

THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

VOL. XIV.

JULY, 1910.

No. 3.

INFIDELITY TAUGHT AT AMERICAN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES.

In a series of articles contributed to the *Cosmopolitan Magazine* last year by Mr. Harold Bolce, he set forth the claim that the leading colleges and universities of the United States taught and promulgated views on religion and morals subversive of biblical tenets. He referred to distinct universities and their teachings, stating in substance, as their doctrine, that the Christian religion is not a divine revelation, but merely the human mind groping in the dark for the infinite, that conscience is but the sum, or result, of human experience in matters moral, that the Bible is not a divine revelation, which God gave to man, but a summary of records showing what ideas man has of the Supreme Being, and how these ideas developed in the course of time, that the family is in no sense a divine institution, but a social arrangement contrived by man, which means that the Sixth Commandment is not obligatory on man.

True, Mr. Bolce was too sweeping in his statements when he represented his findings as the teachings of colleges the land over. *The Christian Statesman*, official organ of the National Reform Association, taking exception to these general statements, made a canvass of the denominational colleges of the country and found hundreds of them "where the Bible is taught as a revelation from Heaven and Christianity as the only true religion." St. John's College, of Winfield, Kans., was one of those whose reply in the affirmative was recorded.

On the other hand, we must, though reluctantly, admit

LUTHER'S MORALS.

"Few are wronged who are not calumniated." These words of James Fenimore Cooper apply preeminently to Dr. Martin Luther, the great Reformer. Johann Albrecht Bengel has rightly said that next to Jesus Christ no one has been more calumniated than Dr. Martin Luther—the apostles not excepted. The calumnies heaped upon Dr. Luther during his lifetime were crowned by that libelous pamphlet¹⁾ which, one year before his death, gave a graphic description of how he had been carried off by the devil. Luther himself edited this account in Italian and German, with some appropriate comments. To bring the beginning of Luther's life into full accord with such a terrible end, Romanists invented the lie of his having been conceived by the devil.²⁾ In the year 1591 Bozius for the first time published the story that Luther had committed suicide by hanging.³⁾

Intelligent Romanists have now given up the absurd claim of Bozius. But they have not dropped it altogether. Some years ago the *Ohio Waisenbote* revamped the old slander, for the edification of the Catholic laity. Nor have they ceased to calumniate Dr. Martin Luther in other ways. Especially since Denifle came out with his volumes of unbounded slanders against the great Reformer, Romanists have again become very busy in exercising their tongues and pens. "Rome has never forgotten nor forgiven Luther. She sought his life while living, and she curses him in his grave. Profited by his labors beyond what she ever could have been without him, she strains and chokes with anathemas upon his name and everything that savors of him. Her children are taught from infancy to hate and abhor him as they hope for salvation. Many are the false turns and garbled forms in which her writers hold up his words and deeds to revenge themselves on his memory.

1) See *Luthers Werke*, St. Louis edition, vol. XXI, col. 3374.

2) See Dr. O. Hegemann, *Luther im kath. Urteil*, p. 19.

3) *Ibid.*, p. 34.

Even while the free peoples of the earth are making grateful acknowledgments of the priceless boon that has come to them through his life and labors, press and platform hiss with stale vituperations from the old enemy. And a puling Churchism outside of Rome takes an ill-pleasure in following after her to gather and retail this vomit of malignity."⁴)

During a recent prohibition campaign, on June 1, 1908, a St. Louis daily informed its readers that a certain candidate for the governorship of the state of Missouri had "declared that the true principle of government exists only where every person is permitted the widest range of individual liberty and enjoyment consistent with good conduct." He was followed by the pastor of an Independent Evangelical Protestant Church, who indorsed the remarks of the preceding speaker "on the effect of restrictive and sumptuary laws, and ended his address with a quotation" cited. Under date of June 2, the undersigned forwarded a correction to the afore-mentioned daily, stating: "The words, 'Who does not love wine,' etc., are no quotation from Martin Luther. These words were falsely fathered upon Luther by J. H. Voss, who probably was himself the author." The undersigned had forgotten the whole matter, when a friend called his attention to an article in the *Diocesan Messenger*, September issue, 1909. The article was written by Mr. Arthur Preuss, editor of the *Catholic Fortnightly Review*. In this article it is, in the first place, difficult to understand the charge that the undersigned had denounced the above statement of the local option speaker in St. Louis, Mo., as a *fraud*. What is the meaning of the word *fraud*? The *Standard Dictionary* says sub "fraud": "An act of deliberate deception practiced with the object of securing something to the prejudice of another; a trick or stratagem intended to obtain an unfair advantage; craft; circumvention; trickery. 'The priests sometimes practice all sorts of frauds upon their credulous followers, by pretending to swallow live

4) Dr. J. A. Seiss, *Luther and the Reformation*, p. 131.

coals, and to pierce their bodies with knives.'” Besides Mr. Preuss no reader has been able to detect any charges of fraud in the author's letter to the *Globe-Democrat* of June 2, 1908. It never entered his mind to lay the charge of fraud at the door of the local option speaker in St. Louis. He believed then, as he even believes at this writing, that the local option speaker is as honest as the “honest old apothecary of Eisleben,” who reported Luther's death, but the Reverend gentleman was nevertheless very much mistaken when he ascribed to Dr. Martin Luther what he should have ascribed to Johann Heinrich Voss. Indeed, the undersigned truly and firmly believes that the speaker did not intend to commit a fraud upon the credulity of his hearers, but — “Errare humanum est!” The editor of the *Diocesan Messenger* was apt to make the same mistake. In the August number, 1909, of the magazine which he edits he asked his readers for information, thus: “Perhaps some of our readers may be able to tell us more about these words.” The information which he received from his correspondent, Mr. Preuss, states: “There is no authority for charging Luther with this dictum.” “Buechmann, in his *Gefluegelte Worte* (I have before me the sixteenth edition), traces the ‘Wer nicht liebt,’ etc., to the *Wandsbecker Bote* of 1775, No. 75, and says that Redlich (*Die poetischen Beitræge zum Wandsbecker Boten*; Hamburg, 1871) made it appear probable that the verses were written by Johann Heinrich Voss, who had them reprinted in the *Musenalmanach* for 1777 under the signature of Dr. M. Luther.”

Editor Preuss and the undersigned are corroborated by the learned H. Boehmer, professor at the University of Bonn, Germany, who writes (we give a free translation):

But is not he (Luther) the author of the odious maxim: “Who does not love wine, women, and song Remains a fool his whole life long”? This maxim is perhaps the most frequently quoted Luther-dictum, but without authority. Not Luther, but most probably Johann Heinrich Voss, is its author; for he first had it printed in the *Wandsbecker Bote* of 1777 (as a Luther-dictum), and could

not give its source when requested to do so. It is probable that he simply translated an Italian maxim which runs: "Who does not love wine, women, and song Is either a fool or a saint," and being a declared enemy of all saints, he simply dropped the saint.⁵)

The editor of the *Diocesan Messenger* only asked for more information concerning the alleged maxim of Luther. Editor Preuss might have rested the case after giving the information; but for reasons sufficient to himself he proceeded to say: "We think Denifle has shown that if Luther did not formulate the maxim, 'Wer nicht liebt Wein, Weib und Gesang, Der bleibt ein Narr sein Lebenlang,' he lived according to it."

It is this charge that we now proceed to examine.

The second question which suggests itself in connection with this matter, and especially apropos of the Lutheran pastor of Red Bud's protest, is this: Does the ascription of the wine, woman, and song sentiment to Luther imply an unjust aspersion of his character? We think Denifle has shown that if Luther did not formulate the maxim, "Wer nicht liebt Wein, Weib und Gesang, der bleibt ein Narr sein Lebenlang," he lived according to it, and there are many passages in his writings which prove that he would not have been ashamed to own it,—not to speak of the testimony of many of his contemporaries, such as, *e. g.*, the papal Legate Aleander, who writes: "Lasso a parte la ebrietta, alla quale detto Luther e deditissimo"—I will not speak of his drunkenness, to which Luther is much addicted.

Editor Preuss mentions and quotes only one of Luther's contemporaries, the papal legate Aleander. Denifle also mentions him and quotes the very same words which are quoted by Preuss. Who was Aleander? What kind of a man was he? Editor Preuss does not tell us what kind of man Aleander was, but Denifle does. He tells us that Aleander was not wholly without *evil repute* ("nicht voellig unbescholten").⁶) On a question of this sort we should consider Denifle fair authority. Luther also mentions Aleander in a letter to John Lang, dated November 28, 1520, and says: "This Aleander

5) H. Boehmer, *Luther im Lichte der neueren Forschung*; Leipzig, 1906, p. 84.

6) Denifle I, 1, p. 101.

has been mercilessly attacked in a witty lampoon because of his many vices.”⁷⁾ It was this virtuous Alexander who wrote concerning Luther: “Lasso a parte la ebrieta, alla quale detto Luther e deditissimo.”

But Denifle—not Editor Preuss—also quotes the friend of Dr. Luther, Wolfgang Musculus,⁸⁾ as saying:

We went into the house of Cranach, and we again drank. After we left the (his) house, we escorted Luther to his own dwelling, where again, according to Saxon custom, drinking occurred (*ubi rursum, saxonice processum, potatum est*). Luther was “wunderbar heiter,” “*mire hilaris*,” *i. e.*, *very joyous or happy*.⁹⁾

It is surprising that Editor Preuss did not quote Wolfgang Musculus. Quite likely that he knows that “wunderbar heiter,” “*mire hilaris*,” never means *to be drunk*, but, *very joyous, happy*. So what does the quotation from Wolfgang Musculus prove? It proves that he, Melanchthon, Luther, and perhaps Cranach, were *very happy*, but it does not prove that they were *drunk*.

Professor H. Boehmer, of Bonn, Germany, writes:

Wenn Wolfgang Musculus 1536 zur Zeit der Wittenberger Konkordie berichtet: “Am 21. Mai geleiteten wir Luther nach der Mahlzeit nach Hause; er war wunderbar heiter (*mire hilaris*); beim Abendtrunke in seiner Wohnung war er wieder wunderbar heiter und auusserst wohlwollend,” und wenn es vorher von Melanchthon heisst: “Wunderbar erheitert diskutierte er bei Tische ueber Astrologie,” so beweist das nicht, dass die beiden Reformatoren *berauscht*, sondern nur, dass sie *vergnuegt* waren, denn *hilaris* heisst bloss *heiter, froehlich*, und *nicht angeheitert* u. s. w. Kurz, das so oft mit grosser Entruestung ausgemalte Bild des *trunkenen* Luther ist ein Phantasiebild. Niemand hat Luther je berauscht gesehen. Sonst wuerden wir das sicher wissen. Denn wenn je ein Mann im Glashaue gelebt hat, so war es Luther.”¹⁰⁾

7) See Margaret A. Currie's *Letters of Martin Luther*, p. 61. St. Louis ed., vol. XXIa, No. 348.

8) Wolfgang Musculus left the Lutheran Church, and in 1549 became professor of theology at Bern. (See *New Internat. Encyclopedia*, sub *Musculus*.)

9) Denifle I, 1, p. 102.

10) A. Boehmer, l. c., p. 83.

Editor Preuss, in his article in the *Diocesan Messenger*, writes:

Does the ascription of the wine, woman, and song sentiment to Luther imply an unjust aspersion of his character? We think Denifle has shown that if Luther did not formulate the maxim, "Wer nicht liebt," etc., he lived according to it, and there are many passages in his writings which prove that he would not have been ashamed to own it.

Editor Preuss introduces Denifle, who cites Luther thus:¹¹

"Ego otiosus et crapulosus sedeo tota die"—I sat around idle and drunk the livelong day, Luther himself writes. (Enders, *Dr. Martin Luther's Briefwechsel*, III, 154.)

Denifle translates the words quoted: "I sit here the whole day idle and drunk." Prof. A. F. Hoppe, in the St. Louis edition of Dr. Luther's Works, translates them: "I sit here the whole day idle and with a heavy head (schweren Kopfes)." Prof. Dau translates them: "I am sitting idle all day and oppressed with thoughts." Since the letter itself is the best refutation of the Roman charge, we here offer it entire:—

TO SPALATIN.

May 14, 1521.

To my most cherished friend in Christ, George Spalatin, the very faithful servant of Christ at Altenburg.

Jesus.

Grace! I have received your letter, my dear Spalatin, on Exaudi Sunday, also one from Gerbel, and one from Sapidus, and it is for good reasons that I have not answered ere this: I hesitated from fear that the report recently gone out of my captivity might prompt somebody to intercept my letters. A great many things are related about me at this place; however, the opinion is gaining prevalence that I was captured by friends sent for this purpose from Franconia. To-morrow the time of the safe-conduct granted me by the Emperor expires. I am sorry that, as you write me, there is an intention of applying the very severe edict also for the purpose of exploring men's consciences; not for my sake, but because they are all ill advised in this and will bring misfortune down upon their own heads, and because they continue to load themselves with a very great odium. Oh, what hatred will this shameless violence

11) See Denifle I, 1, p. 103.

kindle! However, they may have their way; perhaps the time of their visitation is impending.

So far I have received nothing from our people either at Wittenberg nor elsewhere. About the time of our arrival at Eisenach the young men at Erfurt had, during the night, damaged a few priests' dwellings, from indignation because the dean of St. Severus Institute, a great papist, had caught Magister Draco, a gentleman who is favorably inclined to us, by his cassock and had publicly dragged him from the choir, pretending that he had been excommunicated for having gone to meet me at my entrance into Erfurt. Meanwhile people are fearing greater disturbances; the magistrates are conniving, for the local priests are all in ill repute, and it is being reported that the artisans are allying themselves with the student body. It seems imminent that the prophetic saying will perhaps become true, which runs: Erfurt is another Prague.

I was told yesterday that a certain priest at Gotha has met with rough treatment, because his people had bought certain estates (I do not know which), in order to increase the revenues of the church and, under pretext of their ecclesiastical immunity, had refused to pay the incumbrances and taxes on the same. We see that the people, as also Erasmus writes in his *Bule*, are unable and unwilling any longer to bear the yoke of the pope and the papists. And still we do not cease coercing and burdening them, although, (now that everything is brought to light,) we have lost our reputation and their good will, and our former halo of sanctity can no longer avail or exert the influence which it formerly exerted. Heretofore we have increased hatred by violence, and by violence have suppressed it; however, whether we can continue suppressing it experience will show. I am sitting idle all day and *oppressed with thoughts*;¹²⁾ I am reading the Greek and Hebrew Bible. I shall write a German sermon on liberty from auricular confession. I shall also continue my work on the Psalms and on the Postils as soon as I shall have received from Wittenberg what I need. Among the papers I am looking for I also expect the *Magnificat* which I had begun.

12) schweren Kopfes. [Luther himself did not always translate *crapula* and its derivatives with *drunkenness*, *drunken*, etc. Even Denifle admits this. He writes in footnote 1, p. 101: "Crapulae. In Gal. 5 (Weim. II, 591, Jahr 1519) erklart er (Luther) zwar auf Grund von Lukas 21, 34: 'sicut ebrietas nimium bibendo, ita crapula nimium comedendo gravat corda.' Aber Weim. III, 559. 596, ist ihm crapulatus gleich ebrius." (See St. Louis ed., vol. VIII, 1613; IX, 710. — J. H. H.)

You would hardly believe with what kindness we were received by the abbot of Hersfeld. He sent the chancellor and the warden to meet us on the way more than a good mile out of town; he also received us in person at his castle, surrounded by many horsemen, and conducted us into the city. The city council received us at the gate. We were magnificently feasted at his monastery, and he lodged me in his private sleeping apartment. They constrained me to preach them a sermon early in the morning at 5 o'clock, notwithstanding my urgent representation that he was likely to lose his commission, if the Imperialists should undertake to interpret this procedure as a breach of the safe-conduct granted me, because they had forbidden me to preach on the journey. However, I stated that I had not consented that the Word of God should be bound, as, indeed, I had not.

I also preached at Eisenach, however, with the timid pastor entering his protest in the presence of a notary and witnesses, and humbly deprecating to me this act which necessity laid on him on account of his fear of his tyrannical lords. Accordingly, you may have heard it stated at Worms that I had broken my safe-conduct by these acts, but I did not commit a breach. For to yield this condition, that the Word of God should be bound (2 Tim. 2, 9), was not in my power. And so he (the abbot) conducted us the next day as far as the forest, detailed the chancellor to accompany us, and finally had us dine once more at his expense in Berka.

At length we were received by the Eisenachers who had come on foot to meet us, and at eventide we entered Eisenach. Early in the morning all my companions departed with Jerome. I traveled to my relatives beyond the forest (for they occupy nearly all this country), and a short while after taking leave of them, as we were turning into the road to Waltershausen, I was taken captive near Castle Altenstein. Necessarily I had to inform Amsdorf that I was to be taken captive by somebody, but he does not know the place where I am concealed.

My brother,¹³⁾ who espied the horsemen in time, quitted our vehicle and is reported to have arrived that night on foot at Waltershausen, without being met by anyone. After arriving at this place I was divested of my garments and was given knight's garments to put on. I let my hair and beard grow, and you would hardly know me, since for some time already I fail to know myself. I am now living in Christian liberty, released from all the laws

13) Frater Johann Pezensteiner, Luther's fellow-monk among the Augustinians.

of this tyrant, though I could rather wish that you hog at Dresden¹⁴) might be worthy to kill me while publicly preaching, if so please God that I might suffer for the sake of His Word. The will of the Lord be done! God-speed to you! Pray for me! My regards to your entire court.

Given on the mountain (*i. e.*, Wartburg Castle), Tuesday after Exaudi, 1521.
MARTIN LUTHER.¹⁵)

Did Editor Preuss read the whole letter? Perhaps not. The undersigned firmly believes that every one who reads the *whole letter* will readily admit that a *drunken* Luther could not have written it. How could a *drunken* Luther have read the Holy Scriptures in the Hebrew and Greek languages? How could a *drunken* Luther state data and facts as they are given in this letter? The facts are: Luther had left Worms, where he had so courageously confessed our dear Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ. He had concluded his defense with the well-known and memorable words: "*Here I stand, I cannot do otherwise. God help me. Amen.*" And now he was at the Wartburg Castle *oppressed with thoughts*, but not *drunk*. This is evident from his letter to Melanchthon, dated May 12, 1521, written two days before the foregoing letter to Spalatin. Because of its bearing on the situation we offer also this letter as translated by Prof. Dau:—

To Philip Melanchthon, evangelist of the church at Wittenberg, my exceedingly dear brother in Christ:—

Jesus.

Grace! Well, what are you doing meanwhile, my dear Philip? Are you not praying that this retirement, to which I have reluctantly consented, may achieve some greater end for the glory of God? I also wish to know very much how you like this state of affairs. I was afraid that I might be regarded as a deserter from the line of battle, and yet, there was no way open to me for resisting those who desired and advised this plan. I wish for nothing more than to meet the rage of our adversaries and to offer my neck to them.

14) Duke (Herzog) George.

15) THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY, X, 95 ff.

While I am sitting here, I place before my eyes all day long the condition of the Church, and I see, in the 89th Psalm, this saying (v. 48): "Wherefore hast Thou made all men in vain?" My God, what a frightful image is the abominable dominion of the Roman antichrist! And I abhor my callousness, because I am not altogether dissolved in tears, "weeping with my fountains of tears for the slain of the daughter of my people," Jer. 9, 1. But on this last day of His anger "there is none that stirreth up himself to take hold of God," Is. 64, 7, or that should "make up the hedge, and stand in the gap for the house of Israel," Ezek. 22, 30; 13, 5. Oh, a papal kingdom meet, indeed, for the end and the dregs of the world! God have mercy on us!

Wherefore, being a servant of the Word, you should meanwhile continue fortifying the walls and towers of Jerusalem, until they shall attack you too. You know your calling and your gifts. I am praying for you especially, in the hope that my prayer (as I doubt not) may somewhat avail. Do the same for me, and let us jointly bear this burden. We are left standing alone in the line of battle; after me they will seek to lay hold of you also.

Spalatin writes me that there is in press an edict¹⁶⁾ so cruel, that they will begin to search every man in the world, on peril of his conscience, for my books. By this edict they will soon work their own ruin. Their Rehobam at Dresden¹⁷⁾ rejoices, and is eager to execute the edict. They say that the Emperor was also impertuned to write the King of Denmark, requesting him not to receive the remnants of the Lutheran heresy,¹⁸⁾ and they are chanting the well-known strain, Ps. 41, 6: "When shall he die, and his name perish?"

Hartmann Kronenberg has given the Emperor notice that he has quitted his service, for which he was to receive a salary of 200 guilders in gold, because he is loath to serve one who will listen to such impious people. I believe that the upshot will be that this edict will rage nowhere except in the dominions of this

16) This refers to the imperial edict issued at Worms May 8, 1521, by which the papal bull of excommunication was confirmed, Luther declared to be diabolically possessed and outlawed, and his abettors charged with the crime of lese majesty, and all their chattels and goods forfeited to their captors after May 14.

17) Duke George of Saxony.

18) Editor Preuss should not overlook the fact that Luther himself calls his own doctrine the *Lutheran heresy*. — J. H. H.

Rehoboam and your other neighbor,¹⁹⁾ we are both afflicted with vaingloriousness. God lives and reigns to eternity! Amen.

The Lord has smitten me with great pain in the rectum. I am so costive, that my stool is forced from me only with great effort, causing nervous perspiration, and the longer I delay the harder it becomes. Yesterday, after four days, I had the first evacuation. For this reason I have not slept all night, and I am still restless. Do pray for me. For if this affliction is to go on as it has begun, it will become unbearable.

The Cardinal at Salzburg has joined Ferdinand on his nuptial journey to Innsbruck the day before St. Philip and St. James, which was four days after our departure. It is rumored that Ferdinand was not pleased with his companion, nor the Emperor, as Spalatin writes me. However, you may read his letter yourself. Be sure to write me all that is happening among you, and how everybody is. God-speed to you and yours!

Exaudi Sunday, 1521, in the realm of birds.

Your

MARTIN LUTHER.²⁰⁾

According to Denifle Luther commenced drinking in the year 1521, the year which he passed at Worms and Wartburg, and grew worse from year to year.

Every fair-minded and unprejudiced person will readily admit that a *drunken* Luther could not have written such letters. But Luther did not only write letters when he was at the Wartburg Castle. He was occupied with much other work besides. Prof. H. Boehmer tells us that Luther in 1521 published 20 books and booklets, translated one of Melancthon's books into German, began translating the New Testament,²¹⁾ and the writing of his Church Postils.²²⁾ Of his Wart-

19) The Elector Joachim of Brandenburg.

20) THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY, X, 57 ff. See also Luther's letter to Melancthon, dated May 26, 1521. St. Louis ed., XV, 2542. THEOL. QUARTERLY, X, pp. 100—106.

21) J. Howald, *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur*, vol. I, p. 218, says, that Luther translated the New Testament at the Wartburg in *three months*.

22) J. W. Hoppin, *Homiletics*, § 9, p. 146, says: "Luther's best sermons are adjudged to be his Church Postils (Kirchenpostille)."

burg letters 72 are extant. His writings of the year 1521 fill 985 pages in the Weimar edition.²³⁾ He also preached during the first months of this year. Denifle and others, who never grow weary charging Luther with drunkenness and idleness, should know that a drunken and idle Luther could not have done such work in one year, or, rather, in eight months, for Luther entered the Wartburg Castle May 4, 1521.

Luther was a hard worker as long as he lived. He overworked himself and had to suffer for it. His nervous headache began in 1523, and he suffered from it more or less unto his death. No wonder! Prof. Stowe writes in the *Biblical Repository*:

The number of his (Luther's) published works during the first ten years of the Reformation, 1517—1526, is three hundred; from 1527 to 1537, during the second decade, two hundred and thirty-two; from 1537 to 1546, the year of his death, one hundred and eighty three. The number of publications for twenty-nine years is 715, an average of twenty-five per annum, or a book for every fourteen days of his public life. True, he did not write them all in his own hand, but many were taken down by scholars during his lectures (and at other times). Several are but short treatises, but many of them are large books, elaborately worked out. Considering the circumstances under which he had to write, the translation of the Bible alone would have been an enormous task, even if he had spent his entire lifetime on it.²⁴⁾

Does Editor Preuss really believe an idle and drunken Luther capable of performing such an enormous work? Let

23) "Greifen wir auf gut Glueck aus den verschiedenen Perioden seines (Luthers) Lebens das eine und andere Jahr heraus, um seine Arbeitsfähigkeit genau festzustellen. Zunaechst das Jahr 1521. Denn in diesem Jahre hat er nach Pater Denifle das Trinken angefangen. Trotzdem hat er in diesem einen Jahre ueber 20 Schriften und Schriftchen verfasst, die in der Weimarer Ausgabe zusammen 985 Seiten fuellen, ausserdem ein Buch Melanchthons ins Deutsche uebersetzt und mit der Uebersetzung des Neuen Testaments und der Niederschrift seiner Kirchenpostille begonnen, sowie eine grosse Anzahl Briefe geschrieben, von denen noch 72 uns vorliegen. Und doch war er in diesem ereignisreichen Jahre ueber fuenf Wochen durch Reisen zur Untaetigkeit genoetigt." (*Luther im Lichte d. neu. Forschung*, p. 82.)

24) Quoted in the *Arkansas Lutheran*, vol. II, No. 3, p. 3.

him ask the opinion of any physician on this matter. Prof. H. Boehmer rightly says:

A drunkard would lack the mere physical ability of performing such an enormous work as Luther's, not to mention the intense excitement caused by the controversies with such powerful opponents as his. But, of course, that does not prove that he did not get "drunk occasionally." It cannot be denied that whole generations of detectives, perhaps inquisitors also, have been busy in seeking substantial evidences; but all their efforts so far have been in vain.²⁵⁾

But Editor Preuss, in his article in the *Diocesan Messenger*, writes:

In a letter dated March 18, 1535, of which the original is in the Vatican archives (Enders X, 137), he subscribes himself "Doctor plenus" (the full Doctor), and complains (cf. Denifle, *op. cit.* I, 1, p. 102, n. 5) that he cannot join the merry students as often as he would like in their drinking bouts, "the beer being good, the (bar?)-maid pretty, and the companions young." There is no need of multiplying passages.

Luther's letter referred to by Editor Preuss is found in the St. Louis edition of Luther's writings, vol. XXIb, col. 3498 f. The offensive words occur in the following connection:

I leave it to your discretion whether you will indicate to my gracious lord, in a remote way, that His Grace might kindly issue a restraining order in regard to the allowance for board which he makes for his two godfearing students. Credible parties are beginning to say, or whisper, that there is needless waste, and that four students could be kept in board at the same expense. I did not wish to suggest this to my gracious lord, lest the Goat at Lubeck should ridicule me. However, since by request of my gracious lord I am to have an eye on these matters, I wish to indicate this business to you remotely, leaving it to you whether you will transmit the information in the same manner, until we can check Mr. Goat. What harm would there be in friendly oversight? The beer is good, the maid pretty, the fellows young. The students' conduct is truly fine; so that I frequently regret my inability to be with them oftener, owing to my indisposition.

Editor Preuss says: Luther "complains that he cannot join the merry students as often as he would like in their drink-

25) *l. c.*, p. 82.

ing bouts, the beer being good, the (bar?)-maid pretty, and the companions young." Why did Editor Preuss only give a translation and not the original words? Why such insinuations? Most probably, because he did not read the letter, but only quoted Denifle.

If we would correctly understand this letter of Luther, we must know to *whom* it was written, and *why* it was written. The addressee of the letter is Caspar Mueller, the sponsor of Luther's son Johannes. Caspar Mueller was not only a friend, but a very intimate friend of Luther. He lived in Eisleben. Perhaps he was a neighbor of "the honest old apothecary of Eisleben." Caspar Mueller was the Chancellor of Count Albrecht of Mansfeld, and therefore the most honored and influential officer of Count Albrecht of Mansfeld. Count Albrecht supported two students at the University of Wittenberg. The count was very generous and provided for them very freely. Luther was of the opinion that four students should get along with the count's allowances, and hinted his opinion to Chancellor Caspar Mueller. "The beer is good, the maid pretty, the fellows young," he writes to the chancellor. He wanted to say that the students perhaps spend more money than was necessary. As everybody knows, it is not good for young men to have too much money, because too much money spoils many a "good chap." Luther does not say that the two students for whom the count provided were already spoiled; no, he rather says that they are "pious students" ("fromme Studenten"), and that the students verily conducted themselves in a fine manner; and he therefore regretted very much that he could not be in their company oftener.

This letter of Luther, says Editor Preuss, was subscribed "Doctor plenus" (the full Doctor), and consequently — *Luther was a drunkard*. What an argument! The *American Church History* (vol. IX, pp. 340 sqq.) gives the history of the "First Plenary Council of Baltimore." What would Editor Preuss say if we insisted that all the bishops assembled in Baltimore had been drunkards, because it was called "*Plenaru Council*"?

But we would here raise the question: Did Luther really sign his letter, dated March 18, 1535, and addressed to Chancellor Caspar Mueller, the sponsor of Johannes (Hans) Luther, "Doctor plenus"? Editor Preuss writes: "In a letter, dated March 18, 1535, of which the original is in the Vatican archives (Enders X, 137), he subscribes himself 'Doctor plenus.'" What has Enders to say about this letter? He says: "We give the text according to *Evers*,²⁶⁾ who seems to have made mistakes." Enders places not less than thirteen interrogation marks to Evers's version of the letter. Boehmer says concerning this letter:—

Did not Luther at one time sign a letter with the words "Doctor plenus" (the full Doctor)? Fortunately, the letter is extant in the original, but is difficult to read. It is plain, however, that the reading *plenus* must be ascribed to Evers. A mere glance²⁷⁾ at the facsimile tells us that Luther surely did not write *plenus*, but, most probably, *Dr. Johannes*, the name of his son Hans, to whose sponsor the letter was addressed. With certainty the word cannot be deciphered on account of the ink-blotches.²⁸⁾

But Editor Preuss proceeds thus:

No wonder when the honest old apothecary of Eisleben was called to Luther's death-bed and, upon finding him dead, examined the corpse, he found it was bloated with foul gases, due to over-indulgence in eating and particularly drinking sweet wine. (See the document apud Paulus, *Luthers Lebensende*; Mainz, 1896, pp. 5 sqq.)

Editor Preuss only quotes Denifle. Denifle writes, vol. I, 1, p. 103:

Passing over other matters, we shall hear what the apothecary, who made his observations upon the corpse of Luther, has to say. February 17, 1546, early in the morning, the Eisleben apothecary was hurriedly called to Luther, who was dead, and, according to orders from the physicians, he applied the syringe to the corpse of Luther—in order to recall him to life. He did so. "When the

26) G. G. Evers, a raving papist. See Meusel, *Kirchliches Handlexikon*, sub *Evers*.

27) Boehmer must have seen the original, or at least its facsimile.

28) *l. c.*, p. 156.

apothecary applied the syringe to the corpse, he heard that a few loud winds were discharged into the syringe-bag,—for on account of Luther's over-indulgence in eating and drinking his corpse was full of foul gases. No wonder; for he had kept a well-stocked pantry and had an abundance of sweet and foreign wines. It is reported as a fact that Luther drank a sextar of imported sweet wine every noon and evening." Must we be told again not to take this statement seriously, though the record of this affair is adduced as the most substantial evidence of Luther's having died a natural death? We rather find in this report a fine explanation of Luther's words in a letter to Bora, dated July 2, 1540, to this effect: "I eat like a Bohemian, and drink like a German." Even Protestants no longer deny that Luther was a mere child of his times in regard to drinking, and that his was a robust disposition which relished good things.

To be sure, Denifle uses some very strong language, but it cannot help him—nor can it help Editor Preuss. *Strong language does not offend us, but inaccurate statements do.* For all that anyone knows the Eisleben apothecary may have been a very honest old gentleman, but Denifle is guilty of a very gross error when he says that Luther was *dead* when the "honest old apothecary of Eisleben" was hurriedly called to him during the early morning of February 17, 1546, for Luther was not dead—he fell asleep in Jesus on February 18, 1546, as every one knows who has ever studied history. Denifle says that the Eisleben apothecary was "hurriedly called to apply the syringe to the corpse of Luther in order to recall him to life." How absurd! This grotesque idea must have originated in Denifle's head! Lutherans, to be sure, never believed that the "honest old apothecary of Eisleben"—his name was Johann Landau—could have done by means of a syringe what only our Lord Jesus Christ can do through His omnipotent word. Ever since Luther has freed the Church from papal humbugs, Lutherans have not believed in them.

Editor Preuss says: "No wonder when the honest old apothecary of Eisleben was called to Luther's death-bed and, upon finding him dead, examined the corpse, he found it was bloated with foul gases." This Landau-Denifle-Preuss story

reminds one of the Cochlaeus-Bozius-Weislinger foul-gas story which runs, "The corpse of Luther was placed in a *tin coffin* (Zinnsarg), but nevertheless an *unbearable stench* went from it, though in mid-winter. Thousands of crows (Raben) accompanied the funeral procession, and made a doleful noise. Indeed, the stench was so unbearable that the pall-bearers had to leave the coffin on the way to Wittenberg. And what caused Luther's corpse to give forth such an unbearable stench? His drunkenness, to which he had been addicted."²⁹) Denifle-Preuss: "*He* (the Eisleben apothecary) *found the corpse of Luther bloated with foul gases, due to over-indulgence in eating and particularly drinking sweet wine.*" Neither of these gentlemen ever was Luther's guest; nevertheless, they seem to know exactly how much Luther ate and drank. People who were not occasional guests at Luther's table, but who dined with him very frequently, give us an altogether different account. Vitus Dietrich, who boarded with Luther for years, tells us that Luther was particularly careful about his diet.³⁰) Philip Melanchthon, in his *Vita Lutheri*, tells us that Luther was very moderate in his diet. He says that to his knowledge Luther had often fasted for four whole days, and that he often ate only a herring and a little bread. We append Melanchthon's words in the original: "Er (Luther) war aber von Natur von wenigem Essen und Trinken. Ich hab' gesehen, dass er zuzeiten in vier ganzen Tagen, wenn er schon gesund war, nichts gegessen und getrunken hat. So habe ich auch sonst oft gesehen, dass er taeglich nur mit wenig Brot und einem Hering begnuegt gewesen, und das zuzeiten viele Tage lang."³¹) Stein, in his book, *Katharine von Bora, Dr. Martin Luther's Wife*, relates the following incident:

Master Peter, the barber, came hurriedly from the house, greeted Madame Katharine, and asked if the Doctor were not at home. He

29) Dr. O. Hegemann, *l. c.*, pp. 44. 45. 93. 94.

30) See Julius Koestlin, *Martin Luther*, p. 408.

31) *Ehrendenkmal treuer Zeugen*, p. 30.

had knocked three times at the study-door, without receiving an answer.

"No doubt," said Katharine, "he has been at his books all night." She went to her husband's chamber, — his bed was untouched. Then she hurried to his study, and knocking repeatedly, heard no sound from within. She anxiously opened the door, — there sat the Doctor, motionless, bending over a book. Beside him on the table stood a plate with a piece of dry bread and half a herring. "Doctor!" exclaimed Katharine, pausing at the door. Luther did not move. She went to him, took his hand, and bent over him, with a look of mingled anxiety and reproach. Luther looked up in surprise. "Dearest Doctor," said Katharine, "how you have alarmed me! Why do you do thus?" Her question aroused him fully. A shadow passed over his face, and he pointed to the Hebrew Bible before him: "Why do you reproach me, Kate? Think you that what I am doing is evil? Do you not know that I must work while it is day? For the night cometh when no man can work." He spoke almost harshly, but she knew that he was not angry. She silently caressed the kind hand, whose labors for the weal of the human race never ceased. Her eyes fell upon the half-consumed herring, and with a sad smile she said: "How is it that with such meager fare you have so strong and stately a figure? Melanchthon looks like a lad beside you. — But to-day you must permit your wife to refresh you with a festive repast after your labors. Our friends are coming to rejoice with us over the newly-won peace." Luther passed his hand over his forehead. "I had well-nigh forgotten; but I shall enjoy our feast in the company of my friends. Spalatin, too, has promised to be present." He rose, and laying his hand on his wife's shoulder, said gently: "My dear wife, how heartily you are concerned for me. Wish me joy that God has given me a helpmate, who watches over my health so carefully, and bears so patiently with my faults and infirmities. Dr. Martin would fare ill had he not his Kate, who is better able than he to manage his household."

We are persuaded that Luther's wife, Philip Melanchthon, Vitus Dietrich, and others, knew more about Luther's diet than Denifle. The foregoing quotations from Luther's wife, Dietrich, and Melanchthon are indeed "a fine explanation" of those words of Luther's in the letter to Bora, dated July 2, 1540: "I eat like a Bohemian and drink like a German" (Denifle). But let us have the entire letter.

TO KATHARINE, LUTHER'S WIFE.

July 2, 1540.

Grace and peace, my dear Katie! I wish to let you know that I am well. I eat like a Bohemian and drink like a German, for which God be thanked. Amen. The reason for this is that Philip (Melanchthon) was verily dead, and, like Lazarus, has been raised from the dead. God, the dear Father, hears our prayers. This we can understand, although often we do not believe it. I have written to Dr. Pommer that the Count of Schwarzburg wishes a pastor for Greussen, so you might, like a clever lady and doctress, confer with Herr George Major and M. Ambrosius, to see which of the three whom I mentioned to Pommer could be persuaded to go. It is not a bad living (Pfarre), but you might show your cleverness by improving upon this. I have received the children's letters with that of Baccalarien (who is no child), but nothing from Your Grace, therefore I trust you will answer the four letters all at once with your gracious hand. I herewith send the silver apple to Paul,³²⁾ the gift of your hand, which, as I said before, you must divide among the children, and ask how many cherries and apples they would take for it, and pay them in ready money, and keep the stem. Say to our dear boarders, particularly Dr. Schiefer, with my love, that I hope they will look after everything connected with churches, schools, and house, and wherever necessary. Also I trust M. Major and M. Ambrosius will be a comfort to you in the house. And, God willing, we shall leave Weimar on Sunday for Eisenach, and bring Philip with us. I commit you to God. Say to Wolf³³⁾ that he must attend to the mulberries, and not idle his time away, and draw the wine away at the proper time. Let all be joyful and pray.

MARTIN LUTHER, Thy Well-beloved.³⁴⁾

On July 16, 1540, Luther wrote another letter to his wife,³⁵⁾ in which he says: "We are fresh and well, eat like the Bohemians, drink like the Germans, *but in moderation, and are full of joy.*" The words: "But in moderation, and are full of joy," interpret his words in the foregoing letter: "I eat like a Bohemian, and drink like a German." Luther, as all his letters to his wife prove, was wont to joke with her. Of course, Pater Denifle does not and cannot understand innocent joking.

32) Luther's son, born 1533.

33) Wolfgang Sieberger, Luther's servant.

34) See Currie, *Luther's Letters*, p. 388.

35) *l. c.*, p. 389.

Denifle writes (I, 1, p. 103): "It is said, indeed it is, that Luther drank a sextar of imported sweet wine every noon and evening." The St. Louis edition of Luther's writings³⁶⁾ gives the original: "ein halb Stuebigen." How much was a "Stuebigen"? Denifle says, "a sextar." Koestlin says, "a pint."³⁷⁾ Both agree fairly well. According to the *Standard Dictionary* a sextar is $\frac{9}{10}$ pint. But Luther writes: "The town council gives me for each meal a half 'Stuebigen,'" *i. e.*, half a pint, "of Rheinfall, which is very good. Sometimes I drink it with my friends." Denifle says that Luther "drank a sextar of wine at noon and in the evening," but he should have said a half sextar. And why did Denifle omit the words of Luther, "*Sometimes I drink it with my friends*"? One half pint of wine Luther received from the town council for each meal,—and the *one half pint* he "sometimes" drank with his friends. We know that Jonas and Coelius were with him at Eisleben.³⁸⁾ Three men divide a half pint of wine between them; hence, each did not even drink $\frac{1}{3}$ pint at each meal. Luther expressly writes in his letter: "*Sometimes I drink it with my friends.*" The most temperate person may do what Luther "sometimes" did. How can Denifle, or any one else, rightly charge Luther with drunkenness, because he did, occasionally, drink $\frac{1}{2}$ pint of wine? Denifle could have found some good Roman Catholics who, in an affair of this sort, left Luther far "in the shade." Of course, Denifle was not after wine-bibbers, but he was after Luther! If Martin Luther had remained in the Roman Catholic Church, then his drinking of $\frac{1}{2}$ pint of wine would have been considered *very temperate*, as indeed it was. Perhaps Luther would be counted among the saints of the Church.

Boehmer writes (p. 80):—

Charles V can hardly be said to have passed for a drunkard. Still, at meals he quaffed only three cups; however, at each draught he drained, without stopping, a crystal cup, holding about one and half-seidel, *i. e.*, about a bottle of wine. The beautiful Philippine

36) Vol. XXIb, 3196.

37) Koestlin, *Martin Luther*, p. 588.

38) *l. c.*, p. 576.

Welser³⁹) was famed for her delicate complexion; still, at Amras Castle she managed to drink "welcome" to a company, which means that she drained a cup holding two entire liter (2 quarts).

Here we have two good Roman Catholics: one, the Holy Roman Emperor, and the other, the good Christian mother of a Roman Catholic cardinal, "who were not considered drunkards," — and yet the one only drank three bottles (about 2½ to 3 quarts) of wine at each meal, and the other 2 quarts (½ gallon) of wine at one "Willkommen." Two good Roman Catholics about 1¼ gallon! Three good Lutherans about ½ pint! Or, to be exact: Charles V — 3 bottles; Philippine Welser — 2 quarts; Dr. Martin Luther — ⅓ pint of wine at one meal. What must have been the condition of the corpses of Charles V, the Holy Roman Emperor, and Philippine Welser, the learned and beautiful mother of a Roman Catholic cardinal! We pity the unfortunate pall-bearers! What a doleful noise the crows must have made!

Editor Preuss proceeds:

P. Albert M. Weiss, O. P., the continuator of Denifle's work, rightly says in his *Lutherpsychologie* (Mainz, 1906, pp. 187 sqq.) that if Luther was not a drunkard in the full sense of the term, he most certainly did indulge in alcoholic stimulants to the very limit of his bovine capacity, and this fact alone is enough to make his influence an evil factor in these days when one of the first and most sacred duties of every true Christian is to combat alcoholism. "The higher his reputation has grown with the masses, the stronger has become the deleterious influence that must be ascribed to his example and his word." (Weiss, *l. c.*) If the local option speaker mentioned by the *Diocesan Messenger* had developed this idea, the Reverend Mr. Hartenberger could not have floored him so easily.

Luther, as we have seen, drank ⅓ pint of wine *sometimes*. Luther writes in the letter afore-cited: "We live here very well; the town council gives me for each meal half a pint of 'Rheinfall,' which is very good. Sometimes I drink it with

39) Philippine Welser (1527—1580), daughter of Franz Welser, renowned for her learning and beauty, secretly married the Archduke Ferdinand, second son of the Emperor Ferdinand I. One of her sons became a cardinal. (*New Internat. Encyclopedia*, sub *Welser*.)

my friends," Jonas and Coelius. Weiss, according to Preuss, says: "He (Luther) most certainly did indulge in alcoholic stimulants to the very limit of his *bovine* capacity." We are willing to let the readers of this article judge for themselves whether Luther indulged in "alcoholic stimulants to the very limit of his *bovine capacity*," or whether Weiss indulged in ignorance to the very limit of his *bovine stupidity*!

Finally, we may also prove by Luther's great faith in his God and Savior that Luther was not a drunkard, much less a habitual drinker of "alcoholic stimulants to the very limit" of his capacity. Dr. Martin Luther was a giant of faith. History tells us that he prayed three hours each day while he was at Coburg—during the sessions of the Diet of Augsburg.

How Luther used to converse with God as his Father and Friend Melancthon in those days learned from Dietrich. The latter heard him pray aloud: "I know that Thou art our Father and our God. The danger is Thine as well as ours; the whole cause is Thine, we have put our hands to it because we were obliged to do so; do Thou protect it!" Luther daily devoted at least *three hours to prayer*. He taught his family to do the same. He wrote to his wife: "Pray with confidence, for all is well arranged, and God will aid us." Two years later he said in a sermon about the hearing of prayer: "I have tried it, and many people with me, especially when the devil wanted to devour us at the Diet at Augsburg, and everything looked gloomy, and people were so excited that every one expected things would go to ruin, as some had defiantly threatened, and already knives were drawn and guns were loaded; but God, in answer to our prayers, so helped us that those bawlers, with their clamors and menaces, were thoroughly put to shame, and a favorable peace and gracious issue granted to us.⁴⁰⁾

Many letters of Luther could be adduced to show his great faith and confidence in God, but space forbids.⁴¹⁾ We give his letter to Chancellor George Brueck written August 5, 1530.

Grace and peace in Christ! Highly esteemed lord and sir,—

I have written several times to you and others, as if I fancied I experienced more of God's help and consolation than was afforded

40) Koestlin, *Martin Luther*, p. 415.

41) See Luther's letters of the year 1530. Currie, pp. 202—257. St. Louis ed. XXIa, 1405—1609.

to His Electoral Grace. But I was impelled to do this through the depression into which some of our friends had sunk, as if God had forgotten them. But He cannot do so unless He would forget Himself first. "Can a woman forget her sucking child, that she should not have compassion on the son of her womb? Yea, she may forget, yet will I not forget thee." "Behold, I have graven thee upon the palms of my hands."

Lately, I saw two wonders. First, as I looked out of the window I saw the stars shining in God's beautifully vaulted heavens, and yet there were no visible pillars supporting this firmament, and still the heavens fell not. Now there are always some who search for those pillars to grasp them, and, failing in their quest, they go about in fear and trembling, as if the heavens must fall because they cannot grasp those pillars. If they could, then all would be right, they fancy.

Secondly, I beheld great clouds hovering over us, borne down by their great weight, like unto a mighty ocean, and yet I saw no foundation upon which they rested, and no shore which bounded them, and still they did not fall, but, greeting us stiffly, fled on apace. But when they had vanished, a rainbow feebly lit up earth and sky, till it, too, disappeared like a mist among the clouds, making us fear as much for the foundation as for the water-charged clouds above. But in very deed this almost invisible mist supported the heavily charged clouds and protected us.

So there are some who pay more attention to, and are more afraid of, the waters and the dark clouds than give heed to the tiny bow of promise. They would like to feel the fine mist, and because they cannot they fear a second flood.

I write in this jocular way to Your Excellence, and yet it is no jest, for I am much pleased to hear how courageous you are, and what a deep interest you take in all that concerns us. I hoped we would have been able to at least maintain worldly peace, but God's thoughts are far above our thoughts, and this is well, for St. Paul says He hears us, and does exceeding abundantly above all that we can ask for. Were He to hear us when we plead that the Emperor might grant peace, then it might redound to the Emperor's honor, and not to God's. So He Himself will procure peace, so that He alone may have the glory.

These bloody men (papists—*J. H. H.*) have not done half the mischief they intended, and have not yet reached their homes.

Our rainbow is weak and faint, but we shall see who conquers. Your Excellency will pardon my garrulity, and comfort Magister

Philip and the others. Christ will comfort and support our most gracious lord. To Him be praise to all eternity! Amen. I commend your Excellency to His loving faithfulness. From the desert [*i. e.*, Coburg Castle—*J. H. H.*].⁴²⁾

MARTIN LUTHER.

Thus wrote the man who devoted at least three hours a day to prayer while at Coburg Castle. And his prayers were graciously heard and answered by God, as history proves.

But Luther did not first learn to pray while at Coburg. He had been a "mighty man of prayer" years before. A. Stein, in his *Katharine v. Bora*, relates the following (pp. 124 sqq.) :

In the early dawn of a hot summer's day—the 6th of July, 1527—a woman hurried through the streets of Wittenberg, and knocked at the door of the town-preacher, Bugenhagen. With anxious haste she entered the study of the reverend gentleman.

"Dear Doctor, I beg of you, for Christ's sake, come with me; my dear husband is in great anguish, and I am sorely troubled. Perhaps you may be better able than I to comfort him."

Bugenhagen, greatly alarmed, inquired more particularly into the condition of his friend.

Madame Katharine, still panting from her hurried walk,—for the sick man was no other than Dr. Martin Luther,—replied: "His head is confused, and frightful visions arise before him. He imagines that the devil is besetting him, who seeks to put him to shame, and to destroy the work of his life. Although I have endeavored to soothe him with loving words, he seems not to hear me, and refuses food and drink. In January he suffered in a like manner, but a tea of herbs restored him. This time my simple remedies have been without effect."

Bugenhagen listened with painful interest. "Do not despair, dear Madame Luther," he said; "it is not the devil who is at work, but his sluggish blood, which rises to his head and produces these illusions. I can easily explain the cause. His body is taking its revenge for the sins committed against it, when in the convent, out of ignorance, and from mistaken piety, he undermined his health with watching, fasting, and otherwise mortifying the flesh. He sits too closely over his books, denies himself the needed recreation, and tortures his brain with overmuch study and thought. The world's enmity against the truth causes him much sorrow; the miserable Peasants' War has grieved his generous spirit, and the dis-

42) Margaret A. Currie, *The Letters of Martin Luther*, pp. 238. 239.

pute with the Swiss Sacramentarians is not yet ended. All these things have given him many sad hours. But with God's help it will pass over. I will go with you, and do what I can."

They at once repaired to the convent. The servants stood about, in anxious fear, and regarded with dismay the town-preacher, who was also Luther's confessor.

Bugenhagen found the sick man reclining in a chair, his arms hanging listlessly at his side. His friendly greeting was received with a dreary smile.

"You are heartily welcome, dear Bugenhagen. I longed to see you, that I might unburden my heart, and receive absolution. Behold, whatsoever sins I have committed during my life, in thought, word, and deed, rest like a weight upon my soul, and I pray God, for Christ's sake, to have mercy on a poor sinner. Dear Bugenhagen, give me God's assurance that I shall find grace with the ever-living Father of mercies."

Deeply moved, Bugenhagen gave him absolution, and then inquired into the nature of his malady.

"Dear Dr. Pommer," Luther replied, "the torments which are now besetting me remind me of St. Paul, when he was buffeted by the messengers of Satan; for such ills there seems to be no natural cause. Because I am usually of a cheerful countenance, many think that my path is strewn with roses; but God knows how it is with me."

Bugenhagen repeated the arguments with which he had sought to reassure Madame Kate, but they made little impression on the sick man.

Bugenhagen then reminded Luther of the invitation they had both received to breakfast with the Elector's marshal, Hans Loeser. "The society of these men, and the fresh air, will do you good. I pray you, Martin, rouse yourself!" Katharine's eloquence was added to that of Bugenhagen, and finally Luther yielded to their united persuasions.

At the inn, where the breakfast was served, a chosen company was assembled. Luther ate little, but forced himself to join in the conversation. At noon he left quietly, and went to his friend Justus Jonas, the provost of All Saints' School. He sat for two hours, pouring out his heart to his friend, for Jonas was a man of wise counsel and loving sympathy. Before leaving, Luther invited his friend to visit him in the evening. When Jonas arrived at the appointed time, he found the Doctor lying on his bed, complaining of great weakness, and a constant rushing and singing in his left ear. Feeling a sudden faintness, Luther called for water, which

Jonas brought and dashed into his face. This seemed to revive the sufferer. He lay back among the pillows, with wide open eyes. But suddenly his face changed, his body grew cold, and shook as in an ague fit. With difficulty he folded his hands, and a fervent prayer rose from his lips: "My God, if Thou hast ordained this to be my last hour, I submit myself to Thy will. O Lord, rebuke me not in Thine anger, neither chasten me in Thy hot displeasure. Have mercy upon me, O Lord; for I am weak: O Lord, heal me; for my bones are vexed. My soul is also sore vexed. But Thou, O Lord, how long? Return, O Lord, deliver my soul! Oh save me for Thy mercy's sake! For in death there is no remembrance of Thee: in the grave who shall give Thee thanks? I am weary with my groaning; all the night make I my bed to swim; I water my couch with my tears. Mine eye is consumed because of grief; it waxeth old, because of all mine enemies. Depart from me, all ye workers of iniquity, for the Lord hath heard the voice of my weeping. The Lord hath heard my supplication; the Lord will receive my prayer. Let all mine enemies be ashamed and sore vexed: let them return and be ashamed suddenly. Lord, Thou hast been our dwelling-place in all generations. Amen."

While he was praying, Katharine had entered the room, bringing with her Augustine Schurf, the family physician, who at once ordered the patient to be wrapped in heated cloths. Luther seemed to observe nothing of what was passing. His thoughts were with God, and his eyes were turned heavenward. Again he prayed, and all folded their hands in tearful reverence:

"O death, were is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory? Thanks be to God, which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ. I lay me down in peace and sleep; for Thou, Lord, only makest me dwell in safety. Lord Jesus Christ, receive my spirit! I take refuge in Thy wounds; Thy righteousness upholds me,—Thou art our only Mediator and High Priest, who bearest the sins of the world. Dear Lord, Thou hast not counted Thy servant worthy, after the manner of the blessed martyrs, to shed his blood for Thee; yet will I take comfort in the example of St. John, to whom also this boon was denied, albeit he wrote a book against the Antichrist, far more effective than any book of mine."

Turning to his friends, he continued: "Dear, faithful friends, lest after my death the world should say I had recanted, I ask you to witness this my confession. I declare, with a clear conscience, that I have taught none but the true and wholesome doctrine concerning faith, love, the cross, the sacraments, and other articles of the Christian religion, according to God's Word and at His com-

mand, who alone has guided me in this matter, and has drawn and urged me forward, without any will of mine. I testify to those who have reproached me with too great sharpness against the papists and fanatics that I have experienced no remorse in the matter, having never sought any man's hurt, but rather the conversion and salvation of my enemies. I would fain abide a little longer, inasmuch as many a word still remains to be said against fanatics and the Sacramentarians. But God's will be done. Christ is stronger than Belial, and can raise up servants out of stones, who will fight in His name."

His eyes then sought his wife, who stood apart from the others, weeping bitterly. He beckoned her to come nearer, took her hand, and said: "Dearest Kate, I pray you, if the dear Lord take me hence, to submit to His gracious will. You are my true and lawful wife. Of that you shall have no doubt, let the blind world say what it will. Be guided by the Word of God; cling to that, and you will have a never-failing support against the devil and all evil tongues."

He lay back; his breath came hard, like that of a dying man. Then he turned and asked, "Where is my dear little son Hans?"

The child was brought, and greeted his sick father with a smile. Tenderly the cold hand caressed his warm, rosy cheeks, and the pallid lips pronounced a father's blessing: "O thou poor child! I commit my dear wife and my fatherless child into the hands of my loving, faithful God. You have nothing, for I leave you no earthly goods; but God has enough for all. Dear Lord, I thank Thee from my heart that it hath pleased Thee to make me poor in worldly things; I can therefore leave to my wife and child neither house nor land, neither money nor goods. As Thou gavest me them, so I return them to Thee. Thou rich and faithful God, do Thou sustain, teach, and provide for them, even as Thou didst sustain, teach, and provide for me. O Thou Father of the fatherless, Thou Friend of the widow!"

Katharine's heart was wrung with grief. God, in His unsearchable wisdom, was laying a heavy sorrow upon her. For two years she had enjoyed the blessedness of her union with this man; henceforth she and her child must stand alone, poor and defenseless, dependent upon the uncertain favor of human friendship, exposed to the scorn and hatred of enemies, who would make the living feel the insults they might no longer heap upon the dead.—When she thought of herself and the child, her heart seemed well-nigh to break; but when she looked at her husband, and heard his prayer in her behalf, strength was given her to endure in silence, and even to speak words of comfort to the sufferer. Bending over him, she said gently:

"My dearest Doctor, if it be God's will, I would rather you were with Him than with me. I grieve not for myself and for my child only, but for the many good Christian people who still have need of you. Do not, my dearest husband, trouble yourself about me. I commend you to God's holy will, and hope and trust that He will graciously spare you."

It seemed as though her words inspired the others with renewed courage. The physician, who had given up all hope, ordered the cold limbs to be again warmed and rubbed. Love and friendship labored faithfully to restore the precious life, and prayer after prayer rose to heaven.

Then came the merciful answer: "Behold, he shall not die, but live!" It seemed like a miracle when the color returned to the pallid face, and the drops of moisture which appeared on the sick man's forehead seemed like dew from heaven.

The physician exclaimed: "He lives! He lives!" As one intoxicated by the sudden change from despair to hope, the loving wife fell at the feet of him to whom God had revealed the means of preserving her husband's life."

By the grace of God Luther remained a man of faith and prayer unto his end—February 18, 1546. Luther died in Eisleben where he had gone to reconcile the Counts of Mansfeld. His last sermon, on Sunday, February 14, 1546, he concluded with the words: "This and much more is to be said about the Gospel; but I am too weak, we will leave off here."—Koestlin writes:—

At length his efforts to mediate between his masters, the counts, were crowned with success beyond all expectation. On February 14, 1546, a reconciliation was effected upon the chief points, and the various members of the count's families rejoiced. . . . On the 16th and 17th of that month the reconciliation upon all the points of dispute was formally concluded. . . . On the morning of the 17th, however, the counts found themselves compelled, by Luther's state of health, to entreat him not to exert himself any longer with their affairs; and so he only added his signature where required. To Jonas and the counts' court-preacher Coelius, who were staying with him, he said he thought he would remain at Eisleben, where he was born (November 10, 1483—*J. H. II.*). Before supper he complained of oppression of the chest, and had himself rubbed with warm cloths. This relieved him, and he left his little room, going down the staircase into the public room to join the party at

supper. "There is no pleasure," he said, "in being alone." At supper he was merry with the rest, and talked with his usual energy on various subjects—now jocular or serious, now intellectual and pious. But no sooner had he returned to his chamber and finished his usual evening prayer than he again became anxious and troubled. After being rubbed again with warm cloths and having taken a medicine which Count Albert himself had brought him, he laid himself down about nine o'clock on a leathern sofa and slept gently for an hour and a half. On awakening, he rose, and with the words (spoken in Latin), "Into Thy hands I commend my spirit, for Thou hast redeemed me, Thou God of truth," went to his bed in the adjoining room, where he again slept, breathing quietly, till one o'clock. He then awoke, called his servant, and begged him to heat the room, though it was quite warm already, and then exclaimed to Jonas, "O Lord God, how ill I am! Ah! I feel I shall remain at Eisleben, where I was born and baptized." In this state of pain he arose, walked without assistance into the room which he had left a few hours before, again commending his soul to God; and then, after pacing up and down the room once, lay down once more on the sofa, complaining again of the oppression on his chest. His two sons, Martin and Paul, remained with him all night. They had spent most of the time at Mansfeld with their relatives there, but had now returned to their father (Hans was still absent), and his servant and Jonas. Coelius also hastened to him, and the young theologian John Aurifaber, a friend of the two counts, who used to associate with Luther, together with Jonas and Coelius. The town-clerk was there, too, with his wife, also two physicians, and Count Albert and his wife, the latter of whom busied herself zealously with nursing the sick man; and later on came a Count of Schwarzburg with his wife, who were staying on a visit with the Count of Mansfeld. The rubbing and application of warm cloths and the medicines were now of no avail to ease Luther's anguish. He broke out into a sweat. His friends began to feel more happy about him, hoping that this would relieve him; but he replied, "It is the cold sweat of death; I shall yield up my spirit." Then he began to give thanks aloud to God, who had revealed to him His Son, whom he had confessed and loved, and whom the godless and the Pope blasphemed and insulted. He cried aloud to God and to the Lord Jesus: "Take my poor soul into Thy hands! Although I must leave this body, I know that I shall ever be with Thee." He then spoke words of the Bible, three times uttering the text of St. John (3, 16): "God so loved the world that He gave His only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should

not perish, but have everlasting life." After Coelius had given him one more spoonful of medicine, he said again, "I am going, and shall render up my spirit," and three times rapidly in succession he said in Latin, "Father, into Thy hands I commend my spirit, for Thou hast redeemed me, O Lord God of truth." From that time he remained quiet and closed his eyes, without giving any answer when spoken to by those around him, who were busy with restoratives. Jonas and Coelius, however, after his pulse had been rubbed with strengthening waters, said aloud in his ear: "Reverend father (Reverende pater), wilt thou stand by Christ and the doctrine thou hast preached?" He uttered an audible "Yes." He then turned upon his right side and fell asleep. He lay thus for nearly a quarter of an hour, when his feet and nose grew cold; he fetched one deep even breath, and was gone. It was between two and three o'clock in the morning of February 18—a Thursday.⁴³⁾

A Roman Catholic priest, by the name of Claude Fabre, priest of the Oratory in Paris, writes concerning Luther (vol. 29, p. 75): "He felt his end approaching, and he prayed as was his custom, confidently believing that throughout eternity he would behold the face of God, and that no one should be able to pluck him out of God's hand. He commended his soul to God and died peacefully, as eyewitnesses report."⁴⁴⁾

Luther, being such a faithful and prayerful man, had the courage to rebuke gluttony and drunkenness as no one had done before him; he even publicly rebuked his Elector John Frederick for his drinking too much at times.⁴⁵⁾ "In his zeal he (Luther) reproached the Evangelical congregations even more severely than his Catholic and Popish opponents would ever have ventured to reproach them, inasmuch as their own moral attitude, to say the least, was not a whit better. . . . The authorities, in his opinion, were far too unmindful of their great responsibility to God,"—even as they are to this very day,— "and of this he had taken such pains to assure them."⁴⁶⁾

43) Koestlin, *Martin Luther*, pp. 576—578.

44) See Dr. O. Hegemann, *Luther im kath. Urteil*, p. 61.

45) See Koestlin, *Martin Luther*, p. 446.

46) *l. c.*, p. 527.

It is evident, therefore, that only ignorance or, what is worse, malice can prefer the unfounded charge of drunkenness against the great Reformer, Dr. Martin Luther.

* * *

Editor Preuss proceeds thus:

As for Luther's ideas and teachings on the subject of woman and her sexual relations with man, the very fact that he forswore his sacred vows and went to live with an ex-nun, is proof sufficient that he acted on (and therefore believed in) the maxim that a man who leads a celibate life is a fool, even had we not the many quotations from his works and letters which Doellinger has extracted and grouped together in the second volume of his great work, *Die Reformation, ihre innere Entwicklung und ihre Wirkungen im Umfange des Lutherischen Bekenntnisses* (Regensburg, 1848, pp. 427 sqq.). It is impossible to copy even the mildest of these shocking utterances into the pages of a magazine that is read in thousands of Christian homes. Should the Rev. Mr. Hartenberger or any other Lutheran minister desire to learn particulars, I shall be glad to give him the necessary references to Luther's writings.

But I am imposing on your space. It is of comparatively small moment whether or not Luther wrote the verses:

Who does not love wine, women, and song
Remains a fool his whole life long;

but it is of extremely great importance to know and to insist that Luther cannot be counted among the men whose influence can help us in the work of true reform, individual and social, and that the principles upon which he shaped his life and built up his so-called religion, are false and pernicious, no matter how their present-day representatives may choose to knead them.

Editor Preuss is very much offended at Dr. Luther's *marriage*, and he thinks that Luther believed that a man who leads a single life is a fool. Editor Preuss says that Luther forswore his sacred vows (the vow of celibacy is meant) and "went to live with an ex-nun." Observe the phraseology: "He went to live with," etc. Rome does not regard Luther and Katharine von Bora as married. — Luther, on June 13, 1525, married Katharine von Bora. In taking this step Luther acted within the limits of his God-given right. Katharine von Bora was not the wife of any man. She was not a divorced woman.

She was a good and God-fearing lady. Editor Preuss contends that Luther had to forswear his sacred vows in order to marry, and for that reason his marriage is mere concubinage.

This raises the question: *Is the vow of celibacy a sacred vow?* Editor Preuss and many other Roman Catholics think that it is; but to err is human. The Holy Scriptures nowhere speak of the "sacred vow of celibacy." God nowhere says that a person should lead a celibate life. God says: "It is not good that the man should be alone; I will make him an help meet for him."⁴⁷⁾ "And God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth and subdue it."⁴⁸⁾ "And Adam said, This is now bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh: she shall be called Woman, because she was taken out of Man. Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife: and they shall be one flesh."⁴⁹⁾ And Jesus says: "For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife: and they twain shall be one flesh."⁵⁰⁾ St. Paul reiterates these words of our dear Savior Eph. 5, 31. And to Timothy he writes: "Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils; speaking lies in hypocrisy; having their conscience seared with a hot iron; *forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats*, which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving of them which believe and know the truth."⁵¹⁾ "This is a true saying, If a man desire the office of a bishop, he desireth a good work. A bishop, then, must be blameless, *the husband of one wife*, vigilant, sober, of good behavior, given to hospitality, apt to teach; not given to wine, no striker, not greedy of filthy lucre; but patient, not a brawler, not covetous; one that *ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity.*"⁵²⁾ To the Corinthians St. Paul writes: "Have we not power to eat and to drink?"

47) Gen. 2, 18.

48) Gen. 1, 28.

49) Gen. 2, 23. 24.

50) Matt. 19, 5.

51) 1 Tim. 4, 1—3.

52) 1 Tim. 3, 1—4.

Have we not power to lead a sister, *a wife*, as well as other apostles, and as the brethren of the Lord, and Cephas (*i. e.*, St. Peter)? Or I only and Barnabas, have not we power to forbear working?"⁵³) Yes, St. Peter had a *wife*, for we read: "And when Jesus was come into Peter's house, He saw his wife's mother laid, and sick of a fever."⁵⁴) "To avoid fornication, let every man have his own wife, and let every woman have her own husband."⁵⁵) Neither our Lord nor the holy apostles enjoin celibacy, and consequently nowhere demand the vow of celibacy. Luther did not know the Holy Scriptures when he took the vow of celibacy. He took his vows in 1506. Had he known in 1506 what he knew in 1521, he never would have made the papistic vows which he made. In a letter to Philip Melancthon dated August 1, 1521, he writes:

I still fail to see that we must treat the vows of priests and monks by the above rule. For I am much impressed with the fact that the order of the priesthood is ordained by God as a free institution, but not that of monks, which is self-elected and is being offered to God [as a service]. I could almost express the opinion that those who have entered this gorge before the age of puberty or are now in that age, can leave it without compunction. What checks me is only the question what to do with those who have spent a long time and are grown old in this order.

By the way, since Paul declares frankly (1 Tim. 4, 1) that the marriage of priests has been interdicted by the devils, and since the voice of Paul is the voice of divine Majesty, I have no doubt but what we must rely on him, even to the extent of declaring that monks who had consented to the devil's interdict at the time of their reception into their order may fearlessly cancel their pact now that they understood with whom their pact was made.

Now, this interdict of the devil, which is clearly indicated as such by God's Word, urges me greatly and constrains me to approve the action of the Bishop of Kemberg. For God does not lie nor deceive when He says that the interdict is of the devil. Now, when an agreement has been entered into with the devil concerning this matter, the agreement cannot stand, because it was made against [the will of] God, in wicked error, and because it is rejected and

53) 1 Cor. 9, 4—6.

54) Matt. 8, 14.

55) 1 Cor. 7, 2.

condemned by God. For He says plainly⁵⁶) that the authors of this interdict are spirits of error.

Why do you hesitate, then, to accede to this divine verdict, even against the gates of hell? The oath which the children of Israel made to the Gibeonites (Josh. 9, 15) cannot be cited as a parallel. For in their laws they were enjoined to offer peace and to accept peace-offers when they were made to them; also to receive proselytes and such as were willing to adopt their customs. In that instance there was nothing done contrary to the Lord or by the prompting of spirits of error. For although they grumbled at first, yet they approved the matter afterward.

Add to this that celibacy is a mere human ordinance, which, being ordained by man, may be rescinded by man. Any Christian, therefore, may rescind it. I should hold this even if the ordinance were not of the devil, but of some pious person. Now, since I have no such divine statement regarding monks [as the Israelites had in the instance afore-cited—*Ed.*], it is not safe to make a like claim in their behalf. For I should not like to follow them in their course, and hence I could not advise any one else to follow them. Would to God that we could accomplish this [rescind the interdict of the marriage of priests—*Ed.*], in order that no person henceforth might turn monk, or quit his order in the years of pubescence. For if there is not a plain passage of Scripture in our favor, we are obliged to avoid giving offense, regardless of the fact that the matter in question is, in itself, admissible.

Good Carlstadt cites Paul (1 Tim. 5, 9, 11) to the effect that the younger widows should be refused and persons of three-score years chosen. Would to God that this reference would prove the point! For anyone can easily meet this argument by saying that the apostle, in laying down the rule afore-mentioned, refers to the future, while he states in regard to the past (v. 12) that (those who waxed wanton against Christ and married) have damnation, because they have cast off their first faith. And thus the above citation is nullified and cannot serve as a firm rock on which the conscience can gain a footing. For that is what we are trying to find. Again, the argument that it is better to marry than to burn (1 Cor. 7, 9), or that a person should marry to avoid fornication (1 Cor. 7, 2), and do this in the sin of casting off one's faith,—what else is this than a mere opinion of reason? What we want is Scripture and an expression of the divine will. Who knows that the person who is burning to-day will be burning to-morrow?

56) 1 Tim. 4, 1, in the rendering of the Vulgate.

To be sure, I should not have sanctioned the marriage of priests only on account of the burning, if Paul had not called this interdict an error, devilish, hypocritical, and damned by God, thus compelling us, even regardless of the burning, to abandon the unmarried state in the interest of the fear of God. However, it will be useful to discuss these matters more fully. For I, too, would very, very much like to come to the rescue of monks and nuns, so deeply am I grieved over these unfortunate persons, these youths and maidens, who are suffering pollution and burning.⁵⁷⁾

Luther was not contemplating marriage when he wrote the foregoing letter to Philip Melancthon. Perhaps he never would have married had not his friends insisted that he should live up to his doctrine, and set the good example to the clergy. "His enemies, in fact, were taunting him that he did not venture to practice himself what he preached to others."⁵⁸⁾ After his marriage, however, they "spread vulgar falsehoods about him, which soon were further exaggerated, and have been raked up shamelessly again, even in our own time, or at least repeated in veiled and scandalous innuendoes."⁵⁹⁾ Luther wrote to Spalatin: "I have made myself so vile and contemptible, forsooth, that all the angels, I hope, will laugh, and all the devils weep."⁶⁰⁾ Of course, Luther wrote these words in a jocular sense, but it was the truth. The world is indebted to Luther for his marriage. The principles upon which he shaped his life are sound and Christian, even if Romanists will not admit this undeniable fact. The principles of the Roman Catholic Church concerning matrimony and celibacy are pernicious, as those countries prove that have not as yet come under the influence of Luther and other good Protestants. Romanists may slander the great Reformer, Dr. Martin Luther, on account of his marriage, but they cannot do away with the fact that in Roman Catholic countries the number of illegitimate children is very great. The celibacy of Roman Catholic priests never has furthered chastity. Dr. Luther forswore his vow of celibacy,

57) See THEOL. QUARTERLY, XII, pp. 113—115. St. Louis ed. XV, 2586.

58) Koestlin, *Martin Luther*, p. 329.

59) *l. c.*, p. 331.

60) *l. c.*, p. 332.

but *not his vow of chastity*. Many Roman Catholic priests may keep their vow of celibacy, but *forswear their vow of chastity*. Under the heading, "Latin America Judged By Its Bishops," the *Literary Digest* of February 5, 1910, has the following to say to its readers:

If there is any moral need for maintaining Christian missions in the Chinese Empire, says Mr. Robert E. Speer, "there is ten times more need in South America." This leader of the Students' Volunteer Movement has just returned from a visit to the Southern Hemisphere, and his account of the moral state of Latin America shows that its condition is deplored by the leaders of the Catholic Church, from the Pope downward. There is in the facts themselves urgent demand for missionary endeavor from both branches of the Christian Church. Mr. Speer reports that a Passionist father told him that he thought Protestants ought to come and work side by side with the Roman Catholics, as in this country. The South American people, it is said, "do not object to the Monroe Doctrine, but they do object to the negative attitude of the United States, keeping the help of European nations out, but giving little constructive help herself."

Concerning the present condition of things, Mr. Speer quotes from a letter of the Pope to the clergy (Roman Catholic clergy—*J. H. H.*) of Chile. The passage runs thus: "In every diocese, ecclesiastics break all bounds and deliver themselves up to manifold sensuality, but no voice is lifted to imperiously summon the pastors to their duty. It is sad to reflect that prelates, priests, and other clergy are never to be found doing service among the poor, never in the hospitals, never in the dwellings of the afflicted or the distressed, or engaged in works of beneficence; that they are always absent where human misery is, unless paid as chaplains or a fee is given. You, as clergy, are always to be found in the house of the rich, where gluttony is to be engaged in and where good wines are to be obtained."

Almost in the same vein are the words of the Bishop of Caracas, taken from a pastoral letter: "The scandals in the parish or town take on unmeasured proportion. The enemies of the Church triumph because of the shameful evils of the parochial priests, and good souls retire to groan in secret. It is revealed in the deserted churches. We should know that the one cause of this humiliating delay is none other than the hidden corruption of the heart and life of the priests."

Mr. Speer, whose words form part of an address before the convention of the Student Volunteers, reports that in Valparaiso he was told that "only one-half of the priests in Chile were men who were leading clean moral lives." Upon asking a priest in Colombia, he was told that "out of the eighteen priests who were his own intimate friends there was only one who was leading a clean moral life." He gives some figures that indicate the general moral condition of the Latin-American people:—

"Latin America, especially South America, is a country of appalling illiteracy. . . . All of South America together has just about the population of Japan. In all South America there are 43,000 school-teachers and 2,000,000 pupils; while in Japan there are 133,000 school-teachers and 6,000,000 pupils in the schools. . . . According to the last Government census 18 per cent. of the population of Brazil is illegitimate, 27.5 per cent. of the population of Uruguay, 50 per cent. of the population of Ecuador, and 58.5 per cent. of the population of Venezuela. Only 6 per cent. of British blood and only 7 per cent. of French blood are thus tainted, but between 25 per cent. and 50 per cent. of the blood of South America. I asked my friends down in Buenos Aires what their experience was as to the morality of student life in South America. They said that they could count on the fingers of one hand all the students whom they knew who were leading unsullied moral lives. I made the same inquiry about a college in China (Asia), and found that the estimate was 50 per cent. living unsullied lives." . . .

Mr. Speer continues: "The priests of Buenos Aires had actually asked to be allowed to lay aside their clerical garb, because they were so despised they could not get near the people. A friend of mine in clerical garb, a Protestant, was hissed at by the school-children who took him for a priest. A comic paper in Peru has for its title, when a pun is made of it, 'Thick-headed Priests,' and it is taken up with tales of the personal immoralities and scandals of the life of the clergy (Roman Catholic, of course—*J. H. H.*) in Peru. As to church attendance, there is not a town in the United States or Canada where there are not twice as many people at church every Sunday as you will find in South America. I myself visited eighty Catholic churches in different parts of South America. In not one was there a picture or a symbol of the resurrection or the ascension. In every case Christ was either dead upon the cross or ghastly dead in the grave. Where is the living Christ? one cries out again and again, and no voice may give him reply."

What Mr. Speer found in Roman Catholic South America in the 20th century, that Luther found in Roman Catholic Germany in the 16th century. Boehmer writes: "As a rule, unbridled sexual license goes with gluttony. This fact of common experience is substantiated also by the Germans of the 15th and 16th centuries. Fornication during these centuries was so common in Germany and was so little censured that at Luther's table a guest dared to raise the question whether mere fornication (*fornicatio simplex*, not adultery) were a sin. For this very reason venereal diseases were not considered a disgrace; they were rather looked upon as an altogether decent ailment, as the malady of persons of noble rank. Popes, kings, counts, bishops, were sufferers from venereal diseases, and did not blush to own the fact. The Humanists did not hesitate to invoke the help of the Virgin Mary against this disease. Hutten was not ashamed to publish the fact that he as well as his father were afflicted with the French disease. Yea, he even wrote a book on the symptoms and remedies of venereal diseases and dedicated it without the least misgiving to the Archbishop, Cardinal Albert of Mayence, and the Archbishop, with just as little concern, was pleased to accept the dedication. It is well known how much priests, monks, and nuns contributed to this moral corruption."⁶¹⁾

Such are the natural fruits of celibacy. Roman Catholic nuns, monks, priests, bishops, archbishops, cardinals, and popes — they all lead a celibate (unmarried) life; but do all lead a *chaste* life? What Mr. Speer has to say concerning Roman Catholic prelates and priests in South America invites serious reflection, despite the denial of Mr. Speer's facts which Roman Catholic churchmen have courageously undertaken. Are not the principles pernicious to the very core that produce such lamentable results? Think of it, 50 per cent., and over, of all children born in many states of South America are illegitimate! Are conditions better in other Roman Catholic countries? How

61) *l. c.*, p. 85.

about Poland? We are told "that in recent years 100,000 Poles left the Roman Catholic Church. Why? As the chief reason the *immorality* of Roman Catholic priests is given. Fathers and husbands could not protect their daughters and wives against the immoral advances of the priests."⁶²⁾ All of these priests keep their vow of celibacy, but what has become of their vow of chastity which every Christian makes in his baptism? If Roman Catholic priests would only follow Dr. Luther's example and live in wedlock, then they would not cause so many well-principled Roman Catholic laymen to turn their backs upon the Roman Catholic Church. For not only in Poland, but also in Austria we find them leaving the Roman Church. In recent years over 40,000 Austrians have turned their faces from Rome, and joined the Protestant Church. The "Away-from-Rome-Movement" caused Father H. Denifle to write his volumes of slanderous books against Luther.⁶³⁾ But he only injured his Church.

Because Luther *hated the principles* of the Roman Catholic Church, — and he hated them because they are anti-Christian (1 Tim. 4, 3), — he left it and "contended for the faith once delivered unto the saints";⁶⁴⁾ and that is the reason why he married. Luther, indeed, forswore his vow of celibacy; but he kept his vow of chastity, which he had made when he was baptized in the name of the Triune God. Luther lived according to his beautiful explanation of the sixth commandment: "We should fear and love God, that we may lead a chaste and decent life in word and deed, and each love and honor *his* spouse." The *New International Encyclopedia* rightly says, sub *celibacy*: "It is unfortunate that the usual monastic vow should be called one of chastity instead of celibacy, because it leads the ignorant and thoughtless to suppose that chastity is violated in marriage, whereas the married who

62) See *Lehre und Wehre*, vol. 55, p. 379.

63) See O. Hegemann, p. 237.

64) Jude 3.

are faithful to one another are perfectly chaste. Again, one may be a celibate and yet be unchaste." Yea, one may be a celibate (unmarried), and yet be unchaste. Pope Alexander VI (1492—1503) was a celibate. He had to be a celibate, because he was a pope, the "Holy Father." The *New International Encyclopedia* says of him: "Alexander endeavored to break up the power of the Italian princes and to appropriate their possessions for the benefit of *his own children*,⁶⁵⁾ Giovanni, Duke of Gandia, Cesare, Duke of Valentinois, and Lucrezia, the Duchess of Ferrara, *born him by a mistress with whom he lived publicly even during his occupation of the papal seat.*"⁶⁶⁾ But, dear reader, Pope Alexander VI was only the "Holy Father," there were others who were even "holier" than he. Pope Alexander VI was a *provident* father, for he provided for his *illegitimate children*. Indeed, he should be *canonized!*

Editor Preuss and other Romanists must not forget what the Word of God says concerning the state of matrimony—and, therefore, must not speak or write disparagingly of Dr. Luther. God does not forbid any man to marry. He says, "It is not good that the man should be alone."⁶⁷⁾ "Whoso findeth a wife findeth a good thing, and obtaineth favor of the Lord."⁶⁸⁾ "Now the Spirit speaketh expressly that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and *doctrines of devils*. . . . *Forbidding to marry*, and abstain from meats."⁶⁹⁾ These "doctrines of devils" have been accepted, and to this day they are being defended by the Church of Rome. "A bishop, then, must be blameless, the husband of one wife."⁷⁰⁾ St. Peter was married.⁷¹⁾

But the Word of God also has something to say of those who *beget illegitimate children*. What does it say? It says: "Whoremongers and adulterers God will judge."⁷²⁾ "But for-

65) Italics our own.

66) Italics our own.

67) Gen. 2, 18.

68) Prov. 18, 22.

69) 1 Tim. 4, 1—3.

70) 1 Tim. 3, 2.

71) Matt. 8, 14.

72) Hebr. 13, 4.

nication, and all uncleanness, or covetousness, let it not be once named among you, as becometh saints; neither filthiness, nor foolish talking, nor jesting, which are not convenient: but rather giving of thanks.”⁷³⁾ “Let us walk honestly, as in the day; not in rioting and drunkenness, not in chambering and wantonness, not in strife and envying.”⁷⁴⁾ “Know ye not that your bodies are the members of Christ? Shall I, then, take the members of Christ, and make them the members of an harlot? God forbid! What? know ye not that he which is joined to an harlot is one body? For two, saith He, shall be one flesh.”⁷⁵⁾

As Editor Preuss does not present any *specified* charges of immoral conduct against the great Reformer of the Church, the undersigned herewith lays down his pen, — *without personal grudge, of course*, — only to take it up again as soon as the Editor of the *Catholic Fortnightly Review* shall present *specified charges*.

* * *

Dr. Calvin E. Stowe says of Dr. Martin Luther: “There was probably never created a more powerful human being, a more gigantic, full-proportioned MAN, in the highest sense of the term. All that belongs to human nature, all that goes to constitute a MAN, had a strongly-marked development in him. He was a *model man*, one that might be shown to other beings in other parts of the universe as a specimen of collective manhood in its maturest growth.”⁷⁶⁾ And Thomas Carlyle says of him: “I will call this Luther a true Great Man; great in intellect, in courage, affection, and integrity; one of our most lovable and precious men. Great not as a hewn obelisk, but as an Alpine mountain, so simple, honest, spontaneous; not setting up to be great at all; there for quite another purpose than being great. Ah, yes, unsubduable granite, piercing far and wide into the heavens; yet, in the clefts of it, fountains, green,

73) Eph. 5, 3. 4.

74) Rom. 13, 13.

75) 1 Cor. 6, 15. 16.

76) See Seiss, *Luther and the Reformation*, p. 123.

beautiful valleys with flowers. A right Spiritual Hero and Prophet; once more, a true Son of Nature and Fact, for whom these centuries, and many that are yet to come, will be thankful to Heaven."77)

We close with the following quotation from Dr. Joseph A. Seiss:—

Luther was but a man. No one claims that he was perfection. But if those who sought his destruction while he lived had had no greater faults than he, with better grace their modern representatives might indulge their genius for his defamation. At best, as we might suppose, it is the little men, the men of narrow range and narrow heart—men dwarfed by egotism, bigotry, and self-conceit—who see the most of these defects. Nobler minds, contemplating him from loftier standpoints, observe but little of them, and even honor them above the excellencies of common men. "The proofs that he was in some things like other men," says Lessing, "are to me as precious as the most dazzling of his virtues."

And, withal, where is the gain or wisdom of blowing smoke up a diamond? The sun itself has holes in it too large for a half dozen worlds like ours to fill, but wherein is that great luminary thereby unfitted to be the matchless center of our system, the glorious source of day, and the sublime symbol of the Son of God?

If Luther married a beautiful woman, the proofs of which do not appear, it is what every other honest man would do if it suited him and he were free to do it.

If he broke his vows to get a wife, of which there is no evidence, when vows are taken by mistake, tending to dishonor God, work unrighteousness, and hinder virtuous example and proper life, they ought to be broken, the sooner the better.

And whatever else may be alleged to his discredit, and whoever may arise to heap scandal on his name, the grand facts remain that it was chiefly through his marvelous qualities, word, and work that the towering dominion of the papacy was humbled and broken forever; that prophets and apostles were released from their prisons once more to preach and prophesy to men; that the Church of early times was restored to the bereaved world; that the human mind was set free to read and follow God's Word for itself; that the masses of neglected and downtrodden humanity were made into

77) *Ibid.*, p. 125.

populations of live and thinking beings; and that the nations of the earth have become repossessed of the "inalienable rights" of "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

And let the pope and priests their victor scorn,
Each fault reveal, each imperfection scan,
And by their fell anatomy of hate
His life dissect with satire's keenest edge;
Yet still may Luther, with his mighty heart,
Defy their malice.

Far beyond them soars the soul
They slander. From his tomb there still comes forth
A magic which appalls them by its power;
And the brave monk who made Popedom rock
Champions a world to show his equal yet! 78)

Red Bud, Ill.

J. H. HARTENBERGER.
