

# THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

VOL. VII.

DECEMBER, 1927.

No. 12.

## The Lutherans at Lausanne.

The movement to bring about closer relations among the churches along the lines of unionism, and eventually a union, which was inaugurated at the World Conference on Missions in Edinburgh in 1910 and at the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the same year and was supported by other American denominations, notably the Disciples and Congregationalists, gathered its forces this year in the World Conference on Faith and Order, which assembled August 3 at Lausanne, Switzerland, and sat for three weeks. Four hundred and thirty-five delegates attended, representing eighty-one communions, or groups. The only bodies not represented were the Roman Catholics and a branch of the Baptists (called in America the Southern Baptists). "Representatives from all the continents and many islands of the sea were there — patriarchs, archbishops, bishops, deans, canons, professors, executives, editors, ministers, priests, missionaries, and seven women." Bishop Charles H. Brent of Western New York, who has been a prime mover in this affair since the Edinburgh conference, presided, Professor Garvie (Congregationalist) being deputy chairman. The vice-presidents were Archbishop Soederblom, Archbishop Germanos, Dr. Merle d'Aubigné, and Professor Deissmann (of the University of Berlin). The object of the conference, says the preamble by Bishop Brent in the official report of the meetings, "is to register the apparent fundamental agreements within the conference and the grave points of disagreements remaining; also to suggest certain lines of thought which may in the future tend to a fuller measure of agreement." Seven subjects occupied the minds of the conference, all of which, except the first, were thoroughly discussed. "Each subject (of the six) on the agenda was first discussed in plenary session. It was then committed to one of the sections, of more than one hundred members each, into which the whole conference was divided. The report, after full discussion in subsections, was

---

## Why Was Luther Detained at Worms after His Hearing Before the Diet?

W. H. T. DAU, Valparaiso, Ind.

### 3. Conference with Luther at the Hostel of the Teutonic Knights.

Luther would have preferred to return to Wittenberg after his speech to the Diet. To him the plan of continuing the deliberation on his teaching was hopeless. But it showed that there was still a powerful party in the Diet that wanted to make use of Luther for its antipapal measures. For a time Aleander had filled the princes with dread by depicting to them consequences that would follow if they were to foster Luther's "revolutionary" <sup>42)</sup> teaching; but this dread seems to have vanished while they were working on their statement of the *Grievances of the German Nation* against Rome and its misrule and malpractises. Their minds had become heated as they were gathering the evidence for their indictment of the Curia, and they were cherishing a wish to enter into an alliance with the Friar of Wittenberg, if only the latter could be induced to recede from his opposition to the decrees of the Council of Constance. Aleander was already trembling in anticipation of a possible recantation by Luther of his "worst

---

42) See DTC, 209.

heresies" and of his becoming the champion of the princes in their fight against Rome rule. But again Aleander had indulged in needless excitement — Luther recanted nothing. Luther was no opportunist; his vision was profounder and more far-reaching than that of the great politicians who tried to induce him for reasons of expediency to recant his "impractical" attacks upon the sacrosanct decrees of councils. The fundamental error of the German princes was their belief that dogma and discipline can be kept apart. Luther was convinced that the two cohere as closely as the evil root coheres with the impalatable fruit of a noxious tree. From the Pelagian doctrine of justification there resulted the lying indulgences; from the false conception of the Church there followed the arbitrary rule of the hierarchy; from the doctrine regarding purgatory there sprang the exploitation of the living. Luther saw that once he conceded the dogma, he could no longer assail the practise of the Roman leaders. Accordingly, the distinction, or separation, which the German princes wished him to make was for Luther an impossible one, and hence the conferences of the Diet's commission with Luther, which Aleander viewed with such fear, were futile from the start.

In the early morning hours on Wednesday, April 24,<sup>43)</sup> the herald, Caspar Storm, and a chaplain of the Archbishop of Treves came to conduct Luther to the hostel of the Teutonic Knights, where the archbishop had set up his residence. Cordatus reports that Luther's walk to the archbishop's residence nearly caused a riot. "Some fellows rushed up to them and cried, 'What? Have you taken him prisoner?'" Huss's fate at Constance was well remembered at Worms.

It was an illustrious gathering into which Luther stepped. Two electors, two bishops, two princes, and two representatives of cities had been chosen for the commission.<sup>44)</sup> The Electoral College was represented by Greiffenklau and by the learned and eloquent Joachim Nestor of Brandenburg, who was a perfect master of the Latin language. The bishops present were those of Brandenburg and Augsburg; the princes were Duke George of Saxony and the Master of the Teutonic Order, in whose hostel the meeting took place. The city representatives were Peutingen, of Augsburg, and Bock, of Strassburg. Luther came attended by Schurf, Amsdorf, and Justus Jonas.<sup>45)</sup> The opponents of Luther constituted

43) Cochlaeus, *Comm.*, fol. 37 D.

44) Cochlaeus, *Comm.*, 37.

45) RA, 560.

the majority of the commission, and Aleander testifies that the conduct of the princes was excellent. He was displeased, however, because the princes had excluded from this meeting the official of Treves, Eck, whom Aleander had bribed, and who "had conducted himself so excellently" at the examination of Luther in the Diet. Instead of this questionable character the examination of Luther had this time been entrusted to a pupil of Jacob Wimpheling and Ulrich Zasius, Dr. Jerome Veuss<sup>46)</sup> by name, who was then the chancellor of Margrave Philip of Baden. Veuss was a staunch Catholic; his daughter was the abbess at the convent of Lichtenthal.<sup>47)</sup> Even Aleander had to acknowledge that Veuss conducted the hearing of Luther in a skilful manner and as a loyal Roman Christian. And Luther himself admits in his letter to the Count of Mansfeld that the chancellor of Baden had addressed to him "a skilful, well-formed admonition" and had shown himself far superior to the official from Treves.<sup>48)</sup> Veuss himself reports<sup>49)</sup> that the day before, at six o'clock in the morning, he had been commissioned with the conduct of the conference at a preparatory consultation which the princes who belonged to the Commission held at the *Buergerhof* (City Hall). The "Doctor Badensis" would have preferred to be relieved of this task out of regard for his feeble health.<sup>50)</sup> Moreover, he says himself that he had been trained to solve knotty points in jurisprudence, but not in theology. However, having accepted the commission, he prepared for it well and opened the conference with an address that made a deep impression on all present.

In the first place, he explained to Luther that he had not at all been summoned for a disputation on the Creed, but that the princes, "being moved by a particular graciousness and sympathy and wishing to show him brotherly love," aimed at inducing him to make peace with the Church.<sup>51)</sup> Veuss appealed to the testimony of the Church and to Luther's conscience. As regards the former, he pointed out to Luther what offense had been caused by his claim that councils had contradicted each other. They had, Veuss said,

---

46) Jerome Vehus, born 1483, studied at Pforzheim, matriculated at Freiburg 1503, professor of law 1510, after 1514 chancellor. "He was an Erasmian, opposed to the Reformation." Smith, E. B., III, 134 f.

47) Vierodt, *Gesch. d. evang. Kirche Badens*, I, 132.

48) EE, 53, 72.

49) Illgen's *Zeitschr. f. hist. Theol.*, 21, 84. Comp. also Cordatus, No. 1724; Bindseil, I, 440; Foerstemann, 4, 350; RA, 611.

50) RA, 623.

51) Veuss, *l.c.*, p. 86.

taught, not *contraria*, but *diversa*, not contrary, but diverse doctrines.<sup>52)</sup> One could observe similar differences in the Gospel narratives; *e. g.*, when Zacchaeus, the publican, asks Christ to come into his house, while the centurion of Capernaum, from modesty, deprecates Christ's entering his home. Such contradictions must be adjusted from the attending circumstances and the special object to be attained in each instance. "On occasion and in an emergency" a council might even formulate decrees that seem to contradict Scripture, even as a diet may pass exceptional laws in contradiction to the common law. Such occurrences must be interpreted from the state of the times and the attending circumstances, and it would be wrong on that account to deny the authority of the council itself. Furthermore, Veuss declared that Luther's attacks on papal ordinances were offensive. Human ordinances were needed, he said, for the suppression of vice and the curbing of wantonness. In view of the constantly changing needs of the time the Church could not do without human ordinances. St. Martin, St. Nicholas, and many other saints had also attended councils; therefore it was wrong for Luther to pass such a harsh judgment on councils.

In the second place, Veuss stated that he could not spare Luther the charge that his books endangered the public peace, and he appealed to Luther's conscience to say whether the charge was not true. Referring to the Acts of the Apostles, Veuss remarked that the believers in those days had been of one heart and of one mind. Hence, if Luther meant to live and teach in an apostolic manner, he must labor for a similar concord. If he would recant his heretical writings, he would save those of his books which even his adversaries acknowledged to be good books. If he refused to do this, the Emperor would outlaw him and expel him from the Empire. It appears that the Badensian chancellor as well as the Friar of Wittenberg had peeped into the devil's cards; accordingly, Veuss warned Luther of the devil's scheme to render his salutary writings ineffectual by the latest heretical writings for which the devil had furnished him the inspiration.<sup>53)</sup> He warned Luther against "the terror by night, the arrow that flieth by day, the pestilence that walketh in darkness."<sup>54)</sup> The Saxon report of

52) Cochlaeus, *Comm.*, 38.

53) Thus reads the Saxon account. In his own account, published later, Veuss states that his admonition was administered to Luther at the second conference. RA, 621.

54) Ps. 91, 5. 6.

Spalatin sums up Veuss's speech thus: "The whole address, built up in accordance with the rules of rhetoric and oratory, had for its aim to admonish Luther, on the one hand, that he would have a regard for law, right, and order, and on the other hand, that he would consider the danger of men's consciences becoming confused and the public interest." Veuss concluded his address with an ominous reminder of the penalties which the Emperor would impose.

In his reply Luther humbly and gratefully acknowledged the gracious intentions of his lordly collocutors towards such an insignificant little man as himself. He denied that he had lowered men's esteem of all councils. His only objection had been to the Council of Constance for having condemned the thesis of John Huss that the true Church is the sum total of those predestinated unto eternal life. By rejecting this thesis, Luther held, the council had placed itself in opposition to Scripture and to the statement in the Creed: "I believe a holy Christian Church."<sup>55)</sup> Regarding obedience to be rendered the magistrates, Luther stated that he well knew that such obedience was a duty of Christians and that the individual citizen, for the sake of peace, must submit to the powers that be. But he asserted that neither of these considerations must be carried to such an extreme that one becomes a traitor to God's Word. When Luther had finished his statement, he was asked to withdraw, and the princes consulted with each other as to the further mode of procedure.

When Luther was again called into the conference, the Doctor Badensis proposed to Luther that he commit his writings to the Emperor and the Diet for their judgment, with the understanding that he would recant such writings as these two authorities would declare heretical. To this proposal Doctor Martinus replied, humbly and becomingly, that he would accept as judges, not only such great majesties and lords, but even the most lowly persons, if they would refute him with Scripture proofs. However, as to the teaching of Scripture that had a bearing on his cause, he was so clear in his own mind that he could not yield; for St. Augustine wrote that he had learned to respect only those writings which are called canonical and to accord faith to the rest of the teachers only as far as they had written truth.<sup>56)</sup> His conscience, then, being bound and taken captive by God's Word, he begged not to urge him

55) RA, 562. — Letter to Count Albrecht of Mansfeld. EE, 53, 72 f.

56) Augustine, *Ep.*, 82. Migne, *Op. Aug.*, II, 277.

to deny his conviction. Hereupon Elector Joachim summed up the result of the conference by saying that Luther had declared that he would yield only when overcome with Holy Writ. Luther affirmed his statement, saying: "Yes, my dear lord; or with plain and manifest arguments and reasons." The conference was now adjourned, and the princes started for the *Buergerhof*. Only Greiffenklau remained with Luther, whom he treated kindly as his guest.

Veuss, who had followed the princes who were riding to the *Buergerhof*, met Doctor Peutinger in the market-place, and the latter told Veuss in passing that he had just learned from Schurf that Luther was ready to submit his cause to the judgment of the Estates at the Diet. Peutinger asked Veuss to convey this information to his margrave and to announce it at the conference of the princes. He said that he had already communicated this news to the Bishop of Brandenburg. Accordingly, Veuss, taking up a position at the stairway of the *Buergerhof*, began to talk of the prospect of reaching an understanding with Luther in a more optimistic strain than he would have done otherwise. For this reason Veuss was charged afterwards with having circulated an inaccurate report, and this forced him in June, after he had returned to Baden, to address a letter to his prince, the Margrave of Baden, in which he defends himself against the charge and, besides, raises a protest against other points in the Saxon publication *Acta Lutheri Wormatiæ*.<sup>57)</sup>

#### 4. Luther the Guest of Greiffenklau.

By an order of Greiffenklau, the Archbishop of Treves, Luther was detained at the hostel of the Teutonic Knights after the conference had been adjourned. The archbishop sent for Luther to join him in the dining-hall on the second floor. There Luther found the official, Eck, who had conducted his hearing at the Diet and the *Dechant* of Frankfort, Cochlaeus.<sup>58)</sup> All sat down to a luncheon. Since this is the only time that Luther lunched with the archbishop, the anecdote which Luther's physician, Ratzeberger, has told must be referred to this occasion. Ratzeberger relates that as Luther was about to raise his glass to his lips and, according to his habit, made the sign of the cross over the glass, the bottom fell out. Luther's friends suspected that an attempt to poison him

<sup>57)</sup> Illgen's *Zeitschr. f. hist. Theol.*, 21, 83 ff. Comp. also Wrede, RA, 611.

<sup>58)</sup> Spalatin, *Annals*, 44; Cochlaeus, *Comm.*, fol. 39.

had been made and was thus frustrated. Luther himself entertained no such suspicion; his explanation was that the glass had been dashed into cold water, which had caused a fissure that was not discovered when the wine was poured in.<sup>59)</sup> Still Luther did not feel quite at ease at this luncheon. Aleander remarks sneeringly that Luther asked to have his guardians Schurf and Amsdorf present. Luther's experience with a man like Eck, who had already become known as a hired tool of Aleander,<sup>60)</sup> and with the other expert Romanist, Cochlaeus, "the wrathful mannikin with the bell cap," had not been of a nature to inspire confidence. Cochlaeus, who was cathedral *Dechant* at the *Liebfrauenkirche* at Frankfurt, had as late as the preceding year followed his humanistic bent and had publicly taken Luther's side; but after the publication of Luther's *Babylonian Captivity* he had changed his mind, and this tergiversation had not raised him in the public esteem. When he started upon his own initiative<sup>61)</sup> for the Diet on April 16, accompanied only by his young nephew, his colleagues at Frankfurt looked after him with an ironical expression, and one of them, Canon Wolfgang Koenigstein, expressed great surprise over the fact that their *Dechant* seemed to be the only theologian whom Greiffenklau thought a match for the Friar of Wittenberg.<sup>62)</sup> "He had nobody present," Koenigstein muses, "except our *Dechant*, John Cochlaeus, who on Tuesday after Misericordias Domini, which was April 16, went out to Worms to meet Luther. The astonishing things he did I shall pass over; for it is being said that he met with many a setback there and elsewhere." In Worms, Cochlaeus called on "the fox" Capito, who also on this occasion was carrying water on both shoulders and introduced the *Dechant* of Frankfurt to Aleander.<sup>63)</sup>

Cochlaeus did not have to wait long for employment. To begin with, the nuncio had him make excerpts from Luther's writings, thus increasing *post festum* his stock of knowledge of Luther. The manuscripts of Cochlaeus are still in the archives of the Vatican. They are Latin excerpts from Luther's *Instruction for Those Going to Confession*, from the *Tessaradecas*, the *Address to the German Nobility*, and the *New Karsthans*.<sup>64)</sup>

59) Ratzeberger, edited by Neudecker, p. 51 f.

60) Aleander, April 27. Balan, 74, p. 195.

61) *Privatim et ultro a nomine vocatus*. *Comm.*, p. 39.

62) See G. Ed. Steitz, l. c. (*Die Melanckthon- u. Lutherherbergen; Neujahrsschrift d. Vereins f. Gesch. zu Frankfurt a. M.*, 1861), p. 11.

63) Cochlaeus, *Comm.*, 39.

64) Against Murnar, RA, 624.



On April 24, Aleander, of whom even the Emperor said he knew that he never slept, sent for the Frankfurt *Dechant* at four o'clock in the morning<sup>65)</sup> and ordered him to be at the lodging of the archbishop in order to take part in the conference with Luther. But Aleander instructed Cochlaeus under no condition to engage in a doctrinal discussion with Luther, but only to pay close attention and then to give Aleander a faithful account.<sup>66)</sup> However, Cochlaeus had not come to Worms to place his light under a bushel, and to his own hurt he disregarded Aleander's counsel.

The discussion seems to have been quite lively. Luther relates: "Now there were some present who wanted to instruct me how to frame my answer, but Thun [Schurf] told them: 'You need not teach him; he will know what to say.'" <sup>67)</sup> With the same brutality with which Eck had treated Luther at the public hearing before the Diet, he spoke in great style against Luther's Scripture principle. He said that there never had been a heresy but it originated in the Bible. The Arian error had sprung from the statement in John 14, 28: "The Father is greater than I." Another heresy had been caused by Matt. 1, 25: "Joseph did not know his wife until she had brought forth her first-born Son." Accordingly, Eck proposed to overthrow the thesis that the true Church is the communion of saints. Dr. Martin and Schurf, however, reprovved him sharply. Meanwhile the archbishop was called outside, since Veuss had arrived with a message.<sup>68)</sup>

The ensuing intermission was employed by Cochlaeus in introducing himself to the other gentlemen present and requesting their aid for inducing Luther to terminate his controversy. Cochlaeus himself warned Luther that, if he proceeded in his present course, he would ruin the highly gifted Philip Melanchthon and other young men for the Church. "Well," said Luther, "what am I to do then?" Cochlaeus advised him to go before any judge and submit to his verdict.

When the archbishop returned, the discussion was taken up again, and particular theses in Luther's writings were more thoroughly discussed.<sup>69)</sup> "Now the Archbishop of Treves, who

---

65) See his *Colloquium cum Luthero*. RA, 624. In 1540 Cochlaeus claimed to have been summoned by the Archbishop of Treves, perhaps upon a request from Aleander.

66) Cochlaeus, *Comm.*, fol. 39.

67) EE, 64, 371.

68) RA, 625.

69) See passages in Illgen's *Zeitschr.*, etc., 21, 92 f.

was, verily, quite a versatile man of the world, with gracious words led the discussion to a point where he would have persuaded and induced Dr. M. Luther to yield a little.<sup>70)</sup> The conversation turned about the question whether a single individual had the right to rise in opposition to official decrees of councils. Luther was urging the Pauline thesis: "If anything be revealed to another that sitteth by, let the first hold his peace."<sup>71)</sup> At this point Cochlaeus broke into the conversation with the sneering question whether *Luther* had perhaps received a revelation. Aleander, upon information of Cochlaeus, reported to Rome that Luther had at first claimed to have received a revelation, but the next moment had denied it.<sup>72)</sup> Moreover, Cochlaeus had boasted to Aleander that his and Eck's arguments had completely cowed Luther. However, Luther claims that when the archbishop gave Cochlaeus the floor, the latter had thumped the table with his finger and said nothing else than: "O Martin, Martin, you are speaking *per talenta!*"<sup>73)</sup> To the Count of Mansfeld Luther wrote: "It was a wordless disputation; they tried to get at me with sharp words, but did not hit the mark." The Saxon report of Spalatin complains<sup>74)</sup> that during the conversation "the official of Treves and Dr. Cochlaeus had sometimes spoken at the same time and had not given Luther sufficient time to answer them." Cochlaeus complains that Schurf had hurled the words at him, "Let him speak, why don't you?"

Finally, Eck attacked Luther for taking the part of Huss, and the discussion of the thesis that the Church is the sum total of the elect turned into a regular scholastic controversy between Eck and Luther. Cochlaeus found it necessary to remark that Luther wanted to cite passages of Scripture, but did not remember the exact words, while from Schurf, who always spoke German when he interrupted the discussion, he claims to have heard a Latin word.<sup>75)</sup>

At length, the dinner hour having arrived, the archbishop terminated the conversation. While Luther was departing, Cochlaeus exhorted him to recant the doctrines which were displeasing to all decent people. Luther replied that he had not attacked any one personally. Cochlaeus queried, "Not even Leo X?" Luther

70) Spalatin, *Annals*, 44.

71) 1 Cor. 14, 30.

72) Report of April 27. Balan, 74. Comp. *Colloquium Cochlaeicum Lutheri Wormatiae habitum*. Moguntiae, 1540. RA, 626, and Luther's account to the Count of Mansfeld of May 3. XV, 1912 ff.

73) EE, 31, 302.

74) RA, 607.

75) RA, 627.

replied, "He is not a private, but a public person." And so they parted. Luther left in an elated state of mind, conscious of victory, and this fact chagrined the *Dechant* very much. According to the report of the nuncio the archbishop betook himself forthwith to the meeting of the princes, where he obtained from the Emperor a grudging consent to continue the conferences with Luther, which to Greiffenklau still seemed to open up a hopeful prospect.<sup>76)</sup>

### 5. Cochlaeus Visits Luther.

Bashfulness was not a weakness of Cochlaeus. On the afternoon of Wednesday, April 24, he appeared at the hostel of the Knights of St. John on pretense of making a visit to Spalatin. He was met by Amsdorf, who conducted him up-stairs, where Cochlaeus found Luther in company with Petzensteiner, Suaven, Schurf, Jonas, and Thilmann Conradi.<sup>77)</sup> Schurf and Amsdorf took a seat near Cochlaeus, who begged them to counsel Luther more emphatically to make peace with the Church.<sup>78)</sup> Petzensteiner was itching for a dogmatic tilt, and the company was first amazed and then hugely amused to hear him challenge the Frankfurt *Dechant* to a debate. Cochlaeus replied angrily: "Little brother, do you think that there are men only at Wittenberg? What did you do recently? What had the Dominican prior done to you whose gown you plucked in public as he was descending from the pulpit, and whom you charged with having badly interpreted Paul in his sermon? Might you not by such an act endanger Luther's safe-conduct? For the safe-conduct was not issued as a license for insulting people." Luther stepped up to the group, laughing, and said, in a bantering tone: "My brother may be more learned than all of us, especially when he has drunk his fill." All were laughing; only Petzensteiner looked indignant, especially since Cochlaeus had addressed him "little brother."

Cochlaeus now took a seat with Luther and admonished him not to drag all the excellent men present into perdition with him. However, these excellent men, especially Justus Jonas, told him that they took an entirely different view of the situation. One of them upbraided the former Humanist that he had turned traitor to the liberal arts and had attacked Luther in an oration. Cochlaeus expostulated with them, saying that the oration had been spread among the people against his will, most likely by the Humanist Nesen. He declared that he was pained at Luther's

76) BAL, p. 163.

77) Comp. DTC, p. 170.

78) RA, 627 f.

stubbornness. One of the noblemen remarked, "But Luther is not pained." "He soon will be," warningly said the *Dechant*. Schurf now repeated Petzensteiner's challenge and called upon Cochlaeus to name a single teaching in which Luther was in error. Cochlaeus had no desire to enter into a debate with this company of Lutherans. He merely asked why Luther was disturbing the people with his utraquism,<sup>79)</sup> when he had to admit that the body of Christ was received also when the Sacrament is administered only in one form. The gentlemen present appealed to the fact that the cup had been ordained for general use in the Biblical account of the Sacrament. Cochlaeus, however, argued that the term "cup" stands for the contents of the cup, and these the communicant receives also in the bread. Thus the argument drifted to transubstantiation and the Mass. The room was filled with Lutherans, and the *Dechant* could not quit the argument without damaging his theological reputation and exposing himself to ridicule. Accordingly, he appealed to the Fourth Lateran Council, alleging that it had sanctioned transubstantiation. Luther replied: "The Word of God is superior to councils." Cochlaeus claimed that even Ambrose had taught a *conversio* (transformation) in the Lord's Supper. Luther denied this and said that Ambrose had only spoken of a *mutatio* (change). Luther proceeded to exhibit the ludicrous side of transubstantiation, when Cochlaeus proposed to him that he should forfeit his safe-conduct and hold a public disputation with him. This proposal roused a storm of indignation among the knights. "Why must Luther surrender his safe-conduct?" they cried. Cochlaeus remarked that the Lutherans themselves had boasted that Luther would even forfeit his safe-conduct if his opponents would consent to meet him in a public disputation. Schurf exclaimed, "Who should be as foolish as that?"<sup>80)</sup> The Saxon noblemen were so angered by the audacious suggestion of Cochlaeus that they were inclined to throw the *Dechant* down the stairs. Volrat of Watzdorf was about to "facilitate Cochlaeus's exit with a bloody head if he had not been checked."<sup>81)</sup> Luther took a humorous view of Cochlaeus's proposal. "He suggested that I renounce my safe-conduct, and he would hold a disputation

79) The Biblical teaching regarding the Lord's Supper, which holds that both forms of the Sacrament, the bread and the wine, must be administered.

80) *Table Talk*, Foerstemann, 4, 351.

81) EE, 64, 373. "Hætte ihm beinahe einen ziemlichen Kochloeffel gereicht." Krumhaar, *Mansfeld*, N. 9; cf. EB, 2, 145.

with me. One could have split laughing at the booby; so sillily he talked." <sup>82)</sup> When Cochlaeus inquired whom Luther would choose as umpire for their disputation, Luther replied, "A boy eight years old"; and when the question was repeated more urgently, Luther raised the umpire's age to nine years.

Meanwhile several persons of noble rank had entered the room. Cochlaeus took one of them for the Saxon Elector, but it was the Count of Mansfeld. The nobleman asked that the argument between Luther and Cochlaeus be continued. Accordingly, surrounded by a congested circle of guests, the disputants continued their argument on the formula of distribution in the Lord's Supper, "This is My body." Luther interpreted the formula after the analogy of the thesis: God is man. Cochlaeus still insisted that Luther appoint a judge for a disputation, and Luther pointed to the youngest layman present, most likely the nephew whom Cochlaeus had taken with him from Frankfurt. Cochlaeus replied indignantly, "I will not have him." The Count of Mansfeld now suggested that the confused talk in the overcrowded room be terminated, and the two opponents entered Luther's bed-room to come to an agreement there. Spite of Cochlaeus's protestation that he had not come armed, Luther insisted on the presence of witnesses during their face-to-face conversation. The weapons which Luther feared were other than knives and daggers. Accordingly, Cochlaeus took his nephew and Luther his Petzensteiner with him into the bed-room. Both took seats at some distance from the young men, and Luther began to talk kindly about the preceding discussion. He admitted that he had made rather violent attacks upon the Roman See, but he expressed satisfaction over having crushed the soul-destroying indulgences. Cochlaeus now reiterated all the proposals which others before him had made to Luther: he was to offer a partial recantation, to consent to a court of arbitration, etc. He declared that the Archbishop of Treves stood ready to assign Luther to a post where he could live in peace. Cochlaeus appealed to Luther's conscience not to hurl such a genius as Philip Melanchthon with him into perdition. He worked himself into such agitation that he shed tears, and he boasted afterwards that he had moved also Luther to tears. Luther admitted that Melanchthon was much more learned than himself. "What cruelty," Cochlaeus exclaimed, "to place such a man in danger too!" Finally Luther said: "My dear Doctor, I understand quite well that you are dealing with me

82) EE, 31, 302; Cordatus, 1721.

from an evil purpose. But I am the least factor in this business; there are others, greater and more learned than myself. I preach and deliver public lectures on the Psalms. What I am doing is a mere trifle. Hence, it would be useless for me to recant ever so long and ever so often; for others far more learned than I would not remain silent and would continue the controversy." Tearfully Cochlaeus now extended his hand to Luther to say good-by; but he assured Luther at the same time that he would write against him. Luther replied that he would not fail to answer.

The next morning Cochlaeus met Justus Jonas with two other friends of Luther at the Dominican monastery. He had heard from Capito that the Lutherans were incensed because of his proposal that Luther surrender his safe-conduct. Jonas, too, expressed his surprise to Cochlaeus that he alone, from among a thousand Humanists, had sided with the barbarians. "Do with me whatever you please," Cochlaeus replied; "I can never be a Hussite." Jonas, however, advised him not to write against Luther, or forty learned men would take up their pens to write against Cochlaeus.

To Aleander, Cochlaeus reported marvelous facts by which he had triumphed over Luther, and the nuncio made honorable mention of Cochlaeus in his report to Rome and obtained for him a reward of ten gulden. The reward was so niggard that Saraccioli added one or two dispensations to make it look more valuable.<sup>83</sup> The dispensations cost nothing and were worth nothing.

Aleander found to his delight that Cochlaeus confirmed an opinion which the nuncio had long fostered, *viz.*, that "the monster" (Luther) was neither a grammarian nor a philosopher nor a theologian, but a "sheer maniac." "There is a universal conviction," Aleander writes to Medici, after receiving Cochlaeus's report, "that Luther has not composed the greater part of the writings in question himself, and he has even confidentially communicated to some that the more vicious of his books are by his friends, to whom he has pledged his word not to reveal them. Hence he speaks of this matter only to one or the other when no witnesses are present. Moreover, he has said to Cochlaeus that for his part he, as a rule, preaches and teaches and comments on the Psalms, and that those books about which such a hubbub has occurred have been composed by his friends, and that, if he were to recant, more than twenty others would arise and would make matters worse from day to day. In short, in dealing with him, nothing was gained, neither with

---

83) BAL, p. 175.

instruction nor admonition nor cunning, for he stubbornly stuck to his one statement that he would not act contrary to his conscience." This shows that Cochlaeus had been so prudent as to report to Aleander precisely such things as Aleander wished him to report; for that Luther had really renounced the authorship of his writings it is impossible to conceive, unless Cochlaeus had fathered upon Luther all books that had been written in opposition to Rome, which Luther could justly deny. *(To be concluded.)*

---