the AUGSBURG CONFESSION



A Collection of Sources with a Historical Introduction

Johann Michael Reu

CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE • SAINT LOUIS



This edition published in 2005 by Concordia Publishing House
3558 S. Jefferson Ave., St. Louis, MO 63118-3968
1-800-325-3040 • cph.org

Manufactured in the United States of America

ISBN 978-0-7586-7023-6

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 14 13 12 11 10 09 08 07 06 05

PREFACE

The Lutheran Church in America has produced two works of lasting value concerning the Augsburg Confession: the second volume of Dr. H. E. Jacobs' edition of the Book of Concord with its collection of documents relating to the history of the Augsburg Confession and Dr. Theo. Schmauk's *The Confessional Principle* with its translations of a number of Kolde's publications on the subject. But the first appeared in 1883 and was last revised in 1908, while the other, which was finished in 1909, was published in 1911. Consequently neither presents an adequate account of the most recent researches in the history of the Augsburg Confession. For the same reason neither Dr. Richard's capable book, *The Confessional History of the Lutheran Church,* nor Dr. Bente's careful introduction to the *Triglotta* (1921) are any longer adequate.

As a lack of acquaintance with the latest investigations was shown even in the publications of the present Jubilee year I resolved at the last moment, in the second half of this year, to attempt the preparation of a volume that would provide our Church with a source book of the history of the Confession and also with an historical introduction, which would both reflect the present status of scientific investigation and also include the most recent documentary discoveries.

The collection of sources is designed to bring together the most important documents necessary for a clear understanding of the basis and origin of the Augsburg Confession, its most important texts, its defence and its influence on other lands. Almost all of these documents were available in German or Latin but were nowhere gathered together and had to be sought in the most widely scattered sources and in various publications

that have appeared from 1730 to 1930. Even Kolde's collection is restricted to what is most essential. Hardly one-third of the material has been available in English. What was at hand has been thankfully used, though not without considerable revision and with the additions made necessary by the most recent investigations. The close relation between Luther's "Confession" of 1528, the Schwabach Articles and the Augsburg Confession, which was first recognized and stressed by Wernle (*Der evangelische Glaube nach den Hauptschriften der Reformatoren,* I. *Luther,* 1918, p. 268ff.) moved me to include this treatise in an English translation. The "Instruction for the Visitors" is given because there is no other document that so clearly portrays the contemporary church regulations of the Electorate of Saxony to which there is such frequent reference in the Confession itself. Indeed the Elector sent a copy of the *Instruction* to the Emperor at Innsbruck for the express purpose of informing him about these matters. There is also a clear connection between the doctrinal statements here made and certain articles of the Augustana. Many other documents would gladly have been included had space permitted.

The four recensions of the Confession, which are here presented for the first time in the convenient form of parallels and of which the actual text of the second has only been known since July of this year, require a special word of explanation. All four have been printed in German as it is to be expected that the students of history, for whom they have a special value, will have a reading knowledge of German. Out of consideration for the readers three of them have been printed in a slightly modernized form, but the text of June 25th is given in its original antiquated form, so as to reproduce the very pronunciation and verbal form in which the Confession was read before the Emperor and Diet at Augsburg. It is true that this copy has turned the Saxon ino the South German dialect, or, more properly speaking, as no single word has been changed, preserving it in South German orthography. The *Editio Prin-*

ceps has been added in the fourth place to show what considerable alterations it already discloses.

According to the original plan the historical introduction was to have included three additional chapters: 1. The Augsburg Confession in America; 2. Luther's Share in the Augsburg Confession; 3. The Permanent Value of the Augsburg Confession. The first two have already been written but lack of space compels the postponement of their publication. They will probably appear in the course of several months under the title of "New Studies in the Augsburg Confession." The three chapters to which the introduction had to be limited make no pretence at being anything except a concise and accurate synopsis of the latest results of historical investigation concerning the Augustana. On this account I have frequently simply adopted the presentation of particular investigations that have been given by the scholars who made them. Everything that has appeared in Germany up to October of this year has been carefully considered. Students of history will at once perceive how, in some particulars, the picture of the origin of the Confession has been completely changed by the new sources that have been made available in July and August of this year. The third chapter presents much that is independent of the investigations of others. Over a hundred questionnaires were sent to various European countries, and beyond, to gain accurate information concerning the extent of the use of the Confession at the present time.

In spite of the most arduous labors this book could not have been prepared in such a limited time if I had not had assistants. My good friend the Rev. Dr. J. C. Mattes of Scranton, Pa., and my beloved colleague, Prof. Julius Bodensieck of the Wartburg Seminary in Dubuque, have provided the translations of almost all the documents, printed in the second part of the book, that appear here for the first time in an English version. Only a deep and unselfish interest in the work united with real scholarship made it possible for

them to perform their often difficult task in such an acceptable manner. In addition Dr. Mattes undertook the tedious task of making verbal revisions of a considerable part of the manuscript.

Besides them my former pupil, the Rev. Wm. Hertel of Somonauk, Ill., gave untiring assistance in other work of translation. For the smooth rendering of the difficult Italian document (No. 23) I am indebted to Prof. W. F. Kracher of Dubuque, Iowa.

I have still to express my gratitude to the senior among the church historians of this country, Dr. H. E. Jacobs of Mt. Airy, Philadelphia, who cheerfully granted the privilege of using the translations he had made, and to the Board of Publication of the United Lutheran Church for permission to use similar materials covered by its copyrights. I would likewise convey my appreciation to the many scholars, both personal acquaintances and those personally unknown, the librarians and mission directors of many lands, who have replied to my inquiries or have otherwise assisted in furnishing necessary information.

Professor Ottersberg of Waverly has prepared the index and much clerical work was done by the Rev. P. Moeller in Waterville, Ohio.

With the publication of this volume the Wartburg Publishing House terminates its independent existence. For almost thirty years it made possible the publication of many of my works. Now it has surpassed all its previous efforts in the ready co-operation manifested in this undertaking. It has not inquired about the profits that might be expected—and in this case the returns will hardly cover the outlay—but only questioned, as it has always done through its whole career, its ability to render to the Church that service which it recognized as its proper duty. So I would express my heartfelt thanks both to it and to its Board of Directors.

The reader will find some inaccuracies in punctuation and

capitalization. They find their explanation in the fact that the printery was ordered to close on December 31; consequently the proof reading had to be done in undue haste.

And now I offer this work to the Church in whose service it has been written. May it find readers whose hearts are still warmed with love for their Augustana.

M. REU.

Wartburg Seminary,
December 15, 1930.

CONTENTS

Preface III
Contents IX
Abbreviations XII

First Part: Historical Introduction

Chapter One: The Origin of the Confession 3
Chapter Two: The Defense of the Confession 114
Chapter Three: The History of the Confession 142
a. Germany 142; b. Austria 158; c. Czecho-Slovakia 163; d. Hungary, Jugoslavia, and Transsylvania 167; e. Poland and Baltic Provinces 176; f. Scandinavia 182; g. England 188; h. Netherlands 194; i. France 197; k. Other European Countries 199; l. America 202; m. In Other Parts of the World 207.
Historical and Bibliographical Notes 214

Second Part: Collection of Sources

1. Instruction of the Visitation Commissioners *3
Translated by Dr. John C. Mattes
2. Luther's Confession, March 1528 ..... *23
Translated by Dr. John C. Mattes
3. The Imperial Proposition, Speyer, 1529 ..... *32
Translated by Dr. B. J. Kidd
4. The Resolution of the Majority, Speyer, 1529 ..... *33
Translated by Dr. B. J. Kidd
5. The Protest of the Evang. Minority, Speyer, 1529.....*487
Translated by Prof. J. Bodensieck
6. The Secret Agreement, Speyer, 1529 ..... *34
Translated by Prof. J. Bodensieck
7. Instruction for the Meeting at Rotach, 1529..... *38
Translated by Prof. J. Bodensieck
8. The Schwabach Articles, Summer, 1529 ..... *40
Translated by Dr. H. E. Jacobs
9. Luther's Stand at Marburg, Oct. 1529 ..... *44
Translated by Prof. J. Bodensieck and Dr. H. E. Jacobs
10. The Recess of Schwabach, Oct. 1529 ..... *47
Translated by Prof. J. Bodensieck

11. Bucer's Critique of the Schwabach Articles *49
Translated by Prof. J. Bodensieck
12. Instruction for the Meeting at Schmalkalden *58
Translated by Prof. J. Bodensieck
13. Brueck's Reasons Against Union, Nov.-Dec. 1529 ..... *60
Translated by Prof. J. Bodensieck
14. The Recess of Schmalkalden, Dec. 1529 ..... *67
Translated by Prof. J. Bodensieck
15. The Imperial Summons to the Reichstag, 1530 ..... *69
Translated by Prof. J. Bodensieck
16. Instruction to Hans von Dolzig, March 1530 ..... *72
Translated by Prof. J. Bodensieck
17. Archduke Ferdinand to Duke George, Jan. 1529 ..... *78
Translated by Prof. J. Bodensieck
18. The Dukes of Bavaria to the University of Iugolstadt..... *79
Translated by Prof. J. Bodensieck
19. The Torgau Articles, March 1530 ..... *79
Translated by Dr. H. E. Jacobs
20. The First Draft of Melanchthon's Preface, April 1530..... *91
Translated by Dr. John C. Mattes
21. Changes of and Supplements to the First Draft..... *95
Translated by Dr. John C. Mattes
22. Dr. Eck's 404 Articles, March 1530 ..... *97
a. The Dedication, translated by Prof. Bodensieck.
b. Preface to the Printed edition, translated by Dr. Jacobs.
c. The 404 Articles, translated by Dr. H. E. Jacobs, supplemented and revised.
23. Campegius' Instruction to the Emperor, May 1530.....*499
Translated by Prof. F. W. Kracher
24. The Elector's Letter to Luther, May 11, 1530.....*121
Translated by Schmauk-Benze
25. Melanchthon's Letter to Luther, May 11, 1530.....*122
Translated by Schmauk-Benze
26. Luther's Answer to the Elector, May 15, 1530.....*123
Translated by Schmauk-Benze
27. Melanchthon's First Draft of Art. 28, May, 1530 *123
Translated by Dr. H. E. Jacobs
28. The Count of Neuenahr's Letter, May, 1530 .....*126
Translated by Prof. J. Bodensieck
29. The Emperor's Message to the Elector, May 24, 1530.....*128
Translated by Prof. J. Bodensieck
30. The Elector's Reply to the Emperor, May 31, 1530.....*130
Translated by Prof. J. Bodensieck
31. Melanchthon's First Preface, May, 1530 .....*137
Translated by Schmauk-Benze

32. Melanchthon's Draft of the Conclusion *144
Translated by Dr. John C. Mattes
33. Luther's Admonition to the Clergy, June 1530.....*146
Translated by Dr. John C. Mattes
34. The Evangelical's Answer to the Emperor About Preaching, June 17, 1530. .....*156
Translated by Schmauk-Benze
35. Luther's Letter to Philip of Hesse.....*159
Translated by Dr. John C. Mattes
36. Brueck's Preface to the Confession, June 23, 1530.....*162
Translated by the Joint Committee
37. The Oldest Form of the Confession, May 31, 1530 .....*166
38. The Revised Form of the Confession, June 15, 1530.....*166
39. The Final Form of the Confession, June 25, 1530.....*167
40. The German Version of the Editio Princeps *167
41. The Representations of Campegius, End of June, 1530.....*304
Translated by Dr. B. J. Kidd
42. Four Letters from Augsburg to Luther, June 25-26.....*308
Translated by Dr. Mattes and Prof. Bodensieck
43. Five Letters of Luther to Augsburg, June 27-30.....*314
Translated by Schmauk-Benze, revised
44. Luther's Letter to the Archbishop of Mainz.....*319
Translated by Dr. John C. Mattes
45. First Draft of the Confutation, July 8, 1530.....*326
Translated by Prof. J. Becker and Prof. Bodensieck
46. Declaration that no more Articles will be handed in, July 10, 1530 .....*343
Translated by Schmauk-Benze
47. Thre Letters of Luther to Augsburg, July 9-13.....*345
Translated by Dr. Mattes and Schmauk-Benze, revised
48. Confutatio Pontificia, Aug. 3, 1530.....*348
Translated by Dr. H. E. Jacobs
49. Five Letters of Luther to Augsburg, Aug. 26-28.....*383
Translated by Schmauk-Benze, revised
50. Baumgaertner's Report to Speyer, Sept. 13 .....*388
Translated by Rev. W. Hertel
51. Recess of the Reichstag, Sept. 22, 1530 .....*390
Translated by Prof. J. Bodensieck
52. Prima Delineatio Apologiae, Sept. 22.....*392
Translated by Dr. John C. Mattes
53. A few Articles of the Variata of 1540.....*398
Taken from Hall's "Harmony of Confessions," revised by Dr. H. E. Jacobs
54. The Confessio Saxonica, 1551 .....*409
Translation in "An Harmony of Confessions," 1586

55. The Confessio Wuerttembergica, 1551 .....*418
Translation in "An Harmony of Confessions," 1586
56. Confessio Bohemica, 1575 .....*424
Translated by Rev. W. Sandrock
57. Confessio Pentapolitana, Aug., 1549, together with parts of the Confessio Heptapolitana, Dec., 1559, and of the Confessio Scepusiana, Oct. 1569 .....*435
58. Formula Pii Consensus for Transylvania, 1572.....*440
59. Articles agreed upon by the Commissioners of Henry VIII and the Wittenberg Theologians, 1536 .....*554
60. The Thirteen Articles agreed upon at London, 1538 .....*468
61. The "American Recension of the Augsburg Confession," 1855 .....*479
Notes *512
Index *515

Abbreviations. C. R. = Corpus Reformatorum.
Enders = Luthers Briefwechsel, edited by Enders.
Erl. Ed. = Erlangen Edition of Luther's Works.
W. Ed. = Weimar Edition of Luther's Works.

FIRST PART

Historical Introduction

FIRST CHAPTER

THE ORIGIN OF THE AUGSBURG CONFESSION

Theodor Kolde, Theodor Brieger, Hans von Schubert, and Wilhelm Gussmann—these are the men who during the last thirty years have helped us to an accurate and correct understanding of the origin of the Augsburg Confession.[1] Since 1908, when H. von Schubert began his investigations of the various events leading up to this Confession, it has become clearer than ever that all these events depend on two concepts and the facts connected with them: BUENDNIS and BEKENNTNIS, federation and confession. In accord with these investigations it is also necessary to distinguish three, instead of two periods: The first period aiming at a political federation of the Protestant forces; the second, the period of disintegration of these forces, and the third, in which, a political federation made way for a confessional union, which found expression in the Augsburg Confession.

While the lines of demarkation between the first two periods are obvious, those between the second and third are not so distinct, since the period of political disintegration was brought about by the emphasis upon the confession and so was preparatory for the third period.

a. The Period of Political Federation.

The Second Diet of Speyer, 1529, is the starting point for a correct understanding of the events leading up to the Augsburg Confession.

The decision of the First Diet of Speyer, 1526[3] had been very favorable to the Evangelicals. Although Emperor Charles V had demanded that the Edict of Worms, 1521,[2]

be carried through, thus ending the whole work of Reformation, the political situation prevented him from realizing his aim. Pope Clement VII, Francis I of France, the cities of Milan, Venice, and Florence had just then (1526) formed the alliance of Cognac against the Emperor, thereby bringing about the Second Italian war. Then, in the same year, Ferdinand, the brother of Charles V, by the death of Louis II, had inherited Bohemia and Hungary. Welcome as this inheritance may have been, it made acute the menace of the Turk for the Habsburg possessions. The Emperor was face to face with two enemies, either one strong enough to make trouble. In this situation he was powerless to prevent the Evangelical princes of North Germany, under the leadership of the Landgrave Philip of Hesse and the Elector Johann of Saxony, from forming a confederacy at Torgau in 1526. Nor could he prevent them from forcing a decision at the First Diet of Speyer in 1526, which gave them, in the matter of the Reformation, a free hand for the following years. Two resolutions were decisive. On the 7th of August, the Diet decreed that, for establishing religion and maintaining peace and order, it was necessary that a lawful general or provincial council for Germany be held within a year. The Emperor was to come to Germany as soon as possible to arrange it. Of still greater importance was the decree of August 27. Until the council met, each estate was to so live, govern and conduct itself as it hoped to answer to God and His Imperial Majesty. In form this was merely a postponement of the religious question. In reality, however, it was a charter of mutual toleration. Each estate was left free to regulate its religious affairs as it saw fit. We know in what measure they made use of this decree. During the years, 1526 to 1529, the Reformation struck firm and deep root in many districts, nor was the Emperor able to prevent it.

However, when the Second Diet of Speyer was called for February 21, 1529, the political situation had completely changed.[4] The Emperor had signed a treaty at Barcelona with the Pope, in June 1528, and expected to negotiate peace with Francis I which was actually signed in July at Cambray. On the Evangelical side the Landgrave Philip had seriously injured their cause by the notorious Pack affair. The Lutherans came to Speyer disorganized and discouraged to face a compact, confident Catholic opposition. The Emperor, still detained in Spain, was unable to be present and so his brother Ferdinand presided. According to the summons[5] (Second Part, 3), the Diet was to take up the matters of the Turkish invasion and the religious schism in Germany. The Emperor also promised in this summons, that, since his relations with the Pope had improved, he would soon call a general council in order to bring about unity of faith. But until such a council could be held, the sovereigns, both spiritual and temporal, were forbidden, under penalty of the ban, to allow their subjects to join any false faith or new sect. Thus, the Emperor, upon his own authority, declared null and void the Speyer decree of 1526.

Until recently this has been generally believed. But Kuehn[5] furnished proof in 1927—more detailed in 1929—that the well known Imperial proposition which led to the severe decree and so to the protest of the Evangelicals, had been substituted by Ferdinand because that of the Emperor, who was then in Spain, had not reached the Diet in time. When it finally did reach Speyer it proved to be very much milder in its demands. We present it in Part Two as document No. 3a. Here Ferdinand, as so often, again proved to be the firebrand. When, however, the Emperor's document arrived, the events had taken their course and Charles evidently backed up his brother.

What stand would the Diet take toward the proclamation offered them as Imperial? In a resolutions committee of eighteen, there were only three Evangelicals, the Elector of Saxony, Jacob Sturm of Strassburg, and Christopher Tetzel of Nuernberg. They, obviously, were not able to accomplish anything. The majority recommended the revocation of the Decree of 1526[6] (Second Part 4). The Edict of Worms was to be enforced in such a way that, in those territories where it was in force, secession to the Evangelical faith was still prohibited. In the territories where the new faith had found entrance, and from which it could not be expelled without the use of arms, all further innovations were rigidly to be avoided until the meeting of the proposed council. Sects, who denied the sacrament of the true Body and Blood of Christ, were not to be tolerated; Anabaptists were to be suppressed everywhere and all religious books were to be under censorship. Although the three Evangelical members of the committee refused to sign this report, the majority report was adopted by the Diet on April 19, and became a law of the Empire.

The Evangelicals were much alarmed by this action of the Diet, all the more so because it was understood to be merely a first step in the Emperor's policy. Much more drastic measures were expected to follow. George Vogler, the Chancellor of the Margrave of Brandenburg-Ansbach, was commissioned to draw up a formal reply. When presented, King Ferdinand refused to accept it and declared the incident closed. The Evangelicals, however, were successful in having their Protest read in the Diet and so included in the minutes. They furthermore refrained from attending any subsequent sessions of the Diet. On the following day, April 20, the Protest was rewritten, enlarged in form, but unchanged as to contents. In this form it was signed by John, Elector of

Saxony, George, the Margrave of Brandenburg-Ansbach, Ernst, Duke of Brunswick-Lueneburg, Philip, Landgrave of Hesse, and Wolfgang, Prince of Anhalt. On April 22, these protesting princes were joined by fourteen imperial cities: Strassburg, Nuernberg, Ulm, Constanz, Lindau, Memmingen, Kempten, Noerdlingen, Heilbronn, Reutlingen, Isny, St. Gallen, Weissenburg in Franconia, and Windsheim.

This Protest[7], as it is expressly named, has been rightly called the *Instrumentum Magnum* of the Reformation (Second Part, 5). Two reasons are given for protesting against the decree of the Diet and refusing to be bound by it. The first is constitutional: Since a council had been promised to consider religious matters, but none had been called, a mere majority cannot set aside this unanimous Decree of 1526. The second reason is a religious one: The Decree contains matters that "concern the glory of God and the welfare and the soul's salvation of every one of us"; as to these things they are pledged in Baptism and by the divine Word to hold God as highest King and Lord of lords. In matters of religion the Word of God alone can decide.

We give the full text of the "Protest" in the Second Part of this book (document No. 5), here we call attention only to a few high lights: "In matters concerning the honor of God, the welfare and salvation of our souls, each stands for himself and must give account before God. Therefore, in this sphere no one can make it another's duty to do or to decide less or more, which one is not bound to do for other honest, well-founded and good reasons. If we would concede to the Decree, we would not only implicitly but openly deny our Lord and Saviour Christ and His holy Word, which beyond all doubt we hold to be pure, clear, clean and right, and (would) not confess that He has redeemed us from sin, death, the devil and hell and would give the Lord Christ

ground also to deny us before His heavenly Father." In answer to the Decree's demand that the preaching of the Word of God be in accordance with the teachings of the Church, the "Protest" states: "That would be agreeable if all parties were agreed as to what is the true Holy Christian Church. But as long as there is a great contention about this *"we propose to abide by the Word of God alone, since indeed according to the command of God nothing else shall be preached, and to make clear and explain one text of holy divine Scripture by another; as indeed this same holy divine Scripture, in all things needful for Christian men to know, will be found in itself clear and bright enough to illumine all darkness. Therefore we purpose, with the grace and help of God, to abide by it to the end, that only the Word of God and the holy Gospel of the Old and New Testament, as contained in the biblical books, shall be preached clearly and purely, and nothing that is against it. For with that, as the one truth and the correct rule of all Christian doctrine and life, no one can err or fall, and whoso builds on it and endures shall prevail against all the gates of hell.* Nevertheless, on the other hand, all human additions and trifles shall fall, and cannot stand before God. And if this third announcement of our evident grievances is rejected . . . then we herewith *protest* and testify openly before God, our sole Creator, Preserver, Redeemer and Savior, who alone searches and knows all hearts, and therefore will judge justly, likewise before all men and creatures, that we for ourselves, our subjects and in behalf of all, each and every one, consider null and void the entire transaction and the intended decree, which in the afore-mentioned or in other cases, is undertaken, agreed, and passed, against God, His holy Word, all our soul's salvation and good conscience, (and we protest) not secretly nor willfully, but for reasons above stated and others good and well founded." What, in 1521, Luther alone advocated at Worms was in this critical

hour accepted and confessed by a third of the German Empire.

Human calculations now suggested and even demanded a *political federation* of the signers of the Protest for the protection of the confessed gospel and the newly organized Church. It was particularly the Landgrave of Hesse who thought so and did everything to reach this goal, a goal which had been for sometime in his mind and which, with others, he had done much to reach. In North and Middle Germany the previously mentioned Torgau-Magdeburg agreement with Saxony and Hesse as a solid bloc, had materialized in 1525-26, while in South Germany certain Evangelical cities, with Ulm, Strassburg and Nuernberg as a nucleus, had combined since the *Day of Ulm* in 1524. Finally, with the establishing of the "Burgrecht" between Zuerich and Constanz in the year 1527,[8] a third Evangelical group had come into being which soon energetically sought to establish itself in South Germany and, after winning Muehlhausen, had reached Strassburg. That the North German and Swiss group could not meet on common ground can be readily understood. Many things worked together to make this difficult. On the one hand[9] it was the ancient difference of culture between north and south, based on nationality and blood, the difference between monarchial and democratic government, the position occupied by the Elector of Saxony in the Empire, and the traditional friendship between the houses of Saxony and Austria, which was even then a matter of remark; and on the other hand it was the fact that Zuerich was no longer a part of the German Empire and considered Austria its mortal enemy. All this had the effect of driving these groups farther apart. Then probably each group thought itself strong enough alone to ward off any possible Catholic attack, the North depending upon its military power, the

South upon its influence, wealth and cleverness. To this must be added the undeniable difference in the conception of the Gospel which Zwingli, as a matter of principle, would not let go beyond Humanism, while Luther and the Wittenbergers viewed everything from the standpoint of the tortured soul in search of a merciful God. Then to all these old differences had come a new one which went far deeper: the difference in matters of Holy Communion. Zwingli's stand in the matter must have appeared to Luther as the laying of vandal hands on the Most Holy and emptying it of its contents, and as in sharpest contrast to his fundamental views regarding the divine and human, the eternal and temporal. Probably the North was also aware of the questionable tactics which Zwingli and his followers had used in the controversy regarding the Sacrament.[9a] Adding to this also the Diet's decree that sects denying the Sacrament of the true Body and Blood of Christ would not be tolerated, one can very readily understand why cities like Constanz and St. Gallen gladly signed the Protest, but that on the part of the North Germans little enthusiasm was shown towards a political alliance with them. The "Protest" itself, to be sure, was quite negative in tone. It did not confess a certain doctrine but limited itself to the rejection of all authorities outside of Scripture. In this point the North Germans agreed with the Swiss. There were also enough differences between the middle group of the South German cities and the North Germans. Capito, Bucer and Sturm of Strassburg, the most powerful of the South German cities that had become Evangelical, had championed a doctrine concerning the Sacrament which, although not Zwinglian, differed essentially from that of the Wittenbergers. But in the great hour at Speyer the consciousness of unity was stronger than that of difference, indeed, the latter receded so far into the background that the Landgrave

Philip and Sturm of Strassburg succeeded in uniting these two groups into a *political federation.*

On the same 22nd of April, when the Catholic leaders signed the fateful Decree, the leaders of the minority, Saxony, Hesse, Nuernberg, Ulm and Strassburg (Margrave George of Brandenburg, although invited, had not yet joined,) united in a "particular secret agreement" (Second Part, 6). The object of this agreement was the defence of their faith when attacked or whenever hindered in the visitation of their churches under pretext of spiritual jurisdiction. In reading this document one is amazed to note in what detail questions of organization were already being discussed. It shows what preliminary work Sturm of Strassburg and Philip of Hesse must have done when they had met the previous Christmas in Worms.

This secret agreement was a great triumph for Philip.[10] His fond hope,[11] the political union of all Protestants and with it a solid front against the Catholic Emperor and Rome, seemed to become a reality. At the time, when Germany permanently separated into a Catholic and Evangelical part, he not only preserved the unity and union of North and South German Protestantism, but also the unity of the new German intellectual life. A number of prospective members for this little group were at once at hand. The addition of Margrave George of Brandenburg-Ansbach, as much to the interest of the Princes as of Nuernberg, and suggested by the negotiations of the previous year between Saxony and Brandenburg, was at once considered. Furthermore, it was presupposed that all who had joined in the Protest would show a willingness to join the federation. Beyond that there were the members of the North German Torgau-Magdeburg confederacy, and to the south the German cities which already were united in a German-Swiss federation. This brought even Zuerich

in line as a possible member of the new union. To the north the way would easily lead, by way of Hamburg and Schleswig-Holstein, to Denmark and Sweden. But would not Zwingli's and Luther's difference in doctrine, concerning the Sacrament, bar the way? Even for this the Landgrave had an answer. He was certain that a religious colloquy would clear the way of all obstacles. He had already agreed with Sturm of Strassburg; on the same day (April 22) he wrote to Zwingli; Melanchthon would arrange the matter with Luther, and even the Elector himself was now not adverse. At the beginning of June the final negotiations concerning the federation were to be held at Rotach in Franconia. The federation could also be advanced when at the end of May they would meet in Nuernberg to dispatch their representatives with the appeal to the Emperor, as had already been decided in Speyer.[12]

The Landgrave now seemed to be the leader of Protestantism and everything apparently hinged on the thought of a political federation. "Federation," was the cry. Little was heard of "Confession." It is not once mentioned in the secret alliance of April 22. And in the instructions for Rotach[13] (Second Part, 7) the confessional standpoint, for which possessions and blood are to be sacrificed if necessary, is briefly mentioned as "the articles which are to be discussed at the council" (to which they had again appealed at Speyer). True, "the divine Word," "the holy Gospel, our faith and religion," are mentioned in the recess of the convention, called *Confederations-Notel*,[14] but nowhere are they defined nor is it stated how they are to be understood.

b. The Period of Political Disintegration.

Melanchthon had been at Speyer but had not insisted upon a separation from the Swiss and Strassburgers and also had declared his willingness to take part in the religious

colloquy planned by the Landgrave. The meeting was hardly past when his eyes were opened. He bitterly reproached himself for remaining silent regarding the differences in the doctrine of the Sacrament which separated the Wittenbergers from the Swiss and their faction. He now became convinced that a clear cut separation from the Swiss at Speyer would have made a more favorable impression upon the Roman Catholics and would probably have helped to obtain a more agreeable decision. He also clearly saw that the Landgrave merely wished to use this religious colloquy as a foundation for the desired political federation of all Protestants. Melanchthon probably returned home from Speyer on the 6th of May. As early as May 14, he wrote John Fredrick, the Elector's son, with whom he had had a personal discussion in Weimar regarding the matter. He enclosed a copy of his *Judicium* which he had there presented orally. In it he stated: "Personally I am not afraid to discuss the Sacrament with Oecolampadius and his ilk, and so I have not refused it to the Landgrave . . . .; to deal with Zwingli is entirely useless. So I thought that not he, but Oecolampadius is to be summoned; for if he has been summoned, it is not to be expected that he will come . . . . I persist in this that I will have nothing to do with the Strassburgers as long as I live, for I know that Zwingli and his associates are wrong in their writings regarding the Sacrament" (C. R. I, 1069 f.). Three days later, May 17, he opened his heart in letters to Camerarius, Spengler and Baumgaertner in Nuernberg regarding the union. To Camerarius he wrote: "I have (since my return from Speyer) been so restless that I almost died. I suffered all the pains of hell" (C. R. I, 1067). To Spengler: "My conscience is in no small peril regarding the matter. In the mean time I am helpless about it" (C. R. I, 1069). To Baumgaertner: "My conscience urges me to write

you regarding this matter" (C. R. I, 1070). But Melanchthon went still farther in these letters to his friends in Nuernberg. He directly asked for aid in his efforts to thwart the federation. For to Baumgaertner he wrote in the same letter: "I plead with you to do everything you can that the Zwinglians will not be admitted to the federation. It is not right to defend their ungodly opinions (*impiam sententiam*) or to strengthen those who follow godless dogmas (*impium dogma*) so that their subtle poison may spread . . . . Some of us do not reject the association with the Strassburgers but I beg of you, act so that this shameful federation (*turpis societas*) be not established." To Spengler again he wrote: "I adjure you for God's sake that you take care of this matter with all your wisdom and piety, otherwise not only the Empire but religion itself will be endangered." Melanchthon knew why he turned to Nuernberg. The pastors there, especially Osiander, were strong opponents of the Sacramentarians; also, in future negotiations, the Saxons would be more successful if the Nuernbergers were in agreement with them and came to their aid. Then, also, the representatives of the signers of the Speyer Protest were to meet in Nuernberg on the 23rd of May for the purpose of instructing the delegates who were to submit their appeal to the Emperor.

What was it that prompted the gentle and reserved Melanchthon to take such steps? Was it his opposition in the matter of the Sacrament that disquieted him and drove him to attempt to frustrate the federation before it became a reality? Certainly, but this was not the only reason. From his letter to John Schwebel (C. R. I, 1046 f.), written from Speyer, it is evident that neither Zwingli's nor the Strassburg doctrine of the Sacrament offended him as much as it did Luther. There was much, beside the Sacrament, that could cause him and many other Wittenbergers to reflect.

H. von Schubert has formulated these doubts in the following words:[15] "Conditions in Saxony were already more stable. The second Evangelical ruler was on the throne, the Evangelical succession was secure; visitations were held and order maintained; Catechisms were being written for the unlearned; Mayence had withdrawn the episcopal jurisdiction from Saxony and Hesse; Hesse was even the proud possessor of an Evangelical university. However, the city republics were still struggling with the Catholic minority, among them those high and mighty in the council; Strassburg had only as recently as February abolished the mass; the Evangelical victory had been won but was not completely established in Ulm; in Augsburg the Catholics, Lutherans, Zwinglians and Anabaptists were quarreling. It, also, had had a deep impression on the Wittenbergers that even such cities as Schwabian-Hall, the home of Brenz, had lacked the courage to join the Protest at Speyer. To be sure, it is never enticing for monarchies to federate with republics! Did it not weaken one's own position to unite with such unstable people? And even if one was certain that the Reformation had finally been victorious in certain localities, what peculiar ideas these people held! One would also be responsible for them in case of a federation. Since a new center, independent of Wittenberg, had been established in Switzerland, from whence a strong uncontrollable stream of propoganda poured down upon the cities; since the peasant uprisings and the Anabaptists had thrown everything in confusion, any sort of doctrine seemed possible there. Did not even the very foundation of the old *and* new doctrines tremble, even faith in the two natures in Christ and the ancient doctrine of the Trinity? Did not justification by faith give way again to a doctrine of good works, and did not Scripture share her authority with the inner workings of the Holy

Spirit? Were not all visible means of grace ignored and Baptism, especially infant Baptism set aside! The worst rumors were faithfully carried to Wittenberg by good friends. Not everything, however, was untrue. Schwenckfeld at that time came to Strassburg and remained there for years, the guest of a Strassburg pastor; Capito also caused Bucer deep embarrasment; Zwick, in Constanz, wrote about the last conversations of Hetzer, who had been executed for bigamy and adultery: "Would to God we had printed it!" and Thomas Blaurer published a report of his edifying end: Right or wrong, Wittenberg believed anything. And this was what a Christian government was to defend even with the sword! And at what price? The end could only be the ruin of the unity of the church, especially the German. For this ideal of unity was by no means extinct in Wittenberg. Saxony still kept alive the supposition that they were on the way towards accomplishing the reformation and cleansing of the true Catholic Church, of which the Emperor, the true supreme authority, was regarded as the protector. On the other hand, however, the spirit of revolution was also felt, according to which, in line with Zwingli's well known words, empire and emperor were as much Roman offshoots as the papacy. The association with such people must be shunned. Care was to to be taken not to let Zurich and the confederates entangle one in strange plans." Two sentences in Melanchthon's letter to Spengler, "There is danger that from these beginnings not only a change in the Empire may follow," and "Not only the Empire but also religion is in serious danger" are proof sufficient for this statement of Schubert.

Whether Luther at this time, 1529, still seriously believed that the whole church of Germany could be reformed and retain the Emperor as protector I will not answer now. He certainly knew all of these doubts and shared most of them; decisive

for him, however, were the religious reasons against the projected federation. Both are apparent in his significant letter of May 22 to the Elector.[16] We quote it here *in extenso*:

"Grace and peace in Christ! Serene Highness, most gracious Lord, M. Philip has brought me, among other things, the news from the Diet that the Landgrave of Hesse is to establish a new federation with certain cities. All of which moves me not a little. For I was severely burned last year, when God by His wonderous grace relased us from the dangerous federation (Luther is thinking of the Pack affair). And although I hope God will continue to preserve us, and will give your Grace His Spirit, to keep you henceforth from all such and similar federations, I have, nevertheless, due to the prompting of my conscience, not been able to desist from writing to you, since one cannot be too diligent in circumventing the devil. Christ, our Lord, will hear our prayer and grant that, although the Landgrave continues his making of federations (May God have mercy on him), you be not fettered and bound by them, for we cannot even conceive of the trouble that would follow therefrom.

"*First of all* this is certain that such a federation does not come from God, or from trusting in God, but arises from human wit and human help alone, all of which is building without a good foundation and likewise is fruitless, aside from the fact that such a federation is unnecessary. For the mob of Papists have neither the courage nor the ability to undertake anything against which God has not already protected us with the wall of His might. So the federation will accomplish nothing more than incite the opposition to do the same and undertake for their protection and safety things they would otherwise not do. Then we must remember—it is probably very certain—that the Landgrave, after he has established such a federation, inasmuch as he is a restless young prince, might not keep the peace, but, as happened last year, may find cause not only to defend but attack. It is certainly not godly to assume this attitude, since no one is pursuing nor seeking us.

"*In the next place,* and this is the worst of all, we will be compelled to admit into this federation those who strive against God and the Sacrament, as wanton enemies of God and His Word. We shall all become participants in their blasphemy and become entangled with them. No more dangerous alliance could be undertaken to disgrace and suppress the Gospel and damn us in body and soul.

This is what the devil desires. If there is no other way, may God help your Highness to part from the Landgrave as I have heard that the Margrave (George) says he will. Our Lord Jesus Christ, who in the past has helped your electoral Grace without the Landgrave, yes, even marvelously against the Landgrave, will doubtless help and guide in the future.

"In the third place, God has always condemned such human alliances in the Old Testament, as Isaiah 30, 15 says, "in quietness and in confidence shall be your strength," for we are to be children of God in faith and trust. Are we to have such a federation then it will be given us without our planning and seeking as He promises in Matt. 6: "Take no heed therefore, all this shall be added unto you if ye seek the Kingdom of God." and St. Peter says: "Cast your burdens upon Him for He cares for you," and Isaiah: "Who art thou, that thou shouldest be afraid of a man." The Landgrave, who once has made such a great mistake, is not to be trusted, especially since there does not seem to be any change in him, nor has he experienced any repentance or sorrow for his sin.

"This I have written your Grace in the hope that Christ already has in a better and fuller measure given it into your heart. We pray, and will continue to pray, and hope to be heard, that God, the Father of all grace, would guide us and protect your Grace from all onsets and attacks of the devil. Amen. May your Grace pardon this letter."

This letter of Luther, containing as it did the principle "No federation without confessional unity," made a deep impression on the Elector. It agreed so completely with his own thoughts which the efforts of the Landgrave had been only momentarily able to repress. From now on all his actions were animated by the thought of *thwarting the planned federation or at any rate joining only such as were of the same faith.*

As early as May 19 he had stated, in a letter to Melanchthon,[17] that the religious colloquy, which was to formulate the basis for securing the Swiss as members of the federation, would at all cost be postponed. It would be still better, he wrote, to drop it, as well as the federation, entirely. At any

rate, no federation should be definitely established before the colloquy had established unity of faith. At the same time the Landgrave must be counterbalanced by such dependable Lutheran powers as Margrave George of Brandenburg-Ansbach, the Duke Ernest of Lueneburg and those other princes who were united by the Torgau-Magdeburg agreement. Like Melanchthon, he also turned his eyes to Nuernberg.[18] It was to bring them back from the course on which they had entered and prevent the consummation of the federation planned at Speyer as well as block the colloquy, fostered by the Landgrave. For this purpose Nuernberg was ideal not only because its pastors were, as has been stated, avowed enemies of the Sacramentarians but also because it was in close touch with the cities of South Germany. Then, also, it had been tentatively chosen as the place where the proposed colloquy was to be held. Chancellor Beyer, who was to be in Nuernberg on the 23rd of May to instruct the delegates who were to present the appeal to the emperor, was to do preliminary work along these lines. It would also be especially valuable for the consummation of these plans to get in touch with Margrave George of Brandenburg-Ansbach. It was well known that the latter cared little for the Sacramentarians and preferred to stand alone rather than enter a political federation. A conference[19] between the Elector and the Margrave at Coburg, late in October 1528, had already suggested co-operation between them. Then also Nuernberg and the Margrave were in such close relations that the City hardly would have undertaken anything definite without consulting the Margrave. So it need not surprise us to note that Chancellor Beyer also visited nearby Ansbach at the time of his stay in Nuernberg on May 23, or that the Margrave got in touch with Nuernberg regarding these matters late in May.[20] He evidently had decided to send a personal rep-

resentative to the meeting called at Rotach for June 7 where he actually was represented by Caspar von Seckendorf.

Although Luther's letter had made a deep impression on the Elector, so that he was all the more determined to prevent a federation with the South Germans and Swiss, it could not prevent the meeting of Rotach, which had been decided on in Speyer. But now it was to be the means, not of bringing about a permanent federation, for which purpose it was originally called, but to postpone, if not definitely block such a federation. Since H. von Schubert has published the actual text of the instruction given H. von Minckwitz, the Elector's representative at Rotach, this is clear[21] (Second Part, 7). According to these instructions Minckwitz, before he took part in the proposed meeting, was to come to an agreement with the representatives of Nuernberg that the whole action of April 22 be set aside. That, of course, was no longer possible, for Nuernberg's hands were already tied. Nuernberg had asked Spengler to work out a plan for a proposed federation which it had not only shown to the representatives of the Landgrave, who likewise were in session in Nuernberg on May 23, but had also on May 31, upon request, sent a copy to the Margrave. Then, on the 2nd of June, they submitted it to the Strassburgers, who then were on their way to Rotach.[22] Still in Nuernberg the Elector's representatives found a welcome support for the idea, that nothing definite should be decided in Rotach but that a later meeting was to be called at Schwabach the 24th of August. The Elector's representative was not compelled to show his cards to gain his goal. Several things seemed to justify the postponing of definite action.[26] The question concerning the number of troops each member of the federation was to furnish; regard for the Margrave, who, although represented in Rotach, had not definitely decided

to join the federation, and the question, now asked for the first time, whether the princes of the Torgau-Magdeburg federation of 1526 were to be admitted to the planned federation, all played an important part.

That Nuernberg, although it was able to meet the Elector's desires only partially, was completely won over to oppose a federation with Sacramentarians as well as the planned colloquy, may be seen from the fact that the Nuernberg council on June 22 sent an opinion of their pastors to Chancellor Beyer. In strong terms it undertook to prove "why it is not desirable to bring together, in this labyrinth of error of the Sacramentarians, these two mistaken parties to discuss their errors." and then especially emphasizes "a vast difference is to be made between believing and unbelieving members of a federation."[24] More significant, however, was the fact that the Brandenburger Chancellor Vogler, referring to the Rotach "Notel" issued a document,[25] "Points to be considered in proposed agreement," in which he clearly stated, "As to the fanaticism of the Strassburgers and others, we are definitely determined not to enter any federation with them." So Brandenburg had finally taken a definite stand. Now the Landgrave was also to be won over to this principle. To this end the Elector asked both the Margrave and the Landgrave to meet with him in Saalfeld for a personal conference. The Landgrave suspected at once why the meeting was being called and declared it unnecessary and at the same time warned against abandoning the South German cities. Since the Margrave was also prevented from coming, only the representatives of the three princes met at Saalfeld on July 8.

The Margrave had sent instructions with his representative, which left nothing to be desired in matter of clearness. These instructions were to be of the greatest importance

for the so-called Schwabach Articles and consequently also for the origin of the Augustana. Kolde has given us the most important passage from the "Ansbach Religionsakten," now preserved in Nuernberg (Tomus VII fol. 64 ff).[26] There it is stated:

"For the fifth part (it is necessary) that we, the electors, princes, and other estates, who are about to form a federation for our mutual aid, before and while we establish such a federation, mutually, yet definitely, compare the present status concerning the holy Christian faith and its ceremonies in all and every estates and cities ready to join the federation, what they teach and how they hold it in all their churches, institutions and monasteries. Also what position we are to take concerning the assertion of the bishops that the decision in matrimonial and similar affairs belongs under their ecclesiastical jurisdiction, until such time when a universal or general Christian council or national convention can be held. Then we know why we are giving each other help and aid and do not act each one according to his own mind and ideas . . . Our uncle's, the Elector of Saxony, etc., theologians and other teachers are well able to supply a Christian Order and a doctrinal summary based upon a good, firm, Christian foundation. Thereby further errors would be avoided and a unified faith and life established which undoubtedly would be a guide for others. Much that is Christian and good would certainly follow such unity. And especialy must we consider well and seriously whether we, even if Strassburg will not compare her doctrine of the Holy Sacrament and other matters with us, nevertheless should or want to enter a federation."

According to this the Margrave demanded, as a preliminary condition for a federation, nothing less than the *adoption of a uniform confession*, a uniform church order and an equal rule in all questions pertaining to churches, institutions and monasteries in all domains of those who wish to join the federation. A common, uniform church order for all Evangelical states had long been a favorite wish of the Margrave.[27] That, in view of the approaching council, the disputed articles were to be formulated and proven, he had already stated in a meeting with the Elector in the fall of 1528. At that

time the latter had also promised to have his scholars formulate the articles; Luther and the Wittenbergers had agreed to do the work.[28] What the result was at the time we do not know, although there is much that leads us to believe that the Wittenbergers kept the idea alive and therefore, as we shall directly see, showed their willingness to co-operate. However, it can now be shown by documents that the idea of formulating a confession of faith for the coming council, in the fall of 1528, came from the Margrave and that, in his instructions for Saalfeld, he again voiced the slogan: A political federation presupposes a common confession of faith; such a confession must, first of all, be formulated.

The Margrave's principles prevailed at the meeting in Saalfeld. Saxony, represented by H. von Minckwitz, and Brandenburg's representative, Caspar von Seckendorf, declared that on account of the Sacrament they could no longer be allied with Strassburg.[29] Due to this new development the representatives (Hesse was represented by Sigmund von Boyneburg) deemed a personal meeting of the princes unavoidable. It was to be held *before* the day in Schwabach where not only the princes but also the cities (therefore also Ulm and Strassburg) would be represented. Naumburg was designated as the place of meeting. The convention in Schwabach was to be postponed until St. Gall (16th of October).[29]

We must thank Kolde for the documentary proof of the Elector's reactions toward this arrangement. He found, in the *Ansbacher Religionsakten* (VII fo. 36), the Elector's statement in reference to the Rotach "Notel" which also has reference to the Margrave's instructions to his representatives in Saalfeld.[30] In connection with the general statement in the "Notel," "If any member of the federation is attacked on account of the divine Word, the holy Gospel or his faith" the Elector says: "So that no one, referring

to these general words, enter into a federation with anyone who is not one in the faith with the other members of the federation, who does not now or in the future agree with us in the matter of Baptism or the Sacrament, it is necessary, as Margrave George of Brandenburg has pointed out, to confess openly the articles on which this unity of faith and Christianity rests. And if any estate refuses to do this in one or more of these articles, he is to be barred from the federation. Also, if in future it is proven that an estate has fallen from one or more articles of the confession of faith, he shall, if found guilty, no longer be considered a member of the federation." Therefore the Elector wished to see the "Notel" supplemented so that only those were to enjoy the mutual aid who were attacked on account of the articles (appended in a special sheet) relating to the holy Gospel and the faith. So while Saxony ignored the Margrave's wishes regarding uniform church order, etc., it accepted in full and even augmented, his request regarding the formulating of an agreement concerning a confession of faith. They were, from the start, quite certain that under such conditions Strassburg, and probably other cities, "would withdraw from the federation and would not care to compare this article of Christianity with us (Saxons and Brandenburgers)." Still the consequences of these correct principles did not cause them to waver. The Margrave had already reckoned with the possibility, and the Elector agreed with him, that in their place such cities as Noerdlingen, Memmingen, Bibrach, Weissenburg and Windsheim could be gained.[31] Immediately before the day of Schwabach, Nuernberg was to receive their confidence. Above all it was necessary to win the Landgrave for their new plans. Both the Elector and the Margrave were well aware that this would be no simple matter; so in harmony

with their representatives at Saalfeld, they agreed that a personal meeting with him would be necessary.

It is easily understood that the decision of Saalfeld offended Landgrave Philip. While he had prepared everything to peacefully iron out existing differences between the leaders of the two factions—the official invitations for the Marburg Colloquy, to be held end of September, had been sent to Wittenberg on July 1—Saxony and Brandenburg, without even considering the possible success of the Hessian peace movement, followed a plan which was to shatter all of his dreams! He declared the intended meeting of the princes in Naumberg as unnecessary. Regarding the insinuation, that Strassburg and Ulm were not orthodox in matter of the Sacrament, he said: "Since this article is not of such supreme importance that our faith and salvation depends upon it—and, at that, Strassburg is not so very much at variance with us regarding this article since they also confess Christ in the Sacrament as do we—for these reasons and others we ought not to separate from them."[32] He also calls to attention that according to Scripture the erring are not to be "cast aside nor despised" all the more since they are willing to listen to "friendly discussions and instructions." He expresses the hope that the Elector will urge Luther and the others to adjust their differences with each other in a Christian and brotherly way." The Elector, however, did not let this deter him, even though he did substitute, as a place for the meeting, the town of Schleiz which was more accessible for the Hessians. On the 10th of August, he set the 16th of October as the date of the Colloquy of Schwabach while the meeting of the princes in Schleiz was to be held during the first week of October. This he did in spite of the fact that he must have been aware that it would conflict with the Marburg

Colloquy and so it would hardly be possible for the Landgrave to attend.

The new state of affairs, as definitely decided in Saalfeld, must have in some way, become known at once in Wittenberg. How else can we understand why Luther and Melanchthon who on the 22nd and 23rd of June still hesitatingly answered the Landgrave's invitation to the colloquy,[33] now, on July 8, and therefore at the time of the meting at Saalfeld, no longer have any qualms about attending,[33] in spite of the fact that it was not to be held in Nuernberg, where conditions would still have been tolerable, but in Marburg under the very eyes of the Landgrave. If only a confession of faith was formulated beforehand and adopted as the basis of the planned federation, then the colloquy had lost its terrors. Be the result what it might, it could not then have a baneful influence upon the course of events. If the Swiss and Strassburgers embraced the confession—which was hardly to be expected—then one could federate with them; if, however, as was to be expected, they rejected it, then the necessary basis would be lacking and they would withdraw voluntarily.

On the 23rd of September both the Elector and the Margrave urgently begged the Landgrave to appear personally in Schleiz on the 3rd of October. His reply,[34] that due to the Colloquy it would be impossible for him to be in Schleiz, made little impression on the other two princes. They came and held the meeting from October 3-6. The Landgrave was represented by several of his counsellors who, however, were instructed to agree to nothing regarding Strassburg and the Rotach "Notel." So it seemed that the other two princes would have little opportunity to come to an understanding with the Landgrave before the imminent meeting in Schwabach (October 16). This did not prevent them

from presenting a solid front against Strassburg. So they wrote an exhaustive letter and requested the Hessian delegates to deliver it in all haste to the Landgrave. Kolde has published this document for the first time.[35] In unmistakable language it announces the break with those of the South and, if the Landgrave persists in his stand, also with him. The princes declare that they could not, with a good conscience, think of defending with arms anyone who advocates a doctrine which they themselves, by the grace of God, "recognize as a sham and an unbelievable piece of business," and so important "that not only those who, for the sake of the doctrine, adhere to it are to be reckoned as unbelievers and under the wrath of God, but also every one who through association, assistance and aid shares in it." They also ask the Landgrave to ponder the fact that they "do not intend to enter a federation with such as are now or in future connected with these errors in matter of the Sacrament; neither with such who will not confess the chief articles of Christianity with us." Now since the Colloquy was past, it ought to be easily seen whether these enemies of the truth were willing to be instructed by the Word of God.

After the departure of the Hessian delegates they probably set to work formulating the instructions for the meeting in Schwabach. After the above, it is easy to guess their contents.[36] In conjunction with the above mentioned demands of the Margrave they stated: "In order not to federate with anyone who is not agreed, with every other member of the federation, in *one* true Christian faith, as well as in matter of Baptism and the Sacrament, it is absolutely necessary that they openly confess their faith, one to the other. And this confession is to be incorporated, article for article, in the constitution of such federation."

But were these articles of faith, again and again men-

tioned since the Brandenburger instructions for Saalfeld, actually already formulated or were they agreed on at Schleiz or shortly after that meeting?[37] To history they are known as the "*Schwabach Articles*" (Second Part, 8) since they were presented at Schwabach on the 16th of October. Until 1908 it was generally held that they were formulated shortly *after* the Marburg colloquy, immediately *before* the meeting in Schwabach, and that Luther was their author. It was thought that Luther, on his return from Marburg, had, upon request of the Elector, come to Schleiz from Eisenach by way of Weida and had there written the articles. Or, since Kolde has proven that Luther had not gone to Schleiz at all upon a counter command of the Elector, he had done so in Eisenach where he, with Melanchthon and Justus Jonas, had arrived on the 7th of October and remained for two days. Since Luther himself later on said of the articles, "It is true that I have helped in writing such articles (for they are not of me alone)" (E. E. 224, 337) we may also include Melanchthon and Justus Jonas, who were with him in Eisenach,[39] as the authors. Then on October 9, they probably were sent to the Elector who, on the following day sent a copy to his representative at Schwabach, H. von Minckwitz. He was to hand the articles, with a letter from the Elector, to the Council of Nuernberg so that they could fully inform themselves (letter and articles reached them on October 13) and with the Saxons and Brandenburgers plead a united cause at Schwabach on the 16th. Over against this H. von Schubert, in 1908, (on the basis of Kolde's fruitful investigations of the events between Rotach and Schwabach) furnished the proof that the Articles were not incidentally written during the journey but in the time between Saalfeld and Marburg. Or to be more exact between the 8th of July, or yet closer, the 26th of July—Melanchthon in a letter of that date to

Camerarius states that he is busy formulating a number of articles of faith[38]—and the 14th of September, the day Luther, Melanchthon and Justus Jonas were called to Torgau to discuss the "most important matters." They left for Torgau either on the 15th or 16th of September. Aside from other considerations H. von Schubert bases his conclusions on the following two points: 1. When on the 2nd of December at Schmalkalden, Saxony and Brandenburg were asked by Strassburg and Ulm to tone down the Articles of Schwabach, they declared, "upon their conscience they knew nothing they could change since *the articles of faith had been well considered and had been formulated by an impressive council of theologians and laymen.*"[40] There is little time between Marburg and Schwabach for such an important affair of state which commanded an impressive array of theological and lay counsellors. 2. The text of the instruction for Schwabach, *agreed upon in Schleiz,*[41] presupposes the Articles, for it states: "When the councellors reach Schwabach they are above all to demand that the basis of our federation, that is. our holy belief, and what we believe of the holy sacraments of Baptism and the Body and Blood of Christ be openly confessed and *at once present the articles of confession, which they have received with these instructions.* For us they are also to declare that neither can nor will enter a federation for mutual aid with anyone who does not now fully agree with us in our faith, in matter of the Christian Sacrament and other Christian usages, and remain therein." These reasons of Schubert's are decisive. Otherwise it would certainly seem odd that the Wittenberg theologians, in spite of the fact that both Saxony and Brandenburg recognized and emphasized the necessity of formulating articles of faith, and in spite of the fact that the Schwabach meeting was postponed until such articles could be secured and the Landgrave's agreement ob-

tained before the meeting, as well as the fact that they would be so valuable for the Marburg colloquy, would have waited until the last moment to formulate such articles. It is equally unbelievable that the Brandenburgers, who since the Nuernberg Diet in 1524 had been anxious to confer with other Evangelical states regarding the form of the Evangelical faith, and now since 1528 had again and again demanded a formulating of the sum of their articles of faith, had not demanded that these articles be submitted to them for a complete review by their theological and lay counsellors before they staked their whole future upon them. And again, since these articles of faith were finally to form the foundation of a political federation the Elector could hardly do otherwise than discuss the whole matter in detail with his secular counsellors. There was hardly time enough for this in October, but the summer between the meetings of Saalfeld and Marburg would have been ample. In this time the Articles of Schwabach, and with them the first part of the Augsburg Confession, came into being. From the deliberation of Brandenburg and Saxony in connection with Saalfeld and Rotach light is shed on a passage in the Articles of Schwabach.[42] When it is stated in Article XII: "This church is nothing else than the believers in Christ, who hold, believe and teach the above mentioned articles in all their parts and for this suffer persecution and martyrdom in the world," this is absolutely in agreement with the demands made by the Margrave, and also the Elector, that such general terms as "Gospel" and similar ones are not sufficient to determine the basis of church fellowship. From the above it is also seen how incorrect it is simply to name Luther as the author of the Articles of Schwabach. Although sentences in the Fifth (justification) and the Seventh Articles (the oral Word which produces faith) unmistakably point to Luther, yet according to his own words, mentioned

above, we must ascribe a considerable, if not the major part, to someone else, probably Melanchthon (compare my "New Studies in the A. C.").

While the Elector and Margrave, from October 3 on, were conferring in Schleiz, regarding the course to be followed at Schwabach, the well known Coloquy at Marburg between the Wittenbergers on one side and the Upper Germans and Swiss on the other had already begun.[43] It lasted (although the Strassburgers arrived on the evening of the 27th of September and the Wittenbergers on the morning of the 30th) from the first to the fourth of October and must be divided into two distinctly separate sections. The first section was taken up by private discussions between Luther and Oecolampadius and between Zwingli and Melanchthon. These discussions did not deal with the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper but with other articles of faith of which it was said, partly in truth and partly in error, that the Swiss had deviated from Scripture. According to Melanchthon's own statements they discussed original sin, the office of the ministry, the use of the sacraments, the Trinity, the divinity of Christ, justification by faith and the question how such a faith is obtained. In this both Luther and Melanchthon proceeded from the articles which they had formulated in the time between July and September (the so-called Articles of Schwabach). Although in regard these points the differences were cleared away, and the Swiss had "yielded," Luther, in the second section of the colloquy, the public session (Oct. 2-3), once more went back to these articles so, as Hedio reports, "those at home could not say that he was afraid to open his mouth." The following deliberations regarding the Holy Communion (October 2-3) are in their main parts well known or can be conveniently read in Koehler[43] and compared with the letters and documents which have been handed down to us.

In the main they were without results. But another thing has been nearly forgotten, namely, that on the evening of the 3rd of October, another private effort to unite was made which resulted in Luther making far-reaching concessions. Bernhard Bess[43] had again called attention to it in 1901; but in 1928 H. von Schubert gave us the facsimile of Oecolampadius' notes.[43] When Koehler, in 1929, made an effort to reconstruct the whole Colloquy, he republished these notes. We present the exact text of Luther's statement in the second part of this book. With it Luther, who for his stand in Marburg has ever since been decried as "obstinate," presented a proposition with which the Strassburgers may well have been satisfied. Both Zwingli and Oecolampad rejected Luther's offer because they could not interpret it in the sense of spiritual manducation, which they alone granted. So the Marburg colloquy ended, notwithstanding Luther's advances, with the well known Marburg Articles. These, in the first fourteen points, recount the apparent concord, but in the Fifteenth Article, in agreement with the Franconian-Saxon Articles (i.e. the so-called Articles of Schwabach), stated the difference in the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, which could not be settled. That Zwingli was also not really convinced regarding many of the fourteen points was soon apparent, and is manifest in his *Fidei Ratio*[44] which he sent in 1530 to Augsburg.

That the Marburg Articles, especially the already noted proposition of Luther's, had been of great value in promoting the co-operation of Erhard Schnepf with Ambrose Blaurer since 1534 in Wuerttemberg, and bringing about an understanding with the Strassburgers in the Wittenberg Concord of 1536, has been shown by von Schubert[43] but does not concern us here. Neither is this the place to consider the fact that the Landgrave, in the days before the arrival of the

Wittenbergers, seriously discussed the possibility of a Hessian-Zuerich federation with Zwingli, Sturm and Bucer. On the other hand, however, it must be noted that the Marburg Articles were important for the discussions which finally ended in the Augsburg Confession; here the Landgrave had an instrument at hand which went much farther in meeting the Strassburgers and Swiss than the Saxon-Franconian confession, and so, if necessary, could be used against it. For this reason we touched on the Marburg Colloquy. And for the further reason: The Marburg Colloquy did not produce the necessary foundation for a federation with the Swiss. Since Rotach the general trend of things was not toward concentration of the Evangelicals, but toward decentralization, not toward union but toward disintegration. In place of the cry "Federation, federation," the other, far louder cry, "Confession, confession," was heard. Schwabach and Schmalkalden led these lines of development to the end.

When the representatives of the princes and cities met in Schwabach, on the 16th of October, Saxony-Franconia simply presented, according to the instructions agreed upon in Schleiz, their confession, consisting of seventeen articles, the so-called Articles of Schwabach. They were here for the first time, although not yet offered the general public, nevertheless placed before the representatives of the Landgrave and the cities. The representatives from Strassburg and Ulm, however, were compelled to declare that they were not authorized to deal with this matter, and since the Articles were to form the basis of the federation they wished to submit them, for examination, to their principals. So it was agreed to meet again at Schmalkalden at the end of November, and at that time settle the matter of sending a delegation with an appeal to the Emperor, (they had namely received bad news regarding the fate of delegates sent from

Nuernberg on the 23rd of May) and also, to settle the question of confession and federation[45] (Second Part, 10). Since the final decision was to be made in Schmalkalden, the Landgrave through his representative, Sigmund Boyneburg, end of October once more made a stirring appeal to the Elector to consider how much stronger the federation would become if Strassburg and Ulm were not barred on account of their teachings regarding the Sacrament. So, on November 14, the Elector commissioned Chancellor Brueck to again confer with the Wittenberg theologians if, and how far they would go in making concessions.[46] The result of this conference will be found in Brueck's Opinion in the Second Part of this book, document number 13.[47] But Strassburg was also prepared, for Bucer had drawn up a counter-confession to the Articles of Schwabach[48] (Second Part, 11) and the theologically trained Sturm was able to present it. The meeting at Schmalkalden began on the 29th of November[49] (Second Part, 12). The Elector as well as the Landgrave were present; the Margrave was represented by his Chancellor, Vogler, Nuernberg by Christopher Kress, Ulm by Bernhard Besserer, Strassburg by Jacob Sturm. The negative result of the discussions was to be foreseen. Sturm and Besserer declared that their principals had examined the seventeen Articles but had found them "too rambling, conducive to discord and debatable" and that they could not accept them in this form. The Landgrave again demanded, although again in vain, that the question of the Sacrament, at least for the time being, be put aside and not be allowed to block the federation. Nuernberg declared itself in harmony with the Articles of Confession but was not willing to enter a federation, not even the Torgau-Magdeburg agreement, without the other cities.[50] Saxony and Brandenburg declared, through the Elector, that "On their conscience they did not

know of anything in the Articles they would change for they had been well considered and formulated by an eminent council of theological and lay scholars."[40] The lay delegates held a private meeting on the 2nd of December.[51] Also, the leading statesmen, Sturm, Vogler, and Brueck, held a secret conference in which Sturm, casually referring to Bucer's counter-confession, undertook to show why Strassburg objected to the seventeen Articles.[52] In the "Religious Documents of Ansbach" we still have short notes of Sturm's main objections. Schubert has noted them in his reprint of Bucer's counter-confession. However, this secret conference of the statesmen did not change the course of events.[53]

So Schmalkalden (Second Part, 14) is the end of the line which began with the "secret agreement" of April 22. The proposed federation was wrecked on the rock of a common confession! Such a confession was now at hand—that is the lasting gain of these months—but Strassburg and Ulm, refusing to accept it, made their exit before the federation ever became a reality. Without them, Nuernberg, although it accepted the confession, would not enter a federation, and Brandenburg again would not join without Nuernberg. The confession had defeated the federation!

At Schmalkalden a definite decision was also to be made regarding the appeal. The Emperor had very ungraciously received the messengers with the first appeal against the Decree of Speyer, and had even thrown them in prison. Was a second one now to be dispatched? In connection with the appeal something happened which, on the whole, was rather unnecessary. It was thought by the Saxons that also in the matter of the appeal they no longer could go with all the signers of the Protest, but only with those with whom they were one in faith.[54] At first this went too far even for the Margrave's representative but the Elector's

bitter word, "Those cities who teach wrongly regarding the Sacrament, consciously sin against the Word of God and the Holy Spirit," and Brueck's "opinion" (Second Part, 13) brought them again into line. That the Elector took this stand was partly due to the fact which the advocates of the federation again and again emphasized, that the federation is a necessary consequence of the Protest. He simply drew the conclusion. The general doubt regarding a union with the South German or even the Swiss cities, as above noted, also the idea that much more could be gained from the Emperor if among the appellants none were found who leaned toward Zwingli, may have helped him draw this conclusion. Other questions then hanging fire between him and the Emperor—of which we shall speak later on—may have unconsciously helped to swing the balance. But even if the Elector did not lack a number of non-religious reasons, not they, but the religious ones were the driving factor in his stand against a common Protest and Appellation, and for opposing a proposed federation without a united confession.

The session in Schmalkalden ended with a decision to meet again at Nuernberg on Epiphany 1530. Only those in agreement with the seventeen Articles were asked to attend. This meeting was to decide if a separate appeal against the Decree of Speyer, signed only by Lutherans, was to be sent to the Emperor. Therefore only the Lutherans, Saxony and Brandenburg, Lueneburg, Anhalt and Mansfeld, Nuernberg, Reutlingen, Windsheim and Weissenburg (in Franconia) attended this meeting.[55] The Landgrave thought it unwise to break with the Lutherans and so also sent a representative. This was taken as an indication that he now was ready to accept the Confession.

So the second period ended with the Speyer federation broken up; the Zwinglian, Swiss and South German cities