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Considerable attention has already been devoted to the careers of the more famous Reformation leaders, Martin Luther, Ulrich Zwingli, and John Calvin. But among those of secondary rank, there are a number who played important roles in publicizing evangelical doctrines and in introducing ecclesiastical reforms. The purpose of this dissertation is to examine the career of Urbanus Rhegius as a reformer in South Germany and Austria in order to discover the role which he played in the spread of the German Reformation.

The sources for Rhegius' life are inadequate to present a complete picture of his intellectual development and relation to others. Except for a biographical sketch written by his son, Ernst, as a preface to a collection of his father's works and scattered references to him in university matriculation lists and personal correspondence, very little is known about him. But all of the pamphlets and sermons which he published during the course of his career as a reformer have survived. It is from these that one gains an understanding of his development as a theologian and propagandist for evangelical doctrines.

It was not until the nineteenth century that Rhegius became the subject of serious biographical study. The first
work by H. Ch. Heimbürger, *Urbanus Rhegius: Nach gedruckten
und ungedruckten Quellen* (Hamburg-Gotha, 1851), was uncri-
tical in its use of sources and fawning in its praise of
Rhegius. Gerhard Uhlhorn's biography, *Urbanus Rhegius: Leb-
en und ausgewählte Schriften* (Elberfeld, 1862), was the
first scholarly account of Rhegius' life and works. Al-
though Uhlhorn adduced evidence which Heimbürger had neg-
lected, he was often quite cursory in his treatment of Rhe-
gius' pamphlets. In contrast to these two books, which were
sympathetic to Rhegius and to the Reformation, Patricius
Wittmann's *Augsburger "Reformatoren"* (Stuttgart, 1883) was
virulently anti-Protestant. Nevertheless, Wittmann expanded
considerably on the history of Augsburg in order to present
Rhegius in a more precise historical setting. It is the aim
of the present dissertation to present a fuller account of
Rhegius' published works and to examine his thought and
actions within the context of Reformation history.
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CHAPTER I
EARLY LIFE AND EDUCATION

On the north shore of Lake Constance, about eight miles from the former free imperial city of Lindau, lies the small market town of Langenargen. It was here that Urbanus Rhegius was born in the month of May, 1489. Very little is known about his family, and the name itself has been a subject of controversy. Rhegius' son, Ernst, states in the biographical sketch appended to the edition of his father's Opera latine (Nürnberg, 1562) that the name was originally König, but that his father, following the humanist custom of latinizing vernacular surnames, had changed his name to "Rhegius," preferring that to the more accurate but less modest "Rex." This, however, appears to have been an inference on Ernst's part, rather than a statement of fact. The matriculation lists at the Universities of Freiburg im Breisgau and Ingolstadt, as well as references to him by his teacher Johann Eck, prove that the German family name was Rieger. Rhegius' choice of a Latin name may well have been influenced by the name of one of his most admired teachers, Johann Rhagius. There is nothing, however, which contradicts Ernst's story of how his father received his Christian name. During the baptismal service, Rhegius' godparents were said
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to have forgotten the name which the parents had chosen, and so the priest gave him the name "Urbanus," that of a saint whose memorial day (May 25) was drawing near.³

Rhegius' parents were, according to Ernst's account, poor but pious and respectable people. Rhegius himself mentioned with pride that he had been brought up with a true knowledge of Christ.⁴ His enemies later charged that he had been the son of a priest, an accusation which he never denied. Moreover, the fact that married priests were not at all unknown in the diocese of Constance lends credence to the statement.⁵ Rhegius never made mention of his father in his correspondence nor did he discuss his family, save for a brief reference to a younger brother⁶ and a passing remark about his mother keeping house for him in Hall im Inntal during 1522-1524.⁷ Except for these statements, nothing else is known about the family.

Following a period of instruction at the local school in Langenargen and at the Latin school in nearby Lindau, Rhegius entered the University of Freiburg in June, 1508 and received his baccalaureate there two years later. The University, founded in 1460 and modeled after the University of Paris, was especially strong in the Faculties of Law and of Liberal Arts.⁸ Among those teachers who exerted lasting influence over him at Freiburg, high place must be given to the legal scholar Ulrich Zasius. Zasius was born in Constance in 1461 and had studied at Tübingen before taking up residence in Freiburg in 1491, first as a law student at the
University and chancellor of the city council, and then as rector of the local Latin school. In 1499 he resumed his legal studies and earned his doctorate in law shortly thereafter. As a lecturer in poetry and rhetoric and, after 1506, as ordinary professor of law, Zasius served as a teacher and legal advisor to the University until his death in 1536.\(^9\)

Zasius' reputation among his students depended not only on the skill with which he combined the study of law and his love for the classics but also on the personal interest which he showed to those who attended his lectures and lived in his house. Rhegius was one of those who benefited from Zasius' benevolence. He came to live with his teacher shortly after enrolling at the University, possibly because both were from the Lake Constance area. Their relations blossomed into one of friendship and trust, and Zasius, impressed with his young student's diligence and zeal, allowed Rhegius free access to his own private library. Zasius' interest in theology and his insistence that his boarders attend church regularly may well have served to strengthen the practical piety first instilled by his parents.\(^{10}\)

Also among Rhegius' teachers at Freiburg were Wolfgang Fabricius Capito and Johann Rhagius. Capito, born in 1472, had received a doctorate in medicine at Freiburg in 1498 and then, returning to the University after a period of study in Ingolstadt, had begun to devote his attention to the study of law and theology. He received a licentiate in the latter field in 1511 and assumed a lectureship in the Faculty of Arts
shortly thereafter. The friendship between Rhegius and Capito was one of the few from Rhegius' student days which survived the turbulent 1520's. Johann Rhagius, born in 1460 and also known as Aesticampianus after his native town of Sommerfeld, had been a student of Conrad Celtes at Cracow and of Berovaldus at Bologna. He had taught classical literature in Basel, Heidelberg, and Mainz before coming to Freiburg in 1506. Rhegius came to know him well, later praising his teacher both for his erudition and his personal warmth.

It was as a student of Johann Maier von Eck, whom Rhegius had come to know through Zasius, that he was introduced to Aristotelian philosophy and scholastic theology. Eck, born in 1486 and thus only a few years older than Rhegius, was already a man of demonstrated abilities. He had entered Heidelberg at the age of twelve to study philosophy and languages and had earned a Master of Arts at Tübingen before taking up the study of law at Freiburg under Zasius in 1502. His real interest, however, lay in the study of theology, and it was in this field that he received his doctorate in 1510. Eck's precociousness, skill in disputation, and sense of self-importance aroused considerable resentment among the older professors. But he appeared in quite a different light to his students. Since 1505 he had been rector of the Pfauenzburse, a fraternity of students who followed the Nominalist tendency in scholastic philosophy. The fraternity appeared destined for dissolution at the hands of the academic authorities because of its loose morals. But Eck gave the
union a new reputation by undertaking a thorough and conscien-
tious instruction of the students entrusted to him. Unfor-
tunately a brawl arose between some of Eck's students and
those of the Adlerburse, a fraternity of Realists. Although
Eck had been trying to reconcile the difference between the
two modes of philosophy and their adherents, the University
senate held him responsible as the instigator of the quarrel
and punished him with house arrest. The ill-feeling created
by this incident and Eck's failure to receive a promised ap-
pointment in the Faculty of Arts contributed to a growing
tension between Eck and his students on the one hand and the
University officials on the other. Some years later Rhegius
described the poisoned atmosphere which then prevailed as the
result of jealousy directed toward Eck. There are people
whose weak eyes dazzle before the brightness of scholarship,
a crowd suited for evil darkness. For them unusual fame is a
cancer. Burdened with envy, they strive continuously to be-
little others. By 1508 Eck had begun to look for a more
favorable climate in which to teach and study. His opportuni-

ty came when a professorship in theology fell vacant at the
University of Ingolstadt. His departure from Freiburg in 1510
was transformed into a personal triumph by the troop of
friends and students, among them Capito and Rhegius, who ac-
accompanied their colleague as far as Waldkirch on the day of
his leaving.

Eck's conflict with the officials in Freiburg seems
also to have been the immediate cause of Rhegius' gradual alienation and eventual departure from Freiburg. In 1528, after their friendship had been dissolved by the Reformation debate, Rhegius wrote to Eck reminding him of his loyalty during the difficulties in Freiburg.

How greatly you furthered my studies and how dear you were to me is known by the University of Freiburg where I, out of passionate attachment to my teacher Eck, so offended the professors and officials of such a famous University in a satirical poem that I was suspended for a long time and in my own opinion had fallen into the hands of the devil.17

How long the suspension lasted is not known. It is possible that Rhegius may have been in Basel for a time, but it does not appear that he finally left Freiburg for Ingolstadt until the second half of 1512.18 In any event it was, in Rhegius' own words, "chiefly out of devotion to Eck"19 that he enrolled at Ingolstadt, where he was to spend the next six years of his life.

The University of Ingolstadt, under the leadership of its chancellor, Leonard Eck, and with the patronage of its founders the Dukes of Bavaria, was becoming in the early sixteenth century a leading center of humanist studies in Germany. Conrad Celtes had taught poetry and rhetoric there beginning in 1492 and had been succeeded by one of his own students, Jacob Locher, in 1497. Except for a brief period at Freiburg, Locher continued as a professor at the University until his death in 1528. In 1509 Johann Aventin, a scholar fluent in classical languages and celebrated as one of the first historians of his time, assumed a lectureship at
Ingolstadt. Even Eck's appointment may be considered as a part of the University's new policy, for he was not unsympathetic to the achievements of the humanists, and in fact the reform of the Bachelor of Arts program in 1519 to include more courses in grammar and rhetoric was largely Eck's work.

Rhegius' involvement in the development of humanism at the University assumed several forms. When Aventin left Ingolstadt in 1512 to accompany the young Wittelsbach princes Ludwig and Ernst on a study tour of Italy, Eck secured a position for Rhegius as a lecturer in poetry and rhetoric to fill part of the void left by Aventin's departure. When he returned from Italy several years later, his young charge, Duke Ernst, was so enthusiastic about the new humanistic studies that he resolved to bring to the University the most learned men from all corners of Germany, so that, as Rhegius expressed it, "finally after the destruction of barbarism, belles lettres, which had so long been neglected, will bloom again and return to their former brilliancy."

The first humanist to whom Ernst wished to extend the offer of a professorship was no less than Desiderius Erasmus. The negotiations were to be handled by Rhegius. In January, 1516 Rhegius wrote two letters on behalf of the University to Johann Faber, an official of the Bishop of Basel, setting forth the terms of the appointment and asking Faber to mediate with Erasmus, who at that time was working on the Greek New Testament in Basel. Erasmus replied directly to Rhegius, first on February 16, 1516, praising him for his
"candor, prudence, eloquence, and erudition" but expressing regret that his previous pledge of devotion to the service of his own prince, Charles, precluded acceptance of the offer. In a second letter, dated March 7, Erasmus recommended Heinrich Glareanus for the position. Since Erasmus consistently refused to accept a teaching position at any university, his failure to accept the offer from Ingolstadt need not reflect unfavorably on Rhegius' efforts.

Another dimension of the University's interest in fostering the growth of humanism was the organization of the Bavarian Literary Sodality, a group of scholars similar to the Danubian Sodality which had formed around Conrad Celtes during his later years in Vienna and to the contemporary circle of young humanists under Mutian's guidance at Erfurt. The Society was founded in 1516 by Aventin at the suggestion of Chancellor Eck and included among its members Urbanus Rhegius; Hieronymus Anfang; Georg Cuspinianus, a teacher of law and poetry; Johann Kneissel; Matthias Kretz; Augustin Merbold, one of Rhegius' students; and Georg Schalk, a friend of Johann Locher.

The Society devoted itself to the study of history and the writing of poetry. A volume resulting from its studies was published in Augsburg in 1518. The heart of the book was a biography of Emperor Henry IV and a series of his letters which had been discovered by Aventin. The book also included a number of poems written by the Society's members, including several by Rhegius in which he praised Aventin for
his service to historical studies.  

However, the substance of historical study took second place to the rhetorical and poetic exercises in which Rhegius engaged as a teacher and as a student. Forty-six poems composed by Rhegius during his years at Ingolstadt were later collected by his son Ernst and published by Gottfried Wagner in 1712. They are not works of great literary merit but rather stylistic exercises typical of the new poetic and literary culture which was taking root in the German universities. In these poems Rhegius extolled the glories of ancient culture while also celebrating the contemporary joys of wine, women, and luxurious living. Many were also devoted to the praise of famous men and personal associates, among them Johann Eck, Leonard Eck, and a fellow student, Matthias Kretz. Shortly after receiving the Master of Arts, Rhegius was honored for his literary efforts by Emperor Maximilian, who bestowed on him the crown of poet laureate in the spring of 1517.  

Although Rhegius was chiefly a poet and rhetorician in this period, his interest in theology had already been stirred. Religious subjects constitute a persistent theme in his poetic works. But if his praise of the triune God and of the Virgin Mary, his veneration of the saints and the priestly office appear as little more than an expression of conventional piety, his relation to Eck and to Johann Geiler von Kaisersberg is somewhat more illuminating for the study of his theological ideas. It was probably through Eck that
Rhegius came to know the works of Geiler. Eck had been personally acquainted with Geiler, having consulted with him in 1508, the year of his ordination, on the question of the hope of salvation. In 1512 Eck published a German edition of Geiler's sermon *Navicula penitentie.* Another editor of Geiler's works, Jacob Otther, published an edition of the *Navicula penitentie* in 1511 and one of the *Peregrinus* in 1513. Both are prefaced with poems written in honor of the author by Urbanus Rhegius. Rhegius praised Geiler in the former work as the "ornament of Germany" and a "pillar of faith," and recommended to the reader a careful examination of the sermon. It would not be unreasonable to assume that Geiler's Nominalism, his emphasis on the primacy of Scripture and on the value of inner piety, and his denunciation of hollow ceremonies and clerical abuses made some contribution to the shaping of Rhegius' own patterns of thought.

Eck, however, was undoubtedly the most formidible influence on Rhegius' early philosophical and theological development. Even after Rhegius had become alienated from Eck, he did not hesitate to confess that it was Eck who had been his mentor in Aristotelian philosophy and scholastic theology. More exuberant was the praise given his teacher in poems composed as prefaces to several of Eck's theological treatises. In a poem included in Eck's *Chrysopassus*, Rhegius wrote: "Eck's genius, illumined by the divine spirit, penetrates boldly into the deepest secrets of theology. Even now there is no one who can be compared to him, and the future
leads us to expect still greater achievements from him."34

But the future held more for both teacher and student than anyone knew. The years from 1518 to 1520 were of critical importance for the development of Rhegius' theological consciousness. It was during these years that he became enmeshed in the intellectual and religious life of the city of Constance. The writing of his first theological pamphlet, his entrance into the priesthood, and the growth of his interest in the early writings of Martin Luther fall within these years. Rhegius' correspondence with Johann Faber, now vicar-general to the Bishop of Constance, concerning the Erasmus appointment had laid the foundation for his introduction into the Constance circle. When he visited the city in the autumn of 1518 on a vacation trip, he was received as Faber's personal guest.35 It was at Faber's suggestion that he wrote the Opusculum de dignitate sacerdotum incomparabili.36 The pamphlet, written in only six days and completed on September 16, 1518, appears to have been intended as a recommendation for Rhegius' appointment to an ecclesiastical office within the Diocese of Constance. The effusive praise of the priestly class, the flattery of both Faber and Bishop Hugo von Landenberg, and Rhegius' description of the pamphlet as a "very hastily written expression of a perplexed soul stirred by hope, worry, and apprehension"37 make it appear as more than a mere rhetorical exercise.

Rhegius' self-confessed haste is doubtless responsible for the pamphlet's lack of organization and balance. Nonethe-
less it is of importance for the light which it sheds on the state of his thinking during these years. He begins with a flattering introduction in which he confesses himself to be obliged to the bishop for a number of things and praises Faber as his preceptor and patron. He then explains that the work is to be divided into three main parts. The first will deal with the origin and antiquity of the dignity of the priest; the second, with the general accord with which the people have honored the priesthood; and, finally, with the power and honor of the Christian priest. The third part, however, makes up four-fifths of the work, while the first and second are presented in only cursory fashion.

Rhegius takes up the first two aspects of the priesthood, its origin and popular approval, with the observation that the ancient philosophers had contended that man is by nature a religious animal. Since religion and public worship are necessary complements, the origin of the priesthood is contemporaneous with that of religion. This is historically demonstrable in the case of paganism. Moreover, just as the highest temporal and spiritual powers coalesced in pagan religion (the example of the consolidation of consular and pontifical power in the hands of Caesar is cited), so did the same process take place in Judaism. With a brief exegesis attempting to prove that the Jewish king was also the high priest, Rhegius brings to a close the first two parts of his treatise and passes on to the Christian priesthood.
The closer something is to perfection, the more perfect it is in itself. Now according to the sanctions of the papacy and according to the Scriptures, the priesthood is the closest to God of all human institutions. The priesthood is part of the body of Christ and also has the power of creating the body of Christ through the act of consecration. In a definition which seems to be more in line with received theology than with his own syllogism, Rhegius declares that the priesthood consists of six specific functions: (1) consecration, (2) administration of the sacraments, (3) preaching the word, (4) juridical correction, (5) ordination of ministers, and (6) the acceptance of the necessities of life from the sheep to whom in turn the spiritualia are imparted.

The first and highest dignity of the priest is the act of consecration, the power which the priest has to create the body of Christ. This act of creation makes the priest similar to the Creator of all things. Just as God either creates temporal things out of temporal material (e.g. Adam and Eve), or temporal things out of nothing (e.g. the world), or the divine out of the temporal (e.g. the Son of God), so also the consecrating priest creates the eternal body of Christ out of the bread and wine. Because of this power the priest stands above saints, angels, and even the mother of God. From this power flow six priceless qualities of the priest: (1) an appearance which is never ordinary (decor nunquam obsolescens), a brightness and luster in his spirit
similar to the sunlight which Phoebus spreads over the world; (2) assimilation (*assimilatio*), according to which the priest becomes similar to Christ, just as the trichotomy of the human soul makes it the analogue of the Holy Trinity; (3) segregation (*discretio*), the separation of the priest from all others in the future Church triumphant; (4) indefatigable energy (*vigor inmancissibilis*), a power to which no created thing compares; (5) immeasurable value (*inaestimabile pretium*), in contrast to which nothing on earth or in heaven is so precious; and (6) immortality (*vigor indelebilis*), signifying that the priest's fullness of power is eternal.

Although Rhegius clearly aligns himself with the view that the priest's powers are indestructable, he does not deny that clerical prerogatives can be removed by canonical punishment. But the priesthood should not be attacked on account of the sins of its members, because the sins of the priest do not impair the dignity of his office.

In his treatment of the second of the priest's powers, that of administering the sacraments, Rhegius limits himself to the sacrament of penance, which he calls "the second chance after the despoliation of human nature." He begins with the statement that penance involves two things, knowledge and power, and then drops this subject in favor of a series of digressions, first on the importance of an educated priesthood, and then on the primacy of the pope.

Just as doctors and judges must be learned in their professions, Rhegius argues, so also must the priest be
learned in his. It is much to the credit of the Bishop of Constance, writes Rhegius, that he instituted examinations for priests and assigned the task of administration to Faber. Those who contend that knowledge is either unnecessary or forbidden to the priest are not to be heeded. It is the misuse of knowledge which is detrimental, not knowledge itself. Rhegius then gives a list of well-known humanists whose service to knowledge was plainly evident. Among the most important were Capito, Reuchlin, Cuspinianus, Vadian, Mutian, and Johann von Botzheim. These observations are then concluded with a paen to the sixteenth century.

Rhegius then proceeds to a consideration of the primacy of the pope, which he seeks to found on an exegetical and canonical basis. The dignity of the priest is completely eclipsed by that of the pope. "Peter's bark can be attacked by waves but it cannot be sunk." Moreover, Rhegius regards it as monstrous to charge, as some have, that in Rome everything is not judged in the best possible way, and he defends as irreproachable and selfless those servants of the pope whom others were condemning as courtesans of the worst sort. It is more than likely that Rhegius was not yet fully aware of the extent of clerical abuses in Rome, and indeed his subsequent experience in Constance changed his opinions on this matter.

Returning to his discussion of the priest's powers, Rhegius takes up the third of these, preaching the word. He extols the divine word as the nourishment of the soul
which is provided by the priest. Having gathered together all of the places in the Scriptures where the word of God is praised, he then declares that the more majestic the word, the more majestic are those who preach it. He even places the preaching of the word above the classical eloquence of antiquity—an act of self-abnegation of which few humanists were capable.

The fourth and fifth powers of the priest, juridical correction and ordination of ministers, are dealt with briefly. The former is already implicit in the sacrament of penance. It is not merely a brotherly admonition but a form of legal accusation based on Matthew 18:17 and extended to heretics by Titus 3:10. Rhegius labels any who wish to diminish this power as Hussites. The highest form of corrective power resides in the pope, from whom it descends to the lower circles of the hierarchy. Concerning ordination, Rhegius observes only that the monarchy of the Church founded on St. Peter, radiates out from the pope to the episcopal and parish levels.

The sixth and final power of the priesthood refers to the right of self-preservation by means of temporal goods. The foundation for this is I Corinthians 9:9: "Thou shalt not muzzle the mouth of the ox that treadeth out the corn." The priest must be provided the means for his temporal maintenance, otherwise no one would be willing to assume the burdens and sacrifices of the priesthood. Although Rhegius inveighs against the accumulation of benefices while poorly
paid vicars struggle to administer their parishes and attacks monkish begging and priestly greed, he severely reproves the enemies of priestly honors and revenues. In conclusion, Rhegius admonishes the priest to be worthy of his office and then states that he must take leave of his friends in Constance because Johann Eck has summoned him to return to Ingolstadt.

His return proved to be only temporary, however. In November, 1518 Rhegius wrote to Michael Hummelberger, a humanist whom he had recently met in Constance, stating that he would be coming to visit him soon and expressing regret that some troublesome business was keeping him in Bavaria longer than he had expected. However, a letter to the same correspondent, now in Ravensburg, dated January 18, 1519, finds Rhegius back in Constance. Sometime early in 1519 he took holy orders and, through Faber's good offices, received an appointment as spiritual vicar to the Bishop of Constance. In two poems written on the occasion of his departure from Ingolstadt, Rhegius leaves little doubt that it was not any quarrel with the University or with Eck that persuaded him to leave. To his "excellent University" he wished success, and in regard to Eck he wrote: "May Eck live many happy years, he on whose account I came to Bavaria and whose memory time will never destroy."

Rhegius' transfer to Constance placed him in closer contact both with the problems that were stirring reform sentiment and with the writings of Martin Luther, whose
Ideas were under close examination. The diocese of Constance had already witnessed the introduction of several reforms under Bishop Hugo von Landenberg. Bishop Hugo was not a learned man himself, but he was a friend of scholarship and he strove to raise the moral and intellectual standards of the clergy within his diocese. In 1510 he had placed all pastors under the obligation of expounding the Ten Commandments, the Apostles' Creed, and the Lord's Prayer every Sunday. But a visitation in 1517 revealed widespread instances of gambling, fornication, blasphemy, and drunkenness among the clergy. In a letter to Hummelberger in April, 1519, Rhegius gave personal testimony of the unfortunate state of the clergy.

There are so many uneducated people in the priesthood that I can perhaps be regarded as distinguished in comparison to many. You are right in your complaint that many incompetent people are continually being consecrated to God's service, among whom one finds neither morality or learning. I am for this reason quite angry with those who are responsible for giving the examinations because they are admitting the ignorant and uneducated into our ranks. They excuse themselves by saying that if they do not make allowance for the deficient education of the candidates there will soon not be any more priests. I have only recently convinced myself of this again when I took part in an examination and found among thirty candidates scarcely one who was moderately well educated.

The concern for the reform of abuses took on wider scope with the introduction of the sale of indulgences into the diocese. In August, 1518 the Franciscan monk Bernhardin Samson made his appearance in the Swiss part of the diocese as a seller of indulgences commissioned by the pope. Both Bishop Hugo and his vicar-general, Faber, were opposed
to this traffic in indulgences, and the latter wrote to Ulrich Zwingli, then preaching in Einsiedeln, encouraging him to preach against it. Zwingli's appointment as preacher at the Great Minster in Zürich in December, 1518 provided the opportunity for a second confrontation with Samson when he came to Zürich in the spring of 1519 to complain about the opposition he had been receiving in the canton. In a letter dated March 2, 1519, Rhegius wrote to Zwingli that the vicar-general's "stomach is turned at certain pardons and indulgences that a well-known Minorite is peddling all over Switzerland." This was Rhegius' first letter to Zwingli, and, having already received greetings from him through Sigismund Röbli in Lindau and through Faber, he took the opportunity to express his friendship.

You can be sure that I, although surpassed by many in learning, yield to no one in sincere ardent friendship. You were first to send your love to me. I return that love and will take pains not to appear bested by anyone in the duties of humanity.

Zwingli's stand against Samson proved successful, for a papal letter to Samson dated May 1, 1519 admonished him to submit to the wishes of the local authorities in all matters. A June 17th letter from Faber to Zwingli praised the pope's decision and assured Zwingli of eternal friendship.

If Rhegius was already on friendly terms with Zwingli, who was in 1519 still a faithful son of the Church, his attitude toward Luther was not so cordial. Luther's writings had found wide circulation in Constance and were a subject
of discussion not only in intellectual circles but among ordinary citizens as well. As one observer expressed it: "Luther's articles and books made the rounds in Constance, provoked astonishment at first, but also gave cause to pursue the matter further and to read the Scriptures thoroughly." In July of 1519 news of the Leipzig Disputation stirred the country, and Luther's attack on the primacy of the pope and the infallibility of the councils caused many to rein in their earlier enthusiasm. These matters were much discussed in Constance by Faber and Johann von Botzheim, a former student of Wimpheling and since 1512 a canon at the Cathedral.

Botzheim was completely on Luther's side and defended him in disputations with Faber and Rhegius. He wrote to Zasius early in 1520 that Faber was on the verge of publishing a series of arguments against Luther and that Rhegius had "a rather cool opinion of Luther and his followers." Precisely what Rhegius was thinking about Luther during this time remains a mystery. The fact that it was his former teacher Eck who had confronted Luther at Leipzig placed Rhegius in a difficult position. A declaration for Luther would surely mean a break with Eck, and Eck seems not to have doubted that Rhegius was in his camp. In a letter to Faber in May, 1520, Eck wrote of his progress in Rome with the bull against Luther and expressly asked Faber to show the letter to Rhegius. However, Rhegius may already have begun to drift toward Luther if Botzheim is to be believed.

In a letter to Luther on March 3, 1520, the latter expressed
his sincere admiration for Luther and added: "Urbanus Rhegius greets you learned Martin, and he must be considered as your friend all the more so because he has been moved to love you not by sudden passion but from calm consideration." Yet in a poem prefacing a sermon published by Faber in the summer of 1520, Rhegius lamented the misery of the present times and complained of the quarrels and disquiet without indicating on which side he stood. Looking back on this period from the vantage point of a dozen years, Rhegius wrote:

I was stuck deeper in the papacy than this village priest [Luther]. But I found out wherein I was stuck. I also had other temptations in the beginning, but through God's grace they disappeared. I have not entered this doctrinal path in sudden passion but through mature consideration, and that at a time when I had already been a Doctor for several years and had not exactly read scholastic theology and the Fathers in a dream. Rhegius' indecision in these matters was not untypical.

His former teacher Zasius, who early in 1519 had written to Amerbach, the publisher in Basel, stating that what he received from Luther he accepted as if it were from an angel, wrote to Zwingli in November expressing serious doubts about Luther's challenge to papal supremacy. By October, 1520, he had broken completely with Luther. Faber, who had originally joined the lists against Luther following the Leipzig disputation, wrote to Vadian in May, 1521, thanking him for sending one of Luther's pamphlets and expressing his pleasure with what Luther was writing. Less than a year later he had returned to the attack with the publication of
a pamphlet against Luther.  

During his own period of indecision, Rhegius remained on good terms with Faber. His departure from Constance in the summer of 1520 cannot be attributed to any difficulties in Constance but rather to his desire to obtain a Doctorate in Theology at the University of Basel. His residency there was very brief, and in September, 1520, he took the degree with honors. Already in July he had received an offer to fill the position of Cathedral preacher in Augsburg, a position for which he was consecrated in November by Bishop Christoph von Stadion. Rhegius' years of schooling were now over, and with the acceptance of these new responsibilities he began a phase of his life in which he was to break away from the Catholic Church and become an evangelical preacher.
NOTES TO CHAPTER I


3 Uhlhorn, p. 2; Heimbürg, p. 19.


5 Uhlhorn, p. 2; Wittmann, pp. 33-34.


8 Wittmann, pp. 34-35 (fn. 92); Heimbürg, p. 24.


10 Uhlhorn, pp. 3-4; Heimbürg, pp. 27-28.


13 Heimbürg, p. 28; Urbanus Rhegius, "Responsio ad duos libros primum et tertium de Missa Joannis Eccii," (February 16, 1529), *Opera latine*, iii, 6, cited in Wittmann, p. 39 (fn. 118).

14 Klaus Rischar, "Professor Johannes Eck als akademischer Lehrer in Ingolstadt," *Zeitschrift für bayerische Kirchengeschichte*, XXXVII (1968), 194-195; Brecher, "Johann

15Johann Eck, Disputatio Viennae Pannoniae Habita (1517), Corpus Catholicorum, ed. Thomas Virnich, VI (Münster, 1923), 1, cited in Rischar, Zeitschrift für bayerische Kirchengeschichte, XXXVII, 194.

16Rischar, Zeitschrift für bayerische Kirchengeschichte, 193, 195.

17Urbanus Rhegius, "Duae epistolae: prior Eccii, altera Regii" (March 24, 1528), Opera latine, ii, p. 42, cited in Wittmann, p. 36.

18For a discussion of the problem, see Uhlhorn, pp. 7-8, 345.


21Paulsen, I, 141-142. Concerning Eck's relation to the humanists, see Rischar, Zeitschrift für bayerische Kirchengeschichte, XXXVII, 202-203.

22Urbanus Rhegius, "Duae epistolae: prior Eccii, altera Regii" (March 24, 1528), Opera latine, ii, p. 42, cited in Uhlhorn, p. 356 (fn. 9); Hagen, I, 214.

23Urbanus Rhegius to Johann Faber, January, 1516, Opera Erasmi, III (Basel, 1840), 86, cited in Heimbürger, p. 37.


26Ibid.


Johannes Geiler von Kaisersberg, Navicula penitentialiae, ed. Jacob Otther (Augsburg, 1511), back of title page; Peregrinus, ed. Jacob Otther (Strassburg, 1513), back of title page.

Hagen, I, 122-126.

Urbanus Rhegius, "Responsio ad duos libros primum et tertium de Missa Joannis Eccii" (February 16, 1529), Opera latine, ii, p. 6, cited in Wittmann, p. 39, (fn. 118).

Johann Eck, Chrysopassus (Augsburg, 1514), p. civ, cited in Risschar, Zeitschrift für bayerische Kirchengeschichte, XXXVII, 206. Rhegius also wrote laudatory poems for Eck's Theologica negativa (1516) and for the Disputatio Viennae Pannoniae Habita (1517). See Uhlhorn, p. 11.

Uhlhorn, pp. 14, 17; Heimbürgcr, p. 51. Johann Faber, born in 1478, had studied at Tübingen and Freiburg. He served as a preacher in Lindau and as an aide to the bishop of Basel before becoming vicar-general to the bishop of Constance in 1516. He later became bishop of Vienna. See Horowitz, "Johannes Faber," Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie, Vi (1877), 435-436.


Heimbürgcr, p. 46; Rhegius, De dignitate sacerdotum, p. 41, cited in Wittmann, p. 43.

The summary of De dignitate sacerdotum which follows is based on Johann Gottlieb Kranold, "Urbanus Rhegius: Ein Reformatibild," Göttinger Vierteljahresschrift für Theologie und Kirche, i (1845), 186-195.

Hummelberger, born in 1487, had been a student of Lefevre d'Etaples and of Aleander in Paris. He returned to Germany in 1517 following a period of study in Italy. He remained in Constance for some time before returning to his native Ravensburg as a teacher and theologian. See Horowitz

40Rhegius to Hummelberger, Ingolstadt, November 11, 1518, Codicum latinorum Bibliothecae Regiae Monacensis No. 4007, cited in Uhlhorn, p. 347 (fn. 19).

41Rhegius to Hummelberger, Constance, January 18, 1518, Codicium Latinorum Bibliothecae Regiae Monacensis No. 4007, cited in Uhlhorn, p. 347 (fn. 19).

42Heimbürger, p. 49. In a letter to Rhegius dated March 14, 1519, Hummelberger wrote: "Since you have presented to the most high and mighty God the first efforts of your priestly office...with a pure and holy spirit, I wish you genuine success, and not only you but the whole clergy, who, to my delight, have been enhanced by you with a learned and pious first Mass." Codicum Latinorum Bibliothecae Regiae Monacensis, No. 4007, cited in Uhlhorn, p. 346 (fn. 18).

43Contra Heimbürger, pp. 43-44.

44Wittmann, p. 41.

45Uhlhorn, p. 15.


49Rhegius to Zwingli, March 2, 1519, cited in Uhlhorn, p. 18.

50Jackson, pp. 124-126.

51Heimbürger, p. 49.

52Hartmann, "Johannes Botzheim," Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie, III (1876), 208.


27

55Botzheim to Luther, March 3, 1520, Kapp, Nachlese, II, 431, cited in Wittmann, p. 49.

56Wittmann, p. 46; Uhlhorn, p. 20.

57Rhegius, Opera latine, iii, pp. 6, 85, cited in Wittmann, p. 49. The addressee is not given and only the year 1533 dates the letter.


59Zasius to Zwingli, November 13, 1519, Zwinglis Werke, VII, 92ff., cited in Jackson, pp. 142-143.


62Uhlhorn, p. 21.

63Wittmann, pp. 49, 31.
CHAPTER II
OPENING YEAR IN AUGSBURG

At the beginning of the sixteenth century, Augsburg was one of the wealthiest and most powerful cities in the Holy Roman Empire. Founded by the Emperor Augustus in the first century A.D., Augsburg had been an episcopal see since the eighth century and an imperial city since the thirteenth. Among all the German cities there was scarcely one, next to Wittenberg, which was more important for the history of the Reformation than Augsburg. Although the city did not officially become evangelical until 1534, the preponderant majority of its people were in sympathy with the Reformation from the early 1520's on. These circumstances made it a focal point not only of the struggle between the Catholics and the Protestants on the one hand, but also between the Lutherans and Zwinglians, and between the magisterial and radical reformers on the other.

As an imperial city, Augsburg possessed the rights of self-government and enjoyed a number of important privileges which had been granted over a period of years by successive Emperors. Since the bloodless revolution of 1368, the government had been directed by a coalition of patricians and guildsmen in which the latter group held the upper hand.
In the Large Council each of the seventeen guilds was represented by thirteen men for a total of 221 votes. The patricians occupied a total of only twelve places. In the Small Council, in whose hands the day to day government of the city rested, the guilds were represented by 69 members and the patricians again by twelve. At the head of the Small Council stood the two mayors, who were usually elected from among the patricians and rich businessmen. This custom was indicative of the social and political importance which attached to these two groups. The patricians had always been the "best people" in the city, but dwindling numbers weakened their position, and only those who married into rich families or built their own wealth on Augsburg's growing industry and commercial enterprise retained their positions of influence. It was to families like the Welsers, Rehlingers, Langenmantels, and Fuggers that Augsburg looked for political and social leadership.

In the early decades of the sixteenth century, this city of 20,000 inhabitants was famed for its wealth and for the luxurious life-style which that wealth made possible. It was not only trade which made the city prosper but also the Imperial Diets, frequent festivals, and conventions which brought life to its citizens, filled their purses, and enhanced their self-esteem. "Pride," ran the proverb, "is everywhere a sin, but in Augsburg it's a part of life." Not everyone, however, participated equally in the city's prosperity. Guildsmen who could live moderately well
in good times might be plunged into poverty with a change in the economic climate. This was especially true of the weavers, who made up one third of the total number of guildsmen in the city and who periodically suffered from unemployment when the price of cotton rose beyond what the market would bear. Moreover, poverty was endemic among the urban proletariat and among the moral derelicts, who constituted a persistent source of discontent. If the upper classes indulged in the vices of gambling, gluttony, and drunkenness, the lower contributed prostitution, thievery, and vagrancy. But the tendency to violent actions and to rioting seemed to be characteristic of all elements of society from highest to lowest.\(^7\)

A more positive feature of the city's life was the cultural milieu created by its intellectuals. At least since the middle of the fifteenth century there had been men of wealth who, as a result of their business trips to Italy, were won over to Renaissance humanism. In the early sixteenth century Conrad Peutinger was unquestionably the leading humanist in Augsburg. Skilled in Latin, learned in history and law, and free from the pretentiousness of lesser men, Peutinger served his city as the leader of the local humanist sodality and as a chancellor and diplomat. Peutinger's close friend Bernhard Adelmann, a canon at the Augsburg cathedral since 1498, contributed both his time and his considerable financial resources to the pursuit of humanistic studies. Among other scholars of importance who lived within Augsburg's walls were the mathematician and teacher,
Johann Vögelin; the poet and lexicographer, Johann Pinicianaus; the trilingual doctor and printer, Sigmund Grimm; the mathematician and geographer, Veit Bild; and the theologian and teacher of Greek, Ottmar Nachtigall. But with the exception of these few men, most Augsburgers paid little attention to intellectual affairs.

The city was well provided with religious establishments. The bishop, who usually resided in his castle at Dillingen, was responsible not only for the spiritual leadership of the diocese but also for the government of a considerable part of the people and land therein. In addition to the cathedral parish of St. John, there were a number of other parishes which served the city proper. First in order of importance was the large and wealthy monastery of St. Ulrich and Afra; then the monastery of St. Moritz, over whose church the Fuggers exercised patronage; and finally the smaller churches of St. Peter and St. Gertrude. The Augustinians, Dominicans, Franciscans, and Carmelites were also represented by chapters in Augsburg. These religious establishments were well-populated and generally quite wealthy. Some 540 members of the secular and regular clergy participated in a procession in honor of Emperor Maximilian in 1503. Moreover, the property held by the Church had increased to the point where the city council in 1515 forbade the further acquisition of real estate in order to prevent any more taxable wealth from falling under mortmain.

Relations between Church and city were often strained
by the political machinations of the bishops, and the general populace was frequently appalled by evidence of clerical laxity at all levels of the Church hierarchy. The higher members of the secular clergy took second place to none with respect to luxurious living, ceremonial displays, and ostentatious dress and had long since lost whatever power they may have had to stimulate the spiritual life of the community. Indeed, their moral delinquency was an occasional subject of ecclesiastical remonstrance and a frequent target of satire and ridicule. Moreover, the appropriation of Church wealth to sustain the living habits of its princes left many members of the lower clergy in serious financial difficulty. Attempts to squeeze money from the parishioners through usury or demands for free gifts were as much resented as the want of vocation which plagued the clergy at the parish level. Only the Carmelite monastery under Johann Frosch and the Dominican monastery under Johann Faber were happy exceptions to the rule.  

Despite its worldly atmosphere, the city was not completely immune to reform impulses. The repentance preacher Giovanni da Capistrano was warmly received when he visited the city in September, 1454. The sick came to him for healing, and the conscience-stricken burned wagonloads of playing cards and gambling devices in response to his admonition to shun idle pleasures. But the enthusiasm which he had stirred soon died down, and the old patterns of behavior re-emerged. More lasting influence seems to have been exer-
closed by Johann Geiler von Kaisersberg, who preached in Augsburg for three months during 1488. The hearts of many were transformed by his gripping sermons, but the city as a whole preferred profit and pleasure to the Kingdom of God.\textsuperscript{14}

It was not until the fateful years of 1517-1521 that the religious life of the city, quickened by reform currents emanating from several sources, began to assume a new dimension for many Augsburgers. One agent of reform was the newly appointed bishop, Christoph von Stadion, who had succeeded to the office upon the death of Heinrich von Liechtenau in April, 1517. Christoph had been born into a family of the old Swabian nobility in 1478. As a student at Bologna, he had applied himself to the study of theology and canon law and had also been influenced by humanism. His service to the diocese of Augsburg began in 1507 with an appointment as a cathedral canon and continued with successive appointments as dean on the cathedral chapter, coadjutor, and finally as bishop.\textsuperscript{15} He was a man of learning, a skillful negotiator, and, above all, a man of unquestionable integrity.\textsuperscript{16}

Christoph's concern for reform of abuses within the diocese focused on the moral laxity of his immediate subordinates and on the problem of indulgences. At his first synod, held in Dillingen on October 1, 1517, he lashed out against those who neglected their duties for the pursuit of pleasure.

Is it not true that all kinds of vices now occupy the place of the holiness and virtue of our fathers? They concerned themselves with prayer, the giving of alms, and fasting. We pile up riches in order to pander to our pride and debauchery.... My heart breaks and
I cannot hold back the tears when I see so many who are completely empty and senseless, to whom unity is disgusting and piety, obedience, and humility hateful, who love their association with women, usury, and commerce more than the Church, and whose hypocrisy and poisonous dissimulation under the cloak and mantle of virtue is all the more dangerous the more they are regarded as people of good reputation.\textsuperscript{17} 

Christoph then proceeded to renew the synodal ordinances and to add several more which were specifically addressed to the problems which he had outlined. In 1518 he ordered a general visitation in the diocese to enforce the reform ordinances.\textsuperscript{18} 

But the Bishop did not have the power to deal with an abuse which was becoming increasingly onerous—the sale of indulgences. Complaints by Augsburgers about this practice had arisen before in 1451 and 1480 and were renewed in 1515 when indulgences were sold to pay for the construction of a new Dominican church. Many considered the work unnecessary, and even those who favored it regarded the means of financing it as "rogue," because three-quarters of the money collected was already earmarked for the Emperor and the pope. When in 1517 Jodocus Lorcher brought to Augsburg the fateful pardon which was supposed to raise money for the rebuilding of St. Peter's Basilica in Rome, there arose many expressions of discontent among the citizenry. Bernhard Adelmann, for example, objected bitterly to the imposition of new burdens on the ignorant and the poor.\textsuperscript{19} Bishop Christoph made a favorable impression on the community when, on Christmas day, 1518, he himself sang the mass and offered
a pardon from the pope in which all could partake without payment if they "confessed to Our Lady, said three Our Fathers and the Ave Maria, and recited the creed."20

By this time, however, the citizens of Augsburg had become acquainted with another voice of reform which had expressed many of their own feelings about the sale of indulgences and which was to set loose forces of change within the city which went far beyond the moderate reforms envisioned by the bishop. The imperial diet, which had convened to consider the question of a new war against the Turks, was already over by the time Luther arrived in October, 1518. Although the three days of hearings before the papal nuncio, Cardinal Cajetan, served only to demonstrate the seriousness of the impasse between Luther and the Church, his presence in the city gave him an opportunity to discuss his views with many influential people who had come to know him through his writings. Johann Frosch, the prior of the Carmelite monastery and a former student of Luther's at Wittenberg, provided lodging for him during his stay in Augsburg. Christoph Langenmantel, a member of the patrician class and a canon at the Cathedral, came to visit Luther at the cloister and offered his support. Conrad Peutinger, who hosted a dinner for Luther, and a number of the city councilors expressed their sympathy for his position. The Adelmann brothers, especially Bernhard, were greatly enthused about Luther's ideas.21 It was because of men like these that the Reformation took firmer root in the city's life. The reform movement did
not, however, go unchallenged, and the loyalty of Luther's followers was put to the test as the Church acted to check those forces which Luther had set in motion.

On the recommendation of Erasmus and Reuchlin, Bishop Christoph appointed the Basel theologian, Johann Oecolampadius, as cathedral preacher in order to "strengthen the wavering papacy."\(^22\) Oecolampadius, when he arrived in Augsburg in November, 1518, was already a man of mature scholarship and deep religious conviction. He had attracted attention both as a preacher in Weinsberg and as a humanist in Basel, where he assisted Erasmus with the second edition of the Greek New Testament and published a Greek grammar of his own.\(^23\) At the time of his consecration in Augsburg, it was hoped that his abilities would be applied to the rooting out of clerical abuses (he had already written a pamphlet on the subject) and to the repulsion of the Lutheran attacks. But Oecolampadius was already wavering between the old religion and the new theological currents. Under the influence of Bernard Adelmann and others, the latter won out, and he was soon preaching and writing in defense of Luther. When Eck, in a letter to the Bishop of Meissen, complained that several "ignorant canons" were spreading Luther's errors in Augsburg, Oecolampadius and Adelmann replied with the publication in December, 1519 of their Responsio indoctorum canon-icorum. This bitter satire, which contrasted Luther's modesty with Eck's overblown vanity, offended Eck deeply. It was partly
because of Eck's wrath and partly because of his own inability to accommodate to the worldly life-style of the city that Oecolampadius decided to resign his office as cathedral preacher and retire to a monastery near Freiburg in April, 1520.24

Beginning in June, a number of priests came to Augsburg seeking to fill the position left vacant by Oecolampadius' departure. In July, Adelmann directed the attention of the cathedral chapter to Urbanus Rhegius, and after some discussion it was agreed that Rhegius would receive the appointment. From the bishop's point of view, Rhegius seemed to be an ideal choice. He was not only a man of learning and an episcopal vicar in Constance but also a strong supporter of Eck who would take a firm hand in combatting the now openly proclaimed heresies of Martin Luther.25 Adelmann regarded the appointment in a different light. In a letter to Willibald Pirckheimer in Nürnberg, dated July 11, 1520, he wrote:

> We have chosen as preacher Urbanus Rhegius, whose name, I believe, is not unknown to you. He is learned, eloquent, and so detests scholastic theology that I will probably have to exhort him to moderation in this regard. I hope that he will be an excellent teacher and a champion of the evangelical truth.26

This expectation was eventually born out, but in the four months between Rhegius' initial appointment and his consecration in late November, 1520,27 the reform movement in Augsburg had received several setbacks, among them Adelmann's own recantation.
The papal bull, *Exsurge domine*, which threatened Luther with excommunication if he did not renounce his errors within 60 days, was signed in Rome on June 15, 1520. Rumors of its contents had already spread to Germany, and well before it was officially received in Augsburg by Bishop Christoph in October, both he and the city council had taken steps to curb the spread of Luther's teachings. On August 28, the council summoned all of the resident printers to its chambers and forbade them to publish anything concerning "the differences between the clerics and the Doctors of the Bible" or anything of a libellous nature. At a synod held in the autumn of 1520, the bishop issued an order prohibiting the clergy from reading Luther's tracts. On November 8, he publicly posted the bull condemning Luther's errors and forbidding either the defense of Luther's ideas or the possession of his pamphlets by the laity.

These acts were not without effect in the city. The bull dampened the enthusiasm of many, and Adelmann, who had also been placed under the ban, formally recanted the day after it was posted in Augsburg. Others were more stout-hearted. Eck's efforts to have Frosch ousted as prior of the Carmelite monastery accomplished nothing. Nor did the printers show any willingness to comply with the council's order or the bishop's mandate. The further dissemination of Luther's sermons and the reports of his defiant response to the papal bull renewed the spirit of reform and prompted a flood of pamphlet literature which both reflected and strengthened this spirit.
Urbanus Rhegius, consecrated as the new cathedral preacher on November 21, 1520, must have found himself in the vortex of a whirlpool. His spiritual office as well as the policies of the council and the bishop made inadvisable any immediate or overt declaration of sympathy for Luther. But as a pamphleteer writing under assumed names, Rhegius began to express his fundamental agreement with Luther's ideas. During 1521 he published a total of six pamphlets (three under his own name) and German translations of two works by the Church Fathers Cyprian and Chrysostom. His gradual transition from humanist poet, satirizing Luther's detractors, to evangelical theologian, defending Luther's doctrines, can be traced in this pamphlet literature.

It was in response to events which had transpired in the autumn of 1520 that Rhegius wrote his first tract in January, 1521. Public burnings of Luther's books had already taken place at Rome, Louvain, Cologne, and Mainz before Luther replied in kind with the burning of the papal bull of excommunication, the papal constitutions, the canon law, and several works of scholastic theology at Wittenberg on December 10. Soon after, he composed a short defense of his action in which he listed thirty articles from the canon law which he regarded as erroneous and invited anyone to show by what right the papists had burned his books.

It was this pamphlet of Luther's which gave Rhegius the idea of writing a satire ostensible defending the burning of Luther's books but actually attacking the papists.
The work, written pseudonymously in Latin and then translated into German, bore the title: *Argument of this Pamphlet: Symon Hessus Shows to Martin Luther the Reason Why the Lutheran Books Have Been Burned by the Colomners and Louvainers, for Martin Has Desired That in a Pamphlet in Which He Gives the Reason with Thirty Articles Contained in the Canon Law Why He Has Burned the Papal Code at Wittenberg.*

The pamphlet begins with a brief introductory statement in which Symon Hessus, "a protonotary of the Holy See of Rome and servant of our most Holy Father the Pope," offers to accept Luther's challenge and demonstrate the reasons for the condemnation of each of the forty-one articles listed in the papal bull. The arguments which Hessus adduces against Luther rest neither on reason nor on Scripture but rather on the need for maintaining the prerogatives of the pope and the practices of the Church.

In article five, for example, Luther had denied that there was any foundation in the Scriptures or in the writings of the Church Fathers for the division of the sacrament of penance into the three stages of contrition, confession, and satisfaction. Hessus replies that Luther is obviously not a good Thomist. Even if he chose to disregard St. Thomas' tripartite division of penance, he ought to have been content with the will of the pope, who cannot err. It is clear that the article must be condemned not only because it is rejected by Eck, Prierias, and Cajetan, who is as learned in the Scriptures as a Turk in the Bohemian woods, but also because
whatever does not please the pope must be heretical. 38

Hessus further cautions Luther against studying Greek and Hebrew, for

from these languages come many bold people who despise Thomas, Scotus, and such Doctors, and through these languages they penetrate so deeply into the Holy Scriptures and investigate everything so precisely that they repudiate Thomas, against whom no one should imagine anything who wishes to keep the preachers and brothers as friends and remain in their good graces. 39

Luther's seventh article, that there is no sin so great that it cannot be forgiven if the sinner is truly contrite, has been condemned as a detriment to the revenues and income of Rome. If the article should take hold among the people, says Hessus, the poor sinner would henceforth expect more help and consolation from heaven than from Rome. Up to the present, the fear of the sinner has not been unprofitable to the Romanists, for the less trust the simple layman places in God, the more help he seeks from men and the more money he gives to the priest. He orders masses to be said, purchases indulgences, negotiates collects and thinks his sins are not wholly forgiven him by God. As the prophet says, "Fear in the heart is the beginning of wisdom." Likewise, inordinate fear of the pope is a sure beginning of clerical wealth. 40

In response to Luther's claim in article twelve that if a man believes himself to be absolved of sin he is truly absolved, Hessus contends that Luther relies too much on faith and not enough on the power of the pope. It has been
300 years, says Hessus, since anyone claimed as much for faith as Luther has. The scholastics have not found that anywhere in Aristotle. If the great things ascribed to faith were true, something which neither Thomas nor Aristotle would concede, then the Church would be idle and lazy and Christians indolent. Everyone will content himself with faith and not pay very much attention to ceremonies. Rome suffers daily from the harm caused by such thinking.  

Now Rome is the Holy City, the master of all churches and the giver of laws. Rome may administer punishment but is not to be corrected by anyone. Luther has turned this around and has sought to correct the pope, who is the head of Christendom. This is true according to the decretals of the pope, who does not lie, for he is called the most holy of all. Clearly if he is the most holy of all, then he cannot lie. Not only is the pope the head of the Church and in possession of as much power as St. Peter, but he is also more powerful than any temporal prince in affairs of the world. An emperor scarcely brings a part of the earth under his authority, and his authority and justice extend no farther than over our bodies. He has no rights in the soul. But earth, hell, and the whole world fear the power of the pope, and those in purgatory "tremble before the beam of his invisible power." The living are horrified when they see the shadow of a bull. Nowhere can the dead escape the power of the pope. All of this can be demonstrated from the canon law. All the cardinals and all the officials at Rome
hold this opinion, except for two or three scholars.

Even more subtle is the argument proving the pope's supremacy over Christ and his angels. The Wittenbergers have had a difficult time grasping this. Because they do not wish to sharpen their heads on the whetstone of sophistry, they understand nothing but the Gospels, the Prophets, and the Letters of Paul. Christ himself testifies in the Gospels that his kingdom is not of this world. But the pope's kingdom is of this world, so it follows that the pope at Rome is more powerful and greater than Christ. The major premise is true, because Christ himself spoke it. The minor premise is confirmed by the Donation of Constantine; by the papal law, although some say that the whole thing is false; and by custom, which is regarded as law especially if it is good, and here it is good because it comes from the pope. 42

In article eighteen, Luther had denounced indulgences as pious frauds perpetrated on the faithful. Hessus responds that if Luther had written nothing else, his condemnation of indulgences would have been sufficient to place him in the company of heretics. Although he has perceived that the indulgence is nothing in itself but a diminution and relaxation of good works, it would be more profitable to Rome if the simple people believed the indulgence to be a treasury of grace from which gifts can be drawn in exchange for money. But when the laity realizes that it relaxes only certain punishments which the pope has imposed upon them, then they will no longer contribute any more money. 43 Luther has
failed to grasp the importance which attaches to indulgences. It is by virtue of the indulgence that a sinner, even if he intends to sin for another ten or twenty years and never better his life, has assurance of a sanctuary at Rome.

Because of his love for his people, the pope made available the purchase of indulgences in Germany, so that the Germans would be deprived of their remaining wealth, a harmful cause of sin, and thus live more piously.44

Following the completion of his survey of the forty-one articles, Hessus apologizes for any weakness in his arguments and offers Luther some advice.

If you will praise the pope and exalt his power, you will receive 300 or 400 Ducats.... Don't you see that the other theologians are keeping quiet? You're making trouble for yourself. Finally, I ask you not to take me amiss because I have used such lame and weak reasons against your Christian articles and turned things upside down. I was not alone when I wrote this pamphlet but was sitting in a tavern with some drunken peasants. The beer made my head swim. But when I have slept it off, I'll be more clever. In the meantime arm yourself for the battle.45

The second pamphlet written by Rhegius under the pseudonym "Symon Hessus" was occasioned by Luther's appearance before the Diet of Worms in April, 1521 and carried the title: A Dialogue Not Unpleasant to Read, Recently Held by Martin Luther and Simon Hessus at Worms.46 The dialogue is supposed to have taken place on the afternoon of April 18, shortly before Luther's second hearing in which he made his famous declaration, "Here I Stand." The author is, however, fully aware of the outcome of the Diet and in fact
makes reference to a meeting between Luther and Johann Cochlaeus which took place on the 24th. Many of the charges which Hessus made against the pope and his servants in the first pamphlet reappear in this dialogue. But the general tone is more subdued and less satirical. Moreover, it is not the faults of the papacy which draws attention but rather the heroic stand of Luther before the papal and imperial powers.

The dialogue opens with a chance meeting between Hessus and Luther as the latter is coming from the Emperor's lodgings. Hessus, surprised that Luther appears so undaunted, resolves to finish the disputation begun earlier. Luther will not deny him the opportunity and bids him to state his objections. Hessus expresses his amazement that Luther is still alive in view of the fact that he has long since been condemned by the pope. In response to Hessus' question, why the pomp of the papal representatives and the authority of the Emperor have not cowed him, Luther launches into a long soliloquy in which he states the central theme of the discourse.

I do not fear for myself. Things will not turn out so badly that I will change and make myself other than what I am. I am defending the cause of truth. If I present the truth to my enemies, then I will triumph and give God the glory. If I am killed for the sake of the truth, there are still many things which console me and give me courage. There is no disciple above his master, and if the world has despised the master himself for the sake of the truth, why then won't the disciple also suffer persecution in matters that concern the truth? It is of no great importance whether I am killed, but the truth cannot be killed or suppressed....
In the remainder of the dialogue Hessus makes only feeble attempts to refute Luther and defend the papalists. At one point Luther says: "Hessus, you protect the great lords scarcely at all." Indeed Hessus directs his attacks against Church abuses and against individual supporters of the papal cause. He condemns Eck as a traitor to his own country, an oppressor of the truth, and an opponent of Christian faith. Johann Cochlaeus, who had pleaded with Luther to recant, is portrayed as an ignorant and shallow man more concerned with money than with Scripture. The papal nuncios Aleander and Caracciolus, whom Hessus regarded as archetypes of the courtiers and unlearned priests who surrounded the pope, had recently threatened Urbanus Rhegius "because of the evangelical truth which he has been faithfully preaching in the Christian city of Augsburg." The Roman pontiff, who thinks he is the superior of all bishops, either does not know the rule of a true bishop or does not wish to know it. Instead of refuting Luther with Scripture, he has relied solely on his own counsel (scrinium pectoris.) Hessus finds it undeniable that the pope and his cardinals have devoted more of their energy to the creation of a temporal empire and to the acquisition of money than they have to tending the flock of Christ. It is no wonder that the Germans have become disenchanted with the worldliness of their spiritual leaders at Rome.

The dialogue comes to an end as Luther prepares to make his appearance before the Diet. He offers to continue
the conversation later, but Hessus declines, pleading that he must leave for Freiburg shortly. In contrast to the cavalier advice which he offered Luther in the earlier pamphlet, he now takes a much more serious approach. He bids Luther farewell and admonishes him to be bold and not to be frightened away from his purpose, for Christ will not forsake him.  

On balance, these two pamphlets are within the tradition of the famous Letters of Obscure Men which Ulrich von Hutten and Crotus Rubeanus had composed in defense of Reuchlin. Written originally in Latin and interspersed with Erasmian satire, the pamphlets are reflective of the continuing domination of humanistic modes of thought in Rhegius' approach to Luther. However, the second Hessus dialogue does reveal the beginnings of a change in Rhegius' understanding of Luther's challenge to Rome. It is not merely the corruption of the Church which comes into focus but more importantly the image of Luther as a champion of the truth, defending his case by appeal to the Scriptures.

The further development of Rhegius' ideas about Luther finds expression in the third pseudonymous pamphlet of 1521: A Declaration that the Roman Bull Has Caused Remarkable Harm to the Consciences of Many Men, and Not Doctor Luther's Teaching. Using the name "Henricus Phoeniceus," Rhegius begins with a letter of dedication to Jacopo Nepoti (Jacob Naf), a proofreader for the Basel publisher, Hieronymous Froben, in which he complains about how few people correctly understand
what Luther has done and said. Some have opposed him intentionally out of pride or ambition. Others call themselves Lutherans only because they think that he is against the priests, and yet they do not understand his views on indulgences, faith, good works, and the sacraments. Accordingly, Phoeniceus sets himself the task of clarifying Luther's position.

I have been moved by the love which I have for him as his disciple and have written this little book in two days at Roschach—because there are many people who do not have his books or have not read them for a long time—so that people will have his views in a short summary and may judge whether one or more errors have grown out of misunderstanding. Phoeniceus offers a brief rehearsal of the events which had transpired from 1517 to 1521, showing how Luther first became aroused over the issue of indulgences, how the papalists tried to refute him with nothing more than the authority of the Church, and how Luther expanded his initial challenge to include a denial of papal supremacy and a rejection of the sacraments, save for baptism and the Lord's Supper. Luther proceeded with moderation and did not seek to exalt himself as a revolutionary or as the leader of a special sect. In spite of that, he has been maligned by those who understand him least. But Luther's "spirit has such a power that, when one reads him with the right intention, it is quite impossible to be displeased by him." Phoeniceus then proceeds to summarize Luther's ideas on a number of topics and to show why the Roman bull has been the greatest source of harm.
With regard to the priesthood, Luther denies that ordination is a sacrament but affirms its value as a calling in which one may serve the community of believers. The office has become encumbered with the customs and laws of men. Laws such as the prohibition of clerical marriage must be removed and the priest must return to the conceptions of the "preaching office" and the "episcopal stewardship" which were current in the early Church.

Confirmation is a praiseworthy act prefigured both in the Apostles' laying on of hands at the time of the Holy Ghost's descent and in Christ's practice of touching children. But one cannot accept confirmation as a sacrament on that basis, because its role in reaffirming the child's membership in the Church is an ecclesiastical custom and not a divine institution.

In a similar way, Luther, in the Babylonian Captivity of the Church, does not reject the practice of Extreme Unction but denies that it was prescribed by James in the fifth chapter of his epistle. His anointing was in no way similar to the Church's sacrament.

Those who claim that Luther is opposed to marriage do not understand him rightly. He says that marriage is a metaphor of Christ and the Church and not a sacrament of divine origin. His opponents have contended that Paul's letter to the Ephesians (5:31) in which he says, "The twain shall become one flesh; that is a great sacrament" may be regarded as the scriptural basis of the institution. Luther
has shown, however, that this proof rests on a false translation of the original Greek text. The verse reads in Greek, "This is a great mystery (Mysterion)," which is as much as to say that it is a great secret. In the Latin translation, the use of the word "sacrament," which means a sign of something sacred, is erroneous. Moreover, none of the Church Fathers, not even Jerome or Dionysius who wrote a great deal about marriage, calls it a sacrament through which God bestows grace. Luther clearly states that marriage, although not a sacrament, is an institution necessary to human weakness, for it excuses a work of the flesh which would be a deadly sin outside of marriage. 64

In Luther's view, the sacrament of penance has been burdened by additions which undermine its effectiveness and subvert its purpose. The Romanists have divided penance into three parts: contrition, confession, and satisfaction. Contrition has been interpreted by Duns Scotus and others as a state of repentence induced by the sorrowful sinner through his own free will as a preparatory stage for the reception of God's grace. But, as Luther has shown, sorrow for sin is the gift of God and not the result of meditation on our sinful lives. Contrary to what Luther's opponents say, he does not wish to see confession abolished, because it is by opening his conscience to his neighbor that the sinner receives the consolations of God through the mouth of his brother. He does object, however, to the unnecessary suffering which the popes have inflicted by reserving secret sins to themselves
and ordering these sins to be made known to confessors appointed only by them. Finally, the schoolmen teach that sin is forgiven through the rendering of satisfaction. But Paul taught in his letters to the Colossians, Ephesians, Galatians, and to Titus that God has already forgiven us our sins through the death of his Son on the cross. Luther, following Paul, consoles the consciences of men by reminding them that the works of the sinner are unnecessary for the remission of sin. Accordingly, the only true satisfaction, the only genuine repentance which the sinner can manifest is to become a new creature in Christ. 65

The abuse of the penitential system which had caused the greatest outcry from Luther was the practice of selling indulgences to gain remission of the penalties of sin for the sinner himself or for his departed relatives in purgatory. Luther does not deny the existence of purgatory by any means and in fact encourages the Christian to help the souls confined there with prayers, fasts, and the giving of alms. 66 But the pope can do nothing to aid souls in purgatory through indulgences, for an indulgence is nothing more than a remission of the temporal punishment imposed by the Church. It is not a form of grace which can lighten the punishment of sin imposed by God. Eternal punishment for sin is remitted by Christ alone, and the pain of sin is inflicted on the sinner by God as chastisement. Therefore, God either desires from the sinner no other satisfaction for past sin than to abstain from sin in the future and observe His commandments,
or He desires some form of penance which no man has the power to alleviate. 67

With regard to such matters as the observance of fast days and Church holidays, Luther prefers to leave such questions to individual conscience. 68 The veneration of saints is unobjectionable provided that the Christian recognize that the saints have no powers of themselves but act only as intermediaries between God and man. Moreover, one ought to appeal to the saints less for relief from physical distresses and more for the spiritual gifts of patience, charity, and faith. 69

In the sixth chapter of the Gospel of St. John, the Jews asked Christ what they should do that they might perform the works of God. Christ replied that it was a work of God "to believe on him whom he hath sent." Therefore, Luther says, the highest and most noble work of all is faith in Christ through which man is justified before God. It is wrong, however, to claim as Luther's opponents have done that the Christian need no longer concern himself with good works or service to his neighbor. Luther in his book on good works 70 does not forbid them but argues instead for a recognition of the proper order of works and faith. The faith which justifies must be present first; then come the good works freely performed by a good will. Indeed, as Augustine says, the will can never truly be free until it is illuminated by God's grace. 71

Having summarized Luther's teachings, Phoeniceus takes
up the problem of the harm caused by the papal bull. He says that the popes are right in calling their letters bulls (bulla), for they are but bubbles (bleterli) washed away by the rain and soon forgotten. The pope writes bulls like the present one against Luther, rejecting Luther's case but not substantiating his own with Scripture, as if his will was sufficient or as if he could not err. The bull itself is full of errors for lack of scriptural justification and seeks to perpetuate misunderstandings by forbidding the reading of Luther's books. There is a great deal in Luther's writings which cannot be understood at first glance. Therefore, it is necessary that one study them carefully and that the preachers be allowed to explain Luther's opinions so that errors may be corrected. The bull will never be able to suppress the spread of Luther's ideas, because they have already taken root in the minds of the people. The Christian must repudiate the Romish ignorance and flee to God for consolation in the hope that the Church will eventually be freed from its captivity.

The pamphlet provides clear evidence that by mid-1521 Rhegius was on Luther's side. His admission that he was a disciple of Luther made inevitable a break with his old circle of friends and teachers. Although there is no evidence that he had been identified as "Symon Hessus," Eck treated him publicly as the real author of the "Henricus Phoeniceus" pamphlet and threatened him with a citation before the ecclesiastical court. His former friend in Constance, Johann
Faber, had been angered by rumors that Rhegius was preaching Lutheran ideas in Augsburg, and attempts by Michael Hummelberger to mediate their differences were to no avail.75

In addition to this pseudonymous literature, there were also several sermons and translations which Rhegius published under his own name and which, therefore, give a more definite picture of his professed opinions in Augsburg. His Sermon on the Holy Sacrament of the Altar,76 preached on Corpus Christi Day (May 30), borrows heavily from Luther's Sermon on the New Testament, That Is, On the Holy Mass which had been published in late July or early August, 1520.77 Rhegius declares that the greatest manifestation of God's love toward man was the sacrifice of his son for the remission of our sins. It is for this reason that the Church has instituted daily masses and set aside Maundy Thursday and Corpus Christi Day as occasions for special reverence of the sacrament. The other sacraments do not provide the grace which justifies, for that is a noble gift created by God alone and poured into the souls of men, but are only visible signs of invisible grace. The Sacrament of the Altar, however, signifies not only a work of God but also "contains in it truly and essentially God himself, the richly flowing fountain of all grace...."78 God, infinite and incomprehensible in his divine nature, is present everywhere; but there is a special presence in this sacrament, for here the blessed humanity of Christ is present under the lesser form of the bread with his glorified body and most holy soul. Since
Christ's humanity cannot be separated from his divinity, it follows that the latter element is present in the sacrament too. He who receives this holy meal not only sacramentally, that is, under the visible form of the body, but also spiritually, that is, by true faith in the sacrament, is transformed by it. He is no longer carnal but becomes a spirit with God. As Christ says in John 6:56: "He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him." The Sacrament of the Altar was instituted by Christ himself at the Last Supper as a testament of his impending martyrdom and as a sign of the forgiveness of sin. Rhegius advises that we prepare ourselves for the reception of the sacrament by believing the promise of Christ that sins are forgiven freely without any merit of the sinner. Then the sinner "will receive the true great priceless fruit of the sacrament, which is grace for the forgiveness of sins, and increase in faith, which is the fountain out of which all good things flow." It should be sufficient to us that God has removed the eternal punishment of sin and has reconciled us to himself again. But we must be willing to suffer the temporal punishment as the just chastisement of God. It is only by bearing the cross imposed upon us that we defeat the old Adam and grow as new creatures in Christ.

A second published sermon preached by Rhegius exemplifies the devotional literature which was to form a considerable part of his future literary activity. In his short Instruction How a Christian Should Daily Confess to God his
Lord, Rhegius develops the theme of man's dependence on God's mercy. One conscious of his sinful life can be kept from despair only by the knowledge that God's mercy far exceeds the magnitude of man's wickedness. Before a Christian demonstrates to the Church his "true worthiness of repentance" with a confession before a priest, he should confess his sins before God. All Christians should pray to God for a will disposed to do the will of Christ and for an increase in the knowledge of the things of God. Pastors and preachers should pray for divine illumination so that they may lead Christ's flock in the path of holiness. Lastly, those in positions of temporal authority should ask for "an intelligent heart so that they may rule their people well and be able to tell good from evil." "

A third sermon published in 1521, entitled On the Holy Virgin Catherine, was preached on St. Catherine's Day (November 25). According to legend, Catherine was a member of a wealthy patrician family who had devoted herself to scholarly studies but soon converted to Christianity. She suffered a martyr's death under Maxentius in the year 307. In his sermon Rhegius stresses not only the triumph of simple faith over worldly wisdom but also the honor which accompanies the Christian virgin. He begins with the text in Matthew 13:44–46 concerning the treasure hidden in the field and the pearl of great price for which the merchant sold all that he had in order to purchase it. Jerome's interpretation of the pas-
sage is that the field is a metaphor representing the Holy Scriptures and that the treasure hidden therein is the knowledge of Jesus Christ, for which we should sacrifice all of this world's goods in order to acquire it. The wise virgin Catherine had the world's greatest goods, viz., knowledge of the seven liberal arts. But she learned through the grace of God to know Christ, without whom all wisdom is but error and ignorance. Thus, when Catherine was called before Maxentius to give an account of herself, she responded: "I have been instructed in the seven liberal arts, but since these were of no use to me for salvation, I have left the dark night of error-filled emptiness...."

Rhegius argues that as Christians we should prepare ourselves to find the same thing which Catherine found and to cherish it as she did. We should especially imitate Catherine in two respects. First, we should be careful how we use our five senses, for, as Jerome says, the five senses are the same as a window or a door through which the evils of the world may enter the soul. To wish to see and hear all things is to open the gates to the enemy. Secondly, we must cultivate genuine humility. Catherine, although born to nobility and wealth, shunned the honors of this world and humbled her own will to follow Christ. Nor did she fall prey to the temptation of pride in her spiritual goods. Rhegius concludes with the observation culled from Jerome that "a true virginity is purity in body and soul." Thus, we are all virgins in Christ if we resign ourselves to the service of God and
accept eternal marriage with Christ.\textsuperscript{89}

In addition to his sermons and pamphlets, Rhegius also published two translations of works by the Greek Church Father, Chrysostom, and the martyred bishop of Carthage, Cyprian. The former work, \textit{A Beautiful Sermon of the Holy Bishop Chrysostom That One Should Mourn and Lament Sinners Living and Dead}, was dedicated to Lucas Gassner, a guildsman on the city council.\textsuperscript{90} The latter, \textit{A Very Beautiful and Useful Explanation of the "Our Father" by Caecilius Cyprianus}, was dedicated to Frau Amalie von Dankenschwyl.\textsuperscript{91} The publication of these two translations was a continuation of a project begun by Peutinger to translate the writings of the Church Fathers into the vernacular in order to make them more widely available and, thus, to reveal the great chasm which separated the primitive Church from its latter day version.\textsuperscript{92}

Although Rhegius' sympathies clearly lay in the direction of fundamental reform, he did not in any of his writings express direct opposition to the Church as an institution. The abuse of indulgences, the sophism of the scholastics, and the worldliness of Church officials were all objects of Rhegius' censure. But even in his most satirical work, the first Symon Hessus pamphlet, he was careful to distinguish between Pope Leo and "those shameless unchristian people who work their will under the pope's name" and between the Roman Church, "which is pious and holy," and the Roman court, "which only wants to become holy."\textsuperscript{93} He continued to revere the institutions and ordinances of the Church, while seeking
to replace the dead letter of the law with a new spirit of faith. He used the occasion of Corpus Christi Day to preach on the proper way of accepting Christ's forgiveness of sins; the legend of St. Catherine served to shed light on the wisdom contained in the Gospel; and the sermon on daily confession recommended confession to God first and foremost.

There can be little doubt that it was Luther who provided the real impetus for Rhegius' reform-mindedness. And the fact that it was largely Luther's interpretations of the Gospels and of St. Paul's letters that Rhegius was presenting in his pamphlets and sermons provides the key to understanding his service to the reform movement. Rhegius himself was not a creative thinker but rather a popularizer of the ideas of others who was able to apply his talents as a scholar and rhetorician to that end. It is by study that one discovers the knowledge of God, and it is by preaching that one helps the laity to fathom that knowledge.

It was Rhegius' use of the preaching office as a forum for the dissemination of Luther's ideas which prompted his dismissal late in 1521. The concern over Luther's popularity in Augsburg was reflected in a letter from Pope Leo to Bishop Christoph dated February 25, 1521. The bishop was admonished to use his powers for the defense of the Catholic Church. He was to forgive those who returned to the fold and to expel those who persisted in error. Attention fell immediately on the "chief seducer" of the community, Urbanus
Rhegius, who had aroused considerable opposition among the canons at the cathedral for his sermons against indulgences and the consequent decline in the chapter's income. However, when the pope demanded Rhegius' dismissal, the bishop demurred for lack of authority and the canons refused for fear of setting a precedent for future papal intervention. Leo then dispatched two bulls, dated March 27, 1521, ordering the canons to secure Rhegius' recantation and directing the bishop to discipline them if they failed to act. But the bishop had no desire to alienate the cathedral chapter, and the canons were fearful of a popular revolt if they proceeded against Rhegius. An agreement was reached on May 31, according to which Rhegius was to show greater respect for the interests of the chapter and not to preach against indulgences.

The agreement proved to be only a temporary truce, and, under circumstances which remain unknown, Rhegius was forced to leave the city. In late summer, when an outbreak of the plague forced the bishop and the canons to seek refuge in Dillingen, Rhegius asked permission to leave the city for a time also. He was granted a leave of absence from September 18 until Christmas. But his sermon on St. Catherine's day (November 25) and the publication of his two translations in October and November indicate that he still had ties with the city. By January 4, 1522, he had returned to his native Langenargen, and in a letter to Erasmus under that date, he expressed the hope that he would soon be back in Augsburg.
A week later he wrote to the Ulm physician Wolfgang Rychard complaining of the false rumors which the priests spread about him after his departure but expressing confidence that his reputation would not be sullied.

My Augsburgers are better and more clever than to be deceived by the spells of these sirens. If I had given free play to my passions, I could have incited the whole city against the priests with my farewell had Christian moderation not prevented it. Because of this, with a subdued and yet most justified grief of the heart, I gave personal reasons for my departure. 100

Rhegius' hope for a speedy return remained unfulfilled. His old colleague from Ingolstadt, Matthias Kretz, succeeded him as cathedral preacher. 101 It was not until August, 1524 that Rhegius resumed a permanent position in Augsburg. In the intervening period his loyalty to the Reformation and his talents as a preacher were to be tested anew in the evangelical community at Hall im Inntal in Austria. 102
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CHAPTER III
RHEGIUS IN HALL IM INNTAL

Rhegius spent the first half of 1522 in Langenargen and Tetnang, where he lived in relative seclusion. Except for Michael Hummelberger in Ravensburg and Sigismund Röbli in Lindau, there were few clergy in the area who shared his enthusiasm for Luther. His enforced retirement provided him with considerable time for study and reflection, and one of the fruits of this study was a German translation of Erasmus' commentary on Paul's letter to Titus. It was in this same period that he resumed correspondence with Zwingli, who had been preaching in Zürich against the imposition of fasts and the restrictions on the selection of foods during the Lenten season. When some of his parishioners openly violated the fast laws, he was called to account before the city council and admonished by representatives of Bishop Hugo of Constance. Although the council voted to reaffirm the prohibitions, Zwingli used the occasion to publish his first Reformation pamphlet, Concerning the Selection and Liberty of Foods. In a letter dated July 6, 1522, Rhegius expressed approval of Zwingli's position and rejoiced that Zwingli had attacked the Bishop and his vicar-general, Faber, in such a Pauline spirit that "the satellites of Antichrist could do nothing
but gnash their teeth. Another letter, this one addressed to Vadian requesting information about the reception of Luther's ideas in St. Gall, was dated Langenargen, July 31, thus indicating that Rhegius was still on home ground waiting for an opportunity to resume a more active role in furthering the Reformation. His hopes were fulfilled later that summer when he received an offer to assume the preaching duties at the St. Nicholas parish church in the Tirolean town of Hall im Inntal. He was confirmed in his new office by the Bishop of Brixen, Sebastian Sperantus, on September 22, 1522.

The Reformation had already come to Hall in the preceding year. Dr. Jacob Strauss (b. 1480), who had taught philosophy at Freiburg and received a doctorate in theology there in 1516 arrived in Hall in the spring of 1521 and began delivering Latin lectures on the Gospel according to St. Matthew. He was soon invited by the city council to preach at St. Nicholas, and he drew such large crowds from the neighboring villages that services had to be held outside to accommodate them. At Pentecost he preached on the Lord's Supper and on the misuse of confession. During Lent in 1522 he preached sixteen sermons on confession and attacked the Church's practice so vigorously that the conservatives called in a Franciscan monk to defend the confession, and the Bishop saw himself compelled to warn Strauss that he must preach both the Gospel and the Church's laws. Continuing complaints prompted the Bishop to cite Strauss to Brixen several times,
but he consistently refused to go. The city council sent a delegation to the bishop to defend their preacher, and the community provided a guard of thirty to forty men to accompany him wherever he went. But when popular enthusiasm for Strauss andanimosity toward Church officials threatened to blossom into rebellion, the council persuaded Strauss in private negotiations to leave the city. In his last sermon, delivered on May 4, 1522, he informed his congregation of his decision and, despite pleas that he remain, left the city later that month.  

The triumph of the conservatives proved to be short-lived, for Strauss' position was filled in September by Urbanus Rhegius, about whose evangelical leanings the council, if not the bishop, was already informed. Rhegius continued to preach in Hall as he had in Augsburg, avoiding polemical attacks on the Church as an institution while at the same time pressing for a revival of the true Christian spirit. This approach is well-illustrated in his Sermon on Church Dedication, preached on the occasion of the annual church re-dedication in Hall. Showing how the practice of consecration derived from the Jewish festival of the dedication of the temple described in I Kings 8, Rhegius then proceeded to draw a parallel between the "two kinds of God's houses, the material and the spiritual."  

Rhegius observed that, according to the Old Testament, there have always been places of worship and altars where sacrifices were made to God. At the beginning of the Christian Church, men worshipped God and communed with each
other in the temples or in privated homes, as the second chapter of Acts verifies.

Then there were small, dark, dilapidated churches and a great, strong, bright, and sound faith. Now things are turned around. Great, proud imperial palaces are built as churches—bright, exquisite in gold, silver, and precious metals, expensive images, gilded floors, banners, vestments, cups, crosses, paintings, organs, and many similar things. But there are dark, barren hearts, a weak faith, cold love, and a wavering hope.

This reversal has come about because men no longer concern themselves with their spiritual temples, their souls, but instead contribute lavishly to the construction and decoration of buildings or waste money on indulgences. No spiritual profit derives from such a perversion of values. Christ will not ask on Judgment Day how many images we have placed in the churches, but whether we have fed the hungry, clothed the naked, and visited the sick.

What is needed to restore things to their proper order is a return to the conception of the Church as a house of prayer and as a communion of saints and a revival of the idea that the soul is the temple of God. To be sure, churches are necessary as meeting places for the faithful. But they should serve primarily as places of prayer and of praise to God. Just as Christians congregate together in a physical sense, so also they should gather together in a unison of the heart to place before God their needs and the needs of all Christians everywhere. We are all brothers under one Father in heaven. We have one faith, one baptism, and are members of one body whose head is Christ. Where something is
lacking in one of us through imperfection, it is restored through the "rich brotherhood," viz., the community composed of Christ and God's saints. Furthermore, Christian freedom is no longer bound to a place or location as in times past when, for example, the Jews prayed only in the Temple at Jerusalem. As Cyprian says, "What temple can God have whose temple is the whole world?" There is nothing which shelters God better than his own image, the rational soul of man formed in the likeness of the blessed Trinity. As Paul frequently wrote, "we are a house of the living God," and such a temple is not built of stone or consecrated by a bishop but by Christ alone. He has consecrated this temple with the unction of the Holy Ghost and with his most holy blood. If the blood of rams and the ashes of bullocks sufficed to sanctify the Jewish temple, how much more will the blood of Christ purify our souls from the stain of deadly sins. The annual church dedication should be a reminder of this spiritual dedication.

Somewhat sharper in tone was Rhegius' Sermon on the Third Commandment, which appears to have been based largely on Luther's Ten Commandments Preached to the Wittenberg People of 1518. Rhegius begins with an expression of impatience with those of his congregation who have been deluded by human laws and who have failed to observe the Sabbath and the Church holidays spiritually. But since God has begun to enlighten them in the true knowledge of Christ, Rhegius sees himself obliged to show how the Sabbath of the
Jews differs from that of the Christians and how one should observe the Sabbath and the holy days.16

The Sabbath was instituted by God as a day of rest following his work of creation. Accordingly, the Jews were not permitted to do physical labor, for that signified the work of sin. Of greater importance to the Christian is the symbolic significance of the Sabbath as a portent of "that spiritual time which the eternal Son of Righteousness, Jesus Christ, has illuminated.... The dark night of wicked living has passed the Christian by, and an eternal day of holiness has now appeared.... One must celebrate not only with external celebrations like the Jews but inwardly with works of the soul."17

The Christian can celebrate the Sabbath in two ways, temporally and spiritually. Temporal observation of the Sabbath involves an abstention from physical labor and attendance at church, where one can hear the Gospel and receive the sacrament. Although the temporal Sabbath is no longer commanded to the Christian "because it is a figure of the truth which has now appeared," it is not to be abolished because man's will has not yet been perfected. It is still necessary that the will be disciplined by observance of ceremonies and holidays and that Christians assemble to pray for their common needs.18

Spiritual observation of the Sabbath means that one must forsake his own desires and let God work within him. Because of original sin, man has become corrupted in body
and soul. His heart is inclined toward sin from youth on. It is, therefore, erroneous to teach as Aristotle and the schoolmen have that man's reason can triumph over his material nature and that the will, by virtue of its freedom, can choose to act in accord with the dictates of reason. For if we can avoid sin and do good by our own will, without the grace of God, then Christ's death on the cross was in vain. The scholastics have been led into error because they have tried to view the Holy Scriptures "through the dark, cloudy glass of pagan, worldly wisdom...." The Scriptures plainly teach that not only a part of man but the whole man is sinful and evil.  

If God is to exercise his will in us, then we must be free of evil. This can come about in two ways. First, man, by the grace of God, can oppose the flesh by an act of will and thereby seek to discipline his carnal nature through fasts, works, vigils, and chastisement of the body. As Paul wrote in Romans 6 (12): "Let not sin therefore reign in your mortal body, that ye should obey it in the lusts thereof." Peter added in 1 Peter 2 (11): "Dearly beloved, I beseech you as strangers and pilgrims, abstain from fleshly lusts, which war against the soul." The second way in which we may be purged of sin is through the mirror of the divine law in which we see the reflections of our hearts' thoughts and desires. As Paul wrote in Romans 3 (20): "...by the law is the knowledge of sin." No one can
stand unashamed before the law, for everyone sees in the
third commandment that he has never rightly celebrated the
Sabbath. So that one may perceive still better how his
nature fails to correspond to God's will, which is expressed
in this commandment, it is necessary to examine the way in
which most Christians observe the Sabbath.

It is the usual custom for people to dress up on Sun­
day, set out their tables more elaborately than they do dur­
ing the week, and generally take it easy. But although the
body does not work, the mind is active in evil pursuits.
During the week people are too busy to entertain evil thoughts,
but on a holiday, when one is idle and full of good food and
wine, then all the gates are open to the devil. When does a
man do more evil deeds than on a holiday? When is there more
adultery, fornication, and murder than on a holiday? Indeed
it would perhaps be better if there were no holidays except
Sunday, for they are of no use to anyone but the devil, the
innkeepers, and certain greedy priests who extort alms from
the poor.

Rhegius contends that the proper observance of the
Sabbath and the Church holidays rests upon four articles.
First, if the people of the New Testament understand the
Gospels rightly and have the right faith, then no command­
ment is necessary for them. All days are the same to a
Christian, for as Paul wrote in Colossians 2(11): "Let
no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in
respect of an holyday...." Secondly, if we are imperfect in
faith, it is necessary for our salvation that we listen attentively to the Gospel. To that end we must have certain days on which we come together to hear the word of God. Thirdly, on days ordered by the Church for celebration, we should abstain from all physical labor which hinders us in proper worship and free our minds of all carnal thoughts and desires, so that God may effect his holy work in us. Fourthly, certain labors can be performed without violation of the Sabbath if they are occasioned by necessity, such as cooking a meal or pulling a cow out of a ditch; if they are small works, such as a tailor cutting a piece of cloth or a maiden binding a wreath; or if they are acts of mercy performed out of love for one's neighbor, for love is the fulfillment of the law. 22

In addition to these two sermons Rhegius also published two short tracts in 1522. In his Instruction How a Christian Man Should Act So That He Receives the Benefit of the Mass and Takes Communion in a Christian Way, 23 Rhegius presented the same basic position regarding the Lord's Supper as he had in the Sermon on the Sacrament of the Altar of 1521. The Lord's Supper, in which Christ's "natural flesh and blood are present," is a testament to all Christians consisting of four elements. First, there is the testator who bequeaths the inheritance. In this case the testator is Christ. Secondly, there is the sign or seal of the testament, which is the words of institution spoken by Christ at the Last Supper. Thirdly, there is the inheritance, or the remis-
sion of sin. Fourthly, there are the heirs, that is, all those who believe the promise of Christ.24 A new element in Rhe­gius' discussion of this subject is the introduction of the idea of the community of saints, already mentioned in the Sermon on Church Dedication, in connection with the benefits to be derived from receiving the sacrament. He now contends that to receive the sacrament is nothing other than to receive a sign of the community of saints into which one is incorporated through the sacrament.

...If you are distressed and troubled by your own flesh, by the world, the devil, and all kinds of afflictions in this vale of tears, if you yearn to be free and to be with God and his saints, then take communion or hear the Mass, and desire the sacrament from the heart in true faith. A sure sign will be given to you physically or spiritually, indeed by God himself through the priest, that you will be united with Christ and all the saints, and...that Christ's life and suffering will also be your own in addition to the life and suffering of all the saints.25

The second tract, Concerning the Completion and Fruit of Christ's Afflictions Together with an Explanation of the Words of Paul in Colossians 1, "I complete what is lacking in Christ's afflictions,"26 deals not only with the specific problem of scriptural interpretation indicated in the title but also with the more general problem of distinguishing true and false teaching. Taking note of popular complaints that one preacher does not preach like another, Rhegius calls attention to Paul's warning in I Timothy 4(1) to be wary of "seducing spirits and doctrines of devils," and to Peter's prophecy in II Peter 2(12) about false teachers bringing
damnable heresies. Rhegius argues that the only test of truth is conformity to the Holy Scriptures. Anyone who preaches otherwise or who counsels people to accept his words simply because they are those of a council or a Doctor of Scripture promotes the rule of Antichrist.27

This problem of separating true from false doctrine is well-illustrated in the misunderstanding of Paul's words in Colossians 1(24): "Now I rejoice in my sufferings for your sake, and in my flesh I complete what is lacking in Christ's afflictions for the sake of his body, that is, the church...." This verse has been taken to mean that Christ did not render sufficient satisfaction for our sins and that we must, therefore, perform good works in order to complete this insufficiency. Rhegius finds that this error has been further compounded by the assumption that if Christ did indeed merit salvation for us, then we have no need of performing good works.28

These confusions can be cleared up by appealing to the Scriptures. Paul himself asked in I Corinthians 1(13): "Was Paul crucified for you, or were ye baptised in the name of Paul?" Paul was clearly implying that no one but Christ had died for our sins. But the proper imitation of the suffering of Christ must be in us so that we may conform to his example and thereby purge ourselves of what remains of sin. I Peter 4(11) admonishes us: "Forasmuch then as Christ hath suffered for us in the flesh, arm yourselves likewise with
the same mind: for he that hath suffered in the flesh hath ceased from sin." Rhegius uses the same line of reasoning to show that we must also do good works even though Christ has already merited salvation for us. Works are the fruit of faith and serve not only to mortify the flesh but also to help our neighbor.29

Rhegius concludes with the observation that one must be careful about lifting a verse out of context and attempting to explain it without reference to other Scriptures. Those who seek to preach the Gospel without adequate training violate the order of the spiritual body as much as an eye which wants to hear or and ear which wants to see violate the order of the physical body. Preachers who pervert Paul's meaning, as some have done, must either go to school for a while or do some other work, because they are not called to the preaching office.30

In the following year, 1523, Rhegius continued to pursue the same fundamental themes, but it became increasingly difficult for him to maintain a balance between the old Catholic forms of worship and the message of evangelical Christianity. Accordingly, some of the practices which he had defended earlier he now came to regard as either harmful or unnecessary. This new direction is indicated in the first of his published pamphlets of 1523, which was based on a sermon preached during Lent: Concerning Contrition, Confession and Penance, a Short Conclusion Based on Fundamental Scripture and Not on Man's Doctrine.31 In conformity with the
position expressed in his pamphlet defending Luther, A Declaration that the Roman Bull... Rhegius contends that contrition of the heart does not come from man but is the gift of God. Moreover, the imposition of penance by the priest has no foundation in Scripture, for nowhere does God require any other satisfaction for past sins than the sinner's resolution to mend his ways.

With regard to confession, however, Rhegius modifies somewhat his original view as stated both in the Declaration and in his Instruction How a Christian Man Should Daily Confess to God his Lord. He affirms that God instituted three kinds of confession. In the first, the sinner accuses himself before God and confesses his sins. "Christ is not Christ to you unless you confess yourself to be ill, as truly you are, and confess yourself to be in need of divine grace." The second confession is that of a man who confesses his guilt to his neighbor if he has wronged him. This brotherly confession is based on the admonitions in Matthew 5(123-24) to be reconciled with our brother before bringing gifts to the altar and in James 5(16) to confess our faults one to another. The third confession is known as ecclesiastical confession and is based on Matthew 18(15-17), according to which one is to seek redress of a wrong first in private from him who has inflicted the injury, then, in the presence of witnesses, and finally, if all else fails, before the church. If the offender refuses to admit his error and to seek absolution, then he is to be excluded from the church.
Now as Paul indicated in the fifth chapter of I Corinthians, such a confession before the church applied only to the obvious public sins like fornication and drunkenness. But several customs soon developed which were not expressly enjoined by the Scriptures. Not only did ecclesiastical confession give way to auricular confession but it also became incumbent upon the penitent to confess the secret sins of the heart to a priest at least once a year.  

The question as Rhegius saw it was whether auricular confession and confession of sins with all their circumstances were instituted by God or were merely the commandments of men. He notes that the schoolmen had argued that these practices were among Christ's unrecorded instructions to his disciples. Rhegius replies that this is mere supposition on their part and that nothing in recorded Scripture can be cited in defense of these practices. Therefore, those who wish to confess their sins to a priest may do so if they find it useful, but the practice should remain voluntary and not be forced on anyone. The true Christian should, however, welcome the opportunity to humble himself before God through the confession and to receive the reassurances spoken by God through the priest. But it is not necessary that he confess those secret sins of the heart which should be confessed to God alone. Both with respect to this later point and more especially with regard to the voluntary nature of auricular confession, Rhegius moved away from his earlier view of the proper use of confession.
Until the spring of 1523, Rhegius' activities in Hall seem not to have caused any opposition from the Catholics, presumably because of the moderation which he displayed in his approach to the question of Church reform. But the bishop began to impose on Rhegius the same demand which he had imposed on Strauss, namely, to preach both the Gospel and the Church laws. When Rhegius declined and instead offered to debate publicly whether the Apostles had been commanded to preach anything other than the Gospel, the bishop turned for support to the temporal sovereign, Archduke Ferdinand of Austria. Ferdinand was angered by the rumors that Rhegius had been preaching against the tithe and stirring up the people. To mollify the Archduke's anger Rhegius considered it best to leave Hall for a while. In April, he returned to Augsburg where he stayed with Bernhard Adelman. The bishop used this time to indict Rhegius further before the Archduke, and when he expressed a desire to return to Hall, the city council advised him against it because they could no longer guarantee his safety. At the council's suggestion, Rhegius sent a letter of defense to the Archduke but was still waiting in June for a reply. 36

During the summer, Rhegius remained in Augsburg. He preached several times at the request of the city council 37 and also published a sermon, two doctrinal statements, and a pseudonymous polemic against the Bishop of Rochester. On Corpus Christ day (June 4th), he preached on the Sacrament of the Altar as he had done two years before. 38 This sermon,
however, offered a much fuller discussion of the sacrament than the earlier work and also included the conception of the communion of saints first mentioned in connection with the Lord's Supper in the Instruction How a Christian Man Should Act of 1522.

The introduction to the sermon contains the clearest statement to date of Rhegius' own conception of his role as a preacher and pamphleteer.

It would be unnecessary that I and other preachers have their sermons printed if such diligence were now applied to the reading of the principal book of our faith, the Bible, as at the beginning of the Christian Church. But because the people have been diverted from the Holy Scriptures by other books for hundreds of years, and now, although the Bible has again come to light, the Scripture has been obscured in many places by additions of human teaching, the reader needs a pathfinder. Therefore, I want to do my work to that end. Even if I create nothing, I declare my will inclined to serve everyman.

The role of a pathfinder implied for Rhegius the dual obligations of expounding the Scriptures as they really were and of correcting errors that may have arisen in interpretation. Just as he had sought to clear up the problems which had obscured Paul's meaning in Colossians 1:24, so also he undertook to correct several errors regarding the Lord's Supper.

In the first place, he finds that the "ungodly sophists" have tried to philosophize about the divine mystery of the sacrament and have succeeded only in confusing the simple folk. They have asked in what sense Christ is said to be present in the sacrament; when Christ begins to be present in the bread and wine, at the beginning of the words of institution or at their end; how Christ can be present everywhere
when so many hosts are elevated at the same time; and why the accidents of the bread remain unchanged if Christ and his attributes are really present. The devil has given us so many unnecessary questions to busy ourselves with that we do not have time to consider the real spiritual meaning of the sacrament. It is as if a hungry man had been invited to dinner, and when it came time to eat, he was shown the exquisite sideboard, the gold and silver work, and the fine dishes. Thus distracted, he forgot to eat and had to leave the table on an empty stomach.

A second error lies in the inordinate superficialities of worship. The prophets and apostles have always taught that the true form of worship was a proper attitude of the heart toward God. No matter how reverent the external form of worship may be, with bowing of head and bending of knee, if the heart does not worship inwardly, then it is pure hypocrisy. The devil has provided us with so many ceremonies and superfluous customs that we give no thought to the meaning of the sacrament.

The third error derives from a false understanding of the words of Paul in I Corinthians 11:28: "But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup." The sophists have applied this test narrowly and have taught that a man is not ready for the sacrament until he has searched his conscience and confessed his sins with all their circumstances to a priest. If he does not do this, then he receives the sacrament to his eternal damnation.
But in trying to allay the consciences of men, the sophists have created despair and confusion. Not only is it impossible to confess all sins as discriminatingly as they teach us to do, but it is also quite difficult to separate venial from mortal sins or even to be sure that an act was a sin at all. The words of Paul cannot have implied the drudgery of auricular confession. Nor indeed can any Scripture be cited in defense of this practice. This is not to say, however, that auricular confession is to be forbidden, but only that it should remain voluntary and that no Christian should be troubled in his conscience or feel unworthy of the sacrament if he does not conform precisely to the confession book. It is significant that Rhegius no longer recommends confession as a welcome means of humbling oneself before God as he had in his earlier pamphlet Concerning Contrition, Confession, and Penance.

Following the discussion of these errors, Rhegius proceeds to a statement of the main articles of the Eucharist doctrine. The sacrament was instituted by Christ at the Last Supper as a sign of the remission of sin and as a promise of eternal life. His "true, natural body and blood" are present in the sacrament as a "pledge, sign, and memorial." This spiritual food nourishes the soul by increasing the virtues of faith, hope, and charity, unites the spirit of man with the spirit of Christ, and incorporates the believer into the communion of saints. Although there is nothing here which differs from the earlier statements, Rhegius does
provide a much more precise account of the way in which a Christian ought to prepare himself for the reception of the sacrament.

The real test of fitness for the sacrament, as Rhegius saw it, was not the extent of conformity to the confession book but the depth of understanding of the sacrament's meaning. The individual must first examine himself to see if he really believes that the body and blood of Christ are present in the sacrament. Rhegius regards it as an error to believe that there is only bread there as a sign of the body. Secondly, one must recognize that this same body and blood which are present in the sacrament were given in death for the redemption of sin. God promises and we believe. Through that belief we receive the fruits of the promise. Thirdly, it is necessary that the individual confess that his whole life is defiled by sin and that there is nothing pure within him until grace begins to remold the heart. This first fruit of the Spirit's work must be strengthened by a commitment to live according to God's commandments and to abstain from one's previous life of sin. Fourthly, because the sacrament signifies unity and love with Christ and the saints, the Christian must be sure that his heart is right toward his neighbor, and, if it is not, he should seek forgiveness of whatever wrongs he may have inflicted. Once this test has been completed, the Christian may take communion with a clear conscience. Rhegius concludes with the admonition: "Pray God to increase your faith
in his word and sign, kindle your love, and remain hopeful that you, in the power of the Holy Supper, may walk securely through the unsure byways of the world into the eternal, secure Fatherland."46

Hhegius made a significant contribution to the confessional literature of the Reformation with the publication in the summer of 1523 of two of his most widely circulated and most frequently reprinted pamphlets. The Twelve Articles of Our Christian Faith With a Declaration of the Holy Scriptures on Which They Are Founded47 presented an explanation of the Apostles' Creed analyzed into twelve principal parts. The pamphlet was typical of a series of confessions authored by the reformers in the early 1520's and which followed closely the model provided by Luther in his Short Form of Faith published in 1520.48 Rhegius' statement that "the twelve articles contain what a Christian must believe for salvation"49 is the keynote of the work. To believe, says Rhegius, is to cleave steadfastly to the word of God. Faith is more than mere opinion spun out of man's mind; it is the gift of God. Nor is it enough to recite the articles five, six, or seven times a day; they must be written on the heart.50

The second doctrinal statement, A Short Explanation of Certain Familiar Points Which Are Useful and Necessary to Every Christian for a True Understanding of the Holy Scripture, published at the end of July, 1523,51 was a popular version of some of the main theological concepts contained
in the Bible—the nature of God, the soul, sin, faith and righteousness, and free will—and some of the chief institutions of the Church—vows, veneration of saints, choice of foods, holidays, and confession. In Rhegius' view, the Bible contains not the words or doctrines of men, but the words of God himself. Nothing else than this is necessary for the salvation of the soul and the direction of the conscience. Thus the understanding of the Scriptures does not belong to priests alone but is incumbent upon every believing Christian. It is not enough that a man remain content with the faith of his father, for his father may have been taught works righteousness and the efficacy of private Masses. The time is at hand when, as Isaiah wrote (54:13): "... thy children shall be taught of the Lord...."52

Rhegius' exposition of several topics in the Short Explanation provides evidence of his interest in Zwingli's writings. In regard to the choice of foods, for example, both Zwingli and Luther had argued that the prohibitions of the Lenten season were contrary to Christian freedom, and both had urged moderation in repudiating these restrictions lest the consciences of the weak be offended. But Zwingli had been much more vigorous in his denunciation than Luther. Rhegius, for his part, follows the same organization, uses many of the same phrases, and expresses the same critical tone as Zwingli had in his pamphlet Concerning the Selection and Liberty of Foods.53

Of greater interest is Rhegius' incorporation of
Zwingli's ideas concerning the Lord's Supper into his article on the Mass. Zwingli had not yet embraced the figurative interpretation of Christ's presence in the sacrament, but he did see in it another kind of significance in addition to the testamentary and communal aspects which Luther had stressed. In article eighteen of his Sixty-Seven Conclusions of January, 1523, Zwingli declared that Christ had been sacrificed only once and that "the Mass is not a sacrifice but a remembrance of the sacrifice and an assurance of the redemption which Christ has gained for us."\(^5^4\) Rhegius, in his Short Explanation, repeats his earlier view that the Lord's Supper signifies the testament of Christ and participation in the community of saints.\(^5^5\) But he then introduces the idea that the Mass is not a sacrifice, an idea already expressed by Luther in the Babylonian Captivity but ignored by Rhegius up to this time, and then affirms its commemorative nature. "The Mass is not really a sacrifice but a memorial of the holy sacrifice which Christ himself, God's son from heaven, offered on the cross for our sins.... If one now celebrates the Mass or takes communion, then one cannot really say that Christ is being sacrificed again, for he can never die."\(^5^6\)

It is noteworthy that Rhegius had already begun to draw on Zwingli's ideas before the great controversy arose in the following year between Zwingli and Luther over the nature of Christ's presence in the sacrament—a controversy which, although not realized at the time, was already implicit in the
matter of the commemorative significance of the Mass.

The fourth pamphlet which Rhegius wrote during his Augsburg interim, and the last of 1523, was a Latin polemic published under the pseudonym "Symon Hessus" and directed against John Fisher, the Bishop of Rochester.57 The work dealt with the question of the primacy of the pope in the context of a discussion which had begun in 1520 with Luther's reception of a booklet, ostensibly from a young Bohemian scholar, Ulrichus Velenus, seeking to prove that St. Peter had never been in Rome and that the Roman see's claim to supremacy was, therefore, not founded on fact. Luther had used several of Velenus' arguments in one of his own works, although he himself continued to believe that Peter probably had been in Rome but that the claim could not be established with certainty. Velenus' pamphlet aroused considerable concern among the supporters of the papacy, and in October, 1522, the Bishop of Rochester published the first reply to Velenus. It was against this work by the bishop that Rhegius directed his attack.58

Rhegius began by saying that he was not concerned about whether Velenus or the bishop was right about Peter's presence in Rome. The question was not a matter of faith and, therefore, Velenus could no more be condemned as a heretic for denying that Peter was in Rome than could a man be condemned for denying that Fisher was the Bishop of Rochester. What is important is the way in which the papists have made
an idol out of Peter and conceded to his successors a right to institute new articles of faith which belongs to God alone. If the popes conformed to the model of Peter and Paul, everyone would gladly follow them, but instead they have created confusion and dissension by dogmatically imposing rules for which there is no justification. Pope Victor (192-194), for example, brought about the first schism between the Eastern and Western churches by condemning all who did not celebrate Easter on Sunday. Several hundred years later, the Greek and Roman churches split over the use of unleavened bread in the communion. And a most horrible war ensued between the Bohemians and Rome because the pope had forbidden the giving of the cup to the laity. It is to be feared that even worse schisms will occur if such unnecessary articles are enforced as if they were essential for salvation. As far as the Bishop is concerned, his fear that if Velenus is not punished, someone will next deny Christ's death on the cross is sheer nonsense. The latter is clearly confirmed by Scripture, whereas the issue which Velenus raised is simply a matter of opinion. Rhegius brings his polemic to an end with the declaration that he has no desire to continue a quarrel from which nothing good can come. 59

Sometime late that summer or early in the autumn, Rhegius returned to Hall, but without resuming his preaching duties. During the summer Archduke Ferdinand had treated with the Bishop of Brixen concerning Rhegius but had not informed the privy council (Hofrat) in Innsbruck of the results
of the discussion. Since the council had responsibility for the government of the county of Tirol, there was much concern about Rhegius' return to Hall and the consequence which that could have for the peace of the community. The council wrote to the bishop on November 29, 1523 expressing surprise that Rhegius had ventured to come back without a letter of safe conduct. The council had learned from the chancellor that Ferdinand had forbidden anyone to issue such a letter without his express command, and they suspected that the bishop might have done so anyway. The bishop responded on November 13 that he knew nothing of such a letter and recommended that Rhegius be imprisoned or driven out of Hall. The council replied on November 18 that, although they were fearful that Rhegius would spread Luther's teachings whether he held an office or not, they could not order his arrest for fear that such an order might be opposed to the secret arrangements already made between Ferdinand and the bishop. In the meantime that were waiting until Ferdinand returned from the Diet in Nürnberg. 60

Rhegius was thus given an opportunity to remain a while longer in Hall. However, in a letter to Wolfgang Rychard written at Tettnang in late December, Rhegius explained the course of events from his own perspective. After he had returned to Hall, he wrote, the bishop had been very hostile towards him and had made every effort to drive him out. In agreement with the city council of Hall, Rhegius decided to return to his homeland and remain there until the Württembergers had
settled the matter at the Diet through their representatives. Then he would return to Hall, where his mother was protecting his household for him. But if the bishop carried the day, he would go back to Augsburg, where there was a prospect of an appointment.61

In January, 1524 he received his letter of expulsion from the privy council in Innsbruck,62 thus making it impossible for him to return to Hall. He spent the first half of the year in Langenargen and Tetnang and returned to Augsburg sometime during the summer. There he lived as a private individual, giving lectures on Paul's letter to the Romans. In August, he received an appointment as a preacher at St. Anna, the parish church of the Carmelite monastery over which Frosch had presided as prior.63 But he did not forget his congregation in Hall. In 1527 he composed a summary of the doctrines which he had preached during his year there and prefaced it with a letter in which he informed the Hallers that his prayers were with them and that he had composed the Summa "so that you will freshen your memories about what I taught you."64 The congregation did not survive for long, for the seeds of evangelical Christianity which Strauss and Rhegius had cultivated were soon trampled under foot as the Counter-Reformation reclaimed Tirol for Catholicism in the 1530's.
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CHAPTER IV
THE REFORMATION IN AUGSBURG AND THE PEASANTS' REVOLT

Since Rhegius' departure from Augsburg late in 1522, the Reformation had been allowed to develop without concerted opposition from either the city council or the bishop. The Edict of Worms, which placed Luther under the ban and forbade the further publication of books attacking Church dogma or Church institutions, had been posted in the city in November, 1521. But the inability of Emperor Charles to enforce it within the Empire and the reluctance of the diets meeting in Nürnberg from 1522 to 1524 to compel compliance until a Church council was called to resolve the issues raised by Luther allowed the matter to fall under the jurisdiction of local authorities. In Hall im Inntal, as we have seen, the privy council and the Archduke acted to prevent the Reformation from spreading further. In Nürnberg the city council formally instituted the Reformation in March, 1525 by assuming direct control of the city's religious affairs. In Augsburg, however, the council tried to steer a middle course between outright rejection and full acceptance.

During the 1520's the office of mayor was chiefly in the hands of four men: the patricians Georg Vetter and Ulrich
Rehlinger, and the guildsmen Ulrich Artz and Hieronymous Imhoff. Of these only Artz was a declared enemy of the Reformation. Rehlinger, on the other hand, became one of the strongest advocates of reform, and both Vetter and Imhoff leaned toward Rehlinger's view. Moreover, the city's chief diplomat, Conrad Herwart, and the syndic, Conrad Peutinger, were more closely aligned with the Evangelicals than with the Catholics. But in spite of this, there were forces at work which made the city's leadership reluctant to break with the old order. Peutinger, who had served the city as syndic and diplomat since 1497, had acquired a profound sense of the legal relationships within the Empire and was, on that account, very reluctant to advise actions which might appear as evidence of insubordination to the will of the Emperor. On a more personal level, all most all these men had daughters in convents, and many had sons and close relatives who occupied lucrative church offices. Furthermore, all of them belonged directly or indirectly to the community's monied aristocracy and were, therefore, much concerned about the commercial well-being of the city. The avowed enmity of the Fuggers to the Reformation and the network of Augsburg's commercial relations within the Empire and throughout Europe made inadvisable a religious policy which might prove economically disadvantageous. Thus, the evangelical members of the council went hand in hand with their Catholic colleagues when it was a question of the city's continued prosperity.²
During the years from 1522 to 1524, the council tried to permit the Reformation sufficient latitude to appease the evangelical elements within the community while at the same time exercising enough restraint to prevent a complete overthrow of the Catholic institutions. This "middle way" found expression in a number of the council's decrees. In March, 1522, for example, the council instituted a new ordinance regulating charitable activities. The care of the poor, which had traditionally been left to the Church or to private foundations, was now placed under the direction of a six-man commission empowered to collect and distribute alms and to license beggars and mendicant monks. Although the ordinance did not conform in all respects to the ideal of the reformers, it did serve to separate the practice of alms-giving from the Church's conception of meritorious deeds. In August, 1523 the council, acting in accordance with the imperial mandate of March 6, enjoined the city's preachers to preach nothing "except the holy Gospel and the Word of God" and refused to act on the bishop's complaints to the contrary. The council did, however, renew its prohibition on unauthorized printing and bound the printers by oath not to publish anonymous pamphlets or anything at all without the foreknowledge of the mayors. Moreover, it took strong exception to the marriage of a priest, Jacob Griessbeutel, in August, 1523. The mayors refused to allow the marriage to take place in a church, and although the council chose not to act against Griessbeutel, it levied a
fine of ten guldin on the witnesses to the event in the hope of discouraging any such occurrences in the future.6

These temporizing actions found little favor among either the conservatives or the reformers. The papal legate Chieregati complained to Peutinger at the Nürnberg Diet of 1522 that masses were no longer said in Augsburg on All Souls Day or All Saints Day and that the council was allowing the preachers to deny the existence of purgatory publicly. Similar complaints were expressed to the city's diplomats in Valladolid during the summer of 1523. There they were shown a letter from the pope in which he cited Strassburg, Nürnberg, and Augsburg as cities where Luther's doctrines were being spread among the citizenry contrary to the Emperor's command.7 The reformers, on the other hand, eagerly pressed for the abolition of the remaining Church institutions. Beginning in 1523, the fast laws were openly flouted, public letters were circulated urging the monks and nuns to leave their cloisters, and occasional acts of violence were directed against the priests and against Church property.8

Because the council was unwilling to resolve the issue to anyone's satisfaction, the conflict between the Catholic and evangelical factions became more and more energetic. On the Catholic side the bishop began in 1523 to move away from his previously adopted stance of neutrality. In May he met at Tübingen with the bishops of Constance and Strassburg to decide upon common measures which could be taken in co-
operation with the dukes of Austria and Bavaria. Within the city he tried to call to account several priests whom he regarded as guilty of Lutheran heresies, but the council declined to proceed against them. The bishop soon discovered that the best weapon at his disposal was the printed and spoken word, and accordingly he came to rely more and more on the services of three of the most outspoken defenders of the old faith, Johann Faber, Matthias Kretz, and Ottmar Nachtigall.

Johann Faber, prior of the Dominican monastery in Augsburg and vicar-general of his order in Germany, had not been inclined to condemn Luther out of hand. Early in 1521 he had suggested that Luther's case be referred to a court of arbitration or to a general Church council. But his moderation soon gave way to bitter hatred of the evangelical movement. So violent was his opposition that in November, 1524 he was compelled by popular displeasure to leave the city for a time. Matthias Kretz, a thorough-going scholastic who had succeeded Rhegius as cathedral preacher, attracted little attention until 1524 when he, like Faber, fell into disfavor because of his anti-evangelical polemicism. The third of these Catholic preachers was Ottmar Nachtigall, lector at the St. Ulrich's cloister. He was a man of humanist persuasion, contemptuous of scholasticism, and an unsparing critic of ecclesiastical abuses. His work in biblical exegesis and his exercise of the preaching
office at St. Moritz after 1525 helped to strengthen the forces of moderate Catholicism within the city.\textsuperscript{11}

On the side of the reformers there were four men who were chiefly responsible for preaching evangelical doctrines. Johann Prosch, prior of the Carmelite monastery, assumed a position of leadership after Rhegius' departure in 1522. The bishop's attempts to have him removed as prior proved unsuccessful, and under Frosch's direction the parish church of the monastery, St. Anna's, became the focal point of reformed preaching in the city. In August, 1523 he declared from the pulpit that he would no longer read the Mass unless there were people present who wished to receive the sacrament, and from 1524 on, he administered the sacrament in both kinds to those who desired it.\textsuperscript{12} The Augustinian monk and former father-confessor of Queen Anna of Hungary, Stephan Agricola, lent his services to the cause of the Reformation in Augsburg by assuming a position as a preacher at St. Anna in 1523. His narrow escape from a martyr's death at Mühldorf, where he had been imprisoned in 1522 for his preaching activities in Salzburg, had a profound effect on the character of his sermons and tracts.\textsuperscript{13} Although Rhegius had returned to Augsburg during the summer of 1524, it was not until August that he was appointed by the city council as a preacher at St. Anna. He thereby became the first evangelical minister to be officially employed by the city.\textsuperscript{14} Finally, in November, 1524, Michael Keller, who had been active in promoting Lutheran ideas in
Wasserburg am Inn, was retained by the council to preach at the Franciscan cloister. Keller was a man of excessive zeal who was later to become the leading spokesman for the Zwinglians in Augsburg during the controversy over the Lord's Supper.15

These four men and their Catholic counterparts were the prime movers in the Reformation debate carried on from the pulpit and in the press in 1524 and early 1525. Whereas Agricola and Frosch restricted themselves almost exclusively to preaching, both Keller and Rhegius were actively engaged in publishing pamphlets in defense of the Reformation. Rhegius continued to expound his basic theme of biblical supremacy as he lectured at St. Anna, first on Paul's letter to the Romans and then on the letters to the Thessalonians.16 Because few men were sufficiently conversant with Greek and Hebrew to read the Scriptures in the original languages, it was important not only that the preachers expound the word of God to the laity, but also that the laity have access to accurate vernacular translations of the Bible. In September, 1522 Luther had published his German translation of the New Testament based on the Greek edition of Erasmus. Since Luther's version differed in several places from the Latin Vulgate and from the older German translations, the cry went up that his translation was suspect.17 In October, 1524 Rhegius published a tract entitled Whether the New Testament Is Now Correctly Translated Into German in which he sought
to defend Luther against the objections raised by Jerome Emser, one of Luther's most vigorous critics, and to assuage the concern expressed by Andreas Rem and other Augsburgers over this problem.18

Rhegius acknowledged at the outset that anyone who would intentionally pervert or falsify the Holy Scriptures should be dealt with as severely as someone who had poisoned a stream or meadow for the destruction of people and livestock. But since, according to Paul's words, Christian charity should not be distrustful or envious, we must not repudiate the sincere efforts of a translator if there is no evidence that he has intentionally falsified the Scriptures. Not only is there no evidence of any such misdeed on Luther's part, but the passages challenged by Emser are unobjectionable when Luther's translation is compared with the original Greek.19 Rhegius then proceeds to set forth some general principles of good translation which he thinks will help to clear up the matter.

In the first place, if the present German translation is not always the same in word and meaning as the older ones, that should not cause anyone to err, because it is known that the old German translation of the Gospels and the letters of the Apostles, as well as the Latin translation which had been in use for several centuries, is corrupted in many places. If anyone rejects Luther's translation, he is in effect rejecting the Greek edition of Erasmus upon which it is
based. Secondly, if anyone thinks that the present translator of the New Testament has erred in failing to translate every sentence word for word into German, then he does not understand the nature and method of translating. To convey the true meaning of a sentence it is sometimes necessary to leave out words or to rephrase it so that it will be intelligible in another language. Thirdly, this principle is not a recent invention but harks back to Jerome, a man of extraordinary ability in Latin, Greek, and Hebrew. Fourthly, even if all this were not so, the translator in question gains support from the fact that he is not the only one who translates in this way. The evangelists and the apostles as well as the seventy translators who rendered the Hebrew Bible into Greek did not always adhere rigidly to words and syllables but took care to express the meaning clearly and simply. Rhegius ends his discussion with the observation that "we ought not to cast aside and inveigh against the service rendered in making a new translation, but thank God, who wants to make his truth known in many languages."  

In a related pamphlet, A Short Response to Two Blasphemies of God, Against the Enemies of the Holy Scripture, Rhegius dealt with several problems of interpretation which concerned the biblical use of metaphorical language. In his previous handling of such problems, Rhegius' tone had always been one of moderation, and the advice he had offered was given in the spirit of brotherly correction. But in this tract one finds a sharper denunciation of misinterpretations.
Whereas he had formerly attributed errors to simple ignorance or to the corrupting influence of worldly wisdom, he now begins to perceive the work of the devil in such mistakes. In the dedicatory preface addressed to Dr. Wolfgang Mangolt, Rhegius declares:

If it has ever been necessary to put on the armor of God against the assault of the devil, it is now necessary in these dangerous last days for us to struggle not only against flesh and blood but also against the spirit of evil. The father of lies seeks us out with all cunning and attempts to hinder the divine truth because of which his kingdom of darkness has wavered not a little in the last four years. The bright light of the Gospel hurts his eyes, therefore he grasps at our strongest weapon, the holy, divine Scripture.... If he could now suppress the Scripture, our consolation, and bring it into disrepute, then he would have won.23

As an example of this work, Rhegius cites the assertion of those who argue on the basis of Genesis 6:6, "it repented the Lord that he had made man on earth," that the Scriptures are unfounded and false because God can repent nothing. Repentence comes only when a plan or action miscarries because of unforseen circumstances. Since God has foreknowledge of all things, then he must have known that man would fall from his state of perfection. Therefore, he cannot have regretted the outcome of his work of creation.24 The resolution of this problem depends upon an understanding of man's limited ability to comprehend divine truth, for "however high reason flies in the knowledge of God, especially in this mortal life, such knowledge is still immeasurably far from the true nature of God in itself." It follows from this that the words which we use to describe God in no way
express the true nature of God. The Bible often speaks of God becoming angry, records supplications that God turn his ear toward us, and cites the prayers of thanksgiving from those who have been touched by his hand. But no one thinks that God in his invisible, eternal nature undergoes changing emotions or has hands and ears as men do. Therefore, if words and ways of speaking are used which are too far beneath divine perfection, one must not infer a lack of divine perfection but rather recognize that the Holy Spirit must speak to us at our own level as a mother talks to her child.25

The second blasphemy arises from a misunderstanding of divine predestination. There are some who say that if they have been created for salvation, then they are saved for all eternity. If God has ordained them to damnation, then there is no point in praying, preaching, and fasting. Rhegius responds that,

here one recognizes the true Lucifer, who has been exiled from heaven with such thoughts. He wanted to sit next to God; that too is what these silly people want. For if you want to know who is eternally saved or lost and why such things happen..., then truly you do not want that God be God; you also want to be God.

The proper attitude of the true Christian is to honor and praise the judgment of God in reverential silence. To enter into disputations and to demand an account from God is not Christian but devilish. From that we are protected by Christ our Savior.26

Three other pamphlets from 1524 provide further evi-
dence of a more critical attitude toward the opponents of evangelical Christianity. Rhegius had been careful up to this time to distinguish between the outer form of Church institutions and the inner spirit which must be present as an animating force. Rather than calling for the abolition of auricular confession and Church holidays, for example, he had advised that these institutions be used in a proper way. But after his return to Augsburg in the summer of 1524 and the resumption of his involvement in the religious controversies within the city, he began to take a much stronger stand against the Church hierarchy and against unreasonable or superfluous Church laws.

In his Letter Excommunicating the Pope and the Whole Antichristian Realm he opens with the plea:

Let all true Christians be united in the belief that the pope is the antichrist who, in so many ages, has seduced almost all the people and has made the Word of God foreign to them. For that reason he has been placed outside the community of believers and has been rejected by God together with his whole realm of cardinals, bishops, idols, monks, nuns, and other scum and malignancies of the world who depend on the same antichrist.

Rhegius advises that the temporal authorities dissociate themselves from the pope and his followers. Rather than oppose them by force of arms, however, he recommends that they be defeated by the Word of God.

A second pamphlet revealing this change of attitude was the Earnest Supplication of the Evangelical Preachers to the Ecclesiastical and Papal Estate Concerning the Present Sound, True, Evangelical, and Christian Doctrine.
Rhegius declares that many false doctrines of the antichrist are being spread among the people, and that whoever does not wish to be deceived must be watchful for the sake of his soul's salvation. Fortunately, the Spirit of God has provided "clear public signs" by which one can recognize the doctrines and teachers of antichrist. Rhegius then proceeds to identify six of these signs.

The first sign is the fact that the teachers of antichrist have tried to bind the consciences of men with human laws by which one may supposedly serve God and attain salvation. These people fill the world with their commandments, promising security where there is none and creating fear where there is nothing to fear. The second sign is given by Paul in I Timothy 4(1-3) where he describes the "seducing spirits" who will forbid marriage and command men to abstain from meats. This is what the papalists have done in forbidding marriage to ecclesiastics on the false ground that one cannot serve God as well in a state of marriage as in a state of chastity. According to their teaching, marriage must be unholy and impure even though the Holy Spirit has called it an honorable thing (Hebrews 13).

Furthermore, they have forbidden the eating of meat, which God has allowed to be eaten in thanksgiving, as if there was great holiness in eating fish and avoiding meat. The third sign of antichrist, according to Paul in II Timothy 3(15), is that men shall have the appearance of Godly liv-
ing but "deny the power thereof." There is abundant evidence of that in the lives of the cloistered monks who give the outward appearance of piety with their prayers, wretched clothes, chastity, fasts, and the like but whose hearts are set on greed, envy, and lust. They may sit in their cells, but their thoughts and desires wander through the whole world. The fourth sign is the false doctrine that men can atone for sin and merit grace by their own works. Whoever teaches this robs Christ of his office, for if we were capable of self-regeneration, then Christ would have died in vain. The fifth sign of antichrist is indicated in Paul's prophesy to the elders of Ephesus in Acts 20:30: "of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them." Despite the teaching of the Scriptures that there is only one order, namely, the Christian state in which Christ is the head, there have been a number of teachers who have created various sects and orders in the opinion that they should be states of perfection far better and holier than the common Christian state. Not content merely to call themselves Christians, they have preferred to be known as Benedictines, Augustinians, Dominicans, and Franciscans. The sixth mark of the work of antichrist is given in II Peter 2:12 where the Apostle speaks of the false prophets who shall malign the way of truth. This is the path which the pope and his supporters have followed in condemning as heretical those who have taught only what Christ and the apostles have taught.
Rhegius concludes with a challenge to his opponents to decide on the basis of these articles who is right.

If you are able to show with reason and truth that the above mentioned six signs of the false teachers are found among us and not among you, we volunteer ourselves to a public recantation and will as quickly yield and concede that you are right so that the world will come to peace. Your furious anger and the lamentable quarreling on both sides has long since been more than enough. But if you despise our sincere offer and the excellent things which concern our souls' salvation, then the whole world must understand that you do not take to heart the salvation of poor souls and that accordingly you cannot and should not be considered any longer as the successors of the holy apostles.32

In a third pamphlet from this period Rhegius amplified his attack on the orders of the regular clergy, which he had already identified as one of the signs of antichrist. The work bore the prosaic title, *That Tonsures, Cowls, Hoods, Shaving, Anointing, Salt, Oil and the Like Are Abominable to God, One Finds Fundamental Proof in the Scripture.*33 Rhegius finds himself "moved by Christian and brotherly love" to point out the lack of scriptural justification for the special practices introduced by the regular clergy. Not only is there no command of God concerning tonsures, shaving of beards, cowls, and other external signs of piety, but there are indeed prohibitions against such things in the law of Moses. In Leviticus 19:26 God imposed the following prohibition on the Israelites: "Ye shall not round the corners of your heads, neither shalt thou mar the corners of thy beard." Thus, when priests cut their hair in special ways to distinguish themselves from other Christians, they are acting contrary to the express will of God.34
Of more fundamental importance to Rhegius than these outward signs was the underlying reason for their use, namely, the special orders for which these externalities served as distinguishing characteristics. Rhegius contends that no one should establish new sects and attract disciples as if there were other ways to salvation than through Christ. It would be fitting if the mayors, princes, and statesmen availed themselves of the Jubilee year (1525), which the antichrist instituted for the deception and robbery of the German nation, to search through the cloisters of their territories and liberate those imprisoned therein. Rhegius warns the rulers that if they fail to do this, the Lord himself will declare a Jubilee year, free the imprisoned and distressed, and subject you to the hatred and scorn of your subjects and then lead pious people against you, who will possess your territories, cities, and castles and take you and your children prisoner and will alarm you and thoroughly disquiet you, inwardly with fear, trembling, and horror, and outwardly with the sword, because you have forgotten and put aside his word.

This admonition to the princes was no idle threat, for Germany had already begun to experience the stirrings of social discontent. For more than half a century before the outbreak of the Peasants' Revolt in June, 1524 the peasants had been agitating for redress of economic grievances. This was especially true in South Germany where the displacement of customary law by Roman law, the continuation of old manorial payments and services which had lost any justification, and the imposition of new taxes by the territorial estates weighed more heavily on the peasants
than elsewhere. The initiative for redress came not from the
downtrodden but from the more prosperous peasants who sought
both economic amelioration and political power commensurate
with their economic importance. Such a movement was far
from alien to the aspirations of townsman who found them­selves as much oppressed by the monopolies of the great
trading families and the consequent price inflation as the
peasants were by their burdens. 36

These social grievances were placed in a new light by
Luther’s preaching of the Gospel. Not only had he inveighed
against the monopolistic and usurious practices of the mer­chants and bankers as unchristian, but he had also uninten­tionally provided the social radicals with a platform for
democratic revolution in his doctrines of justification by
faith alone and the priesthood of all believers. Moreover,
the concerted effort of the Catholic bishops and princes in
South Germany and Austria to suppress Lutheran doctrines
wherever they appeared made it easy for the peasants and
their urban allies to see in such actions a desire to stamp
out the evangelical faith and to crush any possibility of
genuine social reform. 37

It was not until the early months of 1525 that the
reform program of the dissidents received formal expression
and that the revolt assumed more violent dimensions. South­west of Augsburg in the Swabian town of Memmingen there be­gan to circulate in January and February a list of twelve
articles expressing the demands of the peasants. Among these
were the right of each community to choose its own pastor; a relaxation of serfdom in accordance with divine justice; relief from excessive feudal dues, forced labor, rents, minor tithes, and the death tax; a restoration of the rights to fish, hunt, and cut wood in the common forests; and a return to the ancient written law. The failure of local lords to satisfy these demands gave rise to new outbreaks of violence. It was estimated that by March nearly 100,000 peasants were under arms in southwestern Germany.

Augsburg had already experienced a popular revolt in August, 1524 over the council's dismissal of a preaching monk at the Franciscan monastery, and the city was now adversely affected by this general uprising. Trade and commerce came to a standstill, and the possibility of an attack moved the council to post a guard of 400 men at the city's gates day and night. The threat from within was regarded by many as even more serious, because the radical guildsmen who had failed in August to effect a democratic revolution within the city and the Catholic preachers who were anxious to fix the blame for the Peasants' Revolt on the Evangelicals saw in the crisis an opportunity to accomplish their respective goals. But the council's enforcement of new security regulations against the rabble, its success in winning the better elements of the citizenry to its side, and the work of the evangelical preachers in allaying the fears of their parishioners prevented an outbreak of hostilities within the city. Moreover, the area surrounding Augsburg had been fortified by
the Duke of Bavaria, thus forestalling a direct attack on the city. In April, the tide began to turn against the peasants as the armies of the Swabian League inflicted a series of crushing defeats. By mid-May the back of the Peasants' Revolt had been broken and the temporal rulers were sating their lust for revenge. 40

The evangelical preachers were placed in a difficult position by social radicals like Michael Gaismair in Austria and Thomas Müntzer in Thuringia, who had sought to create New Testament theocracies reserved for the saints and to destroy the godless by force of arms. 41 Their appeal to inner revelation as a source of knowledge superior to the written word of God struck the more conservative reformers as a betrayal of the standard of truth set forth in the Old Testament Law and in the writings of Paul and the apostles. Additional problems were created by the Catholic partisans who did not hesitate to cite the Peasants' Revolt as the logical outcome of Luther's doctrine of evangelical freedom. During this difficult period Rhegius continued to counsel moderation by appealing to the Scriptures as the proper guide in matters of social and economic policy and by interpreting the freedom of the Christian man within the theological limits imposed by Luther. These views were expressed in an advisory opinion written for the Memmingen city council, in a pamphlet on serfdom and servitude, and in a postscript written for one of Luther's tracts.

Memmingen had become the center for the evangelical
movement in upper Swabia owing in large measure to the preaching of Christoph Schappeler, who had come there from St. Gall in 1513. Since 1523 he had been preaching against tithes with the result that in the following year two villages under Memmingen's jurisdiction refused to pay either the greater or lesser tithes. On January 2, 1525, Schappeler defended a number of theses concerning the tithe and other Church practices in a public disputation. He contended that auricular confession and saint worship were unnecessary, that the New Testament was silent on the question of the tithe, that the Mass which was a memorial and not a sacrifice should be administered in both kinds, that there was no scriptural proof for the existence of purgatory, and finally that there was only one priesthood of believers. Although there was scarcely any opposition to Schappeler's articles, the council declined to institute a new church order at once but instead requested advisory opinions from Rhegius and Conrad Sam in Ulm. The council wished to know whether Schappeler's articles were based on Scripture, and if it did initiate a new order, how the council should handle such matters as clerical marriage, exaction of taxes and services from the clergy, imposition of civil law and civil oaths on the clergy, disposal of the benefices of deceased clerics, the proper office of priests who refrain from celebrating the Mass, the celebration of masses for the dead, the collection of tithes, and the singing of the canonical hours.
In response to the first part of the council's inquiry, Rhegius stated that he found nothing amiss in Schappeler's articles. But there were some that required further explanation. With regard to auricular confession, he thought it necessary to proceed with caution lest offense be given to the weaker brethren. To confess one's sins to God through Christ is essential for salvation, for no one will be saved unless he acknowledges his worthlessness. But Rhegius did not find it necessary for the sinner to confess all his sins with all their circumstances; that was merely a monkish invention. The question of the tithe raised special problems. Rhegius made a distinction between the tithe instituted by God for the support of the priests (Numbers 18) and implicitly reaffirmed by Paul in I Corinthians 9 and the modern tithes based on the ordinances of men. The former is to be paid only to priests who preach the Gospel. No one is obliged to support those who fail to do so. The latter class of tithes is not exacted on the basis of divine law but nevertheless derives its force from divine law. For example, the tithes that are paid to support hospitals and charitable foundations are not to be repudiated, especially if the right of collecting such tithes is in the hands of the laity. If there are abuses in such lay tithes, then the temporal authorities are obligated to conduct an investigation to insure that the system of collection is fair to both sides. The preachers, for their part, must be watchful that both donors
and receivers of tithes are frequently reminded of their respective obligations. Rhegius concludes his remarks on the tithe with the observation that Schappeler's opposition to the tithe is not contrary to the council if the matter is handled in the way indicated. With respect to the other questions raised by the council, Rhegius offered the following advice: the celebration of masses for the dead is without scriptural justification; the benefices of deceased clergy should be used to aid the poor; priests should not be permitted to celebrate the mass as a sacrifice but should instead follow the form prescribed by Luther in his *Formula missae et communionis*. The remaining questions Rhegius passes over in silence, admonishing the council to follow the Scripture in all matters and to proceed with discretion and moderation.\(^{44}\)

The council was prepared to act on the basis of this advice and did in fact decree that only the tithes in the hands of the laity were mandatory. The ecclesiastical tithes were held to be voluntary.\(^{45}\) Following Conrad Sam's suggestion, they decided to wait until the city's representatives had returned from their consultations with the Emperor before undertaking any other reforms. But a number of the citizens pressed for an immediate change, and the ensuing controversy required all of the council's talents to pacify the dissidents. Rhegius wrote to the council expressing dismay over this opposition to constituted authority. In his view there were none more godless than those who would seek to misuse
the Gospel for their own ends. The authorities are not to be despised but honored as the servants of God, who has placed them in positions of power. Accordingly, if the council wishes to delay action on certain ordinances until the Emperor's wishes are known, then the people should assent to such a delay. Otherwise it will seem as though Christian faith and freedom are nothing but an excuse for disobedience and self-seeking.46

The problem of obedience to authority among unfree peasants was treated by Rhegius in his pamphlet, Concerning Serfdom or Servitude: How Lords and Serfs Should Conduct Themselves, a Discussion Based on Divine Law.47 The writing of this tract was occasioned by several objections raised against a sermon preached on February 19, 1525 in which Rhegius had admonished his congregation to follow the precepts laid down by Paul in Romans 13 concerning obedience to secular authority. Some of his parishioners had reproached him with the charge that he was against the poor people and was concealing the truth from the lords. They urged him to advise the lords to act in accordance with the Scripture and not to sell their fellow Christians like cattle. In response to these criticisms Rhegius felt it necessary to discuss the matter in greater detail, giving attention to the obligations of both serfs and masters.48

Rhegius begins with a declaration that all men are bound together by certain features common to the human condition. In the first place, they are all children of wrath,
born of Adam, so that there is no distinction among men on account of natural origin. And we are all Christians born again through water and the spirit, so that according to the nature and grace of election no one may take precedence over another. The kingdom of the believers in Christ is not a visible temporal kingdom on earth but rather a spiritual kingdom in faith. It is within this spiritual kingdom that the Christian is the most free lord of all and subject to none. In the kingdom of this world, however, the Christian is the servant of all men and is the subject of everyone. Thus, there can be no conflict between genuine evangelical freedom and the servitude by which a Christian is obligated to pay taxes and duties and to give honor to a temporal lord.

There is abundant evidence in both the Old and New Testaments to prove the antiquity of servitude and serfdom. Noah condemned his son Ham and his descendents to perpetual servitude, Abraham had bondsmen in his household, Joseph was sold into slavery by his brothers, and the law of Moses prescribed the conditions under which servants were to be held. Now if such servitude is imposed on those living under the covenant of the New Testament, they should not seek to escape by using evangelical freedom as a defense. In Paul's letter to the Romans, God subjects us to the authorities who are his servants for good and wills that we "owe no man anything, but to love one another." Peter [I Peter 2:13-19] bids us to subject ourselves to the
magistrates even if they are evil, for the wickedness of one's master causes no harm as long as he commands nothing injurious to faith. And Paul teaches in I Corinthians 7 (120-22): "Let every man abide in the same calling wherein he was called. Art thou called being a servant? Care not for it: but if thou mayest be free, use it rather. For he that is called in the Lord, being a servant, is the Lord's freeman...." Although servitude or serfdom is sometimes difficult to bear, the true Christian will not surrender himself to revolt but instead bear the burdens and afflictions of this life as a means of disciplining his carnal nature. A pious Christian should realize that serfdom is sometimes imposed because of sin, and he should therefore accept it as the righteous punishment of God. Moreover, as Paul writes in I Timothy 6(11-2): "Let as many servants as are under the yoke count their own masters worthy of all honor, that the name of God and his doctrine be not blasphemed. And they that have believing masters, let them not despise them, because they are brethren...."50

It was, in Rhegius' view, especially important that Christian doctrine not be brought into obloquy because of the disobedience of its adherents who fail to grasp the meaning of Christian freedom. The law has not been repealed in such a way that it should no longer be fulfilled. It is not the law but the demands and exactions of the law which have been lifted through Christ's death on the cross. Thus, when one hears a preacher talk about Christian freedom, one
must not think that all things are now permitted him that were formerly forbidden, but rather that he is freed of sin through the grace of Jesus Christ.\textsuperscript{51}

Having discussed the obligations of servants, Rhegius next takes up those of the lords. He warns the masters not to think that the Scriptures already referred to are a confirmation of tyranny. Citing Paul's declaration in Romans 13(14) that the ruler is "the minister of God to thee for good," he admonishes the temporal rulers in the following manner.

Learn there you masters, if it pleases you so well that the Scriptures place us under your power, let it also please you when they tell you what you, on the other hand, are responsible to do. If someone is a temporal lord a limit is placed on how far he may go. In the first place, you are servants of God; in the second place, servants of ours; and in the third, servants for good. Therefore, your office is prescribed and consists in observing, promoting, and maintaining peace, unity, and the common good.\textsuperscript{52}

The lords must be responsible in their exercise of power, for the Scriptures warn in many places that they will be held accountable on Judgment Day. As the lords have faithful service from their serfs, so they should return that service with faithful protection and prompt redress of just grievances. Although a lord is in a higher estate than we are, he should consider that he rules as a free man over free Christians and not over dumb animals. Just as God is the highest master with the greatest power, wisdom, and benevolence, so also should the temporal ruler, as the supreme power on earth, have the greatest wisdom and benevolence. Power without wisdom breeds destruction and ruin. And where there is power
Having established these general guidelines of behavior for both servants and masters, Rhegius proceeds to discuss three special problems. In the first place, it is asked if a Christian can still have serfs without injuring his faith and if he can keep men in serfdom perpetually without sinning. Rhegius responds that one may infer from Paul's writings concerning the proper treatment of serfs that the acquisition of them through purchase or inheritance is not forbidden, otherwise he would have denounced the practice outright. How long a master can retain serfs without sinning is specified by Moses in Exodus 21:2 where he said: "If you buy an Hebrew servant, six years shall he serve; and in the seventh he shall go out free for nothing." Although it may be objected that this rule applied only to the Israelites, Rhegius counters that there are enough similarities between the Hebrew form of servitude and the German that the rule still holds true. Time and external changes make no difference among Christians. There is, therefore, no reason to think that if something is commanded in the Old Testament which is useful to one's neighbor that it should not also be valid in the New.  

Secondly, the question is raised whether a lord may not demand a sum of money from a serf who desires his freedom. In his answer to this question, Rhegius modifies somewhat the position taken in response to the first question. If one is speaking about serfs or servants as they were in
Moses' time, then the answer is quite simple. Moses said in Exodus 2:2 and in Deuteronomy 15:13-14 that the servant "shall go out free for nothing" and that the master shall "furnish him liberally out of [his] flock," so that the servant does not depart in poverty. But in the case of forms of bondage which differ from the Hebrew model, Christian love is the best rule. If, for example, a poor man wishes to free himself from his lord's authority, a Christian master will not impose a fine on him if he does not have the means to pay it.55

Thirdly, it is asked if a ruler may not be opposed who ignores both divine and natural law and tyrannizes over his subjects in an insufferable way. Rhegius replies that he who wishes to be a Christian man must not seek vengeance himself. We should not repay evil with evil but return good for evil and overcome evil with good. Revolt profits nothing, because the innocent always suffer along with the guilty. We are summoned to bear our cross according to the example of Christ, and if we must suffer injustice as a consequence, so be it.56

Rhegius' pamphlet probably appeared in late February or early March, before the Peasants' Revolt had reached its peak. Luther's moderate Admonition to Peace: A Reply to the Twelve Articles of the Peasants in Swabia reached the public in April during the height of the crisis. When Luther learned that the peasants had launched full scale attacks on their landlords and rulers, he responded in early May with
a violent diatribe, Against the Robbing and Murdering Hordes of Peasants, in which he urged "everyone who can [to] smite, slay, and stab, secretly or openly, remembering that nothing can be more poisonous, hurtful, or devilish than a rebel." Unfortunately, the pamphlet was late leaving the press and appeared just as the peasants were being slaughtered by their victorious lords. The tract received wide circulation, and many regarded Luther's statement as a justification for the actions of the temporal authorities. Luther refused to retract what he had written but realized that his stand needed further explanation. In July he published An Open Letter on the Harsh Book Against the Peasants in which he defended his earlier criticism of the rebels and added that the cruelty of the lords was just as reprehensible as the insurrection. Rhegius prepared a special edition of this work for the Augsburg press and appended a short statement of his own, Concerning Temporal Power Against the Rebellious. Rhegius declares that the best policy would be for all men to love their neighbors as themselves and to live according to the teachings of Christ. But because there are few people on earth who do this, God has instituted the temporal sword to bring the impetuous into line and to prevent harm from befalling the true Christians. A prince and every person in a position of authority is responsible by the duties of his office to protect his subjects so that they do not have to suffer robbery, deception, or force at the hands of anyone. The sword, which is a source of fear
for the wicked, can be used in good conscience by Christians. Indeed, since authority is a servant of God, an avenger of those who do evil, no one is more properly qualified to use the sword than a Christian, who by the nature of his faith is inclined to see that no one is wronged. But even if the temporal ruler is not pious, this is no excuse for disobedience. One is not obedient to a superior for his own sake but because he is the ordained servant of God. Divine law recognizes that one should give to the authorities what one owes them—taxes, duties, fear, and honor. He who does not wish to do that is not a Christian but a heathen. If such people throw off the yoke of servitude and just submission because of temporal suffering and oppression, if they incite rebellion and disturb the common peace, then they will deservedly perish according to the righteous judgment of God. 59

The Peasants' Revolt proved detrimental to the Reformation in a number of ways. The peasants felt that they had been betrayed by the reformers who had preached Christian freedom and then turned against them when freedom became rebellion. Not only had they suffered property loss and death at the hands of their rulers, but they had also lost any prospect of participation in the political life of Germany. Disillusioned with Luther, they turned in increasing numbers to rival forms of evangelical Christianity. Moreover, the Catholic princes and bishops, who had seen their castles and monasteries sacked by the peasants, held Luther responsible for the entire debacle and did not hesitate to incarcerate,
banish, or execute evangelical preachers who had participated in the Revolt on the side of the peasants. Perhaps of even greater importance was the accentuation of divisions within the reform movement which had appeared even before the outbreak of the rebellion. Henceforth, the reformers were faced with the dual task of defending their cause against the Catholic opposition and of attempting to reconcile their own theological differences.
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CHAPTER V

RHEGIUS AND THE CONTROVERSY OVER THE LORD'S SUPPER

The social radicalism expressed by certain enthusiasts within the Reform movement was only one manifestation of a current of thought which had begun to divide the reformers into competing theological camps. Some who had regarded the externalization of religion as the greatest abuse within the Catholic Church and who had accordingly placed more emphasis on the revitalization of Church institutions gradually came to regard such external aides to faith as art, music, and the liturgy of the Mass as unnecessary remnants of a more materialistic form of public worship. The spirit must be given primacy over the letter of the Scripture, it was argued, and only those elements of primitive Christianity which conformed to the religion of the spirit should be singled out as worthy of restitution. But such a conception led on the one hand to the rise of a new church of spiritual enthusiasts such as Thomas Müntzer had created in his theocratic experiment in Mühlhausen and on the other to less dramatic but far more critical disputes concerning the fundamental questions of salvation and grace. ¹

The debates among the reformers centered not on the
definition of salvation—there was general agreement on the correctness of Luther's doctrine of justification by faith alone—but rather on the means by which salvation was to be acquired. Even though the old Catholic idea of works righteousness had been repudiated, there remained the question of how the sacramental system, the means by which grace had traditionally been imparted to the Christian, was to be incorporated into this new conception of man's relation to God. The boundaries of the debate had already been set by Luther when, in the Babylonian Captivity of the Church (1520), he denied the efficacy of the sacraments except for baptism and the Lord's Supper. Luther and his adherents, while denying that the former magically removed the stain of original sin and that the latter was a sacrifice of the transsubstantiated body and blood of Christ, continued to argue for the regenerative effect of infant baptism and for the real presence of Christ in the Sacrament of the Altar. Zwingli and the significationists, beginning with Paul's text "The letter killeth but the spirit giveth life" and the Johannine verse "The flesh profiteth nothing", proceeded to dichotomize spirit and flesh and to deny on that basis the real presence of Christ in the sacrament. In Zwingli's view the Lord's Supper was reduced to a memorial of the death of Christ analogous to the commemoration of the Jewish passover. The Anabaptists in turn were convinced that the denial of the real presence logically implied a denial of baptismal grace. Accordingly, the church should rest not on baptism administered
in infancy but on spiritual regeneration symbolized by the baptism of mature adults. These conflicting ideas about the nature and efficacy of the sacraments constituted the heart of the Reformation debates from 1524 on.

Luther appeared at the outset as the dominant figure in these controversies and exercised considerably more influence in shaping opinion than did his Swiss counterpart. Luther had begun to develop a position on the sacraments well before Zwingli entered the field, and his writings had already gained wide circulation before 1524, the year in which Zwingli completed his own doctrine on the Lord's Supper. As early as his Sermon on Penitence of 1518 Luther had contended in opposition to Catholic doctrine that it is not the sacraments which justify the sinner before God but rather faith in the sacrament which must be present prior to its reception. The sacraments do not create faith, they are rather accepted by faith and serve to assure the believer of God's grace. Closely allied to this general conception of the sacrament was Luther's rejection of the Lord's Supper as a sacrifice performed by the priest. He contended in his Treatise on the New Testament, That Is, On the Holy Mass (1520) that we must not presume to offer God something in the sacrament when it is he who is offering a gift to us for our spiritual regeneration. This notion of the Mass as a sacrifice was attacked along with the doctrine of transubstantiation in the Babylonian Captivity. Luther found the doctrine of transubstantiation, according to which the sub-
stance of the bread and wine were miraculously transformed into the body and blood of Christ while the external features remained unchanged, to be an unnecessary philosophical theory. He firmly believed in the real presence of Christ in the Sacrament of the Altar, that is that the consecrated bread is the body of Christ and the consecrated wine is the blood of Christ, but denied that human reason could explain how this takes place.

In 1523 Luther had occasion to express his view on the real presence more emphatically in his book Concerning the Adoration of the Sacrament of the Holy Body of Christ. In response to a pamphlet by some Bohemian Christians in which the true and substantial presence of the body and blood of Christ was denied, Luther identified four errors which he thought must be rejected. In the first place, some had held that there was simply bread and wine in the sacrament and that these elements only signified the body and blood of Christ. Luther replies that the Christian should ignore reason and simply accept the words spoken by Christ: This is my body, this is my blood. A second error was the inference drawn from I Corinthians 10: 16-17 that the essence of the sacrament consisted merely in the communicant's incorporation into the spiritual body of Christ, and that the bread and wine were instituted simply as signs of this incorporation. Luther, in conformity with his previous statements on this point, recognizes the incorporation of the believer into the spiritual body of Christ as one of the fruits of the sacra-
ment but insists that one must distinguish between the spiritual body, which is constituted by the believers, and the natural body of Christ, which is truly present in the bread. The third error which Luther saw in the position of the Bohemians was the view that the substance of the bread does not remain in the sacrament when it is mystically transformed into the body of Christ but only the species of the bread. This was merely a restatement of the doctrine of transubstantiation which he had already rejected for lack of scriptural foundation. The fourth error was the fact that the pope had made of the sacrament a sacrifice and a good work, a point of view which Luther had repudiated in his earlier discussions of the subject.

The second part of the treatise was devoted to the specific problem of the adoration of the sacrament. The Bohemians had contended that the sacrament ought not to be adored because Christ was not present there with the natural substance of his body. Under that form he is present only at the right hand of God, and adoration must be reserved for that mode of presence alone. Luther agreed that the object of adoration is Jesus Christ but went further in stating that because Christ is present in the sacrament in both his human and divine natures, the sacrament is indeed worthy of adoration. How this is so cannot be explained, however, it is sufficient for the Christian to accept on faith the real presence of Christ in both his natures.

Having thus removed the basis for rejecting the ador-
ation of the sacrament, Luther proceeded to note that because adoration was not divinely commanded it may be performed or omitted as a matter of free choice. What is necessary is that the Christian embrace in faith the words of Christ [Luke 22:19], "This is my body which is given for you." Luther saw in these words the summary of the entire Gospel, for in them is imparted and promised to faith the forgiveness of sins based upon the sacrifice of Christ on the cross and the salvation secured by that sacrifice. This idea had become increasingly important for Luther after 1520. In his treatise Concerning the Blessed Sacrament and the Brotherhoods (1519) he had placed the emphasis entirely on the Lord's Supper as a communion whose significance was the fellowship of saints, a conception rooted in I Corinthians 10:17. But in the two pamphlets of 1520, the Treatise on the New Testament and the Babylonian Captivity, he identified the real gift of the Lord's Supper as the forgiveness of sins spoken of by Christ in Matthew 26:28, "For this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins." It is precisely because of these words that Luther was able to forge such a strong link between the redemptive work of Christ on the cross and the sacrament of the altar, in which the same body born of the Virgin Mary and crucified on the cross was truly and essentially present. The adoration of the sacrament must focus on this real presence. Thus one finds Luther counseling the Bohemian Christians that they "be altogether engaged with the words of the
sacrament, that they may feed their faith and receive bread and wine with Christ's body and blood as a sure sign of this same word and faith. ²⁸

As is evidenced by his sermons of 1521 and 1523 on the Sacrament of the Altar, Rhegius' views were closely linked to those of Luther. Except for the idea of the Supper as a memorial, which although present in Luther's early writings seems to have been borrowed from Zwingli's Sixty-Seven Conclusions, Rhegius entered the controversy over the sacrament with a Lutheran perspective. ⁹ The precipitating cause of Rhegius' involvement was the proliferation and widespread acceptance in South Germany of Andreas Carlstadt's figurative interpretation of the Lord's Supper. Carlstadt, who had been one of Luther's closest comrades as a fellow teacher at the University of Wittenberg, co-disputant at the Leipzig Debate, and preacher at the Wittenberg Castle Church, had fallen prey to that spirit of reform which Luther regarded as "altogether too evangelical." During the latter part of 1521 and early 1522, Carlstadt had used Luther's absence from Wittenberg as an occasion to denounce the wearing of vestments by the priest, the practice of confession, the observance of fasts, and the use of images and music in public worship. Furthermore, he had demanded that priests marry. When Luther returned in March, 1522, he rebuked Carlstadt and his supporters for their lack of patience and Christian love and argued that rites and ceremonies not injurious to faith should be retained and that such matters as
marriage, fasting, and confession should be left to the individual conscience lest Christian freedom be bound by a new legalism.  

Carlstadt soon left Wittenberg for a parish church in nearby Orlamünde, and there he developed further his radical spiritualism. To his attacks on images and church music he added the denial of infant baptism and the real presence of Christ in the Sacrament of the Altar. In Carlstadt's view Christ secured the remission of sin by his death on the cross and not because he gave his body in the Last Supper. Accordingly, he interprets Christ's words, "This is my body, this is my blood," to mean, "This is the body which will be broken, this is the blood which will be shed." The real significance of the Lord's Supper is the memorial celebration of Christ's death on the cross, and the benefit of it for the Christian is that he is led by this act of commemoration to a vivid apprehension of the death of Christ and to the incorporation of his own being into that of Christ. Moreover, Carlstadt goes so far as to say that the importance of Christ's death on the cross is that it reveals to the believer what God desires him to do. Christ thus serves as a model of what every Christian is to become. This exaltation of the inward working of the spirit and the concomitant denial of external forms of worship are rooted in an essentially mystical conception of the relation between God and man. Carlstadt's basic demand is that man shall sever himself from all created things and allow God to work within
him so that he may eventually become completely deified. Ceremonies, rites, and physical aides to faith, too coarse in themselves to reach the depths of the soul, can only be hindrances to the ultimate transformation of the inner man.  

For Luther such a bifurcation of spirit and flesh did violence to the nature of man. Thus, while Luther too spoke of the need for spiritualism, he also recognized the need for external assurances of God's grace in the sacraments of baptism and the Lord's Supper as well as the proper use of ceremonies and rites which could capture the attention of the believer and direct him to the spiritual significance underlying the external forms.

Carlstadt's ideas began to circulate more widely as he traveled in South Germany following his expulsion from Orlamünde in the spring of 1524. He published no fewer than five tracts on the Lord's Supper and quickly won converts to his figurative interpretation in such centers of reform activity as Strassburg, Constance, Zürich, Basel, and Heidelberg. It was not his peculiar exegesis of the words of institution or his mystical tendencies that proved so appealing but rather his denial of the real presence of Christ in the Sacrament of the Altar, which in the eyes of many appeared as a new and powerful weapon against the papacy. Augsburg was not immune to such influences, and here, too, Carlstadt found a hearing. Rhegius confessed that he himself had been impressed by Carlstadt's undermining of the Roman Mass, but he soon perceived in these arguments a number of
errors which obviated this advantage. Despite advice to the contrary, Rhegius published in November, 1524 a reply to Carlstadt under the title *Against the New Error of Doctor Andreas von Carlstadt, A Warning for the Sake of the Sacrament.*

Based on an examination of two of Carlstadt's tracts, Rhegius concluded that there were three fundamental errors in his treatment of the Lord's Supper: first, that the sacrament does not forgive sin; secondly, that neither the body nor the blood of Christ are present in the sacrament; and thirdly, that the sacrament is not a pledge or assurance that sin is forgiven. In Rhegius' view these errors amounted to a profanation of the sacrament which was spreading like a cancer in the community. Seizing upon Carlstadt's expressed desire to be shown the error of his way if there be any, Rhegius confesses himself willing to take up the challenge so that "the simple folk are not bewildered by the colorful appearance of your invented arguments and shadowy reasoning and led into error but remain steadfast in sound teaching...."

The first article, namely that the sacrament does not forgive sin, can be easily refuted. Rhegius declares that no one has ever maintained that the sacrament forgives sin, because that office belongs to God alone. A Christian knows that God forgives his sins through the merits of Christ without any previous merit on his own part. But because the believer has in the sacrament both a word of faith and a sign instituted by God, he can say that he finds grace and
forgiveness of sin in the sacrament and every right-minded person will easily understand what he means. For what is ascribed to the sacrament, such as forgiveness of sin, consolation, and peace of mind, is not ascribed to the visible elements but to the invisible power of God contained within.\textsuperscript{18}

In the second article, Carlstadt argued that the sacrament is nothing but natural bread and wine. His defense of this claim rests upon an exegesis of the words of institution which Rhegius finds perverse. Carlstadt maintained that in the verse "He took bread, and gave thanks, and brake it, and gave it unto them, saying, This is my body which is given for you...." [Luke 22:19] Christ was not referring to the bread when he said "This is my body" but pointed to his own body, indicating that it would soon be broken on the cross for the salvation of mankind. Rhegius counters that, every peasant sees how you force the clear words and meaning and drag them by the hair into your error, for if one looks at the words as they fit together, it in no way makes sense that Christ began and gave bread to his disciples to eat and right in the middle of his speech turned to something else and said "This is my body," as if those before him did not know that this was his body which they saw before their eyes.... No one can see and understand here anything other than that the utterances about the bread and his holy body are of such a kind and depend so on each other that you must confess that he did not refer to his body sitting there but to the bread.

Rhegius finds additional evidence in Paul's epistles to refute this interpretation. If the sacrament is supposed to be bread like any other bread, why then did Paul say in I Corinthians 10(126): "For as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death til he come."
Why does he say "this bread" and "this cup"? If these elements were no different from any other, then Paul would have simply said, "As often as ye eat bread and drink wine...." One must conclude from such a careful distinction that it is a very different kind of bread and wine. Moreover, Paul explicitly attached the bread and wine to the body and blood of Christ when he said [I Corinthians 10:27,29]: "Wherefore, whosoever shall eat this bread, and drink this cup of the Lord, unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord.... For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body." Clearly, if the sacrament contained only natural bread and wine, its improper reception could not occasion the loss of one's salvation. 20

Carlstadt also raised two additional problems in connection with the real presence of Christ in the sacrament. Seeking to undercut the power of the priest to invoke the presence of Christ by reciting the words of institution, he asks rhetorically who has granted such power. Hegius responds that the power derives from Christ himself when he initiated the supper as a memorial. Christ is already present in the sacrament when it is administered by the servants of the congregation.21 A more telling objection to the doctrine of the real presence focuses on the question of divine ubiquity. Carlstadt contends that the Scriptures speak of only two comings of Christ, the first when he became flesh and was born of the Virgin Mary and the second when he will
return on Judgment Day. Since nothing is said about his reappearance in the sacrament, it follows that the doctrine of the real presence is a deception. Rhegius counters that a lack of visible evidence is no proof against Christ's presence in the sacrament. If it were, faith itself would be a fraud, for it is the evidence of things not seen. Nor could anyone believe in God or in an immortal soul, because these too are not discoverable by the senses. Rhegius declares that Christ is the head not only of those who reign with him in heaven but also of those who struggle on earth in the flesh. He has promised that he will be with us always unto the end of the world. Therefore it ought not to seem strange that Christ's glorified body is truly present in the Lord's Supper.  

The third of Carlstadt's articles, that the sacrament is not a pledge or assurance of the forgiveness of sins, rests on the argument that one must, according to Paul, examine himself before receiving the sacrament to assure himself that he is worthy of it. Such assurance of worthiness is the gift of the spirit, and if a man knows already that he has a gracious God and that his sins are remitted, then he has no need of the sacrament as a sign or pledge of the forgiveness of sins. Although readily conceding that there should and must be a personal examination of the conscience before the sacrament is received, Rhegius regards the objective of the examination as the realization of one's own sinfulness and of the great merit of Christ's work on the
cross. Moreover, he agrees with Carlstadt's contention that the spirit of Christ assures us inwardly that we receive the remission of sin through the death of Christ, but he denies that the outward assurance provided in the sacrament is thereby rendered unnecessary. A man can be assured in two ways that his sins are forgiven him and that God is graciously disposed toward him:

first, inwardly, as has been stated above through the spirit of Christ itself, and that is the true assurance through which the conscience comes to true peace and calm. That is the inward assurance which is necessary above all things. For where the heart is not satisfied in true faith by the Holy Spirit, a thousand external sacraments would be of no help. Therefore, all of your arguments prove no more than that the true, lasting, and most necessary of all assurances of the conscience comes inwardly, without mediation, from the Holy Ghost, without which our conscience can have no permanent assurance of the forgiveness of sin. Secondly, there is also an outward assurance or pledge to which is assigned the task of admonishing, assuring, or testifying. This is the sign which God has added to his promise.... Here, dear Carlstadt, you will not succeed in making angels out of us as you undertake to destroy and abolish all things and signs and live as the angels in all things of the spirit. Because body and soul are together in this visible world and we use the services of the five senses, we can do nothing without external things and signs. We must have external signs along with the words on which we depend.... Understand also that such signs are external and yet have and signify spiritual things, whereby we are drawn into the spiritual through the external and grasp the external with physical eyes and the spiritual with the inner eyes of the heart.

Thus, just as God sealed with the sign of the rainbow his promise to Noah that he would never again destroy the earth with a flood and gave to Abraham the rite of circumcision as a sign that he would father a great nation, so also did Christ seal the forgiveness of sins with his body and blood in the form of bread and wine.
Rhegius admonishes his readers that they guard against the false teachers who seek to lead them away from the truth. "We must arm ourselves in these dangerous times with the weapons of Christian knighthood—faith, love, and charity—and never let the two-edged sword of the Holy Ghost out of our hands, so that we may defend ourselves against the princes of this world." He offers in conclusion a five-point summary of the Lord's Supper so that the faithful may better protect themselves against error. First, there is the Supper itself, the body and blood of Christ under the form of bread and wine. Because it is the spirit which quickens and the flesh which profits nothing [John 6:63], the body and blood really become food and drink for the hungry and thirsty soul only when they are received in faith. The true food of the soul is the certainty that Jesus Christ gave his life for the remission of sin. Although everything depends on faith in that Word which became flesh, God chose to present his body and blood under visible signs so that it will be impressed on our minds both internally and externally. Secondly, there are the heirs of the testament, those who hunger and thirst after righteousness. Thirdly, there is the recipient's preparation for the sacrament which consists in the recognition of one's sinful state and of the redeeming sacrifice of Christ on the cross. Fourthly, there is the realization that the sinner may partake of the Lord's Supper whenever he wishes to console his conscience. Fifthly, there are the ordained servants of the church who distribute
the sacrament in conformity with Paul's admonition in I Corinthians 14:40 that all things be done decently and in order.27

Rhegius' pamphlet was of considerable interest because it was, according to Michael Hummelberger, the first detailed refutation of Carlstadt's doctrine.28 In a letter to Spalatin dated December 24, 1524, Luther urgently requested a copy so that he could learn what others were saying against people like Carlstadt.29 Early in 1525, Johann Lang printed a new edition of the pamphlet under the title A Warning Against the New Error of Thomas Müntzer, Andreas Carlstadt, and Other Enthusiasts Concerning the Sacrament, and in the preface recommended it as more suitable for the masses because of its brevity and clarity than Luther's own reply to Carlstadt, Against the Heavenly Prophets.30

In Switzerland and South Germany, Rhegius was considered as the head of the anti-Carlstadt forces, and his advice to the Memmingen city council not to employ any preachers of Carlstadt's persuasion served to reinforce that reputation.31

His position was by no means an enviable one, for in Augsburg as elsewhere the laity sided with Carlstadt because his denial of the real presence could be used in arguing for the abolition of the Mass. Among the Augsburg preachers, Michael Keller was the most versatile and persuasive spokesman for the figurative interpretation of the Lord's Supper. Early in 1525, he began to preach and write in defense of this view, and his lively and forceful style won many converts.
He was supported in his efforts by Johann Seifried and Johann Schnedl, preachers at the parish churches of St. George and Holy Cross respectively, and by such influential citizens as the mayor Ulrich Rehlinger, the printer Sigmund Grimm, and the wealthy patrician Georg Regel. Although a majority of the Augsburger soon joined this camp, the Lutheran position did not go undefended. Along with Rhegius, both Frosch and Agricola remained loyal to the doctrine of the real presence, and after 1525 they were assisted by a young Wittenberg licentiate named Caspar Huber, who assumed an important role as a pamphleteer in Augsburg.

The controversy over the Lord's Supper assumed larger dimensions when first Ulrich Zwingli and later Johann Oecolampadius embraced the figurative interpretation and became the leading exponents of this view in Switzerland and South Germany. Already in November, 1524 Zwingli had publicly stated his position in a letter to the Lutheran pastor Matthäus Alber in Reutlingen, but it was not until the publication of his Commentary on True and False Religion in March, 1525 that his doctrine of the Lord's Supper became known in full detail. Under the influence of Carlstadt and of the Dutch humanist Cornelius Hoen, Zwingli developed a position on the sacraments which differed sharply from both the Catholic and Lutheran interpretations. Against the Catholics, who maintained that the sacraments have the power to free the soul of sin, Zwingli contended that God alone possesses this power. How, he asked, could such elements as
water, oil, and salt gain access to the inner man. The word of God and the faith of man were the only means by which the conscience could be purified. Although Zwingli agreed with the Lutherans that the sacrament was a symbol of a sacred thing, he could not concur with Luther in the claim that a purification is performed inwardly when the sacrament is received outwardly or that the sacraments provide assurance of inner purification. In Zwingli's view, we become new men and receive the benefits of Christ by the action of the Holy Spirit. Assurance of this work comes only through faith and not through any material means. The significance of the sacraments is that they are "signs and ceremonials...by which a man proves to the church that he aims to be, or is, a soldier of Christ and which informs the whole church rather than yourself of your faith."35

With respect to the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, Zwingli began with a basis of interpretation which was closer to Carlstadt than to Luther. For Luther the spirit of the Holy Scriptures was bound up with the letter. The Holy Ghost comes to us in the external word. But Zwingli recognized something higher than the letter of the Scripture, namely, the spirit contained therein. The Holy Spirit contacts the soul directly and thus enables man to understand the real meaning of the word. Whereas Luther argued that the meaning of Christ's words "This is my body" can be found only in these words, Zwingli affirmed that they cannot be understood by the letter but by the Spirit which makes the believer
understand the words when he compares Scripture with Scripture. 36.

Although Zwingli rejected Carlstadt's interpretation of the word "this" in "This is my body" to mean that Christ was referring to his physical body, he agreed with the conclusion that Jesus did not regard the bread in his hand as bodily flesh and that the sacrament could not on that account be regarded as containing the flesh of Christ as Luther maintained. The real problem in the passage was not the word "this" but rather the word "is." Following Hoen, Zwingli argued that "is" must be taken to mean "signifies" and cited in defense of this view numerous scriptural passages in which "is" must be interpreted as "signifies." He strengthened his case further by citing the corroborating opinions of Wycliffe, the Waldensians, Origen, Tertullian, and Augustine. 37 The reason why a figurative interpretation of this passage was necessary, Zwingli contended, was that a literal interpretation would imply the logical absurdity that the bodily eating of Christ could have a spiritual effect. Christ said explicitly in John 6:63 that the flesh profits nothing. The verse excludes any other kind of eating except the spiritual manducation implied in the whole chapter. When Christ said in verse 56, "He who eats my flesh and drinks my blood abides in me and I in him," he was not speaking of sacramental nourishment but of the spiritual nourishment which derives from belief in the saving grace of God. As Zwingli expressed it: "We eat the body of Christ
when we believe that it has been killed for us." 38 Thus, by comparing Christ's words instituting the Supper with his utterances elsewhere, Zwingli was driven to the conclusion that Christ was not present in the Sacrament of the Altar in his human nature and corporeal form and that, therefore, Christ must have meant only that the bread signified his body.

The meaning of the Lord's Supper for Zwingli did not rest in the mystical apprehension of the death of Christ as Carlstadt interpreted it or in the assurance of the forgiveness of sins as Luther believed but rather in its character as a joyful remembrance and public acknowledgement of the salvific work of Christ on the cross. The bread and wine serve as symbols of the body which was broken and the blood which was shed, and the Christian's reception of them symbolizes his participation in the church of the faithful. Citing Paul's first letter to the Corinthians (10:16-22), Zwingli concluded that "to eat this bread and drink this cup is to join our Christian brothers in one body. This is the body of Christ, because it is made up of those who believe in Christ's sacrifice for their salvation." 39

Armed with this new interpretation of the Lord's Supper, Zwingli took the offensive against Luther and his supporters, not only because he was convinced of the righteousness of his doctrine but also because he regarded Luther's belief in the real presence as a relapse into Romanism.

In 1525 Zwingli published in addition to his Commentary on True and False Religion a pamphlet entitled The Aid of the
Eucharist, the letter which he had written to Aiber the previous November, and the treatise on the sacrament which Hoen had written in 1521. 40 In September, 1525 Oecolampadius, who had ended his brief retirement into monastic life with the resumption of reform activities in Basel in 1522, 41 entered the lists on Zwingli's side with the publication of a tract in which he argued, following Tertullian, that the word "body" in "This is my body" should be interpreted as meaning "This is the figure of my body." Although his exegesis differed from both Carlstadt and Zwingli, he was still contending for a symbolic interpretation which precluded the doctrine of the real presence. Oecolampadius had dedicated his work to the preachers in Swabia in the hope of winning them over to the figurative interpretation. The attempt failed, however, and in October, 1525 Johann Brenz composed the Swabian Syngramma, which was signed by fourteen Lutheran preachers and published the following year in Augsburg, as a direct refutation of Oecolampadius. 42

Rhegius' further involvement in the growing controversy came as a result of the correspondence into which he had entered with Theobald Gerlacher, called Billicanus after his native Billigheim in the Lower Palatinate. Billicanus had met with considerable success in promoting the Reformation in Nördlingen, and although he had rejected Carlstadt's doctrine of the Lord's Supper in favor of Luther's in his Church Ordinance of February, 1525, his inconstancy was a matter of concern to his fellow preachers. Rhegius, to whom Billicanus
had dedicated his exposition of the Book of Micah, wrote to him the spring of 1525 encouraging him to standfast. Not until December did he receive a reply which amounted to a small book on the question of the Lord's Supper, in which Billicanus attempted to refute the arguments of Carlstadt, Zwingli, and Oecolampadius on purely grammatical grounds without treating the theological bases on which their respective exegeses rested. He admitted freely that he had been impressed by Oecolampadius's arguments, and when he took up their refutation he was careful not to attack Oecolampadius directly but to speak against the passages in Tertullian which he had used in defense of his view. The upshot of the letter was that he had been unable to resolve the issue to his own satisfaction, for at the end he expressed the hope that perhaps Philip Melanchton, a professor of Greek and Hebrew at Wittenberg and one of Luther's closest collaborators, would intervene to clarify the matter.

Rhégius replied on December 18, 1525 and had Billicanus' letter and his own published in pamphlet form the following January. He begins with the assertion that the work of the devil is to be seen in the quarrels which had arisen over the question of the Lord's Supper. Displeased by the success of the evangelical preachers in dispelling the darkness of ignorance and placing Germany on the right path again, "the evil one" had undertaken to prevent the completion of that work by sowing the seeds of disunity among the foremost teachers. Once this had been accomplished, the common people
fell into as many sects as there were preachers. Moreover, the divisions soon became imbued with bitterness and envy as each party strove to defend its position. Rhegius declares that the Carlstadters in particular have become so mad that they will scarcely consider to be Christians any who do not mouth their blasphemies and are ready to condemn to hell those who out of a Godly disposition stand by the plain words of Christ, in simple, honest faith praise with the greatest thanks the redemption which took place on the cross, and want to believe that God comforts his own through a secret presence of his Son in the Lord's Supper, as a pledge, until he appears again visibly and majestically.\textsuperscript{45}

Rhegius admits that at first he had been impressed by the authorities whom Carlstadt had marshalled in his defense, especially Wycliffe and the Waldensians. "What was I supposed to do?" he lamented. "There were many great scholars on their side, and I could neither write nor keep silent. I beseeched God to turn his face toward me, for rashness in judgment is, as always, though particularly in matters of faith, full of mortal danger." Having examined the scriptural passages on which Carlstadt's argument rested, he recognized that the sacrificial character of the Mass could be repudiated and that this would have great popular appeal, but he could not fully accept this view because of the forced exegesis of several key verses which were used as examples of the figurative interpretation.\textsuperscript{46}

The examples which Rhegius cites, however, are drawn not from Carlstadt but from Zwingli, whom he seems to be at-
tacking through Carlstadt, just as Billicanus had opposed Oecolampadius by questioning his use of Tertullian. In the verse from Exodus 12(11); "...and ye shall eat it in haste: it is the Lord's passover," Zwingli had interpreted the word "it" in the second clause to refer to the passover lamb, claiming that the lamb here signifies the passover. Rhegius counters that "it" refers to the entire ceremony and celebration of the feast and that the verse really means "it is the day of the Lord's passover." Likewise Zwingli had used the second clause of I Corinthians 10(44), "...for they drank of that spiritual Rock which followed them: and that Rock was Christ," as further evidence that the link verb must mean "signified." But Rhegius finds no need for such an interpretation, since Paul had already specified that the rock was spiritual, and concludes that the phrase can be taken literally.47 Finally, Zwingli had interpreted the word "body" in I Corinthians 10(46), "The bread which we break, is it not the community of the body of Christ?" to mean the church of believers. Rhegius denies that the verse means anything other than partaking of the actual body of Christ.48

In defense of his own belief in the real presence, Rhegius adduces the authority of a number of the Church fathers. Chrysostom clearly defended the presence of Christ in the sacrament. Theophylactus, commenting on John 6, said that the bread which we eat in the sacrament is not the figure of the flesh of Christ but the flesh itself. Cyprian believed that the bread which Christ gave his disciples, transformed
in its nature but not in its appearance, became flesh through the power of God. And Athanasius spoke of the secret presence of Christ in the sacrament in a way which would not have been possible had he believed with Carlstadt that there was nothing there but bread and wine. Moreover, the words of John 6:63, "...the flesh profiteth nothing," could not be used as the Carlstadters did if they heeded the fathers. As Cyril argued, because the life-giving word is united with the flesh, the whole thing has become life-giving. It is not the flesh of anyone which is in question but that of Jesus Christ in whom the fullness of the Godhead dwells.  

Rhegius adds in conclusion that he has not cited the fathers because he found their glosses more illuminating than the word itself but rather in order to show that the most eminent of the ancients did not agree with the figurative interpretation. Yet in spite of the hard line which he took against the significationists, Rhegius seems not to have been fully convinced that they were wrong. It was not their arguments which impressed him most but their reputations. He confides to Billicanus:

Do you know, my Theobald, what a storm of temptations befell my mind when I saw that such excellent men, who had become so dear and precious to me because of their godly lives and extraordinary learning, were not in agreement with me? I could do nothing rashly or hastily which was contrary to conscience, and to speak against such men, instructed by the spirit and experienced in faith, was foolish. Who was I that I should speak against them? I honor the truth as is right and seek after it diligently. If they are more advanced than I, they will act as brothers and implore God that I, poor soul, will not be left behind.
The response to the publication of the Billicanus-Rhegius correspondence in January, 1526 was mixed. In Wittenberg it was received most favorably as evidence that not all of South Germany had fallen to the significationists. On January 20, Luther wrote to Nicolaus Hausmann complaining of the sacramental enthusiasts who were raging against him. Taking note of Billicanus' letter, he declared that God was arousing those who remained true against the new heretics. In a letter to Johann Agricola dated February 18, he commended Billicanus' work as well as the Swabian Syngramma, a new edition of which had just been printed in Wittenberg, and expressed the hope that Oecolampadius and Zwingli would soon be despairing over a cause of which they had boasted so confidently. That such despair had indeed set in is revealed by a letter from Oecolampadius to Zwingli on February 9 in which he reported that "Brenz, Rhegius, and others are rejoicing. Some of those who seemed to think rightly are now getting lukewarm. The work of the Lord must be pushed diligently." Oecolampadius had already begun to push this work. On January 12, he informed Zwingli that he had read the Billicanus-Rhegius correspondence and had found nothing substantial in it. Later that month he indicated that he would write publicly against Billicanus and answer Rhegius in a private letter. In February, he published his "Apology of Johann Oecolampadius," containing two sermons on the Lord's Supper and replies to the Swabian Syngramma and to Billicanus. In his treatment of Billicanus he said nothing which had not
already been said before. His chief concern was not argumentation but persuasion. Billicanus' objections were dealt with in a friendly manner so that no cause could be given for offense. He ignored Rhegius almost completely except for a passage which he had cited from Theophylactus, and here Oecolampadius praised him as a man of remarkable eloquence but of somewhat lesser judgment in the question at hand. Oecolampadius' efforts were not without effect. On February 17, Billicanus wrote to him complaining that Rhegius had left out part of his letter in the published edition and garbled the rest. He apologized for the misunderstanding and indicated that Oecolampadius' views seemed to him more correct than many believed.

Rhegius proved to be more steadfast despite the indecision reflected in his reply to Billicanus. Zwingli appears to have learned its contents soon after it was written, for he observed in a letter to Vadian dated December 23, 1525 that "Rhegius does not really know what he should say, which proves to me that in the question of the Lord's Supper the truth is being accepted by the Augsburgers too. I have the impression that the man has something of the chameleon's nature in him." In January, 1526 Zwingli wrote to Vadian again informing him that a copy of the Billicanus-Rhegius letters had arrived and exclaiming, "Good God, how they display the vanity of these people. I considered Rhegius to be more reasonable." At Oecolampadius' urging Zwingli composed a double letter dated March 1, 1526 respond-
ing to the objections of both Billicanus and Rhegius with a mixture of argumentation, flattery, and threats. He addresses Rhegius as the "eloquent Mercury" and asks why he has not been willing to delay judgment until he has heard from Zwingli but instead has taken sides with the party which is more dependent on human error than on God's word. It was expected that Rhegius would be an arbiter in the dispute rather than a partisan. In response to Rhegius' exegetical arguments, Zwingli says that these only betray his dependence on others and that his own knowledge of Hebrew is too weak to deal adequately with the scriptural passages in question. Having reviewed these passages in detail in order to lay aside the objections raised against them, he concludes triumphantly:

I always at all times deplore a conflict. If certain people want to discover my claws, which I have extended only part way, that makes me sad. But later, I fear, it may cause them some pain when they have felt them. Change course, Billicanus, Rhegius, Brenz, and other students of belles lettres and theology while there is still time.

Zwingli's letters had their most immediate effect on Billicanus, who gradually grew closer to the significationist position. By the autumn of 1526, Oecolampadius considered him as an ally. Rhegius proved more resistant to Zwingli's tactics. On April 24, he wrote to Willibald Pirckheimer in Nürnberg thanking him for his pamphlet against Oecolampadius and rejoicing that Pirckheimer was on Luther's side. However, there is evidence from this same period which indicates that Rhegius was beginning to waver. In May he published a lengthy treatise entitled A Comparison of the Old
Learning and the New in which he sought to identify the evangelical doctrines with those of the ancient Church and Catholic dogma with the doctrinal and ceremonial additions of the medieval Church. In the discussion of the sacraments he presents a point of view in which Zwinglian and Lutheran elements are combined in a united front against the Catholic conception of the Mass as a recurring sacrifice of the transubstantiated body and blood of Christ. With respect to the nature of the sacraments in general, he affirms that man is saved by faith without benefit of an external sign. One attains salvation by belief from the heart and not through corporeal reception of the sacrament. It follows from this that faith is a necessary antecedent to the acquisition of the fruits of the sacrament. With regard to the sacrament of the Lord's Supper in particular, Rhegius argues that the Catholic practice of administering the sacrament to the laity under the species of the bread alone is contrary to the custom of the early Church as recorded in I Corinthians 11(124-25). Here Christ distributed the sacrament to his disciples in both kinds.

We say that the Lord's Supper should be observed in the way prescribed in I Corinthians 11. Through remembrance of our Lord's death we exercise our faith, kindle our love, strengthen our hope, and through the apprehension of the cause of Christ's death, we are aroused more and more to thankfulness for such incomprehensible love, to the suppression of the old Adam, and to a renewal of life. Consequently, the Lord's Supper is a remembrance of his salvation-bringing death, not a sacrifice but a remembrance of the sacrifice made on the cross... We do not say simply that sins are forgiven through the Lord's Supper, but when we reflect in true faith on the blessing of the act of redemption in which the Son of God
gave his body and spilled his blood as a sacrifice for sin, then we are justified by faith and obtain the forgiveness of sins won by Christ's death. Such faith obtains forgiveness of sins in the Lord's Supper.... Christ says [John 6:55], "my flesh is meat indeed...." If we do not eat and drink of such food and drink, we will have no life in us. For that is the bread of life after which one hungers no more. When one believes in Christ, then just as bread nourishes the body, so also will the spirit be nourished by this bread, which is faith. When the soul believes in Christ, the treasure of our salvation, our satisfaction, our justification, then it eats and drinks the body and blood and thereby lives eternally. That is what one should believe and hold in the Lord's Supper.65

Both Luther and Zwingli could agree with Rhegius' emphasis on the primacy of faith, his denial of the sacrificial character of the Mass, and his advocacy of communion in both kinds. Moreover, the connection of the forgiveness of sins with the sacrament through faith is a characteristically Lutheran idea. But the delineation of the fruits to be derived from the Lord's Supper and the assertion that believing in Christ is equivalent to eating and drinking the body and blood are more Zwinglian than Lutheran. The thrust of the viewpoint presented here is clearly toward the spiritual mandate and away from the sacramental.66

Evidence of a more cordial attitude toward Zwingli is also to be found in a letter to Ambrosius and Thomas Blaurer dated June 14, 1526. Referring to the four-week-long disputation in Baden, which had opened on May 21 and in which Oecolampadius and Eck were the chief disputants,67 Rhegius wrote:

We do not know here [in Augsburg] what happened in Baden except that Eck got soaked, though more with wine than with water. I am sorry about Zwingli's absence from Baden. He would have defeated the papists at once, except for the
point on original sin which it seems to me that he does not handle well. In regard to the Lord's Supper he could not have been overcome by those false theologians, even if one could bring objections against him. It is not clear whether Rhegius was tacitly admitting that his own doubts about Zwingli's doctrine on the Lord's Supper had been resolved, but it seems evident that he was at least trying to shift ground by focusing on the problem of original sin. In a letter to Conrad Sam on July 2, 1526, Zwingli stated that Rhegius had written to him concerning that problem and asked Sam to let Rhegius know that he was planning to write a long letter on the subject. In mid-August Zwingli responded with his Declaration on Original Sin by Ulrich Zwingli to Urbanus Rhegius. On September 28, Rhegius wrote to Zwingli thanking him for his treatise and expressing general approval of his position. There were only a few points which he thought might give cause for concern. He added further that "in Augsburg there is no danger regarding the Eucharist. The truth triumphs even if a few people are grumbling. They are accomplishing nothing but simply promoting absurdities in a matter which they do not understand." In a postscript he observed that "Frosch and Agricola are good people. If they err in our Eucharist cause, it is not out of malice." On October 16, Zwingli thanked Rhegius for his criticisms of the doctrine of original sin and expressed his pleasure that Rhegius was now among his supporters in the sacramentarian controversy.

I congratulate you for having become one of us in the question over the Lord's Supper. More than that, I thank
you for this news, for now hopefully all those who op-
pose the figurative significance, which must have been
easily intelligible to you, will soon perceive the sim-
plicity and clarity of our interpretation.72

Early in November, Oecolampadius reported to Zwingli that
their friends in Augsburg had written that Rhegius is "on
our side, that is, Christ's side" and that Frosch and Agric-
ola were taking it amiss.73 For Zwingli and his comrades
the conversion of Rhegius was regarded as a triumph, but in
Wittenberg the news was received in a different light. In
January, 1527, Luther wrote to Hausmann expressing his grief
that Oecolampadius had "fallen into the abyss" and that
Rhegius was tottering on the brink, if indeed he had not
fallen already.74 In March, he reported to Spalatin the rumor
that Rhegius was threatening to write against him if he attacked
Oecolampadius and Zwingli, so great had the difference be-
tween them grown.75

The degree of Rhegius' conversion to the Zwinglian
position cannot be determined with any measure of precision.
The focal point of his correspondence with Zwingli in this
period was the problem of original sin. The Lord's Supper
appears only as a peripheral issue. Rhegius merely voices
his agreement with Zwingli without making any statement
about what he really believed to be the nature and signi-
ficance of the Lord's Supper. Nowhere does he expressly deny
belief in the real presence or affirm acceptance of Zwingli's
significationist formula. His subsequent writings reveal a
tendency toward a middle position reminiscent of the dis-
discussion of the Lord's Supper in *A Comparison of the Old Learning and the New*. The circumstances which dictated this course were more a matter of practical consideration than of theological conviction. As Luther indicated in his letter to Spalatin, the quarrel over the Lord's Supper had splintered Augsburg into a number of factions. Almost two years later, in December, 1528, Rhegius lamented to Ambrosius Blaurer that the disunity of the preachers themselves was exercising the worst kind of influence and was providing many with an excuse for complete withdrawal from the church. Indeed some were saying that one could reflect on the suffering of Christ without partaking of the Lord's Supper at all. Against such a view Rhegius found it necessary to re-emphasize the importance of ceremonies as an aid to faith for the common man. He considered it advisable to place the debate over the nature of the Lord's Supper in the background and to give primary attention to the fruits to be derived from partaking of the Supper.

In the period from his profession of adherence to the Zwinglian interpretation and the writing of the letter to Blaurer, Rhegius made several unsuccessful attempts to unify the divergent factions. On April 15, 1527, he composed a formula of concord at a convocation of the evangelical preachers in Augsburg. Taking note of the Old Testament commandment that the passover be commemorated with the annual sacrifice of the paschal lamb, Rhegius draws a parallel between that and Christ's institution of the Last Supper. The
purpose of this memorial is to strengthen and support our trust in him as the sole savior who has given his body and shed his blood for the remission of sin. The conscience is thereby purified of dead works, and the covenant of grace between God and man is confirmed. Therefore, it is necessary that he who wishes to be nourished spiritually at this table understand these great things, otherwise he will eat and drink damnation to himself. He must desire to be a holy disciple of Christ, who enjoys the blessings of Christ in this fellowship and who abstains from sin and the devil's company. Paul teaches that a man must examine himself beforehand. He should first hear the words of the Lord, humbly confess himself to be a sinner, consider Christ to be his only physician of the soul and redeemer, and praise and glorify him with heart, mouth, and life. Rhegius' emphasis on the commemorative significance of the sacrament, his use of the passover analogy, and his stress on spiritual nourishment reflect the Zwinglian interpretation. But the idea of Christ feeding and giving drink to the faithful is closer to the Lutheran position in so far as it calls attention to the gift of Christ not only on the cross but also in the sacrament. The general character of the concord seems, however, to have been interpreted as primarily Zwinglian, because the Lutheran preachers were unwilling to give their assent.

The theme of unity was developed more extensively in a pamphlet of 1528, A Test for the Simple Folk Regarding the Lord's Supper. Rhegius affirms that Christ instituted the
Supper as a memorial of his death, through the observance of which our faith is exercised and strengthened, and that in this Supper we are nourished by the body and blood of Christ which has been given to us as the meat and drink of eternal life. He then proceeds to admonish the believer to imitate Christ in service to his neighbor. As Paul wrote in I Corinthians 10(17), "...We being many are one bread, and one body: for we are all partakers of that one bread." That is the communion of the body and blood of Christ in the Supper in which we should be united together in one body. The Lord's Supper is a sign which admonishes us to love and union. Envy, hatred, and contempt for one's neighbor do not harmonize with the Lord's Supper, for it offers to us that love which is the bond of perfection. The position presented here seeks to effect unity not only by stressing the practical benefits of love and the fellowship of believers but also by combining the Lutheran belief that Christ gave his body and blood in the Lord's Supper with the Zwinglian belief in the Supper as a sign of the union of believers.

When these attempts at unification failed to bear fruit, Rhegius began to abandon his seemingly neutral position in favor of a more decidedly Lutheran stance. Already in July, 1528 word had reached Luther that Rhegius was beginning to alter his position. He wrote to the latter asking for confirmation of the rumor and expressing the hope that "Christ will hear my sighs for you and soon console me with such a happy message. It would be a brotherly resurrection,
an Easter celebration, if you were no longer estranged from me but stood with us in true faith." On July 14, Luther wrote to Wenceslaus Link that Rhegius "has come to his senses and is fighting bravely with us against the sacramentarians." Luther's assertion was born out by subsequent events. In September, 1528, at a disputation before the Augsburg city council, Rhegius sided with Frosch and Agricola in defending the Lutheran doctrine against Keller and the Zwinglians. In a letter dated December 2, Wolfgang Wackinger, one of Zwingli's adherents in Augsburg, wrote to Zwingli that the "three Lutheran doctors" were strongly opposed to Keller and were pressing vigorously for Luther's position. Rhegius in the December 21 letter to Blaurer stated: "I do not agree with Zwingli." During the same month, Frosch arranged for the publication of Rhegius' Latin treatise, Thoughts on the Whole Question of the Mass Drawn Partly from the Holy Scriptures and Partly from the Fragments of the Early Church, to the Theologian Johann Rana by Urbanus Rhegius, in which the author inveighed against both the Catholic conception of the Mass as a sacrifice and against the significationists' understanding of the elements of the Supper as mere bread and wine. Citing the words of Hilary defending the presence of the true body and blood of Christ in the sacrament, Rhegius denies that they can be emasculated by a figurative interpretation. He also uses the authority of Cyprian against those spiritualists who despise the flesh of Christ in the sacrament as if it were nothing.
They think that they are sufficiently nourished for eternal life when they, in cold and pharasaical thought, imagined to themselves a spiritual eating. I speak of such presumptuous men whose invented faith obscures the true faith. [They] separate us from communion with Christ and through Christ from the heavenly Father, for their doctrine that by faith we sufficiently eat the flesh of Christ, who sits in heaven far away from us, reveals that they are mere Suchites who with contemnation of the sacrament and profound spiritual indolence fancy that the Eucharist neither harms nor profits them anything.

While denying the fundamental tenets of the Zwinglian doctrine, Rhegius embraces Luther's own doctrines concerning the regenerative effect of the sacrament and the assurance of the forgiveness of sins provided therein. He now conceives of the Sacrament of the Altar as

a most sacred mystery where Christians come together after examining themselves and before receiving so great a mystery as the body and blood of Christ by which they are salvifically nourished. It is through the death of the Lord that we are redeemed from a second death. This mystery, which proclaims and effects redeeming grace, at the same time frees us from sin and death and admits us into the great grace and glory of the Gospel...

It is evident from what Rhegius says here that he had returned to an understanding of the Lord's Supper which was much closer to Luther than to Zwingli. The denial that the words of institution could be interpreted figuratively and the affirmation of the presence of Christ's body and blood in the sacrament and of the sacrament's value as a means of grace were characteristically Lutheran. This doctrinal transformation did not, however, preclude the possibility of further attempts to compromise the difference between the Lutheran and Zwinglian camps. Rhegius was in full agreement with Landgrave Philip of Hesse's proposal that the re-
formers meet in Marburg to effect a reconciliation. Unable to attend because of illness, Rhegius wrote to Philip on September 12, 1529 expressing his great joy that God had moved him to intervene in the controversy, because up to now it has been reflected on very little by a great many people, as if it were unimportant. Yet nothing is so obstructive to the progress of God's word as this schism. But I hope that the merciful Lord will permit the spirit of unity to bring this matter to an end, so that the Gospel will complete its prescribed course through unanimous preaching of the secrets of Christ.93

But Rhegius' hopes were not to be fulfilled. Although Luther and Zwingli were able to agree on fourteen of fifteen articles drafted at the end of the Marburg Colloquy, they admitted in Article XV that there was no agreement on whether the true body and blood of Christ were present in the sacrament. Failure to reach accord on this critical point underlined the seriousness of the division which separated Luther and Zwingli. Although the Articles were hailed in some circles as proof that union was possible, they were largely forgotten by the time the Reichstag met in Augsburg the following year. Henceforth, they ceased to play a role in the formulation of an evangelical confession.94
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CHAPTER VI
RHEGIUS AND THE STRUGGLE AGAINST ANABAPTISM

We have already seen how the radical spiritualism of Andreas Carlstadt forced a division among the reformers over the nature and significance of the Lord's Supper and how Ulrich Zwingli became the champion of the significationist interpretation in Switzerland and South Germany. Within Zwingli's camp, however, there arose a number of radical sectarians who leveled against Zwingli the same charge of half-way reform which he had made against Luther. Although Zwingli and the sectarians originally had shared the same views on the Lord's Supper, the use of images, the fast laws, and infant baptism, serious differences had arisen by the autumn of 1523 over the tempo of ecclesiastical reform. The willingness of the Zürich city council to go along with moderate reform proposals and Zwingli's own desire to place the Reformation in the hands of the civil government in order to insure a gradual transformation of the church order throughout the Swiss Confederation made a more conservative approach advisable. At the Second Zürich Disputation (October, 1523), Zwingli stated that regulations concerning the Mass and the use of images should be left to the council's decision. The radicals, who favored an immediate abolition of both, and a
restoration of apostolic Christianity, felt betrayed by Zwingli's attitude. In the following months, the leaders of the radical forces, Simon Stumpf, Felix Mantz, and Conrad Grebei, presented to Zwingli on several occasions plans of reform calling for the abandonment of the existing church organization and the creation of a new church of the faithful. The failure of these efforts led to the formation of conventicles of believers who adopted an evangelical form of worship differing from that officially prescribed in the churches of Zürich and its dependencies.¹

During the year 1524, it became increasingly evident that the differences between Zwingli and the radicals went deeper than disputes over the strategy and timing of reform. Whereas Zwingli was committed to the state church and the parish system in the cantons, the radicals were in favor of individual congregations in which the Scriptures served as the sole authority. Convinced that the practice of infant baptism had no foundation in Scripture and that their own baptismal birthright in the established church was invalid, the radicals adopted adult baptism as the sign of initiation into the new order of the gathered church of men and women set apart from the world. The only legitimate basis for receiving the sacrament of baptism and entering to the covenant of believers was the experience of an inner quickening of the spirit which enabled the believer to make a confession of faith before his fellow Christians. The baptismal act bound the baptizand to the covenant of the re-
generate and served as an objective sign that his fellow be­lievers recognized in him the regenerating gifts of the Holy Spirit. Bound up with this baptismal theology, however, was a cluster of beliefs which aroused the concern of the civil authorities. The renunciation of oath-taking and the advocacy of pacifism, communism, and missionary crusades seemed to bode ill for the maintenance of civil order.²

On January 21, 1525, four days after the Third Zürich Disputation in which Zwingli withdrew his earlier disapproval of infant baptism and tried to defend that institution as the New Testament analogue of the Jewish rite of circumcision, the first instance of adult rebaptism took place in Zürich in the home of Felix Manz. The baptizer was Conrad Grebel and the baptizand was the former priest, Georg Blaurock. On March 16, the city council decreed that all who accepted rebaptism were to be exiled. In the following year the council attached the death penalty not only to acts of rebaptism but also to attendance at Anabaptist preaching services.³

But conciliar decrees could not stay the force of the new Anabaptist movement. Obeying the command of Matthew 28: 19-20 to go forth and teach all nations, baptizing in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, the Anabaptists went on mission in the Swiss cantons seeking to establish conventicles of regenerated Christians. The movement made inroads at St. Gall, Bern, Basel and at many lesser towns. As persecution at the hands of the civil authorities in­creased, the Anabaptists began to spill over into Tyrol and
South Germany. Beginning in 1525, Strassburg and Augsburg became the two focal points of Anabaptist activity in South Germany. Here Anabaptism came into contact with spiritualistic tendencies informed by the same mysticism and inner devotion which had been disseminated by Carlstadt.  

Conditions in Augsburg were quite favorable for the growth and development of an Anabaptist congregation. The theological crosscurrents already existing within the community, the unwillingness of the council to act decisively in religious matters, and the city's position as a crossroad of trade and commerce made it an ideal target for the proselytizing activities of migratory Anabaptists. The nucleus of the Augsburg Anabaptist congregation was the circle of radical spiritualists which had formed around Ludwig Hetzer, a Swiss priest who had come to the city in June, 1524. While in Zürich he had strongly opposed the use of images in the churches and had devoted his first published work to that subject. Although he was disappointed by Zwingli's conservative stand at the Second Zürich Disputation, he was on good enough terms with the Swiss Reformer to merit a letter of recommendation addressed to Rhegius and Frosch. He was received in Augsburg by the Lutheran ministers as a comrade in arms and quickly found patrons among the local merchants. In December, 1524, Hetzer was back in Zürich arguing against infant baptism. When the institution was upheld at the Third Zürich Disputation, Hetzer returned to Augsburg in January, 1525 and assumed a position as a proofreader with the printer.
Silvan Ottmar. It was at this time that Hetzer began to gather about him a small group of apostolic brethren, "poor in the world, joyous in the cross, and thirsting after God in prayer and reading of the divine word." In this conventicle Hetzer preached the Zwinglian sacramentarian doctrine and inveighed against the practice of infant baptism without, however, preaching or practicing adult rebaptism. When news of his work and more especially of his mocking attacks on the Lutheran ministers reached Rhegius, he challenged Hetzer to a public disputation in September, 1525. When the latter failed to appear, he was banished as "the head of the sectarians, as an unclean, seditious person, hostile to the Gospel."\(^6\)

The leadership of the Augsburg conventicle was assumed by Hans Denk, who had arrived from St. Gall shortly after Hetzer's departure. Denk had been a student at Ingolstadt and a teacher of languages before joining the humanist sodality at Basel. Through a letter of recommendation from Oecolampadius, he had received an appointment as rector at the St. Sebald cathedral school in Nürnberg in 1523. It was here that he came under the influence of the spiritualistic and sacramentarian views of Carlstadt and Thomas Müntzer. Denk became a leading spokesman for these views, and as a result of a judicial hearing before the Nürnberg city council at which several artists were accused of blasphemy, Denk himself was implicated. At the insistence of Andreas Osiander,
the Lutheran-minded preacher at St. Lawrence's and the chief ecclesiastical advisor to the council, Denk was summoned to a hearing in January, 1525 and instructed to present a confession explaining his views. His apology was judged to be "deceptive," and the council ordered him to leave town. After a brief period as Müntzer's guest at Mühlhausen in the spring of that year, Denk went to St. Gall where he worked as a proofreader and lodged at the home of an Anabaptist, although he himself was not yet a convert. Following his arrival in Augsburg, he taught classical languages and gave spiritual counsel to the brethren whom Hetzer had assembled. Then in May, 1526 Denk and others were rebaptized by Balthasar Hubmaier, a former professor of theology at Ingolstadt and the leader of an Anabaptist congregation in the Austrian town of Waldshut. From that time on Denk was unmistakably the leader of a full-fledged Anabaptist congregation in Augsburg.

During 1526 Denk published three pamphlets enlarging upon the views which he had presented before the Nürnberg city council. Influenced by Carlstadt's mystical tendencies, he contended that it is only by resignation of self-will that one attains blessedness. By imitating Christ, whom Denk regarded less as a reconciler between God and man and more as an example of what man can become, it is possible to fulfill the divine law. Indeed Denk thought it possible that even the devil would eventually be saved by virtue of the free will which every creature possesses. Regarding the use of the
Scriptures, he argued that the Bible contains many contradictions and that reliance on its authority could only divide Christians into bitter factions. He inveighed against the Lutheran preoccupation with sermonic exegesis, contending that true understanding can come only from the inner revelations of the Holy Spirit.

Such teachings were quite contrary to what Rhegius and his colleagues had been preaching in Augsburg. But it was almost a year before Rhegius became aware of Denk's activities and confronted him in a private conversation. Denk at first denied and then later admitted that he believed in the ultimate conversion of the devil. Unable to dissuade Denk, Rhegius summoned his fellow preachers to a hearing at which Denk was questioned further about his doctrines. It was agreed that the matter should be taken before the city council, but when plans for a public disputation began to take shape, Denk left for Strassburg in October, 1526, fearing another confrontation such as he had experienced in Nürnberg.

Although the Augsburg Anabaptist congregation had lost one of its most talented leaders, the work of the community was carried on by other hands. Hans Hut, whom Denk had come to know in Nürnberg and whom he baptized in Augsburg in May, 1526, returned to the city in February, 1527 to reorganize the Anabaptist congregation. Hut had entertained radical baptismal views as early as 1521 when he refused to allow one of his own children to be baptized. As a
result he lost his position as a verger in the service of
the knight Hans von Bebra and began a life of wandering
which led him throughout Franconia, Saxony, and Austria,
preaching radical spiritualism and later baptismal repent-
ence. Like Denk he distinguished three kinds of baptism
based on I John 5:6-8, namely, baptism by the Spirit, bap-
tism by water, and baptism in blood. The first was the cov-
enant between man and God; the second, the external coven-
ant whereby the believer gives testimony of his faith be-
fore his fellow Christians; and the third was the continual
struggle with sin and the world. Hut placed far more emphasis
on the latter form than did Denk and coupled with it a firm be-
lief in the imminence of Christ's second coming. He regarded
himself as an apostle sent by God to preach during the latter
days.10

While in Augsburg during February and March, 1527,
Hut resided in the home of the patrician Eitelhans Langen-
mantel, whom he baptized along with Jacob Dachser, a priest
and teacher from Ingolstadt, and Sigmund Salminger, a Fran-
ciscan friar from Munich. Langenmantel had already been won
over to radical spiritualism and to the Zwinglian sacramen-
tarian doctrine by Ludwig Hetzer and had published several
tracts on the Lord's Supper in which he attacked the fruit-
less preaching of the evangelical ministers. He now began
to serve the Anabaptist community as a pamphleteer and lent
to the movement the vicarious prestige of his patrician ori-
gins. At Hut's instigation a secret meeting was held at which Salminger was chosen as leader of the congregation and Dachser as his assistant. A system of poor relief was also organized with first the lacemaker Conrad Auber serving as steward and later the weaver Gall Fischer. Although Hut soon left for Moravia, the newly reconstituted congregation maintained its inner discipline and grew to a strength of nearly eight hundred members. Regular meetings were held in private homes, where new members were baptized and the Lord's Supper was celebrated as a sign of brotherly love. The Anabaptists refused to attend services in the city churches and avoided intercourse with non-Anabaptists as much as possible.  

The city council had already become aware of the sect's existence through the activities of itinerant proselytizers like Hetzer, Denk, and Hut. Those citizens who had provided lodging for them and for other non-resident Anabaptists were summoned to the council chambers and forbidden to provide such assistance in the future. The council also sent representatives to a meeting called by the Zürich council early in August, 1527 to discuss mutually agreeable measures for the suppression of the Anabaptist movement. But at the same time that the council was beginning to mobilize its forces against the Anabaptists, the local congregation hosted a synod at which Hetzer, Denk, and Hut gathered with a number of other leaders to discuss doctrinal and organizational matters. There were three separate sessions, the principal one being at the house of the butcher Matthew Finder on Aug-
August 24 with some sixty people in attendance. The main doctrinal differences were between Denk and Hut, especially over the latter's prophetic utterances concerning the Last Judgment. Hut encountered more opposition than he had anticipated, for both Salminger and Dachser spoke against his position. Denk eventually won the upper hand, and Hut promised not to preach his apocalyptic views to anyone who did not specifically request to hear them. Once unity had been reached on the doctrinal issues, apostles were chosen to go on mission in Germany, Austria, and Switzerland to spread Anabaptist teachings.¹³

The synod was over and most of the leaders had left before the council became aware of what had happened. On August 28, Dachser and several others were brought before the council for questioning. On September 15, a Sunday, agents of the council surprised a gathering of Anabaptists and placed more than one hundred under arrest, including Dachser and Hut. Langenmantel and Salminger were taken a few days later. On September 16, those who were known to have been rebaptized were compelled to take an oath not to leave the city, to abstain from listening to Anabaptist sermons, and to obey any future summons before the council. Those who had not been rebaptized but who were nevertheless present at the meeting were ordered to stop associating with known Anabaptists and above all not to accept rebaptism at their hands. Another group of "suspicious persons" was brought before the council on September 17 and given a similar warn-
ing. The council made it clear that it had no objection if two or three people gathered together to discuss the Scriptures, but no large unauthorized assemblies were to be tolerated. Any who refused to take the oaths prescribed by the council were banished from the city. 14

The council was especially concerned about the influence exercised by the Anabaptist leaders. In an attempt to persuade them of their errors, the council arranged a two-day public disputation (September 21 and 25) in which Rhegius, Frosch, Agricola, and Keller debated Salminger, Dachser, and Hut. But the disputation failed in its objective. On October 1, all those who had earlier taken the oath were brought to the council chambers to hear a sermon by the preachers and to listen to an address by the mayor, Ulrich Rehlinger, on civic responsibilities. Only four of those present were sufficiently moved to renounce their errors. Nine steadfastly refused to recant and were expelled from the city. The rest asked for a three-day period to consider what course they would follow. Most decided to confess their errors, and upon these penitents only a fine was levied as punishment. The council was less charitable in its treatment of those who declined to recant. On October 17, Langenmantel and four others were banished. Hut was held in jail and subjected to nearly a dozen hearings presided over by Conrad Peutinger. Before his case could be decided, he perished early in December in an abortive escape attempt. The council condemned him posthumously for sedition and heresy and had
his body burned. In January, 1528, Salminger and Dachser were sentenced to remain in jail until they recanted. It was not until December, 1530 that the former appeared before the council and renounced his views. Five months later Dachser followed the example of his colleague.15

The evangelical preachers played an important role in the proceedings against the Anabaptists. Early in September, 1527 Rhegius published on behalf of his colleagues, Frosch and Agricola, a lengthy tract under the title, Against the New Baptismal Order, A Necessary Warning to All Believers in Christ by the Servants of the Gospel in Augsburg,16 in which he sought to refute the Anabaptist doctrines set forth in a pamphlet by Eitelhans Langenmantel. Rhegius opens with the charge that Satan is behind the work of certain confused people who are perverting the Scriptures with false interpretations and placing their trust in dreams and personal opinions. The prince of darkness has chosen as agents of his will men who are trying to convert the world with water. Such was Johann Denk, who preached for a long time in secret and spread his poisonous teachings to the great harm of many souls. Rhegius finds himself obligated by the duty of his office and by the bond of love to protect the simple folk against such errors. He turns his attention to a pamphlet which had become quite popular in Augsburg, A Divine and Fundamental Revelation from the True Anabaptists, and identifies thirteen errors which must be refuted.17 Although Rhegius formulated a separate response for each of them, they
fall into three basic categories: denunciations of the evangelical preachers; attacks on the doctrine of grace; and the advocacy of adult rebaptism.

The Anabaptists had charged that the evangelical preachers were divided among themselves and that the people had failed to benefit from their sermons. Moreover, the preachers themselves seemed to be confessing failure by their repeated admonitions that men turn to Christ. Rhegius concedes that there are indeed differences among the preachers but denies that they are so great as to prejudice either the truth of their doctrines or the effectiveness of their ministry. He is careful to point out that he is not speaking in defense of those who have misused the Gospel and ignored the moral improvement of mankind but rather on behalf of those who have preached with the fear of God in their hearts. Their goal has consistently been to teach faith in Christ and brotherly love. Suspecting that the controversy over the Lord's Supper may have given cause for offense, Rhegius cites the dispute among the Apostles over the retention of the rite of circumcision as evidence that Christians can disagree while still maintaining unity on the fundamental questions of faith and salvation. 18

Regarding the alleged ineffectiveness of the preachers, Rhegius contends that their work has in fact borne fruit. Through the grace of God the gift of faith has been bestowed on many persons, who have manifested this gift in acts of love toward their neighbors and in obedience to the will of
God. If men are not immediately transformed into angels, the fault does not lie in the inadequacy of the Gospel but rather in the obstinacy of men. This is why it is necessary that the preachers exhort their listeners to accept the message of the Gospel and abstain from wrong-doing. Far from being a confession of failure, such appeals are an integral part of the preaching office.

The second category of errors concerns the problem of grace and man's ability to receive it. Rhegius charges the Anabaptists with believing that man is capable of obeying the natural moral law and thus of taking the first step toward salvation even before grace is extended by God. This error derives from a misreading of Galatians 5(17), where the spirit of man is said to be against the flesh. The Anabaptists assumed that Paul was speaking here of man in the natural state before grace is extended and inferred that it is within the power of the individual to resist the temptations of the flesh. Rhegius argues to the contrary that Paul was describing only those who have received the spirit of God through faith and who have thus been restored to their prelapsarian wholeness. In his natural state man possesses only a body and a soul which have been corrupted by sin. When God wishes to save a man he does not create a new soul for him or grant him new powers but cleanses the soul of sin and reinfuses that divine spirit which was lost in the Fall.
baptism which is the central issue in the entire controversy. The Anabaptists had contended that there was no verse in the Scriptures which commanded that infants be baptized. Moreover, there were passages which seemed to prove that baptism was to be administered only after the Gospel had been preached. Christ admonished his disciples in Matthew 28:19 to "teach all nations baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." Again in Mark 16:15-16 he instructed them to go "into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved...." Finally, the Book of Acts records that the Apostles Peter, Philip, and Paul preached first and then baptized those who believed. From this evidence the Anabaptists concluded that only adults capable of understanding the Gospel and of accepting Christ on faith should be baptized into the church.22

In response to these assertions Rhegius follows the main line of argumentation pursued by Zwingli in his pamphlet of 1525, Concerning Baptism, Rebaptism, and Infant Baptism,23 although he places far greater emphasis on the injurious effect of original sin than did Zwingli. Rhegius agrees with the Anabaptists that baptism is a proper sacrament of the church, but he disputes the argument that children are to be excluded from it. In the first place, the Scriptures do not expressly forbid infant baptism and in fact provide considerable evidence that children and not only adults are to be counted among God's people. The analogue of the New
Testament practice of baptism is the Old Testament rite of circumcision. As a sign of the covenant among God, Abraham, and his descendents, circumcision was instituted as a rite to be performed on adult males and on eight-day old infants, thus indicating that maturity of judgment was not a prerequisite for inclusion in the covenant. But as Rhegius points out, those who are under Christ, the blessed seed of Abraham, are considered as covenanters of Abraham. As Paul stated in Romans 4(19-16) and in Galatians 3(16-7), circumcision was a seal of that righteousness which was imputed to Abraham because he believed in God. Those who are of the same faith are also the children of Abraham and therefore share in the covenant. Under the covenant of the New Testament baptism plays the same role as circumcision did, as Paul implied in I Colossians 1(10-13). Rhegius concludes from these premises that,

as circumcision was given in the Old Testament not only to adults but also to children, so also should baptism be given not only to older people but also to children. Whoever denies them that is in effect willing that they be excluded from the covenant of God.  

As Rhegius makes clear, there are more compelling reasons for baptizing children than the force of historical precedent. Because children come into the world tainted with the original sin of Adam, it is imperative that they be baptized as a testimony of their participation in the covenant of grace and as a sign of the hope that they will eventually be baptized by the Holy Spirit and follow Christ as true servants.  

Recalling the command of Christ in Matthew 19(12),
Mark 10:14, and Luke 18:16) that the children be permitted to come to him, Rhegius asks:

How can we do otherwise than bring them to baptism according to the example of the believing adults of Christ's time and desire that they, through the holy baptism, be accepted into the Christian community as our fellow members? So that they may be raised in the service of the living God and imitate Christ their Lord and Savior, we ask the Father of all mercy that he create out of the child of wrath a child of grace and a temple of God and through the blood of his only begotten son restore in the child what was destroyed and ruined in Adam. Our whole desire is that this child be baptized in the death of Christ and be buried with Christ in death through baptism. As Christ was resurrected from death through the majesty of the Father, so also may this child walk in a new life, completely die to sin, and live the life of righteousness.26

The discussion of the covenant of grace and the reception of children into that covenant raises a difficult problem about the relation of faith to grace. If circumcision was a seal of righteousness imputed to Abraham because of his faith, and if baptism is the analogue of circumcision for the people living under the New Testament, how can children who are incapable of faith justifiably receive the sacrament of baptism? It was precisely because of the seeming impossibility of such faith that the Anabaptists had denied any validity to infant baptism and advocated its administration only to those who had first heard the Gospel and confessed their faith. Rhegius approaches this problem in two ways. Against those who maintain that preaching must come before baptism, he counters with the example of John in Mark 1:4 who baptized in the wilderness and preached the baptism of repentance for the remission of sin. Here
baptism clearly comes before preaching. More importantly, John's baptism of water preceded the baptism of the spirit which Christ was later to preach. From this it follows that faith in Christ need not precede baptism and that children need not be denied baptism on grounds of their unbelief.27 But even if one were to concede to the Anabaptists that faith must precede baptism, there is no proof that children are incapable of faith because they cannot understand a sermon. Rhegius declares that,

it is not necessary that one wait for arrogant reason with its false calculations. The Savior is ready to help. The child needs his help, for without the blood of the mediator no sin will be forgiven. They do not need the use of reason or personal merit to receive the assistance of Christ. It is sufficient that they are in need of help and purification.28

Faith is the gift of God and not the product of human wisdom. To make the exercise of reason a prerequisite for faith is to fall into the error of Pelagius.29

Although Rhegius' primary concern was the theological position of the Anabaptists, he was not unaware of the threat which their sectarianism posed to the established order. In a very brief discussion of the problem, he lists the following practices as errors of the Anabaptists: the refusal to take up the sword, hold public office, or swear oaths; the advocacy of communal ownership of property; and the condemnation of all who do not belong to their order. He expresses the hope that those who are loyal to the Gospel will accept the work of its servants in good faith and will protect themselves against Anabaptist errors.30
Despite the efforts of the council and the evangelical preachers to check the growth of Anabaptism, the local congregation rebounded from what proved to be only a temporary setback. The death of Hans Hut gave them their first martyr, and letters of encouragement from comrades elsewhere in South Germany helped to keep their spirits high. Anabaptists who had suffered persecution at the hands of the local authorities in Franconia, Bavaria, and Austria sought refuge in Augsburg even though the council continued to expel as many as it could arrest. The Augsburg Anabaptists received a new impetus in February, 1528 when Jörg von Passau slipped into the city and began preaching at the local gatherings. His message was the same as Hut's: Repent for the end is near! Jörg predicted that those who were now persecuting the "children of God" would soon be punished for their sins and that the new kingdom would be established shortly thereafter.

This theme of impending upheaval grew in importance during the late winter and early spring of 1528. Notwithstanding the council's earlier measures against those who had been rebaptized, a number of people of every class and age accepted rebaptism as the Easter holiday approached. On April 4, the day before Palm Sunday, a group of fifty to sixty Anabaptists met in secret to celebrate the Lord's Supper and to elect new leaders. A week later another large group met at the house of Gall Fischer to hear Jörg von Passau preach. Finally, on Easter Sunday (April 11), the day on which Jörg had predicted that the time of troubles would be-
gin, a group of eighty-eight Anabaptists meeting in the house of Susanna Adolf was placed under arrest. The council divided the suspects into two classes. Non-residents of the city who had merely come to attend the special Easter gathering were forbidden to return for a period of six years. Among those expelled was Jörg von Passau, whom the council failed to recognize as the real leader of the Anabaptist congregation. Among the second class of arrested persons, those who were native Augsburgers or foreigners who had resided there for some time, the council found a number who had provided lodging for visiting Anabaptists despite prohibitions to the contrary, others who had earlier forsworn Anabaptism and then relapsed, and still others who had been expelled from the city in the autumn of 1527 and then returned. These people were subjected to flogging, branding, and mutilations before being banished. Only one, however, Hans Leupold, a tailor who had gone on mission and rebaptized large numbers of people, was executed as an incorrigible. In this respect the council displayed a greater degree of moderation than the territorial princes and leaders of the Swabian League who executed scores of Anabaptists late in the 1520's.32

It was not until May 30, the day before Pentecost, that Rhegius again published a tract on the Anabaptist question. His work, entitled Two Remarkable Letters of Two Anabaptists Sent to Their Colleagues in Augsburg: An Answer to All the Errors of These Letters by Urbanus Rhegius,33 offers the same baptismal arguments which he presented before but reflects
greater concern over the threat posed by Anabaptism to civil and ecclesiastical order. Indicative of this concern is the fact that Rhegius begins his refutation of the two Anabaptist letters with a recitation of the fourth article of the Apostles' Creed. The holy Christian church is a community of saints, a spiritual body with Christ as its head. The Holy Ghost assembles this community through the Gospel of Jesus Christ and governs it in a spirit of unity. Outside of this community there is no salvation. The devil is working diligently against the church by drawing away members with false doctrines. Rhegius contends that a new onslaught was initiated three years ago when the devil inspired certain "cracked brains" with the idea that a pure community of believers can only be established through adult rebaptism. He has further provided them with false interpretations of Scripture seeking to prove that infant baptism is invalid.

Rhegius finds that the idea of a sect set apart from the rest of the church and outside the framework of the accepted social order has given rise to various forms of aberrant behavior. The Anabaptists have resorted to secret meetings in "corners, cellars, and haystacks" in order to discuss their heresies in concealment from the authorities as Johann Denk did for more than a year. They have neglected their families and wandered about the countryside avoiding honest work and living from alms. Those who have tried to correct their errors they have labelled as "heathen, false shepherds, and liars." Rhegius felt keenly the sting of
of the Anabaptist charge that they were being persecuted by the authorities for the sake of the truth, and he takes great pains to defend the actions of the evangelical preachers and the council.

If you think we are the high priests [who persecuted Christ] and that you are suffering under us, you do us an injustice. We have persuaded you of your error before the authorities on the basis of Scripture, earnestly requested that you abstain, and humbly petitioned the authorities that they show mercy toward you. This is now your gratitude that you slander us with falsehood.... You are disobedient, and when one asks you, warns you, and finally forbids you with severe punishment not to gather in corners, you then give nothing for any authority. You may say what you want and do what you want. I am speaking of disobedience. What is the consequence? The temporal authority must keep the peace but cannot have peace on account of your gathering together. We know well where it will end, even if the simple people are not able to understand it. Therefore we must punish the disobedient. No one should resist this punishment, for God has instituted the authorities to keep the common peace.38

The source of this rebelliousness was, in Rhegius' opinion, the false spiritualism upon which the Anabaptists relied as their principal authority. The simple folk had been deceived into thinking that the spirit of God is within man by nature and that whatever entered their heads was the result of divine inspiration. Thus it was that people went about predicting famines and hailstorms and prophesying that Judgment Day would arrive on Pentecost, despite the statement of Christ in Matthew 24(136) that not even the angels knew the day or the hour of his coming. The only proof which they could offer for such predictions was an appeal to dreams and visions.39 Rhegius argues mockingly that if one must confirm his faith by such visions, then sorcerers and magicians
should be leaders in the Anabaptist movement. Returning to a familiar theme, he declares that all teachings must be confirmed by reference to the Scriptures. The fact that the Anabaptists persistently refused to listen to the evangelical preachers or to test their inspirations against God's Word demonstrates that their revelations are nothing but invented lies. It is in the interest of protecting people against such deceptions that Rhegius has felt called upon to write against the Anabaptist heresies.40

The failure of the Judgment Day prophesies to be fulfilled at Pentecost marked the beginning of the decline of Augsburg's Anabaptist congregation. The purges conducted by the council had sapped the movement of its leadership, and the imposition of strict immigration controls made it impossible for outsiders to reinforce the congregation's dwindling numbers. There were relatively few instances of rebaptism during the summer of 1528. In August, those who remained decided against holding further meetings on the grounds that the period of teaching and learning had ended and that one must wait patiently for the coming of the new order. By the end of the decade, those who had played a decisive role in the history of the community—Denk, Hetzer, Hubmaier, Langenmantel, and Jörg von Passau—had died or been executed and their followers scattered to Hungary, Moravia, and North Germany.41
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CHAPTER VII
THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE REFORMATION IN AUGSBURG TO 1530

In the period from the end of the Peasants' Revolt in the spring of 1525 to the convocation of the imperial diet in the summer of 1530, the Augsburg city council continued to steer a middle course between the alternatives of supporting the established Church institutions and practices on the one hand and of adopting a thorough-going reform of the cultus on the other. Although the councillors consistently denied the request of the evangelical preachers for a public disputation at which the basis for a new church order could be discussed, they did sanction a number of changes which weakened considerably the force of the old institutions.¹

The cloisters in Augsburg, symbol of the consecrated life, were deeply influenced by evangelical doctrines. A majority of the monks at the Carmelite monastery, over whom Frosch presided as prior until his resignation in 1523, accepted Luther's teachings, renounced their vows, and assumed new roles as secular preachers and tradesmen. By 1525, only eight monks remained in the monastery, and the council denied permission to the provincial to repopulate it. The monastery of the Minorites, at which Keller served as parish preacher, was completely dissolved in the summer of 1526. The Domini-
cans remained true to their order until their prior, Johann Faber, was forced by the council to leave the city in April, 1525 because of his attempts to stir up the populace against the evangelical preachers. The strength of the chapter diminished in the following years until only four monks remained in 1532. A similar fate befell many of the cloistered nuns, although the council attempted to reconstitute their orders, especially St. Katherine's, but only because it held the powers of guardianship over the nunneries. For the most part, the council was willing to let the dissolutions take their course. Similarly, if the council did not actively aid the Reformation by appointing salaried preachers as it had in 1524, neither did it object to the initiative taken by the evangelical-minded parishioners at Holy Cross who elected and supported the former prior Johann Schneid as their preacher and those at St. George's who selected Johann Seifried as theirs.

Of significance both to the history of ecclesiastical institutions and to the personal lives of the reformers was the fact that increasing numbers of former priests and nuns were renouncing their vows of celibacy in order to marry. The city council had taken exception to the marriage of the Basel priest Jacob Griessbeutel at St. Anna's in 1523. But when the inhabitants of the city's own cloisters began to follow the same course, the council turned a blind eye. Three of the city's appointed preachers married: Frosch, on March 20, 1525; Rhegius, on June 16, 1525; and Keller, on October 18,
1526. Rhegius officiated at Frosch's wedding, a favor which Frosch returned three months later, and used the event as the subject of a sermon which appeared in print under the title, *A Sermon on Marriage: How Useful, Necessary, Good, and Free It Is to Everyone.* Although Rhegius modestly denied that his work was really necessary since so much had already been written on marriage, the pamphlet is of special interest because it includes one of the oldest evangelical formulas for the exchange of vows.

In the introduction to his sermon, Rhegius took note of the fact that a large crowd had assembled to witness the marriage of his colleague. Because so many regarded the marriage of a cleric as a strange thing, he thought it advisable to set forth the scriptural basis for the practice. Rhegius finds that marriage was instituted by God at the time of the creation when he declared in Genesis 2(18-25) that it was not good for man to be alone and created a helpmate for him. From this Rhegius concludes that marriage is a useful, good, and necessary thing. That it is also free to everyone, even priests, is proven in Leviticus 21(13-14) where the rules for the choice of brides is prescribed.

Nevertheless, it has been argued that priests should not marry for three reasons: first, it is prohibited by the papal law; secondly, it is contrary to the vow of chastity which is taken at the time of consecration; and thirdly, clerical celibacy is a long-standing practice the abolition of which would be a source of vexation to many. Rhegius re-
sponds to the first objection that all laws, even those of the pope, must be based upon the divine law from which they derive their authority and force. What is outside of or contrary to the Word of God must be rejected. Regarding the vow of chastity, he cites the argument of Paul in I Corinthians 7:6-9, 32-40 that although it is preferrable to remain unmarried in order to do the work of God without the encumbrance of worldly concerns, chastity is a special gift of God and not a state in which everyone can live. In Paul's words, it is better to marry than to burn. Lest anyone think that such advice applies only to the laity, Rhegius cites Paul's counsel in I Timothy 3:2 that a bishop (which Rhegius takes to mean any pastor or preacher) must be the husband of only one wife, thus implying that marriage is not incompatible with service to the church. In response to the final objection, he observes that clerical marriage was permitted for hundreds of years and was not uncommon in the early Church. In any event, as Augustine says, the truth should be more highly regarded than custom.9

The marriage laws were not the only customs of the Church which were modified by the evangelical perception of truth. In Augsburg the ceremony of infant baptism was conducted in the German language and without the use of consecrated oil. Frosch, Agricola, and Rhegius insisted that a proper baptismal order be followed, but Keller, Schneid, and Seifried placed so little emphasis on baptism that many people, exclusive of the Anabaptists, ceased to bring their
children to the font. The evangelical preachers were united in their condemnation of auricular confession as it was being conducted by the Catholic priests, but they were divided over the value of confession itself. The Lutherans regarded it as worthy of retention because it provided the penitent with the promise of the forgiveness of sin. The Zwinglians, and on this point Rhegius must be included among them, considered it only as a means of consolation. Despite opposition from both the council and the Catholics, the observance of a number of holidays and fast days was gradually discontinued as more and more people accepted the evangelical argument that they were without scriptural foundation. Attacks were also directed against the cult of saints and the use of images. Keller preached vigorously against both, and when the council refused to sanction their abolition, he and several others destroyed a large crucifix in the Minorite chapel in March, 1529. The council firmly forbade any such acts in the future, punished Keller's accomplices with imprisonment and fines, but declined to act against Keller for fear of offending the rabble.10

One rite of the Church which was a special cause for concern was the Mass. Beginning in 1524, Frosch administered the elements of the Lord's Supper in both kinds to those communicants who requested it. However, it was not until Christmas, 1525 that Rhegius and Frosch formally celebrated Mass according to the Wittenberg formula, distributing both the cup and the wafer to the laity, omitting those passages of
the canon which described the Mass as a sacrifice, and providing a brief instructional sermon. In April, 1527, the council officially approved the dispensing of the sacrament in both kinds but refused to forbid its administration under one form. The council also permitted vestments from the cloisters to be returned to the laymen who had donated them but would not allow them to be sold lest their future use be required. There was, moreover, no discussion in the council of a complete abolition of the Catholic liturgy such as took place in Nürnberg, Memmingen, Constance, and Strassburg.

Because the council would not act decisively on the question of the Mass, there arose a bitter debate between the Catholics and the Evangelicals over its retention. The significationist interpretation of the Lord's Supper had gained widespread acceptance because it undercut the idea of the Mass as a sacrifice of the body and blood of Christ. In response to this attack, the cathedral preacher, Kretz, defended the Mass in a pamphlet which he published in 1524. Ottmar Nachtigall, preacher at St. Moritz and the leader of the Catholic forces after 1525, praised the Mass as "the greatest work that a Christian could do" and condemned the evangelical preachers as heretics. Support also came from outside the city, especially from Johann Eck who had been deeply offended by the council's censorship of his books on the Mass in 1526. Sometime late in the autumn of that year, Eck visited Augsburg and, in the company of Kretz and Nachtigall,
gall chanced to meet his former student Rhegius at the market place. Rhegius offered to debate them publicly on the subject of the Mass and expressed a willingness to let Eck act as moderator if he would accept the word of God as the final authority. Eck declined and referred Rhegius to his two books on the Mass. In April, 1527, Rhegius wrote a detailed refutation of Eck's books based on the Scriptures and on the Church Fathers. The work circulated in manuscript form, and a copy was sent to the evangelical preachers in Memmingen, who used it in their successful struggle to have the Mass abolished there. Angered at this turn of events, Eck wrote to Rhegius condemning his work as a blasphemy against God and accusing Rhegius of heresy. Rhegius responded in March, 1528, acknowledging his debt of gratitude to Eck for the kindness which he had shown him during their years together at Freiburg and Ingolstadt and committing to God a final judgment on the question of the Mass. In February, 1529, Rhegius published his original reply to Eck along with their subsequent correspondence.

The quarrels over the retention of the Mass, the disputes among the evangelical preachers themselves, and the disorders created by the Anabaptists cast a shadow over the entire spectrum of civic life. The council, the guilds, and even private households were divided over questions of faith and worship. But perhaps of even greater concern to the evangelical preachers than their failure to bring about a new church order was their inability to convert antipapalism
into Gospel religion. The charge of ineffectiveness which Langenmantel had leveled against them was more than an outburst of polemical invective.\textsuperscript{17} In a letter to Ambrosius Blaurer in June, 1526, Rhegius testified to the difficulties which stood in the way of reform. "Among us," he confessed, the course of the Gospel is hindered by 'thick mud,' as Habakkuk calls wealth. From it arises such pride as one scarcely finds elsewhere.... We are hated by many, but that is the fate of truth.\textsuperscript{18} Two years later, in August, 1528, Rhegius was offered the position of church superintendent in Ansbach. He wrote to the Landhofmeister, Hans von Schwarzenberg, who was representing Margrave Georg von Brandenburg in the negotiations, declining the offer for the present but expressing an interest for the future should conditions in Augsburg fail to improve. He conceded that he had observed very little concern for God's work in Augsburg since his return in 1524 and that he had often felt the urge to go elsewhere and "leave pride, greed, and worldliness to God's judgment." But for the sake of the few good-hearted men whom God had preserved "as roses among the thorns," he felt compelled to remain.\textsuperscript{19} In December, 1528, he wrote again to Ambrosius Blaurer, who by that time had met with considerable success as a reformer in Memmingen and Constance, lamenting that,

there is no godly zeal in us. We are lukewarm even if we do preach diligently. We servants of the Word are despised, and no wonder when the people, who are ill-suited to any pious duties, are asleep.... Peaceful guidance of the church is my only desire, and for that reason I have seen
nothing dearer than the unity of the church at Memmingen.²⁰

Perhaps it was in the hope of bringing about unity and of instilling a greater concern for religion of the heart that Rhegius returned to the themes of faith and love in his three published works of 1529. In response to an attack on the Lutheran doctrine of sola fideism by a Leipzig licentiate and preacher named Johann Ross, Rhegius published *An Answer to Two Sermons on Faith and Good Works Which Johann Ross Preached at Leipzig.*²¹ Ross had argued in his sermons that a sinner becomes righteous not by faith alone but by faith, charity, and good works. He defended his assertion by appealing to Paul's statement in Galatians 5:(5-6) that "we through the Spirit wait for the hope of righteousness by faith. For in Jesus Christ neither circumcision availeth anything or uncircumcision; but faith which worketh by love." From this Ross concluded that faith is only a preparation for justification, for even if one believes, he is not yet a child of God. Works are needed to achieve, maintain, and increase justification and thus to merit eternal salvation. Rhegius counters that Ross has erred in his interpretation of Paul. Paul does not say that charity or works effect righteousness. Rather, he is attempting to lead away from works righteousness under the law and toward faith in Christ. As he states explicitly in Galatians 2:(16), it is not obedience to the law which saves but faith in Christ. Because Ross has failed to perceive the proper relationship between faith and works, he has wrongly charged the Lutherans with a denial of good
works. Rhegius answers that "we teach good works, but we teach at the same time how we become righteous in faith in Christ through the pure grace of God so that we might achieve good works."22

To clear up any misunderstandings about the process whereby men are saved, Rhegius spells out "the true order of how a sinner becomes righteous." First, the sinner is called to repentance outwardly by the Word of God and inwardly by the Father himself. Secondly, saving grace is infused. He believes the Word of God. If the Word threatens temporal or eternal punishment, then he fears God's wrath. If the Word promises grace through Christ, then he trusts God's blessings. Thirdly, a child of God is created by this faith and sin is forgiven. Fourthly, if he is a child of God, then he receives the Holy Ghost in his heart. Fifthly, the Holy Ghost pours love into his heart along with other gifts. Sixthly, through this love, faith performs good works. Seventhly, faith purifies the heart and the spirit opposes the flesh. Eighthly, the converted man lives soberly, righteously, and godly, withdraws from the old Adam and becomes a new creature in Christ. Rhegius concludes that in this order everyone sees that good works come only after faith. Faith makes the person righteous before God. Only then does the justified man do works of righteousness.23

Rhegius pursued the same basic theme in his Sermon on Why Christ Called Faith a Work of God, What the True Christian Faith Is, and Why One Says that Faith Alone Justi-
fies, but developed it in a different way. Here the focus is more on the meaning of faith for everyday life and on the performance of good works as a natural expression of that faith. Rhegius uses as his text the story of those at Capernaum who asked Christ what they must do to perform the works of God. Christ answered [John 6(127-29)]: “This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent.” From this Rhegius infers that faith in Christ is the ultimate source of all those deeds which have been traditionally regarded as good works. In order to understand how good works originate through faith in Christ, it is necessary to understand what faith is. Most people believe that faith means simply accepting the articles of the creed as true. But even the devil acknowledges that God is the creator and that Christ is his only begotten son. Mere knowledge of the doctrines of God is within the grasp of any heathen who can understand the language. Because people misconceive the nature of faith, they also misunderstand the nature of works and their proper relation to faith. A man goes to church, hears that God has created the world, has sent his son into the world to assume the burden of our sins, and wants to save us from eternal damnation. He goes out saying that he has examined the sermon and has understood that Christ came into the world to save sinners, that God wants to be gracious to us, forgive sin, and receive us as children if we believe him. He thinks, if I now believe, then I will be righteous and sanctified. But he remains "the old Hans," greedy, arrogant, unchaste, en-
vious, and obnoxious to his neighbor. His neighbor says: "My Hans, you are not evangelical. You have no love for your neighbor. It is only talk with you. One does not see any good works from you." He concludes that it is obviously not true that faith alone justifies. For although he believes what he heard in the sermon, yet he is not righteous. Good works must also be present in order for justification to be complete.26

But if Paul is right in his claim that faith alone justifies, faith must be a far more serious thing than simply believing the articles of the creed. To explain what genuine faith is, Rhegius turns to the example of Abraham. In Genesis 15(5-6), God promised to Abraham that his descendents would be as numerous as the stars in heaven. Abraham "believed in the Lord; and he counted it to him for righteousness." Moreover, Abraham gave testimony of his faith by accepting God's promise that his wife Sarah, despite her age, would bear him a son and in agreeing to sacrifice Isaac as the Lord commanded him. He placed his trust in God and did not doubt because his faith was a faith of the heart. This is the same kind of faith that is required of Christians—a heartfelt reverence for God and a trust in his promise that our sins have been forgiven through Christ.27

If faith in Christ is present, fulfillment of the law and the performance of good works will follow. Rhegius counsels:

If you love your neighbor in Christ, that touches the heart
to the quick, and true good works follow immediately. For when your neighbor is dear to your heart, as a member in Christ and coheir of eternal life, you do not wish him anything evil. Love can not allow that you do him any harm.

But one must pay attention to the proper order of events. First faith, then love, and finally good works.28

Rhegius' last pamphlet of 1529, Medicine of the Soul for the Healthy and the Sick in These Dangerous Days of Deadly Peril,29 became one of his most popular devotional works.30 He intended it as a source of instruction for those who wished to console the sick in their hour of need. He recognizes that physical illness and death are grievous burdens to bear but warns that the sickness and death of the soul is the most horrible fate that can befall a man. Therefore it is necessary that a man prepare himself in advance by exercising his faith daily and by partaking often of the Lord's Supper. Those who have failed to do this will be troubled as death approaches and the terrors of eternal punishment plague the soul. Because their faith is weak, they can not see through the present difficulties and find consolation in the promises of God. He who wishes to comfort a neighbor in such distress must admonish him to consider not only his sins but also the death of Christ, through which the onus of sin was removed, and encourage him to call upon God for mercy and forgiveness. There is no penance too late, if only it comes before the end of life.31

These three pamphlets represent the final phase of Rhegius' role as a defender of the faith in Augsburg. In 1530,
his career as a reformer was turned in a new direction by the larger stream of events. On January 21, 1530, Emperor Charles announced a new imperial diet which would meet in Augsburg to deal with the religious questions which had remained unsettled since 1521. The tone of the mandate was conciliatory, and thus it was with great hope that the evangelical princes and theologians began to assemble in Augsburg in May. Among the former, Elector Johann of Saxony, Duke Ernst of Brunswick-Lüneburg, Landgrave Philip of Hesse, and Margrave Georg of Brandenburg entered into a close association in the weeks before the diet officially opened. Because many believed that the diet would become a kind of national church council, the princes and representatives of the free imperial cities encouraged the attendance of the leading theologians of the reform movement. The city council permitted the non-resident theologians to preach to the Augsburgers, while the princes listened to the city's own preachers. Landgrave Philip was especially impressed with Keller, with whom he shared the Zwinglian sacramentarian view. Rhegius preached on a number of occasions, and his sermons were warmly received by Elector Johann and Duke Ernst. There was a great deal of discussion regarding the outline of a confession which Philip Melanchthon had brought along to present to the Emperor. Rhegius wrote to Luther on May 21 describing the frenzied pace and expressing great pleasure in the conversations between himself and the Saxon representatives, Melanchthon, Justas Jonas, Agricola von Eisleben, and
Georg Spalatin. But differences between the Lutheran and Zwinglian factions rendered impossible a unified confessional statement.

The hope for conciliation between Catholics and Evangelicals also proved illusory. When Emperor Charles entered the city on June 15, he immediately ordered the princes to impose silence on their preachers. On the following day he issued the same order to the city council and demanded that the council dismiss its appointed preachers. The council not only complied but refused to recognize as valid the original appointment of Frosch, R hegius, Agricola, and Keller. On June 18, it was proclaimed that only those approved by the Emperor would be allowed to preach during the diet. The Augsburg preachers were then officially dismissed. On the 25th, Melanchthon's statement, which became known as the Augsburg Confession, was read publicly and presented to the Emperor. The prospects for a compromise improved slightly, but then on August 3, the Confutation of the Catholic theologians, drafted by Eck, Faber, and Cochlaeus, was announced and the subordination of the evangelical estates to the Catholic Church was demanded. Rumors of violence began to spread. On August 6, Landgrave Philip secretly left the city. When the Emperor learned that Johann Schneid, the former preacher at Holy Cross, had warned Elector Johann of a possible attack, he had Schneid imprisoned. Most of the evangelical theologians fled, including Keller, Agricola, and Frosch. Fearing that the remaining evangelical princes might leave before a final
religious settlement could be reached, Charles softened his stand and lent his support to a new attempt at compromise, in which Melanchthon and the Bishop of Augsburg, Christoph von Stadion, assumed the leading roles. Although Melanchthon was sharply criticized by Luther and some of the princes for offering concessions on points which they regarded as uncompromisable, Anegius firmly supported him. Nevertheless, an agreement could not be reached, and so on September 22, 1530 the proposal of a recess was announced according to which the Evangelicals were given until April 15 of the following year to consider whether they would submit the disputed issues to the decision of a council to be summoned by the Emperor. In the interim they were to publish nothing new in matters of faith nor were they to prevent their subjects from worshipping according to the Catholic order. The princes adamantly refused to accept these terms, and on September 23, Elector Johann and Duke Ernst left the city. 35

Two months later the Emperor also took leave, having failed to bring the Evangelicals back into the fold. Even the Augsburg city council refused to comply with the Emperor's demand that all cities which had not signed the Augsburg Confession of the Lutherans or the Tetrapolitana of the Zwinglians confess their loyalty to him in matters of "peace, law, and Christian faith." After the Emperor's departure, the council acted to restore evangelical preaching in the city in response to popular demands. Keller returned to his former position at the Minorite monastery. The council also rein-
stated Frosch and Agricola with the proviso that they come
to an agreement with Keller on an interpretation of the
Lord's Supper. Unwilling to accept the Zwinglian view, Frosch
left to assume a position as a preacher at St. Sebald's in
Nürnberg and Agricola accepted the church superintendency
in Ansbach. They were replaced by two Zwinglian preachers
from Strassburg, thus providing the city with the unified
evangelical party which it had formerly lacked.36

Rhegius, however, did not return. In June, he had been
persuaded by Duke Ernst to assist in organizing a reformed
church order in the Duchy of Brunswick-Lüneburg. On August
26, he left the city of Augsburg to assume a new role in
the service of the Reformation, first as a pastor in Celle
and then as Court preacher and General Superintendent.37
During the remaining eleven years of his life, he continued
to preach and write in defense of the evangelical faith and
to exercise that "peaceful leadership of the church" which he
had longed for in Augsburg.
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The picture of Rhegius which emerges from his sermons, pamphlets, and letters is one of a conservative reformer seeking to restore that spirit of faith which had been deadened by worldliness and replaced with a shallow observance of the outward forms of worship. It is evident from the second pamphlet which Rhegius wrote under the pseudonym "Symon Hessus" that his aim was not merely to satirize clerical abuses but to discover the truth. The truth was not to be found in the classical philosophy of Aristotle or the medie­val scholasticism of Thomas Aquinas but rather in the evangel­ical and apostolic writings of the New Testament. As Rhegius declared in his sermon On the Holy Virgin Catherine, all wis­dom without Christ is error and ignorance.

The idea of the Scriptures as the source of truth had a profound effect on Rhegius' conception of his role as a reformer. In his sermon, Concerning the Worthy Sacrament of the Altar (1523), he declared his intention to serve as a pathfinder through the Scriptures, which had been obscured by glosses or neglected altogether. In Rhegius' view, it was vitally important that everyone, not just priests, understand the Scriptures, for everyone must grasp the message of salvation contained therein. The heart of that message was justification by faith alone, and the failure of both friends and
foes of the Reformation to understand that doctrine compelled Rhegius to discuss faith and its relation to works again and again.

But it was not merely a proper understanding of justification as a doctrine which concerned Rhegius but also the incorporation of faith into the life of the Christian. As he stated in his Short Explanation of Certain Familiar Points, the articles of the Creed must be written in the heart. Rhegius' belief in the principle of scriptural primacy grew in strength during the course of the 1520's. Whereas in 1522 he had contended for the infusion of existing ecclesiastical institutions with a proper spirit of faith, by 1524 he was beginning to speak out more strongly against laws and rules which were contrary to Scripture. The fast laws, the prohibition on clerical marriage, and the existence of monastic orders were all held to be unjustifiable by scriptural standards of truth.

But not all questions could be so easily resolved. The primacy of Scripture itself was called into question first by the radical spiritualists like Andreas Carlstadt and Thomas Müntzer and then by the Anabaptists, whose reliance upon dreams and revelations Rhegius denounced. Even where the principle was accepted, serious disputes arose over the application of Scripture to everyday life and over the correct exegesis of scriptural passages. The revolt of the peasants tested Paul's admonition of obedience to authority and disagreements over the meaning of Christ's words "This is my body"
created serious divisions within the reform movement. Rhegius' response in both cases was to seek reconciliation by reminding both servants and masters of their respective duties and by attempting to find a common ground on which Zwinglians and Lutherans could stand together.

There are few criteria by which Rhegius' career as a reformer can be measured as a success. It was the power of the sword which quelled the Peasants' Revolt and not the admonitions of the pamphleteer. It was the resolution of the Augsburg city council to root out disobedience and not the arguments of the public debater which checked the spread of Anabaptism. Moreover, the disagreements about the Lord's Supper could not be resolved by even the greatest minds of the Reformation. And the reluctance of the Augsburg city council to act decisively in matters of reform might have been a test for Luther's powers of persuasion. Nonetheless, Rhegius' life and works reflect in a very direct way the spread of the Reformation. It is not Rhegius as a prime mover in theological disputation or ecclesiastical reform who is significant but rather Rhegius as a thoughtful man striving to comprehend the ideas of men more gifted than he, coping with the practical problems of institutional change, and performing his duties as a conscientious preacher and pastor. Viewed from this perspective, his career becomes a microcosm of the Reformation in the 1520's.
Primary Sources


Anzaygung dass, die Romisch Bull mercklichen schaden in gewissen manicher menschen gebracht hab, und nit Doctor Luthers leer, durch Henricum Phoeniceum von Roschach. N.p., 1521.

Argument dieses biechlins. Symon Hessus zeytt an Doctori Martino Luther wrsach warumb die Lutherische
büc′her von den Coloniensern und Louaniensern verbrent worden sein, daß Martinus hatt des bezert in enem büchlein darin er vrsach sagt mit. xxx artíccken im geystlichen recht berrıﬀen warumb er de Bapst sein Recht zu Wittenberg verbrent hatt. N.p., 1521.

---


---

Dvaliogus mit unlustig zu lesen. newlich vö Martino Luther und Simone Hess zu Worms geschen. N.p., n.d.

---


---

Vom hochwürdigen Sacrament des Altars, underricht, was man auss hayliger geschrift wissen mag, durch D. Urbanum Rhegium zu Augsburg gepredigdt. N.p., 1523.

---

Kurtz verandtwortung auff zwu gotss lesterungen, wider die feynd der hayligen schrifft, Durch D. Urbanum Regl. N.p., 1524.

---

Newe lere des achtbaren und gelerten man Urbani Regl predigers zu Augsburg uns deutsch aus dem latein gezogen. Translated by Benedictus Schiller. Wittenberg, 1526.

---

Ain Predig Von der hallligen junckfrauwen Catharina, Doctoris Urbani Regl. Augsburg: Silvan Otmar, 1521.

---

VonReuw, Beicht, Büss, kurtzer beschluss Auss ge-grünter schrift nit aus menschenleer. N.p., 1523.

---


---

Ain Sermon vom eelichen stand, wie nutz, not, gut, vnd frey er jederman sey. N.p., 1525.

---

Ain sermon von dem hochwürdigen sacrament des Altars, gepredigdt durch Doctor Urbanum Rhegium, Thumprediger zu Augsburg, am tag Corpus Christi. Augsburg, 1521.

---

Underricht Wie ein Christenmensch got seinem herren
teglich beichten soll Doctoris Urbani Regii Thumpred-
igers zu Augsburg. Augsburg, 1521.

Von volkomenheit und frucht des leidens Christi,
Sampt erklärung der wort Pauli Colos. 1. Ich erfüll,
das absezt den leyden Christi act. Durch D. Urbanum
Regium. N.p., 1522.

Wider den newen irrsal Doctor Andres von Carlstadt,
des Sacraments halb, warnung. D. Urbani Regii. N.p.,
1524.

Zwen wunderseltzam sendbrief, zweyer Widertauffer,
an ire Rotten gen Augsburg gesandt. Verantwurtung al-
ler irrhum diserobgenanten brief, durch Urbanum

Schiess, Traugott (ed.). Briefwechsel der Brüder Ambrosi
und Thomas Blaurer, 1509-1548. 2 vols. Freiburg im
Breisgau: Friedrich Ernst Fehsenfeld, 1908, 1910.

Vadianus, Joachim. Vadianische Briefsammlung. Edited by
Emil Arbenz and Hermann Wartmann. 3 vols. St. Gall:
Huber Verlag, 1890-1913.

Zwingli, Ulrich. Huldreich Zwinglis Sämtliche Werke. Edited
Schwetschke and Son, 1905-1944.

The Latin Works of Huldreich Zwingli. Edited with
notes by Clarence Nevin Heller and with introductions
by George Warren Richards and a preface by William
Walker Rockwell. 3 vols. Philadelphia: The Heidelberg
Press, 1929.

Zwinglis Briefe. Translated by Oskar Farner. 2 vols.

Secondary Sources

Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie. Edited by the Historische
Commission bei der Königlichen Akademie der Wissen-
schaften. 56 vols. Leipzig: Duncker and Humblot, 1875-
1912.

Armour, Rollin Stely. Anabaptist Baptism: A Representative


Clemen, Otto. "Das pseudonym Symon Hessus," Centralblatt für Bibliothekswesen, XVII (December, 1900), 566-592.


Rischar, Klaus. "Professor Dr. Johannes Eck als akademischer Lehrer in Ingolstadt," Zeitschrift für bayerische Kirchengeschichte, XXXVII (1968), 193-212.


