

5-1-1935

An Anniversary We Forgot

Theo. Hoyer

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/ctm>



Part of the [Practical Theology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Hoyer, Theo. (1935) "An Anniversary We Forgot," *Concordia Theological Monthly*. Vol. 6 , Article 42.
Available at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/ctm/vol6/iss1/42>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Print Publications at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Concordia Theological Monthly by an authorized editor of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

gebracht hat, wobei er die Absicht hatte, daß wir, die dem Tode verfallen waren, durch ihn das ewige Leben erhielten. Mit andern Worten, der Apostel weist hin auf die stellvertretende Genugtuung Christi als auf den höchsten Beweis der Liebe Gottes.

Eben diesen Gedanken führt er nun weiter aus. Hierin besteht die Liebe, hierin zeigt sich das eigentliche Wesen der Liebe, nicht daß wir Gott geliebt haben. Diese Annahme wird auf das entschiedenste zurückgewiesen, wie das ja auch der Apostel Paulus schon im Römerbrief, Kap. 5, 8, 10, getan hat, indem er betont, daß Christus für uns gestorben ist, als wir noch Sünder, ja als wir Feinde Gottes waren. Auch in jener Stelle wird nachdrücklich erklärt, daß Gott durch das stellvertretende Opfer seines Sohnes seine Liebe zum Ausdruck gebracht hat.

Wir schauen hier in die unermessliche Tiefe des Meeres der Liebe Gottes, in dem allein das eigentliche Wesen der Liebe sich offenbart, so daß es außer dieser Art der Liebe überhaupt keine wahre Liebe in der Welt geben kann. Was Liebe im wahren Sinne des Wortes ist, muß mit dieser Liebe Gottes in Christo im Zusammenhang stehen oder sie zum Vorbild nehmen. Denn diese Liebe erwies sich eben darin, daß derselbe, der große Gott, uns liebte in der Weise, wie hier beschrieben. Das Seitenstück zu dieser Liebe bietet uns der Heiland in den bekannten Worten: „Niemand hat größere Liebe denn die, daß er sein Leben läßt für seine Freunde“, Joh. 15, 13. Damit, daß der Sohn Gottes nach Gottes ewigem Liebesratschluß sein Leben für uns gegeben hat, ist uns der überwältigendste Beweis von Liebe gegeben, den die Welt je gesehen hat.

Denn aus reiner Heilandsliebe sandte Gott seinen Sohn als Sühnung für unsere Sünden. Das war Zweck und Absicht Gottes bei und in der Sendung seines Sohnes. Dieser sollte die Veröhnung für unsere Sünden sein, das stellvertretende Opfer, das die Ausöhnung zwischen Gott und uns bewerkstelligt. Das *negl* gleich *inieg* betont eben diese Tatsache, daß unsere Sünden Christo zugeschrieben und angerechnet wurden, daß unsere Schuld auf ihm lag. So hat Christus den ihm gegebenen Auftrag voll und ganz erfüllt; so ist die Veröhnung durch Christum zustande gekommen. Vgl. 2 Kor. 5, 18 ff. Zu *negl* vergleiche man 1 Kor. 1, 13; Matth. 26, 28; Kol. 2, 1; Röm. 8, 3; Gal. 1, 4; 1 Petr. 3, 18.

P. E. S.

An Anniversary We Forgot.

August 9, 1534, died in Rome Jacopo de Vio de Gaeta. More of us will recognize him when it is stated that he changed his baptismal name Jacob or James to Thomas when, in 1484, he entered the Dominican Order, fifteen years old, and that later as cardinal he was known by a derivative of the name of his native city, Cajetan.

Even in Roman Catholic circles this anniversary was remembered only "among the more erudite of the European reviews" for his "treatises and commentaries, that are the delight of experts in Thomistic lore," as the *Commonweal* points out. One reason, no doubt, why the world has forgotten his work may be found in this statement of that journal: "So abstruse and complicated were his lessons, his explanation of the text of the master (Thomas Aquinas), that they have given rise to the quip '*Si vis intelligere Cajetanum, lege Thomam*' (If you would wish to understand the commentator, then read the works of the teacher he is explaining)."

We remember him because with all his wisdom and subtlety the learned cardinal could not understand an Augustinian friar whom he met October 12—14, 1518, in Augsburg. It is interesting to note that Cajetan was not sent to Germany for that purpose. History was repeating itself. The Turk, checked by the Crusades, had resumed his advance; and as in 1095 the Popes had gladly embraced the opportunity of restoring the lost prestige of the Papacy which the leadership in that mighty undertaking of a united Christianity offered, so now. Leo X, following the example of his predecessors, called a crusade to crush the Turk; legates were sent to Spain, France, England, and Germany; and the man sent to the German diet was Cajetan.

But, says the *Commonweal*, "at Augsburg he had to face a distracted and hostile diet, where his efforts were foredoomed to failure. At the same time he found a situation that was far more serious than the necessity of a new crusade. The land was torn with dissension and with reports of the rapidly rising popularity of the mutinous monk, Martin Luther. From Rome came orders to Cajetan that he should summon Luther before his tribunal. This he proceeded to do, and on October 12 and the two following days the erring professor of Wittenberg pleaded his cause before the foremost theologian of the papal court. Luther was received with kindness and courtesy; he acknowledged this himself in his letters. But his arrogance would not permit him to see that this was an occasion not for interminable discussions, but for an act of obedience and submission. He fled from Augsburg a determined heretic, while the legate, disgusted by his distracted mentality, sent back to Rome reports of a *corpus sine capite*."

Merely observing that this *corpus sine capite* has influenced the history of mankind vastly more than the erudite cardinal, and wondering whether the *Commonweal* means to imply what the words seem to say, that all Protestantism is the ill-born product of a distracted mentality, we believe that this paragraph is worth a few lines of comment. It is a fine example of the present Roman Catholic method of citing church history—very judicious in its omissions.

The first instructions which Cajetan received were to cite Luther to come to Rome within sixty days after the receipt of the citation¹⁾ as a heretic and a rebel against ecclesiastical power, under penalty of excommunication and the consequences therein implied. (Mackinnon, *Luther and the Reformation*, II, 64, based on K. Mueller, *Z. K. G.*, XXIV, 59. 60.) Luther at once wrote to his elector, asking him "*dass derselbe beim Heiligen Stuhl dahin wirke, dass in Deutschland Richter fuer seine Sache aufgestellt wuerden.*"²⁾ Luther had right and reason to do that. The Fifth Lateran Council, 1512—1517, and Leo X had renewed the extravagant claims of Boniface VIII's bull *Unam Sanctam* (in Leo's bull *Pastor Aeternus*) that the Church has both swords, the spiritual and the secular, the former to wield directly, the latter through the government. How the German nation considered this arrogant claim became evident when, shortly after, Charles V was elected emperor. Before they would consent to his crowning in Aachen, the princes of Germany insisted on a promise, under oath, that he would protect the empire against disturbances and encroachments on the part of Rome, one of the express stipulations being that no German could be outlawed without formal hearing.³⁾ And that Luther had reason to appeal to the elector, Grisar admits: "*Die gefuerchtete Romreise wollte er vermeiden.*" There was a rumor that his enemies would seize him and "baptize him with death," and Count Albert of Mansfeld warned him not to leave Wittenberg.

1) Grisar, *Luther*, I, 274. It should be noted that, though Leo and Rome spoke of it as a "monkish squabble" in far-off, barbaric Germany, yet the machinery provided for the purpose was at once set in motion. Already in the early days of 1518 Albert of Mainz sent his complaint against Luther to the Pope. February 3 Leo X gave instructions to the Augustinians to discipline their errant brother and urge him to change his opinions lest a fire arise that could not be quenched. (*Pastor, Gesch. d. Paepste*, 4, 247 f.) In March, 1518, the Dominicans (in charge of the Inquisition) began their investigation, and by the middle of June Luther was formally accused in the papal court on suspicion of heresy. Early in July, 1518, the citation to come to Rome was issued to him, forwarded to Cajetan and by him to Luther.

2) Grisar, *l. c.*

3) Schubert, *Der Reichstag von Augsburg*, pp. 8. 10. Koehler (*Luther und das Luthertum in ihrer weltgeschichtlichen Auswirkung*, p. 15): "*Die Obstruktion des sachsischen Kurfuersten hatte gerade durch die neue Kaiserwahl eine starke Rechtsgrundlage bekommen. In der von den Kurfuersten erstmalig in verbrieft Form aufgestellten Wahlkapitulation fuer den neuen Herrn stand die Bestimmung, dass niemand ausserhalb des Reiches vor Gericht geladen und die Reichsacht ueber niemand ungehoert und ohne Ursache, sondern nur nach ordentlichem Verfahren verhaengt werden duerfe. Friedrich der Weise hat diesen Artikel hergebracht und wohl die schwebende Sache seines Professors in Wittenberg dabei im Auge gehabt. Jedenfalls war damit in den rein kirchlich-roemischen Prozess ein Keil hineingetrieben; nicht folgt automatisch auf den kirchlichen Bann die Reichsacht, vielmehr emanzipiert sich die Nation und beansprucht das Recht der Mitrede. Die nationale Behandlung der Kirchenfrage wurde hier angetoent. Luther hatte einen reichsrechtlichen Schutz gwonnen, zunaechst freilich nur auf dem Papier.*"

Mackinnon cites a letter of Luther: "He had become, he wrote to Link, 'like Jeremiah, a man of strife and contention to the whole earth.' But his courage only rose with the increasing danger. 'The more they threaten, the greater becomes my confidence.' 'My wife and children,' he adds sardonically, 'are provided for; my lands and goods are disposed of; my fame and good name are already gone. One thing only remains, a weak and worn body, which if they destroy, they will only make me poorer by an hour or two of life. The soul they cannot deprive me of. With Reuchlin I will sing, 'He who is poor fears nothing because he has nothing to lose.' I know that from the beginning the Word of Christ has been of that character that he who would proclaim it on earth must, like the apostle, leave and renounce all and hourly expect death. Unless this were so, it would not be the Word of Christ. It is gained by death; it is proclaimed and preserved by dyings, and it will ever be renewed and repaid by death. Pray, therefore, for me that the Lord Jesus may increase and preserve this spirit of His most devoted sinner.'" Mackinnon adds: "These words were not mere arm-chair rhetoric. For Luther knew that to obey the citation to Rome was to take the road to the stake. At the same time he was determined not to surrender his cause and his life at the bidding of a vulgar obscurantist like Prierias. He would try at least to make sure of a fair trial at the bar of a less prejudiced tribunal than that of his Dominican enemies."⁴)

The Pope changed his instructions to Cajetan. Why? Well, Emperor Maximilian I was old, and a new election was impending; the Pope needed the vote of the elector of Saxony for his candidate; and "the elector was inflexible in his demand that Luther must be tried only upon German soil, and . . . conducted the negotiations with Cajetan in such a way that he gained his point."⁵) The directions to Cajetan in the papal breve of August 23 are given by Grisar, who certainly is not biased in Luther's favor: "*Derselbe (Cajetan) solle im Hinblick auf die Notoritaet von Luthers Handlungen und Lehren ohne andere Formalitaet ein sofortiges Erscheinen desselben vor ihm zu Augsburg mit Hilfe der geistlichen und weltlichen Obrigkeit erzwingen; wenn dazu Gewalt anzuwenden ist, oder wenn Luther nicht widerruft, soll Cajetan ihn nach Rom ausliefern zu Gericht und Strafe; er selbst durfte also nicht eigentlich Richter sein, sondern nur den Widerruf Luthers in Empfang nehmen. Im Falle der freiwilligen Stellung zu Augsburg und des Widerrufs solle Luther, so hiess es in dem Schreiben ebenfalls, Verzeihung und Gnade finden. Sei sein Erscheinen zu Augsburg aber ueberhaupt nicht durchzu-*

4) *L. c.*, pp. 64. 65. Luther's letter, St. L. Ed., XV, 2376 ff. Weimar, Briefe, I, 185.

5) Jacobs, *Martin Luther*, pp. 103. 104.

setzen, so sollen die in Recht und Gewohnheit fuer solche Faelle gesetzmaessig vorgesehenen Massregeln Platz greifen: er und seine Anhaenger seien mit oeffentlichem Bann zu belegen, die Obrigkeiten in Kirche und Staat muessten unter kirchlichen Strafen, auch unter dem Interdikte, gezwungen werden, den Gebannten festzunehmen und auszuliefern."⁶⁾ To this last point Mackinnon supplies details: "All ecclesiastics, princes, and other magnates, and all communities and corporations are bound to seize and surrender him and his followers under penalty of excommunication (the emperor only excepted). If any prince or public body should presume to render him aid or favor, publicly or privately, directly or indirectly, they should incur the penalty of interdict, whilst to all who obeyed the papal mandate a substantial reward was held out at the legate's discretion."⁷⁾ Another papal breve, of September 11, made Cajetan sole judge in the matter.

When, after his return from Augsburg, a copy of the breve of August 23 was placed in Luther's hand, showing that all through the pretended impartial trial he was already judged a heretic, he openly pronounced the document a forgery; he would not believe it of the Holy Father. He still had much to learn. The Holy Father had on the same date written a letter to the elector in which he fulminated against Luther: "That son of iniquity who, as if fortified by his protection, obtrudes himself on the Church of God and fears no authority or reproof,"⁸⁾ and in a poorly veiled way threatened the elector with the anger of the Church if he did not clear himself of the suspicion of abetting a most pernicious heresy. And on August 25 another letter went forth by direction of the Pope to the provincial head of the Augustinian Order in Saxony, Gerhard Hicker, who was "enjoined to arrest and detain Luther, chained hand and foot in custody, under penalty of excommunication and interdict against all acting to the contrary and with the offer of ample reward for obedience."⁹⁾ Remember, all this before Luther had had any hearing.

It is evident, then, why Luther "was received with kindness and courtesy"; that was the express demand of Elector Frederick; "*es [das Gericht] sollte mit 'vaeterlicher Milde' stattfinden. Andere Massnahmen wollte er nicht gestatten.*"¹⁰⁾ The elector had been around in ecclesiastical circles, and he was no longer as unsophisticated as the unsuspecting professor of his university; perhaps he remembered the cardinals of the Council of Constance and John Huss.

6) *L. c.*, pp. 275. 276.

7) *L. c.*, p. 73.

8) Mackinnon, *l. c.*, p. 73. Weimar, II, 23 ff.

9) "This missive was discovered by Kolde at Munich and published in the *Z. K. G.*, II, 472 f. (1878)." (Mackinnon, *l. c.*, p. 74; Grisar, *l. c.*, p. 283.)

10) Grisar, *l. c.*, p. 276.

But all fatherly kindness ceased when it became evident that Luther could not "see that this was an occasion for an act of obedience and submission"; could not see that he should pronounce those fateful six letters *revoco* without any reason but that the cardinal demanded it. The discussion, begun kindly enough on the first day, finally developed into a heated altercation, in which the cardinal tried to drown out all of Luther's attempted objections in shouted objurgations until Luther, too, shouted his answers, the cardinal in the end terminating the audience by ordering Luther to leave and not to come into his presence again except for the purpose of recanting.

It was of course impossible for Luther to recant, as the whole discussion turned on the two most fundamental principles of the Reformation. The first error that the cardinal cited against him was the 58th of his Theses, in which he denied that the merits of Christ and the saints are the treasures of the Church, which the Pope can distribute by indulgences. In the debate, however, the cardinal cited the bull *Unigenitus* of Clement VI; Luther demanded Scripture; Cajetan insisted that the Pope, having absolute and inerrant power, was superior to a general council and even to Scripture. The real point of difference, then, was the *sola Scriptura*—as it is to this day the fundamental point of divergence between Lutheranism and Catholicism. Luther's second error, said the cardinal, lay in his *Resolutiones*, in the explication of the 8th thesis, in which he had stated that faith is absolutely necessary to make the sacraments of the Church efficacious. This the cardinal characterized as "a new and erroneous doctrine" and demanded that Luther revoke his views on justification by faith. Hence again the difference lay in a most essential doctrine.¹¹⁾

Did Luther flee from Augsburg? Well, three days after his curt dismissal Luther sent a very humble letter to the cardinal, asking forgiveness for bitter words spoken in the heat of disputation and offering to revoke as far as conscience would allow; but he must have better grounds than the views of Aquinas. He waited in vain for a reply. October 18 he wrote another humble appeal and waited in vain for a reply. Then on the 20th of October he left Augsburg. Yes, he left the city by night through a postern in the city wall, which a trusted friend opened for him. Had he cause for fear? We shall not decide it; but the fact is that others feared far more than he did. Staupitz, his Vicar-General, fearing arrest, had absolved Luther from his vow of obedience for his return to Wittenberg, including the obligation of wearing the Augustinian habit, and had hurriedly left Augsburg, together with Link, on October 16. Luther,

11) Grisar, *l. c.*, p. 290, correctly states the two "heresies."

by the way, did not avail himself of this method of hiding his identity when he left the city. He left on horseback, attired in his monk's habit; nor did he "flee" very fast. After riding eight miles, he was so worn by the unaccustomed mode of travel that he had to spend the night at Monheim and, dismounting, fell into the straw of the stable.

The cardinal in a letter to the elector expressed great indignation at the deception and treachery of Luther and his companions in frustrating by their flight his efforts to reach a settlement.

Did Luther flee from Augsburg a determined heretic? In reference to the cardinal's letter to the elector, Luther wrote to Langenmantel: "I see that the Romanists persist in their purpose of damning me. But I have steeled myself in my purpose not to yield. And thus I await their condemnation. The Lord will be to me a Counselor and a Helper."¹² What was Luther determined not to yield? In his written defense to Cajetan Luther had clearly asserted that the Pope's decrees are only to be received as far as they agree with Scripture; that in matters of faith not only a general council is superior to the Pope, but even the individual Christian if he is supported by better authority and reason; that justification by faith is infallible Bible-truth and that without personal faith the sacraments can only involve the recipient in damnation. The whole document is studded with Scripture-passages, and Luther concludes: These and many other authorities constrain him to hold the opinion which he has expressed. Therefore he pleads humbly that the cardinal have pity on his conscience and show him the true light by which he may understand this matter otherwise than now and not force him to revoke what his conscience constrains him to believe. "In the face of this supreme authority I cannot do otherwise than obey God rather than man. Let therefore Your Fatherhood be pleased to intercede for me with our lord Leo X that he may not with such inclement rigor be moved against me and not plunge into darkness a soul seeking only the light of truth and most ready to give up, to change, to revoke, all if it can be led to thinking differently. For I am not so arrogant and desirous of vainglory that I may be ashamed to revoke what I may have erroneously said; yea, it will be my greatest joy that truth should be the victor. Only let me not be forced to do violence to my conscience. For without any hesitation I firmly believe this to be enjoined by the Scriptures."¹³ If this be heresy, let the

¹² Weimar, *Briefe*, I, 256. St. L., XXIa, 119. Mackinnon's translation.

¹³ St. L., XV, 571 ff. Weimar, II, 6 ff. Transl. by Mackinnon.— I cannot refrain from pointing out in this connection a fateful mistake in Mackinnon's translation. After summarizing the earlier sections of the *Acta Augustana* down to the statement that without individual faith the sacrament of penance can only involve the recipient in damnation, he

Commonweal make the most of it. Luther rightly said: "For long they have molested John Reuchlin, and me they now molest for the new and resounding crime of having wished to be taught, of having sought the truth. And this in the Church, the kingdom of truth, in which it behooves to render a reason to all who demand it."¹⁴)

It is said that this conference with the man of "distracted mentality," who, however, was so much better versed in the Scriptures, moved the cardinal to devote more time and study to the plain Gospel than to the intricacies of Thomas Aquinas; that this in numerous instances led him into un-Catholic paths, to point out errors in the Vulgate, to reject the allegorical interpretation of the Bible, and, in general, to ignore tradition in critical questions, which involved him in bitter controversies with his Dominican brothers and the Sorbonne. He witnessed the emperor's sack of Rome and had to pay a ransom for his own freedom; and he lived to see England sever communion with Rome, as the result, partly, of his own counsel to Pope Clement VII on the validity of the marriage of Henry VIII and Katherine of Aragon.

It is noteworthy that in the year of the great Open Bible Jubilee this anniversary of Cajetan was practically forgotten.

THEO. HOYER.

Sermon Study on 1 Tim. 2, 1—6.

(Eisenach Epistle-lesson for the Fifth Sunday after Easter.)

Timothy, to whom this letter is addressed, had been left by Paul in charge of the large and influential congregation at Ephesus. Though still a young man, 1 Tim. 4, 12, Timothy was by no means a novice. He had been a "work-fellow" of the apostle, Rom. 16, 21, for a number of years, had been entrusted with a number of important missions, and was one of the most trustworthy associates of Paul, Phil. 2, 20. In fulfilment of Paul's prophecy, Acts 20, 29, 30, false teachers had arisen at Ephesus, perverting both the Law and the Gospel, 1 Tim. 1. There seems to have been a movement for the

proceeds: "Moreover, in matters of belief the testimony of the individual conscience as the voice of God is supreme. 'In the face of this supreme authority, etc.," as above. I find no statement like that regarding conscience as the voice of God in Luther's letter. The text, after citing a great number of Scripture-passages, reads: "*Istae et multae aliae auctoritates, tam expresse, tam copiose, ducunt, cogunt, captivant me in sententiam, quam dixi.*" Then follows the plea to the cardinal to have pity on his conscience (as above) and then this: "*Et stantibus his auctoritatibus aliud facere non possum, nisi quod obediendum esse Deo magis quam hominibus scio.*" *His auctoritatibus* refers to *istae et multae aliae auctoritates*, and the translation of our St. Louis edition is no doubt correct: "*Und da diese Schriftstellen feststehen,*" etc.

14) Weimar, II, 6.