works and in religious orders, "bartering works for Christ" (line 670.)
His answer to the first charge is forthright and serious, setting aside irony. The Church, he says, "does not believe with Pelagious that the force and power of nature with a certain general assistance of grace is sufficient for doing good, but confesses that for doing any good act a certain proper grace is needed" (lines 680-684). He presented the Pelagian position, which "attributed too much to nature," yet "left the necessity of asking for grace" (lines 691-696). Pelagius' own words read: "Ergo in voluntate et opere bono laus hominis est; immo et hominis et Dei, qui ipsius voluntatis et operis possibilitatem dedit, quique ipsam possibilitatem gratiae suae aidiuat semper auxilio. Quod vero potest homo velle bonum atque perficere, solius Dei est." Yet the Lutheran error, More affirms, is even worse, exalting the grace of God so as to "take away entirely the freedom of the will" (lines 684-686). The Lutherans leave nature no free power of acting, and human liberty is "a matter of name alone" (lines 687-688). It is Luther's phrase he quotes -- "rem esse de solo titulo," from the Heidelberg Disputations, and it is one of the phrases selected for special mention in the Errores Martini Luther included in the Bull Exsurge Domine. The will, according to the Lutheran position, is not

12 Pelagius, De Libero Arbitrio, in Journel, Enchiridion Patristicum, 508.

13 See Commentary, lines 688-689 (above, 201).
only enslaved but also vicious and cannot turn to the good. By
the will of God alone, one person is formed for good, another
for evil, not for any other reason than that of the nature given
to him, without regard to his own sin, so that "man does not dif-
fer from a tree" (lines 706-715).

More sees that Luther's arguments make God the author
of evil as well as of good. "[A]s the cause of all good deeds
must be referred to God, so must the cause of all evil deeds be
referred to Him, and that most sweet nature of God is believed
to punish the very crimes which He Himself has caused" (lines
719-721). "This belief about God," he exclaims, "is so impious
and so sacrilegious that, God help me, if I would not prefer ten
times to be Pelagius than once to believe those doctrines which
Luther teaches" (lines 721-724). It was a point on which he
would have more to say later.

More goes on to show that the Church avoids all these
errors, teaching that the human will can do no good without
grace, but that grace is given to all. Catholic truth thus
preserves an exact balance (lines 724-729). More might well
have quoted Augustine's concise phrase: "nec gratia Dei sola,
nec ipse solus, sed gratia Dei cum illo." He is also tra-
versing ground here which St. Thomas Aquinas had covered before

14 St. Augustine, "De Gratia et libero arbitrio," in
Joumefi, Enchiridion Patristicum, 613.
him. St. Thomas gives, at the beginning of his long "Treatise on Grace," a detailed consideration of man's need of grace to perform any good act. Yet it is even more interesting, in this connection, to turn to St. Thomas' earlier and shorter Summa contra Gentiles. In this work, St. Thomas goes into less detail regarding the necessity of grace, but he brings together in two successive chapters precisely the same two points which More is making here: "That man stands in need of divine assistance ..." (which he names in a later chapter grace), and "that the divine assistance does not compel a man to virtue." In these chapters he is specifically refuting the errors of Pelagianism. A little further along in the same work, he refutes that other error which More deals with in this section of his letter -- that God is the author of evil as well as of good.


The statement, as refuted by St. Thomas, reads: "That God is cause of sin to no man." 17

More develops his point that man's need of grace is consistent with his freedom in a series of analogies. The first of these bears striking resemblance to an example developed by St. Thomas in the Summa contra Gentiles to illustrate that very point. Thus St. Thomas wrote:

God on His part is ready to give grace to all men .... But they alone are deprived of grace who in themselves raise an obstacle to grace. So when the sun lights up the world, an evil that comes to a man who shuts his eyes is counted his own fault, though he cannot see, unless the sunlight first comes upon him. 18

In More's analogy, man opens, rather than closes, his eyes:

[Grace is offered to all, just as is the light of the sun [but] the evil pay no attention to it, while the good embrace it, but both by their own free will .... I do not see anything except by the light, and yet I give some assistance to the light when I open my eyes and focus my sight (lines 726-733).

It is another point on which the Council of Trent would speak, in the Decretum de justificazione (Sessio VI):

---

17 The quotations just given are from St. Thomas Aquinas, Summa Contra Gentiles III, 148, 151, 149, 162, Of God and His Creatures, 318, 321, 319, 333.

18 Ibid., III, 160, Of God and His Creatures, 330. The chapter heading summarizes this whole point: "That it is reasonably reckoned a man's own fault if he is not converted to God, although he cannot be converted without Grace."
Having thus dealt with the first of those "blackest of lies," of which More accused Bugenhagen, he passed on to the second: that the Church barter works for Christ, which led him to the second main topic of his letter, the controversy over faith versus works. He deals first with one particular type of good works, the religious orders, which Lutherans call sects or schisms. He answers Bugenhagen's charge against them by a metaphor. He sees nothing wrong about their being "many captains" under "one commander-in-chief, Christ" (lines 753-756). Then he builds an antithesis between the monastic life and the way of life of the Lutherans.

From this, he turns to a general consideration of good works (lines 786-798). For a paragraph he builds up his justification of good works by Scriptural quotations (lines 799-817). He picks out for special comment Bugenhagen's sentence: "It is hypocrisy, a lie, and impiety, resistance to the grace of God, and

19 Denzinger, Enchiridion Symbolorum, 295-296.
a complete denial of Christ, no matter how holy it may appear, if anyone shall try anything else except faith" (lines 821-824). This is a new angle, one which does not seem to be treated as such, for instance, by St. Thomas, although some remarks which he makes concerning the New Law are pertinent. Thus he says: "The right use of grace is by means of works of charity"; and again, "The love of our neighbor requires not only that we should be our neighbor's well-wishers, but also his well-doers." More answers by balancing both sides. A man performing good works "does not by his works contradict grace, nor, like the Pharisee, does he put his confidence in works, because he knows that they will avail him nothing without faith, and that they do not earn any reward elsewhere than from the bounteous goodness of God" (lines 826-831). But he says: "They openly attack grace and deny Christ who extol grace to such an extent that having taken away the merit and fruit of good works . . . they make men lukewarm in their purpose of doing good," and he adds with characteristic realism: Men "must be incited almost more to the fruit of good works than to that of faith, -- since you find many more who prefer to believe well than to act well" (lines 838-842). These


words suggest St. Thomas' "well-wishers and well-doers."

More digresses into irony over Bugenhagen's words, "Whatever He proclaimed with His own lips we teach" (lines 851-852). Where did Christ teach with his own lips the denial of Purgatory or the throwing away of the Cross? (lines 869-872). Then More returns to his main argument concerning faith and works. He examines the Scriptural quotations on which Bugenhagen bases the denial of the validity of good works. More shows that they apply only to the futility of good works, if not accompanied by faith or if performed apart from grace. He affirms that in teaching faith, Bugenhagen and Luther are "un-teaching good works" (line 1037). He quotes Luther, making slight verbal alterations (lines 1040-1042). Luther's exact words read as follows: "Nulla enim peccata eum possunt damnare, nisi sola incredulitas: caetera omnia si redeat vel stet fides in promissionem divinam baptisato factam in momento absorbentur per eandem fidem . . . ." 

Bugenhagen states that a man's sins are not imputed to him if he has such confidence in God as to believe that they will not be imputed to him because of his faith. More calls this with characteristic irony "a wonderfully free and easy short-cut to heaven" (line 1070). Men have been agreeably freed from "the obligation of shedding tears for their sins, the

---

22 See Commentary, lines 952-954 (above, 205).
irksomeness of confessing them, the tediousness of making satisfaction for them" (lines 1070-1072). He is traversing here the territory covered in Luther's Babylonian Captivity, which he cites specifically (line 1076).

He points out that Bugenhagen goes even further; for good works, according to him, are positively "harmful to us and hostile to God" (lines 1085-1086). They must be "avoided with care and caution" (line 1086). More's answer is again one of irony: Bugenhagen is saying, in effect, that "God sent His Son to earth to teach men that He came to free them from all care for virtue and from every effort . . . asking only one thing: that no one should hesitate to trust Him in this promise" (lines 1109-1117). His method is reductio ad absurdum. Bugenhagen affirms that faith of necessity produces good works. More amasses Scriptural proofs to the contrary, and accuses Bugenhagen of being more timid than Luther, of trying to conceal the true import of his doctrines to make them more palatable in England. He is really teaching with Luther that "in omni opere bono iustus peccat."23

This error is so unbelievable that More says he gave all his attention to find a different meaning, but he could not (line 1130). That he was not straining Bugenhagen's words is attested by the fact that the Council of Trent thought it necessary to

---

23 See "Errores Martini Luther," Denzinger, Enchiridion Symbolorum, 277 (Error no. 31).
pronounce on this very point in canons 25 and 26 on Justification:

Can. 25. Si quis in quolibet bono opere iustum saltem venialiter peccare dixerit aut (quod intolerabilius est) mortaliter, atque ideo poenas aeternas mereri, tantumque ob id non damnare quia Deus ea opera non imputet ad damnationem, anathema sit.

Can. 26. Si quis dixerit, justificatum peccare sum intuitu aeternae mercedis, bene operatur, anathema sit.

More fights by various tactics, first pushing his adversary onto the horns of dilemma (lines 1175-1187), then assembling Scriptural proofs. Bugenhagen asserts that good works are to be recommended, even though they avail nothing toward the soul's justification. More counters with irony: The holy Pomeranus scorns to work for a reward. He prefers to perish on a gallows outside the vineyard (lines 1238-1244). In all this section of the letter, More is dealing with the issues that were to occupy the Council of Trent in its sixth session, to be defined in the canons and decrees on Justification. More has extracted a wide variety of topics from Bugenhagen's first long quoted passage, and is ready to tackle the second.

In this second passage, which ushers in the last section of More's letter, Bugenhagen affirms that worship must be "in spirit and in truth, not in the flesh" (lines 1328-1329), and he recommends certain practices, which More points out are

---

24 Denzinger, Enchiridion Symbolorum, 298.
nothing less than good works. Why recommend them, asks More, if man has no free will (lines 1363-1364), and if good works are despised by Lutherans? He is quick to put his finger on that sort of inconsistency.

He takes the second point before the first, and it brings him back again to the question of free-will; but he touches on other aspects than those he treated before. He brings in, in passing, a point mentioned earlier -- that the Lutheran doctrines refer the cause of our sins to God. It is not a new error, or else St. Thomas would not have treated it in his *Summa contra Gentiles*, nor Augustine in his *De Libero Arbitrio*. In a section entitled "That God is cause of sin to no man," St. Thomas stated: "Though there are some sinners whom God does not convert to Himself, but leaves them in their sins according to their deserts, still he does not induce them to sin." So too Augustine wrote:

Motus ergo ille aversionis [a Deo], quod fatemur esse peccatum, quoniam defectivus motus est, omnes autem defectus ex nihilo est, vide quo pertineat, et ad Deum non pertinere ne dubites. Qui tamen defectus, quoniam est voluntarius, in nostra est positus potestate.

That the point was commonly held in sixteenth century Lutheran


writings is indicated by this dictum of the Council of Trent:

\[ \text{Si quis dixerit non esse in potestate hominis vias suas malas facere, sed mala opera ita ut bona Deum operari, non permissivi solum, set etiam proprie et per se . . . anathema sit.} \]

More has once again put his finger on a sore point, but he passes over it to fasten on an anomalous piece of reasoning in Luther's *De Servo Arbitrio*, to wit, that when God ordered man to keep the commandments, He spoke ironically (line 1435), knowing that man was not able to do so. It was an interpretation which More calls "insane" (line 1448), and it too was the subject of a decree of the Council of Trent: "Si quis dixerit Dei praecepta homini etiam iustificato et sub gratia constituto esse ad observandum impossibilia: anathema sit."\(^{28}\)

It is only by such distorting of Scriptural texts that the Lutherans can find grounds for their doctrines.

He shows how inconsistent Bugenhagen is in recommending that men assist their neighbors, for Bugenhagen has previously branded all good works "hypocrisy, a lie . . . an assault on grace, and a denial of Christ." He shows how, in short, one part of Bugenhagen's "Gospel" destroys the other (lines 1517-1520). Bugenhagen says that good men must necessarily bring

\[ \text{Can. 6 on Justification, Denzinger, Enchiridion Symbolorum, 296.} \]

\[ \text{Can. 18 on Justification, Denzinger, Enchiridion Symbolorum, 297.} \]
forth good fruit (lines 1539-1541). More shows what kind of fruits the Lutherans are bringing forth (lines 1573-1574).

More now passes to Bugenhagen's second point -- that men should adore "in spirit and in truth, not in the flesh."

Two points are under attack here -- bodily mortification and the sacramental system, both close to the heart of More and part and parcel of his own life. In defense of the first, he marshalls Biblical instances -- Mary washing the feet of Christ and drying them with her hair, John the Baptist and his fare of locusts. In defense of religious ceremonies, he cites David dancing and singing before the Ark of the Covenant (lines 1576-1586). "You deny everything except clear passages from Scripture," he writes, "and those which are clear you call obscure, or what is more shameful, that which is clearly against you you loudly insist is clearly for you. You even argue against the nature of the Church and . . . decide there is no church on earth at all" (lines 1603-1608). Previously, in the Vindicatio, he quoted Luther's words on this point: "Sed omnia sunt libera et indifferentia: ita non est necessæ certum locum certamque personam habere."29 The Catholic position is that "every one who is validly baptized and who has neither wilfully separated

29 See Commentary, lines 1606-1608 (above, 208).
himself from the Church nor is excommunicated is (ipso facto) a member of the Church." Anyone, so baptized, is a member in two ways: "externally," wherein, by a visible sign, one is "incorporated into the body of the Church," and "internally," by "the indwelling of the Holy Ghost," whereby one is "united to the soul of the Church." "Actual or external communion with the Church is necessary as an ordinary means of salvation." More goes on, after this, to a series of questions, each one presenting a common Lutheran error. The points under discussion come largely from Luther's Babylonian Captivity, and each in turn is the subject of decrees and canons by the Council of Trent. "Who among the good ever thought Holy Orders to be a creation of the imagination?" he asks (lines 1613-1614). "Omninoque figmentum ex hominibus natum" are Luther's words, in belittling Holy Orders. More picks up the word figmentum. So too does the Council of Trent: "figmentum quoddam humanum." It is one more indication of how closely More was reading Luther, and how surely he was anticipating the action of the Council.

31 Ibid.
32 Ibid., 382
33 See Commentary, lines 1613-1614 (above, 208).
"Who raved against contrition?" asks More (line 1614). One of the "Errores Martini Luther" included in the Bull "Exsurge Domine" reads: "Contritio, quae paratur per discussionem, collationem et detestationem peccatorum ... haec contritio facit hypocritam, immo magis peccatores." 34 "Who tore down the ornaments from the Churches? Who hated the veneration of the Saints?" (lines 1618-1619). More is writing just as the iconoclastic activities of Carlstadt have caused trouble in Wittenberg, and the matter is a touchy one with Luther. More deals in greater detail with the Blessed Sacrament and the nature of the Mass as a sacrifice. It is here that he shows his familiarity with Luther's shifting position and the emerging views of Carlstadt, Oecolampadius and Zwingli (lines 1626-1637). He comments on the Lutheran license for the laity to administer the Sacrament (line 1640) -- a point anathematized in Canon 10 in the Canones de Sacramentis in Genere. 35

He passes from his catalogue of errors to a similar catalogue of crimes -- the personal ones of the leaders, the collective ones attendant on the Peasants' Revolt (lines 1689-1694). More has virtually ended his argument, and it has brought him back to the beginning. These are the same evils which he

34 Denzinger, Enchiridion Symbolorum, 275.
35 Ibid., 301.
catalogued in the first part of his letter, though he brings in fresh details. So too, he picks up the Biblical connotation in Bugenhagen's "Hear ye Him," and deals with it ironically, as he dealt with Bugenhagen's salutation: Christ did not say "Hear Pomeranus. Hear Luther" (lines 1714-1715). The Lutherans will hereafter experience the vengeance of God for their teachings (lines 1735-1738). At the beginning, Luther was "the Anointed One"; now he is "the Commander-in-chief, Luther" (lines 1751-1752), but the tone is similar. There is, in fact, in this parallelism, a kind of symmetry. His letter, despite its repetitions and its lack of conciseness, is not without pattern.

More, being More, has only one way to end it -- not on the level of indignation or of indictment, but with a plea for Luther to return to the Church, and if not Luther, at least Bugenhagen. "If you do this, Pomeranus, and I pray God you may do it, then at length you will truly rejoice for us, and we, for our part, who grieve that you are lost, will give solemn thanks that you have been found" (lines 1788-1791).

Such is the organization, tone and substance of More's letter to Bugenhagen. The method of basing it on quotations from the work he is trying to refute is one that will be familiar to readers of his *Vindicatio Henrici VIII*. More's quotations from the introductory section of Bugenhagen's letter are brief, but when he gets to Bugenhagen's main points, he allows him to speak
his mind in full. There is hardly a sentence in Bugenhagen's letter which escapes his notice, and some passages -- those which express, in his estimation, the essence of the Lutheran errors -- appear again and again. The chief advantage of More's method is its absolute fairness. As formerly, in his Vindicatio, he allowed Luther to speak for himself, so in this letter he offers the same opportunity to Bugenhagen. Its chief disadvantage is that it militates against conciseness.

If this fairness is one quality deflecting him from conciseness, a second is his indignation at the spectacle of Lutheran immorality and the distortion of truth. This brings him back repeatedly to the same point and affects not only the length but also the tone of his arguments. The tone of the letter is serious, and he generally handles his opponents' arguments with a vehement earnestness, especially when they involve definite theological issues. Yet it is shot through with irony and often employs ridicule. It does not display the genial wit of the Utopia, but rather, the caustic wit of a man whose whole nature is aroused.

Some passages bring up the criticism occasionally leveled against More of an over-violent use of language, bordering at times almost on scurrility. More has his own answer to make to such charges in the Apology. If men speak against him personally, he is "content to forbere any requytynge thereof
and geue them no wors wordes agayn then yt they speke me fayre," but he goes on: "But surely theyr raylyng agaynst all other, I purpose not to bere so pacyentely, as to forbere to lette theym here some reste of lyke language as they speke." However, he adds "utterly to matche them therein, I neyther can though I wold, nor wyll neyther though I could." Moreover, one must remember that in More's eyes, heresy is "the worst cryme that can be," and the heresy he is answering is "the wurste kynde of that cryme that euer came out of ehrystendome." It is evil that calls out his ire, and if he seems to attach opprobrium to individuals, it is because of the evil they represent. Nor does he ever, as has been pointed out, lose sight of Bugenhagen as a soul to be saved.

In his handling of Bugenhagen's arguments, More reveals the well-trained mind of the lawyer, accustomed to penetrate straight to the heart of the matter. The force of his logic is manifested in the way he shows up the fallacies in Bugenhagen's statements. No weakness or inconsistency in his opponent's position escapes him. Where there is lack of logic he pounces on it at once, as in the discussion of freedom of the will or of good works. Similarly, he grasps completely the full significance of

36 More, Apologye, 48.
37 Ibid., 50.
Bugenhagen's arguments, following them through to their ultimate consequences, even when Bugenhagen himself seems unaware of them or has chosen to ignore them. Frequently, as has been seen, More's refutation takes the form of the dilemma. It is interesting to watch the slow but steady progress of his reasoning until he has his opponent squarely impaled on its horns. Finally, More's logical mind enables him to set forth the true Catholic position with accuracy and lucidity. He often makes use of analogies, but he uses them merely to elaborate his arguments, never relying on them to carry the burden of his proof.

The logic of More's mind is established on a solid basis of familiarity with the Scriptures. The Scriptural passages with which he reinforces his arguments are frequent and apposite. His ease in their use suggests that he does not have to look them up, but has them at his finger-tips. Slight variations in phraseology, a certain freedom in adapting them to suit his context, the spontaneity with which they flow, all suggest that he is usually quoting from memory. The slight adaptations which he permits himself -- usually only the changing of an inflection or the use of his own phrase to link several scriptural passages together -- never do violence to the meaning (lines 1716-1717). For so modifying scriptural passages as to alter meaning, More severely criticizes Bugenhagen (lines 1219-1220). His sure recognition of such mishandling is another indication of his
knowledge of the Scriptures.

More's patristic learning likewise gives solidity to his analysis and refutation of Lutheran errors. His references to the Fathers of the Church are, in this work, of a general nature. He reminds Bugenhagen again and again that the writings of the Fathers support the Catholic position against the false doctrines of the Lutherans (lines 371-372; 578-579). He refers once by name to Augustine, in discussing the interpretation and authority of the Scriptures (lines 430-431), and the task of annotating his letter takes one to both Augustine and Hilary. One other aspect of his logical defense is worthy of note — his connection with the methods of the Scholastics. More's humanism was not of a sort to alienate him from Scholastic Theology, and he put it to good use in answering Bugenhagen. In one very interesting section, he defends the methods of the Schoolmen, asserting that "by the inspiration of God, who prospers devout efforts, they arrive at many clear solutions . . . and not only do they themselves receive therefrom a most sweet, honorable and . . . a most holy intellectual pleasure, but also they bring to others the healthgiving fruits of doctrine worthy of knowledge" (lines 419-424).38

By way of conclusion, it is interesting to compare More's letter with the controversial works immediately preceding and following it -- the *Vindicatio* and the *Dialogue*. In its method of presentation, the letter approaches the *Vindicatio* more closely than the *Dialogue*, in that he was answering a definite opponent. In the *Vindicatio*, More does not appear in person. Not only does he not sign his name, but he hides his personality as well, concealing himself behind the fictitious author, William Ross. Since he is defending the King, he quotes liberally from Henry's *Assertio Septem Sacramentorum*, as well as from Henry's adversary, Luther. In the *Dialogue*, he sets up an artificial opponent, the Messenger, to display the arguments which he is refuting. Although it is written in his person, it does not call out his own emotional response in the same way as when he is facing a real adversary. Hence More, confronting and responding to the issues of the time, stands out more clearly in the letter than in either of the other two works. Therefore, the letter has real importance for the understanding of both the times and the man.

Finally, it is instructive to compare it as a piece of controversy with that of Cochlaeus. The latter is much briefer, since Cochlaeus, on his own testimony, was crowding it in between other duties, wishing to get it without delay into the hands of Hermann Rinc. Also, Cochlaeus had previously discussed in his
writings against Luther many of Bugenhagen's points. Like More, he used the method of alternating quotations from Bugenhagen with answers to the quoted passages. Cochlaeus made no attempt, however, to marshall theological arguments, but merely pointed out the areas of error. Where he did back up his arguments, it was mainly with Scriptural passages. The wit and irony of More are wholly absent; the indignation is there to a considerable degree, but it is called forth mainly by the insult to the English which he saw in the letter. Compared with the vast body of Lutheran writing that was flooding Germany, Bugenhagen's letter would hardly have been worth mentioning except as a thrust at England and the English king. Cochlaeus' answer is the product of a less colorful champion of the Catholic cause than More. Perhaps the chief interest in the comparison lies in this fact. It throws into high relief More's individuality as a controversial writer.
CHAPTER V

THE LETTER AS AN HISTORICAL AND BIOGRAPHICAL DOCUMENT

The events leading up to the English Reformation are so complex that even the least testimony concerning their time sequence or the psychological and ideological forces at work has its place. More's letter throws light on the amount of awareness which a well-informed Englishman had regarding Lutheran activities abroad and at home just prior to Henry VIII's formal break with the Pope.

Nine years had passed since Luther published his ninety-five theses in 1517. His new doctrines had spread far by means of his own pen and the pens of his followers. Sufficient time had elapsed so that not only the theological and moral but also the political consequences of the Lutheran movement were evident. More had foreseen in the Vindicatio that political as well as moral evils would result when the ignorant and the rapacious carried the ideas of Luther to their logical conclusion.1 By the time he was writing the letter to Bugenhagen, he could see those predictions fulfilled in the Peasants' Revolt. In the eyes of More, as of others of his contemporaries, Luther was instrumental in both fomenting and crushing the revolt, extinguishing

1 More, Vindicatio, Peroration.
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the hostility aroused against himself "in the blood of those poor wretches whom he himself had stirred up and slaughtered" (lines 1756-1757). More's own response was one of horror.

In view of this realization of the perilous crisis in Germany, it is significant that he did not evince much concern over the Lutheran threat in England. There could hardly have been a layman in England in 1526 more likely to know the real state of affairs, both intellectual and political. He knew that there were those in England who had been dabbling in Lutheran doctrines. He watched the course of such controversies, but did not take part in them because, as he said, "I was no theologian." "I had definitely resolved to keep myself entirely free from the poisonous touch of that plague" (lines 26-27). Yet one cannot read the letter to Bugenhagen without concluding that he did not feel that there was any real danger in England. Thus he stated, '[D]o not be so foolish as to think you can judge the whole of Britain from two or three apostates and deserters from the faith of Christ" (lines 258-260). In his eyes, Henry was still the defender of the Faith. More refers to him in the letter as "the Prince of this illustrious realm, who is as devout as he is invincible," and adds:

Since that Prince long ago with very clear quotations from Scripture and with logical reason overthrew your leader who was attacking the Sacraments of Christ, where could you get the presumption to hope to seduce his people? (lines 267-271).
This could be conventional hyperbole, such as a subject would use in speaking of his sovereign, but the letter does not offer very much motive for such rhetoric, and it has the ring of sincerity.

He also trusted the English people. If Bugenhagen were more "fully acquainted" with the people, if he "understood of what character" the bishops were, he would "put aside that wild expectation" of corrupting them (lines 260-264). More further stated: "Truly you deceive yourselves wonderfully. For neither is the Gospel of such little value here . . . . [T]he Son of Man is not rejected by us nor is the preaching of the Cross reckoned as foolishness" (lines 285-289).

Two years later, in the Dialogue concerning Tyndale, he was aware of the mischief of English apostates, as they gathered in Germany.\(^2\) He also saw Tyndale as a new threat to England.\(^3\) Yet the tone was still not one of alarm at immediate danger to England, and he still spoke of Henry in superlatives: "There was neuer, I trow, brought in this worlde a prince of more benign nature and of more mercifull mind."\(^4\) Even as late as 1533 he stated that "the realm is not full of heretics, though that few be indeed over many and grown also by negligence in some

\(^2\) More, Dialogue concerning Tyndale, 2
\(^3\) Ibid., 221.
\(^4\) Ibid., 238.
parts than there has been in some late years past." He warned, but mildly, and with qualifications, and his concern arose not so much from the number of heretics as from the lack of vigilance on the part of English Catholics. They were like "Crystes faythful apostles" who, "for all Crystes callynge vpon them to wake and praye, fell fyrst in a slumber, and after in a dede slepe: the traytour neyther slept nor slumbered." What had happened elsewhere could happen in England, "as god forbede it shold, & I trust it neuer shall," by "cold slouth & negylgence on the catholyke partes, and suche hot fernenct labour of the heretykes." Yet even then he could add: "I nothyng dout of good mennes good hertes, nor of the present ayde & helpe of god ...." He found reassurance in the thought that the Faith had always triumphed "in thys realme" when heretics "haue attempted the like." That More showed no greater anxiety is one more piece of evidence corroborating the opinion that the ultimate success of the religious revolt in England was not inevitable, and hence that the king's action in the annulment case was truly a major cause.

5 Quoted in Gasquet, Eve of the Reformation, 193.
6 Ibid., 179.
7 Ibid., 182.
Cochlaeus' answer also confirms this impression. Prominent in his letter is the conviction that it is a positive insult to the loyalty of the English to the Church that Bugenhagen should have addressed such a letter to them.

Not only does the letter to Bugenhagen throw light on the times; it also gives a very characteristic picture of More. The attitudes which are dominant in the letter are those which marked him from his youth to his very last day -- his fairness, his tolerance, his impatience at pretense and hypocrisy, his love of truth, his flaming but very righteous anger.

The letter to Bugenhagen provides, in the first place, an interesting link in tracing the development of More, the man of affairs and student of government, having to grapple with one of the most difficult problems for a humane and tolerant man to face -- the treatment of heretics. Some have accused More of abandoning in his controversial writings the position set forth in the Utopia. Any seeming contradiction is explained by the fact that he was having to face the problem of toleration on a succession of levels. As a young man, writing the Utopia, he was facing it in theory only, and with reference to a religion which was not divinely revealed. He could afford to take an extreme position. Even in Utopia, however, dissenters who dis-
turbed the peace were severely punished. 9

In the letter to Bugenhagen, he was not discussing the matter directly, but it reveals his mounting indignation at the harm done by heresy -- indignation which he could hardly, at times, keep in check. Such harm must surely bring down the vengeance of God: "His wrath and indignation will destroy you, I repeat, impious and bloodthirsty murderers of the faithful" (lines 1735-1736). Yet at this stage, More was not having to act, except with his pen, and he was not anticipating acute disturbance at home. He could afford to leave the penalties for God to inflict; and he could write of Luther, after contemplating the Peasants' Revolt in all its violence and misery: "I would certainly wish both the nobles and peasants to forgive him provided only he would determine to act in such a way above all that God might forgive him" (lines 1771-1773). Yet even then, his aroused horror suggested what his future response would be.

In the Dialogue concerning Tyndale, two years later, the infection had come closer. In this work, he was crystal­lizing and defending his position on the treatment of heretics. He had come to the conclusion that princes have the duty to put

down heretics, and he felt even burning to be justified, "sith there is no fault that more offendeth God." 10

The fear of these outrages and mischieves to follow upon such sects and heresies, with the proof that menne haue had in some countreys therof, haue bene the cause that Princes and people haue bene constrainned to punishe heresyes by terrible death, where as elles more easy waies hadde been taken with them. 11

By the time of the Apology, he had had to meet those issues in his own person as Chancellor, and in his own realm, England. It was no longer a matter of mere theory. However, as he himself stated, he did not as Chancellor turn heretics over to the Ordinary till he had done his best, in as "herty louynge maner" as he could, to bring them back to the Church; and he denied that he had had recourse to torture. 12 A heretic had but to amend his ways to encounter More's kindly charity. Thus he wrote:

As touchynge heretykes, I hate that vyce of theyrs & not theyrs persones ... Yf all the fauour and pytys that I haue used amonge theym to theyre amendment were knowen, yt wolde I warraunt you well and playne appere wherof yf it were requysyte, I coulde bryng forth wytnesses mo then men wold wene. 13

Thus he would work with an offender, in the comfortable privacy,

11 Ibid., 274.
12 More, Apology, 132.
13 Ibid., 190.
it might be, of his house, and if the man were brought to a better frame of mind, "I haue ben so gladde, therof," wrote More, "that I haue vsed hym from thens forth not as an euyll man or an abiect, nor as a straunguer neyther, but as a good man and my very frende." The last passage in the letter to Bugenhagen comes surely from the same pen.

The saint stands forth, here. Indeed, one might say that the letter to Bugenhagen gives a glimpse of the humanist and man of affairs turning into the saint. He was gradually being drawn into the vortex of events which would demand of him the heroism of sanctity. The letter to Bugenhagen is a vehement, almost violent, human document, but the very sources of that vehemence lie close to those traits which flowered in the saint. Different strands in his nature are involved, implementing his indignation. There is first of all his love of purity. It was a life-long strand. After four years in the Charterhouse — not under vows — he decided his call was to the married state; but he cherished the highest reverence for the three vows of religion. Hence the spectacle of the flouted vows of the Lutheran leaders could arouse him as little else could do.

14 Ibid.

A second strand was mortification -- that profound and unostentatious asceticism which Roper writes of. ¹⁶ The man who wrote the letter to Bugenhagen was wont to say the seven psalms, litany, and suffrages nightly with his wife and children, to spend the whole of his Fridays, as a rule, in prayer, and to go to confession and communion before deciding any weighty matter. He "used also sometime to punish his body with whips, the cords knotted, which was known only to . . . his eldest daughter, whom, for her secrecy above all other he specially trusted -- causing her as need required to wash the same shirt of hair."¹⁷ Such practices put teeth into his argument with Bugenhagen concerning mortification. "To you, all rough clothing is hypocrisy," he wrote to Bugenhagen; "it was not so for the Baptist" (lines 1578-1579). Nor was it, one might add, for More himself.

His love of the Church and the truths it teaches was a third strand. He could not keep his indignation from getting in the way of his logic and his rhetoric when the Church was impugned, or when he contemplated the perversion of truth, as the heretics offered "their poisonous doctrine to the whole world to drink. . . passing around the cup openly, anointed with the honey of Scripture" (lines 505-507). For this same Church, this same truth, he met death not many years later.

¹⁶ Ibid., 30-31.
¹⁷ Ibid., 46.
Side by side with the comparable answer of Cochlaeus, More's letter is a much more thorough and interesting document. Compared with his own larger controversial works, it gives him much less scope. However, it manages in a small compass to isolate and answer the major issues at stake and to mention almost all their ramifications -- a fact manifested by comparing the topics in the letter with the chapter-headings of the proceedings of the Council of Trent.

A study of the letter reinforces the opinion of More as a master of the Latin of his day, yet as a man who cared more for the matter than the manner of his utterance. His style shows a greater classical regularity than is to be found in some Renaissance Latin, yet it is subservient to his purpose and personality. He was not ruled by his periods. He had at his disposal a variety of rhetorical devices -- analogy, metaphor, simile, anaphora, to mention a few. He brought to his argument a solid basis of Scholastic and Scriptural learning, with which to answer those points which deserved serious attention. Other points were treated with ridicule, often ending in reductio ad absurdum. His irony was too omnipresent to be termed a device. It would have been a dangerous weapon if wielded by anyone but a saint. Yet, never forgetting that his adversary had a soul to be saved, he managed to preserve charity, despite both his irony and his indignation.
His weapons in the letter were those with which he fought to the end. First there was the weapon of his logic. He wielded it at his arraignment. So too, he made use of analogy: he appealed to Scripture and the Fathers, to Gregory and Paul. He appealed to the sanctity of the Church. His irony too stayed with him. He used it to cut away the testimony of Lord Rich's perjury. He used verbal nicety, playing on the word *malitia* and *malevolentia*. Scorning threats, he said, "My Lords, . . . these terrors be the arguments for children, not for me." Just so, he had written to Bugenhagen that the saints"laugh at your feeble attempts as at the arrows of children" (lines 162–163). The More of the letter to Bugenhagen was the same More who mounted the scaffold. He left only one weapon behind him -- his indignation. It was conspicuously lacking in the last great battle of his life, perhaps because he was defending himself, whereas before he was defending the truth.

There has been no desire, in this study, to claim for More's letter to Bugenhagen a greater measure of importance than it warrants. Yet with a man of More's stature, anything coming from his pen has importance, especially at just that

juncture in the history of England and the Church. For this reason, the letter has interest for the admirer of More the statesman, the apologist and the saint, and for the student of the times in which he lived.
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APPENDIX

A COMPENDIUS LETTER WHICH JOHN POMERANE, CURATE OF THE
CONGREGATION AT WITTENBERGE, SENT TO THE
FAITHFULL CHRISTEN CONGREGATION
IN ENGLANDE, 1536

J 11 Grace be wyth you, and peace from god our
cfather & from our Lorde Jesu Chryst. We coulde
not but rejoice, when we herde that in England
as in other countres the joyfull message of the
glory of God was very well taken of dyverse. Not
wythstondynge, thys also is shewed us that many
weaklynges yet be drawen bake agayne because of
unknownen rumors that there be noysed of ys by
them that withstonde the Gospell of God. Thys is
oure rejoycunge: Nevertheless I thynke it not
nede to withstonde such lyes as be uttered agaynst
the preachers of the Gospell. For whereto schulde
Matt. 5 thys blessynge be mete els, namely Blessed be ye
whan men curse you and / revile you, etc. But we
do not alowe & supporte yt onybody under pretence
of Chrysten liberty behave hymselfe unchristenly:
For all they that have taken upon them the name of Chryst, have also put on Chryst. And this we mar-vayle of, why some wyth you feare to take upon them the holy gospel of Christ by reson of the mysreport that we are mysreported not remembrynge that yt behoveth the Sonne of God to be reproved of the worlde & the preachyng of the crosse to be counted foolishnesse. Though it were trewe that men do falsely surmise upon us, for Christes cause, shulde not they therefore accepte the glad tydynges of health so frely offered them of God? What poynpt is more folysshe than this, namly that you be more curious unto my wykednesse / than to your owne health? Wylt thou therefore

be no Christian, because I am a synner? Why do not they rather folowe the rule of Paul sayinges: Prove all thynges, & kepe that which is good. If I that have respecte to mans ryghteousnesse or un-ryghteousnes, whan shall I be deluyvered from errour (whereby the whole worlde dyd neare perysche) and knowe the ryghtwynes of God. No wyll the rude saye who can perceave this doubtfull thynges? For men dispute of mans fre wyll, of vowes, and monastical sectes, of Chryst & satisfactiouns, of
the abuse of the blessed sacrament, of worshippinge
of sayntes that be dead, and such lyke. Some other
saye we feare lest under thys variauncce be some
poysen hydde, and myschefe. As though / we went
aboute wyth, entysyne wordes of mans wysdome,
and not wyth evydent Scriptures agaynst whom the
gates of hel hetherto coulde not prevayle? Or as
though oure adversaries brought ony thinge els for
them agayynste us save statutes, and tradicions of
men, the which God doth damne Isaius, XXIX and
Christ Math XV. But what poyson do ye feare here,
whytes we attempte nothyng in secrete: but we
propone all our doynges to the whole worldes
judgment. And because thou shalt not excuse thy
self with the diversyte of doctrynes, to be shorte,
we teache but one artikle, though we preache much
dayle, and wryte much, and do many thynges for
oure adversaries, that they also maye be saved.

And this is the artikle, namely: / Christ is oure
ryghtuynesse. He is become unto us of God the
Father, wysdome, justice, satisfaction, and re-
demption. He that doth not grante us that, is no
Christen man, and he that doth graunte us it, wyll
sone gave over all ryghtwysnesse of men. Here
shall the heresy of Pelagius nothyng avayle,
wherewith (though they have altered the wordes)
those persons are infecte, which boast themselves
onely to be Christians. The confyndence of sectes
and outwards works as are now adayes shal not
proyte us, the whichoure Pharises have brought
unto us refusynge the shame of Christes crosse,
in that they setoure workes in Chrystes steade.

/ Agaynste whome, and againste the whole kyngdom

Gala. 2, of Satan, we brynge forth thyse moost sure argument
with Paule sayenge, if ryghtwessness come by the

Rom. iii law & oure owne fre wyll, than dyed Christ in vayne

Gala. 11. Thys ryghtwysnesse which is Chryst,
hath wytnesse of the lawe, and prophetes. But they

Rom. 9 that folowe thyser owne ryghtwysnesse, do never at-
tayne to the trewe ryghtwyssnesse as the Jews did. For

Rom. 10 they cannot be brought subiecte under ryghtwysnesse
of God. This ryghtwysnesse of Chryst is thynge

1 Petri. 2 ye thou receive Christ by Fayth. For Chryst dyed
not for hymself, or for his owne synnes, but for
the and thy synnes. Therefore, what other thynge
soever thou attemptest to be made free/ from

v the dyspleasure of God, from synne, from death,
and from hell, it is all but hypocрыsy, falsede
and wickednesse, hath it never so fayre a pre-
tence of holynesse. For yt shall stryve
agaynst the grace of God, and denye Christ. Per-
adventure thou wilt aske what our opinion &
teachig is of costumes, of worshippynge of God,
of the sacramentes, and such lyke. To thys I
answere that Christ which is becomeoure ryght-
wysness, is also our teacher: Whatsoever he
hath taught us by his worde that councill we to
be observed, lyke as he himself hath commanded in

Joh. 6 the last chapter of Mathew. Fyrst of all he hath
taught this to be the worke of God, that we be-

Math. 7 leve in him whome the father hath sent us. And

who so bele / veth in hym he is a good tre, &
can not but brynge good frute at his season:
not that frute which hypocrisy faineth, but that
frute which the spirite of God bryngeth forth

Gal. 4 there, of his owne accorde. For they which be

1 Petri, 4 ledde with Christes sprete, they be the children
of God. Wherefore he shall lyve soberly, godly,
and ryghteously: he shall worshippe God in sprite
and treuth. and not in elementes of this worlde.
not in chaunge of meates, and dyversite of vesture
or other hypocrisy. He shall beleve or tele of the
sacramentes that, whiche God hath taught, and or-deyned. He shall serve his neighbure in teachyng, counsell, prayer, in his substance, yee with the parell of hys lyfe also, not to his frenede only, but also to his emmy. These thi / ges hath Christ taught. To these draweth the nature of the sprite the hartes of them that beleue; & all these teach we to be done. And for as much as we be yet in the fleshe, whatsoever is not done by the motion of these doth not satysfye and recompence God. And because we synne dayley, therefore we teache with Christ that forgesenesse of synne be con-tynually desired. Christes commaundement to praye was: forgive usoure dettes, etc. And for this faythful trust in God we assure then that the synne Rom. 7 which resteth yet in the fleshe shal not once be imputed unto them. Paul sayeth: I fynde in me Mat. 9 (that is in my fleshe) no good. But thankes to Luc. 5 God that Christ is not come hyther for the right- wyse, but for the unrightwyse & synners. / For publicanes & whores shall entre into the kyngdome of heaven before the Pharises, supposynge them ryghteous by their workes. What wyll the wicked mouth babbell and saye skornfully, seing we preach,
Deut. 10 nor teach other thynges? God sayeth by Moses: Whoso doth not heare that prophete (meanynge Christ) I wyll be avenged upon hym: Let these enmyes of the gospell think this sentence spoken agaynste them. The father also sayeth of Christ:

Math. 17 Heare hym. And Christ hymselfe sayeth: My shepe shall heare my voyce and not the voyce of straun-gers. This have I written to you brethren in

Joh. 10 fewe wordes, to testifye unto you the rejoy cynge that I have of you and also to give accompte unto you of the good hope that we / have to god agaynst them that with onshamefast lyes perverte and overthrowe al that we buylde. Praye ye to God for us, and for all the sayntes, and for all oure adver-saryes, that the worde of God be knowne and growe we in the worlde to his glory and

the health of men, thorow

Jesu Chrysteoure
Lorde & Saveour
To whom
be
Glory and power
forever and
ever
Amen.
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