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ABSTRACT

The aim of this study is to shed light on the thought of Michael Sattler, formerly a Benedictine monk, later an Anabaptist leader and author of the influential Schleitheim Articles. The method followed has been first to seek out potential sources of influence on Sattler by re-examining his life, following which the relevant literature has been analyzed.

Concerning his pre-Anabaptist life it has been shown that at St. Peters of the Black Forest Michael Sattler lived in a monastery undergoing reform. This observant monastic background is central to understanding Sattler's subsequent thought as an Anabaptist. This study concludes further that the rebellious Black Forest peasants played a central role in providing Sattler his point of contact with the evangelical, revolutionary and Anabaptist movements. Following his departure from the monastery, Sattler resided in the Zürich Unterland, living in the house of a radical Anabaptist weaver. He was rebaptized in the late summer of 1526. Michael Sattler thus belongs to the second generation of Anabaptist leaders which emerged following the failure of both the peasants' revolt and early Anabaptist efforts at territorial church reform.

An analysis of Sattler's thought shows that of the monastic, evangelical and peasant milieux to which he had been exposed, the primary imprint on his thought stems from his monastic past. Although he follows a Protestant lead in holding to sola scriptura, a corresponding doctrine of sola fide is absent. Sattler's interpretation of scripture,
his Christology, his soteriology and his ecclesiology all recall monastic, rather than Protestant, theology. Michael Sattler accepted the doctrines basic to the early Swiss Anabaptists -- adult baptism, the ban, and a commemorative Lord's Supper -- but he introduced significant monastic elements into the Anabaptist tradition through the Schleitheim Articles. In particular he contributed a monastic emphasis on following Christ, as well as a doctrine of the church as the separated, ascetic community of saints.
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INTRODUCTION

In the summer of 1975, as I was working assiduously toward a Master of Arts degree in the gritty heat of downtown Hamilton, Ontario, I read the following lines:

When Martin Luther disposed of Anabaptism as a revival of monasticism he was in one sense totally right. For Anabaptism was in a very real sense the continuation of the medieval Catholic ideal of community.

Walter Klaassen's words triggered some questions that refused to go away. In what sense was Anabaptism a continuation of the Catholic ideal of community, and how did it come to retain that ideal, given the fact that it was also a Reformation phenomenon? And how would one go about documenting this "Catholic continuity" in more detail, were one so inclined? I was fortunate enough to be able to discuss such questions with the author of that citation; he suggested that a study of Michael Sattler would go a long way toward answering questions of this sort, for Michael Sattler had been a Benedictine monk before his Anabaptist conversion and had left his mark on the Swiss Anabaptist movement through the Schleifheim Articles. Thus did this dissertation first appear, in ovo, conceived on one side of sound advice, on the other of naive curiosity.

The focus of the dissertation soon came to be Michael Sattler himself. Certainly the Catholic and Protestant elements of his thought needed to be sorted out, but how could one begin to sort until it was known what the actual monastic and Reformation realities had been at
St. Peters of the Black Forest? Michael Sattler's thought could not be isolated from his life. The project grew. Proficiency in German and Latin was essential, as was basic paleographical skill for working with archival sources. Detailed information on St. Peters proved difficult to obtain: a prolonged visit to Germany was advisable and, thanks to the generosity of the Canada Council, was made available. There soon followed puzzled looks by patient archivists as I explained -- as best I could -- that I was not only seeking the needle of Wiedertäufer in the haystack of history, I was seeking information relating to one particular Anabaptist, died 1527, formerly a monk at St. Peters, named Sattler. This latter query produced an astonishment that was general and bordered, in some cases, on mirth.

Michael Sattler himself proved to be a somewhat elusive archival subject, but soon details concerning St. Peters, the Breisgau and the Peasants' War began to raise fundamental questions concerning earlier biographical treatments of Sattler. A critical re-examination of published Anabaptist sources raised further questions and, in the end, previous biographies needed to be amended and revised. The first half of this dissertation is concerned with such historical questions, and thus utilizes an historical methodology. That is, documents and records pertaining to Sattler's life were sought out and evaluated in order to construct a more accurate picture of the man and the milieux in which he lived and moved. But biography was, in fact, incidental to the central question: given the historical reconstruction of Sattler's life, at what points and in what ways does his mature thought reflect the various traditions to which he had been exposed? The pursuit of this
question called for a second methodological approach and occupies the second half of the dissertation.

The identification of the theological sources of Sattler's thought required a thematic analysis of Sattler's writings along with a comparison of his writings with texts representative of the various traditions to which he had been exposed. It is in setting the parameters of this representative literature that the historical section performs its second function, in that it provides the source foundation for the comparative analysis pursued in the second half of the dissertation. A constant concern underlying the historical section is thus the identification of representative literature: given the fact that Sattler had been a monk at St. Peters of the Black Forest, what literature can be considered representative of that milieu? Or granted that Sattler may have lived among radical artisans in the Zürich Unterland, what literature can be taken as representative of this milieu?

Concerning the original question of monastic continuations in Michael Sattler's thought, the conclusion we have drawn is that the Anabaptism of Michael Sattler does in fact represent a continuation of the medieval monastic ideal of community, particularly in its Christocentric emphasis. Six years of work and several hundred pages of documentation have succeeded in verifying the conclusion drawn by my mentor in two concise sentences. What this study offers, then, is not a novel thesis concerning Catholic influences on Anabaptism, for such a thesis is anything but novel. What this study offers is a concentrated look at one central Anabaptist leader, examined as a test case for the general thesis regarding Catholic influences.
The conclusion that a significant monastic component was introduced into Swiss Anabaptism through Michael Sattler is one that must ultimately stand or fall on the quality of documentation and argument introduced in its support. I have tried to avoid apologetics, to be as thorough and as objective as possible in presenting the evidence; but the deficiencies are obvious to me, and will be even more evident to others. Very real consolation lies in the fact that scholarship is a communal enterprise that must advance through dialogue, by short uncertain steps rather than great omniscient leaps. I look forward to such conversations.
THE LIFE OF MICHAEL SATTLER
CHAPTER I

A REVIEW OF BIOGRAPHICAL LITERATURE
AND SOURCE EVIDENCE

The introductory lines of John Yoder's recently published book on Michael Sattler outline his early life in the following way:

Michael Sattler was born sometime around 1490 at Staufen in the Breisgau. He entered the Benedictine Monastery of St. Peter's northeast of Freiburg, where he became — or was likely to become — prior. In the 1520's he came, by way of Lutheran and Zwinglian ideas, to forsake the monastery and to marry, and by March, 1525, had become a member of the Anabaptist movement which had just begun at Zürich two months before. Although his major focus of activity probably continued to be in the Breisgau, Sattler was again at Zürich for the great disputation of November 6-8, 1525, following which he was imprisoned and then expelled on November 18. He continued active in Breisgau and Württemberg until we find him a year later in Strasbourg. With these few lines we have sketched practically all that is known of the life of Sattler until the time of the earliest documents in the present collection.

Granted that Yoder's work is not biographical in nature, it must be pointed out that the above lines go somewhat beyond what is actually known of Sattler's life prior to the end of 1526/beginning of 1527: the four italicized portions in the above sketch each represent assumptions concerning Michael Sattler's life and thought which have only tenuous support in the sources. Yoder, however, is merely reproducing the received view of Sattler's life. The biographical tendency to expand on the data is present not only for the early portion of Sattler's life, but also in the reconstruction of Sattler's Anabaptist career, where sources are more numerous. In what follows we shall briefly compare the
received biographies with the source literature in order to identify areas calling for further critical examination.

There are four primary treatments of Michael Sattler's life. The central work is that of Gustav Bossert, but Wilhelm Wiswedel's short article is also significant. Wiswedel owes much to the Introduction with which Walther Koehler prefaced his edition of the *Brüderlich Vereinigung* and other Sattler materials. Most recently, Martin Haas has published a short biographical sketch of Sattler. These four treatments differ from each other mostly in emphasis and detail rather than in substance.

Nothing is known of Sattler's early life except that he was born in Staufen in the Breisgau, his date of birth not being known. On this the biographers and the sources are in accord. The question of Sattler's education, however, gives rise to some speculation. It is clear from the sources that he was literate and able to understand and to speak Latin thus a certain degree of education must be assumed, but whether Sattler had more education than was available to him in the cloister is open to question.

Bossert, Koehler and Wiswedel all state that Sattler was "learned" and familiar with the original scriptural languages, presumably Hebrew and perhaps Greek. The direct source here appears to be the trial account as recorded in the *Hutterite Chronicle* which calls Sattler ein gießerter Man and attributes to him the knowledge of both Latin and Hebrew. The problem with the Chronicle as a source in this connection is that the Chronicle account appears to be only a summary version of known accounts, except for the details quoted above, which go
beyond the information contained in extant accounts. It is most likely that the chronicler simply expanded his account. If Sattler knew Hebrew and Greek this would indicate a full and intensive humanist background and would place him in very close proximity to the other marginal Hebraists, Hans Denck and Ludwig Haetzer, both of whom he would have known in Strasbourg. On the other hand, such an education could be expected to have left behind some traces of evidence.

Sattler's name, however, has failed to appear on university matriculation lists, he is yet to be identified in the correspondence of scholars interested in the biblical languages, nor does his extant work give evidence of such a background. In short, the question of the extent and quality of Sattler's education remains an open one.

The sources are not very informative regarding Sattler's monastic life. He was a monk at the Benedictine monastery St. Peters of the Black Forest, near Freiburg, and appears to have reached the position of prior. It is not known when he entered or left the monastery, since contemporary records from St. Peters are not extant. Bossert, Koehler and Wiswedel indulge in no speculation beyond these bare facts: they consider the monastery only in so far as Sattler eventually became dissatisfied with it. Granted the general tendency of the biographers to expand on the data, this is a rather curious "sin of omission," since Sattler received his initial religious training within the Benedictine milieu. There would seem to be every reason to consider monasticism as a potentially positive force, instrumental in shaping some of Sattler's later views. Further examination of Sattler's monastic milieu may well shed light on Michael Sattler as an Anabaptist.
It is not clear from the sources why Sattler left the monastery, nor is it clear what steps took place in the transition from the cloister to the Anabaptist brotherhood. The primary evidence bearing on Sattler's reasons for leaving the cloister comes from his trial statement. Sattler states that he left the monastery because of a "call from God," he alludes to the decay and corruption of the monastic estate (certainly not novel, even for a Catholic), and suggests further that monasticism as such was the fulfillment of the prophecy found in I Timothy 4:3. At the stand, the reasons given by Sattler for leaving the monastery are singularly uninformative.

In spite of the lack of evidence to the effect, all three older biographers assume that Sattler left the monastery as the result of evangelical conviction. Bossert is the most restrained of the three in that he only implies such a causality. Koehler and Wiswedel are less cautious: they point specifically to Luther and draw parallels wherever possible. Particularly misleading is the assertion that "like Luther, the study of the Pauline letters drove him to break with the old church." On the contrary, Sattler's only reference to Paul in this connection is in reply to the eighth charge against him at his trial. It is clear that his reference to Paul in that place does not point to the Pauline letters generally, but rather to the text which he quotes immediately following -- namely I Timothy 4:3. It should be noted further that Sattler at no time gives either Luther or Zwingli credit for his departure from the monastery. In sum, that Sattler left the monastery for Protestant reasons is an assumption not warranted by the evidence as we have it. Such a conclusion may be safely made only after further research,
assuming it can be made at all.

If the biographers are not shy in putting forth reasons why Sattler left the monastery, neither are they reticent in describing the actual steps supposedly followed in the transition process, as follows: a) Sattler leaves St. Peters, sometime in the 1520's; b) he marries; c) he is forced to flee to Switzerland because of Ferdinand I's efforts to extirpate heresy in the Breisgau; and d) early in 1525, while in Switzerland, he joins the Anabaptist movement. It must be granted, first of all, that all the events listed above actually did take place, but it is far from clear that they took place in this particular sequence, at these times, or for the reasons adduced. Sattler may well have married having been in Switzerland, for example. He may have been in Zürich out of curiosity or interest, rather than in exile. There are no textual reasons for assuming that the biographers have put together the authoritative chronology here.

More serious is the question of when Sattler joined the Anabaptist movement in Zürich. The sources cited in this connection are two. On March 25, 1525, a "brother Michael" appears in the Zürich record, but this brother subsequently recants completely. If this is Sattler, his Anabaptist convictions certainly have not been demonstrated. The first mention of Sattler by name occurs on November 18, 1525. At this time he abjures and is released upon payment of costs. Thus although Sattler is demonstrably in Anabaptist company in November 1525, his actions at that time do not demonstrate strong Anabaptist convictions, in marked contrast to his later heroism in the face of incredible torture. The two references quoted in support of Sattler's early conversion to
Anabaptism in Zürich are less than decisive.

Besides the November oath of renunciation in the Zürich record, Sattler's name appears also in the testimony of three prisoners from the Bülach area, a town ten kilometers north of Zürich. The one datable testimony places Sattler's missionizing activity in the summer of 1526. There is one further piece of evidence which appears to pertain to Sattler, namely a letter written by Hans Kuenzi to the Zürich Council. In that letter Kuenzi mentions that an ex-monk by the name of Michael is living with him, learning the weaver's trade, but Kuenzi seems to deny that this Michael is the same Michael "who had been your prisoner" -- an almost certain reference to Sattler. This latter document is not without its problems, as we shall see later, but in any case it is clearly not considered or utilized by the biographers.

In summary, the sources do document the fact that Sattler missionized as an Anabaptist in the area just north of Zürich. As against the picture drawn by the biographers, however, there is little support for the view that Sattler was converted in early 1525, missionized in the Zürich area and was then ejected in November 1525, because his success drew the attention of the Zürich authorities. Neither are there indications that Sattler had "close connections" with Grebel, Manz and Blaurock in Zürich proper. Rather, the Anabaptist names which appear along with Sattler's name in the Zürich record are the names Kuenzi, Winckler, Brennwald and Muntprat. In sum, a closer look at Sattler's relationship to the Zürich movement is called for.

Following the notice of Sattler's missionary activity north of Zürich there is no record of his whereabouts until late December,
1526/early January, 1527. At that time a farewell letter was written by Sattler to Bucer and Capito, whom Sattler addresses as "beloved brothers in God." It appears that upon leaving Strasbourg, Sattler missionized in and around the nearby town of Lahr, across the Rhine in Baden. On the 7th of February, 1527, Jacob Ottelinus, pastor at Lahr, wrote to Martin Bucer complaining of Sattler's Anabaptist activity in the area.

There is evidence that Bucer and Capito had been favourably impressed upon meeting Sattler. Capito wrote a letter to the Horb City Council soon after Sattler's trial and death in which he spoke very highly of Sattler: "he demonstrated at all times an excellent zeal for the honor of God and the church of Christ." Likewise Bucer, in writing against the errors of Kautz and Denck, stated concerning Sattler that "we do not doubt that Michael Sattler, who was burned at Rottenburg, was a dear friend of God, even though he was a leader in the baptism order." In retrospect, Capito and Bucer were willing to concede that Sattler had been an earnest and sincere Christian, even if somewhat in error.

The sources are silent concerning several statements made by the biographers. There is no evidence that on leaving the Zurich area, Sattler attempted to stay in the Breisgau only to be forced out by Ensisheim's persecution. Neither is there any evidence that Sattler stayed at Wolfgang Capito's home as a personal guest of the reformer. Again, there is no direct evidence of contact between Sattler and Hans Denck. Denck was banished from Strasbourg on December 24, 1526. Assuming that Sattler was already in Strasbourg at this time, it is
virtually certain that the two men would have met, for the Anabaptist circle was too small to preclude such a meeting. But Sattler did not play a role in the debate between Denck and the Strasbourg reformers. 33 It is clear that Sattler knew Ludwig Haetzer, for Haetzer later said some rather unflattering things about him, 34 but we have no evidence that Sattler was "repelled" by the man. 35 Finally, although the disagreement between Sattler and the Strasbourg reformers was obviously cordial rather than vitriolic, it is questionable whether this cordiality alone allows the historian to make broad theological assumptions regarding the orthodoxy of Sattler's position as against that of Denck. 36 There remain fundamental questions concerning Sattler's relation to the reformers in Strasbourg and to the Strasbourg Anabaptists.

Following the mention of Sattler in Ottelinus' letter of February 7, 1527, we find Sattler next in the town of Schleitheim on February 24. 37 The evidence is today considered conclusive that Michael Sattler was the primary figure responsible for framing the Schleitheim Articles which were accepted at that time. 38 The biographers, with the notable exception of Haas, 39 place Sattler in Württemberg following his stay in Strasbourg and prior to his Schleitheim activity. 40 Apparently Ottelinus' letter was not known to Bossert, for the time span open to Sattler is a mere seventeen days between the time of his Lahr activity and his presence in Schleitheim. Furthermore, we have no sources which point directly to Sattler having been active in Württemberg. In fact, recently discovered sources suggest strongly that Sattler's activity in Württemberg was minimal and limited to whatever time was available between the Schleitheim meeting and the arrest. 41
Following the Schleitheim conference, Sattler appears to have travelled directly to Württemberg, to the town of Horb on the Neckar. He was arrested there very soon after his arrival by officials of Count Joachim von Zollern, regent for Archduke Ferdinand of Austria.\textsuperscript{42} Being under Austrian political jurisdiction, the officials of the district were militantly Catholic, and preparations for a trial were undertaken immediately. A trial proved to be a difficult undertaking, for not only did local sentiment run in favour of the arrested Anabaptists, but also the attempt to find willing judges met with a variety of obstacles.\textsuperscript{43} The initial trial date, set for April 12, had to be postponed, and Count Joachim, perhaps fearing that his prisoners might be set free,\textsuperscript{44} moved Michael Sattler, his wife and two other "foreigners" to a tower in the little town of Binsdorf.\textsuperscript{45}

A new trial date was set for May 17, in the town of Rottenburg on the Neckar. This trial was held, with the four prisoners from the Binsdorf tower tried along with seventeen prisoners from Rottenburg.\textsuperscript{46} The trial lasted two days, at the end of which Michael Sattler and his co-defendants were found guilty. Sattler was sentenced to have his tongue cut off, to have his body torn seven times with glowing tongs and finally to be burned to death. This verdict was carried out on the 20th of May, 1527.\textsuperscript{47}

The details concerning Sattler's arrest and trial are found in essentially correct form in the biographies. What has emerged is some new source evidence which changes details of the picture. We now know, for instance, that there were two arrests in Horb, that Michael Sattler's wife's name was Margaretha, that the number of prisoners
tried in Rottenburg was twenty one, that the prisoners had been interrogated under torture, and that Sattler himself had been questioned prior to the actual trial. These details are informative and add perspective to the arrest and trial of Sattler, but the biographers and the sources agree on all essential points concerning this final period of Sattler's life.

This brief comparison should serve to underline the need for a fresh appraisal of Sattler's life. In the case of Sattler's pre-Anabaptist days, too little is known of the circumstances in which Sattler found himself. What kind of monastery was St. Peters of the Black Forest? What was its educational policy? What was its relation to contemporary Benedictine currents? How might Sattler have come into contact with Reformation ideas? Further research into the early milieux in which Sattler lived and moved should provide a better framework for answering these and other questions concerning Sattler's pre-Anabaptist days.

In terms of Sattler's Anabaptist career, the brief span of time and the relative wealth of documentation shifts the task from one of exploring milieux to one of critical evaluation of documents and their use. Some of the results of this critical evaluation have already been indicated. What should emerge following a total study such as we are outlining is a fresh view of the life of Michael Sattler. One aim in this first half of the dissertation will be to provide such a critical biography, the second aim being to identify the literature with which we shall work in the second half of the dissertation.
The chapters which follow explore the central periods of Sattler's life, beginning with his monastic career and ending with his trial and execution. The final chapter in this first half of the dissertation will present a revised biography of Michael Sattler written in light of the preceding critical analysis.
CHAPTER II

THE BENEDICTINE CONTEXT:
ST. PETERS OF THE BLACK FOREST

The bare fact that Michael Sattler had been a monk at the Benedictine monastery of St. Peters of the Black Forest provides this study with an initial point of focus: what sorts of influences can we expect to have taken place given Sattler's tenure in the monastery? Clearly the Rule of St. Benedict must be considered a central source of influence, since Sattler vowed a lifetime of obedience to that Rule, but what actual role did the RB play at the particular Benedictine monastery of St. Peters of the Black Forest? Was the monastery in decline or was it following a regular observance? And further, are there texts besides the RB which can be considered as representative of the spirituality to which Sattler was exposed? Finally, do the monastic sources themselves tell us anything about Michael Sattler? In order to answer these questions we must briefly outline some developments within Benedictine monasticism as a whole as well as looking more specifically at the history of St. Peters of the Black Forest.

St. Benedict's aim in establishing his monastery is stated with great clarity in the conclusion of the prologue: the monastery is to be a "school for beginners in the service of the Lord." ¹ Dom Butler has identified three central services which St. Benedict requires of his monks, namely, self-discipline, prayer and work. Of these three self-discipline is "the subjective basis and condition of the others, that
which gives meaning to the whole life . . . " Of the external services
prayer, particularly the communal prayer of the Divine Office, is first
in importance as St. Benedict makes clear in chapter 43 of the RB. ³
The monks are also to devote about four hours a day to reading and
study as well as approximately seven hours a day to manual labour. ⁴

For our purposes, that which Dom Butler classes under self-disci-
pline is particularly relevant, for this spiritual teaching remained the
foundation of Benedictine monasticism even though the forms of prayer
and work underwent changes. St. Benedict legislated a moderate,
communal ascetic life. ⁵ Asceticism or spiritual training is understood to
have both a negative, renunciatory aspect as well as a positive, con-
structive aspect, the classic New Testament text being Jesus' call in
Mark 8:34: "If any man would come after me, let him deny himself and
take up his cross and follow me." The denial of self and the following
of Christ are the two spiritual foundation stones of the RB.

Exterior observances and interior dispositions are intimately
united in St. Benedict's spiritual programme. Although the monk might
begin at the lowest point of internal observance, clinging to his own
will, St. Benedict believed that through the daily, willing practice of
obedience and renunciation in the monastic community, such a monk
would be able to achieve deeper and more significant levels of internal
observance. ⁶ The pivotal chapter on Humility outlines how through the
continual practice of humility the monk will progress in the spiritual
life.

And then, the virtues which first he practised with anxiety,
shall begin to be easy for him, almost natural, being grown
habitual. He will no more be afraid of hell, but will advance
by the love of Christ, by good habits, and by taking
pleasure in goodness. ⁷
The active practice of monastic observance, then, serves as the means to genuine spiritual observance.

The culmination of the ascetic life is the attainment of perfect love,\(^8\) which is reached when one's own will has been perfectly renounced; it is expressed in perfect obedience. This is the ideal exemplified by Christ Himself, who in total obedience yielded up His will to that of God the Father.\(^9\) Mortal man, however, by nature not being inclined to such perfection, must renounce the world, pledge himself to obedience in a community, and continue the daily practice of discipline. In this way the monk will become progressively more like Christ. St. Benedict's basic spiritual programme of sanctification through renunciation and obedience remained available through the centuries to all who read his Rule.

Although St. Benedict's basic spiritual teaching remained unchanged in the Rule, the forms of Benedictine life, the outward expressions of Benedictine spirituality, changed radically over time. The RB divided the day between communal prayer and worship (the "Divine Office"), manual labour, and study (lectio divina). The monks were to have at least eight hours of uninterrupted sleep. Around three hours of each day were to be devoted to the Divine Office, approximately four hours to reading and study, and between six to eight hours a day were to be spent in manual labour.\(^{10}\) St. Benedict's emphasis on the lectio divina was to make libraries a virtual necessity, leading to the copying and preservation of precious manuscripts\(^{11}\) while the emphasis on manual labour made early monasteries potentially self-sufficient.
The basic independence of each monastery was something taken for granted by St. Benedict. He did not visualize an "Order" based on his Rule, as far as one can determine from the RB itself; rather each monastery was to be subject to civil and ecclesiastical laws. The basic independence of St. Benedict's monasteries proved early to be an advantage and later a detriment: on the one hand monasteries could be missionizing outposts, functioning without need of centralized direction, but on the other hand the reform of monasticism as such was always faced with the obstacle of the basic independence of each cloister and the autonomous authority of each Abbot.

Finally, St. Benedict clearly did not anticipate the results of the incorporation of his monasteries into the feudal system. For St. Benedict, the monastery was to be open to all who earnestly seek God, regardless of social rank. Further, the Abbot was to be the spiritual (as well as the administrative) centre of the cenobium: he "is believed to stand in the place of Christ in the monastery."

Although the Abbot's position of final authority within the community is to be upheld, in the final analysis, in virtually all matters, the RB does also strongly enjoin the Abbot to seek the counsel of the community in important decisions. The repeated stresses in the RB on abbatial authority and monastic obedience are best seen in the context of spirituality — i.e. as means of spiritual growth — rather than as expressions of a purely monarchichal polity. The Abbot as described by St. Benedict is not a secular lord or a monarch, but rather he is the representative of Christ. Only as such is he to be the centre of the community.
The history of the Benedictine Order can be seen generally as a continuing cycle of expansion, crisis and reform. In answer to the devastation caused by the Barbarian invasions, Pope Gregory the Great promoted the establishment of monasteries based on the RB. This active employment of Abbots and monks as missionaries changed the character of the monasticism outlined by St. Benedict. One now notes the tremendous activity of Abbot-Bishops, the most notable of whom is undoubtedly Augustine of Canterbury, who converted the kings, queens and nobility of Great Britain. No longer is an Abbot simply St. Benedict's pater or magister presiding over the dominici schola servitii.

The flexibility of the RB which made it possible for Benedictine monasteries to do the important work of christianization also made possible other less admirable applications. Soon monasteries came to be founded for transparently political and economic ends. Under Charlemagne monasteries were granted immunity, i.e. they were established as independent judicial and tax districts, they were granted imperial protection and were provided with a secular solicitor, the Vogt. In return, the emperor had the right to utilize Abbots as diplomatic representatives, Abbots had to raise armies on demand and, further, lead these troops into battle. In addition there were taxes and the duty of providing food and lodging for imperial retinues. Monasteries had a central political function to serve within the Frankish state -- a mixture of political and religious aims certainly not in keeping with St. Benedict's original conception.

Charlemagne was very interested in monastic reform, but the widespread implementation of reform came under Louis the Pious, who
encouraged and supported the work of Benedict of Aniane. Benedict of Aniane has been called the "second founder of the Benedictine Order." His reforming efforts were directed toward unity of observance of the RB, and he was supported in this by the emperor Louis. By the time of Benedict's death in 821, numerous monasteries were following the strict observance of the RB; his vigorous promotion of the RB as the sole guide to Frankish monastic life made possible a Benedictine Order as such.

The negative legacy of Carolingian policies is perhaps equally significant. The heightened importance which Benedict of Aniane placed on the liturgy led to results that have been called a "catastrophy" for the Order and further, the type of centralized reform instituted by Benedict, based as it was on the support of the emperor, did not survive beyond Louis the Pious. In fact, the immunity given to so many monasteries succeeded in establishing them as independent feudal establishments, with Abbots taking on the role of landed gentry. The domination of monasteries by secular interests was slowed briefly, but by the end of the ninth century, a general monastic decline had set in once again. The progressive shift from missionizing monasteries to imperial monasteries to independent feudal establishments moved monasticism steadily further away from St. Benedict's original conception.

The next wave of reform came in the tenth century from the monastery of Cluny. The Cluniac reform movement called for a return to the RB, subject to some changes and qualifications. The most far-reaching changes took place regarding the relation between manual labour and liturgical prayer. As far as manual labour was concerned,
Cluny "abandoned manual labour, which, moreover, was hardly practiced in the aristocratic circles out of which most of the monks came."\textsuperscript{26} What took the place of this labour was an extension and elaboration of the Divine Office,\textsuperscript{27} and it was considerable. Dom Schmitz has made the following computation:

at Cluny (the monks) came to recite, during Lent, 180 Psalms in one day, not including the Psalms and canticles of the breviary, all of which totalled about 220 Psalms, whereas St. Benedict had spread the 150 Psalms of the Psalter over an entire week.\textsuperscript{28}

As Dom Schmitz notes further, the liturgy was extended to the point where it occupied almost the entire day.\textsuperscript{29} In terms of education, with the exclusion of the laity from Cluniac schools, monastic schools had lost their influence by the beginning of the 12th century.\textsuperscript{30}

Cluny soon inspired a reform movement in southwest Germany centred on the monastery of Hirsau. The success of the Hirsau reform has been attributed to the personality, ability and zeal of Abbot Wilhelm, who ruled the monastery from 1076 to 1091, and to the political and reform interests of the South-German upper nobility.\textsuperscript{31} The reform at Hirsau began with the attempt to free the monastery from all secular attachments. What was in fact achieved was a compromise between the monastery and its landlord, the Count of Calw, which is documented in the "Hirsauer Formular" of 1075. The essential compromise stipulated that the monastery was to have the right of the free election of its Abbot and of the overseer (Vogt) of the monastic property. The Vogt, however, was to be elected only from the descendants of the founding family.\textsuperscript{32} This hereditary overseership (Erbvogtei) posed clear advantages for noble families anxious to expand their holdings, while the free
election of Abbots made possible a return to a regular observance. The "Formular" received a wide distribution as the model constitution for monasteries founded or reformed by Hirsau.

Hirsau's new legal constitution was soon followed by the acceptance of new monastic ordinances. In 1079, Abbot Wilhelm instituted the Cluniac ordinances, subjecting them to some modifications as Abbot Hugo of Cluny had suggested. The result was a document called the Constitutiones Hirsauenses which also was introduced into the monasteries of the Hirsau observance. Although the reform at Hirsau was thus directly Cluniac, Hirsau in fact never formally joined the circle of monasteries dependent on Cluny.

Hirsau had great local success. In less than twenty years, it had founded around thirty new monasteries, and in total, more than 100 monasteries finally adopted the Hirsau observance. Many of the new monastic foundations owed their existence to "donations" of the Swabian nobility, who made monasteries a part of their land holdings according to the constitutional compromise described above. St. Peters of the Black Forest came into existence in just this fashion in the year 1073, first as a priory (Weilheim) established by the Zähringen family and peopled with monks from Hirsau and later, in 1093, as a full-fledged monastery, supported by and supporting the Zähringen line. The struggle for independence from the imperial system which was always a part of the Hirsau movement reached a climax with the investiture struggle in which Hirsau and its daughter houses, including St. Peters, were active advocates of the Gregorian party.
St. Peters of the Black Forest thus came into being on the crest of Cluniac enthusiasm in southwestern Germany. From this fact alone we know that a strict following of the RB was central, subject to the Cluniac interpretation as expressed in the Constitutiones Hirsugienses. In terms of St. Benedict's balance between prayer, study and work, Hirsau and those monasteries following the Constitutiones were true daughters of Cluny: the liturgy was seen as the essential activity for monks to the exclusion of manual labour and, in actual fact, to the practical exclusion of intellectual labour. 37 We also know that at the time of its foundation, St. Peters of the Black Forest would have been open to monks from all social classes. 38 It remains to be seen in what form these beginnings were to survive into the sixteenth century.

St. Peters of the Black Forest: 1093-1496

We are relatively well informed about the religious life of St. Peters of the Black Forest for the very earliest years of its existence; we can conclude from available evidence that the Hirsau observance was being closely followed. On August 1, 1093, the first Abbot of St. Peters was elected, Adalbero (Abbot from 1093 to 1100), a former Hirsau monk. 39 Abbot Adalbero is described in the Annals of the monastery as "a man most scrupulous concerning the regular observance," 40 as one would expect from a Hirsau monk of the period. We are also informed that Abbot Gebhard of Hirsau, who succeeded Wilhelm in 1091, personally instituted the "regular discipline" at St. Peters. 41 In the confirmation document of Pope Urban II we are told that at the founding of the monastery the right to the free election of the Abbot by the community was established, as described by the RB; further,
that the overseer of the monastic property was to have no power to dispose of that property, and that secular persons were forbidden to live in the monastery.\textsuperscript{42} The zeal and high expectations which one would expect to find at the founding of a monastery are evident on every side. The second Abbot of St. Peters, Hugo (1100-1108), is described as "a man tried in all virtue and piety\textsuperscript{43}" and we are told that he too had been a student of Abbot Wilhelm of Hirsau.\textsuperscript{44}

The strict observance continued under the third Abbot of St. Peters, Eppo the Venerable (1108-1132), who is described as "a most proven cultivator of monastic perfection, under whom the monastery flowered exceedingly."\textsuperscript{45} In 1115, during Abbot Eppo's rule, "Abbot Pontius of Cluny granted Abbot Eppo of St. Peters and the monks and bearded lay-brothers the society of the Cluniac fraternity.\textsuperscript{46} This acceptance of St. Peters into the Cluniac "fraternity" in fact documents the coming into existence of a brotherhood for the remembrance of the dead between Cluny and St. Peters. The Annals of St. Peters for the year 1115 go on to state that "the names of the dead for every year are to be exchanged and read in the chapter, and are to be written in the Missal book; moreover, an office of the dead is to be done for them by the community, and on the following day, a Mass.\textsuperscript{47}

In touching on the subject of intercessions for the dead we have entered an area central for the understanding of the religious and economic life of those monasteries associated with Cluny. The liturgical intercession for the dead goes back at least to Benedict of Aniane\textsuperscript{48} but with the development of the Cluniac reforms comes the full elaboration of the practice,\textsuperscript{49} not only in terms of liturgy, but also in terms of
economics. Persons donated property, valuables, rents, or sometimes even themselves to the monastery in exchange for prayers on their behalf, on behalf of deceased relatives, or on behalf of all Christians. The motive force behind the multitude of donations was a genuine religious concern for the welfare of the soul after death coupled with the conviction -- promoted energetically by Cluny -- that the good works of the living did in fact further the progress of the departed in the afterlife.

It is clear that a central motive force behind the foundation of St. Peters and behind the numerous donations of property to the monastery was precisely the kind of religious sentiment described for Cluny. The religious motives behind the founding of St. Peters by the Zähringers would seem to have been the establishment of a consecrated place of burial for the family, watched over by monks dedicated to prayer and intercession for the dead. This same concern for the welfare of departed souls is explicitly expressed in most of the donations documented from this earliest period and is further documented as a central concern of the monks themselves, as seen in the prayer brotherhoods and the keeping of a Liber vitae.

Abbot Eppo the Venerable died in June of 1132: "Abbot Eppo, abounding in good works and merits of the saints, was called to the crown of glory reserved for the faithful servants of God . . ." and with his death end the biographical notices concerning the religious zeal of the Abbots of St. Peters. The Annals contain no such notices for his successors, Gerwardus (1132-1138), Gozmannus (1138-1154), Macwardus (1154-1183), Rudolphus (1183-1191) or for Berthold I
(1191-1220). We are told, however, that the church was re-built under Gozmannus in 1148, and subsequently consecrated by the bishop of Constance, donations to the monastery continued in good number following Eppo's death up to at least 1203, as can be seen from the Rotulus sanpetrinus. One would have to agree with J. Mayer's conclusion that the data as it stands argues for a good monastic observance from the foundation of St. Peters up to about 1220.

With the end of the rule of Abbot Berthold I and the election of Abbot Heinricus I, we pass from one discernable epoch to another in the life of the cloister. In 1218, during the rule of Abbot Berthold I, the last duke of Zähringen, Berthold V, died. With his death came the end of the hereditary overseership (Erbvogtei) of the Zähringers as well as the end of their economic support. St. Peters was henceforth no longer a Familienstiftung. As fate would have it, with the rule of the very next Abbot, Heinrich I, began a period of economic and political difficulty for the cloister that was to last, in varying measure, until the late blooming of the monastery in the eighteenth century.

The event that signalled the beginning of difficulties for St. Peters was the great fire which totally destroyed the monastery in the year 1238. The financial loss was obviously great, but also without a monastery or a church, a "regular observance" was an impossibility. The subsequent Abbot, Arnoldus, is described as "Pastor sine ovili" (A pastor without a sheepfold), and in fact the monastery was only rebuilt under the following Abbot, Waltherus I, who was elected in 1275. Besides the obvious expense of such an enterprise, the Annals of the monastery -- beginning already in 1094 -- note with increasing frequency the twin calamities of plague and famine.
The "cause" of these disasters is also noted from time to time. For 1192 we read: "an eclipse of the sun caused the sterility of the earth and, finally, the plague," and other sightings of comets and eclipses portend further disasters in the following centuries.

The toll of the plagues was horrible indeed. The plagues depopulated the monasteries and subverted their economic foundation: there were few surviving peasants from whom the monks could derive a living. It is hard to imagine that the Hirsau liturgy could have been continued in such circumstances. The elaborate liturgy and ritual surrounding the death and burial of a brother, for example, must surely have seemed anachronistic when confronted with the reality of mass deaths such as occurred in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. The Cluniac liturgy of Hirsau was born of, and suited to, happier times.

With the death of the last Zähringer, the Vogtei of the cloister came to rest with Count Egeno of Urach, count of Freiburg, whose wife Agnes was a sister to the deceased Berthold V of Zähringen. Egeno and his immediate descendants appear to have been true advocates and defenders of the monastery. In any case, their main interest lay in their Freiburg possessions. But around 1280, Count Egeno III, "with whom the line of the Counts of Freiburg began a turn for the worse," began to "over-step the rights of the Vogt." From here on there are reports of increasing problems with the Vogt who, rather than being a defensor of the cloister, now became an offensor: the question became one of how to defend the monastery property from the "defender" of the monastery.
The situation became particularly severe in 1368 during the conflict between Count Egeno IV and the city of Freiburg, in which the Count's opponents retaliated by attacking the Count's possessions: St. Peters was plundered as a result. Besides the burden of the Counts themselves, the cloister was left without an advocate to defend its property rights, a task that was called for repeatedly in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

Such is the evidence as we have it for St. Peters of the Black Forest from the time of its founding up to 1414. From a purely material point of view, the picture is clear: the cloister prospered initially due to large donations from the Zähringens, numerous smaller donations from interested nobles and commoners, and the protective interest of the founding family. This period of initial prosperity lasted from 1093 up to ca. 1220, and appears to have been accompanied by a continuing regular observance of the RB, as interpreted by the Constitutiones Hirsau. The second era in the life of the cloister, from 1220 to 1414, saw the economic decline of the monastery due to events not conducive to the prosperity of institutions: fire, plagues, famines, floods and wars. That the cloister was experiencing financial difficulty is evident from the records of property sales and incurred debts.

The proportion of purely economic notices also increases steadily as we proceed through the centuries. While the Rotulus mostly documents transfers of property to the monastery "pro anima mea," the Annals of the fourteenth century concentrate rather on civil suits and court decisions involving monastery property. The reasons for this emphasis on economics are, clearly, to a large extent external; beside the acts of
God stand the political realities of the fourteenth century. The benign political atmosphere of the eleventh century had turned malignant by the fourteenth.

When we ask whether conditions inside St. Peters declined along with the decline in the exterior conditions, we must first point to the lack of adequate documentation: we possess no visitation records, or other documents which might give us first-hand knowledge of conditions within the monastery walls. We can surmise that a liturgy as is outlined in the Constitutiones Hirsauyienses would have been extremely difficult to maintain, given the external conditions. We can note that an economically pressed cloister was rarely an observant cloister. We can point to conditions in the Order as a whole, which were admittedly deplorable in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. On the positive side of the ledger, however, must be noted the lack of negative notices regarding St. Peters for this period -- a "distinction" not shared, for example, by St. George of the Black Forest and Blaubeuren.71 Also positive is the fact that St. Peters did not become an exclusively noble-house; in this it remained true to the Constitutiones long after Hirsau itself had gone the way of exclusivity.72 The continuing donations to the monastery for the purpose of liturgical remembrance can also be taken as indicators of a continuing observance within the monastery: donations for a "perpetual anniversary" can hardly be expected if a cloister is neglecting to perform its appointed liturgy. The donors must have had a measure of confidence in the internal state of the monastery. Such is the positive side of the ledger.
When we summarize these findings we are left with properly qualified conclusions: in the absence of evidence for an energetic monastic life within the cloister, we can hardly conclude that St. Peters was a shining exception to the rule in these dark years. On the other hand, in the absence of damning evidence, neither can we conclude that St. Peters had totally lost its monastic character. In fact, the evidence would seem to indicate a respectable level of monastic observance in the context of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.

Although St. Peters appears to have sustained a certain measure of monastic observance throughout the "dark" thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, there is no reason to conclude that the monastery had no need of a monastic renewal. The thirteenth and fourteenth centuries had seen a marked decline in the vitality of Benedictine monasticism. By the time we reach the fifteenth century, the Benedictine Order is a heterogeneous mixture of imperial cloisters, monasteries founded and controlled by noble families, congregations exempt from controls, monasteries whose Abbots are appointed by the Pope, and houses where only the nobility need apply. A "reform of the Benedictine Order," in spite of the sharing of a common Rule, could not but collide with an endless variety of vested interests, each claiming a right or an exception or appealing to a different authority.

It was clear that a reform of the Benedictine Order would have to begin by imposing a uniformity of observance on individual houses. The attempt by the Council of Constance (1414-1417) to legislate and encourage such uniformity marks a significant upsurge of Benedictine reform efforts. Although the hoped-for reform of the entire Church
in capite et in membris did not take place, the Benedictine Order -- particularly in Germany -- did experience a wide-spread renewal.  

There are two particular streams which combine to make up the general current of reform in Germany for this period. The first encompasses the bulk of Benedictine monasteries in Germany which were caught up, in varying degrees, in the provincial reform movement initiated by the Council of Constance. The second stream of reform is that of the particular reforming congregations, namely the reforms associated with the names of Kastl, Melk and Bursfeld.  

Since these reforms all stressed a return to the regular observance of the RB, rejection of such reform by a particular monastery is a good indication of declining monastic zeal. What was St. Peters' relationship to these reforming movements within the Order, and what does the evidence suggest concerning the state of the monastery during the fifteenth century?

Detailed records documenting participation in the provincial reform movement are hard to find, but the evidence available allows us to draw general conclusions concerning St. Peters' participation. From 1417 to 1439 the Abbots of St. Peters attended the provincial chapters and appear to have supported the reform movement in a general way. But even in these years the Abbots of St. Peters are not found among the reform leaders. Economically, the monastery continued to be vexed by rapacious overseers. When the Vogtei was mortgaged to a particularly greedy local knight, the monastery chose to discharge the debt of 600 Gulden, but then the Vogtei passed back to Count Conrad, the original source of the trouble. The Annals report occasional
famines\textsuperscript{78} and poor weather, but the primary economic disaster for the monastery occurred in 1437 when the monastery was levelled for the second time in its history by a catastrophic fire. The Annals report that the monastery and the church were destroyed along with their contents, and that "our founders rested for some time in a non-consecrated place."\textsuperscript{79}

The great fire of 1437 dominates the history of St. Peters until the turn of the century; the economic struggles of the monastery fill the Annals to the virtual exclusion of religious notices. The question arises as to how any liturgy or regular monastic life was possible in the absence of a monastery and a church. Unfortunately we have no information which might shed light on the question of how the monks lived during these years. While some construction of monastic buildings must have taken place in the years following 1437, no large-scale rebuilding is recorded until the election of Abbot Petrus III in 1496.\textsuperscript{80}

St. Peters had no representative present when the papal legate, Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa, attempted to revivify the provincial reform movement in 1451;\textsuperscript{81} the concern had evidently become one of survival rather than reform. In fact one of the few notices we have relating St. Peters to the provincial reform comes from the year 1479, when Abbot Petrus II Emhardt (1469-1492) was declared contumacious for refusing to allow access to provincial visitators.\textsuperscript{82} Given the depressed economic state of the monastery\textsuperscript{83} and its failure to maintain ties with the provincial reforming movement, it is no surprise to find that St. Peters did not join the reforming congregations of Kastl, Melk, or Bursfeld. We may safely conclude that the religious life of St. Peters of the Black
Forest had reached a low ebb by the third quarter of the fifteenth century. The fact that Annals fail to record any pious donations to the monastery from 1440 to 1496 suggests that the neighboring laity had come to the same conclusion.

**St. Peters of the Black Forest: 1496-1531**

The period from 1496 to 1531 spans the rule of two Abbots of St. Peters of the Black Forest, Abbot Petrus III Gremmelspach (1496-1512) and Abbot Jodocus Kaiser (1512-1531). In terms of our subject this is the most crucial and relevant period in St. Peters' history, for it was during this time that Michael Sattler professed obedience to the Rule of St. Benedict and entered the monastery. It was also during this time that he fled the same monastery.

Abbot Petrus III was an Abbot of unusual talent and ability. The year following his election he began to compile historical information from such documents as had survived the two fires. Much of the historical information we possess today comes to us thanks to Abbot Petrus' efforts. From the surviving fragments, Abbot Petrus compiled an account of the founding of the monastery, began a new *Liber vitae*, noting past donations, composed a genealogy of the founding family and compiled a catalogue of the Abbots of St. Peters. Abbot Petrus did not concern himself only with the past life of the monastery, but began immediately to re-build the church, which had been in ruins for more than 60 years. This task was completed in 1500, and the church was dedicated with due ceremony in the same year. In the same year the remains of the founders were re-interred in a special mausoleum, complete
with a likeness of the founder, Berthold II, sculpted in stone. The year 1503 saw the founding of a chapel at Lindenberg, which later became an important pilgrimage chapel.

As might be expected, the genuine religious interest of Abbot Petrus resulted in a new interest in the monastery on the part of the neighboring laity. Jacobus Mörswin is noted as a benefactor of the church for the year 1500, and in 1502 Bernardus Straumer and his wife Genovesa founded an anniversary to be celebrated with eight priests. The years 1507 and 1511 saw the establishment of two more anniversaries through donations to the monastery. Although these four anniversaries are the sum total of donations for the length of Abbot Petrus' rule, this is still a significant number considering the total absence of such notices from 1440 to 1496.

The economic notices for the years of Abbot Petrus' rule are the usual notices concerning rents with perhaps an increase in terms of the total value of land sales and mortgages. The year 1502 saw another outbreak of the plague, and the Annals note the emergence of the Bundschuh in the region of Spire in the same year, but the natural disasters do not appear to have been particularly severe for this time period, and the emerging peasant's revolt did not touch St. Peters. The sale of lands and the frequency of mortgages is explained by Abbot Petrus' building programme, which must have required considerable funds. The economic situation of St. Peters relative to that of other Benedictine monasteries of the province is revealed for us in extant tax lists from the period. In a tax list for the province from 1501, St. Peters paid a tax of 6 florins as against an average payment of 10.4
florins for the other monasteries of the diocese of Constance. In 1515, St. Peters' share totalled 5 florins as against an average of 10.4 for the other abbeys. St. Peters remained one of the poorer monasteries in the diocese, but in any event, it now had a church of its own.

It is clear that under Abbot Petrus III St. Peters underwent a renewal of monastic and religious life, but the extent and scope of that renewal must remain unknown. We have no notices from St. Peters or from the provincial chapters which would shed light on St. Peters' relationship to the provincial organization. There is no notice of Abbot Petrus assuming active leadership in the province, but neither do we have notices of his defying the organization. The "renewal" appears to be much more the out-working of Abbot Petrus' own religiosity than a result of the Benedictine reform stemming from Petershausen. As far as can be determined, Petrus' religiosity re-affirmed the centrality of the remembrance of the dead. This is evident in his revival of the Liber vitae, with its listing of benefactors, the re-burial of the founding family, and in the new interest shown by the laity in such memorials. Petrus' literary activity seems to have served this religious function, rather than being the result of a scholarly bent. From these indications, it would seem that St. Peters under Petrus III belongs with the older Cluniac tradition of the Constitutiones Hirsauienses rather than with the newer movement toward liturgical simplification and scholarship. Although we have no hard data regarding monastic observance at St. Peters for this period, we can say with reasonable certainty that the quality of the monastic life improved greatly under Petrus' leadership.
Jodocus Kaiser, born of non-noble parentage, was elected to the abbacy in February of 1512. He was to rule St. Peters for 19 very stormy years; his rule saw the emergence of the Protestant Reformation, the culmination of problems with the Vogtei and the outbreak of the Peasants' War. While it is possible that Michael Sattler would have professed vows under Abbot Petrus III, it is certain that he lived under Abbot Jodocus' rule and that he escaped that rule.

The beginnings of the Protestant Reformation do not seem to have made much of a direct impression on the monastery. The Annals begin by noting the usual economic happenings, then for the year 1517 the Annals note: "in the year 1517, in which Martin Luther began to spread his teachings, there was an enormous shortage of crops lasting the entire year... Earth quakes were felt in many places with enormous injury. For many people the earthquakes were followed by a mortal illness of the head and the destruction of the mind." Undoubtedly the biggest impression of the Reformation on the monastery was economic: "the wealthy property in Herzogenbuchsee was being threatened by the reformation in Bern. In fact the deanery with its three parish churches of Buchsee, Huttweil and Seeberg was secularized in 1527, but the final financial settlement -- St. Peters received 5,000 Gulden for the property -- did not come about until 1557." The events which preoccupied the monastery most of all were only indirectly related to the Reformation. Already in 1513 the Annals note a short-lived revolt by the peasants of Lehen, on the outskirts of Freiburg, and unrest among the peasants grew as the years progressed. Conditions appear to have gotten harsher. In 1514 extremely unfavourable
weather is reported; the monastery helped the city of Freiburg by sending in six wagon-loads of wheat. In 1515 we have a notice that Anna from Seelgut donated herself to the monastery, and in spite of a report that 1516 was a good harvest year, in 1517 Benedictus Keck also donated himself "to God and to St. Peters." In 1518 there were two more such donations: Matheus Lang donated himself, his wife Ottilia and their 12 children to St. Peters, and Joannes Schreiber did the same along with his wife and their three children. It would seem that economic hardship, rather than outright piety, was a primary motive in these self-donations. To add to the difficulties of the time, the plague broke out again with great intensity in the year 1519.

The peasants were clearly feeling the economic squeeze, but the monastery was likewise having difficulty. Abbot Jodocus tried to compensate by enforcing the monastery's traditional rents and payments to the letter. The peasants, however, claimed that their old customs and traditions were not being respected. Abbot Jodocus eventually called on the Vogt to enforce the rights of the monastery against the refractory peasants, but Margrave Ernst of Hochberg did not feel disposed to act in the matter.

The tense conditions were exacerbated by the increasing presence of the Hither-Austrian government at Ensisheim. The Austrian government imposed a tax on its subjects, and Abbot Jodocus passed this tax directly on to the subjects of the monastery. The peasants refused to pay, whereupon Abbot Jodocus appealed to Ensisheim; the peasants were cited. For their part, the peasants appealed to the Margrave, who listened willingly to their complaints. The next move
belonged to the Margrave, who in March of 1522 invaded St. Peters with his army of mercenaries, and put Abbot Jodocus to flight. Later that year the Margrave explained to the Freiburg Senate that the action took place not "out of displeasure against the Abbot, but only to protect his true subjects from unfair taxation." Margrave Ernst's rather bold step only served to crystalize the opposition, and he found himself cited before the Ensisheim government by Abbot Jodocus as well as by the city of Freiburg: he was accused of inciting the peasants against the payment of a fair tax and of invading and mishandling the monastery.

The Margrave was clearly no match for such opposition, and in 1523 he offered to sell the Vogtei to Archduke Ferdinand of Austria for the sum of 1,000 Gulden, but soon after the offer was made the full-scale Peasants' Revolt broke out. The peasants from St. Peters participated in the revolt, as is clear from the war-reparation lists, but the monastery of St. Peters itself was not damaged in any way. In 1526, soon after the collapse of the Peasants' Revolt, the transfer of the Vogtei from the Margrave of Hachberg to the house of Austria was completed. Typically, the monastery had to produce the 1,000 Gulden required; it was never paid back by the Austrian house. The peasants were instructed to swear allegiance to the monastery and to the government at Ensisheim, which they did willingly, since the law which was renewed was simply the customary Dingrodel of former times. The end result of these events was increased debt for the monastery. Not only did the monastery remain with the considerable debt resulting from the building of the new church in 1500, it also lost
1,000 Gulden in purchasing its freedom and in 1527 it lost the revenue from its Swiss properties. Thus it is not surprising that the remaining notices in the Annals document the sale of property in 1527, a debt of 400 florins in 1528 along with litigation and more land dealings for the same year. Irritations with the Margrave seem to have continued, as a report from 1528 indicates: Abbot Jodocus had to file a complaint with the Margrave concerning debts which had remained unpaid by the Margrave's subjects.\textsuperscript{115}

From 1519 and the new outbreak of the plague up to the end of Abbot Jodocus' rule the monastery was repeatedly forced to deal with disruptive external events. The Annals certainly contain only a dim reflection of the actual local unrest caused by Reformation ideas, peasant aspirations and the political dealings of the Margraves and the Hapsburgs. In the following chapter we shall look more closely at these events in terms of the Freiburg area specifically.

Concerning the religious life of the cloister during these years, we have evidence of a different nature than was the case for Abbot Petrus' rule. The Liber vitae\textsuperscript{116} shows records up to and including 1519, with a subsequent gap of 25 years in the notices, the next entry being dated 1544. Although the six entries for 1519 do not originate from St. Peters itself but from the Necrologium of Gunterstal,\textsuperscript{117} still the entries in the Gunterstal Necrologium would have to have originated from St. Peters. We may conclude that a record of some sort was kept, but has since been lost. Further entries in Abbot Petrus' Liber vitae were not made in this period, and all records of deaths cease until 1544. External events certainly played a significant role here.
We are surprisingly well informed concerning St. Peters' relation to the reform movements in the Order. That St. Peters continued to neglect the provincial chapter is evident from the fact that St. Peters was not represented at the chapter held in Würzburg in 1518 and appears to have been absent without legitimate excuse,\textsuperscript{118} but we then find an interesting notice in the \textit{Annals} for the year 1521. It states: "Because of the pressing and urging of the matter by Hugo, most reverend lord Ordinary (bishop), Abbot Jodocus consented to the reform of the monastery on the 13th of April and accepted it."\textsuperscript{119} A further search of the documents relating to St. Peters turned up more information on this monastic reform of the cloister.

The earliest extant notices of reform at St. Peters are dated March, 1519. The \textit{Stadtarchiv} in Freiburg possesses a letter dated March 3, 1519, written by the government at Ensisheim to the Burgermeister and Rat in Freiburg,\textsuperscript{120} in which Ensisheim reports that Abbot Jodocus had requested the presence of "one from among us" along with "our gracious lord from Constance" (mit unnsers gnedigen Herren von Constanz) in order "to counsel and advise, also to describe to him other matters, such as they touch upon our friend, resulting from the undertaking of the reformation in his monastery, and to help, in addition, in handling other necessary matters."\textsuperscript{121} Ensisheim goes on to excuse itself from participating, due to a busy schedule, but praises the reform effort (es ein loblich und on zwiefel got gefellig und gut werken ist) and empowers Freiburg to act on its behalf in the matter. The \textit{General-landesarchiv} in Karlsruhe likewise has a letter relating to this reform dated May 4, 1519, written by Abbot Jodocus to Margrave Ernst,\textsuperscript{122}
announcing the fact that Jodocus intends to reform his monastery, and asking the Margrave to be present at the official undertaking of the reform.

The two letters make it plain that Abbot Jodocus was carrying out a full-scale reform of St. Peters, but neither letter makes mention of a reforming congregation or gives any other pertinent clues. The Chronicler of St. Peters, Prior P. Gr. Baumeister (who was not aware of the existence of the above letters) states in one of his earlier Annals that "this reformation, if I am not mistaken, is that of Bursfeld . . . by which . . . many monasteries were restored to the integrity of the Rule . . .". A search of the now-published records of the Bursfeld Congregation verified Baumeister's surmise. The decrees from the Annual Chapter of the Bursfeld Congregation, held August 26-28, 1520, contain the following statement.

Moreover, we accepted an honourable and religious petition of the venerable father lord Jodocus Abbot in the Black Forest, which he brought to us and to the persons of our observance . . . This is, that the reverend other presidents and definitors and the entire chapter entrusted the venerable fathers lord Abbots in Alpirsbach and in Hirsau with full authority in order that, as necessity requires, they visit the afore-mentioned monastery and ordain its life according to the Rule, or improve it, and that the lord Abbot be present personally in a future chapter, with all necessary letters, so that then he be able to be incorporated; meanwhile, however, he with his monastery will enjoy our support.

Thus St. Peters made a formal petition to the Bursfeld Congregation and was accepted by that Congregation in August of 1520.

One can only guess what became of the reformation at St. Peters, for there is no further notice in the official Bursfeld record of continuing contact with the monastery. Abbot Jodocus did not return with the "necessary letters," and the full incorporation of St. Peters
into the Bursfeld Congregation was not realized.\textsuperscript{125} Dr. Paulus Volk, the historian of the Bursfeld Congregation, does note however that the initial petition was usually only a prelude to further negotiations, which could often extend over a period of years.\textsuperscript{126} By late winter of 1522, the monastery had been invaded by Margrave Ernst, and this was soon followed by the Peasant's War. If negotiations were taking place at the time of these events, we need look no further for an explanation of the failure to complete the reform.

In reconstructing the timetable of events, Prior Baumeister's report that the reformation was completed, at the urging of Bishop Hugo, in April of 1521 is puzzling piece of evidence, for the reformation appears to have been completed already in 1520. This puzzle is resolved when we read Baumeister's earlier account of the reformation of St. Peters, in which the matter is treated in more detail, as follows.

When lord Jodocus and the conventuals of this monastery not long ago had consented to and accepted the reformation of the order of St. Benedict (at the urging and promotion of the matter by the most reverend lord Bishop of Constance and our Ordinary, Hugo), he promised the most reverend lord Ordinary in return on the 13th of April to observe [the reform] according to the Rule of the holy Order, and in no way to relinquish it in the future. In addition he promised to recognize the Bishop of Constance as Ordinary for all time, and not to seek exemption from his authority in any way, nor to refuse visitation, admission to election and confirmation of election. On the other hand the lord Ordinary was to guard the Monastery and its members and was bound to conserve our rights and privileges.\textsuperscript{127}

Thus it appears that the only record of the reformation at St. Peters known to Prior Baumeister is in fact a record of the official agreement between Abbot Jodocus and Bishop Hugo as to what their mutual relationship was to be, given the newly-accepted reform. That is, it appears that we have here evidence of "negotiations" following acceptance into
the Bursfeld Congregation, which were completed April 13, 1521. We have no further evidence of other negotiations, but these would surely have included Margrave Ernst, the Hither-Austrian government and the conventuals of the monastery itself. We were not able to uncover any further information concerning the reform at St. Peters, but it does not appear to have affected St. Peters' attitude towards the provincial chapter. Unfortunately we have no attendance list for the provincial chapter held in 1521, but we do know that St. Peters was declared contumacious following the final chapter held in Nurnberg in 1524.

We have no way of knowing exactly how daily life and the Divine Office were conducted in Sattler's day, but given Abbot Gremelsbach's conservative zeal and Abbot Jodocus' reforming attempts, we would seem justified in concluding that monks probably did sing the office with regularity, most likely in the Cluniac manner, even if their daily lives were probably not conducted in strict accordance with the detailed guidelines contained in the Constitutiones Hirsauenses.

Speaking in broad historical terms, the Cluniac manner of celebrating the Divine Office prevailed throughout most of Germany until the 16th century, when it began to be replaced by a simplified Roman Office. The most vigorous promoters of the simplified Roman Office were the Bursfeld reformers. We can only conjecture here, but one must wonder whether the "Reformation" of St. Peters in 1519, spoken of by Abbot Jodocus, may not have involved the acceptance and institution of the Bursfeld Breviary and Missal. By 1519 there had already been at least six separate printings of the Bursfeld Breviary, the 1496 edition of which had been prepared by Johann Trithemius.
At best, however, we can only say that it is possible that St. Peters had actually modified its liturgical practices during the 1520's according to the Bursfeld pattern; but in any case, the contrast between the Cluniac monastic model and the reforming model of Bursfeld would have been readily evident to any monk residing in a monastery contemplating such a reform. This contrast stands out in clear relief when we compare the Cluniac/Hirsau novitiate with the Bursfeld novitiate.

Stated in oversimplified terms, the transition from a Cluniac model to a Bursfeld model involved a shift from a predominantly objectified religious practice to a substantially more subjective religious practice. The Cluniac/Hirsau novitiate was to last at least one year during which time the novice had to learn how to take part in the liturgical life of the cloister. The movements of a Cluniac monastic community -- even the performance of mundane tasks -- were designed to fit into an over-all pattern and motion of divine ritual. After the novice had expressed the desire to join the community the main task before him was to learn the proper order of life. Thus following three chapters concerning admittance to the novitiate, the Constitutiones go on to detail the matters in which all novices are to be instructed. These matters take up the next sixty-eight chapters and pertain to the customary Cluniac bows, phrases and rituals after which the consecration of the novices is again taken up. Clearly the Cluniac concern was with the objectified order and worship of the community as a whole, for the primary task before the novice is to learn how to execute the proper motions of that worship. The Constitutiones evidence no concern with the development of subjective piety on the part of individual novices.
The primary document pertaining to the Bursfeld novitiate is the work of Johann Trithemius, his *De triplici regione claustralium*. At the 1498 chapter of the Bursfeld Union it was resolved that not only were all the monks of the Union to own and read the work, but also that visitators were to examine individual monks concerning their knowledge of its contents. Furthermore, "no novice is to be admitted to profession in the future if he is not well acquainted with the work." Thus this writing became the standard text to be used in the novitiate of Bursfeld monks. Paulus Volk maintains further that this work alone is authoritative in establishing the hallmarks of a distinctively Bursfeldian spirituality and piety.

The expository half of *De triplici regione* really contains nothing radical, but rather is devoted to exhortations to ascetic efforts. It is in the exercises of the second part that a more distinctive approach to the monastic life becomes visible. The exercises composed by Trithemius are prayers and meditations designed for each part of the monastic day. There are prayers and thoughts for rising, leaving one's cell, entering church, at holy water, before the sacrament, and during choir. Where the Cluniac novice is taught to perform the complex motions of the Cluniac liturgy, the Bursfeld novice is taught to meditate on the significance of every-day activities. For the Bursfeld fathers, the liturgy has become a vehicle for subjective devotion, prayer, and growth rather than being considered a sufficient end in itself.

In conclusion, the spiritual and practical dynamics involved in the reform of St. Peters emerge rather clearly. After 1519 the motion or tendency was toward the celebration of the Divine Office stripped of
"unnecessary accretions"; the simplification of the Office was matched by a tendency towards the simplification of the monastic life generally, the predominant tone becoming meditative and contemplative rather than liturgical. Furthermore, the more relaxed and casual approach to the monastic life so often in evidence in the sixteenth century monasteries of the older observance was in the process of being replaced at St. Peters by a "reformed" fervour which stressed an immediate return to St. Benedict's original vision. The central themes found in De triplici regione, although expressed in a subjective, meditative vein not found as such in the RB, are none other than the classic Benedictine themes of sanctification through the active practice of renunciation and obedience.

It was within such a dynamic milieu that Michael Sattler lived as a monk at St. Peters of the Black Forest. It is clear from contemporary documents that such reforming attempts often resulted in an instant polarization of the monastic community. At the neighboring Benedictine monastery of Schuttern, for instance, the final acceptance of the Bursfeld reform also involved the granting of a lifetime pension to five monks in return for their departure and disavowal of all future legal rights.¹³⁷ We have no conclusive evidence that Michael Sattler favoured Bursfeldian simplification, contemplation and reform, but the weight of the evidence favours that conclusion. Sattler's later contempt for lax monastic conditions and his rigourous and exacting character all suggest that he had been actively involved in the reforming efforts at St. Peters.

In summary, from 1496 to 1531 St. Peters of the Black Forest did not undergo a wholesale reform in the sense of the Petershausen decrees or in the sense of the Bursfeld Union. What reform there was,
was a matter of individual leadership on the part of particular Abbots, and these efforts do not appear to have altered the basic structure of the monastery: the benefice economy remained as did the basic egalitarianism of the Constitutiones Hirsaugienses. The high point in the religious history of St. Peters up to 1531 obviously begins in 1496 with the election of Petrus III, and the momentum he generated clearly carried over into Abbot Jodocus' rule. Although Petrus III was essentially a conservative, Jodocus' attempt to institute the Bursfeld reform indicates his willingness to move beyond the traditional limits of the Hirsau observance in terms of liturgy, economics and education. With the failure of his efforts we must assume that the traditional observance remained in force.

Conclusion

St. Peters of the Black Forest was not a particularly significant or influential Benedictine monastery, for its days of glory came and went with the waxing and waning of the Zähringer family. Nonetheless, in spite of the long period of apparent religious indifference, it had begun to show signs of a religious awakening on the eve and during the early years of the Reformation. It would have been an exciting and perhaps a disturbing time to have been a monk at St. Peters, for the introduction of a full scale reform called for a fundamental re-evaluation of the monastic life of all concerned. The spiritual teaching of the Rule would have been very much in the forefront of the discussion. The fact that Michael Sattler was a monk at St. Peters during this time of re-evaluation is extremely significant in terms of his spiritual and intellectual background.
We found absolutely no evidence in the monastic record concerning Sattler's early life, and very little evidence generally concerning his education. The latter evidence, however, indicates that Michael Sattler learned his Latin outside the university, quite possibly in a Latin school, and in the monastery, which he entered at an unknown date.

Although Benedictines generally showed little interest in higher education at the beginning of the sixteenth century, the number of matriculated Benedictines at the University of Freiburg for the years 1460 to 1527 outnumbers that of all other orders, as follows: Benedictine, 40; Order of Preachers, 26; Friars Minor, 20; Carmelite, 14; Cistercian, 7. In itself this figure is rather surprising, although it must be noted that only five of these forty Benedictines actually completed a degree. The neighboring Benedictine monasteries are heavily represented in the total number, above all St. Trudperts, Allerheiligen in Schaffhausen, Ettenhaimmunster, Esslingen, Weingarten, and St. Blasien. St. Peters of the Black Forest, however, is not mentioned in the matriculation lists until the year 1551, when Abbot Jodocus Sunthoffer (1544-1553) attended the University of Freiburg.

The above cannot be taken as evidence that all monks at St. Peters were without education. On the contrary, when we consider the names listed in the Necrologium, beginning with Joannes of Kyssenberg (d. 1484), ending with Christophorus Stoppel (d. 1519), and adding such further names as can be found, we discover that Joannes Eberlin from Lorch attended the University of Freiburg from 1494 to 1495 and received the B.A. degree. However, he attended as a
layman, for there is no mention of St. Peters or of clerical status.
Ambrosius Holdermann, listed as prior of St. Peters in 1518,\textsuperscript{145} attended
as a layman in 1491 but received no degree.\textsuperscript{146} Joannes Stock, later
dean of Herzogenbuchsee, attended the University of Freiburg in 1506
as a layman, but received no degree.\textsuperscript{147} Four more brothers at St.
Peters may have attended university, but the evidence in these cases is
equivocal.\textsuperscript{148} A search of the matriculation lists of the universities of
Heidelberg, Basel and Tübingen failed to turn up any monks sent from
St. Peters for further study, although two brothers may have attended
Heidelberg prior to entering St. Peters.\textsuperscript{149}

Granted that St. Peters did not send its monks to pursue
higher studies, this still does not eliminate the possibility of Michael
Sattler having attended some university prior to entering the monastery.
With this in view the matriculation records of the following universities
were searched: Freiburg, Basel, Tübingen, Rostock, Wittenberg,
Frankfurt a. D., Vienna, Bologna, Erfurt, Greifswald, and Cologne.
In all cases the results were negative, even though the search was
conducted under all possible variants of the name Sattler known to me,
namely Setler, Sättelin, Sellatoris, Cellatoris, Sellarius, Stratarii, and
Ephipiarus. We must conclude, first of all, that Michael Sattler would
not have been sent to the university as a monk from St. Peters: St.
Peters was no spawning ground for young humanists and scholars.\textsuperscript{150}
Secondly, it is clear that Sattler did not matriculate in any university
known to us. All available evidence militates against the conclusion of
the Hutterite Chronicle that Sattler was a "learned man," conversant in
Greek and Hebrew. We are still left, then, with the evidence provided
by Sattler's trial: his mastery of Latin was such that he was able to converse fluently in that language. This suggests at least a Latin school education and perhaps a respectable length of stay in the monastery.

The Annals of St. Peters contain no mention of Michael Sattler by name, nor did his name appear as the recipient of a benefice in the records for the diocese of Constance. This is disappointing, for more information on the question of Sattler's status in the monastery would have been welcome. The Annals tell us that Nicholas Tagmesser was prior at St. Peters from 1487 until about 1502. His post as prior was taken by Albertus Hezel, who died in 1503. Johannes Stoeckli is reported as prior in 1505. His place was taken at some point by Ambrosius Holdermann, who died in 1518. There is then an unfortunate gap in the record until about 1545, as we have already noted above. In other words, documents for the precise time period most interesting to us are simply not available.

While there seems to be no first hand proof of Sattler's having been prior of St. Peters, neither has any evidence been found militating against such a possibility. In the absence of opposing evidence, we can accept Valerius Anshelm's statement that Sattler had been prior of St. Peters. We can conclude further that Sattler must have held this post sometime between the year 1518, when we have notice of the death of prior Holdermann, and 1525, when Sattler appears in Zurich in Anabaptist company. This period of seven years thus assumes a great importance in the monastic setting.
If it can be granted that Michael Sattler became prior of St. Peters between 1518 and 1525, it is of great relevance to note that he would have been chosen to fill that position precisely during the period in which the Bursfeld reform was being considered. It is clear that a reform-minded Abbot would have chosen a reform-minded prior. Thus we may be certain that Michael Sattler, as a monk at St. Peters, was well informed as to what the Bursfeld reform involved. We may hypothesize further that Sattler was in favour of that reform and that for this reason he was chosen prior. In short, Michael Sattler emerged out of a setting in which the return to basic Benedictine principles was a very live issue, and he appears to have played a leadership role in establishing a reformed monastic observance.

This chapter has also been meant to provide a basis for choosing texts from the Benedictine milieu which we can consider as representative of the literature available to Sattler. Thus we are now faced with the question of what is to constitute a "representative Benedictine text," given the limits of our study. One of the most important of the literary sources Sattler would have encountered in the monastery is scripture itself. By means of monastic literature, through the daily practice of liturgical prayer, and by direct encouragement to read scripture and meditate upon it, Michael Sattler would have been introduced to a monastic interpretation of scripture dating back to the Patristic period. No survey of "monastic literature" can exclude scripture itself. Secondly, it is also clear that the Rule of St. Benedict is central. It is, in fact, the sine qua non of any Benedictine literature as such. The interpretation of the Rule which played the central role at St. Peters is the
interpretation embodied in the Constitutiones Hirsugienses. Accordingly, the Rule must be considered in light of the Constitutiones. At this point arises a difficulty: the Constitutiones are concerned primarily with the description and elaboration of the liturgy. In fact, the monastic life is almost totally rendered liturgically. From the nature of the case, which is that our study deals with Michael Sattler, and takes its departure from his Anabaptist writings, our interest of necessity lies more in the forms of thought representative of Benedictine life. The fact that a good deal of the Benedictine life is involved in communal prayer, for example, is significant for our study, but the mechanics involved in the execution of that communal prayer are less so. In terms of the Rule, this means that our interest lies primarily in the content of the Prologue and the first seven chapters, rather than in the content of the liturgical chapters. Likewise, our study would be served more by ascetic writings by monks of the Hirsau observance rather than descriptions of liturgical usage, even though the latter may be more "representative" of Benedictine spirituality than the former in certain cases.

At this point we are confronted by a further difficulty, which is that by the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, monks of the Hirsau observance, which never had encouraged literary production, had ceased writing altogether. Thus a comparison between Michael Sattler's writings and writings representative of late Hirsau spirituality is a practical impossibility. Late-medieval Benedictines were not noted for literary production in any case, but such literary production as there was emerged from the reforming movements, rather than from the more liturgically oriented Hirsau monasteries.
Given this state of affairs, we will centre our analysis on the Rule of St. Benedict itself, since it remains the heart of the matter for all Benedictines. The Constitutiones Hirsauienses will also be utilized insofar as they are applicable. Further, the initiation of the Bursfeld reform at St. Peters means that we must also consider the body of literature authored by contemporary "reforming" Benedictines.

The most prolific and influential Benedictine author of this period was undoubtedly Johannes Trithemius. Besides his historical and reform writings, he also wrote a lengthy, but unfinished, commentary on the Rule of St. Benedict. Although it was never published, it provides us a sixteenth century lens through which to view the Rule. Trithemius also wrote other works relating to the monastic life which received wide circulation through printed editions. Furthermore, his work was central for the Bursfeld Union: he wrote the official handbook for monks of the Union, as we have noted. In sum, it is the combination of the Rule of St. Benedict, the Constitutiones Hirsauienses and the writings of Trithemius that we will consider as being "representative Benedictine writings," keeping in mind that this literature relies upon, and continually expresses, a distinctive understanding of scripture itself.
CHAPTER III

THE REFORMATION IN SOUTHWEST GERMANY

The question that underlies this chapter is the question posed by Michael Sattler's transition from a practicing Benedictine monk to his presence in the city of Zürich with known Anabaptists. While we know the date of his expulsion from Zürich (November 18, 1525), unfortunately we have no concrete evidence concerning Michael Sattler's departure from St. Peters of the Black Forest, nor do we know what events took place in the interim. Since this is the state of the evidence, it seems that we must pay particular attention to the events and currents of thought which formed the "atmosphere" surrounding St. Peters. In the preceding chapter, we have considered St. Peters primarily as an isolated entity within the monastic tradition, and we have noted the influences to which it was subject in that context. In this chapter we wish to consider St. Peters primarily as a monastery located within a larger social, political and geographic context. Our focus will be the "Reformation," i.e. the events and ideas which crystallized following Martin Luther's posting of the 95 theses in 1517.

Steven Ozment has identified three "moments" or stages in the development of successful reformation movements in the cities, as follows:

Preachers and laymen learned in Scripture provided the initial stimulus; ideologically and socially mobile burghers, primarily from the (larger) lower and middle strata, created a driving wedge of popular support; and government consolidated and moderated the new institutional changes. . . .
the Reformation was a movement that embraced and required
for its completion all three moments.¹

The three stages identified by Ozment are useful in presenting our
present subject in that they clearly indicate those "moments" which, in
the case of Freiburg in the Breisgau, failed to arrive.

The Emergence of Reformation Ideas up to 1522

In October of 1517 Martin Luther posted the celebrated theses
concerning the power of indulgences. The theses soon broke into the
larger arena where they found an immediate response. The initial vein
of sentiment tapped by Luther's theses was precisely the anti-Roman,
German nationalist reforming fervor which was so pervasive in early
sixteenth century Germany.² The development of events following the
posting of the theses in Wittenberg needs no repetition here. It is
important to remember, however, that Luther's break with the Catholic
Church was not realized at one stroke, but only came to be as Luther
began to draw the conclusions of his basic theological principles.³

Many early supporters of Luther, drawn often from among the ranks of
the humanists, turned back to the Catholic Church as the Reformation
progressed.

Luther's personal presence in southwest Germany was limited to
his appearance in Heidelberg in 1518, where he presented theses for
disputation at a chapter of his order. Several persons were present at
the "Heidelberg Disputation" who were impressed by Luther and later
became leaders in the Protestant movement, most notably Martin Bucer.⁴
Luther's influence in southwest Germany generally, and in the Breisgau
in particular, was not dependent upon his own presence in the area,
for after 1518 Luther never again came so far south. Rather, the spread of Luther's ideas took place primarily through the distribution of his writings and the activity of sympathetic proselytizers.

In the Breisgau, the area of our specific concern, we must note the developments in and around the city of Freiburg, which forms the cultural and intellectual centre of the region. The people first affected by Luther's message were, quite naturally, those close to the academic community: the professors, students and graduates of the University of Freiburg. Among the most prominent of the early Luther partisans in Freiburg were, first, the influential teacher, humanist and jurist Ulrich Zasius, second, the poet Philipp Engelbrecht (Engentinus), who had studied in Wittenberg and was a rarity in that he had actually met Luther, and Jakob Otter, the learned follower of Wimpfeling and Geiler. Other less prominent members of the "Zasius circle" were Jakob Bedrott, Johann Lonitzer and Gervas Sauffer. The number of students influenced by Luther's ideas can only be guessed at, but one can surmise that the Luther partisans at the University of Freiburg formed a vocal minority in the first few years following 1517.

The popularization of Luther's ideas reached a new level with the publication of the great reform writings of 1520, To the Christian Nobility of the German Nation, On the Babylonian Captivity of the Church, and On the Freedom of the Christian Man. Luther had now become a cause célèbre, known by peasant and humanist alike. Although the records are scarce documenting the spread of the Reformation ideas in Freiburg, it is clear that the higher levels of local government and the clergy contained no active Reformation partisans. One can conclude
from later events that among the lower clergy and the middle and lower-class laity a small proportion of these groups sympathized with Luther's message. In the years leading up to 1522, support for, as well as opposition to, Luther was largely muted, with the highest concentration of support being located at the University of Freiburg. It appears that the majority of the citizens of Freiburg took no interest in joining the movement. 10

The conservatism found in Freiburg was not unusual as such. As Miriam Chrisman has shown, even in such a "liberal" stronghold as Strasbourg, the Reformation owed its eventual victory to the concerted effort of a small but dedicated minority. 11 Thus the question is not whether Luther's message found immediate and wide-spread support in Freiburg during the early years, but rather, whether his few supporters would be able to create a broader base of support from which the local magistracy could be influenced. Local political realities played the crucial role in these developments.

The enforcing of the Edict of Worms, and of subsequent Imperial edicts against "Lutheran ideas," took various forms depending upon the political situation prevalent in the region in question. In Strasbourg the council might indeed concern itself over relations with the emperor, but as a free Imperial city, Strasbourg could exercise considerable latitude in practice. The city of Freiburg, on the other hand, had been under direct Austrian rule since 1368; its latitude in applying decrees made by the Habsburgs was considerably more restricted, and was to become even more so. In 1521 Charles V began to transfer control of his eastern territories to his brother, Archduke Ferdinand of
Austria, and in 1522 the Breisgau and Württemberg came under Ferdinand's direct control. Ferdinand, a Habsburg and a militant Catholic, moved forward with a purpose, as will be noted presently.

A further political element that played a role in the unfolding of Reformation events in the Breisgau was the presence of non-Austrian territories bordering on the Austrian lands. An important exception to the general Austrian domination of the Breisgau was created by the territories ruled by Ernst of Baden, Margrave of Hochberg (or Hachberg). In some cases, such as in the case of the town of Wolfenweiler on the outskirts of Freiburg, the Margrave's lands were surrounded on all sides by Austrian lands; in other cases, the Margrave shared borders with Austria. Beyond inheriting the immediate control of various lands, Ernst also inherited jurisdiction over other properties; most notably for us, he became Kastvogt or overseer of St. Peters of the Black Forest.

To the natural political tension arising between Ernst and the Austrian regime was added the tension arising from Margrave Ernst's apparent sympathy with the new evangelical teaching. It is particularly hard in the case of Margrave Ernst to distinguish between political and religious motives, but it can be noted that from 1518 to 1522, Jakob Otter was preaching the new doctrines in the town of Wolfenweiler. In terms of St. Peters of the Black Forest, Ernst displayed an uncommon egalitarianism already in 1521 when he refused to accede to Abbot Jodocus' demand that, as Kastvogt, he discipline refractory peasants. These points of friction were to become more marked in the years from 1522 to 1524.
If one were to choose individuals to epitomize this initial period of the Reformation in Freiburg and the Breisgau, no better examples exist than Ulrich Zasius and Jakob Otter, both of whom were among the first to be attracted to Luther, but who were to proceed in opposite directions as the Reformation progressed.

Zasius' early letters concerning Luther are openly enthusiastic: he says that he thinks of Luther's writings as though they had come from an angel.\(^{13}\) Zasius, like most of the German humanists, shared Luther's dislike of Rome. In his attempt to establish the sources of Roman Law, Zasius was faced with the problem of scholastic glosses on the "pure" text: Luther and Zasius shared in the crusade to return to the sources, and in both cases scholasticism was a common foe.\(^{14}\) Zasius became more cautious following the Leipzig disputation in 1519, when the implications of Luther's position became evident with regard to the authority of the Pope and the Church Councils, but he continued to express his support for Luther.\(^{15}\) As late as 1520 he still praised Luther as being a "Phoenix among the theologians,"\(^{16}\) but in 1521 his eventual position began to emerge. In speaking of Erasmus and Luther, Zasius states that although both men are worthy, he prefers Erasmus.\(^{17}\) The humanistic interest at the base of Zasius' concern, which provided the initial attraction to Luther, remained primary for Zasius. Luther, on the other hand, "was not in 1521 a humanist in the sense . . . that he put the restoration of antique culture first in importance nor did he ever become one."\(^{18}\) Luther's central insights, rather, derived from a religious perspective, from "a theology which is lived existentially."\(^{19}\) Luther's positive programme ventured far beyond his initial criticisms of
Rome and the scholastics into areas which had little in common with humanism.

Zasius eventually joined his fellow humanists Faber, Mutian, Pirkheimer and Erasmus in rejecting the Reformation. Jakob Otter, on the other hand, who was thirty years younger than Zasius, eventually went the way of Melanchthon and Capito. Otter's education began under the guidance of the renowned Wimpeling, and eventually it took Otter to Heidelberg, Strasbourg (where Geiler was active), and then to Freiburg, where as a member of the Carthusian order Otter received the M.A. in 1515 and the licence in theology in 1517.20 One of Otter's principal teachers at Freiburg was none other than Ulrich Zasius, with whom Otter studied jurisprudence.21

On conclusion of his studies, Otter obtained a post as a preacher in Wolfenweiler, a suburb of Freiburg.22 He preached in Wolfenweiler for four years, from 1518 to 1522, and achieved a wide reputation in the Breisgau.23 His enthusiasm for Luther's teaching was unbounded. In 1520, Zasius wrote to Zwingli that "in the Breisgau there are many admirers of Luther, and also among the theologians, especially a learned preacher Jakob (Otter), a man as sincere and upright as anyone, and I often argue with him in a friendly way when he 'Lutherizes' too much."24 In 1522, when Zasius was beginning to express caution, Otter threw caution to the winds. When the town council of Kenzingen, a town some 20 kilometers north of Freiburg, invited Otter "to teach and preach the pure Gospel to the citizenry, free from man-made fables,"25 Otter accepted the call. For Otter, humanist training had served as a prelude to activity as a religious leader in the "reformed" mold.
The cases of Zasius and Otter illustrate the salient features of the Freiburg situation up to 1522. The Reformation was accepted first among the educated, the initial point of contact being Luther's criticism of Roman practices, but as the radical nature of Luther's teaching became more evident, (and as Luther's ideas began to find some support among the Volk), a division began to occur among the early Lutheran supporters. The cases of Zasius and Otter illustrate the two directions taken: Zasius remained in the University, pursuing his humanistic studies, while Otter took Luther's message to the people. In the political and ecclesiastical spheres, the emergence of the Reformation in the Breisgau was overshadowed by the overwhelming presence of the pro-Catholic Austrian regime, actively represented after February of 1522 by Archduke Ferdinand. The Austrian presence in the Breisgau was countered here and there in the territories of the evangelically-minded (but politically out-manned) Margrave Ernst. It was surely no accident that Jakob Otter chose to preach in the Margrave's town of Wolfenweiler rather than attempting to do so in the Freiburg Munster. In any case, the stage was set for later developments in the Breisgau with the Catholic party enjoying an undeniable advantage.  

Growing Opposition: 1522-1524

Shortly after Archduke Ferdinand's installation in February of 1522, the "evangelical party" in Freiburg made itself known by means of a letter addressed to bishop Hugo of Constance, in which some citizens requested the celebration of the Lord's Supper in both kinds. In April 1522, bishop Hugo responded with a letter to the Freiburg city council, "in which he asked them to remain in the laws, ordinances,"
constitutions and customs of the old Church, in the way of their fore-
fathers." The letter was posted on the door of the Freiburg cathedral,
and was soon responded to, in rhymed verse, by a local wag. The
following three lines give the essential tone and content of the response:

   Wenn wir nicht bessere Christen wären,
   Als uns Deine Pfaffen lehren,
   Der Teufel hätt' uns längst schon hin; 29

In short, bishop Hugo was reminded in no uncertain terms that pastoral
care had long since been absent in the old Church. The verses conclude:

   Der Teufel hol' sie Alle hin,
   Wir wendt (wollen) doch gute Christen syn! 30

While the language is humourous and crude, the sentiment is unmistak-
able.

On the second of May 1522, bishop Hugo promulgated a pastoral
letter through the entire diocese of Constance in which the clergy were
urged to "stand with the Catholic Church and Religion through these
disorders, and fight this wrong teaching in word and deed ..." 31
The immediate cause of the pastoral letter appears to have been the
events in Zürich, where citizens had eaten sausages during Lent and
where Zwingli (already secretly married) was advocating clerical mar-
riage and the "subjection of traditional religious practices to the text of
Scripture." 32 Bishop Hugo's pastoral letter did not go unanswered.
Dr. Sebastian Meyer, in an anonymous pamphlet published in Basel,
soon attacked the bishop's position, and was not above utilizing the
ad hominem argument: "There are hardly two pimps in the whole
bishopric who take in so much money (as does the bishop)." 33 The
reference was, of course, to Hugo's well-known Milchzins, or concubine
tax levied against clergy who cohabitated.
By the summer of 1522, there was an obvious struggle taking
place between the two parties in Freiburg. Balthasar Hubmaier visited
Freiburg at this time and reported in a letter that "this city finds itself
contradicting its name, since it is in no way 'free' but rather is op-
pressed and enchained through opposed parties in civil and in church
matters." That the "parties" were not of equal strength, however, is
clear in the case of Johannes Lonitzer, a member of the Zasius circle.
Lonitzer argued openly with a Franciscan who was preaching in the
cathedral, but when the Franciscan filed a complaint with the city
council, Lonitzer immediately fled the city and took up residence in
Esslingen. The evangelical teaching spread more easily in the countryside
around Freiburg. In Kenzingen, Jakob Otter was preaching and winning
adherents, and in Hecklingen, a town close to Kenzingen, Johann
Kress was preaching in the new sense. As of July, 1522, Otto Brunfels
was preaching in Neuenburg, Alexander Reischach was active in the
region of the Kaiserstuhl from 1522 onward, and Johann Wehe of
Wittnau and Jakob Stümpfi of Ballrechten were adherents of evangelical
teaching. The countryside did not lend itself to such strict controls
as did the city of Freiburg itself.

If the bishop's efforts at stemming the tide led primarily to
barbed replies, Ferdinand's efforts were markedly more successful. On
November 7, 1522 an Edict was promulgated from Nürnberg in which
not only was preaching in a reformed sense outlawed, but also all such
books were banned in the Austrian lands. This Edict found an
immediate response in Freiburg. According to the Freiburg council,
the document was to be read in each and every guild in the city and all questionable books were to be brought for examination. In addition, a house to house search for such books was to be made. The result of this effort in Freiburg was a public burning of around 2,000 "Lutheran" books in the Münsterplatz, including Bibles. The Freiburg city council did not sit idly by watching the movement gain strength, but rather actively opposed the evangelical party at every turn.

On January 9, 1523 the first Zürich disputation took place, with Zwingli confronting Johann Fabri, the vicar general of the bishop of Constance. The entire disputation was to be decided "according to the truth of Holy Writ." The debate generated considerable excitement and interest in southern Germany; the city of Freiburg was officially represented there by a "learned" man. The debate itself, however, was "stage-managed, one-sided, and unfair to the Catholics, whose case had very largely gone by default. Fabri was determined not to enter into any serious discussion with his opponents. With Fabri maintaining that he was present only as an "observer," the first Zürich disputation resulted in a "striking triumph" for Zwingli in particular and the evangelical party generally.

The course of events in Zürich seems to have precipitated some outbreaks in Freiburg. These, however, were minor, short-lived, and of no great import. Pater Christoph, a Carmelite monk, preached openly at the priory of All Saints in Freiburg, but "his activity did not last long." He was immediately arrested by the city council and summarily banished, apparently for preaching against Mary's perpetual virginity. Ludwig Oeller, a Carthusian monk, had been preaching
against clerical immorality since 1522; his outspokenness and radicalism earned him a trial in 1523, and he was condemned to prison. Oeller, however, escaped to Strasbourg, which was rapidly becoming a haven for reform-minded Freiburgers. Among the chaplains at the Freiburg Münster, Diebold Kempf came to be suspected of evangelical tendencies. He reported that among his fellow priests, "the one threatened me, that if he had the written authority from the bishop, he would put me in St. Martin's tower; the second would opine that I should be forged to a wagon and taken to Constance; the third threatened to throw me over the church walls by the hair if I spoke more to him (concerning the Gospel)." Kempf appears to have answered to the satisfaction of the city council, and to have retained his post in the cathedral. Freiburg was no safe place in which to voice dissent.

It is easy to understand from the above why Otto Brunfels would write from Neuenburg in 1523: "The Gospel is blooming everywhere except in the Netherlands and in the Breisgau ..." Brunfels himself soon left the Breisgau for Switzerland, where "one is allowed to state what is written in the Gospel." But while open evangelical activity was becoming difficult in the Breisgau, some preachers continued to have success, most notably Jakob Otter in Kenzingen, who had the support of the town council. There are also reports of clandestine preaching, particularly by the notorious Karsthans. By December of 1522, the Austrian authorities had written to Freiburg to be on the lookout for this man. By late March of 1523, the Freiburg city council reported that Karsthans "instructs the ignorant common folk everywhere in the Lutheran opinion, and gives instruction in the evangelical sense
and reason for disobedience and Bundschuh activities. He had been active in Horb, and was now active in other small towns in Württemberg. About a month later, the council volunteered the information that Karsthan had been active in and around Freiburg some years before, that he practiced medicine, and that in spite of their efforts they had not been able to apprehend him. The impact of such undercover evangelists on the Breisgau countryside is difficult to assess, but it is clear that itinerant preachers such as Karsthan were able to move freely among the country folk; the evangelical overtones which pervaded the Peasants' Revolt lends some credence to the Freiburg council's concern that such preaching would lead to Bundschuh opinions.

In the absence of direct evidence, it is difficult to assess the significance which local Reformation events would have had for the monks of St. Peters, but most likely the effect was slight. Abbot Jodocus, a leading citizen ex officio of the city of Freiburg, was certainly not sympathetic to Luther's cause, and we know that the monastery was pursuing a reforming, observant direction as late as 1521. The event which dominates this period in the history of the monastery, namely the invasion and occupation of St. Peters by a troop of soldiers in the hire of Margrave Ernst, is an event which arose out of political considerations rather than religious ones. Nonetheless, the invasion highlights social and religious issues central to the Reformation as well as providing us with a rare close-up view of the monastery itself.

Margrave Ernst inherited his father's concern to establish high moral standards in his territories, especially in the monasteries under his control. Margrave Christoph of Baden, in his testament of 1505,
still expressed the sentiment (so current a century before) that "each and every cloistered man and woman be maintained by you (my heirs) in a state of good spiritual reformation . . . "56 We know of at least one case in which Margrave Ernst took his father at his word. The lax moral conditions in the Benedictine nunnery in Sulzburg eventually led Margrave Ernst, with the consent of the bishop of Basle, to seize the cloister in 1521, to establish a secular overseer and thus to restore the monastery after 28 years of decline.57 It is typical of Ernst that he would simultaneously allow Jakob Otter to preach in Wolfenweiler while yet wishing to reform a monastery in the traditional sense of re-establishing a strict observance.58

As we have noted above, St. Peters of the Black Forest was actively in the process of monastic reform already in May of 1519 and we know that Margrave Ernst was not only invited to participate in some initiatory ceremonies but also that Abbot Jodocus had discussed the reformation of St. Peters with Ernst beforehand.59 We know further that in August of 1520, the Bursfeld Union accepted Jodocus' petition that his monastery be reformed according to the Bursfeld pattern, and also that in April of 1521, reform negotiations were completed between Abbot Jodocus and bishop Hugo of Constance. It is thus clear that in the case of St. Peters, the seizure of the monastery by Margrave Ernst had nothing to do with the establishing of a strict observance, for the evidence is overwhelming (by sixteenth century standards) that a strict observance was already in place. In fact, at no time does Ernst suggest that his action was prompted or justified by conditions within the cloister.
The invasion of the monastery must have taken place on March 5 or 6, 1522, for on March 7, 1522 the city council of Freiburg wrote to the Hither-Austrian government at Ensisheim that their burgher, Abbot Jodocus of St. Peters, had reported to them "what our gracious lord Margrave has done to him and his monastery" and further that the council had sent a delegation "to those (men) who, because of the Margrave, are in the monastery," which delegation was to ask the invaders to leave. Margrave Ernst's response to the council's delegation is also dated March 7. In that letter, Ernst states that his Landvogt, Conrat Dieterich von Bolsenheim, apparently the officer in charge of the Margrave's forces, had sent him, the Margrave, a written report of the council's request and inquiry. Ernst maintains, against allegations, that the monastery was not invaded because of any displeasure or indignation against the person of the Abbot, but rather he had acted in his capacity as Kastvogt in order to protect the rights of his subjects, the peasants, who were being subjected to unfair taxation. Ernst states further that if the Abbot or anyone else demonstrates that the Margrave's subjects are not to be protected by such action, the invaders will be withdrawn immediately and all costs paid. The Margrave concludes by saying that some monks have been sent from the Abbot to him and that he has given them his answer and he will let the matter rest there.

The following day (March 8) the city council of Freiburg wrote again to Ensisheim, reporting on the contents of the Margrave's letter to them. The council adds further that the monks with whom Ernst spoke are being sent to Ensisheim so that "they may report (to you)
verbally all that took place between them and the Margrave 

64 Ensisheim wrote the following day in what can only be described as hostile tones. The city of Freiburg is asked to send armed representatives (waffenlich botschaft) to Ensisheim so that they can take counsel together to decide what is to be done. Ensisheim concludes by pledging support for Abbot Jodocus. 65 The Austrian authorities were plainly ready to take definite action.

After this flurry of letters there is silence in the record until March 24. At that time Margrave Ernst wrote to Ensisheim that he had heard that Ensisheim was accusing him, the Margrave, of violating the peace of the Empire. Ernst pleaded his case with Ensisheim, pointing to the justice of his cause and the traditionally friendly relations between the house of Baden and the Austrian regime, and asked for a written reply via his messenger. 66 Ensisheim's reply is not extant, but four days later, on March 28, Ernst wrote a lengthy reply to Ensisheim in which the entire situation is detailed and argued.

In his letter of March 28, Ernst goes directly to the heart of the matter: the real issue is the question of who has rights over the monastery. Abbot Jodocus claimed the protection of Austria. On the contrary, maintains Ernst, "the abbey of St. Peters has been under our protection, and that of our forefathers, longer than can be remembered, and it still is under our protection and we still possess higher and lower authority (over it)." 67 Ernst apparently had already brought up such questions at the Imperial Diet at Worms in 1521, for Ernst states: "we petition the royal majesty concerning this and other articles, as we also petitioned him at the last Diet held in Worms in the presence of
many of our lords and friends, electors and princes...\textsuperscript{68} No
decision was handed down, however, and Ernst concludes, a little
repetitiously, that "in this we await your majesty's decision and law,
and will stand by it, and wish to await the royal majesty's decision in
this and (since) the same is yet to come it is therefore not needful for
us to negotiate in another disputation or meeting."\textsuperscript{69}

The letter continues with Ernst repeating that he is the legal
lord of the monastery (Unser vordern und wir desselben gotzhus als
schyrmenherren und Castvogt... in Ruwiger possession gewesen, und
noch syen) and then going on to detail the course of events. Some time
ago, Ernst states, some of his subjects at St. Peters came to him and
told him that "a rather unjust tax was being laid on them by the govern-
ment at Ensisheim, from which tax they and their ancestors had been
exempt and which had never before been levied."\textsuperscript{70} When these peas-
ants protested the matter, they were greeted with threats and unfriend-
liness, "especially from their lord, the Abbot, who more than others
should be concerned with such matters and protect (the peasants) from
these things."\textsuperscript{71} As a result of this "their submissive request and plea
to us was that we as their Kastvogt, protector and lord, legally protect
and keep them in the face of such might...\textsuperscript{72} Ernst reports that
he has a copy before him of the letter he wrote on the matter, but
since he received no reply "and nevertheless the subjects remained in
need, we finally undertook the invasion of St. Peters...\textsuperscript{73} What
becomes clear for the first time is that the Margrave's invasion was a
reaction against the Ensisheim government particularly, which had
imposed a tax on the Margrave's subjects. Further, it is clear that the
Abbot's sympathies in the matter lay with the Austrians.
Ernst's defense of the conduct of his troops gives us a glimpse of other events surrounding the invasion. Ernst states that his troops behaved well, and "not improperly as the Abbot alleges." And further, that they (the troops) snatched the keys away from the turnkey and gave them to one among them should be seen as follows; that the Abbot (since he is so inclined to do everything that is contrary and harmful to us) wrote to the Prior and convent (which document we have) that none of our men were to be given anything to eat or to drink; therefore because of their need our men had to get the key themselves but with no force or coercion; and further when the convent was told by us why the armed men were there they gave food and drink happily, (and) our men gave the key back to them, or at least offered to give it to them, for our intention has never been, and still is not, to burden the monastery in any way...

From this we know that, although the Abbot fled the monastery, the Prior and most of the monks remained at St. Peters and, if the Margrave is to be believed, saw the justice of the Margrave's action and shared their food and drink willingly with the troops.

Ernst concludes his letter with a bitter complaint against Abbot Jodocus, whose action has caused "such a sharp, un-neighborly writing to be brought against us, almost not taking into account the friendly relations we have happily held towards you (Ensisheim) till now, and still wish to hold..." The letter is then signed by the Margrave, who appended a one page decree, in which he asserts his right to tax the inhabitants of his territory and in which he requests that the Austrian tax be lifted from his subjects.

We do not know when the Margrave withdrew his troops from the monastery or under what conditions the withdrawal took place, although letters on the subject continue to be exchanged until as late as March, 1523. In the end no armed conflict ensued, and apparently
the Margrave managed to retain his rights over St. Peters, for he offered to sell that jurisdiction to Ferdinand for 1,000 Gulden and actually did so in March of 1526. The territorial realignments resulting from the invasion of St. Peters, however, are of less interest than is the invasion itself, which is significant in view of later events.

For the peasants the Austrian presence constituted an immediate financial threat. The peasants' objection to the taxes, namely that they were "levied contrary to ancient custom and usage" was to re-appear later as a central grievance during the Peasants' War. Turning to the Margrave, it was clearly in his interest to back the peasants. The traditional role of the Kastvögler, however, was that of "defender of the rights of the monastery" rather than "defender of the rights of the peasants." Although the Margrave was acting primarily out of self-interest rather than on the basis of noble egalitarian principles, the defense of the common man against the interests of the privileged was an act which was closer to the spirit of the age than the Margrave perhaps realized.

In light of Reformation events, the confrontation at St. Peters was significant as a mild rehearsal of what was to come. What is here documented is the escalation of an economic grievance, with the aid of the Margrave, into a successful, armed take-over of a monastery, whose Abbot was forced to flee. Similar grievances later resulted in the wide-spread plunder and destruction of cloisters. A key element missing in 1522 was the conviction among the common people that monasteries were not divine institutions at all and further, that tithes and taxes as such were imposed against divine Law. For his part, the Margrave, who capitalized on peasant discontent in 1522, was soon to find himself
fleeing from peasant troops and negotiating with them for the return of his castles.

One must conjecture about the effect of the 1522 invasion of St. Peters on the monastic life of the community. It is obvious, first of all, that the monastic routine was disrupted for some time, but beyond this, it is probable that the invasion and the necessary subsequent litigation and diplomatic activity put an effective end to the efforts at incorporating St. Peters into the Bursfeld Union. Abbot Jodocus, now forced into his role as a feudal lord, had pressing secular matters to attend to. One must also wonder how the confrontation between the powerful and the powerless affected the monks. The Margrave's report, that the Prior and convent happily gave his men food and drink once they had the true reason for the invasion, may be an overstatement on the Margrave's part, but it also remains true that the Margrave's anger was directed towards Abbot Jodocus and not towards the monks, whom he describes as being cooperative. It may well be that some monks did indeed sympathize with the cause of the "common man" at this point.

At the very least one can say that the issues were present in such a way that no monk at St. Peters could ignore them: Were the peasants right in refusing to pay the tax? Was the Margrave justified in aiding the peasants? What were the monastery's rights as lord over the peasants and from whence came those rights? In short, an undeniable result of the invasion of St. Peters was the suspension of ordered, cloistered life and the forceful intrusion of the social realities of the day: the peasants were clamoring for justice, and they were being opposed by the powerful, among whom were numbered "my lord Abbot"
as well as the monks themselves as "cloister lords." The same issues would again be brought to the doors of St. Peters in about two years' time, this time couched in the language of the Reformation.

The dispute between Margrave Ernst and the Austrian regime over the jurisdiction of St. Peters was, as we have noted, a political dispute which had revolutionary religious overtones only in view of subsequent events. Nonetheless the political opposition between the Margrave and the Austrian house soon developed a more overt religious dimension, and the catalyst here was none other than Jakob Otter, who had earlier preached in the Margrave's town of Wolfenweiler.

By the end of 1523, vocal and visible dissent had been effectively silenced in Freiburg by the swift and stern action of the city council. The countryside, however, remained less amenable to control, as Freiburg's unsuccessful attempts to apprehend Karsthans demonstrate. As Austrian pressure continued to be applied, the attempt to control the surrounding region began, and nowhere was the new heresy more visible than in the town of Kenzingen, where Otter had been preaching with success since 1522. Kenzingen was, in fact, under Austrian rule, and was represented locally by the knight Wolf von Hürnheim.

Open action against Kenzingen began with the summoning of Jakob Otter by the bishop of Constance. Otter did not appear, but instead the town council of Kenzingen sent its mayor and town clerk to Freiburg to speak with the bishop's representative, to inquire about the reason for the summons. They were told in no uncertain terms that "the preacher at Kenzingen is preaching Lutheran, heretical things." The Kenzingen representatives thereupon placed the Old and the New
Testaments on the table, and affirmed that "the preacher has taught only what is written in here." Their action, predictably, failed to make a good impression on the bishop's dean.

Otter was again summoned by the bishop of Constance, but this time the town took a different approach, namely a town council meeting was held followed by a general meeting of the burghers. At the latter meeting the mayor made a rousing speech in which he reminded the burghers that "Master Jakob has shown us nothing but love and kindness and has taught nothing but brotherly love and Christian order in his sermons and instruction." The mayor went on to maintain that Otter's preaching had "reformed the town in a moral sense.

It is well-known to the entire citizenry how the authorities have up to now sought in vain to put an end to blasphemy, immoderate drinking and other excessive vices. Only since the pure Word of God was proclaimed here, and the citizens were thus earnestly instructed, have these things come to an end. He then concluded his speech by telling the burghers of the council's decision to allow Otter to proclaim "the Word of God," even if this meant that one stone was not left standing on another. The burghers for their part responded by asserting their willingness to defend Otter "with life and limb," and the revolt at Kenzingen was underway.

The Kenzingen citizenry next appealed to their local lord, the knight from Hürnheim, that he allow them to keep their preacher. The knight was most conciliatory, but he warned the people that Otter could stay only on the condition that "the Lord's Supper not be taken in both kinds, that baptism not be performed in German and that no reading of the Mass in German be allowed." As a further attempt at compromise the knight sought to arrange an interview between Otter and Archduke
Ferdinand, but the latter stated outright that he "did not wish to hear or see Master Jakob." 88

Otter himself then tried another approach, namely he attempted to argue his case in print. His book *Die Epistel Sti. Pauli an Titum, gepredigt und ausgelegt durch Jacobum Otter, Predicant zu Kentzingen* was printed in Strasbourg in early 1524 and contained a justificatory preface dedicated to none other than his former patron, Margrave Ernst.

May a pious Christian decide truly, whether (the sermons) are heretical. I give them over to your Princely Grace because I recognize that your Grace's Christian disposition is ready and eager, with the highest diligence, to be faithful unto the death to the Christian Truth, and that you aim to extirpate false teachings and lies. 89

We do not know what reaction the Margrave had to Otter's decision or to the book, but the effort won Otter no support among the pro-Catholic Breisgau nobility.

At the conclusion of the Imperial Diet in Nürnberg in April 1524, and at the height of the Kentzingen uproar, Archduke Ferdinand decided to visit his Breisgau territories. Ferdinand was greeted "as the sword and armour of the holy Catholic faith, as the executor of Imperial wrath, as the lightening ray of the ban and execration against the heretic." 90 The city of Freiburg welcomed him on May 13, 1524 with notable pomp, splendor and ceremony. 91 Ferdinand's arrival certainly ended what little Protestant opposition still existed in Freiburg and inspired pro-Catholic sentiment in the countryside. The Archduke's visit to the Breisgau did not bode well for Kentzingen and Jakob Otter.

Symbolic of the course of events during this epoch are, again, Ulrich Zasius and Jakob Otter. Otter, as we have seen, effectively
propagated evangelical teaching among the people of Kenzingen, gaining the support of the local magistracy and even gaining qualified support from the local knight. Such success, however, put him on a direct collision course with the Austrian authorities; Ferdinannd's visit to the Breisgau only made that collision unavoidable. Ulrich Zasius, on the other hand, although he privately still spoke well of Luther as late as June 1523,93 was able to re-trace his steps to orthodoxy. By September 1524, Zasius could write to Amerbach that "the spirit of Luther breeds enmity, feuding, friction, sects, malice and death."

The events to come are not unfairly represented by the figures of Zasius and Otter, with Zasius safe behind the orthodox walls of Freiburg, and Otter defying the might of Austria from a small country town in the name of the "Word of God."

Kenzingen and the Peasants' War: 1524-1525

As had been the case before in Freiburg, so now again in Kenzingen: the futile attempts by the bishop of Constance to establish control were soon followed by direct and effective political action. The Landtag held in Breisach went badly for Kenzingen. Ulrich Wirtner there stated outright that "Luther's opinion leads to uproar, to heresy and to Bundschuh,"95 following which the towns of Endingen, Waldkirch, Breisach and Ensisheim volunteered to help stamp out the rebellion of heresy in Kenzingen. Kenzingen responded with a written disavowal of heretical beliefs.

We do not know Luther and his teachings; but if he speaks the truth, then he is doing so through Christ. Rather, we know Christ. We were baptized in the name of Christ and we wish to be saved in his name.96
This defense failed to impress the Austrians, for the Hither-Austrian government wrote in reply that "in spite of all orders and mandates from the emperor and the archduke, the Lutheran opinion and sect has established itself in Kenzingen." Political reprisal was promised if Jakob Otter did not leave Kenzingen immediately.

The threat of Austrian action got results, if only temporarily. Otter did in fact leave Kenzingen, but he returned a few days later and preached a sermon on steadfastness. The city council met and drafted yet another letter in which they appealed for the right to choose a minister of their own -- an issue which was to appear later among the peasants. Austria wrote a predictable reply, after which both the city of Freiburg and the knight from Hürnheim urged the removal of Otter in no uncertain terms. The council at last decided to bow to the demands, and it recommended that Otter leave. On June 20, 1524 Otter did in fact begin to leave Kenzingen, but he was surrounded by a large group of partisan burghers, who brought him back into the city by force. The people of Kenzingen were apparently determined to resist the bishop and the Austrians.

From this point on the city of Freiburg began to play a decisive role. Following Otter's forced re-entry into Kenzingen, Freiburg wrote an angry letter in which it argued, among other things, that

if your preacher had as great a love for you as he maintains, why has he not gone into exile of his own free will in order to protect you and your children from such misery (as will come)? You would surely be able to be pious Christians without him, as also doubtless your ancestors were. 98

The prolonged pressure finally took effect, for on June 24, Jakob Otter preached his last sermon in Kenzingen and departed. He was accom-
panied, however, by an escort of about 200 armed burghers, who saw him safely into the territory of Margrave Ernst. The armed troop halted in Malterdingen, in Ernst's territory, and sent a delegation of twelve men to the castle at Hochberg to seek asylum and protection for their preacher.

The surprised prince advised them to leave their preacher in safe keeping at his castle, but he reprimanded the burghers for having come into his territory armed and in such numbers. This could easily have appeared as disobedience against the Archduke, whom the Margrave had visited just a few weeks before . . .

The Margrave advised the burghers to return home immediately.

Since it was already late in the day, the armed band was not able to return to Kenzingen until the following morning, but on arriving at Kenzingen, they found the town gates shut and they were refused entry. News of the armed troop had reached Ensisheim, and Kenzingen, acting on orders, would not allow the rebels to enter. On June 29 the Landtag assembled again, and this time Freiburg offered to provide troops for the settling of the matter. With this the armed citizens from Kenzingen, now numbering about 150, set sail down the Rhine with their preacher.

The Kenzingen refugees were welcomed by the city of Strasbourg. It is reported that on the first night of their exile in Strasbourg, the preacher Matthias Zell sheltered some 80 Kenzingen citizens in his home, and "for four weeks he fed never less than fifty or sixty of them." Back in the Breisgau, however, the matter was not yet considered over and done. On July 4, troops from the city of Freiburg invaded Kenzingen in what appears to have been a rather barbaric manner. The Kenzingen citizens complained that they were "treated
like bandits and dishonest people. In any case, the Reformation in Kenzingen was most definitely over.

The role of Freiburg in the Kenzingen affair won the city little esteem in the country-side, for in spite of the loud threats coming from Ensisheim, actual Austrian military might was not a present threat in the Breisgau, and without Freiburg's help, the overthrow of Kenzingen would have been a risky matter. Immediately following the invasion of Kenzingen, while Margrave Ernst and the city of Strasbourg were un成功ally appealing to the Archduke that he allow the exiled Kenzingen citizens to return home, Freiburg was further involved in punishing the guilty. On the July 7, the "chief heretic" from Kenzingen, the town's clerk was beheaded in the presence of his wife and children while kneeling in the ashes of confiscated Bibles and Lutheran books. Several of the judges responsible for the execution had been sent from Freiburg, "which further increased the resentment already present in the Breisgau against the city."

Bad feeling against Freiburg was particularly intense in Margrave Ernst's territory, where the Freiburgers were called "rogues" publicly and where it was said that "Freiburg has disgracefully dealt Kenzingen a blow, and plunged it into ruin. But in a short time Freiburg, who wishes to 'miss-print' the Word of God, will also be dealt a blow and plunged into ruin. When news of this sentiment became known to the council in Freiburg a letter was immediately sent to Margrave Ernst (July 29, 1524) asking him to punish the subjects who spoke this way, particularly those of the Margrave's subjects who had been identified by name in the letter. The Margrave, for his part, made some investiga-
tions, but did not actively pursue the accused, whereupon the Freiburg council wrote another letter (August 22, 1524) in which many more such incidents were reported. The council concluded reproachfully that "It must be gathered from all these things that your princely grace's subjects are completely embittered against us and ours." 110 The Margrave's reply was completely conciliatory, for he stated that "we also are truly disposed to showing you friendly and gracious neighborliness," 111 and he promised further to send a personal emissary to help settle the matter. The Margrave's diplomatic efforts were undoubtedly occasioned by the growing unrest among the peasantry; the threat of peasant rebellion made allies essential. 112

In June 1524, while the Kenzingen affair was at its height, the peasants in the Stühlingen area near Schaffhausen rose in revolt, signalling a beginning to the widespread peasant rebellions collectively called the Peasants' War. 113 The Stühlingen revolt soon extended into the Black Forest and came to involve also the town of Waldshut. 114 In the Breisgau, however, peace reigned following the suppression of Kenzingen in early July; although there were rumblings of discontent, it appeared that Freiburg had pacified the country-side. Freiburg's religious sentiments and political leanings were so well-known that the Stühlingen peasants did not bother sending the city its letter of grievances, even though the letter was sent to all other cities and territories capable of helping. 115

For its part, Freiburg maintained close contact with Ensisheim and neighboring cities, and was usually ready to provide armed assistance. 116 On September 12, 1524, Ensisheim asked Freiburg to send 175
armed men to help subdue the rebellious Waldshut. Waldshut, in turn, asked Freiburg to negotiate with Ensisheim on its behalf; in this case Freiburg followed the latter course, much to Ensisheim's distress, for the Austrian government wished to make an "example" of Waldshut. In the meantime, however, unrest was increasing, with Duke Ulrich of Württemberg capitalizing on peasant grievances in the Hegau. On October 3, a group of volunteer soldiers from Zürich took up residence in Waldshut, further complicating the situation for the Austrians, who could ill-afford a war with a member of the Swiss Confederacy. The military weakness of the Austrians at this time was painfully evident. Waldshut was left "unpunished," even though the campaign was to have begun on October 19, 1524; as peasant unrest increased, the city of Freiburg was called on more and more to provide military aid.

In early December, the town of Villingen was threatened by peasant troops. Freiburg responded immediately by sending a troop of 100 soldiers to the city. This action was a little hasty, for on December 12, 1524 the peasant revolt came to within a few miles of Freiburg. On this day, peasants from the Black Forest (subjects of the Benedictine monastery, St. Blasien) joined with the peasants of the Münstertal (subjects of the Benedictine monastery St. Trudpert) in plundering the monastery of St. Trudpert. As a result, Freiburg recalled its troops on December 16, and the city began to prepare for the possibility of attack. Even so Freiburg maintained, at its own expense, a garrison of some 50 soldiers in Laufenburg and a troop of 20 more in Stückingen.
The December uproar in the Münstertal turned out to be only a preliminary skirmish, for the real revolt in the Breisgau did not begin until early spring of 1525. In March of that year, the peasants on the Kaiserstuhl, northwest of Freiburg, began by plundering a farm belonging to the cloister Tennenbach. The movement grew until "nearly the entire population of the northern Kaiserstuhl had risen up." The Kaiserstuhl troop, now of considerable size, next turned towards Kenzingen and Margrave Ernst's territory. The Margrave began preparing his personal fortress, the Hochberg, for defense in April, as the peasant bands grew larger and continued their destruction. Around May 3 the monastery of Tennenbach was plundered and burned completely to the ground. The Abbot and the monks had taken refuge in Freiburg. The neighboring cloisters Wonnental and Kirnhalde met the same fate, and still the numbers of peasant troops increased. Soon the peasant troops from the Kaiserstuhl and from Kenzingen had joined with the peasants from the Hochberg to make the area north and west of Freiburg virtually peasant territory. The Margrave was in a tenuous position. By May 5 Margrave Ernst had abandoned his defensive plans; he left the Hochberg and took refuge with his family behind Freiburg's city walls.

In Margrave Ernst's southern lands of Badenweiler, Sausenberg and Rötteln the peasants had been unruly already in March. Now, they informed the Margrave that they had accepted the Twelve Articles of the peasants and that they wished to set up a peasant government. "If the Margrave was ready to be their lord as a proxy of the Kaiser, who was the only lord they would tolerate, and if the Margrave was ready
to accept the Peasant Articles, then they would consider him their lord and would leave him his castles." The Margrave found all this "detestable to hear" and remained in Freiburg's protection. The Margrave's southern subjects then moved against the town of Heitersheim, where they plundered a cloister. The Margrave's castles at Badenweiler, Sausenberg and Rötteln also fell to the peasants, but these were not plundered or burned. The peasant band then turned northward, towards Freiburg, where they took up positions south and west of the city.

In late April and early May the peasants in the Austrian territories south of Freiburg also rose in revolt. Discontent had been simmering since the initial outbreak of the peasants in the Münstertal against the monastery of St. Trudpert, in December of 1524. Now the revolt erupted fully, with the peasants from Staufen assuming a leading role. The Staufen and Münstertal peasants joined the Margrave's subjects in attacking Heitersheim, and from there they turned towards the Schönbach, where they plundered the castle in Bollschweil and the priories of St. Ulrich and Sölden. "The entire population, with few exceptions, was involved in the larger movement. It all served to prepare the excited masses for uniting in a greater undertaking, the siege of Freiburg." In Freiburg itself preparations were being made for the defense of the city: horse-powered mills were set up, walls and gates were fortified, guards were posted and the citizens urged to wear arms. On May 12, 1525 the encircling of Freiburg was completed when the victorious Black Forest peasant troops moved down from the monastery of St.
Georgen to St. Peters and Kirchzarten to take up positions to the east of the city. Abbot Jodocus had already found refuge in the city of Freiburg, but it appears that the monks remained in the monastery; St. Peters was not plundered or destroyed.

On May 14 the peasants made their grievances known in a letter to the city of Freiburg. The points were primarily two: "They were burdened with taxes to such an extent that they could no longer bear it. They demanded further that the Word of God be purely proclaimed to the common man. What the Holy Gospel allows, that they wished to leave to the spiritual and worldly authorities." The letter concluded with the admonition that the city unite with the peasants and "protect the godly law." A prompt answer was not forthcoming, so the peasants wrote again, this time emphasizing their religious demands even more. They were in Kirchzarten, they maintained, "only out of brotherly love, to preach the Word of God and the Holy Gospel to the common man, also (so that) all spiritual and worldly authorities be clearly obedient to the Holy Gospel." Freiburg could no longer postpone a decision, and on the following day the city reported back to the peasants that it could take no such steps "without the knowledge and consent of . . . Austria." Freiburg's courage was perhaps bolstered by the news of the defeat of the peasants at Böblingen, for following several more fruitless exchanges in which the city refused to capitulate, the peasants moved into position.

From the outset the matter went badly for Freiburg, for the strategic blockhouses overlooking the city on the Schlossberg were very poorly guarded and fell immediately into the hands of the peasants. The
loss was not even noted at the time, and, as the historian Heinrich Schreiber has described, "it was a beautiful May evening (and) the lords sat as usual before their club houses in the cathedral square... when suddenly several hundred musket shots announced the loss of the fortifications." Possession of the Schlossberg gave the peasants a tremendous tactical advantage.

Attempts by the Freiburgers the following day to weaken the peasants' hold on the blockhouses through artillery fire met with no success, for during the night the peasants had reinforced their positions. A foray out of the city was attempted by a troop of knights and nobles, but this was convincingly beaten back at the city gates: Freiburg found itself out-manned, at a tactical disadvantage and, more importantly, without a source of water. Even so the city hung on until May 23, at which time it capitulated without a struggle. On May 24 the city of Freiburg entered into an agreement with the peasants in which the city promised to support peace, to look after the peasants' grievances and to "support the teaching and the word of Christ." The agreement, however, was not to hinder Freiburg's oath to the Austrian house, and all of the city's former privileges were affirmed. Although there were some isolated instances of robbery by peasants and the castle at Wisneck and the cloister in Ebnet had been plundered, Freiburg itself escaped with very little damage.

The actual agreement changed the situation little. Freiburg's basic attitude remained as it had before, and help was given to the peasants only grudgingly. Ulrich Zasius' comment regarding the peasant demand that the Gospel be taught was the wry observation: "as if
Christian people had not done this previously.\textsuperscript{141} Very soon the city became noticeably more aloof, and the peasants less belligerent as the Swabian League began to accumulate victories in other territories. Already by June 3 peasant leaders were urging (in contrast to their earlier bellicosity) that Freiburg do its best to re-establish peace by means other than the sword. The balance of power was shifting rather abruptly back to the side of the lords. By June 9, Freiburg felt secure enough to arrest and execute a peasant who had been instrumental in the destruction of the cloister Tennenbach, and the request by the peasants on June 10 for 200 armed men, two cannon and gun powder was evaded and eventually declined by the city.\textsuperscript{142}

By early June the peasants were primarily interested in negotiating a peace; Freiburg, on the other hand, was primarily interested in getting back into Ferdinand's good graces. Freiburg's craning efforts, which began already on June 20, were capped by a Verteidigungsschrift, sent to Ferdinand in October 1525, "in order to justify (Freiburg's) position during the War."\textsuperscript{143} Ferdinand finally gave his blessing, saying that "he had examined their apology and he was satisfied with it for now."\textsuperscript{144} In the meantime the subjects of Margrave Ernst had come to an agreement with the Margrave, and on June 13 Ernst received his castles back. The peasants for their part had to pay a fine of six Gulden per household\textsuperscript{145} -- a settlement which did not begin to pay back the Margrave's total losses. Ferdinand, however, was biding his time. June, July, August and part of September had passed before he was willing to negotiate, but finally on September 18, 1525 he made peace with his Breisgau subjects and the Breisgau chapter of the Peasants' War was officially over.\textsuperscript{146}
 Günther Franz, the foremost historian of the Peasants' Revolt, has identified two types of peasant movements which were antecedents to the Peasants' War: the struggle for "ancient rights" which was generally local in character, and the struggle for "divine law," which in the form of the Bundschuh movements had a more universal appeal and which made broader demands.\textsuperscript{147} Even in this more universal form, however, the peasants' movement remained fundamentally composed of local rebellions involving a minority of the peasantry. It was only with the emergence of the Reformation that the necessary unifying principle became available, and this principle was "the Bible alone."

It is clear in the \textbf{Twelve Articles} of the peasants that they justified their demand for social revolution by the application of the principle of \textit{sola scriptura}. The twelfth and concluding resolution of the \textbf{Articles} states that

\begin{quote}
if any one or more of the articles here set forth should not be in agreement with the Word of God . . . such article we will willingly recede from when it is proved really to be against the Word of God by a clear explanation of the Scripture.\textsuperscript{148}
\end{quote}

The peasants besieging Freiburg likewise claimed to be demanding no more than obedience by all in authority to the just claims of the Holy Gospel. In light of the actual demands of the peasants, i.e. the right to choose pastors, restrictions on the payment of tithes, release from serfdom, expanded hunting rights and wood-cutting rights, and a decrease in services demanded, the peasant claim to be wholly based on scripture may seem extravagant. The fact remains, however, that "the desire of the peasants for social renewal became united in (the principle of divine justice) with the manner of thinking of the Reformation and
the striving for a new order. Divine justice, in its Protestant interpretation, became the bridge over which the peasants who had professed only ancient law up to now found their way to revolution. 149

The identification of Luther's message with Aufruhr, which had been the Catholic claim early on, now became decisive in areas under the control of Catholic rulers. The Peasants' War brought the Reformation to a conclusive halt in Freiburg and the Breisgau. 150

Conclusion

We turn in conclusion to the question of the place of the monastery St. Peters of the Black Forest within the course of Breisgau Reformation events and to the question of Michael Sattler's place within the monastery. It is clear from the evidence that the Reformation attempt in Freiburg did not manage to establish support in the ruling class and was subsequently suppressed very quickly, while in the country-side the "new teaching" (as understood by the popular mind) took hold in combination with traditional peasant grievances. The monastery of St. Peters occupies a unique position within this tableau for its ties with Freiburg were strong, but geographically, it was located in the country, some 15 kilometers outside the city.

There is considerable evidence to suggest that there was a strong compulsion to maintain the conservative Freiburg position within the monastery. The attempted reform by Abbot Jodocus, the holding of burgher rights by the Abbot and his exercise of those rights, as well as Abbot Jodocus' obvious favouring of Austria over Margrave Ernst all point to a conservative atmosphere within the monastery. On the other hand, the grievances of the common man and the appeal to the Word of
God were burning issues which surrounded the monastery on every side. The most obvious intrusions of this reality occurred in 1522 and in 1525, on the two occasions when Abbot Jodocus felt constrained to flee the cloister and to take refuge in the city of Freiburg. In sum, it is extremely doubtful that a monk at St. Peters would have had free access to evangelical literature within the monastery, particularly after the public book-burning held in Freiburg in late 1522. The Freiburg monasteries -- and St. Peters can be considered a "Freiburg" monastery -- kept firm control over their religious. But on the other hand, the appeal to the Word of God which took hold among the common people was an appeal which could not be denied a hearing, particularly when that appeal was translated into force of arms.

Turning to Michael Sattler, as Prior he would have negotiated with Margrave Ernst's soldiers in the absence of his Abbot and again, in the absence of Jodocus, Sattler would have negotiated with the peasant forces who came to hold the monastery in 1525, assuming, of course, that Sattler was still in the cloister as of May 1525. There is no hard evidence telling us when Michael Sattler left St. Peters, but on the basis of the course of events in Freiburg and the Breisgau we can venture to make some general observations. One primary fact surrounding Sattler's departure is the complete absence of notices in the extant record. Michael Sattler apparently left St. Peters without fanfare, unlike pater Christoph the Carmelite in Freiburg or Ambrosius Blarer, the Benedictine Prior of Alpirsbach. This suggests that Sattler did not leave the monastery during the heady days immediately following the first Zürich disputation, when the evangelical party in Freiburg was
at its most vocal. Rather it appears that he left at a time when the open espousal of the evangelical cause was no longer an option, and further at such a time when the departure of a monk from his monastery was not "news" as such. This points to a time following May 1524; that is, we are directed to the time of growing peasant unrest in the Breisgau.

Given the local political and religious realities, Michael Sattler's departure from St. Peters is significant in a more general way. As a monk at St. Peters Sattler found himself not only among the Catholic majority, but also among the socially privileged: he was a "cloister lord" in a region where the Catholic traditions were being hotly defended by those in power. It is important to remember that Sattler was not faced with a situation such as was found in Zurich, Strasbourg, or in many of the Imperial cities, where the evangelical party was represented by a vocal minority among the privileged who in turn were supported by one or two influential preachers. The situation in Freiburg, rather, was dominated by the Catholic majority who did not allow an evangelical preacher to establish himself; the evangelical message came quickly to be limited to clandestine activity among the "common folk." Given this extremely polarized situation in the Breisgau, the bald fact that Michael Sattler decided to leave the monastery tells us that not only a religious decision, but also a social decision had been made.

The religious shift undergone by Sattler is clear in its outlines. As a monk in a cloister undergoing reform, the burning question would have been the return to the strict monastic observance; with his departure from the monastery, it appears that Sattler is not only rejecting
the form of monastic renewal, but also the institution of monasticism itself. Sattler's departure can lead to the hasty conclusion that he left the monastery due to a conversion experience paralleling Luther's. The polarized situation surrounding St. Peters, however, suggests that the mediation of the "common folk" may have been instrumental in Sattler's decision.

From the perspective of the "common folk" the lives of the monks were built on a social system which allowed the indolent to live lives of ease (and all too often, lives of debauchery) at the expense of the "honest labour" of the common man. The theological refrain concerning "works righteousness" so central to Luther's criticism of monasticism found no echo or response among the common people: as far as they were concerned, the monks did not do enough work, either with their hands or to ensure their righteousness. The peasant criticism of monasticism clearly owes little to Luther's theological critique. Its roots lie rather in the tradition of peasant grievances and medieval reform movements. Sattler's leaving St. Peters of the Black Forest obviously has its roots in the Reformation. The question that remains, however, is whether those roots extend farther -- or in a different direction -- than the actual movement among the "common folk." This question can be answered only after we have analysed the relevant literature.

It is, of course, impossible to determine accurately which Reformation writings Michael Sattler was familiar with or which he may have found decisive. Sattler's introduction to the Reformation could have come in a variety of ways, not necessarily literary. For this reason, although Luther's great Reformation writings form an essential background
to the Breisgau events, we will pay special attention to those writings which express the spirit of the local Reformation attempt. The texts which emerge from the specific Freiburg situation are as follows. 1. Jakob Otter's *Die Epistle Sti. Pauli an Titum*, composed at the height of the Kenzingen affair in 1524. 2. The writings of Karsthas (Hans Murer) and reports concerning his teaching. 3. Literature which emerged from the peasant uprisings, most specifically the writings of Sebastian Lotzer, presumed author of the Twelve Articles of the Peasants. The comparison and contrast between Sattler's writings and the local Reformation literature should prove instructive.
CHAPTER IV

MICHAEL SATTLER'S RELATION
TO THE SWISS ANABAPTIST MOVEMENT: ZÜRICH

We now put behind us Sattler's life as a monk and look rather to the beginning of his association with the Anabaptists. In doing so we turn away from the Freiburg area and look to Zürich. The reformation in Zürich, led by Huldrich Zwingli, has been well documented by numerous scholars. Our interest lies primarily in the Anabaptist movement which emerged from the Zwinglian milieu, for Michael Sattler does not appear in Zürich as a Zwinglian but rather as a person in company of Anabaptists. Accordingly our chapter is divided into two main sections. In the first section of the chapter we will review the historical discussion concerning the origin and character of Swiss Anabaptism. The second section of the chapter will be concerned with a detailed examination of the source evidence relating Sattler to the Zürich movement. We will then be in a position to draw conclusions regarding Sattler's place in the emerging movement and to identify areas of textual concentration for further analysis.

The Emergence and Spread of Anabaptism in Zürich

Perhaps no topic in Radical Reformation studies has received more detailed treatment in the past fifty-odd years than has the question concerning the origin, identity and characteristics of the Anabaptist movement. Virtually every major treatment of an Anabaptist theme or
subject has required a lengthy historiographical section wherein the author identifies the various positions assumed by different scholars. Rather than paralleling these efforts here we shall remain content to point to the most recent literature on the subject. The question of how one may characterize "Anabaptism" is not one that directly affects our subject, for Michael Sattler was, beyond question, a member of the Swiss branch of the Anabaptist movement. Thus for us the central question concerns the debate over the origin, character and development of Swiss Anabaptism, a question that has also generated considerable scholarly controversy in recent years.

The essential facts concerning the Zwinglian origins of the Swiss Anabaptist movement, facts which Heinrich Bullinger had done his best to conceal, began to come to light in the modern period. The picture that emerged simply did not support Bullinger's contention that Swiss Anabaptism traced its origin to Thomas Müntzer and the Zwickau Prophets; rather, it became apparent that the core of early Anabaptist leaders in Zürich had been zealous followers of Zwingli and co-workers with him. Furthermore, except for questions of church practice, the Swiss Anabaptists remained essentially Zwinglian in their central theological principles, e.g. in the question of the Lord's Supper they followed Zwingli directly in rejecting any suggestion of sacramental efficacy. In spite of this general recognition of Swiss Anabaptist dependence on Zwingli, disagreements concerning the interpretation of the Zürich data have arisen.

The central questions of disagreement can be simply put. First of all, were the Anabaptists those non-revolutionary followers of Zwingli
who followed his religious principles to their logical conclusions, or were the Anabaptists those radical (i.e. hot-headed, revolutionary) followers of Zwingli who eventually broke away from him because he was not radical (i.e. revolutionary) enough? The first view is put forward by the Mennonite historian Harold S. Bender and is substantially supported (though not in all its details) by John H. Yoder. The opposing view has been most forcibly expressed by Robert Walton, who wrote in direct opposition to the Bender/Yoder hypothesis.

The Bender/Yoder hypothesis was at once a theory concerning the nature of Zwingli's development as a reformer and a theory concerning the nature of the "radicals" who came to form the core of the Zürich Anabaptist movement. With regard to Zwingli, the Bender/Yoder hypothesis called for a "turn" or an abandoning of earlier principles by Zwingli; with reference to the core Anabaptist group, the Bender/Yoder hypothesis called for a group motivated by purely religious principles, with only incidental connections with radical social and economic activity. Walton attacked both of these positions. Regarding Zwingli's "turn," Walton marshalls evidence that a) the Zürich council was disposed to intervene in religious matter already in the fourteenth century, that b) Zwingli had already decided in favour of a "theocratic" solution prior to his coming to Zürich, and that c) from the beginning of his reforming work in Zürich, Zwingli worked along with the council for the reform of the entire commonwealth. Thus Walton concludes that there was no "turning" in Zwingli's position but rather "as Zwingli understood the problem, church and society were one: to maintain the unity of the commonwealth was to defend the church."
With regard to the core group of Zürich Anabaptists, Bender argued that there simply was no "radical party" in Zürich in 1522-1523 and that Grebel was "not the leader of any such party."\(^{12}\) John Yoder, on the other hand, did not deny outright the possibility of the existence of such a party, but denied that Grebel played any leadership role.\(^{13}\) As against this position Walton tries to show that men who later were followers of Grebel were the instigators of the meat-eating during lent of 1522,\(^{14}\) and in support of this interpretation, he quotes the work of Goeters on Ludwig Haetzer.\(^{15}\) Walton concludes that "from 1522 on, the activities of an organized radical party, which was the forerunner of the Baptist movement, were one of Zwingli's central problems."\(^{16}\)

The two foci of the Bender-Yoder/Walton disagreement, namely the interpretation of Zwingli and the question of the existence of a "radical party" in Zürich, have evoked two scholarly reactions. Regarding Yoder's interpretation of Zwingli, Stayer reports that "outside Mennonite circles and to some extent even in them . . . Walton is thought to have had the better of the argument and to have convicted Yoder of anachronism in his interpretation of Zwingli . . . ."\(^{17}\) Concerning the existence of a "radical party" in Zürich, Stayer notes on the one hand that Walton's insistence that a radical party was in operation from the time of the breaking of the lenten fast in 1522 onward is an "exaggeration."\(^{18}\) On the other hand, the corresponding insistence by Bender and Yoder that the break between Zwingli and the radicals came on or after October, 1523 has been also challenged by recent scholarship. In connection with the rise of the "radical party" in Zürich, the work of J.F.G. Goeters \(^{19}\) and, following Goeters, of Stayer and Haas, \(^{20}\) is central.
The consensus among these scholars is that the radical party in Zürich began to emerge as a distinct group in the summer of 1523, in connection with the issue of the payment of tithes.\(^2^1\)

The ramifications of the work by Goeters, Stayer and Haas extend much further than simply a fussy revision of an earlier historical chronology. What emerges, in fact, is a convincing new delineation of the nature of the early radical protest and the subsequent Anabaptist movement. The agitation of the radicals concerning the tithe is central here, for the tithe highlights the connection between early Reformation anticlericalism, Swiss radicalism, peasant unrest and Anabaptism.

In his work on the Zürich Anabaptist movement, Martin Haas begins at the point of popular anticlericalism -- the focal point of the earliest Reformation ferment, used by Luther as well as by Zwingli. The abuses in the church and the privileges of often unworthy clergy were points of criticism easily grasped by everyone.\(^2^2\) The theological points at issue, however, clearly passed by many people. Thus the "freedom of a Christian" for some came to mean "freedom from tithes," and the "priesthood of all believers" came to mean "social equality among Christians."

Translated into practical terms, the apparent Reformation negation of the old church hierarchy meant that the local community became the focal point for religious decision-making: the community was supporting the pastor with tithes, thus it had a right to appoint its own pastor and to examine him.\(^2^3\) This reaction was wide-spread in the early years of the Reformation, usually in opposition to a Catholic hierarchy. We see, for instance, the town of Kenzingen arguing with the bishop of
Constance for the right to appoint its own (evangelical) pastor. The issue concerning the payment of tithes, or the providing of financial support for the local pastor, posed the question of who was to control the religious situation of individual towns and parishes. The situation in Kenzingen was that of a small town attempting to keep its evangelical pastor against the will of a powerful Catholic lord; the outcome of this situation was more or less predictable. The situation around Zürich, however, placed reform-minded rural parishes in opposition to a reformed city government. There were no particular guidelines in place for this latter situation. Was the Zürich reformation going to follow the early, popular principle of self-determination or would local communities be subjected to centralized control?

The opposition between some rural parishes and the city of Zürich began to develop early in 1523, although that opposition was not recognized at first. The town of Witikon elected Wilhelm Reublin as its pastor and called him on Christmas day 1522, in opposition to the wishes of the Grossmunster chapter lords; Simon Stumpf was the elected preacher in the town of Höngg. In both of these cases the city of Zürich saw no initial problem. Problems began when Simon Stumpf began preaching in Höngg that the monks from Wettingen (whose Abbot held the benefice from Höngg) were "good-for-nothings, who had stolen their livings from the people long enough." Needless to say, the tithe began to be withheld in Höngg. The Zürich Council forced the people from Höngg to pay the customary tithe to the Abbot in this case, but the movement had begun.
By March of 1523, the Zürich Council had had to pass decisions concerning the tithes paid to the benefice-holders for Höngg and Witikon, and in both cases the Council allowed for the local election of the pastors, but emphasized that the customary tithe must also be paid. Reublin and Stumpf continued to preach actively, and in June of 1523, some six communities where Reublin had preached (including Witikon and Zollikon) complained to the Zürich Council that they were "now informed and instructed by the holy Gospel that the tithe was nothing else but an alms, yet it is common knowledge that some of the canons misuse it for useless and frivolous purposes." The Zürich Council ruled that the earlier church structure was to remain in force, and that it would undertake the responsibility for the necessary reforms. At this point Zwingli preached his famous sermon, "On Divine and Human Righteousness," in which the practical priority of human laws was stated unequivocably: "so long as the Council demands payment of the tithe, it is the civil duty of the Christian to pay it. Zwingli received full support from the Zürich clergy in this, while on the opposing side stood the country preachers Reublin, Stumpf and (before long) Brötli as well as the young Zürich radicals Conrad Grebel and Felix Mantz. What must be noted here is, first, that the Council's decision to maintain firm control of church income and its administration meant, in essence, that most of the local parishes remained with their former priests, since most of the incumbent priests followed the Zürich reform. The question of the local election of pastors was settled, in effect, by the establishment of Zürich's administrative authority. Secondly, in so far as the early "radical" movement in the Zürich area is concerned, it
is evident that the central early leaders were the rural pastors Reublin and Stumpf. Grebel and Mantz, in supporting the rural movement, were turning away from Zwingli's "erastian" position and identifying with this (more anarchic) rural movement.

It appears, then, that the break between Grebel and Zwingli began in earnest in the summer of 1523, and that "by the Second Disputation the division of the Zwinglian Reformation was a public matter." It appears further that Simon Stumpf was instrumental in bringing about that disputation. Stumpf preached openly in Höngg, at the end of September, against images in the church and his parishioners immediately proceeded to "purify" their sanctuary. The church in Höngg was, in fact, the first evangelical church in the region to remove its images. But the removal had been unruly, and when similar incidents began to occur in Zürich as well, the Council declared a disputation for October on the subject of images and the Mass. The upshot of the disputation was a widening of the split between Grebel and Zwingli and an "alliance between the radicals in Zürich and the reformed radicals outside Zürich." Zwingli, against the wishes of Stumpf and Grebel, decisively turned over the timing and the administration of the Reformation to the Zürich Council.

The Zürich Council soon asserted its authority in relation to the instigator of the Aufruhr in Höngg. After some investigations into the disorders there, Simon Stumpf was relieved of his office — in spite of appeals in his favour by the townsfolk. Although Stumpf did not subsequently become an Anabaptist, the fact remains that "he was the first important leader of radical reformed congregationalism ..."
movement which stood opposed to the tithe system, which tried to remove all images from its churches, and which attempted to maintain independence in religious matters. It was this movement of radical congregationalism that formed a base for the early Anabaptist movement. It was also this movement of radical congregationalism that shared several important "planks" with the peasant platform in the later upheaval.44

It is important to note that the radical evangelical movement in and around Zürich was not so much concerned with theological issues -- although it grew directly out of the Reformation principle of sola scriptura -- but rather the radicals, true to their anti-Roman, anticlerical beginnings, directed their efforts against existing church practices and structures, opposing the same with "the word of scripture." Thus the issues became unworthy local pastors, tithes, images in the churches and continued celebration of the Mass in the absence of (or in opposition to) Scriptural proof.45 The question of infant baptism, which became the next point of radical attack, represents a continuation of the radical attempt to purify the church from corrupt "human" (i.e. Roman) accretions.

The question of baptism generally was a cloudy one in the early years of the Reformation, and especially so for Zwingli, for whom the outward sacraments could have only secondary significance, given his spiritualistic sacramental theology. Baptism for Zwingli was essentially only an "outward sign" of an inward purification by faith.46 There is evidence, furthermore, that Zwingli had early held infant baptism to be unscriptural. Balthasar Hubmaier claimed that in May 1523, Zwingli had declared against infant baptism during a discussion with Hubmaier in
Zürich. The testimony of other Zürich Anabaptists lends support to Hubmaier's contention, and Zwingli himself stated that he had earlier been misled concerning baptism. Hubmaier, in retrospect, claimed that Oekolampadius, Jud, Hofmeister and Haetzer, among others, had also agreed that infant baptism was not scriptural. Even allowing for some possible exaggeration on Hubmaier's part, it is clear that there was no early consensus on this question among early evangelical reformers.

As in the cases of the tithes and church ornaments, the question of infant baptism became a burning issue following radical, unilateral action outside the city. Early in 1524 some inhabitants of the towns of Witikon and Zollikon refused to allow their infants to be baptized. This action was clearly precipitated by the preaching of Wilhelm Reublin of Witikon, for he was imprisoned briefly in August of 1524 and called upon to justify his actions. Reublin was soon joined in Zollikon by a fellow radical evangelical, Johannes Brüti, who arrived in the area probably in the summer of 1524. At the same time, that is during the first six months of 1524, the baptism issue gained ground among the Zürich radicals centred around Grebel and Mantz. According to Ludwig Haetzer, the Zürich radicals found infant baptism to have been grounded in Canon Law, rather than having any basis in Scripture. The conclusion drawn by the radicals was that infant baptism was a papal invention and an "abomination of the Devil." The issue began to generate some friction; the Zürich Council naturally saw a challenge to its authority in the continuing opposition from outlying towns and vocal Zürich citizens.
The impulse to action may have originated with Reublin in Witikon, but the Zürich radicals soon began to take some action themselves. Conrad Grebel and others attempted to establish contact with Karlstadt, Müntzer and Luther in the Fall of 1524. These efforts, as the contents of the extant letter to Müntzer demonstrate, were attempts to gain support for an already-established position. The opponents of infant baptism arranged for a private disputation with Zwingli in late Fall and early winter of 1524; two of these discussions were actually held.  

The position of the radicals in these discussions was essentially the following: infant baptism is an abomination stemming from Rome. Christ did not enjoin the practice, the apostles did not perform it, and even John the Baptist baptized only adults. Therefore infant baptism is not to be allowed. Zwingli's task was rather more difficult. His argument in favour of infant baptism rested on the two theses that Christ's own baptism had been given before 'knowledge' and that baptism takes the place of Old Testament circumcision. Thus Zwingli could conclude that "it is permitted to baptize, with water, those infants who are to be educated into the faith." No agreement was reached between Zwingli and the radicals, but Zwingli published a work which he hoped would settle the question. There he stated that the New Testament neither commanded nor forbade infant baptism. This being the case, evidence from the Old Testament had to be considered decisive -- by which, of course, Zwingli pointed to his solution of equating baptism with circumcision.
Zwingli's hopes for an end to the trouble were in vain. Felix Mantz wrote a strong letter of protest to the Zürich Council, Brötli got into a quarrel in Zollikon, Jakob Hottinger interrupted a sermon which had been defending infant baptism, and Conrad Grebel refused to bring his infant daughter to be baptized. The Zürich Council responded by calling a disputation on the question of baptism for the 17th of January, 1525. The results of this disputation were predictable: the Council decreed that Grebel and Mantz were to desist from further agitation in the city. Reublin, Brötli, Haetzer and Castelberger, all of whom were not citizens, were expelled from the area. The foreigners were given eight days in which to comply with the Council's decree.  

The exact dating of the events that took place following the Council's second mandate on January 21, 1525 are not absolutely certain, but it appears that on the evening following the second mandate, a group of the Zürich radicals gathered at Felix Mantz' house. Present were Conrad Grebel, Felix Mantz, George Blaurock and others. After discussion and prayer, Blaurock, who had played no significant role up to this point, "entreated Conrad Grebel for God's sake to baptize him with the right Christian baptism upon the confession of his faith. And as he kneeled down with this request and desire, Conrad baptized him ..." Blaurock, in turn, baptized all the other people present, and the "re-baptizing" movement as such had its beginning.

The Hutterite Chronicle, our source for the description of the first Zürich baptisms, concludes its account by saying "therewith was the separation from the world and its evil works begun," thus suggesting that the separatism which was to characterize the Swiss Anabaptists
following the Schleitheim conference was, in fact, a central motivation from the start. While it has been argued that Grebel, Mantz and the Zürich radicals early give evidence of a "sectarian mentality," on the other hand Swiss Anabaptism as a whole progressed only slowly toward a consensus on the question of separation, as Martin Haas has shown. Seen against the background of the discussions with Zwingli and the unsatisfying disputation on baptism, the first baptisms must be seen as underscoring the conviction of the Zürich radicals that the "divine rites" as "found in crystal-clear Scripture" were not being followed. Thus the rejection of infant baptism and the institution of believers' baptism stands directly in the same line of concern as do the earlier objections to images and objections to the Mass: we have here a continuation of earlier radicals concerns.

Judging from the nature of the Anabaptism that spread out from Zürich it is clear that adult baptism as such was not initially conceived as a "sectarian" sign. In fact the first representatives of the movement did their best to establish Anabaptism as a legitimate alternative to Zwinglian reform. The Anabaptist missionaries actually succeeded for a time in Waldshut and Hallau, and they made strong attempts in Zollikon, Schaffhausen and St. Gall.

The first town to be evangelized by the Zürich group was neighboring Zollikon, that stubbornly independent town which had been receptive first to Reublin's teaching on the tithe, then had protested the celebration of the Mass in 1523, had supported the radical pastor Brüti and had then been the scene of the earliest refusals of infant baptism in 1524. Within eight days of the first Zürich baptisms,
Some thirty five inhabitants of Zollikon had also accepted rebaptism. Brötli was the most active baptizer, followed by Mantz and Blaurock. Brötli had been banned, however, and he had to leave the area. On the 29th of January, a Sunday, Blaurock repeatedly interrupted the local pastor in the Zollikon church. Not surprisingly, Monday saw the arrest of Mantz, Blaurock and the Zollikon Anabaptists. The Zürich Council managed to secure disavowals from the Zollikoners, most of whom were poorer peasants, and they were released on the 8th of February. Mantz and Blaurock stood firm and were kept in prison, although Blaurock, a foreigner, was freed on the 18th of February with no recantation. It appeared that the Zürich Council had again successfully established its authority, and had suppressed the local reformation in Zollikon. The Anabaptist movement, however, only went underground. It emerged again in mid-March, this time with public rebaptisms held in the parish church in Zollikon. This led to more arrests and the final suppression of the movement in late March.

There is no record of Conrad Grebel actually baptizing anyone in Zollikon. Rather he appears to have gone directly to Schaffhausen where he remained until the end of March. In Schaffhausen, Grebel tried, apparently with some success, to win over the local pastor, Sebastian Hofmeister. Reublin and Brötli visited with Grebel, Hofmeister, and Sebastian Meyer in Schaffhausen after they had left the Zürich area. Anabaptist effort in Schaffhausen continued, with Felix Mantz also appearing there sometime after the end of March. In short, the presence of these Zürich radicals in Schaffhausen "appears to have been a planned attempt to move that urban Reformation in their direction."
Reublin's move towards Waldshut corresponds with these missionary efforts. Balthasar Hubmaier, the reformer in Waldshut, had early reformed the city along Zwinglian lines, but in the autumn of 1524, differences began to appear between Hubmaier and Zwingli over the question of baptism.\(^\text{75}\) By the beginning of 1525, a few days prior to the January disputation on baptism in Zürich, Grebel could write to Vadian in St. Gall that Hubmaier opposed Zwingli on the baptismal issue and that Hubmaier intended to write against Zwingli on the matter.\(^\text{76}\) It was thus natural that after the institution of believers' baptism, Reublin would move towards Waldshut in an attempt to convince Hubmaier to take the further step of rebaptism. Reublin apparently made several trips to Waldshut during February and March of 1525, and he baptized some Waldshut citizens in a village near there on one of these trips.\(^\text{77}\) It appears that Conrad Grebel also made a trip to Waldshut either in February or March.\(^\text{78}\) These efforts bore fruit on Easter Sunday, April 15, 1525, when Wilhelm Reublin publicly baptized Hubmaier and about sixty other citizens in Waldshut. Hubmaier himself baptized around three-hundred more citizens during the Easter season.\(^\text{79}\) The Anabaptist reform of Waldshut was to survive until December of 1525.

The activities of Reublin and Brötli centred on the town of Hallau, located between Schaffhausen and Waldshut. Reublin used Hallau more as a springboard from which to spread the Anabaptist message while Brötli made Hallau itself his main area of concentration.\(^\text{80}\) While Reublin was travelling to Waldshut and other places, Brötli began preaching in Hallau. Already by April, the local pastor was involved in litigation against Hallau concerning his benefice, and by summer, Brötli
and Reublin had been accepted as the pastors for Hallau. A majority of
the local population accepted rebaptism, and the ceremony was apparently
performed in the local church. At Hallau, as in Waldshut, the Anabap-
tist reform became the established religious form, preached in the local
curch and supported by the populace and the local authorities.

Just as the Anabaptism in Zollikon must be seen against the
background of early Reformation anticlericalism and efforts at local
autonomy, so the Anabaptism north of Zürich, in Waldshut, Hallau and
Schaffhausen must be seen against the background of the peasant
uprisings. The peasants from Stühlingen, near Schaffhausen, had
already revolted in June of 1524, although this particular revolt ended
with a treaty in September of that year. Waldshut's position with
regard to this early uprising is clear, for the city and the peasants
made an agreement "whereby both parties promised to help and protect
each other in case of need." The mutual aid agreement came to an
end with the September treaty, but it is significant that Waldshut, in
its effort to maintain religious independence from Austria, had found a
temporary ally in the Stühlingen peasants.

The question at issue between Waldshut and Austria was the
Reformation which Hubmaier had been introducing, which was essentially
a Zwinglian reformation. It was therefore natural, at the end of September,
when Waldshut was threatened by a siege of Austrian forces, that it
should look to Zürich for military aid. The Austrian authorities had
granted Waldshut a period of grace up to October 2, but on October
3, in response to Waldshut's request, a troop of volunteer soldiers from
Zürich entered Waldshut to help in its defence. The presence of
Zürich citizens in Waldshut and the uncertainty regarding Zürich's intentions complicated the political situation for Austria and preserved Waldshut for a time. The aid from Zürich, however, was not "official" and the majority of the soldiers had to leave by December 1524; Zürich had come under heavy pressure to withdraw support. By the end of January, 1525, Waldshut could no longer rely on aid from Zürich and negotiations with the Austrians had completely broken down. In this situation Waldshut turned again to the peasants. On April 14, 1525 -- or just days before Hubmaier was baptized by Reublin -- troops from Waldshut had joined the peasant army in the Black Forest.

To the east of Waldshut, the entire area surrounding Schaffhausen was in religious and social upheaval. The town of Hallau had recently come under the governance of Schaffhausen, much to the resentment of the Hallauers who had hoped for independence. Hallau, because of a "combination of economic, political, ecclesiastical and religious grievances," came to play a central role in local peasant unrest. Besides Hallau's armed confrontation with Schaffhausen in March 1525, out of which no actual fighting ensued, soldiers from Hallau joined troops from Waldshut in supporting the fighting peasants -- against Schaffhausen's orders. In July the Hallauers moved to defend neighboring Thayngen when that town was threatened by anti-peasant troops. The Hallauers were joined in this defence by armed men from Bülach, a town north of Zürich which had signed a mutual assistance treaty with Waldshut. It was into this volatile setting that Brötli and Reublin came and won the positions of pastors in Hallau. It is clear, moreover, that no neat distinction is possible here between the religious and the social: "The
complex mutual relations of Hallau, Waldshut, Bülach, Thayngen and the various German peasant bands demonstrate the complex mixture of radical Reformed and peasants' movements.

In the midst of the peasant upheaval Schaffhausen remained in the control of its conservative City Council. Although Hofmeister lectured the Council on Zwingli's mistaken defense of infant baptism, and although, under pressure from the local vine-dressers, the Council allowed images to be removed from the churches, the Council was merely waiting for the opportune moment. On August 9, "when it was clear... that the German Peasants' War would end in the failure of the rebels," the Council called out the militia, caught the vine-dressers off-guard and completely suppressed the incipient revolt in the city. The next day saw Hofmeister exiled from Schaffhausen "with mention of his preaching against the mass and infant baptism."

Shortly thereafter Schaffhausen turned towards rebellious Hallau, and sent some troops to capture Reublin and Brötli. The Hallauers, however, would have none of it and protected their pastors with force of arms: "As long as the rebellion of other Klettgau peasants had not subsided, Brötli and Reublin continued to be safe from Schaffhausen, just like Hubmaier from the Austrians." The Klettgau peasants and their allies from Waldshut, however, were decisively defeated on November 4 in a battle at Griessen, not far from Hallau. By early December, 1525, Waldshut and Hallau had fallen; Hubmaier, Reublin and Brötli successfully fled the area.

When we last noted Conrad Grebel's activity he was in Schaffhausen with Hofmeister. At the end of March we find him briefly in
Zürich and then in St. Gall, where his brother-in-law Vadian had considerable influence. The Anabaptist movement had been carried to St. Gall by Lorenz Hochrutiner, Gabriel Giger and Wolfgang Ulmann, the latter of whom Grebel had baptized in February near Schaffhausen. Grebel was in St. Gall for two weeks, into early April, and is reported to have baptized "a great crowd" of people on Palm Sunday, April 9, 1525. The authorities in St. Gall were at first tolerant of the movement, but as the movement gained strength the Council called for a written disputation on the question. On June 5 the Anabaptists read their defense (composed by Grebel), while Vadian read his composition against Anabaptism. The Council's decision against the Anabaptists was aided by Zwingli's first printed attack on the Anabaptists, the Täußbuchlein, which was dedicated to St. Gall. The Anabaptist movement in St. Gall declined following the Council's mandate of June 7, 1525.

From the above outline it should be clear that this first stage of Anabaptist expansion north of Zürich cannot be characterized as "separatist," "non-resistant," "purely religious" or overly concerned with the "purity" of its membership. As against the principles expressed in September 1524 in Grebel's letter to Münzer, the Supper in Zollikon was celebrated with any who desired it, and the mass-celebration of the Supper in St. Gall was likewise no carefully-monitored affair. Furthermore, mass baptisms such as occurred in Waldshut and St. Gall are indications that both Hubmaier and Grebel had in mind a broad Reformation movement which would counter Zwingli's efforts. On the question of non-resistance, again maintained vigourously in the letter to Münzer, we are faced with the strange fact that two co-signers of that letter,
Heini Aberli\textsuperscript{97} and Johannes Brüti, both also displayed forbearance on the question of armed resistance when the occasion demanded it. Hans Krüsi\textsuperscript{98} and Wolfgang Ulmann, both of whom owed their baptisms to Grebel, likewise accepted armed protection from their peasant supporters.\textsuperscript{99} Hubmaier's position on the sword, of course, has never been in doubt. Stayer's conclusion is that "the most appealing short-term recourse for those Anabaptist leaders surrounded by peasant upheavals had been realpolitical, not apolitical, and that was how Hubmaier, Brüti and Krüsi had behaved."\textsuperscript{100}

Swiss Anabaptism, particularly north of Zürich, emerges as a mass movement capitalizing on popular, radical anticlericalism; as such, this Anabaptism did not conform to a pattern hinted at earlier by Conrad Grebel.\textsuperscript{101} Even Grebel appears to have been willing to compromise on certain points in order to institute a mass movement. Early Swiss Anabaptism contained a strong tendency toward a popular alternative to the Zwinglian reform, as well as a more sectarian bent seen first in the Grebel circle in Zürich.\textsuperscript{102} This latter tendency, encountered primarily where Anabaptism was an oppressed minority position,\textsuperscript{103} began to emerge south of Zürich in Zollikon and Grüningen. The most visible leaders of this "conventicle" stream of Swiss Anabaptism were Conrad Grebel, Felix Mantz and George Blaurock.\textsuperscript{104}

Conrad Grebel worked in and around Grüningen from the end of June, 1525 until his arrest in October of the same year. By late summer Grebel had been joined by Blaurock and Mantz.\textsuperscript{105} In addition, Anabaptists from Zollikon, and even pacifistic Waldshuters,\textsuperscript{106} worked in the area.\textsuperscript{107} Grebel's method in Grüningen was apparently much as it
had been in Schaffhausen: he tried to win local pastors over to his point of view, and although he had little success in this, the movement did begin to grow substantially. The strength of the movement was manifested on October 8 in the town of Hinwyl. On that day, a Sunday, Blaurock, Mantz and Grebel conducted a service openly in the Hinwyl parish church. A magistrate from Grüningen came to put a stop to the proceedings, only to find the crowd opposing him; he got reinforcements from a neighboring village and then returned to arrest Grebel and Blaurock. Although Mantz escaped arrest for three weeks, all three Anabaptist leaders ended up jailed together in the castle at Grüningen until they were brought to Zürich for another disputation on baptism, which was held November 6-8, 1525.

Although it has been argued that early Anabaptism combined both "popular" and "sectarian" tendencies, it seems a mistake to consider them equally strong inclinations. Even Grebel seems to have worked for a mass-movement from the start. Further, the primary "sectarian" teaching in evidence in early Anabaptism is the refusal of the sword of war and government, rather than a full-blown doctrine of separation from the world following the example of Christ. In fact, consensus regarding "separation" began to emerge primarily when the political power base of the "popular" stream was eroded away, that is to say, when the peasant revolts were suppressed. With the re-establishing of the traditional lines of authority and political control -- an established fact by the end of the year 1525 -- Anabaptism lost those supporters who had hoped primarily for increased community control. The authorities, in their suppression of mass-Anabaptism, succeeded in
turning aside those "popular" elements and thus furthered the cause of "sectarian" Anabaptism.

The response within the Anabaptist movement to the increased external pressure is seen in the emergence of teachings which underscored the separateness and the uniqueness of the movement. Foremost here was the teaching on the oath. There is no mention of the oath in the letter to Müntzer in September 1524, nor were the Zollikon Anabaptists reticent to swear, although some individuals refused to swear oaths already early in 1525. The general spread of this latter teaching had serious social and political implications: "The more the refusal of the oath gained ground... the more did the entire movement set itself apart politically." To reject the oath -- the "cement" of medieval society -- was to take a giant step towards "separation from the world."

The refusal to bear arms, as Stayer has shown, was also originally a minority position. For the authorities the very idea was suspect, seditious, and raised the question of sinister motives, for the ultimate defense of a territory depended in the last analysis on the sworn allegiance of its citizens. Here again, to refuse to defend one's city or territory was to separate oneself unequivocably from society at large. Closely related here is the question of whether a Christian might hold a position of political authority. The Zürich group eventually decided that a Christian could not hold political office. This teaching gained ground slowly, however, and its acceptance was not uniform. In sum, the emergence of the teachings on the oath, the sword and the magistracy underscored (and virtually guaranteed) the separateness of the Anabaptist group.
An interesting reversal occurred with regard to the payment of the tithe. Whereas Conrad Grebel himself objected to the payment of tithes in 1523, already by March of 1525 an Anabaptist arrested in Zollikon stated that the tithe should be paid since "if someone asks a Christian for his coat, he should give him his cloak also." It was the latter view that eventually came to prevail: "A true Christian... pays his tithe, even though he does not believe along with the preacher and has nothing to look for in the hierarchical church." With regard to the established churches, the growing Anabaptist criticism of the moral tenor in these churches was accompanied by a growing emphasis of the purity of the Anabaptist group, the latter of which was enforced by the ban. The development here was also towards separation. Whereas earlier Anabaptists had disrupted sermons and services in the local churches, the later reaction was to avoid the services altogether, since "they feared being seduced by the false teaching." The early attempt to establish the election of pastors by the local community gave way to the election of the pastor by each individual Anabaptist congregation. The democratic principle remained in force within the confines of a separated church; the congregation not only elected its pastor but also remained the sole and ultimate arbiter of their pastor's doctrinal and moral purity.

All resistance from the peasants was over by the end of 1525. The following year saw the development of the "separatist identity" of the Swiss Anabaptist movement as we have outlined above, although as we have also indicated, some elements comprising that identity were inherent in the beginnings of the movement. A strict consensus was
not achieved until February of 1527, with the composition and general acceptance of the Schleitheim Articles, but there is evidence that already in 1526, Anabaptist congregations answering to the Schleitheim model were in operation north of Zürich up to Schaffhausen and Schleitheim and west to Bremgarten and Klingnau. It was precisely in this area that Michael Sattler carried on his missionary activity prior to his departure for Strasbourg.

The Zürich Sources

As we saw in the introductory chapter, the Zürich sources pertaining to Michael Sattler are primarily three, dating from March 1525, November 1525 and some time after May 1526. In what follows we shall pay particular attention not only to the testimonies themselves but also to the historical context.

1. March 25, 1525.

Brother Michael in the white coat wishes to separate himself from rebaptism and is now so well instructed that he confesses to have acted wrongly, and he wishes to recant his teaching that he preached concerning baptism, etc. Has sworn to desist.

The testimony translated here is the first possible reference to Michael Sattler which is extant in the Zürich records. Modern historical treatments of Swiss Anabaptism have generally made two assertions concerning this testimony: first that "Brother Michael in the white coat" refers, in fact, to Michael Sattler and second, that this testimony then demonstrates that Sattler joined the Swiss Anabaptist movement as of March 25, 1525. On the first point, we find that Emil Egli's older collection of documents from Zürich does not link "Brother Michael" with "Michael Sattler." On the other hand, Fritz Blanke, von Muralt/
Schmid, John Yoder, Myron Augsburger, and most contemporary scholars dealing with Swiss Anabaptism seem to assume without question that Brother Michael and Michael Sattler are one and the same person. This assumption bears further examination. On the second point, a statement typical of the modern historical consensus is that of Myron Augsburger, who states outright that "Sattler was introduced to the Anabaptist cause in Zürich and was led to join it sometime during February or March, 1525." This assumption, affirmed again in Martin Haas' recent biographical outline of Sattler, also bears further examination.

Leaving the central question aside for the moment, we must ask whether "Brother Michael" was in fact rebaptized and an active rebaptizer. The key phrase here is "wil von dem wydertouff stan." The combination of stehn with von is used in contemporary documents in the sense of "desist from." The resulting translation, "desires to desist from rebaptism," conveys the impression that this "Brother Michael" has been rebaptizing (which would indicate that he had been rebaptized) and now wishes to refrain from that activity. However, the phrase allows for an alternative translation and interpretation: Brother Michael may have been willing to drop the issue of baptism. The ambiguity of the phrase leaves doubt as to whether or not "Brother Michael" was an active Anabaptist as of March 25, 1525.

The central question clearly concerns the identity of "Brother Michael." The internal evidence of the testimony itself provides precious little ground for the conclusion that "Brother Michael" is Michael Sattler. The name Sattler is, first of all, nowhere mentioned. There
are two internal elements which seem to have suggested Sattler's name, namely the fact that the identifying term "Brother" suggests a monastic connection, and the fact that this "brother" is subsequently identified as a foreigner. We are thus apparently dealing with a religious from outside the Zürich area who was arrested with the Zollikon Anabaptists and expelled March 25, 1525. Granted that this information "fits" Sattler up to a point, it is clear that we have here no demonstration of Sattler's presence in Zürich at this time. The hypothesis that Brother Michael is Michael Sattler can be held only provisionally. But in fact, evidence in the testimony itself points away from Sattler, for Benedictine dress is black rather than white. The phrase "in the white coat" suggests that if this religious was a monk, he was a Cistercian rather than a Benedictine. In sum, the internal evidence supporting the identification of Brother Michael as Michael Sattler is extremely weak.

Given the ambiguity of the March 25 testimony we must carefully consider the contextual and circumstantial evidence. The historical context for this testimony is the second mass imprisonment of the Zollikon Anabaptists and persons connected with these Anabaptists. Zollikon had been relatively quiet following the release of the imprisoned Zollikoners on February 8. Ten days later, however, George Blaurock was released from prison and soon began rebaptizing in Zollikon once again. By March 8 the Council had gotten wind of renewed trouble and had resolved to make the necessary investigations. On March 11 the Council resolved to fine all those who had allowed themselves to be rebaptized, in the amount of one mark in silver. By contrast, all those who had rebaptized others were to be arrested. On March 16 the
latter resolution was reconfirmed; the hearing of the arrested Zolikoners began the next day, with the final report being submitted March 25, 1525. It is in this final report that "Brother Michael" appears. 

It is a curious fact that "Brother Michael" is mentioned nowhere else except in this document, for the other 16 prisoners mentioned in this final document had all been previously interrogated by the Zürich authorities, and the records of these interrogations are extant. From these records we know that there were actually twenty-one men arrested and questioned in the period from March 16 to March 25.138 Of these twenty-one men, sixteen appear again in the final document of March 25, four others were questioned and apparently released immediately, and one man, identified as Phillip Kym, appears only once, questioned in company with Valentin Gredig.139 At this point one is tempted to ask whether Phillip Kym and Brother Michael might not be one and same man. Was the reporter on March 25 perhaps misinformed as to Phillip Kym's name? Why does Phillip Kym disappear from the record without a trace and "Brother Michael" appear in his place?

A closer look at Phillip Kym's testimony excludes the possibility that he and "Brother Michael" are one and the same. The decisive point here is the fact that our Brother is a foreigner, while Kym appears to have been a Zürich citizen.140 Thus we return to square one: a "Brother" appears in the testimony, "out of nowhere" as it were, swears to desist from rebaptism and preaching concerning baptism, and leaves the area. We have no record of the brother's earlier interrogation nor is such a person identified as being a recipient of baptism in the testimony of the Zolikoners.141 In fact, it is not clear who would have
been the recipient of this brother's baptizing activity, since there is no testimony of a religious (or ex-religious) rebaptizing anyone in the Zürich/Zollikon area. The contextual evidence leaves one with more questions than answers.

In conclusion, neither the internal evidence of the March 25 document nor the contextual evidence of supporting documents lends weight to the conclusion that Brother Michael is Michael Sattler. Such identification rests entirely on circumstantial grounds: Michael Sattler appears eight months later in Zürich, in Anabaptist company; therefore it has been assumed that "Brother Michael" refers to Sattler. Other evidence suggests, however, that this conclusion is unlikely, as we shall argue further.

2. November 18, 1525.
Marthy Ling from Schaffhausen and Michael Sattler from Staufen in the Breisgau are to be released on the swearing of an oath of loyalty and the payment of costs.\textsuperscript{142}

The above testimony is the first mention of Michael Sattler by name in the Zürich record. Most modern treatments of Swiss Anabaptism, having already concluded that Sattler joined the movement some eight months prior, take this testimony as evidence of Sattler's continuing involvement in the Swiss Anabaptist movement.\textsuperscript{143} The particular document from which the above testimony is taken also makes mention of the sentences passed out to Conrad Grebel, Felix Mantz and George Blaurock, as well as the sentence of Ulrich Teck and Margaret Hottinger. Christian Neff, in an article on Conrad Grebel, conjectures that the mention of Grebel and Sattler indicates that they had worked together in the Grünningen area prior to the arrests there. Dr. Neff concludes,
however, that there is unfortunately no direct evidence in the matter. The possible link between Grebel and Sattler suggested by Neff is taken up by Myron Augsburger, who goes so far as to state that Sattler was present at Blaurock's sermon of October 8 in Grünningen. The placing of Sattler in the Grünningen area is, in the absence of contradictory evidence, a possibility, but it would seem to be no more a possibility than placing Sattler in Schaffhausen, Klingnau or Schleitheim, i.e. in those places where Teck and Link were active.

In and of itself the testimony tells us only that Michael Sattler was in the company of Anabaptists as of November, 1525, that he incurred the displeasure of the Zürich authorities and was arrested, and that he was willing to abjure, to pay costs and to leave the district. The testimony says nothing of Sattler's being rebaptized, of his rebaptizing others, of unruly behaviour or of a previous arrest. In short, the November 18 testimony demonstrates Sattler's commitment to the Anabaptist cause only if one is willing to assume beforehand that Sattler was already an Anabaptist. As we have shown, there is no compelling reason to make that assumption. If one wishes, however, to assume that Sattler was already an Anabaptist in March, some difficult questions arise. One wonders, first of all, why the Zürich authorities dealt with Sattler in such a cursory fashion in November, if Sattler had already been rebaptizing in March, had been arrested, and had sworn an oath to stay out of the district. Secondly, one wonders at the weakness of Sattler's commitment to the Anabaptist cause, given his willingness to abjure in November. Grebel, Mantz and Blaurock, by contrast, refused to abjure and were sent to the tower. Sattler's behaviour is strange
indeed if one is to think of him as having been an active Anabaptist missionary for eight months, perhaps working along with Grebel in Grünningen. When Sattler's obvious strength of character is added to this picture, his willingness to abjure Anabaptism is even more striking. Thus the question arises: was Sattler a convinced Anabaptist as of November, 1525?

H.W. Meihuizen has suggested that Sattler's willingness to recant was due to the fact that he was not yet a fully convinced and baptized member of the brotherhood. Meihuizen, paradoxically, accepts without question the identification of "Brother Michael" as Sattler but, citing the support of Hans Kuenzi's testimony, concludes that Sattler could not have joined the Anabaptist movement before the period between November 18, 1525 and approximately November 1526.147

Over against Meihuizen's view, the more traditional dating of Sattler's Anabaptist "conversion" is argued by John Yoder in an extended footnote in his translation of Sattler materials. As an alternative explanation of Sattler's readiness to abjure, Yoder lists three points which he feels are more relevant to the matter.

. . . (a) the rejection of the oath was the least clear of the Anabaptist distinctives in 1525; (b) it was not a clear common conviction of the Anabaptists . . . that the Urfehde was identical with the swearing which Jesus and James forbid; and (c) Anabaptists, being human, sometimes weakened under persecution.148

As Yoder would have it, Sattler joined the movement in March, 1525 but recanted twice because either he was not certain that he should not swear, or he was not certain that he actually was swearing, or perhaps he experienced two "weak moments" in the face of a threatened prison sentence.
All things considered, Meihuizen's hypothesis is the more convincing of the two. One can grant that the question of the oath is complex, and that the bald fact that Sattler swore the Urfehde proves nothing about his Anabaptism as such. Even the proven Anabaptist Ulrich Teck, who actually did missionize in the Grüningen area,\textsuperscript{149} swore the Urfehde at this time, albeit following some resistance.\textsuperscript{150} The central point, however, is not that Sattler swore an oath, but rather the fact that he was sufficiently removed from the Grebel circle to prefer leaving the area rather than standing on principle. The most logical hypothesis is that Sattler chose to leave the Grebel group because he was not yet fully committed to their cause. Sattler was not a man to "weaken under persecution," as he demonstrated later when he was persecuted in the most savage way imaginable.

The historical context which gave rise to the November 18 testimony suggests a wider range of possible interpretations. The events which triggered the November sentencing of Grebel and his companions began with missionizing activity in the Grüningen area. This activity reached a climax on October 8, when an audience of about 200 heard George Blaurock preach a sermon in the parish church in Hinwyl. This activity led to the arrest of Grebel, Blaurock and, eventually, Mantz.\textsuperscript{151} The next series of events occurred during the imprisonment of the Anabaptist leaders in Grüningen. On October 17, Jörg Berger, the Vogt for Grüningen, wrote to the Council of Zürich on behalf of the twelve Grüningen administrators requesting a disputation on the question of baptism. The prisoners and other Anabaptists in the area were asking for a just hearing on the question.\textsuperscript{152} It was
requested further that when this dialogue took place, Zwingli allow the Anabaptists the freedom to respond fully.\textsuperscript{153} The request for a disputation was echoed by some Zollikon Anabaptists who asked for an opportunity to debate publicly guided by Scripture alone.\textsuperscript{154}

The Zürich Council responded by calling a disputation for November 6, 1525. The subject was to be baptism: all those who held that infant baptism was of the devil and that rebaptism was correct were to be present. Furthermore, those who had been rebaptized and who held that they had acted rightly in allowing themselves to be rebaptized were to be present, as were those who held that children should not be baptized.\textsuperscript{155}

The disputation itself was held on three consecutive days, November 6-8. The numbers of people present caused the event to be moved from the Council chambers to the Cathedral,\textsuperscript{156} but the details available are few. Four presidents were appointed, including Vadian and Sebastian Hofmeister, the latter now a convinced Zwinglian.\textsuperscript{157} Infant baptism was defended by Zwingli, Jud and Caspar Grossman (Megander) while the Anabaptist speakers were Grebel, Mantz, Blaurock and their disciples and followers.\textsuperscript{158} The report of the disputation adds further that "everyone, learned or unlearned, spoke his opinion satisfactorily, without hindrance . . ."\textsuperscript{159} We know that Anabaptists from outside the area were present because the names Nicholas Guldin and Wolfgang Ulmann from St. Gall as well as that of Hans Pfistermeyer from Aarau are mentioned in an extant letter.\textsuperscript{160} Two Anabaptists from the Zürich area went to Hubmaier in Waldshut to ask him to be present at the disputation;\textsuperscript{161} he was prevented from attending by the political situation in the Klettgau.\textsuperscript{162}
We know little of what was said by Grebel, Mantz and Blaurock in the three days of disputation, but it seems a safe assumption that no new arguments appeared. We do have testimony that "rank and file" Anabaptists spoke and raised objections towards the end of the proceedings. Their objections were overruled by ad hominem arguments, but the fact that these peasants spoke at all underscores the fact that the disputation involved not only the Anabaptist leaders but also other persons, learned or unlearned, as the report from the Council states.

The disputation, not surprisingly, was declared to have been won by Zwingli and the city preachers, and so began the next series of events, namely the preparation for the sentencing of the prisoners by the Zürich authorities. The documents for this period fall into two categories: the bringing of charges by various witnesses and the statements of the prisoners themselves. The primary witnesses against the prisoners were Zwingli, Hofmeister, and Johannes Brennwald with Anthony Walder and Jörg zum Krumbfuss adding some minor testimony. The witnesses did their best to show that the defendants, namely Grebel, Mantz and Blaurock, were guilty of seditious teaching, e.g. that there should be no magistracy, or that all things should be held in common. The strongest charge was brought against Blaurock, who was accused of having urged armed resistance. Grebel, Mantz and Blaurock all replied to the charges, denying outright the charges linking them to seditious teaching. One can agree with Harold Bender in saying that Zwingli's case was not particularly strong. The essential question remained the question of baptism, with the defendants refusing to accept the "results" of the disputation, i.e. the official sanction of infant baptism and the outlawing of adult baptism.
The climax of the testimonies came with the sentencing of the
prisoners on November 18, which brings us to the document with which
we are most concerned. In the first paragraph of this document we
read that Grebel, Mantz and Blaurock have been sentenced to an indefinite
term in the tower "because of their rebaptism and their improper practice." 168
Next comes notice that a further talk is to be held with Margaret Hottinger
to dissuade her from Anabaptism. We know from later notices that this
talk was not successful for the authorities. 169 So far the defendants
have been the prisoners who had been on trial and had presented
statements, but the next entries in our document introduce three new
names: Ulrich Teck from Waldshut, Marthy Ling from Schaffhausen and
Michael Sattler from Staufen are to pay costs and swear out. The
swearing out apparently took place the same day.

Looking back over the historical events we can place Sattler
hypothetically at virtually any point. Was Sattler arrested at the
beginning of the chain of events, in Grüningen; was he arrested in the
interim prior to the November disputation; was he present at the dispu-
tation and arrested there, or was he arrested sometime after the dispu-
tation and before the November 18 date of sentencing? It goes without
saying that, in the absence of direct evidence, conclusions are tentative,
but the silence concerning Sattler in the record militates against his
having been under arrest from early October until late November. It
seems most likely that Sattler came to Zürich for the disputation itself.
That he would not have had to be an Anabaptist to have an interest in
the question of the Biblical foundation for infant baptism goes without
saying. 170 It is possible that he may have had a question or two
during the disputation itself. Again, however, Sattler's name appears nowhere in the post-disputation questioning, suggesting that he was not arrested at the disputation, but rather was arrested shortly before the date of sentencing. He very likely was in company of Anabaptists, although of the three foreigners expelled that day, only Ulrich Teck gives evidence of having had strong Anabaptist connections; these connections are missing for both Sattler and Ling.

Grebel, Mantz, Blaurock and Margaret Hottinger were jailed in the tower; the Anabaptist misfit Ulrich Teck and the two suspected Anabaptists Sattler and Ling left town, presumably returning to the area north of Zürich, south of Schaffhausen, where Ling lived and where both Teck and Sattler were soon to appear in the record. That Sattler was not yet a convinced Anabaptist, let alone an Anabaptist leader, is evident when we compare his actions with those of George Blaurock. Blaurock, writing prior to his sentencing in November, compares his sufferings with those of Christ: "... 'I am a good shepherd, a good shepherd gives his soul for his sheep.' So also do I give my body and life and my soul for my sheep, my body in the tower and my life to the sword or fire..." Thus wrote Blaurock, with a commitment that Sattler too would demonstrate a year and a half later. That Sattler could not go along with Blaurock's sentiments in November, 1525 argues that he had not yet given himself totally to the Anabaptist cause.

3. Sometime after May 21, 1526.

Further, a person came to me who had also been a monk, and asked me for love's sake that I teach him to work, for he wished to eat bread from his own hand, without pride, which I desired to do following the command of God; by
this it is supposed that he is that Michael who was earlier your prisoner, but for him it is not as it is for me, for which you have been all the more inclined to constrain me, and [This Michael] has conducted himself in a completely quiet manner and has not dealt with baptism and is also is not [re]baptized. In addition he went one time with my brother to (blank) at my suggestion because of a young woman, where he was begged to read and where there was quite a crowd present. 173

The testimony translated here comes from the pen of Hans Kuenzi of Klingnau, a weaver who lived and worked in the town of Oberglatt, north of Zürich. As mentioned briefly above, it is on the basis of this testimony as well as on the basis of Sattler's willingness to abjure in November, 1525 that Meihuizen has postulated a late "conversion" date for Sattler. The testimony now in question, however, is not without problems. Yoder states, first of all, that the document is "undatable." 174 Dating is, in fact, a problem, but to say that the document is "undatable" is to overstate the case. The editors have dated the document as falling between the dates May 21, 1526 and December 26, 1529. The latter date is simply the earliest date on which news is given of Kuenzi's death, while the terminus a quo is established through a reference to the Baden disputation which took place on May 21, 1526. If the monk referred to in the letter is actually Sattler, then the important date is the terminus a quo, for we then know that Sattler was not baptized as of May 21, 1526. Thus if the contents of the letter can be shown to refer to Sattler, the letter is sufficiently "datable" to refute the thesis that Sattler was already baptized as of this date.

The second problem has to do with the interpretation of a central but obscure passage in Kuenzi's letter. Yoder, in arguing against Meihuizen, states that Kuenzi "denies that the unbaptized monk
who came to him was the same as 'the Michael who was previously your prisoner'. The passage in question is obscure, but I find no justification for Yoder's rendering. The German reads as follows: "Darby ist vermeint, er syg der Michel, der vormals ouch uwer gefangner gsin ist, im ist aber nit also, daruss ir mir dester geneygter zutrungen hannd, unnd der selb gantz inn stillem wasen by unns gewandlet ist etc." One difficulty stems from "im ist aber nit also." Kuenzi is in fact denying something here, but he is not denying the man's identity. Rather he is saying "for him (dative) it is not as it is for me." What this might mean is not immediately clear, even when the next clause is added: "for which you have been all the more inclined to constrain me." The meaning only becomes clear when we know that Kuenzi was being "constrained" (he was a hunted man at the time of the writing) by the Zürich authorities for his Anabaptism and his disruptive behaviour. But, Kuenzi is saying, for Michael the matter is not as it is for me, since he is living a quiet life, does not deal with baptism and has not even been baptized. In short, Kuenzi is not saying "my friend Michael was not your prisoner"; rather he is saying "my friend Michael, your former prisoner, is no Anabaptist or rabble-rouser."

Granted that Kuenzi's friend Michael is Zürich's former prisoner, it still has not been shown that Kuenzi's friend is Michael Sattler. In order to shed more light on this question we must turn to a detailed examination of the historical context. We can begin by putting Kuenzi's document itself into perspective.

The background to Hans Kuenzi's letter begins with the jailing of Grebel, Mantz and Blaurock in November of 1525. Some three months
later Carli Brennwald was arrested for Anabaptist activity and was
thrown into the tower along with Grebel and the other prisoners. At
his hearing Brennwald spoke of "the two from Klingnau," a clear refer-
ence to Hans Kuenzi the elder and his son, also named Hans, both
weavers from Klingnau. Nothing came of this information until after
March 21, 1526, when all the Anabaptist prisoners, including Brennwald,
escaped out an open window. The Zürich authorities naturally made
some investigations, and in the process they arrested father and son
Kuenzi. On interrogation, Hans the younger admitted that Brennwald
had come directly to his house in Oberglatt the night of the escape,
but he assured the authorities that Brennwald was no longer in the
district. Hans the elder reported that he had seen Grebel after the
escape, but he says that he last saw Grebel headed towards Glattfelden.
Both father and son Kuenzi were soon released by the authorities, with
Hans the elder swearing a recantation in which he affirmed infant
baptism and repudiated rebaptism.

It is clear that Hans the younger did not desist from disruptive
activity, for sometime after May 21, 1526 he wrote the letter to the
Zürich Council with which we are now concerned. Kuenzi's real inten-
tion for writing the letter is not clearly apparent until the conclusion.
There he states that as he was coming home one day, the local pig
herder warned him that there were men surrounding his house, prepared
to arrest him. With this warning, Kuenzi fled and eluded capture.
But, he says, "I entreat and admonish you that you allow me to come to
my wife and children for, if God will, I wish diligently to hold to His
truth ... " Thus the immediate context for our document is the
attempted arrest of Kuenzi. His letter is his attempt to justify his behaviour to the Zürich authorities.

Kuenzi defends himself with regard to three specific situations. First of all he speaks concerning his actions towards the reformed pastor in Obergland, Johannes Freitag. Kuenzi had admonished the pastor to "amend his vice and evil manner," which admonition, Kuenzi reports, the preacher "did not accept in a Christian way" even though it had been offered "out of love" on Kuenzi's part. Kuenzi also opposed the buying of a chalice for the local church, and apparently the local Vogt had to interfere in the matter. The second situation requiring justification is the matter of the ex-monk Michael. We have already seen how Kuenzi justifies his behaviour in this case: Kuenzi has done no more than teach a monk a trade (presumably weaving), and the monk is a peaceful man, not concerned with Anabaptism, even though he did do some reading at a gathering. The third charge concerns the question of whether Kuenzi had been preaching secretly, which Kuenzi denies: he has spoken only for edification. Following this comes Kuenzi's request to be allowed to return home.

Turning to the broader context, namely Kuenzi's activity as an Anabaptist, we find the first hint of a connection between Sattler and Kuenzi in the testimony given by the elder Kuenzi at the time of his April questioning in Zürich. In that testimony Kuenzi tells the authorities that he was baptized by Ulrich Teck of Waldshut. Teck had been expelled from Zürich in November together with Michael Sattler and Martin Ling, as we have seen above. It is altogether likely that on leaving Zürich these three travelled north to Obergland.
We have no further notices linking Teck and Kuenzi, but we do have considerable evidence linking Kuenzi with two other Anabaptist evangelists, namely Carli Brennwald, mentioned above, and Conrad Winckler from Wasserberg. From the direct testimony of arrests by the Zürich authorities we know that a) Brennwald and the Kuenzis were good friends and that b) Winckler and Brennwald had spent some time in prison together in Zürich.\textsuperscript{186} The testimony of arrested Anabaptists gives us much more information concerning Kuenzi, Brennwald and Winckler. From this testimony it is clear that these three men worked together, primarily in the Bülach area, although Winckler was by far the most active and successful evangelist. At some point Winckler and Kuenzi left Brennwald and missionized together in the Regensberg area.\textsuperscript{187}

The relevance of this information becomes clear when we turn to the last testimonies concerning Sattler in the Zürich records. In the testimonies of the witnesses from Bülach appear the names of two other evangelists along with names of Kuenzi, Brennwald and Winckler. These two evangelists are Michael Sattler and Muntprat from Constance.\textsuperscript{188}

It is not absolutely certain when Kuenzi, Brennwald and Winckler were joined by Sattler and Muntprat. The first notice of Sattler's activity in the Bülach area comes at the hearing of Jakob Zander from Bülach, called Schmid, who was interrogated on January 27, 1528. He mentions three names: Muntprat, Michael Sattler and Conrad Winckler.\textsuperscript{189} Immediately following his hearing Heinrich Bächli from Kimenhoff (in the Bülach district) testified that he had been taught by Brennwald, Sattler, Muntprat and Winckler.\textsuperscript{190} There is yet one more testimony relevant
here, namely that of Hanns Meyger from Wellenberg who names Sattler, Muntprat, Winckler, Brennwald, the weaver from Klingnau (Kuenzi) and Hans Ockenfuss, the tailor. Meyger states that "These men have taught him, and also have taught the others wherever they came together..." 191

Although the dating of these events is next to impossible to reconstruct, we do know from Meyger's testimony that he was baptized in late June of 1526.192 This is the only datable testimony concerning Sattler's evangelizing as an Anabaptist in the Zürich area, and it must be noted that this testimony not only links Sattler with Hans Kuenzi, it also places his Anabaptist activity sometime around late summer of 1526. In sum, apart from Sattler's leaving Zürich with Teck and Ling, all references in the record mentioning Sattler by name link him with Hans Kuenzi, Conrad Winckler or Carl Brennwald. Given this fact we can affirm with certainty that Hans Kuenzi's friend, the ex-monk Michael, is in fact Michael Sattler.

**Conclusion**

The most obvious conclusion of our study is that traditional biographical sketches of Sattler must be modified. The identification of "Brother Michael," listed among the Zollikon Anabaptists, as Michael Sattler is not a conclusion justified by the evidence: the record is silent concerning connections between the Zollikoners and Sattler. Likewise the conclusion that Sattler had worked in Grüningen with Grebel, Mantz and Blaurock does not stand up to scrutiny: again the record is silent, and Sattler's actions demonstrate no commitment to the Anabaptist cause. Sattler's non-commitment in November, 1525 is clari-
fied by Hans Kuenzi's testimony to the effect that Sattler was not yet baptized as of May, 1526. From the testimony of Hans Meyger we can surmise that Sattler had indeed received baptism by late June, 1526.

If we ask when and how Michael Sattler was likely to have come to the Zürich area, we find it profitable to look once again at the evidence from Freiburg. Although the Black Forest peasants had been in various stages of uproar from December, 1524 on through to the summer of 1525, the move against Freiburg did not come until early May, 1525. By May 12, Black Forest peasants, including volunteers from Waldshut and Hallau, had taken control of the monastery St. Peters of the Black Forest and were camped outside Freiburg's city walls. It is most likely that we have here the occasion of Sattler's departure from St. Peters, for although most evangelical Freiburgers had earlier fled down the Rhine to Strasbourg, Sattler apparently fled south. When he first appears in the Anabaptist record he is in company of Teck from Waldshut and Ling from Schaffhausen. Furthermore, we find evidence of his missionary activity only from Bülach, north of Zürich. As we have noted above, the entire area north of Zürich, from Waldshut to Schaffhausen, was filled with evangelical/peasant agitation. The Bülach area in particular had close connections with Waldshut during the peasant uprisings. As it happens, the village of Schleitheim is also located in this same geographical region, in the Unterland north of Zürich.

In summary, although the evidence is circumstantial, it leads to the conclusion that Michael Sattler left St. Peters of the Black Forest shortly following the taking of the monastery by peasant troops on
May 12, 1525. He travelled to the Waldshut/Schaffhausen area. At this time virtually all of the Black Forest to the north and west of Schaffhausen was in control of peasant troops. In some areas, such as Waldshut and Hallau, the pro-peasant forces were also Anabaptist, and it was most likely in this setting that Sattler was introduced to Anabaptism. Nothing is known of Sattler's activities until he appears in Zürich at the time of the November disputation on baptism. Sattler may already have been learning the weaving trade at the time of the disputation; he clearly was thus employed as of May, 1526. He had joined the Anabaptist movement by late June, 1526.

When we apply this chronology to the emergence of the Swiss Anabaptist movement generally, we see that Michael Sattler was not actively involved in the first phase of the movement. That is, Sattler did not become an Anabaptist until the "popular" option had been played out. With the collapse of the peasants' movement came the full emergence of the "sectarian" Swiss elements. Interestingly enough, the Anabaptists with whom Sattler had the most contact, that is Kuenzi, Brennwald and Winckler, all became fully committed Anabaptists after the collapse of the peasants' movement. Hans Kuenzi, for example, had baptized no one as of April/ May, 1526. Carli Brennwald was baptized by Anthony Roggenacher only in Late January of 1526, and Conrad Winckler, although he was involved in baptismal agitation in June of 1525, nonetheless recanted in March of 1526 and confessed that he had not baptized anyone nor had he taught rebaptism. This same man later baptized a huge number of people and suffered martyrdom by
drowning. All evidence points to Sattler's joining the Swiss movement after the first wave of popular enthusiasm had passed. The circle within which Sattler moved and worked likewise emerged following that first wave of enthusiasm. What emerged from the circle of Sattler, Kuenzi, Brennwald and Winckler was a vision of the separated church of the faithful which carried early Zürich themes several steps further.

In turning to the question of literary sources, it is clear that Sattler's contribution through the Schleitheim Articles will have to be seen as a part of the "second wave" of Swiss Anabaptist thought. As such his writings will have to be contrasted to both the early "popular" writings of the peasants -- of which he was doubtless aware at first hand -- and to the early writings of the Anabaptist movement. Such a comparison will, in the first instance, provide a negative point of comparison, for the peasant position had been superseded. In the second instance the comparison involves the more constructive question of what themes are developed further and in what way they are developed. The Anabaptists most relevant in this connection are Grebel, Mantz and Blaurock, representing the Zürich beginnings, Balthasar Hubmaier, who wrote the most definitive statement on the question of baptism, Gross and Teck as pacifistic Waldshuterers, and Kuenzi, Brennwald and Winckler, the teachers of Anabaptism with whom Michael Sattler had the best documented contact.
CHAPTER V

SATTLER'S ANABAPTIST CAREER:
STRASBOURG, SCHLEITHEIM, HORB AND ROTTENBURG

In this chapter we will look at Michael Sattler's emergence as an Anabaptist leader, which took place following his departure from the Zürich area. We shall pay particular attention to the relevant scholarly literature pertaining to this period and also look carefully at the sources in question. The underlying question throughout remains the identification of Sattler's role within the growing Anabaptist movement.

Strasbourg and Lahr

Following his activity in the Zürich Unterland, Michael Sattler appears next in the record of the city of Strasbourg. The central piece of evidence here is a farewell letter written by Sattler to the Strasbourg reformers, Bucer and Capito. There is an appeal in the letter for certain persons held prisoner in Strasbourg. Correspondingly, there is a record of the imprisonment of these Anabaptists,\(^1\) which makes it possible to establish when Sattler wrote his farewell letter.\(^2\) Sattler must have written this letter and left Strasbourg between late December, 1526 and early January, 1527. Sattler's date of arrival in Strasbourg is unknown, but Bucer and Capito were obviously well acquainted with him.\(^3\)

Sattler's presence in Strasbourg, his dialogue with Bucer and Capito and the subsequent emergence of the Schleitheim Articles has led
John Yoder to put forward the thesis that the "Crystalization point" of (Swiss) Anabaptism occurred following Sattler's unsuccessful attempt at ecumenical dialogue in Strasbourg. Up until the time of this failed dialogue the Anabaptists had been able to retain the hope that their ideas might be implemented on a larger scale; accordingly, they composed no binding "constitution" for themselves as a distinct group until it became obvious that they no longer had a part in the wider reform movement. 4 Schleitheim thus marks the beginning of the (Swiss) Anabaptist movement.

The particular historical facts which Yoder considers to be central here are first that Sattler, unlike Denck, had no public dispute with the reformers and, second, that Sattler was not exiled. Rather, Sattler's theological differences with the reformers were relatively minor (as compared with the problems posed by Denck), 5 and Sattler's departure from Strasbourg was voluntary. 6 Given Sattler's comment that his "conscience" allowed him to remain in Strasbourg no longer, Yoder concludes that the possibility existed for Sattler's continued presence in the city. Since Sattler wanted to continue working in Strasbourg, "this cannot be understood other than in the form of some co-working within the official reformation of Strasbourg." 7 What Sattler had hoped to accomplish, and what Strasbourg was still theoretically open to at this time, was the possibility of a "Waldshut on a larger scale." 8

Against this background Yoder turns to the Schleitheim Articles and asks to whom they might be directed. The central question here concerns the "false brothers" mentioned in the cover letter. 9 The common assumption has been that the "false brothers" were other Ana-
baptists with spiritualistic and antinomian tendencies but, says Yoder, "this is to confuse the effect of Schleitheim (the unity of Anabaptism) with its prerequisite." Yoder concludes that the "false brothers" are Bucer, Capito "and others of their sort," and in fact, with the departure of Sattler from Strasbourg an ecumenical "point of no return" was reached: "Schleitheim signifies not so much a crisis of gathering, disciplining and clarifying of an Anabaptism already two years old, but only the birth of that movement." Yoder's thesis elicited a direct response from Klaus Deppermann. Deppermann's response was framed around three questions, as follows: a) How far did the borders of "tolerance extend in Strasbourg up to 1527? b) Was Sattler's own thought such that it allowed him to consider establishing a "Waldshut on a larger scale?" c) Is it true that the Schleitheim Articles were not directed against the spiritualistic Anabaptists? Regarding the limits of toleration in Strasbourg, Deppermann points out that the Strasbourg reformers (specifically Bucer) were extremely tolerant on the issue of baptism, primarily because outer baptism was considered to be secondary and of no essential importance. In spite of this tolerance, however, the one qualifying point emphasized with regard to baptism was that it was to be practiced "without the destruction of love and unity," i.e. that baptism was not to lead to division and schism. "From the beginning, Bucer had viewed the city as an indivisible 'Christian community,' as a small 'corpus Christianum' . . . " In spite of some opposition by the other city reformers, "all official evangelical preachers were agreed on the point that freedom of
faith and conscience could never free a citizen from his civic duties, that is from the taking of the civic oath before the authorities, from military service and guard duty, and from the acceptance of public offices in law and administration. 16

The position of the authorities on this question is illustrated by the cases of the Anabaptist prisoners for whom Sattler appeals in his letter. In his questioning of these prisoners, Bucer centres on the question of their acknowledgement of the magistracy, and on this point he finds them lacking. The authorities responded to Bucer's appeal and expelled the men from the city. 17 Already in the summer of 1526 Capito had criticized the Anabaptists "because they consider the magistracy to be an unchristian institution, thereby undermining the civic constitution, and they recognize only re-baptized Christians as brothers."18 In sum, when one asks how open the Strasbourgers were to the Anabaptist movement one must conclude that "in the central point of 'separation,' the differences between the Anabaptists and the Strasbourg reformers were insurmountable from the start."19 The "limits of toleration" in Strasbourg extended to baptism but did not extend to "separation from the world."

Turning then to the second issue, namely Sattler's own "ecclesiological and socio-ethical ideas," Deppermann states that "in opposition to the Strasbourg reformers, Sattler believed the baptism of believers to be an act necessary for salvation, 20 which joined the faithful to the body of Christ. At the same time the candidate completed by this act his separation from the world."21 In short, Sattler's fundamental principle (Grundgedanke) was the establishing of a pure community
through separation from the world. Such a concept of "church" could
never be compatible or reconcilable with either the Strasbourger's
ecclesiology or even Hubmaier's, for that matter. "Sattler never intended
to found a 'Waldshut on a larger scale,' and therefore there was no
cooperation possible between him and the Strasbourgers."²²

Deppermann grants that Sattler was more theologically acceptable
to the Strasbourg reformers than was Denck. However, Sattler's pre-
sence in Strasbourg is not to be explained by an "invitation" from Bucer
and Capito, of which there is no mention in the sources.²³ Rather "the
initiative for the dialogue between him and Bucer/Capito originated with
Sattler, who wished to free his arrested co-religionists Hiller, Tucher,
Gross and Echsel from prison, and to this end he expounded the legiti-
macy of his teaching."²⁴ The fact that his followers were exiled and
that he was not is explained by the respective social positions involved:
as a former prior of a monastery Sattler was a "lord" while the men
exiled were simple artisans.²⁵ In sum, Sattler's teaching of the sep-
rated church of the faithful rendered "cooperation" between Sattler and
Strasbourgers an impossibility. Their respective ecclesiologies were
fundamentally opposed. Sattler was in dialogue with the reformers
because of his jailed Anabaptist comrades.

Regarding the identity of the "false brothers" mentioned in the
Schleitheim Articles, Deppermann argues that the Articles were directed
to brothers within the Anabaptist fraternity. It was Hans Denck's
teaching in particular that was being combatted in the Articles.²⁶ The
conclusion to be drawn is that the winter of 1526/27 "was in fact the
time of a cristallization process in the history of Anabaptism"²⁷ in that
the biblicistic and spiritualistic wings within the movement were decisively separated.

The controversy between Yoder and Deppermann continued with an exchange of letters on the subject, which we will not detail here. We must, however, come to a decision regarding the points at issue. Yoder begins his essay with a methodological discussion, pointing out that different historical criteria will yield different points of origin for a religious movement. Yoder wishes to know specifically when the Anabaptist protest moved from the point of "hopeful dialogue" with the main-line movement to the point of establishing itself as a viable, independent movement. He maintains that in the free church context, "the transition from a local split to a viable movement is . . . , in terms of church history, far more important than the crystallization of the first core-group or the first proclamation of a new idea." And it is generally agreed that a "viable supra-national constitution for South-German/Swiss Anabaptism was produced for the first time in the 'Brotherly Union' of Schleitheim in February, 1527." What should be noted here is that there is no disagreement concerning Yoder's use of the phrase "crystallization point" in referring to Schleitheim: it is clear enough that the stream of Anabaptist thought begun by Grebel, Mantz and Blaurock "crystallized" at Schleitheim. The problems arise because Yoder is not really interested in the crystallization point as such (as his title would imply), but rather he wishes to make a point concerning the crystallization process. It is Yoder's reading of how the process of crystallization took place which must be tested against the evidence, and here the central question becomes the
nature of the "dialogue" which took place between Sattler and the Strasbourg reformers.

Deppermann's essay centres precisely on those points which must be tested against the historical evidence: to what extent was Strasbourg "tolerant;" does Sattler's thought give evidence of his wishing to create a "Waldshut?" If the historical evidence demonstrates that a) the Strasbourgers for their part were, from the start, fundamentally opposed to Sattler's position and that b) Sattler was, from the start, fundamentally opposed to the reformers' position, then it becomes a curious kind of "dialogue" which took place. What the word "dialogue" in fact means in this case is that two fundamentally opposed sides have met and affirmed their opposition.

It seems to me that Deppermann has done excellent work in demonstrating that the Strasbourg reformers, for their part, entered the "dialogue" with a clear-cut position regarding "separation," namely that separation from basic civic duties would simply not be tolerated. As far as I can see Deppermann has not been bettered here. 32 Until it can be shown, then, that Bucer and Capito were actually open to a quasi-Anabaptist programme, it surely strains credulity to suggest that they invited the Anabaptist Michael Sattler to be a "co-worker" with them. That they may have been willing to work along with Sattler on the condition that he give up his Anabaptist beliefs and accept their position is, on the other hand, entirely credible, but it is hardly exceptional.

Turning to the question of Michael Sattler's expectations, the direct evidence is limited to his farewell letter to Bucer and Capito. Of
the seven points which later appear in Schleitheim, Sattler and the reformers discussed six prior to the writing of the farewell letter, namely baptism, the Supper, the sword, the oath, the ban, and separation.\textsuperscript{33} In short, it is apparent that Sattler approached the "dialogue" with an outline of essential Anabaptist beliefs in hand, which outline then re-appears fully enunciated at Schleitheim. According to the letter, the central point of disagreement between Sattler and the reformers was on the question of separation: true Christians are to be baptized into the body of Christ after they believe (i.e. they will be adults). The body of Christ will be conformed to Christ, that is it will be separated from the world and will suffer persecution from the world as Christ himself did.\textsuperscript{34} It is clear that Sattler approached the reformers bringing with him a separatist programme for the establishment of a pure church of the faithful -- a programme that was in fundamental opposition not only to the Strasbourg reformation of Bucer and Capito, but also was considered unworkable in Waldshut itself.\textsuperscript{35} Is it possible that Sattler hoped to win Bucer and Capito to his position? Did Sattler hope to apply his programme to Strasbourg itself?

For my part, along with Stayer, Stauffer and Deppermann, I cannot see how Sattler's separatist programme can be conceived as providing a basis for a Waldshut-like reformation of Strasbourg, nor does it seem at all realistic to imagine this as one of Sattler's "hopes."\textsuperscript{36} Was the city as a whole to become a persecuted minority over against the devil and the world? Sattler was not this naive. It is possible, however, that Sattler hoped to convince Bucer and Capito of the scriptural accuracy of his understanding. In fact, their discussion centred
on Scripture. But here again one must imagine Sattler as being unduly naive if one is to see him as actively hoping to "convert" Bucer and Capito to Anabaptism. In fact some of Sattler's comrades were already in prison for these same beliefs. It is most likely that Sattler's main hope in his discussion with the reformers is that which he expresses in the conclusion of his farewell letter to them: "be mercifully considerate, I pray you, of those who are in prison and do not permit a merciful judgement to be superseded by a blind, spiteful, and cruel one. Those who are in error (if that they were) are not to be coerced but after a second admonition to be avoided." The most realistic hope for Sattler, given the clear-cut differences between his position and the reformers' position, was that mildness would prevail on the side of the reformers.

It is a curious feature of Yoder's thesis that it remains impervious to such discussions as the one presented by Deppermann. The reason for this is the framing of the question, which Yoder presents as follows: "When did the Anabaptist leaders for the first time regard the split between the Anabaptist movement and the growing territorial church-dom . . . as final and irrevocable?" Given this question, the fact that Sattler and the reformers spoke together at all will indicate that Sattler still cherished the "hope of reconciliation." But is the underlying assumption accurate? Where is the evidence that Michael Sattler approached his "dialogue" with reconciliation in mind? It would seem that Michael Sattler was most concerned with the accurate understanding and application of Scripture. In no extant document does Sattler appear as an ecumenically-minded man; rather he appears as an uncompromising champion of his understanding of Scripture, as we shall
see again below. Furthermore, the position outlined in Sattler's letter to the reformers is uncompromising in the extreme. It is Bucer who hopes for reconciliation by the application of 1. Timothy 1:5; it is Sattler who rejects the ecumenical (i.e. "universal") solution by insisting on the formation of an exclusive, separated community of the faithful.

In conclusion, the "crystallization process" of Swiss Anabaptism went through several stages. The early popularity of the movement faded with the collapse of the peasants' revolt; the year 1526 saw the growth of the more sectarian elements first seen in Grebel's original vision. It was at this point of development that Michael Sattler became an Anabaptist, and it is at this point of development that we may identify what he personally may have added to the movement. Sattler's arrival in Strasbourg and his discussion with the reformers there does not indicate a return to the "popular" vision of a territorial Anabaptism; rather, Sattler arrived in Strasbourg with a separatist programme in hand. There is no indication that this programme was negotiable or that Sattler was seeking "reconciliation" in Strasbourg. Sattler could not, in full conscience, understand Scripture in a non-separatist way. He defended his understanding, and that of his imprisoned brothers, before Bucer and Capito and thereby won their respect, but at the conclusion of the discussion the point remained as before: Bucer pleaded for a conciliatory, inclusive vision of the church, while Sattler could not move from his vision of a pure, separated and persecuted church of the faithful. It was Bucer who sought "reconciliation"; Sattler was seeking a "merciful judgement."
The Strasbourg episode marks yet another point in the development process of Swiss Anabaptism, and this not because there was a "dialogue" with main-line reformers, but rather because Sattler's letter reveals the further growth of Grebel's original vision. The Anabaptism of the separated, persecuted minority was beginning to assume definite contours. The limits of Sattler's Anabaptism were present prior to his arrival in Strasbourg and would have been identical had he never had his "dialogue" there. When we drop the notion of a Michael Sattler in search of "reconciliation," we see that the Schleitheim Articles can hardly be understood as a document directed primarily against Bucer and Capito. The Articles are rather the "crystallization point" of a particular understanding of Scriptural imperatives which had its earliest enunciation with Grebel and Mantz in Zürich.

Michael Sattler's next appearance in the record is the mention of him in a letter written by Jakob Ottelinus addressed to Martin Bucer. Ottelinus, apparently pastor at Lahr, was writing to Bucer concerning the growing Anabaptist menace in and around Lahr. Ottelinus begins by discussing certain matters concerning Hans Denck, thanking Bucer for a letter in which the "deceits of the Anabaptists" were laid bare. Ottelinus, however, does not distinguish between Denck and Sattler but rather goes on to say the following things concerning the Anabaptists generally.

In Christ's name I consider these men to be most pernicious, for the edification particularly of those who are feeble of conscience, since the Anabaptists compel those who are now contrite in heart and humiliated by God to satisfy the law to the last measure. . . . The grace of Christ promised to Paul in days of old is not sufficient for them, but rather these hangmen try to restrain the impulse by the weight of the law enforced by Moses. O most evil
pharisaism! Foremost in this matter is Michael, formerly a monk at St. Peter, the most stubborn of all, who concedes to no one, condemns all magistracy, obliges no one, even if (because of the demands of charity) he flatters on occasion; he is in fact terrible, horrible and of impetuous voice when arraigned for his insolence; moreover, in consequence of his monastic position he attacks the one bringing him Scriptures and reproaches him for being an adherent of the dead letter, and instead of the adduced argument, he claims that the spirit has revealed to him all things needful; by his own spirit he distorts all things because his opinion is founded on itself.43

We can note several things about this letter. It is, first of all, dated on February 7, 1527. Given Lahr's proximity to Strasbourg, and given the fact that Ottelinus uses the present tense throughout in referring to Sattler, we can assume that Sattler missionized in Lahr following his departure from Strasbourg and was probably still active there as of this date. We know further that Jakob Gross, one of the brethren arrested in Strasbourg for whom Sattler interceded, had been a prisoner in Lahr prior to his arrest in Strasbourg.44 Could it be that Michael Sattler also worked with Gross in and around Lahr prior to his discussion with Bucer and Capito? There is no further evidence in the matter, but such dating remains a possibility.

Ottelinus' unflattering characterization of Sattler is clearly polemical and exaggerated -- one could call it a caricature -- but it is nonetheless valuable, for Sattler's position remains identifiable. We know from Sattler's farewell letter that Sattler considered the "commands of Scripture" to be non-negotiable; thus it is no surprise when Ottelinus speaks of him as the "most stubborn pharisee of them all." Sattler maintained that all Christians must live according to the specific commands of Scripture; thus Ottelinus speaks of his "monasticism" and "legalism." When asked about the foundation of his understanding of
Scripture, he claimed the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. He was opposed to the participation of a Christian in the governing order. In all these details, save in the matter of the Holy Spirit, Ottelinus verifies the picture we receive on reading Sattler's letter to Bucer and Capito. In neither case do we come away with an impression of Sattler as an ecumenically minded seeker of reconciliation. The man that emerges is rather a champion of the "demands of divine truth."

Returning to Ottelinus' letter, the pastor from Lahr goes on to document a case in which Sattler has won over a certain local man and his wife.

... there is a certain man in the neighborhood near me, a pious man, had he not been seduced by these impostors, a man whom I had earlier educated in the gospel as a small favour, as if he were a catechumen in the matter of faith. Led I know not by what spirit, he gave himself entirely to the Anabaptists, and he completely turned away from me as one skilled in the impiety of this world, who was enmeshed in the affairs of this world. Moreover it came to pass a few days ago that when his wife had given birth to a child, he refused, at the instigation of Michael to purify the child with the baptism of water. For which reason our officers and Council, after deliberation on the situation and examination of the case, ruled that he have his child baptized according to custom.

Ottelinus goes on to report on the arguments used by the defendant. For our purposes it is enough to note that Sattler's personal work in and around Lahr was of sufficient duration for him to have instructed at least this one convert. There are no extant records of similar converts won by Sattler in the city of Strasbourg.

In conclusion, Michael Sattler was present in Strasbourg in late 1526. While in Strasbourg he defended the essentials of the Anabaptist faith before Bucer and Capito. His length of stay is unknown — it may have been a few days or a few weeks. Following his discussion
with the reformers, Sattler composed a farewell letter in which he outlined their differences, also pleading for mercy on behalf of his Anabaptist brothers. Of the imprisoned Anabaptists three were foreigners, namely Jakob Gross, Mathias Hiller and Wilhelm Echsel; Tucher and Ziegler were citizens of Strasbourg. Of the three foreigners, Echsel and Hiller were residing and working in Strasbourg. Jakob Gross, on the other hand, was obviously evangelizing in the city; he baptized several persons there, including Mathias Hiller.

There are visible connections between Gross, Sattler and Hiller. Gross had been working in Lahr and had been arrested there prior to his arrest in Strasbourg. After Gross and the other Anabaptists were arrested, Michael Sattler appears in Strasbourg and has a discussion with the reformers. That he himself was not arrested and exiled may well stem from the fact that he had committed no overtly illegal acts: there is no record of Sattler baptizing or preaching in Strasbourg. Gross, on the other hand, was extremely active. On leaving Strasbourg Sattler went to Lahr, or perhaps he returned to Lahr. It is not known where Gross and Hiller went immediately following their exile from Strasbourg, but it is altogether possible that they joined Sattler in Lahr. Mathias Hiller was arrested with Sattler less than two months later.

While Michael Sattler was in Lahr he missionized actively, winning at least one adherent to Anabaptism. He also had occasion to argue his beliefs with Jakob Ottelinus, whether publicly or privately is not clear. The exact date of Sattler's departure from Lahr is not known, but it is virtually certain that he was still in the area as of February 7, 1527.
These words stand near the beginning of the Brüderliche Vereinigung (Brotherly Union) written on the 24th of February, 1527. They are the primary testimony to the fact that a conference of Anabaptists was held at this time. There are no extant lists of persons present, although it is generally agreed that all of the participants were representatives of the "Swiss Brethren" stream of Anabaptism.

The question of where the meeting was held generated some difference of opinion. Representative of the older view is that of Walther Koehler, who wrote that the meeting took place "in the village of Schlatt am Randen, now in Baden." This view has since been corrected. It has been shown that the local dialect in the Schaffhausen area was responsible for the confusion, for in that dialect the town of Schleitheim is still identified as "Schlatt." Current scholarship accepts Schleitheim as being the site of the conference.

Given the later importance of the Articles which emerged from the Schleitheim conference, there has been considerable interest in the question of who was primarily responsible for their framing and content, and thus who was the "leader" of the conference. As we have seen in the introduction, the biographical treatments of Sattler emphasize Sattler's successful missionary activity in Horb, which supposedly took place following his stay in Strasbourg, as being the primary cause of his being chosen to lead the Schleitheim conference. It should be clear that there is no evidence of Sattler's having gone to Horb following his
stay in Strasbourg. In fact, the time span between his documented presence in Lahr and the Schleitheim conference is a mere seventeen days. We do know, however, that Sattler had missionized north of Zürich, that he had defended Anabaptist teachings in Strasbourg and had missionized actively in Lahr. This activity in itself, along with his evident interest in a systematic detailing of Anabaptist "distinctives" seen in the listing of points discussed with Bucer and Capito, makes Michael Sattler a prime candidate for leading such a conference.

There are only a few possible candidates for the leadership role at Schleitheim. Of the earliest leaders of the Zürich group, only Blaurock still remained alive. Conrad Grebel died at Maienfeld in the summer of 1526; Felix Mantz had been sentenced to death and drowned in Zürich on January 5, 1527. George Blaurock, who had been arrested and tried with Mantz, was exiled from Zürich on the day of Mantz' execution. There is no further record of Blaurock's presence in the Zürich area, but since Blaurock continued his Anabaptist activity until his martyrdom in September, 1529, his presence at Schleitheim is a possibility. A more likely participant is Wilhelm Reublin, who was working in the Rottenburg area at this time; Johannes Brüti, who had worked with Reublin in Hallau, may also have taken part. To these names one could add other possible participants such as Martin Ling (called Weninger), Mathias Hiller, Jakob Gross, and the three evangelists Kuenzi, Brennwald and Winckler.

The question of who led the conference is closely bound up with the question of who was primarily responsible for the framing of the Articles adopted there. Tradition has unanimously ascribed author-
ship to Michael Sattler. Sebastian Franck, writing less than four years after Sattler's death, referred to the "Articles of Michael Sattler" when speaking of Schleitheim. There are more identifications of this sort in different documents dating from 1540, 1555, 1610, and 1672. A second reason for suspecting that Michael Sattler authored the Articles is the fact that the descriptions of Sattler's teaching given by Bucer and Capito correspond closely to the contents of the Articles of Schleitheim. On the basis of the above evidence, however, the best conclusion that can be arrived at is that "Sattler belonged to the leading thinkers of that Anabaptist circle which stood behind the Schleitheim Confession."

Such was the conclusion of Beatrice Jenny following her study of the Schleitheim Articles. The question of authorship, however, has since been conclusively demonstrated by Hans Stricker. The essential document here is the letter of Sattler to Bucer and Capito, a document apparently not known to Jenny. A critical comparison of that document with the Schleitheim Articles reveals a striking parallel in the "points of disagreement" listed there and the actual articles which appear at Schleitheim; one can even surmise that Sattler had a draft of the basic articles in hand already in Strasbourg. In short, the re-appearance of the points raised in Strasbourg argues for Sattler's role as author or framer of the Schleitheim Articles. Secondly, there are close linguistic parallels to be noted between the Strasbourg letter and the Schleitheim Articles, and lastly, there are significant linguistic parallels between the Articles and the subsequent letter written by Sattler to the church at Horb. There is thus conclusive evidence that Michael Sattler was
the man primarily responsible for the Schleitheim Articles. He is so listed in the new critical edition of the Brüderliche Vereinigung. 66

The importance of the Schleitheim Articles for the emerging Anabaptist movement was recognized immediately by friend and foe alike: the Articles spread quickly in hand-written copies, and Zwingli soon had several copies in hand from which he prepared a Latin translation and refutation. 67 It is clear that the Articles detail distinctive doctrines and practices of the Swiss Anabaptists. Most scholars describe the Articles as being a type of "confession" or "creed" while noting that the Articles are not a "Confession of Faith" in a dogmatic sense. 68 That is, the Articles do not offer a complete outline of Anabaptist theological beliefs, but rather delineate essential Anabaptist practices.

The Articles are not exhausted, however, by a delineation of essential Anabaptist practices. They also are clearly polemical in tone and intent. While the positive achievement of the Articles is generally recognized, the question of the more negative focus of the Articles has given rise to some difference of opinion. On the one hand, most scholars emphasize the "intramural" aspects, and conclude that the Articles were directed primarily against other Anabaptists of more spiritualistic persuasion; 69 other scholars emphasize the "ecumenical" aspects and conclude that the Articles outline only those points in which the Swiss Anabaptists differed from the broader Reformation. 70 On this question John Yoder has noted that the "intramural" interpretation derives its strength from the "cover letter" which circulated with the Articles, while the "ecumenical" interpretation stems from an analysis of the Articles as such. 71 Yoder concludes; however, that both interpre-
tations are valid: "The clear statement of what distinguishes the Swiss Brethren movement from the Protestant and Catholic churches was at the same time the solidest defense against confusion and cross purposes within the ranks of the brotherhood . . . "72

The matter of the primary focus of the Schleitheim Articles was not, however, left to rest here as we have seen above, for Yoder's thesis concerning the "Crystalization process" of Anabaptism went on to posit that the central thrust of the Articles was directed against Bucer and Capito rather than against "false brothers" in the Anabaptist ranks. Or said another way, Yoder wished to see Schleitheim primarily as an "ecumenical crystalization point"; Deppermann argued that Schleitheim must be seen primarily as an "intramural crystalization point."

We have argued above in connection with Sattler's stay in Strasbourg that he came to Strasbourg with a separatist programme in hand and that Bucer and Capito were already unequivocably set against the institution of any such programme. In short, Sattler's position was already crystalized even if it was not yet sanctioned by a "synod" such as met at Schleitheim two months later. Given these facts, one can scarcely regard Schleitheim as having resulted from the passing of "all hope of ecumenical dialogue." Schleitheim was, in the first instance, an internal affair among the rebaptizers and the re-baptized; it is best understood within the framework of the development of Anabaptist teaching and practice. Within this framework, Strasbourg marks an episode of far less developmental importance than the failure of the Peasants' War.
Granted that the primary thrust of Schleitheim was not directed against Bucer and Capito, the fact remains that Schleitheim effectively demarcated the boundaries of Swiss Anabaptist belief and practice over and against spiritualistic and revolutionary Anabaptists, main-line Reformers and Catholics alike. In this connection we can note that some points of criticism voiced in the Articles are applicable to positions held by Bucer and Capito as well as being applicable to positions held by Denck and others. In the end what had crystallized was a distinctively separatist Anabaptist thought and practice, and with this clear demarcation came also the unequivocal grounds for separation from all those who failed to live within these borders and limits.

In conclusion, the biographical evidence emerging from Schleitheim is not considerable, but it is central to a study of Michael Sattler. It is in large part through his authorship of the Schleithiem Articles that Michael Sattler influenced subsequent Swiss and Mennonite doctrine and practice. The teachings of Schleitheim were unquestionably reinforced by Sattler’s heroic death at Rottenburg.

**Horb and Rottenburg**

Shortly following the Schleitheim conference on February 24, 1527, Michael Sattler was arrested in the small Württemberg town of Horb on the Neckar. Exact information concerning this arrest and subsequent imprisonment is difficult to come by. Few of the sources pertaining to these events have been published in the Täuferakten series, and the available sources do not agree on details. The exact date of Sattler’s arrest is not known, but it took place within days of
the meeting in Schleitheim. The earliest report of the arrest is found in a letter written by Archduke Ferdinand of Austria. Ferdinand there makes reference to a letter from Count Joachim von Zollern dated March 18, 1527, in which the arrest is reported. Thus it is clear that Michael Sattler was arrested very soon after his arrival in Württemberg.

The arrests in Horb were not the first arrests to take place in the Domain of Hohenberg. Already on February 16, or eight days prior to the Schleitheim conference, Hohenberg officials had arrested eight Anabaptists in Rottenburg. Thus the Schleitheim conference took place under increasingly hostile political repression both in Zürich and in the Austrian territories. This atmosphere may help to explain the origin of the article concerning the replacement of the "shepherd," should he be "led to the Lord by the cross." Shortly following the Schleitheim meeting came the arrests in Horb as well as further arrests in Rottenburg.

The reports vary concerning the number of Anabaptists arrested at Horb along with Sattler. Wilhelm Reublin reports that "sixteen men and eleven women were arrested," but the account of Christian Friderich Sattler states that "eight men and as many women were arrested." The discrepancy here may be explained by the fact that there were two arrests in Horb. It may be that the sources used by C. F. Sattler referred only to the first arrest. In any case, Reublin identifies Michael Sattler, Sattler's wife, Matthias Hiller and Veit Veringer by name as being among those arrested in Horb. C. F. Sattler states that Reublin himself, later called the "chief Anabaptist," managed to "slip away," although Reublin's wife and young son were among those arrested.
With Reublin's account of the arrest in Horb we have the first mention in the sources of Michael Sattler's wife. Very little is known about her. The official charges read against the prisoners list her name as "Margaretha, wife of Michael Sattler from Staufen." Valerius Anshelm tells us that she had been a Beguine and that she was a "refined and comely little woman" who died valiantly two days following her husband's execution, preferring death to recantation and a pardon. While it will probably prove impossible to trace Margaretha Sattler any further on the basis of such slender source evidence, it may still be possible to locate her in Anabaptist documents. One wonders whether she might be the same Margaretha to whom Nicholas Guldin directed a letter in 1525. However, the state of the evidence at present does not allow for such a conclusion.

According to Reublin's account, shortly after the prisoners were arrested at Horb, "the strangers, Michael together with his wife, Mathias (Hiller) furrier from St. Gall and Veit Veringer of Rottenburg were taken to Binsdorf by the knight and placed in the tower there." While in the tower at Binsdorf, Michael Sattler composed his letter to the congregation at Horb. From Reublin's account it appears that the remainder of the prisoners arrested at Horb were kept under guard there, while only the four prisoners mentioned were transferred to Binsdorf.

The letter written by Michael Sattler at Binsdorf appears to be the source of the tradition which states that Sattler left Strasbourg to work with Reublin in Württemberg prior to the Schleitheim conference, for the letter to the congregation at Horb breathes a decidedly pastoral
tone. As we have seen above, however, in strictly chronological terms it is unlikely that Sattler served the Horb congregation prior to the Schleitheim meeting. All other records we possess locate Sattler near Zürich and in Lahr as an active missionary. There are no similar records documenting Sattler's missionizing in Württemberg. In fact, Sattler is only charged with missionizing (baptizing) in "Zürich and other places" while the trial charges make specific mention of the local, Hohenberg activity of Reublin and Veringer. 92 It appears, in short, that Sattler had accepted a call to serve the Horb congregation -- perhaps at Schleitheim -- and had just assumed responsibility for his flock when he was arrested.

There is evidence that the Anabaptist prisoners had some popular support among the local people. C. F. Sattler reports on a letter written on April 27 by officials of the Domain of Hohenberg to the Innsbruck authorities in which the officials state that "Reublin has already ignited a great fire in the district which becomes stronger the longer those arrested do not receive their punishment, especially since they have numerous friends." 93 The Hohenberg officials, who were clearly nervous, suggested that the best preventative measure would be quickly to banish those prisoners who recanted and summarily execute those who did not. But the Innsbruck authorities "did not approve of anyone being condemned without a trial and a sentence." 94

The Innsbruck authorities knew well, however, that such a trial was proving difficult to arrange, for the original trial date had been set for April 12, and had had to be postponed. 95 The University of Tübingen had refused to send two representatives to the trial since
they were forbidden, as clergy, to take part in trials concerning capital
offenses. The Württemberg authorities, however, felt that it was
imperative to have learned representation at the trial "since it concerns
the honour of God, the keeping of the True Faith and fundamental
Christian Order . . ." Negotiations with Tübingen continued up until
May 6, just before the new trial scheduled for May 17. Two represent-
atives from Tübingen were finally persuaded to attend, they were
joined in Rottenburg by twenty-two other judges on May 15.

On May 15, the same day that the court was assembling in
Rottenburg, Archduke Ferdinand wrote a letter to his Hohenberg officials
in which he recommended a summary "third baptism in the Neckar" for
the monk who had dared to baptize people a second time. What is
unusual about Ferdinand's advice is that he here recommends punishment
without due process of law. It is clear that the Hohenberg officials
did not receive this letter in time to act on Ferdinand's recommendation,
for the trial proceeded as planned. In any case, the judges demonstrated
no lack of originality or initiative in contriving an "appropriate" penalty
for Michael Sattler's crimes.

At some undetermined point before the trial itself opened,
Michael Sattler was interrogated by the prosecution. A summary of this
official hearing was subsequently sent to the bishop of Constance and is
still extant. This hearing may have taken place following the con-
vening of the court on May 15, although an earlier hearing by Hohenberg
officials remains a possibility. The trial itself was finally held in Rotten-
burg, May 17 and 18.
According to Wilhelm Reublin, the prisoners put on trial at this time were Sattler, his wife Margaretha, Matthias Hiller and Veit Veringer "together with those imprisoned at Rottenburg, namely seven men and eight women . . ." Thus the four "strangers" arrested at Horb were first moved to the tower at Binsdorf and were then tried at Rottenburg with Anabaptist prisoners from Rottenburg. The official charges read against the prisoners list twenty one prisoners by name, or two more than Reublin's nineteen. Perhaps this discrepancy is explained by the fact that two prisoners recanted after the charges were first read.

We are well informed as to the events of the trial itself, particularly when we pay attention to the relationship between trial accounts and to their relative veracity. We have available to us three independent trial accounts. They are the account of Klaus von Graveneck, of Wilhelm Reublin, and of Christian Friderich Sattler. The events of the trial are described accurately and in detail by Gustav Bossert in several articles: the detailing of those events need not concern us here; the broad outline of events is as follows.

The trial, which stretched over two days, opened with the court requesting that the prisoners choose an advocate. Michael Sattler, speaking for the defendants, refused to do so. This caused some delays, after which the defendants answered that "when the charge touched on God's Word, it was forbidden for them to dispute." At this point the city clerk of Ensisheim, Eberhard Hoffman who acted as prosecuting attorney, read out the charges against the prisoners. The charges, with one exception, dealt with violations of Catholic
doctrine and practice, specifically concerning the Eucharist, baptism, unction and the veneration of Mary and the Saints. Sattler himself was specifically charged with having left the monastery and married as well as having urged non-resistance to the Turk. This last charge implied sedition as well as heresy, but the trial was clearly based on violations of church law rather than on civil violations as such. In fact given imperial claims, religious violations in the Holy Roman Empire could be tried as civil violations.  

Following the reading of the charges, Eberhard Hoffmann called for the application of the death penalty. A close textual comparison of the trial accounts suggests that more delays took place at this point, and the first day appears to have ended without the accused having made a statement of defense. The following day, Saturday May 18, opened with more delays and appeals, following which Sattler requested that the charges be read once again. This was eventually done, in cursory fashion, and Sattler made his reply and defense on behalf of all the prisoners. They based their defense on Scripture, he said, according to which they asked to be shown where they had done wrong. The judges "laughed and shook their heads" following Sattler's defense, with Hoffmann adding "the hangman will debate with you, you can believe me." The court retired for about an hour and a half, following which the verdict was handed down:

In the matter of the prosecutor of the imperial majesty versus Michael Sattler, it has been found that Michael Sattler should be given into the hands of the hangman, who shall lead him into the square and cut off his tongue, then chain him to a wagon, there tear his body twice with red hot tongs, and again when he is brought before the gate, five more times. When this is done to be burned to powder as a heretic.
This verdict was carried out May 20, 1527.

Some confusion has been generated concerning the fate of the prisoners tried along with Sattler. Following Sattler's death by fire, four of his brethren were beheaded; Margaretha Sattler was drowned two days later. The remaining prisoners, with the possible exception of Veit Veringer, recanted. At the July trial of the Anabaptists imprisoned in Horb, the authorities were successful in persuading all twenty-four prisoners to recant.

Conclusion

Our study of Michael Sattler's brief Anabaptist career following his stay in Zürich leads to the conclusion that Sattler was on the point of emerging as the central spokesman and leader of the pacifistic Swiss Brethren when he was arrested in Horb. We can trace his gradual emergence as leader fairly clearly. Following his baptism in the summer of 1526 and his missionizing with Winckler, Brennwald and Kuenzi, Sattler probably worked near Strasbourg, in and around Lahr, possibly in association with Jacob Gross. When Gross and some brothers were arrested for actively proselytizing in Strasbourg, Sattler argued the Anabaptist case with Bucer and Capito. At this point we hear, for the first time, of "articles" concerning baptism, the Supper, the sword, the oath and the ban.

Although Sattler maintains that the articles were not original with him alone, but rather originated in the brotherhood as a whole, still his role as a systematic formulator and spokesman for the Swiss movement begins to emerge clearly at Strasbourg. No doubt his formulations had been sharpened in his debates with Ottelinus in Lahr.
as well as through discussions within the Anabaptist circle itself, particularly with followers of Hans Denck. It seems plain that the "intramural" and the "ecumenical" discussions both preceded and followed Sattler's appearance in Strasbourg: the articles Sattler presented to Bucer and Capito have to have been formulated prior to any rejection by the reformers, but those articles were further refined and more explicitly stated following Sattler's departure from Strasbourg, at the Schleitheim synod.

At Schleitheim, Sattler's influence as a Swiss Brethren leader and spokesman reached a new height, for his imprint is clearly visible in the Articles adopted there. Sattler was undoubtedly on the point of consolidating and strengthening the movement on the basis of the Schleitheim consensus when his untimely arrest took place in Horb. The evidence indicates that he had not missionized extensively in Württemberg prior to his arrest there. Sattler's "pastoral letter" to the congregation at Horb notwithstanding, it was Wilhelm Reublin and not Michael Sattler who was the central Anabaptist leader in Horb.

Sattler's arrest and notorious trial and execution brought it about that his primary influence on the movement was posthumous. As such, however, his influence was both deep and extensive. The Schleitheim Articles -- from the first associated with Sattler's name -- were soon circulating in conjunction with accounts of his trial and heroic martyrdom. In the years to come scores of Anabaptists adopted the basic guidelines set forth in the Schleitheim Articles and of these Brethren, hundreds were to follow Michael Sattler's example of steadfast martyrdom.
The essential corpus of writings by Michael Sattler emerges entirely from the period here considered. Those writings are essentially seven: the letter to Bucer and Capito, the Schleitheim Articles, the Letter to the Church at Horb, and four independent documents relating to Sattler's trial and martyrdom. Of these seven documents, the Schleitheim Articles occupy the central position as the most extensive and systematic of Sattler's writings. The Articles are central also in that they provide the first doctrinal crystallization of the movement begun by Grebel and Mantz in Zürich. We have noted above some of the historical development which took place in the interim. In the second half of the dissertation we shall examine in more detail the doctrinal development which led from the position outlined in Grebel's letter to Thomas Müntzer to the Schleitheim Articles. Our aim in that analysis will be to discover central points of modification and to identify Sattler's role in those modifications.
CHAPTER VI

THE LIFE OF MICHAEL SATTLER RECONSIDERED

Our study of the historical contexts in which Michael Sattler found himself leads us to a substantially new view of the life of Sattler. In this chapter we will summarize our findings in the form of a connected biographical account.

Michael Sattler was born in Staufen in the Breisgau at an unknown date. Gustav Bossert has conjectured that Sattler was born around 1490, and this seems to be a reasonable conclusion. Concerning Sattler's early life and education, we must piece together our conclusions from such meagre evidence as is available. We have found absolutely no evidence, in the monastic record or elsewhere, concerning Sattler's early life, and very little evidence pertaining to his education. It appears that Michael Sattler learned his Latin outside the university, quite possibly in a Latin school and in the Benedictine monastery St. Peters of the Black Forest. We do not know when he entered the monastery. In the absence of conclusive evidence we may surmise that he was in residence at St. Peters from at least 1520 on, and in the absence of any opposing evidence, we may accept Anshelm's statement that he was prior of the monastery. He would have been appointed prior of St. Peters sometime after 1518, but before 1525.

When we consider the internal state of St. Peters we find that the monastery had been progressing since the rule of Abbot Petrus III
Gremmelsbach, who was Abbot from 1496 to 1512. Under Jodocus Kaiser St. Peters was undergoing an active process of reform from 1519 until about 1522. This knowledge adds a significant dimension to the Michael Sattler story, for we must now assume a strong Benedictine background and training when considering Sattler's intellectual foundations. Granting his position as prior, we must conclude that he was chosen to fill that position by the reforming Abbot, Jodocus Kaiser. This being the case, it follows that Sattler was an active proponent of the most demanding kind of monastic reform.

There are few clues pertaining to Sattler's departure from St. Peters, but the conclusion that Sattler left purely because of the influence of "Lutheran and Zwinglian ideas" must be rejected. The Reformation in Freiburg and the Breisgau did not attain the respectability and public availability seen in Zürich and Strasbourg: the Reformation was squelched early in the Breisgau, and all indications are that Reformation ideas made little entry into St. Peters itself. Instead, Reformation ideas in the Breisgau spread mostly among the peasants and common people and emerged most fully during the Peasants' War.

That Michael Sattler left the monastery under the influence of the peasants is suggested by Hans Kuenzi's statement concerning Sattler: upon leaving the monastery he wished to learn how to work and hoped to earn his living honestly. Taken as whole, the contextual and direct evidence suggests that the "call of God" heard by Sattler in the monastery was mediated by the peasants.

The circumstantial evidence concerning Sattler's departure from St. Peters is convincing because it is consistent and cumulative.
Assuming that Sattler was in the monastery on May 12, 1525, he would have met the Black Forest troop of peasants. In that troop of peasants he would have met volunteers from the Waldshut-Hallau-Schaffhausen area, an area where Anabaptism and peasant unrest went hand in hand. The hypothesis that such was the case explains how a Benedictine monk in the Breisgau could have come to be in Switzerland in the company of Anabaptists, rather than in Strasbourg, Constance, or Nürnberg.

Further, we would expect Sattler to be found in the company of persons residing and working in the Waldshut-Hallau-Schaffhausen area. In fact such is the case: Michael Sattler is found consistently in the company of such people. We find him swearing out of Zürich along with Teck from Waldshut and Ling from Schaffhausen; we find him learning a trade in Obergland and living with Hans Kuenzi; we find him missionizing in Bülach, and then in Lahr where Jacob Gross had been active; we find him leading a synod in Schleitheim. Sattler's involvement with the common people in the Zürich Unterland is plain.

Michael Sattler joined the Anabaptist movement in the summer of 1526; nine months later he was arrested by the Austrian authorities on charges of heresy, and less than a year after his conversion to Anabaptism he was dead. It is because of Sattler's increasing emergence as an eloquent Anabaptist spokesman that his influence was enduring. Thanks to the relative wealth of sources, we can trace Sattler's activity for this period of time with some accuracy.

Following his conversion and baptism -- perhaps at the hands of Kuenzi, Winckler or Brennwald -- Michael Sattler worked along with them in and around Bülach, north of Zürich. It then appears that he
departed for the small Baden town of Lahr, where Jakob Gross was active. It may be that Gross and Sattler used Lahr as a base from which to evangelize, for Gross, after being arrested in Lahr itself, was soon arrested in Strasbourg along with other Anabaptists. Sometime in late December or early January Michael Sattler also travelled to Strasbourg, where he pleaded the Anabaptist case with Bucer and Capito. He presented "articles" to the reformers concerning what he perceived to be Christian essentials. To all indications the talks were cordial, and the men spoke together as Christian brothers, but Sattler could not agree with the reformed interpretation and left the city, writing a short farewell note to Bucer and Capito. In that farewell letter can be discerned the outlines of the points soon to be enumerated at Schleitheim.

Following his stay in Strasbourg, Sattler returned to Lahr where his presence ocassioned a letter of protest from Jakob Ottelinus to Martin Bucer. It is apparent that Sattler was still north of Zürich for the Schleitheim conference which took place February 24. Sattler's leadership at the Conference is apparent in considering the Articles; they were clearly written largely by him. The Articles represent the beginning of Swiss Anabaptism as a coherent, self-defined movement; they are Michael Sattler's enduring contribution to Anabaptism.

It appears that at the Schleitheim Conference Michael Sattler accepted a call to serve the church at Horb. Soon after the Conference, in early March, he was arrested in Horb along with his wife and others of the Horb congregation. Shortly thereafter followed a second arrest in which more Anabaptists from Horb were imprisoned. The original trial was to have taken place on April 12, but this had to be postponed
for lack of qualified judges. At some point Sattler, his wife, Mathias Hiller and Veit Veringer were moved to the tower at Binsdorf. They remained there until the new trial was convened in Rottenburg on May 15, 1527. The trial itself took place on May 17 and 18, with the four Horb prisoners being tried with seventeen prisoners from Rottenburg.

Sattler emerged as the chief spokesman for the Anabaptist prisoners throughout the trial. This fact was reflected in the verdict which was handed down: Michael Sattler was to be tortured and then burned to death as a heretic; his wife was to be drowned, and the rest of the prisoners put to death in some undetermined way. The verdict against Sattler was carried out May 20, 1527; his wife was drowned two days later. Four more Anabaptist brethren were beheaded, and the remaining prisoners recanted. Of the Anabaptist prisoners in Horb arrested with Sattler, all recanted following their trial in July.

The biographical sketch presented here remains in complete accord with earlier estimates of Sattler's significance as an Anabaptist leader and the magnitude of his contribution. In this regard we can only second the words of John Yoder:

That (Swiss) Anabaptism survived as a viable movement with visible structures from the naive beginnings in Zürich in the mid 1520s to the time of the synthesizers of the 1540s, was the work of Michael Sattler more than any other one person and was the effect of the Seven Articles of Schleitheim, more than any other one single cause.

Michael Sattler's contribution to Swiss Anabaptism in undeniable. Nevertheless, our study has indicated the following revisions.

1. Michael Sattler was not a university-educated man, even though he was well versed in Latin.
2. A central element in Sattler's intellectual background is the strong current of Benedictine monastic reform, particularly as expressed by the Bursfeld movement.

3. Sattler's introduction to Protestantism came via the peasants and common people, rather than through significant contact with main-line reformers.

4. Upon leaving the monastery, Sattler moved to the Waldshut-Hallau-Schaffhausen area, where he lived with the common people and began to learn the weaver's trade. It was in this environment that he was surrounded by Anabaptism.

5. There is no evidence that Sattler learned his Anabaptism from Grebel, Mantz and Blaurock. Rather it appears that he learned his Anabaptism from Kuenzi, Brennwald, Winckler, Teck and possibly Gross.

6. Michael Sattler joined the Anabaptist movement in the late summer of 1526, after the revolutionary option had been played out among the peasants.

7. His career as a missionary and Anabaptist spokesman was just emerging when he was arrested, tried and executed. He stood at the threshold -- not at some midpoint -- of a significant career as an Anabaptist leader at the time of his death.

Given these fundamental revisions, Sattler's writings must be seen against a background which assumes dialectical contours. Sattler's thought emerged out of the antithesis between a strong monastic reforming background and the complete rejection of the monastic enterprise by
the peasants. The antitheses here are both religious and social. In terms of religious background, Sattler's efforts at self-discipline and sanctification as a monk must be seen in contrast to the anti-clericalism of the peasants, their understanding of *sola scriptura*, and their radical understanding of the "freedom of a Christian." In social terms, Sattler's position of privilege as a monk and "cloister lord" contrasts with the radical egalitarianism of the peasants. Both poles of the dialectic, however, were superseded by Sattler's mature thought.

The resolution of the antitheses in Sattler's life was substantially aided by the Anabaptist thought that had emerged in Zürich with Grebel, Mantz and Blaurock. It is here, however, that caution is needed, for the dialectical process suggests that Sattler may well have retained elements from his antithetical past in constructing the synthesis which emerged most fully at Schleitheim. The question is precisely to what extent the Anabaptism of Schleitheim is a continuation of Zürich Anabaptism and to what extent it is the product of Michael Sattler's own creative vision. The mature writings of Michael Sattler are a cloth woven from selected monastic, popular, and Anabaptist strands of his life. In the second half of this dissertation we will be concerned to unravel these strands in the hope of following each to its point of origin.
THE THOUGHT OF MICHAEL SATTLER
Our historical study has led to the conclusion that Michael Sattler had been an active monastic reformer who left the monastery under the influence of the Black Forest peasants, settling in the Zürich Unterland among Anabaptist artisans, fully joining the movement in late summer of 1526. As we now attempt to clarify the character of Sattler's thought we shall proceed chronologically according to the historical stages we have identified, utilizing those writings we have found to be potentially most influential upon Sattler. Our comparative study will begin, as a rule, with the points of coincidence and difference to be found between Sattler's thought and that of his original Benedictine milieu, turning then to the Evangelical and peasant contexts, and finally, to the early Anabaptist centres of Zürich and Waldshut. Our ultimate aim is to determine in what ways Michael Sattler's writings — and most particularly the seminal Schleitheim Articles — may be said to reflect motifs that are Benedictine, Protestant, Anabaptist, or Sattler's own. We will thus address not only the question of whether Sattler's writings are "Monastic" or "Protestant," but we will also be concerned to identify Michael Sattler's own contributions to the Anabaptist movement.

The central comparative categories we propose to utilize in this study are those that arise out of Sattler's own writings. Consequently our study begins by examining Sattler's own thought in isolation. Subsequent chapters go on to analyze and compare four areas of thought central to Sattler, namely his views on scripture, Christ, salvation, and the church.
CHAPTER VII

MICHAEL SATTLER'S THOUGHT
AS SEEN IN HIS WRITINGS

Of the total sum of writings variously ascribed to Michael Sattler there are seven documents of primary importance for which Sattler's authorship or responsibility can be established with reasonable certainty. The earliest extant writing we have from Sattler's hand is his Letter to Bucer and Capito;¹ Sattler's authorship is established through his signing of the document. Next follow the Schleitheim Articles² which have been shown to owe their essential structure and content to Michael Sattler. We may speak of Sattler's being the person most responsible for framing the Articles. Soon after Sattler's arrest at Horb, he along with his wife and two other prisoners were moved to the tower at Binsdorf, where Sattler composed a third document central for our study, his Letter to the Church at Horb. This letter was signed by Sattler himself.³ There are four independent documents concerning the trial at Rottenburg, namely the report of Sattler's pre-trial hearing,⁴ the Trial account of Klaus von Graveneck,⁵ the Letter of Wilhelm Reublin,⁶ and the Trial account edited by Christian Friderich Sattler.⁷ This sum of seven documents makes up the essential corpus of Sattler material.

In addition to the seven documents listed above there are a variety of other writings which have been ascribed to Sattler. Primary among these are two hymns which appear in the Ausbund,⁸ numbers 7 and 136 respectively. There are reasons for questioning Sattler's
authorship of either hymn, but there is a reasonable possibility that Sattler did in fact write the hymns. In any event, the material in the hymns presents little that is new. There remain six writings sometimes attributed to Michael Sattler, namely Congregational Order, On Divorce, On the Satisfaction of Christ, On Two Kinds of Obedience, On False Prophets and Evil Overseers, and How Scripture Should be Discerningly Exposed. We shall not refer to these documents at all in establishing the hallmarks of Sattler's religious thought. In what follows we shall take up each of Sattler's verified writings in turn, analysing each document independently.

The Letter to Bucer and Capito

Michael Sattler's letter to Bucer and Capito grew out of a discussion held between Sattler and the reformers. As Sattler himself tells us, the discussion had been friendly and had concerned "several articles which I together with my brothers and sisters have understood out of Scripture..." Bucer and Capito, however, had argued that "Paul writes in 1 Timothy 1 that love is the end of the commandment, wherefore it is necessary that all commands of God be guided by the same..." To this argument Sattler replies: "I am not able so to conceive, in my understanding and conscience, that this may be done as you do it with all the articles; namely with baptism, the Lord's Supper, force or the sword, the oath, the ban, and all the commandments of God." In sum, Sattler had presented articles concerning Anabaptist essentials to Bucer and Capito, which were based on "the commands of Scripture" as understood by Sattler and his "brothers and sisters"; the articles concerned baptism, the Supper, and the ban.
But Bucer and Capito had argued that the Scriptural injunctions referred to by Sattler had been superseded and were to be guided by the injunction to love. Thus the discussion had centred on the very practical question of how a Christian is to respond to the demands of Scripture. Michael Sattler is now writing to clarify further what it is that "hinders" him from accepting the reformers' use of I. Timothy 1.

Sattler begins by listing two points on which he and the reformers should, prima facie, agree: Christ came to save those who believe on him, and baptism is necessary for salvation. What is less than apparent is how these two points could have "hindered" Sattler. Here the key word is clearly believe, which must be understood in the context of baptism. Christ came to save those who believe on him, but conversely, he did not come to save those who do not believe, even though they have been baptized as infants, without faith. One must believe and be baptized, in that order, to be saved.

Faith and baptism are simply two aspects of one response, as Sattler makes clear in the next two points. Faith in Christ reconciles us with the Father -- the action is inward and heaven-ward -- while the act of baptism "incorporates all believers into the body of Christ, of which He is the head" -- the action is outward and directed towards the visible body of Christ on earth. Thus Sattler makes it clear that the favoured Anabaptist text concerning baptism, Mark 16:16, is in fact the cornerstone of his separatist ecclesiology. Faith and baptism are two inseparable aspects of one essential response of man before God's saving act: The act of baptism cannot be understood apart from faith, nor can faith be understood apart from the act of baptism.
Sattler's conviction that baptism should follow a confession of faith is a belief that he shares with all Anabaptists so-called from January 1525 on. But Sattler's assurance that faith must issue in the act of baptism if salvation is to follow is Sattler's crucial step into separatism and exclusivity. On this central question Sattler and the reformers would or could never agree. Wolfgang Capito, speaking of Sattler and his followers, noted disapprovingly that "It is true that when they believe the outer baptism upon confession to be necessary for salvation, they are in error."23 In short, the first four points made by Sattler go directly to the heart of his disagreement with Bucer and Capito. The Scriptural injunctions are plain, and they must stand: the inner act of faith and the outer act of baptism are necessarily conjoined in the realm of salvation. Soteriology can only be discussed within the context of ecclesiology.

The next three points made by Sattler build upon the necessary conjunction of faith and baptism: "5. Christ is, the head of His body, i.e. of the believers or the congregation. 6. As the head is minded, so must its members also be. 7. The foreknown and called believers shall be conformed to the image of Christ."24 Just as the outer baptism of water is the visible manifestation of the believer's faith, so the community of baptized believers is the visible body of the risen Christ. The believing community, as the tangible "body of Christ," will bear all the marks of Christ Himself. Here again there is a strict conformity between inner reality and outward manifestation: the believers will be spiritually conformed to Christ (Christ-minded), but this inward conformity will bear fruit in a visible conformity with Christ's actions. As
Sattler says further, "But they are the true Christians who practice the teaching of Christ with works."25 The true body of Christ is no mystical body known to God alone, but is rather a visible community of saints: "Christians are the members of the household of God and fellow citizens of the saints, and not of the world."26

Sattler goes on to make clear that the true body of Christ will share also in Christ's rejection by the world. "8. Christ is despised in the world. So are also those who are His; He has no kingdom in the world, but that which is of this world is against His kingdom. 9. Believers are chosen out of the world, therefore the world hates them."27 Here we have arrived at the full fruit of Sattler's soteriological conjunction of faith and water baptism, his insistence on inner and outer correspondence and his emphasis on a strict conformity with Christ. The end product is a thoroughgoing visible division between those who belong to Christ and those who belong to Satan, as is clear in what follows.

"10. The devil is prince over the whole world, in whom all the children of darkness rule. 11. Christ is the Prince of the Spirit, in whom all who walk in the light live. 12. The devil seeks to destroy, Christ seeks to save."13. The flesh is against the spirit and the spirit against the flesh. 14. Those who are spiritual are Christ's; those who are carnal belong to death and the wrath of God."28 This line of thought is concluded in a most forcible way in Sattler's two last points: "19. Flesh and blood, pomp and temporal, earthly honor and the world cannot comprehend the kingdom of Christ. 20. In sum: There is nothing in common between Christ and Belial."29
The culmination of the factors hindering Sattler from accepting the reformers' application of I. Timothy is in fact an unequivocal expression of the radical ethical polarity underlying Michael Sattler's separatist ecclesiology, but the seeds of the twentieth proposition were already contained in the first. For Sattler faith or belief has no soteriological relevance apart from the act of water baptism following one's confession of faith. That baptism, in turn, will not save a person who is not prepared to conform to Christ, both inwardly and outwardly. "Conformity to Christ" will entail of necessity the enmity of "the world," whose ruler is Satan. Thus true, saving faith leads necessarily through baptism to the establishment of a separated community of saints, the visible body of Christ, against whom stands the world, the visible representation of Satan himself.

The Schleitheim Articles

The Schleitheim Articles are composed of a prefatory letter, the main body of the text containing seven articles, and a concluding postscript. The introductory letter directs itself to fellow Anabaptists in the hope that "you might turn to the true implanted members of Christ, who have united with us in the power of a godly Christian spirit and zeal for God." 30 The letter makes clear that the meeting which took place at Schleitheim resulted in unity being achieved: "... we have been united to stand fast in the Lord as obedient children of God, sons and daughters, who have been and shall be separated from the world..." 31 Thus the introductory letter immediately strikes several central themes seen in the Strasbourg letter, for those who gathered in Schleitheim are identified as the "true implanted members of Christ" who have resolved to remain separated from the world in obedience to God.
The Sattlerian tone of the letter becomes even more explicit when the writer explains why such a meeting was necessary.

A very great offense has been introduced by some false brothers among us, whereby several have turned away from the faith, thinking to practice and observe the freedom of the Spirit and of Christ. But such have fallen short of the truth and (to their own condemnation) are given over to the lasciviousness and license of the flesh. They have esteemed that faith and love may do and permit everything and that nothing can harm nor condemn them, since they are "believers."

Note well, you members of God in Christ Jesus, that faith in the heavenly Father through Jesus Christ is not thus formed; it produces and brings forth no such things, as these false brothers and sisters practice and teach. Guard yourselves and be warned of such people, for they do not serve our Father, but their father, the devil.

But for you it is not so; for they who are Christ's have crucified their flesh with all its lusts and desires. You understand me well, and (know) the brothers whom we mean. Separate yourselves from them, for they are perverted.

This extended passage is, in fact, a direct application of the principles outlined by Michael Sattler in his Strasbourg letter. When the Schleitheim writer speaks of those who have "turned away from the faith," he is employing the term "faith" (Glauben) in Sattler's sense: faith is not so much a matter of "belief" or "trust" but rather, faith is even more a matter of practice. "Faith in the heavenly Father through Jesus Christ" must have a certain visible "form." True faith will bring forth a visible conformity to Christ: "They who are Christ's have crucified their flesh with all its lusts and desires." And again, there is the unequivocal call to separation from those whose faith lacks the "form of Christ," i.e. from those who "do not serve our Father, but their father, the devil." In sum, the arguments adduced point to Michael Sattler as the author of the prefatory letter.
The articles as such deal with seven points, namely baptism, the ban, the Supper, separation, shepherds in the church, the sword and the oath. The first article concerning baptism expands on what Sattler had already indicated in the Strasbourg letter. Before baptism can take place there must first be teaching concerning repentance and amendment of life. There must then follow belief in the personal forgiveness of sins through Christ as well as a "desire to walk in the resurrection of Jesus Christ and he buried with Him in death, so that they might rise with Him." When a person who has been thus taught understands and believes and desires to "walk in the resurrection," he is to be baptized.

We must note here again the dual emphasis which is comprehended by the baptismal act. The teaching which is to precede baptism points, significantly, both to the inner condition of repentance as well as to the outer fruits of that repentance, namely amendment of life. And again, belief in Christ's atoning death must be conjoined to a desire to walk in Christ's footsteps. Thus baptism confirms the repentance and faith which have already taken place in the believer, joins the believer to the body of Christ on earth, and commits the believer, as a "member of Christ," to walk in conformity to Christ.

The second article concerns the ban, which is to be employed among "all those who have given themselves over to the Lord, to walk after (Him) in His commandments; those who have been baptized into the one body of Christ . . . and still somehow slip and fall into error and sin, being inadvertently overtaken." The method of admonishment is to follow the pattern set in Matthew 18, with disciplining to take
place before the celebration of the Supper "so that we may all in one spirit and in one love break and eat from one bread and drink from one cup." 37

The point of departure for the article on the ban is the concept of the baptized community as the pure body of Christ on earth. It is clearly assumed that the "members of Christ" who have met the criteria outlined in the first article will for the most part keep the "commandments of the Lord" and will remain without sin. If, however, some error or sin should creep in, the unity of the pure body must be re-established through discipline. 38 Only in such a state of purity (i.e. sinlessness) will it be possible to "eat from one bread and drink from one cup." Thus the "desire to walk in the resurrection" is much more than a pious hope. It is in fact a live expectation and a requirement for all baptized members of Christ; the unity of the body of Christ depends on the purity and obedience of its members; the ban is instituted to maintain this purity and obedience.

The third article concerns the Lord's Supper, and makes it clear first of all that the Supper is commemorative, not sacramental. The focus of the article, however, is not on the communion itself so much as on the community, for it is the status of the community that determines the validity of the celebration of the Supper.

... all those who desire to break the one bread in remembrance of the broken body of Christ and all those who wish to drink of one drink in remembrance of the shed blood of Christ, they must beforehand be united in the one body of Christ, that is the congregation of God, whose head is Christ, and that by baptism. For as Paul indicates, we cannot be partakers at the same time of the table of the Lord and the table of devils. 39
Referring to the italicized words above, it is clear that unity is the all-important consideration with regard to the Lord's Supper. There is only one Lord's Supper and it is celebrated only among those who have been united into the one body by the one baptism (following confession of faith). All those who have not been so united through such a baptism are, quite simply, of the devil. 40

The fourth article concerns separation, and follows logically from the articles on baptism, the ban and the Supper. In fact, the article on separation only makes explicit what has already become apparent: true faith leads of necessity to separation from the world, with "the world" defined as all that has not been "united with God." 41 The following lines, certainly from Sattler's pen, make this point crystal clear.

So it is; since all who have not entered into the obedience of faith and have not united themselves with God so that they will to do His will, are a great abomination before God. Nothing else can or really will grow or spring forth from them than abominable things. Now there is nothing else in the world and all creation than good or evil, believing and unbelieving, darkness and light, the world and those who are (come) out of the world, God's temple and idols, Christ and Belial, and none will have part with the other. To us, then, the commandment of the Lord is also obvious, whereby He orders us to be and to become separated from the evil one, and thus He will be our God and we shall be His sons and daughters. 42

There are only two choices in the world, Christ and Belial, and all that has not been united with God through the "obedience of faith" (as defined in the preceding articles) is necessarily of Belial. In sum, the number of the saved is comprehended by the baptized and separated community of saints on earth.
It should be apparent that the first four Schleitheim articles
contain the same elements seen in Sattler's letter to Bucer and Capito,
and that these elements are developed logically in an identical manner.
In the Strasbourg letter, Sattler states that on his understanding, the
"commands of God" demand obedience. The twenty articles that follow,
however, hinge on one central "command" as expressed in Mark 16:16:
"He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth
not shall be damned." For Sattler this "command" leads inexorably to
the visible, separated community of the saints. Such was the basic
consideration that hindered Sattler from accepting the reformers' more
ecuminal solution, a solution that pointed to "love" rather than "com-
mands," i.e. that pointed to the "mystical body" rather than the "visible
body."

The first four Schleitheim Articles also hinge on Mark 16:16,
with the difference that certain details are filled in. Belief and baptism
again open the door to salvation, and lead directly into the pure com-
munity of the saints. The ban (not directly mentioned in the Strasbourg
letter) is the means whereby the body of Christ is maintained in sinless
unity: there can be no unity without the maintenance of obedience and
purity. The Lord's Supper (also not mentioned directly in the Strasbourg
letter) is explicitly a Supper of remembrance, but in a distinctive and
more profound sense, it is a Supper of union, for there is one bread,
one cup, one body of Christ maintained in purity. There can be no
communion outside the pure, disciplined body of Christ for "we cannot
be partakers at the same time of the table of the Lord and the table of
devils."43 The conclusion of the arguments is simply made more explicit
in article four on separation: "everything which has not been united with our God in Christ is nothing but an abomination which we should shun." 44

The first four Schleitheim articles, while leading to the same polar and separatistic conclusion as was the case in the Strasbourg letter, nonetheless tell us much more concerning Sattler's particular vision of the body of Christ. What is most striking is the theme of unity, a theme which runs like a leitmotiv throughout the entire document, from the prefatory letter to the concluding postscript. 45 In the context of the first four articles, the stress on unity emerges in the statement that the inward desire to walk in the resurrection will manifest itself visibly in union to the body through baptism; the union of the body with Christ its head will be maintained by the exercise of the ban; the union of the pure body to Christ precludes communion with any who are not so united; anyone or anything not united with God in Christ is to be avoided as being of the devil. The world is divided into two camps. On the one side are those united with God in Christ through baptism, discipline and the celebration of the Supper of unity; on the other side are the followers of Satan.

The remaining three articles deal with shepherds, the sword and the oath respectively. If the first four articles form a coherent whole, the last three are directed towards specific individual issues in a rather ad hoc manner. The fifth article concerning "shepherds in the church of God" 46 establishes the guidelines for choosing the "shepherd," 47 outlines the duties of the office, 48 sets up guidelines for the discipline of the pastor 49 and concludes by saying that "if the shepherd
should be driven away or led to the Lord by the cross, at the same hour another shall be ordained to his place. Thus the fifth article provides the basic guidelines for leadership within the community of saints, with pastors being chosen by the community, supported by the community and disciplined by the community.

The articles on the sword and the oath are applications of the general principle that true Christians must obey the commands of Scripture, particularly the commands (and the example) of Jesus. These two articles were likely included because of their controversial nature; the secular authorities found these teachings particularly threatening and seditious. The first mention of the sword had actually occurred at the end of article four, on separation. As a footnote to the theme of separation, the writer states that "thereby shall also fall away from us the diabolical weapons of violence -- such as sword, armor, and the like, and all of their use to protect friends or against enemies -- by virtue of the word of Christ: 'you shall not resist evil.'" While this short reference is directed against the waging of war -- and one thinks immediately in this connection of the imminent Turkish threat upon Europe -- the detailed sixth article on the sword deals explicitly only with the "sword of government" rather than with the "sword of war."

The opening statement in article six is striking indeed.

The sword is an ordering of God outside the perfection of Christ. It punishes and kills the wicked, and guards and protects the good. In the law the sword is established over the wicked for punishment and for death, and the secular rulers are established to wield the same. But within the perfection of Christ only the ban is used for the admonition and exclusion of the one who has sinned, without the death of the flesh, simply the warning and the command to sin no more.
This formulation, first of all, makes clear the particular world-view within which all the teachings of Schleitheim must be placed. The participants in the Schleitheim Synod -- Michael Sattler included -- had a keen and lively sense of God's providence. The providence of God embraces all things that are; but there is a further distinction between what God ordains and allows to take place and what represents God's perfect will for mankind. It is God's perfect will for mankind that is central for Sattler, and this is summed up quite simply as "the perfection of Christ."

The dictum that the sword has been ordained by God outside the perfection of Christ raises three questions which are dealt with in turn. The first question is whether a Christian may wield the sword "against the wicked for the defense of the good, or for the sake of love." The answer to this question comes in two parts and points directly to Jesus Himself. First of all, "Christ teaches and commands us to learn from Him, for He is meek and lowly of heart . . ." We have here an instance of a "command of the Lord," in this instance the "command" to learn from Jesus' life itself. When Jesus' life is so considered, one finds that Jesus' response to the woman taken in adultery was not a judgement (in that He did not say "stone her") but rather Jesus responded with "mercy and forgiveness" in that He said simply "Go, sin no more." The answer is clear: "Exactly thus should we also proceed according to the rule of the ban." Within the perfection of Christ, only the ban is possible, following Christ's example.

The second question that arises is whether a Christian may pass judgement in "disputes and strife about worldly matters . . ."
i.e. whether a Christian may be a judge outside the perfection of Christ. The answer to this question parallels the above reply: "Christ did not wish to decide or pass judgement between brother and brother concerning inheritance, but refused to do so. So should we also do."57 Here again it is the example of Jesus that is decisive. The third question is whether a Christian may be a magistrate if chosen to such an office. Once again the example of Christ is appealed to: Jesus fled when the multitude wished to make Him a king (Jn. 6:15): "Thus we should also do as He did and follow after Him, and we shall not walk in darkness."58 The essence of all three replies is cited in conclusion to the third reply: "Christ has suffered (not ruled) and has left us an example, that you should follow after in His steps. (I. Peter 2:21)." Those who follow Christ, who are living members of his visible body, will live as Christ their head lived, i.e. they will submit to the will of the Father, will take up their cross daily and will follow Jesus into the suffering which must come.

The marks of Sattler's thought are visible in the above, first in the statement that only the ban is to be used among Christians,59 but more significantly in the concrete application of the principle that "as the head is minded, so must its members also be," which Sattler had already expressed in Strasbourg.60 It is significant that the bulk and essence of the argument against the use of the sword by a Christian is not based upon a literalistic reading of Scriptural commands: neither Exodus 20:13 or Matthew 5:21-22 are cited or alluded to. Rather, the "command" on which the discussion is based is "learn from me . . . (Matt. 11:29)."61 It is Christ as the living head and example that is
decisive for Sattler in his Strasbourg letter and in later writings; the extended application of that principle in article six of Schleitheim thus points to Michael Sattler.

One more point is made regarding the sword, and here Sattler's hand is even more conspicuously evident. The sword was repudiated above first because within the perfection of Christ only the ban is to be used and secondly, because Jesus' own actions point to a rejection of the sword. The concluding reason why a Christian should not be a magistrate is simply that "the rule of the government is according to the flesh, that of Christians is according to the spirit. Their houses and dwelling remain in this world, that of Christians is in heaven. Their citizenship is in the world, that of the Christians is in heaven." These sentences appear almost verbatim in the Strasbourg letter as does also the conclusion to article six on the sword: "In sum: as Christ our Head is minded, so also must be minded the members of the body of Christ through Him, so that there be no division in the body . . . Since then Christ is as is written of Him, so must His members also be the same, so that His body may remain whole and unified . . . For any kingdom which is divided within itself will be destroyed." Sattler's hand is unmistakable here.

The final article concerns the oath. Although the (Old Testament) law forbids false swearing only, "Christ, who teaches the perfection of the law, forbids His (followers) all swearing." The article goes on to counter three arguments that are advanced in favour of swearing, and concludes: "Christ taught us similarly when He says: Your speech shall be yea, yea; and nay, nay; for what is more than
that comes of evil . . . Christ is simply yea and nay, and all those who seek Him simply will understand His Word. Amen.65 The substance and argumentation of the seventh article is straight-forward and unexceptional: the word of Christ is simple and clear, therefore nothing more than simple obedience is required. The social implications of the forbidding of oaths, however, were staggering, virtually guaranteeing that the "separated church of the faithful" would be persecuted as teaching sedition and anarchy.

At the conclusion of the seven articles stands a short postscript, clearly written by the author of the prefatory letter. The second paragraph of the postscript makes it quite clear in what esteem the articles are to be held. The writer says: "Now that you have abundantly understood the will of God as revealed through us at this time, you must fulfill this will, now known, persistently and unswervingly. For you know well what is the reward of the servant who knowingly sins."66 The writer plainly considers the articles to have been a revelation of the divine will of God, therefore what is demanded is nothing less than unconditional obedience.67 The fact that the articles as such are based on Scripture and refer to Scripture does not mitigate the astounding fact that the writer here is certain that the Schleitheim Articles are, in fact, the divinely revealed key to the understanding of Scripture. The context, as is usual, is salvation, and the implication is clear: holding to the Articles means fulfilling God's will; going against the Articles means the reward of willful disobedience, i.e. damnation.
The clue as to how such a conclusion could have been considered valid is provided by the consistent use of the term *Vereinigung* in the passive sense of "we have been united." The clear implication is that the Synod at Schleitheim has been acted upon by the Holy Spirit, who Himself has brought the meeting into unity. The prefatory letter says "we have sensed the unity of the Father and of our common Christ as present with us in their Spirit. For the Lord is a Lord of peace and not of quarreling, as Paul indicates." Thus the achievement of unanimity and peace is considered a sign and seal of the presence and leading of the Spirit of God. But more than this, it is thus apparent that, according to Schleitheim, the final authority in questions of Biblical interpretation is the community of saints, informed and united by the Holy Spirit.

A second interesting fact to emerge from the postscript is the function of the community in the forgiveness of sin. After reminding the readers of the dire consequences awaiting those who "knowingly sin," i.e. who do not follow the teaching of the Articles, the writer says the following:

> Everything which you have done unknowingly and now confess to have done wrongly, is forgiven you, through that believing prayer, which is offered among us in our meeting for all shortcomings and guilt, through the gracious forgiveness of God and through the blood of Jesus Christ. Amen.

It is the prayer of the community of saints that activates God's forgiveness through Christ's atonement. It would also seem that we have here a description of how the discipline of the community worked in re-establishing the sinless purity and unity of the body of Christ. If a member were admonished concerning a sin, he could be absolved of that sin.
through the "believing prayer" of the pure church -- if he were first repentant and confessed the sin. Following repentance, confession and absolution, such a sinning member could then be "re-united" with the pure body of Christ and could participate in the Lord's Supper.

The broad features of Sattler's view of sin within the community should be evident from the above. It is clear that sin is not expected to occur with those who have been regenerated, who have been chosen out of the world to be physical members of the body of Christ. The norm is sinlessness; the falling into sin is seen as happening "iradventently." The unity of the body of Christ depends upon the purity of the members making up that body, and the ban is therefore instituted to maintain that unity and purity. According to the "command of Christ" in Matthew 18, a brother who sins is to be admonished twice privately, and then before the entire congregation. This may lead either to exclusion from the communion of saints if the sinner is unrepentant, or to repentance, confession, absolution and re-admission as indicated above, but in either case what the body of Christ binds or looses on earth is also bound or loosed in heaven (Matt. 18:18).

The postscript to the Schleitheim Articles ends with two separate exhortations to purity and separation and the quoting, verbatim, of Titus 2:11-14. The latter text exhorts the reader to "deny ungodliness and worldly lusts," awaiting the coming glory in hope, and points to Jesus Christ "who gave himself for us, to redeem us from all unrighteousness and to purify unto himself a people of his own, that would be zealous of good works."
In conclusion, the Schleitheim Articles detail and elaborate further the basic themes expressed by Michael Sattler in his letter to Bucer and Capito. Our analysis has shown that the first four articles of Schleitheim in particular retrace, with a greater wealth of detail, the line of thought and the essential ideas expressed in the Strasbourg letter. Likewise article six on the sword bears definite marks of Sattler's hand. On the other hand, Sattler's responsibility for articles five and seven, on shepherds and the oath respectively, cannot be established with any such probability. We have no other writings from Sattler which contain similar expressions. This, however, does not presume against the possibility of his authorship of these two articles as well. Finally, the prefatory letter and postscript also bear the marks of Sattler's thought and mode of expression. The internal evidence thus strongly supports the tradition which early identified Michael Sattler as the author of the Schleitheim Articles.

**Letter to the Church at Horb**

Michael Sattler's letter to the church at Horb was written following the arrest of Sattler in Horb and the subsequent moving of four Anabaptist prisoners, Sattler included, to the tower at Binsdorf. Sattler must have known that he likely would not be found innocent at the trial that was being prepared in Rottenburg; thus his letter is, as he says, "my farewell from all of you who truly love and follow God . . . and a testimony of my love toward you, which God has put in my heart for the sake of your salvation." The church at Horb was a beleaguered one, having suffered two consecutive mass arrests, resulting in 24 persons being imprisoned. Sattler's farewell letter is written from
prison to a persecuted remnant, and as such the letter is full of exhortations to remain faithful to the essential teachings which had given rise to the community.

Sattler's farewell letter hearkens back to the central themes we have noted above. There is, in fact, a tremendous consistency in Sattler's teaching which remains whether Sattler writes to Bucer and Capito regarding questions of Biblical interpretation, whether he is composing articles for general acceptance among Anabaptists, or whether he is exhorting the congregation at Horb in a direct and personal way. Each of the documents we have considered, however, gives a slightly different point of view on Sattler's central doctrines.

Foremost among the teachings Sattler emphasizes in his letter is the holy conduct which is required of the regenerate. As he reminds the congregation immediately following his salutation: "you know with what zeal and love I admonished you recently when I was with you, that you would be sincere and righteous in all patience and love of God, so that you can be recognized in the midst of this adulterous generation of godless men ..." Sattler's exhortation to purity is summed up in the admonitions that the members of Christ's body "walk as befits and becomes saints of God" and that the grace of the Holy Spirit "keep you flawless, without sin, and present you joyous and pure ... at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ ..." The true church will be united in a godly walk, remaining pure and sinless, walking in the footsteps of the Lord Christ.

Concomitant to the exhortations to moral purity are the repeated exhortations to separate from the ungodly: "Guard, guard yourselves
against such . . . who act against the command and law of God, but admonish the same with strict attentiveness and excommunication . . . "83

And again, Sattler exhorts the congregation to meet constantly together, for "In such meeting together you will make manifest the heart of the false brothers, and will be freed of them more rapidly."84 Thus Sattler's concern for the purity of the body of Christ is expressed, first, in his exhortation that the members of the body walk in holiness, in imitation of Christ, and secondly, that the ban be used to maintain purity.

With regard to the ban, there is a new tone that emerges in this letter by Sattler that has not been seen before. Along with the stress on separation from the ungodly comes the reminder that such excommunication must be done "with all love and compassion for their coldness of heart."85 Further along in the letter Sattler devotes more time to love, "without which it is not possible that you be a Christian congregation."86 After paraphrasing Paul's hymn to love in I Corinthians 13, Sattler concludes by saying that love must first be directed toward God, and then toward the neighbor. This has implications for the application of the ban.

But if you love the neighbor, you will not scold or ban zealously, will not seek your own, will not remember evil, will not be ambitious or puffed up, but kind, righteous, generous in all gifts, humble and sympathetic with the weak and imperfect.87

The ban, Sattler reminds the church at Horb, must be applied in love.

It is clear that Michael Sattler recognizes the dangers of an unbridled application of the ban, and that he is hoping that discipline will be governed by love. At the same time, however, purity must be
maintained; those who break God's commandments must not be allowed to
ccontaminate the pure body of Christ. In spite of Sattler's exhortations
to love, the emphasis on purity has the more important place in his
thought. The issue had already come up in Strasbourg, when the
reformers had put forward their view that "love is the end of the
commandment, wherefore it is necessary that all of the commandments of
God be guided by the same ... " To this view Sattler replied une-
quivocally "I am not able so to conceive ... " It is characteristic
of Sattler's thought that if there is a conflict between purity of the
body and love, the former must be given pride of place; the necessary
excommunication, however, should be done in love and sympathy for the
sinner.

If Sattler's letter to Horb attempts to mitigate some of the
harshness which comes with a strong emphasis on discipline, it also
reveals another dimension in Sattler's thought which explains and rein-
forces the stress on discipline and the pure church. A central motive
force in the establishment of the pure church is nothing less than the
expectation of Christ's imminent return. The letter to Horb, unlike
Sattler's other writings, abounds in apocalyptic language, imagery and
Scriptural quotations. The Scriptural quotations standing at the begin-
ing and the end of the letter are quotes from the apocryphal book of
Esdras, and both quotes have direct apocalyptic applications; the book
of Revelation is freely alluded to throughout. Sattler himself is most
explicit, as the following quote indicates:

Pray that reapers may be driven out into the harvest, for
the time of threshing has come near. The abomination of
desolation is visible among you. The elect servants and
maidservants of God will be marked on the forehead with the name of their Father. The world has arisen against those who are redeemed from its error. The gospel is testified to before all the world for a testimony. According to this the day of the Lord must no longer tarry. 89

Michael Sattler has clearly interpreted the events involving the baptizing community, i.e. their baptism (mark on the forehead) and their subsequent suffering at the hands of a persecuting world, as indicating the Lord's imminent return.

Sattler's apocalyptic expectation is not particularly significant as such, for his belief in the imminent return of Christ was one shared by many of his contemporaries. What is significant is the ecclesiological conclusion that Sattler draws from it. The following passage is central. Sattler is writing concerning separation, and he is convinced that following a strict and attentive excommunication of the disobedient, there will follow

a quick and rapid separation of those who do not wish to walk the surefooted and living way of Christ, namely through cross, misery, imprisonment, self-denial, and finally through death; thereby (i.e. by means of separation from the impure) you can assuredly present yourselves to God your heavenly Father as a purely righteous, upright congregation of Christ, purified through His blood, that she might be holy and irreproachable before God and men, separated and purified from all idolatry and abomination, so that the Lord of all lords might dwell among them and (that she might) be a tabernacle to Him. 90

The central Scriptural allusion here is to Revelation 21:1-3, where the New Jerusalem is established, "made ready like a bride adorned for her husband," following which God comes to dwell among men. For Michael Sattler the church (i.e. the true church) must be maintained in purity for it is the tabernacle to which the Lord will presently come; the end time is nigh.
It is within this context of apocalyptic expectation that Sattler's stress on purity and sinlessness takes on its full dimension. Purity and sinlessness are, perhaps, called for by the demand to "walk in the resurrection," but the urgency of the call for perfection remains unexplained until the apocalyptic dimension becomes visible. Here we may again quote Sattler's concluding comments in his letter to Horb, this time including the apocalyptic phrases.

May the grace of Jesus Christ, and the love of the heavenly Father and the grace of Their Spirit keep you flawless, without sin, and present you joyous and pure before the vision of Their holiness at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, that you might be found among the number of the called ones at the supper of the one-essential true God and Savior Jesus Christ. 91

The visible church of the faithful, baptized saints, the true body of Christ, is the bride for whom the Lord will soon return and with whom He will dwell. The call for separation from the world is a call fueled and fed by apocalyptic expectation. 92

One further element in Sattler's thought emerges fully in the letter to Horb, and this is Sattler's complete trust in God's providence. This trust was alluded to in the fifteenth point of his letter to Bucer and Capito 93 and appears again in the Schleitheim Articles. 94 In both cases trust in God's providence is affirmed in the context of statements on the sword. The situation at the time of the writing of the letter to Horb had changed, however, for now Sattler is being threatened by that very sword. His reaction is simply to re-affirm the correctness of trust in God: "If you love God you will rejoice in the truth and will believe hope and endure everything that comes from God." 95 Sattler gives an example of such endurance later in his letter, drawn from his
own experience since his arrest.

During this time we underwent all sorts of attacks from the adversaries. They menaced us once with a cord, then with fire, then with the sword. In such dangers I completely abandoned myself to the Lord in His will and readied myself for death for the sake of His testimony... 96

What is needful is such trust in God's providence that life itself can be counted as naught, if God so wills it through external events.

Sattler's unshakable belief in the immediacy of God's presence and the unlimited power of God's providence leads him to speak of the sufferings of persecution as being God's "chastisement" and "discipline."

Be not weary if you are chastized by the Lord, for He whom God loves He chastizes, and, like a father, He finds pleasure in His son... All that is, is manifest before Him, and nothing is hid from Him... Why do you flee the rod of your Father? If you will not be drawn according to the will of your Father, you cannot be an heir to His possessions: why do you prefer a brief and passing rest to the blessed, measured chastisement and discipline (for you salvation) of the Lord... How long will you be, carnally minded? 97

With baptism and the putting off of the flesh comes a total submission to God's providence and will; if sufferings in the flesh occur, it is so ordained -- for the further perfecting and purifying of the saints. 98

It is within the context of the "chastisement of the Lord" that perseverance is called for: "there are few who are willing to persevere in the chastisement of the Lord, whereas the majority when they suffer something minor in the flesh, become dull and slack, and no more look upon the Prince of our faith and its perfecter Jesus." 99 It is with this in view that Sattler says "so it seemed needful to me to urge you by this exhortation to follow us in God's combat and thereby to console you that you might not become weary under the discipline of the Lord."

...
And again Sattler says "forget what is carnal, that you might truly be named Christians and children of the most high God; persevere in the discipline of your heavenly Father, and turn not aside, neither to the left, nor to the right, that you might enter in through the gate . . ."  

The world itself, i.e. the persecution of the world, is the means by which God brings the body of Christ into perfection. The persecuted, suffering body of Christ, in remaining steadfast, is following in the footsteps of its head, Jesus Christ, who was likewise tried and persecuted according to the will of the Father.

**Sattler's trial responses**

The last direct statement by Michael Sattler in which his theological position is visible comes from the time of his imprisonment and trial. Sattler's statements are limited, first of all, by the questions asked by the prosecution; Sattler was appearing before a Catholic court and was being tried for heresy, i.e. he was being tried for violating the accepted Roman Catholic doctrine and practice. The questions put by the prosecution are directed towards proving that Sattler and his fellow prisoners are guilty of such violations. In the second place, Sattler's responses as such are conditioned by the trial atmosphere for, as we have argued elsewhere, the trial defense bears the marks of having been prepared for the occasion. Sattler's defense was that he and his fellows had not violated Scripture, and in order to demonstrate this, his trial replies invariably point to Scripture. Thus the exaggerated biblicism which emerges at the trial is not so much evidence of a literalistic spirit in Sattler as it is the result of a deliberate trial defense.
The "trial of Michael Sattler" was in fact a trial of some 21 Anabaptist prisoners, for whom Michael Sattler acted as chief spokesman. Seventeen of the prisoners had been arrested in Rottenburg; Sattler, his wife, Matthias Hiller and Veit Feringer had been arrested at Horb, moved to Binsdorf, and were now being tried in Rottenburg. The official charges were read by the prosecution to the judges on the "Friday before cantate," i.e. on May 17, at which time only the general charges against all the prisoners were read. The results of Sattler's pre-trial hearing may also have been read at this time. 104

The general charges against all the prisoners concerned the Supper, baptism,unction and the veneration of Mary and the Saints. It is important to note that these four charges, directed against all the prisoners, were augmented by several more charges, most of which were clearly directed against Sattler himself. 105 The specific charges against Sattler as read at the trial cannot be reconstructed verbatim from the sources as we have them, but it appears that the trial centred increasingly on him. We know that he was charged with baptizing "several persons in the Zürich area and in other places," 106 that he was charged with leaving his monastery and marrying, that he was charged with refusing to swear oaths of obedience to rulers, and finally, that he was charged with advocating submission to the Turk.

Of the charges directed against Sattler himself we can note that the charge concerning baptism simply falls within the general charge read against all the prisoners. The charge concerning his leaving the monastery and marrying points to a further violation of Roman Catholic canon law which concerned Sattler alone. The final two charges against
Sattler point to the charge of sedition since they imply that Sattler
counsels disobedience to the civil authority and would welcome the
invasion of the Turk. We can note further concerning the oath that
this accusation appears for the first time in the pre-trial questioning of
Sattler, asked in connection with obedience to temporal authority. The
Rottenburgers are not charged with refusing to swear oaths of allegiance.
In fact some of the prisoners are reported to have sworn obedience to
the government. Thus we may conclude that the Schleitheim teaching
concerning the oath, maintained by Sattler, was not representative of
the Anabaptism taught and practised in Rottenburg at this time.

Turning to the substance of Sattler's replies, we see first that
cconcerning the charge that the real presence in the Eucharist is denied,
Sattler's reply immediately brings out a new dimension of his eucharistic
thought. In reply to the charge, Sattler simply quotes the Apostle's
Creed: Christ has risen and sits at the right hand of God the Father;
therefore He cannot be in the bread or the wine, for He is in heaven.
This reply is not as simplistic as it appears at first glance, for the
argument is not original with Sattler. It had been advanced by Zwingli
in the latter's writing of February 1526 concerning the Lord's Supper,
and again by Balthasar Hubmaier in spring of that year.

The reply to the charge concerning baptism contains no major
surprises. Baptism is, first of all, a sign which is to follow faith on
the part of the believer. We have here again an allusion to the favourite
Anabaptist text concerning baptism, namely Mark 16:16. Secondly,
baptism is no sacrament (depending upon consecrated water) but rather
it is primarily an interior event (I Peter 3:21). This spiritualistic
argument has not been alluded to before by Sattler in quite this form. Rather Sattler has emphasized up to now the necessity of the concrete act of water baptism over against the more spiritualistic understanding of Denck, Haetzer, Bucer and Capito. In the context of the trial, when confronted with the Catholic sacramental view of baptism, Sattler emphasizes rather the importance of the inner dimension of faith. As we have noted above, Sattler considered both inward faith and the outward act of baptism to be essential for salvation. It was not necessary to bring out this full dimension in the context of the trial however.

Concerning the rejection of unction, Sattler's reply is interesting in that it is the only statement by him which indicates his reasons for rejecting the sacramental system as such. Oil is a "creature of God," and as such it is already "blessed" (gesegnet), "and the popes and bishops should not bless such things further and thus hold their blessing to be better than God's blessing." The argument thus applied to the sacrament of unction clearly also applies to baptism, the Eucharist and the other sacraments: oil, water, bread and wine are sufficiently "blessed" by God. The clergy of the Roman church can claim no power higher than God's by which they can "improve upon" the natural, "blessed" state of common elements.

The basic point that Sattler makes here, that God can be approached directly without the mediation of sacraments blessed by an ordained priesthood, is a view that Michael Sattler shares with the reformers generally. But it is striking how intimate a presence Michael Sattler considers God to be. As we have noted above, for Sattler all events that take place must be considered directly ordained by God,
and as such they work toward the disciplining and purification of the saints; God's will is revealed in the daily course of events to which the believer is called to "yield." Now we see that for Sattler, creation as such is directly touched by God's blessing. There is no gulf between creation and the Creator which demands the sacralization of creation. Seen through the eyes of faith, God sanctifies and blesses all things for the good of them that love and obey Him. The awareness of God's nearness and involvement in creation is an important and consistent underlying feature of Sattler's thought; as such it emerges at various points, naturally and unexpectedly.

The next charge, concerning the veneration of Mary and the Saints, is answered in several parts. Concerning the virgin Mary, Sattler grants that she has "given birth to God" -- and here two manuscripts add that this birth was "according to the flesh"112 -- but Mary cannot intercede for us since she still awaits judgement. Only Jesus can intercede for us with the Father.113 Likewise the Saints are to be honoured as "blessed" but the true saints are those who are living in obedience.

Sattler's reply brings out several interesting points. The comment that Mary has given birth to the Saviour "according to the flesh" is worthy of note simply because Sattler felt constrained to make the distinction. It appears that a distinction between a "corporeal" and a "spiritual" birth is implied here. More important are Sattler's assertions that Mary and the Saints cannot intercede since they are not yet ascended, and that Christ alone can intercede for us. The former assertion destroys the rationale on which rested the entire edifice of Catholic
devotion to the Blessed Virgin and on which rested also indulgences, prayers for the dead and appeals to the dead. It appears that Sattler held the doctrine of psychopannychism, or sleep of the soul, rather than the traditional Catholic view. The second assertion expresses the positive teaching: Christ alone is with the Father and can mediate for us. Finally we may note that Sattler states explicitly at his trial that "the saints" are those who for God's sake suffer "adversity, anxiety and tribulation" here on this earth. Those who have died only await judgement; those who live and obey are the true "saints." The believing, baptized, persecuted church of the faithful comprehends the saints of God.

There is no agreement in our sources as to the order in which Sattler took up the charges directed specifically against him. According to von Gravenneck, Sattler next replied concerning the oath, saying that "one should not swear allegiance to government" since the Gospel commands us not to swear at all. At his pre-trial questioning Sattler adds that "one should be obedient to God and obedient to the authorities only in temporal things," thus indicating that the command not to swear in Matthew supersedes the "ungodly" demand for oaths on the part of the temporal authorities. C.F. Sattler's trial account, while it does not specifically mention Sattler's reply to this charge, does contain the following sentence: "For no one is obligated to obey the authorities against the Word of God; except only in worldly matters which do not offend against God's commandments and will." Thus it appears that Sattler's reply to the charge concerning the oath and obedience to government was a brief explanation based on articles six and seven of
Schleitheim: obedience is owed to the civil authority, for it is ordained by God, but for the members of the body of Christ, obedience to God's commands is primary and takes precedence. In the matter of swearing oaths, God's command is unequivocal.

Concerning the Turk, Sattler was charged with counselling that the Turk should not be resisted and that if it were right to make war, he would rather go to war against the Christians than the Turks. Sattler replies first that he has counselled non-resistance for we are clearly commanded not to kill. Our defense should be God, on whom we should call in prayer for defense. Secondly, Sattler maintains that he would rather fight the "so-called Christians" than the Turk since the Turk "is a genuine Turk and knows nothing of the Christian faith. But you claim to be Christians, boast of Christ, and still persecute the faithful witnesses of Christ. Thus you are Turks according to the Spirit." Sattler's reply here hearkens back first to his teaching concerning "yieldedness" and non-resistance in imitation to Christ as these teachings were expressed in his previous writings. Secondly, Sattler's antagonism toward the "so-called Christians" is a passionate expression of his conviction that true Christians will be visibly Christ-like. The comparison between the Turk and "so-called Christians" was not, however, original with Sattler. It is found throughout the popular literature of the period.

The final charge to which Sattler responds is the charge that he has left the monastery and married. In reply to this charge he points out first that the monastery was a place full of every conceivable vice and sin, therefore "no one should be astonished that he had left
his Order and habit and had given himself into the married estate."\textsuperscript{122} Secondly, Sattler points to I Timothy 4:3 where Paul says that "in the last days it shall come to pass that they will forbid marriage and food, which God has created that they might be enjoyed with thanksgiving."\textsuperscript{123}

This reply is one of the few statements we have concerning Michael Sattler's monastic experience. In view of his background as a reformer at St. Peters, his criticism of the standards which he witnessed in the cloister has a sharper ring: the cloister was not a holy place. Furthermore, the monastic order as such, with its enforced fasts and vow of celibacy, "was fabricated by men, and this counter to the ordering and commands of God, as Paul indicates."\textsuperscript{124} In fact, such prohibitions are arbitrary, come between God and His creation, and point to the nearness of the end times. Thus Sattler's reply mirrors the unsuccessful attempt at reform in St. Peters and indicates Sattler's awareness of the current popular Scriptural objection to monasticism.\textsuperscript{125} Further, Sattler affirms again the nearness of God and the goodness of His creation, and gives expression to his conviction that the end times are nigh.

Conclusion

Several observations concerning Michael Sattler's religious thought must be made in conclusion. It is clear, first of all, that Sattler takes for granted a tremendous amount of traditional theology, and feels no need to state his position in a comprehensive way. When we turn to a universally accepted symbol such as the Constantinopolitan (Nicene) Creed, it is clear beyond a shadow of a doubt that Sattler
subscribed to its contents. Sattler’s thought is clearly founded on
belief in the triune God, in the doctrine of the incarnation, crucifixion,
resurrection, ascension and return of Jesus Christ, and in the activity
of the Holy Spirit. Points of difference come not at all in the essential
matters of orthodoxy. Rather, points of difference arise in the interpre-
tation of the Nicene phrases "(We believe) in one, holy, catholic and
apostolic Church. We confess one baptism for the remission of sins."
Sattler would surely have subscribed to both statements, but the essen-
tial meaning with which those statements are invested is something
unique in the sixteenth century: the "one church" is the baptized
community of saints on earth; the "one baptism" is baptism on confes-
sion of faith following repentance.

Michael Sattler was no "theologian"; he was not concerned with
"discourses about God" in an abstract or systematic sense. In fact he
expressly rejected such "speculation." He was, however, a preacher
and a reformer who was concerned above all with salvation. The central
and primary context for Sattler is always soteriological. This in itself
does not immediately set Sattler apart, for a case could be made for
such a statement referring to St. Benedict or Martin Luther: they too
are primarily concerned with the matter of salvation. Within the soterio-
logical context, however, fundamental differences of theory and method
begin to appear; it is to these points that we must come in the analyses
of the chapters to follow.

Michael Sattler maps out the essentials of salvation in the follow-
ing way. Salvation depends upon faith in Christ the Saviour, but this
faith must issue in freely chosen water baptism. Said more comprehen-
sively, teaching, repentance and faith must precede baptism. Baptism is of no avail without personal faith; personal faith is of no avail without water baptism. Further, the act of baptism has both an individual and a corporate meaning. It signifies, first of all, a personal dying in Christ to sin and the desires of the flesh; conversely it signifies the birth of the spiritual man and the putting on of the mind of Christ. Secondly, baptism makes the believer a member of the pure body of Christ on earth. Through baptism the believer is united to those who are also minded as Christ was minded, yielded and submitted to God's direct discipline and chastisement, ready to follow after Christ the Lord. The pure body of Christ is maintained in unity and purity through the ban by means of which an erring member may be brought to repentance and confession and may then be given absolution. Failing such repentance, purity is maintained through excommunication. The Supper is a celebration of remembrance, celebrated truly only among the united members of Christ's body. The purity of the body is essential, for the signs of the times are writ large; Christ will soon return to His pure bride. The reward of perseverance is the crown of glory, but there is only one way that leads to heaven, and that is "the surefooted and living way of Christ, namely through cross, misery, imprisonment, self-denial, and finally through death."¹²⁷

The particular synthesis we have outlined here is unique to Sattler, but the individual component elements of his thought reflect the sources which informed him. In the remaining chapters of the dissertation we will analyse Sattler's thought in light of the Benedictine, Evangelical and Anabaptist traditions which together made up the milieu in which he
lived. The relevant comparisons can be made under three general categories. First we will be concerned to analyze Sattler's view of scripture, for his acceptance of sola scriptura suggests that he belongs within the broad Protestant stream of reformers. Secondly, we will analyze two facets of Sattler's understanding of Christ in recognition of the central role played by Christ in his thought. Finally, we will examine pertinent elements of Sattler's teaching concerning the church, the Body of Christ.
CHAPTER VIII

SATTLER AND SCRIPTURE

Nothing so motivated Reformation events as did the direct appeal to Scripture. In attempting to trace the roots of Michael Sattler's particular scriptural principles we will be guided by Sattler's own categories; accordingly, this chapter is divided into three main sections. The first section, under the general heading of sola scriptura, seeks to identify general interpretive approaches to scripture as found in Sattler's milieu. The second section focuses on the "commands of scripture," tracing this Sattlerian theme in the relevant literature. The final section takes its departure from Sattler's ruling theological principle, the "following of Christ."

Sola Scriptura

So much has been made of sola scriptura as the central Reformation principle that one can easily get the mistaken impression that pre-Reformation persons had virtually no interest in Holy Writ. When we look at the role of scripture within the Benedictine tradition -- especially as represented by the Bursfeld reformer Trithemius -- it is clear that such an impression does not fit the facts.

The Rule of St. Benedict, although prima facie it appears only to legislate the daily life of the cloister, nevertheless is very directly grounded in scripture and holds scripture in the very highest esteem. The monastic tradition to which St. Benedict was heir in fact was built
out of the materials of Scripture and was centered on its study and assimilation.¹ Beyond the scripture quoted in the RB and alluded to throughout, beyond the scripture recited daily in the Divine Office, and the general emphasis on lectio divina, St. Benedict also commends the direct study of scripture to his monks: "What page -- even sentence -- of the inspired Old and New Testaments is there that is not an excellent rule of life?² St. Benedict expected his monks to immerse themselves in scripture.

Granted that Michael Sattler vowed obedience to the Rule of St. Benedict, the crucial question is whether he did in fact follow the Rule at this point. While we cannot answer this question with certainty, we do know that at St. Peters the Cluniac tradition was being overlaid with reforming impulses from the Bursfeld Union. We also know that the Bursfeld reform movement stressed a return to the Rule of St. Benedict as well as a return to the direct study of scripture as the means of monastic renewal.³ It goes without saying that Trithemius considered the Rule of St. Benedict to be a faithful rendering of scriptural truth. Thus the Bursfeldian emphasis on scripture in no way represents a rejection of the Rule; quite the contrary, in fact. The Rule contains the precepts of God given through his servant Benedict.⁴

Trithemius' writings abound with appeals for the diligent study of scripture. Such a study leads one to monastic perfection, for it leads to divine love, contempt for the world, and a following of Christ.⁵ Furthermore, the Gospel has an authority above that of all "wordly constitutions," including the statutes of the Church and the monastic Rules themselves; none of the latter can be compared in worth to the
scriptures. The way to a full restoration of the monastic life is to return to the perfect life taught in the Gospel. It is interesting to note that Trithemius had no doubt that a simple and direct reading of scripture would lead one directly to the ascetic life: scripture provides the "guide for life" of the monk. It is also worth noting -- in light of subsequent Reformation events -- the amount of authority Trithemius is willing to grant to scripture. When we add to this picture Trithemius' keen awareness of the shortcomings of the Church and his public criticisms of papal and curial abuses, we have two central elements necessary for a doctrine of sola scriptura. In the end, however, Trithemius demurs and submits his writings wholly to the judgement of the Church. In the crucial question of final authority to interpret scripture and to define doctrine Trithemius will not challenge the "Sacrosanct Roman Church."

We do not know to what extent the writings of Trithemius were read at St. Peters and thus influenced our monk in the 1520s, but we do know that in so far as the Bursfeld reform penetrated the monastery, by so much was there a growing awareness of the centrality of scripture in the monastic life, both as the original monastic foundation and as the means of monastic renewal.

With Luther's declaration at the Leipzig Disputation came the fundamental challenge to the interpretive authority of the Roman Church: "No believing Christian can be coerced beyond holy writ. By divine law we are forbidden to believe anything which is not established by divine Scripture or manifest revelation." The appeal to "scripture alone" became the central mark distinguishing the new "Evangelical" party. In
the Breisgau this call was early taken up by such diverse types as Karstans, Jakob Otter and, finally, the peasants. Although the appeal to "scripture alone" separated the evangelicals from the Catholics there were also clear differences of approach within the evangelical camp.

Hans Maurer, named Zündauf and also Karstans, was one of the early lay preachers of the "Gospel" in the South-German/Swiss area. His preaching took him from Freiburg in 1521, where he had also practiced medicine, to Strasbourg, Basel, Horb on the Neckar, and finally to his arrest by the Württemberg authorities in Stuttgart in 1523. From the few notices we have, his message denied the validity of the Catholic sacraments, excluding the Supper, and recommended that priests and monks take wives. It appears that his preaching was largely anti-Roman and polemical, and based on a simple doctrine of sola scriptura: he asked to be corrected from scripture at all points in which he might be in error. Sebastian Lotzer, writing to the people in Horb after Kartshans' arrest, says "it did not happen without God's special grace that God almighty allowed His holy Word to be preached to you by a simple layperson named Karstans."

In contrast to the unlettered Kartshans, Jakob Otter, the former student of Wimpeling and Zasius, would occasionally clarify a scriptural point in his sermons by making a brief excursus into Hebrew or Greek etymology. As might be expected, Otter's preaching remains closer to the main line of evangelical orthodoxy: man is saved through faith in Christ's atoning death. This is the heart of the scriptural message. Otter's understanding of scripture is clearly mediated by his
theological training and his intimate acquaintance with Luther's writings. An interesting emphasis in Otter's preaching is the emphasis on the "works of faith" which follow immediately from faith.\textsuperscript{15} This strong moralistic strain -- also attested to by testimony from Kenzingen\textsuperscript{16} -- perhaps derives from his days with Wimpeling. In any case, in no way does the moralistic emphasis erase Otter's Evangelical understanding of the proper content of "the Gospel."\textsuperscript{17}

If Karsthans may be taken to represent early, popular, anti-Roman sentiment based on sola scriptura, and Jakob Otter a main line sola fide reading of scripture, then with the peasants we have yet a third approach to scripture, namely one that based demands for social and political reform on "scripture alone."\textsuperscript{18}

Two days after the Black Forest peasants had overtaken St. Peters of the Black Forest and the villages east of Freiburg they wrote to the Freiburg city council that "above all we desire that God's Word, through the holy Gospel, be proclaimed and preached to the common man."\textsuperscript{19} Freiburg was invited to join in the "Christian Union" or "Brotherhood" to promote brotherly love, peace, the Gospel and divine Justice.\textsuperscript{20} When we trace these themes to their source we find that the person responsible for drafting the Twelve Articles and the "Bundesordnung" of the Christian Union was Sebastian Lotzer, the lay preacher from Horb, later active in Memmingen,\textsuperscript{21} and eventually questioned in St. Gall in 1526 in company of the Anabaptist Gabriel Giger.\textsuperscript{22}

In his letter to Horb in 1523, Lotzer clearly enunciated his approach to scripture: God gives his Word to the simple, pious people. This is seen in the fact that Christ's birth was announced to shepherds,
not to theologians or Pharisees.\textsuperscript{23} This stress on a simple, sincere, lay understanding of scripture is found repeatedly in Lotzer's writings,\textsuperscript{24} accompanied by an air of egalitarianism\textsuperscript{25} and a concern for the poor and powerless.\textsuperscript{26}

Turning to Michael Sattler, we can see that he too fits within the broad evangelical stream on the basis of his acceptance of scriptural authority: unlike Trithemius, he did not submit to the authority of the Roman Church, but rather left the monastery. The few reasons Sattler gives for his leaving are instructive. In the first instance, he states that when he had read Paul (I Tim. 4:3) that in the last days food and marriage would be forbidden, he understood this to apply to his "dangerous" monastic estate, and therefore he left the order and married.\textsuperscript{27} This particular scriptural justification for leaving a religious order was a common one, used by Luther as early as 1520, and argued in the popular literature of the day.\textsuperscript{28}

A second justification given by Sattler has a less direct scriptural basis. It was clear to him that his monastic estate was "condemnable" since he had seen nothing but greed, pride, immorality, fornication and evil in the monastery.\textsuperscript{29} The note we can detect here is not so much "scripture" as it is "reform": the monks were not living up to the demands of the Gospel.\textsuperscript{30} The third reason given by Sattler for leaving St. Peters is again indirectly related to scripture. When Michael Sattler came to Hans Kuenzi, he asked Kuenzi to teach him how to work, so that he might earn his keep with the labour of his own hands.\textsuperscript{31} In this case the note we detect directly echoes the concern of the peasants, who deeply resented the burden of tithes by which they supported (by the sweat of their brows) the "idle monks."\textsuperscript{32}
When seen against the background of the theological milieu of the Breisgau in 1525, the justification given by Sattler for his leaving St. Peters illustrates that although Sattler too fits within the "evangelical" stream by virtue of his acceptance of scriptural authority, this stream is too broad to be of much significance. What we wish to know is where -- and in what way -- Sattler fits within that stream. But here we find that Sattler's testimony concerning his monastic departure draws not only from commonly available evangelical sources, it also hearkens back to monastic reforming concerns as well as appealing to arguments common among the peasants. We will see such a blending of diverse sources again as we examine Sattler's thought further.

When Sattler came to the Zürich Unterland in late summer 1525, he settled in an area torn with contrasting models of reform. Not only did the peasants have strong support in the Unterland, the Zürich reformation had reached there as well; in addition there were two rather different Anabaptist models present, the one stemming from Hubmaier in Waldshut, the other from Grebel and Mantz in Zürich. However, in all these cases there was a direct appeal to sola scriptura built on a Zwinglian foundation: only the commands of scripture were valid for determining church practice. This scriptural principle was followed by Hubmaier, Grebel, Mantz, and, incidentally, Lotzer.

Although there had been early agreement concerning the general reforms demanded by scripture, such as the abolition of the mass and the removal of images, differences had soon become manifest. To the Zürich radicals Zwingli seemed all too ready to "theologize" where a simple reading of scripture would have sufficed. In terms of church
reforms in the Zürich area the question of baptism became central. The Zürich radicals were soon joined by Balthasar Hubmaier who wrote the first definitive work on adult baptism, and stoutly defended the "plain sense of scripture" against Zwingli.\textsuperscript{39} In spite of important differences between Grebel and Hubmaier, the Anabaptists as a whole here agreed with the peasants over against the learned reformers: scripture is to be taken in its simple, literal sense. A layman requires no theologian to guide him through scripture: the Word speaks for itself.

Michael Sattler's appeal to "scripture alone" is well documented in his writings and is especially evident at his trial: it is apparent that Sattler prepared his defense on purely scriptural grounds.\textsuperscript{40} Sattler stands firmly within the evangelical tradition here. But further, Sattler's own approach to scripture is precisely the simple, lay approach: "Christ is simply yea and nay, and all those who seek Him simply will understand His Word."\textsuperscript{41} As we have seen, this approach to scripture is found most directly among the peasants as well as among the Anabaptists of Zürich and Waldshut. Given Sattler's leaving the monastery and settling among the common people in the Zürich Underland in late summer 1525, it is not surprising that for him scripture is the final authority and that his approach to scripture is egalitarian.

The Commands of Scripture

There can be no doubt about the seriousness and weight Sattler gives to the "commands of scripture": when scripture is read simply and directly it provides the "rule of life" for a Christian by means of its commands. Thus Sattler disagrees with Bucer and Capito, saying that the specific commandments of God cannot be set aside by a general
appeal to love. A simple and direct reading of scripture gives the
correct command concerning Christian baptism, Supper, the sword, the
oath, the ban, and other matters guiding the Christian life. Examples
of this direct appeal to scriptural commands abound in Sattler's writings.
In surveying the various positions making up Sattler's milieu we will
here consider the general question of "obedience to God's commands";
and in order to lend the comparison more force, we will also consider
the specific questions of the oath and the sword --questions on which
there are clear "scriptural commands" in Matthew 5. On the oath the
Schleitheim articles give Sattler's own position clearly enough: "Christ
taught us . . . : Your speech shall be yea, yea; and nay, nay; for
what is more than that comes of evil." Likewise concerning the sword
the Schleitheim Articles state clearly that weapons of violence will not
be used by a Christian "by virtue of the word of Christ: 'you shall
not resist evil.'" The specific test cases of the oath and the sword
should help us identify congruent approaches to scripture.

The Benedictine tradition strongly emphasizes living by the
"commandments of God." Although St. Benedict makes far more use
of the Old Testament than does Sattler, nonetheless in both cases
scripture is understood as setting forth how the Christian life is to be
lived: scripture is a practical document, not a "theological" one.
Consequently, for St. Benedict the first degree of humility is "always
to remember (God's) commands," and the Abbot is enjoined not to
"teach, establish, or command anything contrary to the law of the
Lord."
Trithemius shares St. Benedict's respect for scriptural commands. In his commentary on the RB, Trithemius notes that "just as any carnal father is able to disinherit his son for some reasons, so God, the Father almighty, will exclude impudent sons, and those disobedient to his commands, from the companionship of His elect." Trithemius seems to emphasize scriptural study more explicitly than does the RB. In one case he says that of course God requires us to know and to do His will, but we can only know His will by knowing scripture; therefore the study of scripture is essential. Or again, Trithemius notes that a soldier only knows the will of his lord by means of messengers and epistles; in the same way a monk will know the precepts of the Eternal King in no other way than through the "Evangelical Scriptures." Trithemius, while in no way denigrating the RB, is directing his fifteenth and sixteenth century hearers to return to St. Benedict's original source, so that they may find there the "commands of God" to which every "soldier of Christ" is bound.

Concerning the specific scriptural commands to swear no oaths and to do no physical violence, St. Benedict accepts both at face value. Two of the instruments of good works are "not to swear, for fear of being perjured," and "to speak truth from the heart as well as the mouth." The rejection of the swearing of oaths and the speaking of truth from the heart -- clear references to Matthew 5:34-37 -- are identical to the scriptural reference and conclusion in the Schleitheim Articles: "We cannot perform what is promised in swearing, for we are not able to change the smallest part of ourselves ... [Christ] says, your speech or your word shall be yes and no ..." Concerning
violence, St. Benedict simply repeats Exodus 20:13 and forbids killing. He further admonishes his monks to turn the other cheek (Matthew 5:39-41) and to show love to their enemies (Matt. 5:44). In short, St. Benedict understood scripture to forbid explicitly the swearing of oaths and the taking of human life, and he passed these precepts on in like manner to his monks.

Trithemius presents an interesting historical contrast to St. Benedict, for by the fifteenth century the oath was considered to be a crucial societal bond; warring Abbots and armed monks found less acceptance — especially after the attempted reforms of Peterhausen — but they too were to be found occasionally. Trithemius has less trouble rejecting the sword than he does rejecting the oath, for the doing of violence runs plainly counter to the entire monastic enterprise of denial of self and the practice of humility and renunciation. However, one finds few direct echoes of the pure Biblical command against the taking of human life. He plainly is not concerned with the lowest common denominator — in this case the mere command not to kill — but rather with the radical giving up of self which takes non-violence absolutely for granted. The matter of non-violence emerges most clearly for Trithemius, as it does for Sattler, in the context of faithfulness in following Christ rather than in the literal context of commands.

Trithemius finds the rejection of the oath more troublesome. Faced with the statement in the Rule that oaths are not to be sworn for fear of perjury, he comments initially that "it is not against the precepts of God to swear, but when we swear we risk the crime of perjury. Therefore, he who fears that he will perjure himself ought never to
swear. But there should be no distinction between truthful speech and swearing. Trithemius clearly is not satisfied with this response, for he presses further: "But is a monk allowed to swear in truth or not?" He answers that swearing is to be avoided wherever possible, and is to be done only in matters of the most extreme necessity, "because he whose words are to be always true ought not swear." But in "cases of necessity," such as in the election of an Abbot, swearing is not prohibited. In the end, however, "the speech of a monk ought to be, following the precept of the Lord, yea, yea, nay, nay . . ." Trithemius, caught between the social reality of his day and the explicit command in both scripture and the Rule, reluctantly allows for "oaths of necessity." That he felt compelled to deal with the question at length illustrates the weight he gives to the "commands of scripture."

The absence of the phrase "commands of scripture" is conspicuous in the evangelical preaching of Jakob Otter. Although Otter preaches the necessity of "works of faith," the accent falls strongly on "faith" rather than "works which are commanded." For Otter the sum of Christian teaching and life is contained in faith and love; the specific injunctions in Matthew against the oath and the sword are never brought up for discussion.

In contrast to Otter, Lotzer's more naive, lay approach leads him to speak frequently of "God's commands" as revealed in scripture. In writing to the people of Horb in 1523, Lotzer urges his "beloved brothers" to buy a New Testament, for the only way into the sheepfold is through the Word of God, namely through "what [God] has commanded and taught." It is worthy of note that some four years later another
letter arrived in Horb in which the "beloved brothers and sisters in the Lord" are admonished to remain true to the "letter of Holy Scripture" and to "turn not aside, neither to the left, nor to the right, that you might enter in through the gate...." One wonders what role was played by the lay preaching of Karsthans and Lotzer in preparing the way for Reublin and Sattler.

Lotzer's manner of identifying God's commands is straightforward: the New Testament says nothing of feasts, indulgences, the veneration of Mary and the saints, or of withholding the cup from the laity. In short, "Christ commands us in many places in holy scripture that we in no way do anything not contained in his godly word...."

Although Lotzer holds the "commands of scripture" to be normative for the Christian life -- thus standing with Trithemius and Sattler against Otter -- still in the specific identification of those commands Lotzer differs from Trithemius and Sattler. Lotzer nowhere comments on the injunction against the oath, and although he grants that the Gospel brings peace, he nevertheless goes on to point to Christ's words: "I came not to bring peace, but the sword." This strange ambivalence concerning violence is seen again in the Twelve Articles of the peasants. The preface to the Articles acknowledges outright that "the Gospel is not the cause of revolt and disorder, since it is the message of Christ, the promised Messiah, the Word of Life, teaching only love, peace, patience and concord." How then does the armed revolt find justification? The preface speaks rather vaguely about the enemies of the Gospel who foment opposition to the Word of God. This point is more explicitly stated in Lotzer's "Ausslegung" of 1524:
"there can be no greater sin committed than to oppose (persecute) the most holy Word of God, and not to accept the same, as is unfortunately being done today by both the spiritual and temporal estates." 76 In brief, the blame for the "uproar" lies not with the peasants, but rather with those who "oppose God's Word."

For Lotzer the ruling scriptural command is thus "that this Gospel be taught [to the peasants] as a guide in life..." 77 the injunction against violence is noted, but suspended because of the "ungodly" opposition to the spread of the Gospel; the oath receives no mention. The "commands" which emerge in the Twelve Articles are, rather, that each community be able to choose its own pastor, that only the "scriptural tithe" (great tithe) be paid, that the peasants be released from serfdom "unless it should be shown us from the Gospel that we are serfs," and that the restrictions on the hunting of game be removed. 78

The early Anabaptists, as we have noted above, followed Zwingli in stressing that only what is commanded in scripture is normative. As Hubmaier says, following Zwingli: "Only those works are good which God commanded us, and only those are evil which He has forbidden. Here fall fish, meat, cowlis, tonsures." 79 In subsequent points he goes through the entire list of "Romish" practices: candles, holy water, masses for the dead, images, and so on. There are no "commands" which establish these practices, and they must therefore be abandoned. In the same vein, but taking a more literalistic turn, Grebel writes to Müntzer that not only should he establish church practices on the basis of explicit commands, but also "that which is not taught by clear instruction and example we shall regard as forbidden to us..." 80 Grebel's
stronger literalism is clear, as for example in his rejection of singing in church: "That cannot be right, when we find no teaching in the New Testament about singing, and no example of singing."\textsuperscript{81} In spite of these differences between Hubmaier and Grebel, nonetheless they are beginning from the same essential premise: the commands of God as revealed in "crystal-clear Scripture" are normative.

It is concerning the specific question of the sword that differences between Waldshut and Zürich emerge clearly. Already in September 1524, Conrad Grebel wrote to Müntzer that even if someone "resists the Word and the moving of God" -- and here we ought to recall Lotzer's justification for violence -- "such a man, we declare, on the basis of God's Word, shall not be killed, but regarded as a heathen and publican, and let alone." With "true believing Christians," says Grebel, "killing is absolutely renounced."\textsuperscript{82} Likewise Felix Mantz at his trial in late December 1526, testified that "his opinion always had been, and still is, that no Christian may be a magistrate nor pass judgement with the sword nor kill or punish anyone, for he had no scripture allowing it."\textsuperscript{83}

Although Hubmaier published nothing on the sword during his time in Waldshut, we know from other evidence that the issue of pacifism must have come up shortly following his baptism.\textsuperscript{84} Hubmaier reported in 1526 that he had been confronted publicly in the church and called a "blood guzzler" as a result of his defense of the sword.\textsuperscript{85} In connection with the scriptural injunctions forbidding the taking of life, Hubmaier chose an interpretation other than the "crystal-clear" literal meaning.\textsuperscript{86} In his later work "On the Sword" he argued against a literal application
of Matthew 5:38 to all Christians, saying that the injunction does not apply to the authorities, whose particular God-given office it is to protect the innocent and punish the wrong-doer. It is precisely by wielding the sword that the authorities do God's will. 87

It may appear to be a foregone conclusion that Michael Sattler stands firmly within the Zürich Anabaptist tradition, given his strong pacifistic stand; and this may well be so. But insufficient attention has been paid to the possible formative influence of Anabaptists who occupied a "middle position" -- geographically and otherwise -- between Zürich and Waldshut. Waldshut too spawned its pacifists, whether independently or as a result of missionizing is not clear, since there is no evidence bearing on the question. In September 1525 Jakob Gross and Ulrich Teck were arrested in Grünningen, near Zürich, for Anabaptist activity. They had been exiled from Waldshut for refusing to defend the city with arms. 88 Their reasons for so refusing were purely scriptural according to Gross' testimony later in Strasbourg: "it is written in no command of God that one is to kill people." 89

A further peculiarity attached to Gross and Teck is that in Grünningen they also refused to swear the oath of renunciation (Urfehde) "but rather said yes must be yes." 90 Although Gross and Teck did swear such oaths later -- Gross in order to leave prison in Bruck; Teck for the same reason in Zürich 91 -- Gross continued to maintain that the swearing of oaths was not allowed by scripture. In prison in Strasbourg Gross simply quotes Matthew 5:34. 92 Gross and Teck are atypical Waldshutlers in the matter of oaths as much as in the question of the sword, for Hubmaier takes the validity of oaths for granted.
But even in Zürich the question of oaths was far from clear. Grebel makes no mention of the oath in his letter to Müntzer, and the Zollikoners felt free to swear the required oaths. It appears that Andreas Castleberger was among the first in the Zürich area to refuse the oath. As Martin Haas has argued, the growing move toward refusing to swear oaths marked the progression of Anabaptism towards separatism; but in 1525 separatism and refusal of oaths was by no means an obvious corollary of adult baptism. In the matter of faithfulness to the "commands of scripture," particularly as it relates to the oath and the sword, we have found that teachings congruent with Sattler's own are found in his Benedictine past, among some Zürich Anabaptists and with the Waldshut dissenters Gross and Teck. Although Lotzer, the peasants, and Hubmaier accept the principle that the commands of scripture are normative, their understanding of the specific content of those commands points away from Sattler. In the case of Jakob Otter, the exegetical stress on commands is missing altogether.

Following Christ

Michael Sattler's approach to scripture, although it is undeniably geared to a simple reading of scripture and a literal understanding of its commands, nevertheless gives evidence of a more abstract ruling principle. Not only do the explicit commands guide the Christian, the central guide through the scripture is provided by the life and example of Christ Himself. What makes this approach to Scripture distinctive in a Reformation context is the fact that the emphasis appears to fall not on Christ's redemptive work but rather on Christ incarnate, after whom
the believer must follow. This "practical Christocentrism" is seen most clearly in Schleitheim's second, more profound discussion of "the sword."

Here, in answer to the complex questions of how a Christian is to relate to "the world" and its governing powers, Sattler points to a peculiar proof text: "Christ teaches and commands us to learn from Him, for He is meek and lowly of heart . . . ."\(^95\) A central "command" for Sattler is, quite simply, "be like Christ." Scripture gives witness to the Christ in whose footsteps the believer must walk.

The Benedictine Rule is decidedly Christocentric in this same "practical" way: it is Christ who rules the monastery and its daily life; it is Christ who is to be emulated by the monks.\(^{96}\) The recognition of this fact is so widespread, and corroborating passages in the Rule are so numerous, that one cannot escape the feeling of repeating truisms which are nevertheless true: the following of Christ lies at the very centre of monastic spirituality as conceived by St. Benedict.\(^{97}\) That this ideal was not always attained is also true, but monastic renewal movements over the centuries could and did appeal to this Christocentric element in encouraging a return to St. Benedict's original vision.

Trithemius and Bursfeldian piety generally are part of such a renewal movement.

As is the case with St. Benedict, so also with Trithemius: the life and person of Christ are to be dominant in the monastic life. Christ has left us the example of His life so that we might walk in the way He has walked.\(^{98}\) The following statement, taken from one of Trithemius' personal letters of exhortation, expresses his Christocentrism very well.

JESUS is the way to life. Jesus is the gate to the sheepfold of the saints. JESUS is the means of coming to the Father.
If you do not wish to stray, He is the way. If you do not wish to err, He is the truth; if you do not wish to die, He is life eternal. Knowledge of the Saviour is life. St. John expresses in few words how one is to walk in this life, saying "He who says that he is in Christ ought to walk as He walked." [Cf. I Jn. 2:6]. The Lord himself says "He who follows me does not walk in darkness, but will have the light of eternal life." [Jn. 8:12]. Here, therefore, is the difficult road to eternal life: to follow the Lord JESUS.

The unanimous opinion of our Benedictine witnesses places the practical following of Christ at the center of the monastic life.

If it is a truism to say that the Benedictine vision is a daily following of the incarnate Christ, it is no less a truism to say that Christ the Saviour is the focus of Luther's Reformation: God deals with sinful man according to man's faith in Christ. Jakob Otter, the Breisgau's most visible supporter of Luther's doctrine of sola fide, could find little room for the "commands of scripture" -- except for the "command" to love one's neighbor. As we have noted above, Otter emphasizes the primacy of faith in Christ's atoning work, as did the main-line reformers, but he then goes on to point to the importance of the "works of faith." In this latter context Otter does speak of Christ as the Christian's model and example. The Christian is to understand Christ in the following way:

First, [he is to see Christ] as a gift and a present from our heavenly Father, who is necessary to his salvation through faith. And following that, as an example, a model for his life, his work, and the exercise of his faith in love of the neighbor; which example he finds in the accounts of the holy life of Christ Jesus, how he lived and worked, namely not to do good for himself but rather for us.

Christ's example is summed up in Christ's selfless love.

Although Otter points to Christ as the example of selfless love, the difference between his view and the monastic view is clear: for
Otter the content of "Christ-like love" is left undefined, whereas in the monastic writings, Christ's actions as such are normative. In fact, Otter understands Christian faith to have "freed" the Christian from the constraint of "commands" and "works." Thus his critique of monasticism echoes Luther's: although openly impious folk are sinful, even more deeply sinful are "the wise, holy, learned, spiritual people, who are pious before the world and themselves, building on their own works." The question of faith and works, so central to the Reformation, will be taken up again shortly, but it should be clear that in the specific matters of commands and the following of Christ Michael Sattler's Anabaptist writings stand closer to his Benedictine past than to the main-line Reformation.

The Twelve Articles of the peasants and the correspondence from the Black Forest troop give no indication that the peasants read the scriptures with an emphasis on imitatio Christi. The accent is rather on "Gospel, Gospel, Gospel." and the bearing of scripture on socio-economic matters. Sebastian Lotzer, with the exception of an occasional suggestive comment, does not direct his readers to a life of "following in Christ's footsteps." Rather the accent is on a life lived in accordance with the Word, and the Word witnesses to salvation by faith through grace, which is expressed necessarily in works of love towards the neighbor. In general, Lotzer's writings suggest a strong main line Protestant influence.

Turning to the Zürich Anabaptists, we find Grebel, Mantz and Blaurock overwhelmingly concerned with the implementation of "proper ceremonies" according to the witness of scripture. In a characteristic
sentence from his letter to Thomas Müntzer, Grebel says "it is far preferable that a few be rightly instructed in the Word of God, believing aright, walking in virtues, and observing (biblical) rites than that many through adulterated doctrine falsely and deceitfully 'believe.'\textsuperscript{107}

The primary focus of the letter emerges in these few lines: there shall be, no "false sparing of the weak," even if there are only a few who will follow the pure Word, believe truly, and walk virtuously. Here would have been a natural place to mention a following of Christ, had Grebel's understanding of scripture been informed by that principle. Instead he speaks of "rites" and "walking in virtues." The letter to Müntzer gives no evidence of the practical Christocentrism seen in Sattler.\textsuperscript{108} The few testimonies we have from George Blaurock lead to the same conclusion.\textsuperscript{109}

Felix Mantz, while entirely in accord with the Grebel/Blaurock emphasis on commands and ceremonies, does appear to have a stronger sense of Nachfolge Christi. In his "Protestation" of late 1524/early 1525, Mantz' concern is that ceremonies -- specifically baptism -- be performed as commanded in scripture, but Mantz adds the further argument that infant baptism "is also against the example of Christ, who was baptized at thirty years, (but) circumcised at eight days. Now Christ has given us an example that as he has done so also ought we to do."\textsuperscript{110} While this is a rather restricted and literalistic example of Nachfolge, the reference to following the example of Christ's actions is suggestive. In his farewell letter two years later, Mantz is more explicit. "Christ never prosecuted anyone, as the false teachers of our time do . . . Christ never hated anyone, so also his true servants hate no one
and follow after Christ on the true way, as he has gone before."\textsuperscript{111} The polemic tone is visible here,\textsuperscript{112} but so too is the suggestion of a fuller Nachfolge Christi doctrine. In the end, however, it must be said that the principle of "walking in Christ's footsteps" plays a minor heuristic role in the thought of Grebel, Mantz and Blaurock.

Hubmaier's writings as a whole give more emphasis to the following of Christ, although this emphasis usually appears in restricted contexts. The following of Christ is first mentioned in the context of baptism: the baptismal candidate gives a commitment to better his life and "to follow after Christ."\textsuperscript{113} The phrase is suggestive, but the emphasis on the "new life" in connection with baptism is unexceptional and is shared by the early Zürich Anabaptists generally. Hubmaier also refers to following Christ in the context of his arguments concerning free will: "The plain and simple will of God is that we keep his beloved son Christ Jesus before our eyes and follow after his life and teaching . . . ."\textsuperscript{114} The point here is that the requirement to follow Christ would make no sense if a man could not choose to follow.

Beyond these contextual applications of Nachfolge Hubmaier does also make two references of a more general nature. In his catechism booklet he indicates that the way to eternal life is through suffering for Christ's sake, "for where Christ is present and lives, he brings his cross with him on his back, from which he gives to each and every Christian a small cross to bear, to follow after him."\textsuperscript{115} This same theme is expressed even more strongly and fully in Hubmaier's final work, the Rechenschaft, written in prison just prior to his execution.\textsuperscript{116} Viewed in the total context of Hubmaier's writings these few references
to the following of Christ are significant, even though they cannot be said to be central in Hubmaier's approach to scripture, which consistently sees the Word as providing authoritative commands rather than witnessing to the life and person of Christ.

Turning finally to the Anabaptists outside Zürich and Waldshut, the brief testimonies we have from Gross and Teck from January 1525 to late summer 1526 indicate that their stress did fall on "commands" rather than "following Christ." An exception here is Hans Kuenzi, who in the same letter in which he defends harbouring the ex-monk Michael Sattler also states that the Christian must expect to follow Christ into suffering and bearing the cross. One would wish to know whether Kuenzi learned this from his house guest or vice versa. There is no conclusive evidence here, but one is strongly inclined to the former conclusion.

In tracing the application of "the following of Christ" as a heuristic principle we have seen that by far the strongest such emphasis is found in the monastic environment. The main-line Protestant preaching in the Breisgau did not contain such a stress nor did the evangelical preaching of the peasants. Although the early Anabaptists do stress the "new life" which is to follow baptism, the specific Nachfolge Christi approach to scripture is usually not present; when it is present it is overshadowed by the stress on the "commands of scripture." Is the Nachfolge emphasis of the Schleitheim Articles ultimately traceable to Michael Sattler's monastic upbringing? The preliminary conclusion would seem to be that it does originate with Sattler, who retained a strong, practical Christocentrism from his days as a Benedictine monk.
In conclusion, our analysis of Michael Sattler's understanding of scripture indicates that while he is part of the evangelical stream by virtue of his acceptance of scriptural authority, still his stress on the "commands of scripture" -- specifically concerning the oath and the sword -- places him in close proximity again to his monastic past as well as to the early pacifistic Anabaptists. In terms of Sattler's ruling principle of **Nachfolge Christi**, we have found the strongest prima facie congruence to exist between Sattler and his monastic past. Thus our conclusion must be that although Sattler left the monastery for "scriptural" reasons, he continued to read scripture in what can well be called a monastic manner: scripture, when read simply and directly, provides the rule of life for Christians by means of its commands and its witness to Christ's life. Even granting this general conclusion serious questions remain, for the content of Sattler's Christocentrism has yet to be analyzed contextually. The chapter that follows will direct itself to such an analysis.
CHAPTER IX

SATTLER'S CHRISTOLOGY

While we have titled this chapter "Sattler's Christology," it should be made clear at the outset that Sattler nowhere deals with Christology as an abstract theological issue. Rather Sattler concentrates on the significance of Christ for the believer. Thus although Sattler is concerned with a proper understanding of Christ, his is a practical, not an abstract Christology. We have seen in the previous chapter that Michael Sattler's Christocentric approach to scripture has clear parallels primarily in his monastic background, with suggestive comments found in the statements of some Anabaptists, primarily in Mantz, Hubmaier and Kuenzi. In this chapter we wish to examine the specific content of that Christocentrism: Who is the Christ the believer is to follow, and what does it mean in concrete terms for the believer to follow Him?

The chapter is divided into two sections dealing with Christ Incarnate, the man of sorrows, and Christ the Spiritual Conqueror. Each section aims to examine in detail one aspect of Sattler's central polarity of flesh/spirit.

Christ Incarnate, the man of sorrows

The centrality of the incarnate Christ for Michael Sattler is beyond dispute, for the emphasis on walking as Christ walked is prominent in all of his writings. In the letter to Bucer and Capito Sattler
writes "The foreknown and called believers shall be conformed to the
image of Christ;"¹ the Schleitheim Articles conclude "Since then Christ
is as is written of Him, so must His members also be the same . . . ;"²
and in writing to the church at Horb Sattler says "Be mindful of your
predecessor, Jesus Christ, and follow after Him . . ."³ Granted the
importance of Nachfolge Christi we wish now to examine what kind of
example Sattler considers Jesus to have left, going on to consider
where in Sattler's background such a view is to be found. Beyond this
general consideration we will also apply a specific test case. Michael
Sattler's Christocentric vision is applied specifically in the matter of
coercive temporal power: where in his milieu is such a teaching to be
found?

For Michael Sattler the incarnate Christ is, above all, meek and
lowly, the rejected, persecuted, suffering Christ⁴ who yielded up his
will and, trusting in God,⁵ walked the way of earthly trial through the
cross on to death.⁶ It is this Christ whom the "saints of God" are to
follow: "follow after Him in faith and obedience, love and longsuffer-
ing."⁷ Christ was a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief; the
members of His body must likewise expect to "suffer in the flesh."⁸
Thus repeated themes for Sattler are perseverance unto death and the
complete acceptance of God's will as revealed in daily events.⁹ It is in
this context that Sattler's striking and pervasive polarity between spirit
and flesh must be understood. The desire for physical comfort and
security, for acceptance by the world at large, must be abandoned,
following the example of Christ: "they who are Christ's have crucified
their flesh with all its lusts and desires."¹⁰ "The flesh" and "the
world" are precisely what Christ overcame in meek, accepting obedience; the faithful follower of Christ must do likewise. Further, just as Christ experienced the enmity of the world, so will the disciple also experience that enmity, for "the flesh is against the spirit." ¹¹

The concrete implications of this Christocentrism are seen very clearly in Sattler's teaching concerning temporal authority. The letter to Bucer and Capito contains a strong preliminary hint: "Christians are fully yielded [like Christ] and have placed their trust in their Father in heaven without any outward or worldly arms." ¹² Since Christians have their citizenship "in heaven and not on earth" they repudiate "Flesh and blood, pomp and temporal, earthly honor and the world ..." ¹³ This theme is developed more fully at Schleitheim.

The sixth article of Schleitheim states outright that the "sword" of government is "ordained" by God -- it is part of the divine order -- to punish the wicked and to protect the good, but "within the perfection of Christ only the ban is used ..." ¹⁴ In answer to the question of whether a Christian may then participate in the larger political "order" Schleitheim answers that, following Christ, the Christian should withdraw from the worldly process of government, justice and punishment. ¹⁵ "The worldly are armed with steel and iron, but Christians are armed with the armor of God ... In sum: as Christ our Head is minded, so also must be minded the members of the body of Christ through Him ..." ¹⁶ Thus at his trial Michael Sattler could say concerning the imminent Turkish military threat against Europe that "We should not defend ourselves against the Turks ... but with fervent prayer should implore God that He might be our defense and our resistance." ¹⁷
True Christians are yielded, accepting all the "fleshly suffering" that might come directly from God's hand.

For Michael Sattler the "Christ-like life" is a life of obedience to God's commands, renunciation of the desires of the flesh, yieldedness to God's providential will, and separation from the world. The prima facie monastic character of this vision of the Christian life was not lost on Sattler's contemporaries.18 And in fact there are strong parallels to be found in the Benedictine tradition at every point. At the end of his Prologue St. Benedict says "I am to erect a school for beginners in the service of the Lord" and he suggests that through perseverance "we shall here share by patience in the passion of Christ and hereafter deserve to be united with him in his kingdom."19 From the very start St. Benedict indicates that the monastic life is a sharing of Christ's suffering. This is accomplished, in essence, by denial of self and the world and an obedient following after Christ:20 "I address my discourse to all of you who will renounce your own will, enter the lists under the banner of obedience, and fight under the lead of your lawful sovereign, Christ the Lord."21

The most essential form of renunciation or self-denial spoken of in the RB is the renunciation of self-will. The chapter on humility contains the following injunction.

As for our own will, we are forbidden to pursue it by these words of Scripture: "Turn away from thine own will": and we are required to ask God in prayer that his will may be done in us.22

And again in the same chapter we find the following:

The second degree of humility is, if anyone, not wedded to his own will, finds no pleasure in the compassing of his desires; but fulfills with his practice the word of our Lord:
"I came not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me."

Examples could be multiplied here.

Concerning the renunciation of self-will, we should note first of all that the central example of this renunciation is Christ himself. It must be noted further that in speaking of renunciation of the will, St. Benedict is speaking of renunciation at the deepest levels of self and personality. The most basic renunciation for St. Benedict is spiritual and internal; external discipline is instituted as a means of achieving that end.

St. Benedict took it for granted that renunciation of "the world" and the subjugation of "the flesh" were essential components of a truly Christ-like life. Chapter four of the RB, for example, contains the exhortation "To eschew the ways of the world," and further along St. Benedict lists the following: "Not given to wine. Not given to too much eating. Not to sleepiness. Not to laziness." A summary of all these injunctions could well be the further statement "Not to accomplish the desires of the flesh." The RB is not lacking in recommendations of external renunciation. As St. Benedict notes in a later chapter, "The whole life of a monk ought to be a continual Lent."

The "positive" counterpart to renunciation is obedience, and it too is central to the spirituality of the RB. The monastic process involves both negation and affirmation. Perfect obedience, as exemplified by Christ, grows out of perfect renunciation; perfect renunciation will express itself in perfect obedience. When this takes place the monk has reached the height of attainment, the goal of the monastic life, namely perfect love. The daily practice of monastic discipline,
that is renunciation and obedience, allows the monk to move progressively closer to the ideal represented by the incarnate Christ.

St. Benedict mitigated the severe physical austerities of the earlier monasticism, but there really is no comfortable "middle way" in Benedictine monasticism. The terms are unconditional, even if relatively temperate: the monk has chosen to follow Christ, so he must renounce the promptings of the flesh and the world; he has chosen to serve God, so he must learn to obey God's commands and accept His will. It becomes readily apparent why the Benedictine reform movements of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries called for a return to the letter and spirit of the Rule as a corrective to monastic abuse and laxity.

The writings of Trithemius are even more emphatically Christocentric than is the RB. For Trithemius, as for St. Benedict, Christ is the man of sorrows who, through His humility, renunciation and obedience has shown us the narrow way to life. Trithemius, in commenting on the "strait and narrow way of salvation," says "do not for that reason flee the way of salvation, because it is necessary that we enter the kingdom of God through many tribulations"[Acts 14:22]. This verse is a great favourite with Trithemius; he quotes it repeatedly, and even calls it the "one rule." It is clear to Trithemius that "We all wish to live and reign with Christ, but not to suffer with Him." On the contrary, however, the kingdom of God is for those few who are prepared to follow the suffering Christ.

Trithemius' teaching on this point is aptly summed up in an address to his monks, titled "Concerning the spiritual battle of monks." It is fitting, he says, that monks be tried by adversity, like gold in a
furnace. The monk is to live according to the counsels of perfection, following Christ's commands and sanctifying himself. The soldier of God faces three opponents: the flesh, the world, and the devil, all of whom must be resisted with the arms of virtue and good works. The soldier of God must follow after Christ, but this means suffering, as it is written of Him. Christ thus conquered the world, and the soldier is to follow, fighting the flesh and the world, in prayer and fasting. The monk must remember his vow and fare forward, from virtue to virtue, holding to Christ above all, turning away from the world. However, rejecting the world is not enough; the soldier must renounce himself as well, following the example of Christ. He who perseveres to the end will reign with Christ in glory.

For Trithemius the way to glory is the way of Christ. The monk is to renounce self-will; he is to attain humility in his heart; he is to obey with sincerity, following Christ's example; he is to persevere in all patience, living a life of poverty and chastity. In short, "This is the perfect and straight way to life: to renounce one's own will, and to follow Christ."  

Particularly interesting for our comparison with Michael Sattler is the fact that the admonition to follow Christ is often expressed by Trithemius in very strong polar terms of the battle between "spirit and flesh" or "heaven and world." The following passage is striking, given the parallels of thought structure and language in Sattler.

Do not deceive yourself, for no one is able to delight in this world and then afterwards reign with Christ. It is necessary that we enter the kingdom of God through many tribulations ... Strive for life through the narrow way, which is not to perform the desires of the flesh, but rather to hate the world and to live by the spirit. You are called
by God to fight against the vices of the flesh; do not rest before the victory; do not stand apart from the battle, for no one is crowned but the victor. In this life there is no certain victory but rather a continuous battle. He who perseveres until the end will be saved.40

The strict division between spirit and flesh41 and the constant battle between them is a time-honoured theme in monastic literature which St. Benedict adopts and Trithemius put to constant use. Thus we read repeatedly of the "arms of obedience" which require renunciation of the self42 and which are the most powerful weapons in driving away the devil;43 we hear of a strict separation from the world44 which is voluntary, but also inevitable given the necessary hostility between God and Satan.

Blessed are those who wage war against vices and have peace with God. He who wishes to be a friend of God must prepare himself to withstand the persecutions of the world, for he who is of God conquers the world. Indeed the world always despises the one who does not belong to it. . . . Evil has nothing in heaven, you have nothing in this world. "He who wishes to become a friend of this world becomes an enemy of God." (James 4:4). Certainly no one is able to please both God and the world.45

The necessary separation and antagonism between the spirit and the flesh is a constant Benedictine theme.

The emphasis on following the suffering Christ into a life of renunciation and separation quite naturally provides the basic guidelines for the monk in the question of coercive temporal power.

Indeed no one fighting for God implicates himself in worldly matters. Do no one an injury, but learn to bear what is given with patience, following the example of your Lord who, hanging on the cross, entreated his persecutors that they not perish. Keep peace with all men . . .46

The way of Christ has nothing to do with "the world" or with coercion but is rather the way of meekness: "Seek peace, seek the Lord Jesus
Christ, who alone is the true peace, and follow Him."47 The point is not simply non-violence. As we have seen above, for both St. Benedict and Trithemius the taking of human life is not allowed to a monk; but more fundamental than the command not to kill is the following of Christ in meekness and submission which lies at the heart of monasticism: "We are commanded to pray for those who persecute us and those who revile us, that we may be perfect as our Father in heaven is perfect and good, permitting his sun to shine upon both the good and the evil."48 Thus Trithemius can, on the basis of yielded behaviour, distinguish between two sorts of monks: "If the peacemakers are the children of God, then without a doubt those who fight are none other than the children of the Devil."49 For Trithemius the "perfection of Christ" excludes the use of the temporal sword.

Our comparison of Sattler's suffering Christocentrism with that of his Benedictine tradition leads to the conclusion that the content in both cases is very closely congruent. In both cases Christ is understood to be the submissive, suffering Christ whom the true disciple is to follow in denial of self and the world. In both cases the following of Christ leads to a separation from the world and the earning of its enmity. In both cases the basic conceptual framework is polar, giving the disciple one of two choices: Christ or Satan, Good or Evil, spirit or flesh, the community of saints or the world.

The striking polarity seen in Sattler has long attracted comment. Some ninety years ago Gustav Bossert noted perceptively that baptism was a secondary matter for Sattler; "The primary fact is his dualistic world-view, which he brought with him out of the monastery. His
words sound almost like those of a Hirsau monk under Wilhelm. . . . One sees that the monk studied Paul in the monastery, but failed to understand him. He left the cloister walls, but the monastic spirit of flight from the world and contempt for the world remained with him. His ideal of Christian piety is still the monastic one . . . 

50 Our study strongly supports Bossert's conclusions on this point, and suggests that the striking parallels Jean Seguy 51 has drawn attention to concerning Sattler and Loyola actually do have significant roots in Sattler's Benedictine tradition, as John Yoder suggested some time ago. 52 Whether there are other potential sources in Sattler's milieu will concern us momentarily.

We have seen that for Sattler and for the Benedictine tradition the "life of perfection" called for by the following of Christ leads also to a renunciation of the coercive measures necessary to governing in the temporal realm. In fact, Michael Sattler's conclusion that the temporal sword is a legitimate part of the divine order -- but outside the "perfection of Christ" -- is a strikingly monastic formulation. It is monastic precisely because two legitimate moral orders are assumed, each following different ethical guidelines; it is "sectarian" in that it denies salvation to all who fall outside the order of perfection. Granted this difference, we must go on to say that Sattler's more restricted soteriological vision does not appear to be a rejection of the monastic view; rather it appears to be a radical heightening of the monastic view. Not only does the monk's salvation depend on his Christ-like life of renunciation and separation, but the salvation of all Christians depends on their following Christ in this way. The "community of
saints" now includes all who will be saved; the "counsels of perfection" now apply to all believers. This, it would seem, is granting more, not less, ultimacy to the monastic vision.

As we have seen in the preceding chapter, the evangelical preaching of Jakob Otter and the evangelical principles guiding Sebastian Lotzer and the Black Forest peasants fail to give evidence of the practical Christocentrism seen in Sattler and his monastic background. Thus Otter, Lotzer and the peasants disagree with Sattler on the specific question of following Christ in rejecting the temporal sword. Sattler clearly did not learn his radical Christocentrism from them. Likewise, although Otter and Lotzer make an occasional comment concerning the antagonism between the spirit and the flesh, their remarks point to non-analogous conceptual frameworks. Again, Sattler's position cannot be traced to these sources.

Turning to the Zürich Anabaptists, an examination of Felix Mantz' expressions of Nachfolge leads to the conclusion that for Mantz, Christ is not primarily the "man of sorrows" we have identified in Sattler. The emphasis in Mantz is on the literal Word: Christ was baptized as an adult, therefore we must baptize adults following Christ's example. Christ was also merciful, never prosecuted anyone in a court of law, and never hated anyone; in all these things we should follow His example. We clearly have elements of a Nachfolge Christi theme here, but the Christus Mantz indicates is not the suffering, renounced and obedient Christ. Mantz' focus is "the Word," not "the suffering Christ of the Word."
On the question of the temporal sword, Mantz at his hearing expressed an opinion congruent with Sattler's: "his opinion has always been, and still is, that no Christian may be a magistrate and should not judge with the sword, nor kill or physically punish anyone ..."\(^5^7\) Although Mantz does not spell out the legitimacy of two orders, still what he has outlined here points towards the doctrine of the "perfection of Christ" seen at Schleitheim. However the reason Mantz gives for his doctrine of the sword is simply that "the Christian has no scripture commanding it."\(^5^8\) Here again the Christocentrism fundamental to Sattler's position is missing, with the stress falling rather of the literal Word. Finally, the polarity so prominent in Sattler is not found in Mantz.

As we have noted above, the Nachfolge theme is even less in evidence with Conrad Grebel than with Mantz. However Grebel, like Mantz, does say that Christians are to avoid using the civil sword: "One should also not protect the gospel and its adherents with the sword, nor themselves."\(^5^9\) The basis for this position, as we would expect, is "God's Word." Grebel then goes on to make rather startling comments concerning the suffering that Christians must expect in this world. The comments are startling because one would expect to find them in a strong Nachfolge Christi context, which is quite absent in Grebel.

Since these phrases may be taken as evidence that Grebel intended to establish a persecuted church of the faithful already in September 1524,\(^6^0\) we should pay particular attention to the context and meaning of Grebel's words. Immediately after stating that Christians
should protect no one with the sword, Grebel writes to Müntzer "we learn from our brother that this is also what you believe and hold to. True believing Christians are sheep among wolves, sheep for the slaughter. They must be baptized in anxiety, distress, affliction, persecution, suffering, and death. They must pass through the probation of fire, etc." What has in fact happened is that Grebel is here paraphrasing Müntzer: he has understood Thomas Müntzer to hold to a doctrine of non-resistance because of Müntzer's references to yieldedness and suffering. It is plain on careful reading that Grebel's own non-resistant stand, however, is based on the Word, not on Christocentric suffering.

Given that we are in search of a Christocentrism which stresses Christ, the man of sorrows, we cannot avoid bringing into our discussion the notorious recipient of Conrad Grebel's letter of 1524, whom Grebel quite obviously misunderstood. Both of Thomas Müntzer's books, to which Grebel refers enthusiastically, Concerning Fictitious Faith and the Protestation, speak repeatedly of the "true faith" being that faith which is willing to suffer, following the example of the yielded, suffering Christ. Thus when Müntzer speaks of the "fictitious faith" he means the faith which fails to demand that a believer yield to the work of God following the example of the suffering Christ. Further, Müntzer speaks of God working directly in the yielded heart, the "true baptism" being baptism with the spirit. Grebel, in his enthusiasm, somehow misses Müntzer's mystical Christocentrism, for he stresses throughout his letter to Müntzer the "literal Word" and the "proper ceremonies," equating Müntzer's "false faith" with the "false sparing" which allows improper rites to occur. It is indeed hard to see how
anyone can argue for a direct influence of Müntzer's thought on Anabaptism via Conrad Grebel: Grebel has repeated some of Müntzer's formulae (e.g. the "bitter Christ") without understanding their significance for Müntzer or incorporating their substance into his own thought.

While Müntzer's stress on the suffering Christ is striking, the conclusion that Müntzer had a direct influence on Sattler does not seem to follow. The central point would seem to be that Sattler continues to hold to the normative nature of the written Word, which is never superseded by the inner Word. The believer must act in accordance with the written commands as well as living as Christ lived, "as it is written of Him." For Sattler "true faith" can never become revolution, for Christ did no such a thing; for Müntzer, "true faith" can become revolution, for Christ-like yieldedness and suffering take place essentially and primarily in the heart. The practical outworking of these Christocentric emphases points in fact to fundamental differences between them, in spite of their surface similarities.

We have noted above that there are several references in Hubmaier's works to the suffering Christ and the necessity of following Him, even though these references are few. When we consider the specific test case of the temporal sword, however, the limits of Hubmaier's Christocentrism become clear. Hubmaier's On the Sword is particularly valuable for our discussion for in it Hubmaier argues directly against the Schleitheim position.

The first point of Hubmaier's argument is directed against the implications of Sattler's polarity.
Christ says to Pilate: My kingdom is not of this world, for if it were of this world my servants would undoubtedly fight for me, to prevent my being given over to the Jews. John 18:36. Some brothers conclude from this scripture that a Christian may not wield the sword, for the kingdom of the Christian is not of this world.69 The position Hubmaier refers to here is quite clearly the pacifistic one arising from the Christ/Satan, heaven/world polarity we have seen in Sattler and Schleitheim. Hubmaier responds that "Christ alone may truly say 'My kingdom is not of this world,' for he was conceived and born without sin, a blameless lamb ...."70 The Christian, says Hubmaier, is not to be confused with Christ. Christ Incarnate was not of this world; the Christian is of this world.71 Thus Christ, the suffering saviour, cannot be taken as a normative example or model for the Christian.72

Hubmaier goes on to elaborate by developing the theme of the various "offices" which fall to Christians. He refers to Luke 12:13, and Christ's refusal to pass judgement between brothers.73 The conclusion Schleitheim had drawn from this passage was "So should we also do."74 Hubmaier says rather that Christ's meaning is "I was not called or commanded to be a judge. It is not my office. It belongs to others."75 In short, Christ's office is to save and forgive sin, that of temporal authorities is to protect the good and punish the evil, and that of subjects is to obey the authorities in all matters not counter to God. The ban is the ordained instrument of discipline within the body of Christ; the sword is likewise ordained in the world. Both are legitimate and come from God.76

It is clear that Hubmaier maintains, in essence, a view that Sattler has left behind. Although Hubmaier wishes to emphasize a
serious following of Christ -- especially in an ecclesiological context -- in the matter of civil government he has recourse to an inclusive doctrine of God's providence: since all offices, civil and religious, fall under God's providence, all are legitimate. It is a short step from here to a doctrine of special monastic "vocation" for those to whom such an "office" may fall. But clearly Hubmaier does not wish to go in this direction. It is precisely at this point that he wishes the church as a whole to follow Christ in all seriousness. There is indeed a tension here in Hubmaier's thought, as Denny Weaver has noted. For Hubmaier the church must walk as Christ walked while also accepting "civil" offices even if they call for "un-Christ-like" behaviour. Sattler resolves this tension by excluding all that falls outside the "perfection of Christ." But a serious anomaly also remains for Sattler: God's providence apparently requires a sinful and nonredeemable civil order for the "protection of the good and the punishment of the evil." While Sattler's Christocentrism is more consistent than Hubmaier's, his harmonization of Romans 13 and the Sermon on the Mount presents its own difficulties.

In conclusion, we have found that when we focus on the renunciatory aspect of Sattler's Christocentrism, substantive parallels appear only in Sattler's monastic background. It is here alone that we find a full doctrine of following the suffering Christ in daily life, separating from the sinful world and enduring the opprobrium of the world in imitation of Christ. The nature and content of this doctrine of Nachfolge Christi is further clarified in Sattler's teaching on the temporal sword: true Christians are yielded and separated and thus refuse to participate in government in imitation of Christ. Although the teaching of non-
participation in government is present among the Zürich Anabaptists as well as in the monastic tradition, we have found the Nachfolge justifica-
tion for this teaching only in the monastic tradition.

Our study thus indicates that the Schleitheim doctrine of a Christ-centred separation from the world, resulting in withdrawal from the sinful political order, is in fact Michael Sattler's own contribution to Anabaptism. Further, our study suggests that this doctrine has its roots in the Benedictine tradition.

Christ the spiritual conqueror

We turn now from Sattler's doctrine of following Christ in the renunciation of the flesh to the corresponding doctrine of following Christ in spiritual victory. In doing so we enter a more dimly-lit area of Sattler's thought, for although the victory of the "spirit" over the "flesh" is spoken of often, Sattler never spells out systematically what process is to lead to this victory of the spirit, or how much the spirit is to be relied on vis-à-vis the Word, or what it means exactly for the believer to be "spirit-filled," that is, of Christ. But these are crucial questions. Does the spiritual life emerge fully only after a long process of denial of the flesh and the world? Or is the process of purgation essentially "spiritual" rather than "physical?" Or do all persons have the Christ within which, given cooperation on anyone's part, results in a Christ-like (i.e. spiritual) life? Or does election by God convey Christ's spirit, which then inevitably results in a Christ-like life? Or is the cooperation of the chosen also required? And further, is the truly Christ-like life essentially a matter of spiritual submission, or are
there physical constraints as well? And if there are physical con-
straints, what are they?

It would seem to be no accident that of all the positions we
have considered so far in our study, the two strongly Christocentric
emphases we have encountered have gone hand in hand with a "high"
view of the spiritual life. For Trithemius a life of renunciation and
obedience is the means to a life of perfect peace and union with the
divine; for Thomas Müntzer the birth of the spiritual life takes place
as the result of God's direct action in the yielded soul. At this point
we must also take note of Hans Denck, whom Sattler would have known
in Strasbourg or Lahr after his own position had been established.
Denck too had a strongly Christocentric view, linked with a "high"
doctrine of the immanent Word. In order to shed more light on
Sattler's teaching on the victory of the spirit in the believer we will
first gather together as many clues as we can from his own writings,
then going on to contrast Sattler's teachings in a general way with
those of St. Benedict and Trithemius. We will be guided by three
areas of inquiry. We will ask first concerning the relationship between
Spirit and Word and, more generally, spirit and outward life; secondly
we will consider differences and similarities in "ascetic theology"; finally
we will examine the theme of regeneration.

1. Spirit and Word; Spirit and Flesh.

The tendency to divide the "Radical Reformation" along the
lines of Spirit and Word stems from the very real problem of making
sense of a large amount of disparate data, but on occasion such cate-
gories cast more shadow than light on the subject. In the past the subdivision of Anabaptists into Evangelical, Revolutionary and Contemplative types has led to the grouping of Michael Sattler with the "Evangelicals" Grebel, Mantz and Blaurock, over against Denck the "Contemplative." The reasons for listing Sattler with the Zürich Anabaptists are clear: in both cases the commands of the written Word are understood to provide the guidelines for the Christian; Hans Denck, on the other hand, values the inner Word over the written Word. Sattler held to "Word" over "Spirit" when the question is put in this way.

So far so good, but if left here the comparison fails to note the points of difference between Sattler and the Zürich Anabaptists or the points of similarity between Sattler and Denck. We have seen that in the central question of Christocentrism Sattler and the Zürich Anabaptists do not agree; but precisely here do Sattler and Denck agree. Further, it is Sattler's Christocentrism that leads him to speak of the spirit conquering the flesh, but we hear nothing of this in Zürich. It appears that the typology is at fault here, for in terms of the "life of the spirit" Sattler does not "fit" precisely with either Grebel or Denck. At this point we may elaborate on Walter Klaassen's insight regarding Spirit and Word: rather than applying an "antipodal" distinction, we may speak rather of "degrees of spiritualisation" in a graduated continuum. Michael Sattler may well fall somewhere between Grebel and Denck rather than at one pole or the other.

We may take it as abundantly demonstrated that Michael Sattler holds to the authority of the written Word. We have seen that his view
of scriptural commands recalls his Benedictine past as well as the views of some Zürich and Unterland Anabaptists. But the fact that Sattler relied on the "spirit" for his understanding of scripture is less often recognized, even though the sources strongly suggest this conclusion.\textsuperscript{85}

Two witnesses from very different geographical regions testify that Sattler claimed to have received significant guidance from the Holy Spirit. Jacob Ottelinus reports that Sattler relied on the Spirit in interpreting scripture.

\textit{...in consequence of his monastic position, he attacks the one bringing him scriptures and reproaches him for being an adherent of the dead letter, and instead of the adduced argument, he claims that the Spirit has revealed to him all things needful...}\textsuperscript{86}

Even after allowing for polemic intent, Ottelinus’ testimony indicates that when pressed, Sattler founded his interpretation on the direct leading of the Holy Spirit. Apparently he made a similar point at his trial, for Eberhard Hofmann, the hostile city clerk from Ensisheim, argued that the charges should not be re-read to Sattler “for if he has the Holy Spirit, as he boasts, the Spirit should be able to tell him what is in the indictment.”\textsuperscript{87} Although both men are unfriendly, the substantive agreement in their testimonies indicates that there is some truth in their assertions.\textsuperscript{88}

Sattler's own writings speak more in support of the visible signs, rather than the inner working of the Spirit, for Sattler found himself combating spiritualism and, to all appearances, antinomianism. The preface to the Schleitheim Articles speaks of the "great offense" introduced by the "false brothers among us" who "have turned away from the faith, thinking to practice and observe the freedom of the
Spirit and of Christ." But they are in fact not "spiritual" at all, but rather "are given over to the lasciviousness and license of the flesh."89 This antinomianism rests on a false separation between the inner condition of faith and the outer requirement of a Christ-like life. But "they who are Christ's [i.e. "spiritual"] have crucified their flesh with all its lusts and desires."90 Sattler, in giving guidelines for discerning what is truly spiritual, says that the fruits must be Christ-like. He has not, however, denied the necessity of the inward activity of the Holy Spirit.

The same pastoral problem is taken up again in the Letter to Horb, but this time Sattler's own position is made clearer. Some brothers "have become useless with vain speculation and understanding of those things which God wants to keep secret to Himself." At this point Sattler adds significantly, "I do not admonish or reject the grace and revelation of God, but the inflated use of this revelation."91 Here Sattler clarifies that he expects and accepts such direct "grace and revelation," but again he ends with the caveat that the inner spiritual life will bear fruit in outward behaviour, in a Christ-like life. Further, this "fruit" will be in harmony with scripture: "Let no one shift your goal, which has been set in the letter of Holy Scripture . . . . believe not their spirit, for it is completely submerged in the flesh."92

Putting all of this together, we must conclude that on the question of Spirit and Word Michael Sattler does indeed fall somewhere between the more literal Zürich Anabaptists and the spiritualist Denck. Sattler expected to be informed by the "grace and revelation of God," and most probably relied on such direct revelation, but the limits of
that revelation are set by scripture, read Christocentrically. As Orley Swartzentruber has noted, "In Sattler's mind there is no conflict between living in the light of the Spirit and living by the word of the Scriptures." 93

Just as Sattler could hold to both the Spirit and the Word in this way so also we have seen that his view of Spirit and Flesh follows the same pattern. The spirit-filled life is a life simultaneously informed by the Holy Spirit and following the clear commands of scripture and the pattern of Christ's life. A "spiritual" reading of scripture points to the suffering Christ. Stated negatively, one can discern by anyone's false fruits "whether they have abandoned themselves completely to God," 94 that is whether anyone is being ruled by the spirit of Christ. Stated positively, "those who are spiritual are Christ's . . . Christians are fully yielded and have placed their trust in their Father in heaven . . . But they are the true Christians who practice the teaching of Christ with works." 95 Scripture thus understood is the hedge against antinomianism on the one hand and the appeal to "love as the highest commandment" on the other; it is a doctrine that denies revolution to the peasants and to Müntzer, and the sword to Hubmaier, but demands proper external manifestations from Denck. 96 But it must be noted that here also is the demand for, and expectation of, a vital "life of the spirit" over against the literalism of Grebel and Mantz. Since Sattler apparently did not derive his view from any of these sources, are there traces of such a view in his monastic background?

One is inclined to answer this question in the affirmative, for the Benedictine tradition not only emphasizes obedience to scripture and
the Rule, it goes beyond the letter to stress the necessary correspondence between outer behaviour and the inner life.\textsuperscript{97} The outer life, although it must necessarily follow the pattern of Christ's humility and renunciation, is not the end or goal, rather the state of inward Christ-likeness is.\textsuperscript{98} Thus for Trithemius the highest aim of the monastic life comes in the "spiritual realm," when the monk has succeeded in subduing the flesh: "Just as in that celestial homeland there is the highest repose and eternal peace, so also in the region of the spirit there is a continual tranquility of mind."\textsuperscript{99} The end result of a visibly Christ-like life is the attainment of Christ's spirit of charity and peace.

The sixteenth century Benedictine tradition had its own stream of mystical piety, well represented by Trithemius,\textsuperscript{100} but it is a muted mysticism, centred on the liturgy of cloistered life,\textsuperscript{101} in little danger of veering into antinomianism or a rejection of the written Word or the Rule, as Trithemius' continual exhortations to obedience indicate. Thus if Denck and Müntzer give evidence of having appropriated elements of Eckhart and Tauler, we must say that Sattler gives evidence of having appropriated elements of the less enthusiastic spirituality current in some Benedictine monasteries, for Benedictine spirituality retains a firm hold on the commands of scripture, the life of Christ, and the prescriptions of the Rule.

2. Ascetic Theology.

So far we have looked at the content of the spiritual life in relation to the Word and external behaviour. In this general context the life of the spirit, according to Michael Sattler, contains elements
most closely congruent with those found in the sixteenth century spirituality of Bursfeld, as expressed by Trithemius. But it is when we begin to inquire about the process of attaining the spiritual life that the "fit" begins to go awry.

In his book on John Cassian, Owen Chadwick has outlined a very useful distinction between an "ascetic life" and an "ascetic theology." An "ascetic life" is a life such as is called for in the New Testament: a life of renunciation in imitation of Christ. "Yet an ascetic life is not identical with an ascetical theology nor does it necessarily beget it." An "ascetic theology"

conceives the ascetic life as a slow progress upward toward God, a climb of the hill by spiritual exercise -- prayer, mortification of the carnal lusts, growth in the knowledge of God -- until the soul has become Christ-like, God-like. The monastic tradition leading to St. Benedict and beyond him presupposes such an "ascetic theology."

We have seen that without a doubt Michael Sattler holds to a doctrine of an ascetic life of following Christ, as does the Benedictine tradition from which he emerged. But does Michael Sattler also have an ascetic theology such as is found in his Benedictine tradition?

The traditional Benedictine imagery used to represent its ascetic theology is the ascending ladder of degrees in humility, which St. Benedict borrowed from Cassian and which Trithemius comments on at length. We search in vain in Sattler's writings for parallel imagery or language. The ascetic language in Sattler does not point to progressive purification but rather to the maintenance of a fait accompli. Sattler speaks as if his hearers have already arrived, have already received the "spirit of Christ" in its fullness. For Sattler the ascetic life does not imply an ascetic theology.
How then, according the Sattler, do the believers receive the spirit? The answer here seems to be a direct election, with no particular suggestion of predestination or irresistibility. Out of the mass of humanity some are "called out of the world unto God" by Christ, "who has begun (the work of God) in us, and will direct and teach the same unto the end, to His glory and our salvation." Separation from the abominations of the world is the direct result of the work of Christ "who has freed us from the servitude of the flesh and fitted us for the service of God and the Spirit whom He has given us." It is the living spirit of Christ working in the believer that results in Christ-likeness and causes the elect to shine in the midst of the godless generation. In sum, the doctrine indicated by Sattler's writings is a doctrine of the reception of Christ's spirit at the time of election; the elect, therefore, are the saints who must thereafter preserve and maintain their purity.

Put this way, it appears that the life of the elect is a purely negative one of defense from contamination, but the positive counterpart to mere maintenance of purity is the eschatological hope in the imminent union with Christ the bridegroom. The "day of the Lord" will soon come, when "Babylon and the earthly Egypt" will receive their torment and suffering, and the pure bride of Christ will be a tabernacle to the Lord. The live hope for the future is the full union of the body of Christ with its Head.

When we look at this formulation against the background of Bursfeldian spirituality we see that Trithemius' emphasis on individual, subjective meditation leading to progressively perfect peace and charity
plays no role at all. For Sattler the believers already have the spirit of Christ: they are no longer viatores, they are the sancti. Although the final consummation and union has yet to take place between Christ and the believers, still the stress on progressive personal sanctification is absent. The reason for this would seem to be that for Sattler, in contrast to Trithemius, the immediate goal is eschatological union with Christ rather than mystical or spiritual union. Each believer is a "saint," filled with Christ's spirit, awaiting the final consummation. Also in contrast to Trithemius, the future hope, the object of maintaining purity, is communal rather than individual: the Body of Christ as a whole awaits full union with the Head when he returns in glory. This specific teaching on the ascetic life as the maintenance of purity by the community of saints, in expectation of Christ's return to that community, does not have discernable roots in the monastic spirituality that formed Sattler's background.

What are we to conclude concerning Michael Sattler's Christocentric polarity given that we have found a close congruence with monasticism in considering the renunciation of the flesh, but less congruence when considering the victory of the spirit? Clearly we must look elsewhere for possible sources of the latter teaching. But we must also note that the distinctions we have drawn in the latter case have been somewhat overdrawn for the sake of analysis. While Sattler does not have an ascetic theology, nevertheless for him the battle of the spirit against the flesh is constant and ongoing; there is always the possibility that the flesh will overtake the spirit, hence his constant exhortations to perseverance and vigilance. Conversely, in the monastic
tradition, while the highest level of spirituality lies at the end of an ascetic climb, the very entry into the monastery indicates a partial victory of the spirit, as does each step of the climb. Here again perseverance is called for since the victory of the spirit over the flesh is not yet assured. The ongoing battle of the spirit against the flesh, following Christ's example as read in scripture, is shared by Sattler and the Benedictine tradition; the essential structural conception is the same.

The difference we have noted comes in the respective images evoked in describing the battle between spirit and flesh. The Rule of St. Benedict suggests an image of individual soldiers enlisting in the infantry of the divine King, battling ever upward to the summit with the weapons of renunciation and obedience; Michael Sattler suggests a more defensive image of a community of warriors, hand-picked to defend the divine citadel, waiting expectantly for the king and his army to return and end the siege: their weapons, however, are also renunciation and obedience. While these two images of the battle between spirit and flesh are significantly different in aim and conception, the essential congruence of the overall structure is no less significant. As we have concluded concerning Sattler's doctrine of civil government so too we may conclude here that an essentially Benedictine structure has been altered in some important particulars, but remains visible behind those particulars.
3. Regeneration.

As we have noted previously, for Sattler the elect are capable of sinless perfection. How far such a conclusion is removed from the main-line Reformation should be clear without further proof. It is also removed from Benedictine anthropology, for although St. Benedict presupposes the potential perfectability of man, and works toward effecting that perfection, he also fully expects the process to be a difficult one, lasting a lifetime, to be achieved by few. For Sattler, on the other hand, election, repentance and baptism suffices to place sinless perfection within grasp. In short, Sattler's anthropology is neither Benedictine nor Protestant. We may say however that Sattler's anthropology may conceivably be a radicalization of "optimistic" Benedictine anthropology, but by no means can we say that Sattler has radicalized Protestant (i.e. Augustinian) anthropology. On this question Sattler and the Protestant Reformers stand fundamentally opposed.

A further point must be made concerning Sattler's anthropology. Although his view is undeniably "optimistic" in that perfection may be attained, nevertheless the accent falls not on man's own efforts at progressive purification, as it would in a Pelagian context, but rather falls on the action of Christ's Spirit. In other words, what appears at first glance to be an uncommonly optimistic anthropology is, on further analysis, the manifestation of a very high pneumatology. Sattler nowhere teaches or implies that humankind can attain perfection by a natural exercise of virtue. The possibility of sainthood depends rather upon the transformation effected by election and the reception of Christ's Spirit. Christ did not simply overcome the flesh in an historic sense;
He continues to work and claim victory by regenerating the yielded believer through His Spirit. The primary difference between Sattler's view on the working of the Spirit and the monastic view is, again, the absence of the image of progressive sanctification in Sattler. The Spirit of Christ regenerates immediately and leads to baptism and a Christ-like life. The baptized believers are the saints; they do not become the saints following a lifetime of learning to heed the Spirit. When we ask where in Michael Sattler's milieu he might have encountered such a teaching we are led directly to the early Anabaptists.

The Anabaptist call for a regenerated life on the part of Christians is one of the most visible characteristics of the movement. A radically changed life was expected following the acceptance of baptism. Such an understanding is found in the account of the first Zürich baptism,\textsuperscript{119} as well as in the subsequent testimony of Mantz,\textsuperscript{120} Blaurock,\textsuperscript{121} Grebel,\textsuperscript{122} Hubmaier,\textsuperscript{123} Kuenzi,\textsuperscript{124} Winkler,\textsuperscript{125} Roggenacher,\textsuperscript{126} Gross\textsuperscript{127} and countless others. There can be no doubt that the living of a regenerated life was a central and crucial Anabaptist theme.

Also evident in the early testimonies is the pneumatic basis for this new life,\textsuperscript{128} although the sources here are less consistently present. In fact, we may usefully employ the image of a "tensional continuum" here again in describing the variety of Anabaptist positions on the working of the Spirit. On the one hand we have the strong stress on the renewing power of the Word, especially in Grebel and Hubmaier, the latter of whom notes that "the Spirit brings us life, and the Spirit comes with the Word."\textsuperscript{129} At the other end of the scale we see scattered references in the Swiss Täuferakten to the direct working of the Spirit.
in the yielded and baptized believer. In short, a variety of views concerning the working of the Spirit were available in the Anabaptist context, with the common conclusion being that the believer was to bear witness to the working of God in his life by the acceptance of water baptism and the living of a sanctified life. Thus Michael Sattler's own anthropology and pneumatology, although it can be seen as a radicalization of elements already present in the Benedictine tradition, has very direct parallels in the Anabaptist milieu. We may conclude that Sattler's optimistic teaching concerning the victory of the Spirit over the flesh, in both its pneumatological and anthropological poles, reflects the direct influence of the early Anabaptists.
CHAPTER X

SATTLER'S SOTERIOLOGY

The question of whether Anabaptism has Catholic or Protestant affinities has had a long history of scholarly debate that continues to this day. Two basic positions have emerged: Anabaptism is seen as either essentially Protestant, "the culmination of the Reformation" in Bender's phrase,\(^1\) or as non-Protestant in some central theological distinctives.\(^2\) Discussion on this question has become rather murky, for there is no general agreement on central terms and definitions. Some scholars speak of Anabaptism as though there existed a uniform movement with a well-defined theology; others speak of Anabaptism but mean only the Swiss Brethren; yet others (the most recent trend) speak of regional movements within Anabaptism. Moreover, terms central to the theological discussion, such as Pelagianism, Semi-Pelagianism, faith, works, grace and justification are used with varying degrees of precision. As a result, a survey of the secondary literature reveals a perplexing variety of claims and counter-claims based on widely diverse data, interpreted with more or less critical rigour.

Our way through this maze will be to concentrate on the analysis of Michael Sattler's thought, rather than speaking to the issue of Anabaptism as such. Secondly, what is at issue in our discussion is the identification of a soteriology. The central issue for Pelagius, Cassian, Augustine, Luther and Sattler is "How is salvation to be
accomplished?" In this regard we wish to know whether Michael Sattler has a Pelagian, Semi-Pelagian, Augustinian or wholly original soteriology. In order to know this, however, we must pay particular attention to the doctrines of salvation represented by the well-worn labels.

We certainly make no claim to completeness in this chapter, but rather wish only to outline the essential background to Sattler's particular soteriology. The chapter is divided into three sections, the first recapitulating Sattler's view, the second outlining the Pelagian controversy, and the third focussing on the Reformation context. We will exclude Anabaptism from this discussion, returning to it in conclusion.

Sattler's view

Bucer and Capito, the reformers of Strasbourg and contemporary observers of Michael Sattler, provide an interesting commentary on Sattler's soteriology. Martin Bucer, in comparing Sattler to Denck, stated unequivocably that "with regard to the redemption of Christ, upon which everything depends, we have found no such error in this Michael as in Denck." Bucer here appears to indicate that, unlike Denck's rejection of sola fide, Sattler holds to such a view. That is, Sattler holds that we are saved through faith in Christ who redeemed us from sin through His death. Bucer had noted earlier that a "printed booklet" concerning Sattler "proved his point [concerning baptism] by arguing that faith alone can save." One could conclude from all this that Bucer has recognized Sattler to have accepted the Protestant view of Christ's vicarious atonement and the corresponding doctrine of justification by faith alone.
On the other hand, if Bucer meant to indicate that Sattler held to a strictly Protestant view of justification another comment he makes is curious indeed. He calls Sattler "a leader in the baptism order" thus implying that Sattler was continuing a form of monasticism rather than relying on Christ's atonement. Capito confirms this impression in his letter to the mayor of Horb: "we were not in agreement with him [Sattler] as he wished to make Christians righteous by their acceptance of articles and an outward commitment. This we thought to be the beginning of a new monasticism." These two assertions -- the one affirming that Sattler held to a Protestant doctrine of atonement and justification, the other that he continued to demand "external works" for salvation -- are contradictory, at least from a Protestant perspective.

As we have noted above, for Sattler the question of salvation does not rest solely on faith. Faith leads to baptism, which indicates joining the Body of Christ and living a Christ-like life. Soteriology cannot be divorced from ecclesiology and ethics. What then is Michael Sattler's doctrine concerning Christ the Saviour? Are we saved by faith in Christ's atoning death or are we saved by a faithful following of the suffering Christ? Clearly the question is improperly formulated; it is not an "either/or" matter for Sattler, but rather a question of "both/and." The apparent confusion of the Strasbourg reformers anticipates this answer.

Wolfgang Capito has the clearest grasp of Sattler's position as a whole, for he states outright that although Sattler and his followers begin with confession of sin and God's gracious forgiveness through Christ, still they refuse to allow salvation to be comprehended by faith
alone. Salvation must include faith in God's gracious forgiveness in Christ, and a Christ-like life lived in the community of saints. Or, as Capito puts it in his appeal for Sattler's imprisoned followers at Horb, "their foundation is truly that we must hear Christ the Son of God and that he who believes in Him has eternal life. This foundation stands fast against the gates of hell. On it, however, they build wood, hay and stubble..."9 In short, Bucer's praise of Sattler's position regarding the redemption of Christ is accurate, insofar as it indicates Sattler's soteriological point of entry, but Bucer and Capito both recognized Sattler's unwillingness to let the matter rest with sola fide. In encountering Sattler's soteriological requirements of adult baptism and a following of the suffering Christ in separation from the world they spoke of a "new monasticism."

What are the possible sources of Sattler's view? In pursuing this question we will begin by looking at the Benedictine context. The most relevant issue here appears to be the question of grace, for through monastic theology a distinctive emphasis concerning grace and salvation was preserved and transmitted.

Grace

Broadly speaking there have been two distinct soteriological emphases in the history of the Christian Church.10 Taken at their extreme poles, these have been either a stress on the sufficiency of divine action in the saving process, or a stress on man's ability and responsibility in answering God's call for sanctity. The Church has generally rejected either extreme, recognizing that the two poles are in a dialectical relationship rather than an antithetical one.11 Nevertheless
following the Reformation, has come to take its stand firmly with St. Augustine rather than with Pelagius. Although extreme Augustinianism has generally been denied (e.g. double predestination), the dialectic clearly grants priority to grace over against free will. Even so, many doctrinal possibilities remain. Just as there are degrees of Augustinianism so too there are degrees of Pelagianism.

The essence of Pelagianism lay in its anthropology. True to his ascetic interest, Pelagius saw man as fitted by nature for a holy and perfect life.\textsuperscript{12} Adam's original sin had left no permanent disability in man's nature as such; "Men had simply decided to imitate Adam, the first sinner."\textsuperscript{13} Thus original sin is seen as a habit or disposition to sin, inherited externally; although sin accumulates over time, man's essential nature remains untouched.

Since man's nature is innately capable of perfection, and original sin consists of an accretion of habit, it follows that the doctrine of grace invoked by Pelagius will be correspondingly external. Grace was understood as having at least four aspects: 1) as the original gift of the capacity for perfection (i.e. the gift of man's perfectible nature), 2) as \textit{doctrina} (Law), 3) as \textit{exemplum} (Christ), and 4) as forgiveness of sins.\textsuperscript{14} Man has been granted, first of all, the ability to make proper choices and this is a gift of grace; this is as close as Pelagius will come to interior grace. Secondly, the Law is a gift in that through the Law man is enabled to strip away the layers of sin (ignorance) which have accumulated. Thirdly, Christ's example of how to live serves this same purifying and educating function. Finally, through baptism one's past sins are forgiven through Christ's atoning death on
the cross. In sum, grace as understood by Pelagius establishes man's essential freedom *qua* man. Following instruction and baptism, man remains totally free to choose either good or evil. Grace does not save man of itself, but rather serves to open up the possibility of salvation. When pressed, Pelagius held that he wished to maintain both the reality of free choice and the help of God, but God helps man by granting him the ability to choose: "That we are able to do the good comes of him who gave us this ability; that we do the good belongs to ourselves."  

The Pelagian view of God sees Him as a God of justice: God would not require something of a man which that man would not be able to fulfill. Neither would God punish a man for what lay beyond his capacity. Since God is just, and since He has commanded obedience from men, it is clear that men can fulfill God's commands, if only they will. "Since perfection is possible, it is required." Man will be judged finally by his success in fulfilling a rational, intelligible system of law. Pelagius' scheme is thus rather legalistic, but insofar as Pelagius was expressing a concern for Christian obedience to God's commands, he was expressing a concern which was to reappear throughout the ensuing debates.

When Augustine wrote *On the Deserts and Remission of Sins* in 411 he was sketching a reply to some ideas that were "in the air" and which had been reported to him by Marcellinus from Carthage, but Augustine's response established what was to remain the groundwork of his position. He began by attacking the Pelagian notion of original sin. As he in whom all are made alive not only offered himself as a pattern of righteousness to be imitated, but also gives to the faithful that altogether hidden grace of his Spirit, which he pours unseen even into infants: so he in whom
all die not only is the example imitated by those who voluntarily transgress the commandment of God, but also has infected in himself with the corruption of his carnal desire all those who come of his seed.  

Man is sinful because of standing in Adam's lineage. The radical depravity of human nature is essential to Augustine's position, as is the interior nature of grace.

In *The Spirit and the Letter* written in the following year Augustine filled in his position in more detail. Augustine had written that man was theoretically sinless, but actually never so. Marcellinus had written to ask how this could be so. Augustine now replies that the human will, if left to itself, will sin. Pelagius had identified the problem as one of ignorance and habit; Augustine maintains rather that it is no solution to know what ought to be done for the Law does not provide the means of fulfilling the requirement. Further, although a person may fulfill the law through fear, this is not the same as fulfilling the law through love. God looks upon the heart and it is on that basis that man is judged. Finally the internal gift of the Holy Spirit, the gift of the love of God, must proceed from God as grace. "By the law of works God says: 'Do what I command'; by the law of faith we say to God, 'Give what thou commandest.'"  

Toward the end of *The Spirit and the Letter* Augustine turns to the question of whether faith may be said to be in man's power. In the course of answering this question he spells out the limits of the human will. Augustine defines "power" as the union of will (voluntas) with ability (potestas). Augustine grants that man's will is involved in believing, in that man assents to the truth; however, if the will is left to itself it inevitably wills sin, even if the power to sin be lacking.
Now it sometimes occurs that God, as an act of judgement, grants a man the ability to perform the acts "natural" to man qua fallen man, i.e. God allows some men to damn themselves in that he grants them the potestas but does not instill the love of the good in their voluntas. On the other hand, God grants to the predestined not only potestas but also the inward love of the good. In the final analysis it is God's grace and mercy that bring about the love of God and the good actions of those who will be saved, while it is man's own fallen, sinful nature which is responsible for the condemnation of the damned.

This way of expressing the limits of man's will and the extent of God's grace immediately raises the question of God's justice: is it just for God to condemn men for the sin of Adam? If man can do nothing to save himself, how can it be just that he be damned? On what basis are some men saved and others damned if all are equally guilty before God? But to questions of this kind Augustine replies that God's justice cannot be measured in terms of man's justice. God's justice so far exceeds man's justice that the only answer possible is the one given by St. Paul: "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are his judgements, and his ways past finding out!" (Romans 11:33). The answer is cloaked in mystery.

In conclusion, Augustine returns to what was ostensibly the central question addressed: how can man be said to be potentially sinless, and yet never have achieved sinlessness? For Augustine man is potentially sinless because God can conceivably bring such a thing to pass. But certainly man qua fallen man lacks any such potential for
perfection. Man is potentially sinless only insofar as he is a creature capable of being supernaturally raised to that state by an all-powerful God. For Pelagius there had been no innate, natural hindrance to perfection in man's nature; for Augustine there can be no hindrance for God.

Pelagius was condemned as a heretic in 418, and with Augustine's victory came the decisive statement that God's grace is primary in the saving process, given man's inherent sinfulness. Out of the "lump of damnation" that is the human race, God mercifully chooses and predestines some to salvation: "His grace converts them, leads and controls them throughout their life and brings them to the eternal kingdom."

This grace is irresistible in that after having received it, the human will has no desire to turn to evil; conversely, prior to grace, the human will had no desire to turn from evil. The practical implications of this position seemed especially dangerous to ascetic Christians, for whom efforts of the will were a daily concern. Some monks from Hadrumetum addressed questions to Augustine concerning the relation of grace to works, to which he replied in two further writings, On Grace and Free Will and On Rebupe and Grace. With these works Augustine began to deal with what has come to be known as the "Semi-Pelagian" position.

The monks from Hadrumetum were concerned that a strong stress on God's grace negated man's own efforts in the saving process; in Grace and Free Will Augustine sets out to show that he does not hold either to grace at the expense of free will (determinism) or free will at the expense of grace (Pelagianism). Augustine begins by quoting scripture which lends support to man's free will: "it is certainly the
freedom of the will that is being cited whenever someone is told: 'Be not overcome by evil.' For, to be willing or unwilling has to do with each man's will.\textsuperscript{27} Since man has free will, then clearly he is responsible for any sinning which is committed. But, there are also scripture passages where, although the will to perform good deeds is present, the power to do the deed is lacking. Such passages indicate that even the good will of man is in need of grace: "Even when his will is called into play and he is told: 'Be not overcome by evil,' what good is this to him unless the command can be carried out with the help of grace?"\textsuperscript{28}

With regard to grace the central question is really the question of merit: can man merit grace in any way? The answer is negative, for grace is not given as the result of merit; rather merit is the result of grace. What then does scripture mean to indicate when it says that "God will render to everyone according to his works?" Augustine answers that "our good works themselves, which enable us to receive eternal life, are referred to God's grace by reason of our Lord's words: 'Without me you can do nothing.'" In brief, eternal life is "grace given for grace."\textsuperscript{29} Faith comes from God's grace, good works spring from that faith, and eternal life from those good works.

In discussing the justice of God, Augustine reiterates his former position: God never gives man less than man deserves --- only more than man deserves in the case of those chosen and predestined for salvation. Given his discussion of grace and God's justice it would seem that Augustine has fallen into asserting an extreme doctrine of grace to the virtual exclusion of free will, which is one of the positions he is allegedly combatting in his work. What becomes of man's free will? In
conclusion Augustine affirms that grace does not take away man's will but rather turns man's will from bad to good. Man's will is "free" insofar as it is either "free from righteousness" in Adam or "free from sin" in Christ, but man's will as such is not destroyed.

The questions from Hadrumetum indicate a frame of reference which is in some ways closer to Pelagius than Augustine. Insofar as asceticism is spiritual exercise, it presupposes human effort and progress toward the heavenly goal. Insofar as grace and predestination are stressed the practice of asceticism is questioned in a very basic way. Augustine's writings to the monks at Hadrumetum came into the hands of John Cassian in Gaul, and he set out to articulate an alternate theoretical framework more in harmony with ascetic Christianity as he understood it.

John Cassian's reply to Augustine is contained in the thirteenth of his Conferences. In the seventh chapter of that Conference Cassian begins an examination of scripture, much in the manner of Augustine in Grace and Free Will. Cassian quotes the seemingly contradictory passages, the one indicating freedom of the will, the other indicating the primacy of grace. The question for some, Cassian says, is whether God grants his grace because of the beginning of a good will in man (even though the power to act may be lacking) or whether that beginning itself is the result of grace. Like Augustine Cassian affirms that both grace and free will must be upheld, but unlike Augustine Cassian wishes to leave a small space in which man's will may operate for good prior to the reception of grace. This is the heart of the Semi-Pelagian position: the granting of the first grace depends upon man's meriting that grace in some small measure.
Cassian denies the total and radical fallenness of Adam: Adam received the knowledge of evil after the Fall, but this merely obscured and did not obliterate his knowledge of good. There remain some "seeds of goodness" in every soul, even though no great claims can be made for them, for God's grace must be added if the "seeds" are to grow. In the final analysis, however, man's will is truly free in that man can make some small turning either toward God or away from God; when such a feeble turning toward God is made, God in his mercy aids and strengthens man with grace. Further, the fact that man makes some feeble effort does not subtract from God's gift of grace.

And none the less does God's grace continue to be free grace while in return for some small and trivial efforts it bestows with priceless bounty such glory of immortality, and such gifts of eternal bliss.

Cassian here anticipates the later scholastic distinction between merit de congruo and merit de condigno: man's efforts can never subtract from the reward, for the reward is much too great in proportion to the effort, but man is expected at least to do his minute part.

The image Cassian uses to illustrate the relationship between God and man is that of an anxious nurse with a child: the nurse watches over the child through all the stages of infancy, setting tasks of corresponding difficulty for the child so that it may grow into full maturity. Just so does God lead his children into salvation. For Cassian God is a loving, concerned Father who saves men in a variety of ways. In some who have a feeble desire for salvation He adds his grace and urges them onward; others He converts by giving them the initial desire for salvation, and still others He converts against their will. Just how God works salvation in man is cloaked in mystery: it
caused the apostle to exclaim "O the depth of the riches . . . ", and so must men exclaim in all humility.\textsuperscript{38} The conclusion must be that God works all things in us, but also that the action of man's free will is all-important, even though how both statements can be true simultaneously is not open to man's scrutiny.\textsuperscript{39}

It is clear that Cassian stands a good distance from Pelagius. Unlike Pelagius Cassian does not ascribe overtly human standards of justice to God, nor does his view of original sin posit a mere external "habit," nor does he view grace as being given only in return for human effort, nor does human effort merit salvation. The most visible points at issue between Cassian and Augustine come down to three: regarding man's nature, must man's will be seen as free only insofar as it is free from righteousness following Adam's fall, or do some seeds of goodness remain? Secondly, concerning the nature of God, is He to be seen as an inscrutable judge, or as a solicitous Father? Finally, concerning grace, is prevenient grace always necessary for faith, or can man set the beginnings of faith prior to grace?

Pelagius had clearly erred on the side of man. Such was Augustine's central point and it was accepted even by the "Semi-Pelagians."\textsuperscript{40} But Cassian's critique is far more subtle. Cassian criticises Augustine's doctrine of predestination and irresistible prevenient grace as being an instance of intellectual pride in that it destroys the mystery of the saving process. One cannot presume to know, says Cassian, how every particular man must be saved. The mystery of salvation for Cassian centres on the paradoxical juxtaposition of the human will and divine grace. The dialectic between the two must not
be destroyed by an outright denial of the human freedom to will the good in some minute measure. For Augustine, on the other hand, the mystery of salvation centres on the inscrutability of God's predestination: any emphasis on man's part falsifies the true state of affairs; man minus grace is only free to sin.

Such was the basic opposition between Augustine and Cassian. Augustine's view was well suited to the structure and nature of the western Church as it had evolved in the century following Constantine's conversion. The emphasis on God's grace and election ensured that no man could have knowledge of anyone else's ultimate salvation. The Church, then, was not to be composed of the "saints" -- as it clearly was not by the fifth century -- but in its earthly form contained both the saved and the damned, with no sure visible distinction between them. As Peter Brown has said: "The victory of Augustine over Pelagius was also a victory for the average good Catholic layman of the later Empire, over an austere, reforming ideal." As a Catholic bishop Augustine defended the right of congregations to be composed of the lukewarm as well as the fervent.

It is also clear that Cassian's view, while avoiding Pelagius' requirement that all Christians be, in effect, monks, was a view well suited to the monasticism just emerging in the West. Along with the rapid growth of the Church following Constantine came also the growth of monasticism for those Christians who felt called to live according to Christ's counsels. It was in large part Cassian who transmitted to the West the ascetic spirituality of the East, of Clement, Origen, Evagrius, Chrysostom and the Desert Fathers, that is, the teaching of an
ascetic ascent to God. The vast bulk of Cassian's writing centres on the removal of obstacles from the path of grace, even though he also affirms, on occasion, that God's grace is ultimately responsible for man's ascetic progress. A full-blown doctrine of predestination and irresistible grace was perceived to be inimical to the ascetic enterprise, given the stress on progressive sanctification through discipline and training. For Cassian grace is considered primarily in relation to works, as an assisting power.43

The Church soon decided against Cassian's position: in 529 the Second Council of Orange declared that any turning toward God must be "prevened" by grace;44 with this the Semi-Pelagian position became heretical. This was not the end of the debate, however, for "the Pelagian controversy . . . had been decided exclusively among the bishops of the Latin Church. One vital area had not been touched: the monasteries."45 The debate between Augustine and Cassian is particularly relevant for our study since St. Benedict relied heavily on Cassian in composing his Rule46 and also recommended the reading of Cassian to his monks without any qualification whatsoever.47

The question of whether or not the RB contains a Semi-Pelagian doctrine of grace is, understandably, a sensitive one for Benedictine writers;48 the Rule itself does not deal with the issue directly, for it is concerned with the ascetic life, not theology. As such, however, it does make an indirect theological statement: as in Cassian, the stress in the RB falls on progressive sanctification and efforts of the will on the part of the monks. Although references to grace in the RB are muted, there are some notable phrases: "First, I
advise that you should implore the help of God to accomplish every
good work you undertake" says St. Benedict early in the prologue. 49
Further, in answer to the question of who will dwell in the heavenly
tabernacle, St. Benedict answers: "He who fears the Lord without grow-
ing proud of his virtue and humbly acknowledges that what is good in
him does not proceed from himself." And, after exhorting his monks to
fulfill the conditions necessary for dwelling in the heavenly tabernacle
(namely achieving virtue), St. Benedict says "we must beseech God to
supply with his grace what is impossible for nature to effect alone." 50

In those places where the RB mentions grace the points made
parallel Cassian: the stress in the RB is on grace as an aid to merito-
rious works and as an antidote to pride. 51 The practical, day-to-day
stress in the RB falls on man's efforts to yield and obey, and so to
cooperate with grace. Perseverance is rewarded by salvation. Whether
or not this teaching is technically "Semi-Pelagian" depends on whether
grace "prevenes" the many meritorious works mentioned by St. Benedict,
but the Rule is silent on this matter. At the very least one must say
that the Rule points toward an essentially Non-Augustinian view of
grace and free will in that predestination and irresistible grace are
minimized.

Granted that he was writing only for monks and not for the
Church at large, for St. Benedict the question of salvation is strongly
linked to personal sanctification. Thus God's grace in seen primarily as
an enabling power that can bring forth visible, Christ-like fruits such
as humility, obedience, and yieldedness, provided the monk is diligent
and applies himself to virtue. As a consequence the monastery is
expected to be a visible community of saints, daily growing in perfection and sanctity. Within the Church at large grace might conceivably remain hidden; within St. Benedict's monastery it was expected to manifest itself.

The Reformation: Justification

In the millennium separating the Second Council of Orange from the posting of Luther's theses in 1517 the Augustinianism decreed by the Council of Orange was steadily modified. By the tenth century the decrees themselves had mysteriously disappeared; they only surfaced again -- no less mysteriously -- at the Council of Trent. The focus in the meantime had shifted to the Church, its clergy, and its expanded doctrines of penance and sacraments -- the visible signs of invisible grace. In the Church at large, grace was to be mediated through the sacraments. The Church took on a rather Pelagian cast; in the popular mind, at least, salvation often became a matter of attaining enough merit by the mediation and intervention of the Church and the Saints. Beyond the Church at large were two further centres of influence, the schools and the monasteries.

In scholastic theology the dialectic between God's grace and man's response was subtly formulated in a great variety of ways which cannot concern us here. In general, however, the rational fallenness of man was tempered, the inscrutable nature of predestination was softened somewhat, and grace was understood to include an enabling function which called for cooperation on the part of man. On the question of whether prevenient grace is required for a turning toward God, St. Thomas, following Augustine, clearly answered that there
could be no turning toward God prior to God's grace.\textsuperscript{57} The Nominalists, on the other hand, suggested that "God is committed to give his grace to all who do what is in them." That is, "if man goes halfway, God will meet him with the gift of grace."\textsuperscript{58} Luther was evidently responding to the "Semi-Pelagian" position of the Nominalists when he affirmed his radical Augustinianism.\textsuperscript{59}

The complexity and diversity of scholastic theology precludes the possibility of an accurate summary. Nevertheless, Gerhard Ebeling has described the generally accepted Catholic position as follows:

A righteous person is one who is endowed with the power to carry out righteous acts. Although this \textit{habitus} is not self-acquired, but is infused through grace, nevertheless the way in which the acts of a justified person proceed from this \textit{habitus} is conceived in entirely moral terms. That is, the life of the righteous person is located within himself as a new, albeit supernatural quality, but one which is as it were his nature, in so far as the new life of the righteous person must be realized on the basis of this endowment. Thus a person is only truly justified to the extent to which grace is realized in works.\textsuperscript{60}

For the scholastics grace enabled and required a change in actual human righteousness.

It is clear that the Rule of St. Benedict stands in basic agreement with the medieval Catholic views outlined above; in fact, the RB contributed greatly to the formation of the medieval Catholic view by preserving and transmitting an emphasis on personal sanctity. Thus when St. Benedict uses the word "faith" it has a distinctly non-Augustinian ring: "let us walk by faith and try to serve him with good works . . . that we may deserve to behold him who has called us to his kingdom."\textsuperscript{61} The monastery is a school, a training ground whose goal is the objective purification and ultimate salvation of the soldiers of Christ.
St. Benedict does not speak directly to the question of the nature of grace and, as we have seen, there were several doctrinal formulations available by the late medieval period. Granted that the followers of the RB will be concerned with progressive sanctification rather than with theological discussions concerning grace, still we wish to know what doctrine of grace was current among sixteenth century Benedictines.

This question is virtually impossible to answer because of the lack of written records, but an explicit "Semi-Pelagian" teaching is absent from Trithemius' writings. Trithemius' commentary on the RB contains a most interesting passage discussing the question of whether we are saved by grace or by merit. Trithemius answers as follows:

Surely we are saved by grace. Paul says to the Romans "therefore by faith, that according to grace the promise may be firm to all the seed." If therefore we are saved by grace, of what necessity is merit? For the Apostle also says to the Romans, "Indeed we think that a man is justified by faith without the works of the law." It must be said and believed, that we are saved through grace, by means of merit, because merit comes from grace: indeed grace prevenes that holy work by which one accumulates merit, as the Lord says: "Without me you are able to do nothing." Therefore he who does not have grace is also not able to do good works. For the Apostle says in the same place as above "[They are] justified freely by his grace, through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus." Do you see that the faithful are saved by grace? In fact when he says "we think that a man is justified by faith without the works of the law" it must be understood of the Mosaic Law, not of the Evangelical Law, and therefore he added explicitly "by faith," that is, by faith formed by charity because, as James says, "faith without works is dead." 62

The problem of synthesizing Romans and James is overcome by Trithemius by means of two central distinctions. First Paul's reference to "the Law" must be understood to be referring to the Mosaic Law rather than
the Evangelical law of Love. Then follows the conclusion that when Paul speaks of being justified by faith without the works of the law, he meant to indicate that we are justified by "faith formed by love" without the works of the Mosaic Law. Certainly we are saved by grace, and certainly the only merit possible accrues to man as the result of prevenient grace, but that grace is an enabling grace which carries a demand for works, i.e. which demands actual righteousness. 63

The distinction between "unformed faith" and "faith formed by love" was first formulated by Peter Lombard in his famous Sentences and was common currency in medieval Catholic theology, but the use to which Trithemius applies the distinction is suitably Benedictine. The above discussion was called forth by the following sentence in the Prologue of the RB: "I am to erect a school for beginners in the service of the Lord: which I hope to establish on laws not too difficult or grievous." 64 How such a sentence could have evoked an extended discussion of justification, grace, faith and works is not immediately obvious, but the point that Trithemius wishes to make is simply that since God saves the faithful through grace, and such grace prevenes meritorious works, there can be no such things as laws "too difficult or grievous." 65 The monastic object of ascending the ladder of humility to perfect charity is an attainable object, for the works leading to perfect charity and salvation are enabled by grace. Thus what was to become the classic Reformation text directed against monasticism, "a man is justified by faith, without the works of the law," is used by Trithemius to argue the attainability and necessity of actual righteousness.
Insofar as Trithemius is representative of reformed Benedictine thought on this matter, we must say that his teaching on grace is certainly not Pelagian or even Semi-Pelagian, but neither is it strictly Augustinian in its emphasis. In fact Trithemius stands in essential agreement with St. Thomas and the later formulations of the Council of Trent: on the one hand natural man cannot justify himself without God's grace, but on the other hand man must assent to, and cooperate with, grace when it is freely offered, or that grace is of no avail. And further, a man who so assents and cooperates will become more just in fact. Such a view is in harmony with St. Benedict's aim of salvation through sanctification.

In summary, by the time of the Reformation three distinct spheres are visible in the Catholic Church, each with its own characteristic emphasis concerning grace. In the Church at large, stress fell on grace as mediated through the institution of the sacramental Church; in the schools there was little consensus regarding crucial definitions, although it was agreed that human cooperation with grace, and actual righteousness following grace, are essential; in monasteries following the RB the concern remained progressive sanctification through discipline, leading to salvation. In this latter context the requirement of actual, visible righteousness received a particular emphasis. All three of these perspectives elicited a reaction from Martin Luther.

Luther's central attack on the mediating function of the sacramental church came in The Babylonian Captivity of the Church. There, against the understanding of the mass as a sacrifice and the good works of penance Luther argued for the necessity of direct faith in
God's promises as contained in the Word. There is no need of a specially ordained priesthood to handle the sacraments of the altar: "we are all equally priests, that is to say, we have the same power in respect to the Word and the sacraments." In short, the sacramental church and its clergy is to be deprived of its special mediating status; all Christians stand equally before God who looks only upon their faith. In this context, Luther's attack on salvation by works is an attack against the view which saw merit accumulated by endowed masses, pilgrimages, indulgences, and the rest, all of which were within the province of the Roman Church.

Luther's attack on scholastic theology was aimed in large measure at the teachings of Ockham and Biel concerning grace. Contrary to the teaching that man could merit first grace by "doing what in him lies," Luther affirmed man's radical fallenness: man without grace is only free to sin. Although Ockham's teaching concerning prevenient grace differs from St. Thomas', for Luther scholastic theology as such held a deficient view of grace and salvation: he failed to distinguish between the Neo-semipelagianism of the Nominalists and the basic Augustinianism of St. Thomas on the question of prevenient grace. Nevertheless, beyond this point Luther did in fact have differences with the scholastics as such, for he held that "grace does not alter something within man, but alters his situation, and so alters man himself in respect to his standing in the sight of God, the way he is regarded from God's point of view." For Luther man's radical fallenness is decisive; there is no question of co-operation with grace leading to actual righteousness in God's sight. As a result, for Luther the grace that brings forth
faith in Christ's atoning death results in an imputed righteousness in spite of man's actual unrighteousness. Although Luther does expect good works to flow from faith, these works stand outside the saving process; they do not justify. Salvation is by faith, not works. For the scholastics, on the other hand, grace enables and requires a change in actual righteousness: justification cannot exclude sanctification.

Given Luther's pessimistic anthropology and his teaching concerning imputed righteousness, his position regarding the monastic enterprise of progressive sanctification is predictable.

Faith in Christ cannot tolerate grace and justification coming from our own works or the works of others, for faith knows and confesses continually that grace and justification come from Christ alone. ... nothing in their life of vows is necessary for righteousness, salvation, and the remission of sins. Faith alone is necessary. 73

For Luther the basic problem with monasticism as such is that "these men under vows boast that they teach something more than faith. And that something more is nothing but a work ... But you cannot teach works unless you hurt faith, since faith and works stand at opposite extremes in the matter of justification." 74 For Luther man is saved by faith alone, and remains at once justified before God and a sinner in fact.

Luther's doctrine of salvation "by faith alone" ran counter to the then generally accepted Catholic doctrine of salvation. Stephen Ozment in particular has noted this.

For the medieval theologian, it is axiomatic that the viator-status of the Christian life is suspended only in direct proportion to the degree to which the Christian is no longer sinful in re. The reason why the viator-status can be so completely overcome in the medieval mystical traditions is that these traditions go furthest in making man righteous and, indeed, even godly in re. 75
An essential criticism of Luther by contemporary Catholics centred on his doctrine of *sola fide* for, as they understood it, "the *sola fide* suspends the *viator*-status of the Christian life while at the same time leaving the Christian sinful *in re*."76 Thus Jacob Hochstraten (d. 1527), a Dominican from Cologne, criticized Luther's *sola fide* on the basis of the medieval distinction between "unformed faith" (*fides informis*) and "faith formed by love" (*fides charitate formata*). Hochstraten identifies *sola fide* with "unformed faith" and states that such a faith cannot justify, for "without the purification of the heart through *charitas* there can be neither righteousness, merit, nor eternal life."77 Rather, if faith is to justify it must be "faith formed by love," i.e. faith that produces actual righteousness.78

When we consider Michael Sattler's teaching on grace, faith and human righteousness against this background we must conclude that his position agrees in its fundamentals with the medieval Catholic tradition as expressed by Trithemius rather than the Protestant tradition: the emphasis in his writings is not on the irresistible nature of grace, the confidence in salvation based on election, or the imputed nature of righteousness. Instead he writes, in what can only be called an ascetic tone, "they who are Christ's have crucified their flesh with all its lusts and desires."79 The doctrine of election in Sattler does not signify an assured salvation; rather the believer has received Christ's enabling spirit. Thus it follows that true Christians are those "who do the teaching of Christ with works."80 The believer must continue to fight the battle of the spirit against the flesh, for the final result has yet to be determined. The elect believer has a crucial and continuing role to
play in the plan of salvation. It is possible to fall away. So Sattler warns the church at Horb that they must persevere, watch, and be pure "that you might not of yourselves make void and set aside the cross which God has laid upon you . . ."\(^81\) This, as we have seen, is not Pelagian or Semi-Pelagian, for grace is necessary and prevents good works, but neither is it strictly Augustinian, for grace is not irresistible; it demands cooperation and effort from the believer, and must bear visible fruit.

With regard to faith it is certain that Sattler does not hold to sola fide in the Protestant sense. Indeed Sattler says in one place "Christ came to save all those who would believe in Him alone,"\(^82\) but as he goes on to elaborate, faith in Christ's atoning death must issue in actual, visible righteousness on the part of the "believer," i.e. salvation is not by faith alone. The phrase used by Sattler is not sola fide but rather "the obedience of faith."\(^83\) Also relevant here is the cover letter of the Schleitheim Articles where the faithful are warned concerning those "believers" who mistakenly assume that since they "believe" they have the freedom to do as they please. Sattler says: "Note well, you members of God in Christ Jesus, that faith in the heavenly Father through Jesus Christ is not thus formed."\(^84\) Faith must have a visible form, a Gestalt, a forma, and it will be the form of Christ. While Sattler makes no mention of the traditional distinction between "unformed faith" and "faith formed by love" nonetheless he makes the same substantive point as do the Catholic critics of Luther: true, saving faith must produce actual righteousness. This is in complete harmony with the ethical christocentrism of Sattler's monastic past, but quite at odds with an insight crucial to the Protestant Reformation.
From St. Augustine, the bishop, the line of development led to the corpus christianum within which the sacraments of the Church made grace available to all. From St. Benedict, the Abbot, the line of development led to a visible, separated community of saints within the larger Christian body. The medieval Church, in its Catholicity, embraced both soteriological emphases: the monks did not neglect the sacraments or the local bishop, nor did they often mistake their cloister for the true church. The Church, in its turn, gave a special status to the religious, recognizing the monks as the front line troops in the militia spiritualis. When we contrast Luther with Sattler against this background we find that Luther, with his emphasis on grace, denied the monks their privileged place within the church and discredited the ascetic enterprise as such. Although Luther's church followed the model of the corpus christianum, with grace now flowing through the Word and through faith, the Christian body was purged of monasticism. Sattler, on the other hand, denied that the corpus christianum could be the true church of Christ; the true church is only the called and elected community of saints, visibly blessed with Christ's spirit which is manifest in Christ-like lives, purity, and separation from the world. The monastery is now rid of the Christian body. It would seem more than a coincidence that Luther had been an Augustinian and Sattler a Benedictine. Two distinct soteriological emphases have led to two very different ecclesiologies.

Although Sattler's soteriology has clear affinities to monastic theory and practice, we must go on to note that reformed Benedictine monasteries were very much a part of the Catholic sacramental and
penitential system. Sattler, in leaving the monastery, also rejected masses for the dead, veneration of relics and saints, pilgrimages, indulgences and all the rest. Insofar as Luther's critique of salvation by works was a condemnation of these practices, Sattler agreed. Could it be that his acceptance of the monastic emphasis on sanctification made this rejection all the easier for Sattler? In any case, in this crucial matter Sattler shows himself to be very much in the Protestant tradition: salvation depends first and foremost on the direct relationship between man and God, not on sacramentally mediated grace. But on the other hand, insofar as Luther denied possibility of actual righteousness following grace, Sattler stands within the Catholic tradition: he does not share Luther's pessimistic anthropology.

In the context of the Reformation, with the Benedictine background in view, Sattler's soteriological vision is clearly congruent with the position outlined by Trithemius as against the Protestant understanding: we are saved by God's grace which enables us to follow after Christ with works of renunciation and obedience. For Sattler faith cannot be spoken of in isolation; it involves obedience and separation from the disobedient. On the other hand, there is a definite Protestant colour to Sattler's soteriology in that he denies five of the Roman Catholic sacraments, to the exclusion of baptism and the Lord's Supper, and speaks explicitly of sin, repentance, and the direct granting of Christ's Spirit. We must say that Sattler is here echoing Reformation themes, not Roman Catholic ones. Thus the over-all structure of Sattler's soteriology is neither strictly Benedictine, Catholic in the sense of Trent, or Protestant but rather reflects a synthesis of Catholic
and Protestant elements. The overall tenor of Sattler's soteriology, however, recalls his Benedictine past above all.

If we now consider Sattler's soteriology in the context of early Anabaptist thought we must conclude that the synthesis between a Reformation-inspired doctrine of salvation by faith and a Catholic doctrine of cooperation with divine grace leading to sanctification is not unique to Sattler; rather it is characteristic of the early Anabaptist position generally. The scope of this synthetic soteriological vision is striking. When one notes that the early Anabaptists reflect widely varying backgrounds (think of Grebel, Hubmaier, Sattler) and one notes the lack of definitive Anabaptist writings on this question one cannot help being impressed by the uniformity of this non-Augustinian understanding of "salvation by faith" seen in early Anabaptism.

It is highly unlikely that Grebel, Mantz and Blaurock stand at the point of origin of this soteriological understanding. Certainly Sattler does not, for it antedated him. A more likely originator and disseminator, if such must be sought, would seem to be Andreas Karlstadt. However, an even more likely explanation would seem to be that the medieval Catholic call for actual righteousness following grace remained deeply ingrained in sixteenth century consciousness and was not erased by Luther's radical Augustinian dicta. "Sacramental works" and "works of penance" could be, and were, rejected without an affirmation of the vastly more radical *simul iustus et peccator*. In any case, to say that the Anabaptists "completed" the Reformation because of their stress on "the obedience of faith" and actual righteousness is to overstate the case. The Anabaptists' emphasis on cooperation with
grace and actual righteousness is not original with them but rather reflects their common Catholic background. In the matter of justification, the Anabaptists disagreed with Luther in the same manner as would the Council of Trent. 89
CHAPTER XI

SATTLER'S ECCLESIOLOGY

We have noted, following our study of Michael Sattler's thought as seen in his writings, that the various soteriological strands in Sattler's thought converge in his concept of the church as the Body of Christ. In the final analysis, soteriology can be discussed only in the context of ecclesiology. It is therefore only in this chapter that we can again bring together the elements of Sattler's thought that have been analyzed in isolation above.

To recapitulate, Sattler's soteriological vision begins with faith in Christ the Saviour. We have noted that this emphasis, next to sola scriptura, marks a visible Reformation impression on Sattler's thought: faith is the soteriological sine qua non. For Sattler, however, salvation is not by faith alone but rather those to whom Christ has given His Spirit understand that the grace that brings faith entails obedience, both to the literal commands of scripture and to the example of Christ. As we have seen, the pneumatic emphasis hearkens back to the early Anabaptist understanding in and around Zürich, while the strong imitatio Christi theme points rather to the monastic environment.

The "obedience of faith" spoken of by Sattler, however, points beyond imitatio to the specific action of water baptism. It is this act that establishes the visible community of saints: Christ's elect become His Body by freely chosen and accepted water baptism, as He has
commanded (Mk. 16:16). Individually this baptism signifies the death of the earthly, sinful man and the putting on of the mind of Christ; corporately, baptism establishes the Body of Christ on earth which preserves its purity through discipline, celebrates the true (pure) Supper of unity, and separates from all worldly abominations in expectation of Christ's return to His pure Bride. Just as individuals are chosen by Christ and yielded to His Spirit, so too the Church as a whole is guided and informed by the Holy Spirit, while yet visibly conforming to the objective requirements of scriptural command and the renunciation and obedience characteristic of Christ's life. 1

While Sattler's ecclesiology is Anabaptist by virtue of its dependence on adult baptism, significant contextual questions remain. In what ways is Sattler's vision of the church congruent with the Benedictine vision of community? 2 Further, are there elements of Sattler's vision that appear to stem from Protestant sources? And finally, what ecclesiastical elements did Sattler bring to the Anabaptist movement as opposed to those elements he appears to have taken from that movement?

Benedictine Community

When we consider the Schleitheim understanding of community and compare its general outlines with the Benedictine view as seen in the RB we see surprising parallels at all important points, as follows: entry into the community is to be voluntary, and takes place through a public act of profession; 3 through that profession a person subjects himself to a common way of life; 4 discipline commonly takes the form of exclusion from community activities, such as meals, the oratory, and the Supper; 5 the community will be separated from the world; 6 the
leader is to be elected by the community, and is responsible for the spiritual growth and discipline of the community. In examining these parallels in more detail we can be guided by three basic areas of comparison: baptism/profession, obedience and discipline, and separation.

1. Baptism/Profession.

Entry into the Anabaptist community is elaborated in the first point of the Schleitheim Articles.

Baptism shall be given to all those who have been taught repentance and amendment of life and (who) believe truly that their sins are taken away through Christ, and to all who desire to walk in the resurrection of Jesus Christ and be buried with Him in death, so that they might rise with Him; to all those who with such an understanding themselves desire and request it from us.

To summarize, entry into the Anabaptist community by baptism entails a) repentance, b) amendment of life, c) belief in the forgiveness of sins, d) a "dying to self in Christ," and e) is to be voluntary.

"Repentance" and "amendment of life" are in fact the subjective and objective conditions of the same process; as such they are central elements in Benedictine profession. Although repentance is not one of the actual vows of profession, still St. Benedict expects the monastic life to be one of continual repentance, followed by amendment of life. Among the instruments of good works, for instance, we read: "To confess to God every day in prayer, with tears and sighs, our past offences. To amend those sins for the future." The subjective condition of penitence is essential for all true spiritual growth.

If repentance is assumed by St. Benedict, amendment of life is called for directly in the monastic vow. The actual vow taken by Michael Sattler is most probably the vow of profession used at St. Peters during Abbot Jodocus' rule. It reads as follows:
I, brother [Michael Sattler] promise stability, amendment of my way of life and obedience according to the Rule of Saint Benedict, before God and His Saints, in this monastery which was built in honour of the blessed apostles Peter and Paul, in the presence of the Reverend Father and Lord Jodocus Kaiser, Abbot of this place, which document I myself sign. 11

Thus both the Anabaptist baptism of Schleitheim and the Benedictine vow of profession call for repentance and a new life. As we have detailed sufficiently above, that new life is to be in both cases a dying to self and world, a life of self-denial in imitation of Christ. Even the renunciations which are expected in both cases are quite similar, namely things of the flesh such as too much wine, gluttony, swearing, war, and pride. The one exception is the acceptance of marriage in Anabaptism. 12

It is also worthy of note that the parallel initiatory rites of baptism and profession are to be voluntary; a life of serious discipleship must be chosen with a free will. Moreover, in both cases the claims upon the committed disciple are ultimate, involving nothing less than his salvation. 13 In both the RB and in Sattler's writings the gravity and ultimacy of the voluntary initiatory act is made clear. In both cases a life of great difficulty, in imitation of Christ, calling for strength of the will and perseverance, is being entered voluntarily; in both cases the reward for perseverance is eternal life.

We may note here an old tradition, going back at least as far as St. Jerome, which considered monastic profession to be a "second baptism." Basilius Steidle has noted,

At a very early age, monastic profession, that oblation of oneself to Christ, was already called a "second baptism." As a man dies to the world and is incorporated into Christ's holy family through baptism, so the monk through his profession becomes a member of the holy monastic family, a "community of saints." His monastic habit is a new baptismal robe. 14
Indeed the similarity of form and function is striking between Sattler's view of baptism and monastic profession as seen in the Benedictine tradition from which he emerged. Could it be that the ecclesiological dimension of Sattler's teaching on baptism has important roots in the Benedictine tradition?

Although the over-all congruity between baptism and profession is clear, still two points in particular do not harmonize. The Schleitheim call for "faith in the forgiveness of sins through Christ" is not found explicitly in the RB. The call for faith in the atoning death of Christ most likely stems from Reformation sources. Secondly, the call for "stability" following Benedictine profession is nowhere paralleled in Sattler's writings: remaining in the monastery of one's profession until death clearly did not apply in the Anabaptist context. Michael Sattler was not instituting a cloistered life and, in fact, he had recently departed from the monastery of his profession. This latter point of distinction actually indicates a fundamental difference in the way each respective community is conceived, as we will elaborate shortly.

2. Obedience and Discipline.

Although Michael Sattler does not mention obedience specifically in the article concerning baptism, the connection between baptism and obedience is established in the second of the Schleitheim Articles, concerning the ban. Those who have become members of Christ's body through baptism have given themselves over to following (i.e. obeying) Christ's commandments.

The ban shall be employed with all those who have given themselves over to the Lord, to walk after (Him) in His commandments; those who have been baptized into the one body of Christ...
The ban is to be employed in those cases where God's commands, as laid down in scripture, are disobeyed. Some of the commands identified by Sattler are actually understood to follow from scriptural principles, rather than being explicit commands in scripture. Thus from the principle that "everything which has not been united with our God in Christ is nothing but an abomination which we should shun" Sattler extrapolates separation from churches and not frequenting taverns. 16 "Obedience" for Sattler includes Christ-like behaviour as well as obedience to scriptural commands.

Beyond the call to obey scriptural injunctions and to obey rules of Christ-like behaviour is also a call for obedience to the guidelines laid down in the Schleitheim Articles themselves. The concluding letter to the Articles is most emphatic.

Now that you have abundantly understood the will of God as revealed through us at this time, you must fulfill this will, now known, persistently and unswervingly. For you know well what is the reward of the servant who knowingly sins. 17

For Michael Sattler, membership in the Anabaptist community entails obedience to scripture and obedience to the example of Christ as well as obedience to the definitive articles clarifying scripture. Disobedience at any of these points must be dealt with by means of exclusion from community activities until such time as the offender has repented, confessed, and been re-admitted.

The necessary conjunction of obedience and discipline is also fundamental to monastic life. The monk vows obedience on his profession; disobedience, therefore, is to be reprimanded and, if necessary, corrected through punishment. St. Benedict devotes several chapters
to disciplinary questions. The first such chapter explicitly appeals to
the oft-quoted Anabaptist text, Matthew 18.

If any of the community prove rebellious, disobedient,
proud, or murmuring, or contemptuously disobey the holy
Rule or the commands of the elders, he shall be admonished,
according to the precept of our Lord, once and then twice
by the seniors in private. If notwithstanding he does not
mend his ways, he shall be publicly rebuked. If then he
remains incorrigible, and understands how great the penalty
is, he shall be excommunicated. 18

"Excommunication" in this case means exclusion from community activities
rather than expulsion from the monastery. There are graduated levels
of discipline "in proportion to the fault committed," 19 from exclusion at
communal meals and the oratory all the way to corporal punishment with
the rod. If all these means are of no avail, "then let the abbot use the
surgeon's knife, and sever the infected member from the community .
and then one diseased sheep will not infect the flock." 20 As a Bene-
dictine monk, Michael Sattler lived in voluntary community bound to
obedience and discipline; as an Anabaptist leader he worked to establish
a lay community along those same lines. The general parallel here is
obvious.

While obedience and discipline are central features in both
Benedictine and Anabaptist communities, the nature of obedience as
such is somewhat different. St. Benedict clarifies what he means by
obedience following profession by saying "if, upon mature deliberation,
he promises to observe the whole Rule and to obey whatever commands
he is given, he shall be admitted as a member of the community ..." 21
The specific form of obedience promised at profession is two-fold:
obedience to one's superior and obedience to the Rule.
Although the monastic accent falls on the Rule, still obedience to the Rule seems to cover both aspects of obedience seen in Sattler, namely obedience to scripture and obedience to articles clarifying scripture. The Rule itself was always seen as a particular expression and understanding of scripture and, as we have seen, obedience to scripture is also an integral part of the Rule itself. Thus for both St. Benedict and Michael Sattler obedience to a particular, articulated understanding of scripture, as well as obedience to scripture itself, is called for when a person joins the community. The primary emphasis of Schleitheim, however, falls on scripture, while the primary emphasis at profession falls on the Rule.

In looking at obedience to one's superior we are brought to a comparison of St. Benedict's Abbot with Michael Sattler's "shepherd." The points of congruence are easily listed and documented: both the Abbot and the shepherd are to be elected to their respective offices by the community, both are to be visibly moral and upright persons, and both are to be the executors of discipline and edification within the community.

Although both the shepherd and the Abbot are in positions of authority, the shepherd's authority does not extend to the point where he may command obedience. In fact, the shepherd himself is subject to discipline, should it be required.

But should the shepherd do something worthy of reprimand, nothing shall be done with him without the voice of two or three witnesses. If they (i.e. the shepherds) sin they shall be publicly reprimanded, so that the others might fear.

Although a certain amount of protection of the shepherd's authority can
be seen, in that more than one witness is required for his discipline, still the shepherd does not hold absolute authority; rather the community does.

By contrast, although the Abbot is elected by the community, once elected he is in office for life. He can be removed from office only in extreme cases by persons outside the community.\textsuperscript{26} Within the community the Abbot's power and authority are virtually absolute, as is apparent in chapter 68, "If a brother be ordered to do something impossible." St. Benedict answers this question by saying "if, notwithstanding [the monk's] plea, the superior persists in the order, the brother is to be persuaded that it is for his good, and in charity, trusting in God's help, shall obey."\textsuperscript{27} As for the Abbot commanding something that he himself is not fulfilling, St. Benedict advises "In all things to obey the abbot's command, although (which God forbid) he act contrary himself ..."\textsuperscript{28} In short, the Abbot's position is one of absolute authority. The Abbot commands obedience; the shepherd, on the other hand, remains one of the congregation.

Behind these two conceptions of authority lie two different conceptions of the obedient community. The monastic community is structured in such a way that Christ is represented in a two-fold manner: Christ is present both in submission and in authority.\textsuperscript{29} In professing a vow of obedience, the monk is promising to follow Christ's example of total submission to God the Father. "Such [obedient] men live up to the practice of our Lord, who tells us: 'I came not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me.'\textsuperscript{30}" The community as a whole thus represents Christ in submission and follows Christ in
obedience. Such a following of the obedient Christ is found also in Sattler's conception: "Be mindful of your predecessor, Jesus Christ, and follow after Him in faith and obedience, love and longsuffering." In both communities the obedient, submitted Christ is held to be the model and standard.

In the words of Basilius Steidle, the monastic community "is an ideal presentation of the Church of Christ in miniature." That is to say, not only is the obedient church to be found within the monastic community, but Christ Himself is also to be found there, in the person of the Abbot. The Abbot "is esteemed to supply the place of Christ in the monastery." The Abbot's absolute authority within the community derives only from the fact that he "takes the place" of Christ, but St. Benedict says unequivocally, "the obedience we pay to superiors is paid to God ..." In Sattler's community there is no corresponding role; there is no concrete "representation" of Christ in authority.

Looked at as two models of Christian community, the monastic community appears to be a wholly self-sufficient, self-contained, self-governing structure while the Anabaptist community appears to be leaderless. Both of these pictures, however, are wrong -- at least in theory. Although there is no denying that monasteries sometimes functioned as self-sufficient political (and secular) entities, just as Anabaptist communities tended toward anarchic disintegration, in theory both communities are to be following the leading of the Holy Spirit. They are to be led by Christ Himself. In this St. Benedict and Michael Sattler are agreed. Where they disagree is on the question of who is to decide what is the true leading of the Spirit, and how this discern-
ment is to be accomplished. For St. Benedict the answer is simple: the Abbot may call for counsel, but he alone weighs the evidence and makes the final decision. For Michael Sattler the answer is more complex: the community decides, for unity and unanimity give witness to the truth. The monastic community is obedient to Christ via its obedience to the Rule and its Abbot; the Anabaptist community is to be obedient directly to Christ, His Word and His Spirit.

To summarize our discussion of obedience we can say that both St. Benedict and Michael Sattler consider obedience to the commands of scripture and obedience to a particular interpretation of scripture (i.e. a rule of life) to be essential components of community life. Disobedience entails discipline in the form of admonition and exclusion from community activities or, in extreme cases, expulsion from the community. For both St. Benedict and Michael Sattler the model of obedience is Christ Himself. In both cases the community is to be Christocentric, with the community to be led by Christ's words, Christ's example, and Christ's living Spirit. In terms of obedience, Sattler's views are congruent with those found in the Rule except at the points of scriptural emphasis and "obedience to one's superior." Even at these points, however, the differences are not as great as they appear at first sight, for it is abundantly clear from the Rule (and even more in Trithemius) that scripture is to be obeyed and that Christ Himself is the true head of the monastery. Sattler's teaching that the Body of Christ, the community, is to be obedient to Christ the Head, when seen against the background of the monastic view, takes on the appearance of a modification of monastic teaching rather than a radical departure from it. The essential
vision remains the same, with the most substantive modification being the removal of the Abbot's position of intermediate authority between Christ and the community.

Sattler's removal of the Abbot's authority within the community is seen as even less radical when we consider sixteenth century monastic literature. The abuse of abbatial authority was a problem that arose persistently in the centuries following St. Benedict. Monastic reformers, who had to contend with opposition from less than enthusiastic "spiritual fathers," came to question and modify St. Benedict's teaching of unqualified obedience to one's Abbot. Trithemius, although he praises obedience in the highest terms possible, nevertheless states in his commentary on the Rule that if the Abbot commands something beyond that which was vowed at profession, then disobedience is allowed. In another place he adds that only those commands are to be obeyed which are not "against the honour of God or the salvation of the soul." Such a fundamental questioning of Benedictine abbatial authority by a Bursfeld reformer further reduces the distance between Sattler's Anabaptist position regarding obedience and that of the monasticism of his day.


It is when we look at the respective conceptions of the separated community that the differences between Sattler's vision and that of St. Benedict can be seen most clearly. The point here is the fairly obvious one that St. Benedict was establishing a cloistered, separated community within the larger Christian community, while Michael Sattler was establishing the only Christian church, the pure and separated Body of Christ. Thus for Michael Sattler entry into the community is by baptism, the
Christian initiatory sign, rather than an optional vow of profession. In the same way, the true church is to be obedient to Christ directly, rather than indirectly through obedience to an Abbot. And further, members of the Body of Christ are chastised directly, by events in the persecuting world, rather than subjecting themselves to the special disciplines characteristic of the cloister. In short, the mediating agencies set up by St. Benedict, the cloister, its Abbot, and the RB, do not play a part in Sattler's community of saints.

However, two points must be made. On the one hand, Michael Sattler's vision of community is extremely similar in form to the Benedictine vision of community, as we have noted. Baptism and profession function in the same manner, the ethical expectations following the initiatory signs are closely parallel, and obedience and discipline are presupposed. On the other hand we must not lose sight of how much that is specifically Benedictine has been set aside in Sattler's conception of community. Given Sattler's rejection of fundamental Catholic doctrines and practices as well as his rejection of the fundamental Benedictine vows of stability and obedience to Rule and Abbot, we cannot, in all fairness, say that he has continued "Benedictine spirituality" in the guise of Anabaptism. Such a claim would be simplistic and incorrect. There can be no Benedictine spirituality without the common liturgical prayer of the Divine Office, or outside the cloister, the Rule, and the Catholic Church.

The conclusion that offers itself, then, is that Michael Sattler's vision of community displays a structure and form that is essentially monastic, but that important elements have been removed from this
essential form. Granted this conclusion, we can go on to search for those forces which played a formative role in translating the monastic conception of community into Michael Sattler's conception of the Anabaptist brotherhood as the Body of Christ.

**Evangelical and Anabaptist influences**

When we turn to the Evangelical models of community available to Sattler in the Breisgau, namely the model of Kenzingen under Jakob Otter and the preaching of the peasants as represented by Sebastian Lotzer, we discover quickly that the "congruence of essential structure" we have been speaking of in connection with monasticism is missing. For Otter, the church is made up of those who hear God's Word and hold to it with faith.\(^4^0\) This stress on the Word and salvation by faith alone is characteristically Protestant: the establishment of a visible community of saints in not part of the programme. Although Otter does refer to Matthew 18 in appealing for the banning of heretics, his aim clearly is toleration as such rather than the preservation of purity in the church.\(^4^1\) For Jakob Otter the church is essentially an invisible community: we must bear with one another's imperfections in love.\(^4^2\)

For Sebastian Lotzer, the Christian Church is also a community of faith, gathered in the Spirit, but essentially known to God alone.

Truly the holy Christian church is none other than the assembly of all believing people, who have been gathered in the grace of the Holy Spirit. . . . a holy Christian church is gathered in the Holy Spirit, known to God alone.\(^4^3\)

Although elements of Lotzer's ecclesiology correspond more closely to Sattler than is the case with Otter,\(^4^4\) in neither case does the essential structure of the believing community recall Sattler's doctrine of the pure Body of Christ.
While there is no overall congruence of ecclesiological structure here, it is clear that some influence has taken place. The clues emerge most clearly from Lotzer's writings. One of Lotzer's favourite phrases is "Brothers in Christ,"\(^45\) a phrase also much used by Sattler and other Anabaptists. Lotzer also speaks of the union of Christians with Christ, which makes them all "glyder in Christo, mit im eyngeleibt," again language that is directly echoed in Sattler.\(^46\) The essential point is that we are all priests: the keys to the kingdom belong to believing Christians, not the Pope, for Christ Himself is the head of the church rather than the Pope in Rome.\(^47\) The radical putting into practice of the "priesthood of all believers" was achieved most completely in the peasant brotherhoods. They preached the immediate removal of those special titles and places -- prelates, pilgrimages, monasteries -- now seen as unscriptural and thus essentially false. All Christians and occupations are equally special; we are all "members of Christ's body."

Needless to say, the peasants here appropriated elements of Luther's teachings and incorporated them in their own characteristic way; the root is Protestant. But the point to be made is that the radical egalitarianism of Sattler's vision of community, particularly with its rejection of the mediating "institution of separation" (the monastery), most likely had its origin with the peasants of the Black Forest troop.\(^48\) On the other hand, it is clear that although Sattler accepted egalitarian arguments for leaving the cloister, he retained a strikingly monastic conception of community.

In broader terms, the rejection of mediating agencies per se reflects the Protestant critique of Catholic doctrine and practice. It is
impossible to say whether the sources of these critiques are primarily
main line or radical, but it is evident that in rejecting the efficacy of
prayers to the Blessed Virgin and the Saints as well as in rejecting
the entire mediating edifice of sacramental Catholicism (and we may
think also of the mediating role of St. Benedict's Abbot), Sattler has
adopted a Protestant critique. Let it be noted, however -- and this is
a crucial point -- that the removal of the mediating agencies merely
freed Sattler to enunciate what he perceived to be the true teaching
concerning faith, scripture, community and, in a word, salvation. The
Protestant Reformation in its varied forms appears to have provided the
means and the occasion for a rejection of Catholic mediating agencies,
but it did not thereby automatically give content to Sattler's soteriological
vision, which retains strong monastic elements. This is particularly
true in the case of Sattler's ecclesiology which, we have argued, follows
from his soteriology.

When we now turn to the teachings of the early Anabaptists, we
find a fundamental congruence at all central points: the elements of
personal faith, adult baptism, amendment of life and the ban were
central Anabaptist doctrines from the start. In other words, these
central doctrines in the Schleitheim Articles were present in the Ana-
baptist movement well before Michael Sattler appeared in the Unterland
in the summer of 1525.

The earliest statements we have from Zürich concerning adult
baptism invariably point to the necessity of faith and amendment of life.
Felix Mantz' "Protestation," for instance, states that "only those should
be baptized who reform, take on a new life, lay aside sins, are buried
with Christ and rise with Him from baptism in newness of life, etc."
And again he says that baptism ought to be given to one "who having been converted through God's Word and having changed his heart now henceforth desires to live in newness of life . . . ."\(^{51}\) Since scriptural baptism requires a mature conversion and the desire to live a new life, infant baptism is excluded.

The early Zürich statements on baptism were further developed and cogently argued by Balthasar Hubmaier in his baptism book of July 1525. In a characteristic passage, Hubmaier outlines the apostolic (scriptural) order concerning baptism: first must come recognition of sin, then teaching concerning forgiveness, followed by faith in the forgiveness of sins, through Christ. From this is born the intention to live a new life, which intent is sealed by the act of baptism, the sign of a good conscience, the public sign of joining with other believers, the sign that one is subjecting oneself to the discipline of the "Rule of Christ" (Matt. 18:15ff).\(^{52}\) To those who argue that faith, not baptism, saves Hubmaier says "he who believes is baptized and disputes no further, for he sees before his eyes the ordering of Christ . . . ."\(^{53}\) According to scripture, baptism follows naturally from faith and involves the commitment to a new life lived in community with other believers.

The call for church discipline had also been present from the beginnings in Zürich. In his Letter to Muntzer in September 1524, Conrad Grebel already speaks of the "Rule of Christ" which must govern the Lord's Supper. The Supper is a memorial (following Zwingli), but further, by faith it is also "an incorporation into the body of Christ and with the brethren."\(^{54}\) The Supper is a supper of unity and brotherhood, but "It shall not be observed except in conformity with Christ's
rule in Matthew 18, for then it would not be the Lord's Supper, for
without Matthew 18 . . . brethren and false brethren go to the Supper
together and eat."55 Already before the first rebaptism the Zürich
brethren were concerned to establish a disciplined brotherhood of
believers. Hubmaier seconded this concern,56 as well as the Zürich
conception of the Supper as both a memorial and a supper of unity.57

It is clear that the first three Schleitheim Articles, concerning
the baptism of believers, the ban, and the Lord's Supper restate the
basic doctrines of early Anabaptism. We have little difficulty in explaining
Michael Sattler's attraction for the Anabaptism he found in the Zürich
Unterland in the summer of 1525: in Anabaptism he found his true
monastery. The general outlines of Anabaptist doctrine -- a concept of
grace that enables works, a concept of faith that requires a righteous
life, a call for repentance and a public commitment establishing a community
ruled by obedience and discipline -- these doctrines would surely have
been affirmed by an ex-monk who retained a monastic vision of community.

What then, if anything, did Michael Sattler contribute to the
"Anabaptist vision" he discovered in the Unterland? In answering this
question we must remember the fluidity of that vision prior to Schleit-
heim. While it was agreed that a new life was to follow adult baptism,
the specific content of that new life was defined in various ways; the
community was to be subject to discipline, but specific guidelines govern-
ing the ban were not yet in place. In fact, several ecclesiastical models
were compatible with the doctrines we have identified as "Anabaptist."
The fact that this term applies equally well to Grebel and Hubmaier
should be proof enough of this. In 1525 one could defend Waldshut
with a pike or argue for biblical non-resistance, holding to the above Anabaptist doctrines equally well in either case. Michael Sattler's contribution, then, comes not at the point of the basic Anabaptist doctrines of baptism, the ban and the Supper, which were already in place and which he came to accept, but rather in providing a further point of focus.

The particular focus that Michael Sattler contributed to the Anabaptist movement in fact created a church. From one perspective we can see that the subsequent Schleitheim articles concerning the oath, the sword and separation immediately set the followers of Schleitheim apart: separation from the world is called for explicitly and would have been unavoidable in any case. But from another perspective we can see that the essential content provided by Sattler, underlying the distinctive ecclesiology of Schleitheim, is in fact a pervasive Christocentrism. It is this Christocentrism that provides the central hermeneutic and ethical guidelines, that leads to reliance on the Spirit of Christ, that requires the church to be the Body of Christ. We thus arrive at the conclusion of our study: if Michael Sattler's essential contribution to the Anabaptist movement stems from his fundamental and pervasive Christocentrism, what sources contributed to this vision of Christ?

Our study leads to the conclusion that Michael Sattler's Christocentrism derives from the emphases found in the Benedictine tradition. At numerous points above we have spoken of an identifiable Benedictine structure which forms the core of Sattler's thought. Thus scripture is read Christocentrically, in the manner of
the monastic tradition, with the Christ of scripture being seen as the
yielded, obedient, suffering Christ. On this base rests the doctrine of
Nachfolge or Imitatio Christi so prominent in Sattler and the Benedictine
tradition. Likewise Sattler's understanding of the granting of Christ's
Spirit, while not traceable to the monastery in all its details, nevertheless
can be seen as a modification and a continuation of the subdued mysticism
of Bursfeld, rather than as a radical break with that tradition. So too
Sattler's understanding of Christ as the Saviour who gives the grace
that enables the obedience of faith: the essential understanding continues
the monastic vision, guaranteeing the centrality of Nachfolge Christi.
Finally, Sattler's vision of community, as we have just seen, is also
closely congruent with the Benedictine vision of a visible community of
saints, separated, disciplined and devoted to following Christ. In short,
of all the traditions we have surveyed, it is only in the monastic tradition
from which he emerged that the overwhelming Christocentrism of Sattler's
thought finds close parallels. Our conclusion is that while a distinctively
non-Augustinian stress on a new life was present in Anabaptism from its
beginnings, the emphasis on Christ which focusses the Anabaptist
church at Schleitheim stems from Michael Sattler, and reflects his Bene-
dictine past.

While the Christocentrism of Sattler's thought recalls the monas-
tery, the points of modification are clearly evident. Following the
Protestant lead, the mediation of the sacramental institutions was rejected,
with the emphasis falling on the authority of scripture and personal
faith. Following the lead of the peasants, an actual priesthood of
believers was instituted. Following the Anabaptists, the presence of
Christ's Spirit was expected and sought and a visible believer's church was established through baptism. In Sattler's case, these modifications of Benedictine Christocentrism resulted in a doctrine of the church as the Body of Christ, separated and purified, directly related to and led by Christ the Head. The Catholic agencies of mediation had been removed but the monastic vision of community remained, now occupying the entire field of vision: there is no salvation outside the perfection of Christ.

One element has remained unaccounted for thus far, and that is the eschatological expectation which becomes visible in Sattler's letter to Horb. Although the expectation of Christ's imminent return was common enough in the sixteenth century, we have found no close parallels in the traditions we have surveyed. Unless Sattler was in contact with influences unknown to us, his interpretation of the Body of Christ as the New Jerusalem, the pure Bride of the book of Revelation 21:1-3, is his own unique contribution to Anabaptist thought.

The thought of Michael Sattler is neither Protestant, nor Catholic, nor monastic: it is Anabaptist. But Sattler's Anabaptism, the Anabaptism of Schleitheim, is one that begins with strong Benedictine elements, sharing some points of concern with both Protestants and peasants, finally finding a congenial atmosphere in the Anabaptism of the Zürich Unterland. Our conclusion is that through the Schleitheim Articles two highly significant monastic elements, mutatis mutandis, were introduced into Swiss Anabaptism: a strong stress on the centrality of Christ, and an emphasis on the pure and separated community of saints.
CHAPTER XII

CONCLUSION

This study has offered a concentrated examination of the life and thought of Michael Sattler with the aim of testing the general thesis that significant Catholic influences are visible in the structure and development of Anabaptism. We may now return to this larger question in conclusion, asking what light our study sheds on this and related matters.

The first fact to be noted is that since Michael Sattler was a relatively late convert to Anabaptism, joining only in the late summer of 1526, he belongs not to the first generation of Swiss Anabaptist leaders in Zurich, but rather to the second generation of Anabaptist converts which formed north of Zürich following the collapse of the Peasants' War. Thus Michael Sattler encountered an already established Anabaptism in the Unterland which he accepted and upon which he exerted his own influence; his role is that of a modifier rather than a founder. Given this fact, a careful comparison and contrast between pre-Schleitheim and post-Schleitheim Anabaptism is crucial.

In the matter of Catholic influences upon early Anabaptism generally, the Catholic elements to be found in pre-Schleitheim Anabaptism are striking. This is particularly true when we consider the non-Augustinian shape of early Anabaptist soteriology in light of the strong Reformation emphasis on sola fide. What are the sources of this
pervasive Anabaptist stress on salvation through the regenerated, spirit-filled life? What are the sources of the ethical reading of scripture evident in the earliest Anabaptism? Does the initial connection between baptism, the new life, the ban and the Supper have Catholic roots? Did Karlstadt play a crucial role here? Did the peasant brotherhoods exert a positive influence? These questions lie outside the scope of our study; certainly more remains to be done in uncovering the sources of pre-Schleitheim Anabaptism in Switzerland.

Early Anabaptism clearly left its mark on Michael Sattler; the Anabaptist doctrines concerning baptism, the ban, and the Supper became central elements in his thought. We have suggested that Sattler could accept these teachings readily, since they echo elements strongly present in the monastic tradition in which he had been educated, but one point of Anabaptist influence on Sattler stands out for its novelty vis-à-vis the monastery, and this is the heightened role of the Spirit. The lack of an ascetic theology in Sattler is curious, given his stress on the ascetic life and the unanimous emphasis on progressive sanctification in the monastic tradition. Instead we find in Sattler an optimistic expectation that the elect of Christ will form the visible community of saints and will maintain their purity. In tracing this heightened pneumatic emphasis in the literature we were led to the early Anabaptists; but the sources of the pneumatic stress in early Anabaptism remain somewhat obscure. Certainly more needs to be done to identify the sources of this optimistic reliance on the transforming power of the Spirit. Perhaps there is a source independent of both Sattler and the early Anabaptists to which they owe their distinctive pneumatology.
If Sattler learned much from the Anabaptism he encountered in the Unterland he certainly also impressed a new direction and emphasis on Swiss Anabaptism that reflects specific elements of his Benedictine past. This new direction is seen most clearly in Sattler's ecclesiology, although it is visible in all dimensions of his thought. With the Schleitheim Articles the Anabaptist church becomes the faithful, pure, and separated Body of Christ outside which there is no salvation. With Schleitheim monastic Christocentrism, soteriology and community are heightened to the exclusion of all other forms of Christianity. In a word, with Schleitheim Anabaptism chose the road of sectarianism.

It is our conclusion that Sattler's background as a Benedictine monk prepared him with a distinctively non-Augustinian soteriology. As we have seen further, the Reformation, rather than providing him with a new soteriological emphasis concerning faith and imputed righteousness, provided Sattler with a rationale for rejecting Catholic agencies of mediation. Thus although Sattler rejected Roman Catholic authority and tradition, his soteriology underwent no such radical change; in fact it was now set free to inform his ecclesiology. The end result of this non-Catholic soteriological stress on regeneration, the obedience of faith, imitatio Christi, and separation from the world was a non-Catholic monastic community -- albeit stressing maintenance of purity rather than progressive sanctification. Post-Schleitheim Anabaptism owes its development in this sectarian direction to the ex-Benedictine Michael Sattler.

More must be said concerning the sectarian nature of the Schleitheim Articles. There was no compelling internal logic in pre-
Schleitheim Anabaptist beliefs which demanded a sectarian ecclesiology. The fact that Grebel himself set out to establish territorial Anabaptist churches, and that Hubmaier actually did so, should be proof enough of this. And so the question has arisen: whence then Anabaptist sectarianism? It has been argued, especially by John Yoder, that separation came about as a result of the Anabaptists being excluded from political and ecclesiastical power; the Swiss Anabaptists did not choose sectarianism, but rather had it forced upon them.

It is true that Schleitheim stands chronologically at the end of the failure of the peasant bid for power and also following the rejection of Anabaptism by Zwingli, Bucer and Capito. But chronology does not tell the whole story. That the true church would be a community of saints separated from the world at large was never a negotiable issue for Sattler, as far as the sources reveal. What was at issue in Strasbourg was Sattler's insistence on defining the true church, the community of the saved, on the basis of certain visible marks, including their separation from the ungodly. In short, sectarianism was the very issue on which Sattler and the reformers disagreed; it was not the unfortunate result of the reformers' intransigence.

There are solid textual and historical reasons for not accepting John Yoder's thesis concerning Sattler, Strasbourg and Schleitheim, as we have noted in previous chapters, but even if there were no arguments of that type, one further fact would seem to be enough to question the hypothesis. The internal logic requiring sectarianism which is missing in pre-Schleitheim Anabaptism -- we can call it the Christ/Belial mentality -- is in fact the bond that ties all of Sattler's thought together. Sectarianism
is fundamental for Sattler, I would argue, because he retained a strong belief in the correctness of the separated monastic model of community which was heightened by an optimistic pneumatology and a pressing eschatology. That belief certainly pre-dates any rejection by Bucer and Capito, since it was the very cause of their rejection. Whether Sattler's sectarianism pre-dates the failure of the peasants' revolt and persecution by the authorities is a question that cannot be answered definitively with the sources that are available. But the implacable logic of the Christ/Belial mentality suggests a radical mind-set, not an ecumenical last-resort. The failure of Anabaptism to establish itself in the centers of political and ecclesiastical power without a doubt made competing views within Anabaptism far less viable; we can safely say that the wide acceptance of sectarianism among Swiss Anabaptists began at Schleitheim. But the sectarian conclusion itself leads from Michael Sattler straight through to the monastery. A question not yet answered is in what way, and to what extent, the distinctive theology of Schleitheim influenced subsequent developments within Anabaptism.
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18 See Koehler, "Brüderlich," p. 280: "the force of a Lutheran experience of faith allowed the monk to remove the cowl and... to take a wife." See also Wiswedel, Bilder, III, p. 10: "not contenting himself with the study of the Church Fathers and the available theological literature, he rather held to Holy Scripture itself... Like Luther, so Sattler came to certainty of belief and salvation in the monastery. This inner transformation allowed the monk from St. Peters to take off his cowl and take a wife."

19 Koehler, "Brüderlich," p. 280. Haas is a little more cautious here and says only "Die Reformation berührte ihn jedoch sehr stark." "Sattler," p. 115. Haas qualifies this still further by saying "Aus Gründen, die wir nicht genau kennen, begab er sich dann nach Zürich." Ibid.


25 See Bossert, ME, IV, p. 427; Koehler, "Brüderlich," p. 280; Wiswedel, Bilder, III, p. 10. Haas, although he speaks of the influence of Grebel, Manz and Blaurock upon Sattler, does place Sattler's missionizing following the November imprisonment.

26 TA, el. I, p. 68. The dating of the letter is possible because of Sattler's request for a "merciful judgement" for those who are in prison. These Anabaptist prisoners, Jörg Tucher, Jacob Gross, Wilhem Echsel, Matthias Hiller, and Jörg Ziegler, appear in the record as well. They were arrested in late December, 1526 and expelled from Strasbourg before January 15, 1527. See Ibid., p. 67, for the data concerning the dates in question. Sattler's letter thus falls within this range of time.

27 Ibid., pp. 72-74.


33 There is never a mention of Sattler in connection with Denck. Rather, Bucer and Capito make pains to distinguish between the two.


35 As in Bossert, ME, IV, p. 428.

36 "Both (Denck and Sattler) questioned the Lutheran doctrine of justification and also held works to be important to man's salvation, but they differed on Christ's work of redemption. Sattler agreed with Protestant teaching..." Bossert, ME, IV, p. 427. Bossert's source here is Bucer's comment that "with regard to the redemption of Christ, upon which everything depends, we have found no such error in this Michael Sattler as in Denck." Yoder, Legacy, p. 19. TA, el. I, p. 110. Bucer's word cannot be taken as authoritative here without support in Sattler's writings.


42 Archduke Ferdinand makes reference to a letter from Count Joachim which was dated March 18, 1527, in which Count Joachim reports the arrest. Ferdinand's letter is found in Tiroler Landesarchiv, Von der königlichen Majestät, II, 25r-25v.


44 Four Anabaptist prisoners arrested in Rotenburg in mid-February had escaped already in March, presumably with aid from sympathizers outside the prison. See G. Bossert, "Das Blutgericht in Rotenburg am Neckar," Christliche Welt (1891), p. 503. Cf. the reference to this escape by Ferdinand in the letter cited in n. 42 above.


47 According to the trial account of Klaus von Gravenbeck. See translation in Yoder, Legacy, p. 75.

48 See Snyder, "Rotenburg," pp. 219-222.
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6 "But as we advance in the practices of religion and in faith, the heart insensibly opens and enlarges through the wonderful sweetness of his love, and we run in the way of God's commandments." RB, Prologue, p. 293.

7 RB, ch. 7, p. 304. "

8 Ibid.

9 "... the appeal to the example of our Lord brings us to the final touchstone of the spiritual life, which in all its forms must be for Christians a Following of Christ. This St. Benedict knew well; and so his Rule begins with Christ, ever dwells on Christ, and ends with Him. ... the last words of the Rule proper (for the final chapter is an appendix) are that [the monk] is to prefer nothing whatsoever to Christ. And this is the sum of St. Benedict's teaching on the Spiritual Life." Butler, Monachism, p. 57.


11 Schmitz has calculated that, reading on the average of 10 pages an hour, St. Benedict would have a monk read 15,000 pages in a year, or 50 volumes of 300 pages each. This would necessitate a library. Histoire, II, p. 69.

13 RB, ch. 2, p. 294.

14 In chapter 68 of the RB, St. Benedict deals with the question of what a brother should do if he is ordered to do something extremely difficult or "impossible." The conclusion is that if the superior continues to insist, the brother is to submit in obedience.

15 RB, ch. 3, pp. 296-297.

16 Schmitz, Histoire, II, p. 32.


18 By 577, Monte Cassino had been destroyed by the Lombards. The monks fled to Rome with their Rule, where they were established in a monastery near the Vatican by Pope Pelagius II. Schmitz, Histoire, I, pp. 30-32.


20 Ibid., p. 27; Schmitz, Histoire, I, p. 89.

21 Ibid., p. 87.

22 Ibid., p. 100.

23 Ibid., p. 94.

24 Ibid., p. 99.

25 "... l'abbé immunitaire est devenu indépendant, il gouverne en son nom propre... Le chef du monastère, de spirituel qu'il était, devient seigneur selon l'esprit du siècle...." Ibid., p. 102.

26 "[Cluny] abbandona le lavoro manuale che non era più praticato d'altrove e alcuni di loro si fecero la maggior parte dei monaci." Ibid., p. 134.

27 "Le travail manuel n'occupait plus une grande partie de la journée du moine; le travail intellectuel ne pouvait pas alors le rem-

28 "A Cluny, on en est arrivé, en carême, à réciter, outre les psaumes et cantiques du breviaire, 180 psaumes, ce qui fait en tout 210 psaumes, alors que saint Benoît a réparti les 150 psaumes du psautier sur toute une semaine." Ibid., p. 316.

29 Ibid., I, p. 134.

30 Ibid., II, p. 62.

31 "Für die Hirsauer Reformbewegung sind insbesondere folgende Faktoren wichtig geworden: Die Persönlichkeit Abt Wilhelms ... und das Reform- und Herrschaftsinteresse führender Hochadelsgeschlechter." Schreiner, Mönchtum, p. 36.

32 Ibid., p. 37.


34 Schmitz, Histoire, I, p. 188.


39 Mayer, Geschichte, pp. 3-4; Synopsis Annalium Monasterii S. Petri in nigra silva O. S. B. ... Extranx P. Gregorius Baumeister ... 1770, p. 7 (1093). Hereafter cited as SA.


41 "Gebhardus autem abbas Hirsauriensis regularem disciplinam monachorum hic loci instituit." SA, p. 7 (1093).


43 "vir omni virtute et religione probatus." SA, p. 10 (1100).

44 "Hugo, religiosissimae conversationis et bonae memoriae abbas in veteribus monumentis appellatus. Erat et ipse discipulus S. Wilhelmi ... " Monumenta, p. 287. SA, p. 10 (1100).

45 "monasticæ perfectionis cultor probatissimus, sub quo monasterium adprime floruit." SA, p. 11 (1108); see Monumenta, p. 287.

46 "... Pontius abbas Cluniacensis Epponi Abbati nostro et fratribus Monachis et Barbatis conversis donavit societatem Cluniacensis fraternitatis ... " SA, p. 16 (1115). For the full document, in which
the monastery of St. George of the Black Forest is also included in the
fraternity, see J. Mabillon, Annales ordinis S. Benedicti, t. V. (Paris,
1713), Lib. LXXII, p. 615.

47 Nomina Defunctorum singulis annis altrinsecus mittebantur et
recitabantur in capitulo, scribebanturque in Missali Libro. Ad haec
fiebat illis officium Defunct. a conventu, et in crastinum Missa communis."
SA, p. 16 (1115). See P. W. Jorden, Das cluniazensische Totengdacht-
niswesen (Münsterische Beiträge zur Theologie, Heft 15) (Münster i.

48 Ibid., pp. 98-100.

49 "Cluny, à son époque et sans doute sous sa direction, et
grace à la liturgie des défunts, a beaucoup contribué à réunir dans une
vaste communauté de sentiments religieux moines et fidèles, et leurs
parents décedés. On lui doit l'institution de la commémoration de tous
les fidèles défunts, le 2 novembre. Celle-ci est l'aboutissement d'un
large mouvement d'idées qui a marqué Cluny dès ses origines: le

50 "Es ist ein einziger, grosser religiöser Gedanke, der hinter
der ganzen Urkundenmasse von Cluny steht, der Gedanke an das Seelenheil

51 For a particularly apt example, see the letter of Abbot Peter
the Venerable, Contra Petrobusianos Haereticos . . . ("contra id, quod
dicunt, vivorum beneficia nihil prodesse defunctis"). A relevant sen-
tence reads "Quis enim, o Catholicici lectores, non aduerat satanam,
. . . ut tot bona a tantis bonis assidue per orbem pro mortuis facta,
hoc astu auerteret, et iuges eleemosynas, continua sacrificia, irrequietas
orationes, et his similia, quae et viuis comparant meritum, et defunctis
requiem, consilio infernalii aueteret?" The letter is found in M. Marrier,
A. Duchesne, Bibliotheca Cluniaensis (Paris, 1614), col. 1202.

52 "Der Glaube an die Verdienstlichkeit der guten Werke war
Gemeingut des Volkes . . . Ebenso allgemein war der Glaube, dass
man durch gute Werke den armen Seelen im Fegfeuer zu Hilfe kommen
könne." Jorden, clu. Tot., p. 48. Interesting are the examples of
contemporary belief in the efficacy of alms, e. g. "Gebet Almosen, und
alles ist euch rein."
; "Wie Wasser Feuer, so löscht Almosen die Sünden
(strafen) aus." The basic Scripture passage is "Date et dabitur vobis."
Luke 6:38. Ibid., p. 49. The emphasis on alms in connection with the
remembrance of the dead entered into the actual liturgical practice
stemming from Cluny.

53 The concluding 15 chapters of the Constitutiones Hirsaugienses
(hereafter C. Hir.) deal with the subject of death. The liturgical
details contained in these 15 chapters are interesting in themselves, but
too involved to repeat here. Most relevant is chapter 78, "De familiar-
ibus nostris vivis et defunctis; quid agatur pro eis." This chapter
describes how the prayer brotherhood is to function: "There are many
congregations, not only of monks but also of clerics, who are of our society and fraternity, so that when a mortuary roll of theirs comes [to us], or one of ours reaches them, an office and a mass are performed, and afterwards a sepytary with offices and masses." ("Nonnullae sunt congregatones non solum monachorum, sed etiam clericorum, quae habent societatem nostram, et fraternitatem, ut cum brevis venerit de defuncto illorum, vel ad illos nostras, officium et missa geratur, et postea septuarius cum officiis et missis.") C. Hir., col 1145. The chapter goes on to speak of the laity, both poor and rich (plerique fideles Christi tam pauperes quam divites) who also wish to belong to the fraternity; no mention is made of donations. They are to be remembered with special psalms while yet living; after death, with other specified psalms and prayers. Three times a year a special commemoration is made for them "cum officio et missa, cum septenario et praebenda ...." C. Hir., col. 1146. (praebenda in this context means allowances of food given to the poor; i.e. alms.) The concluding chapter, chapter 79, gives specific liturgical instructions concerning those buried on the monastery grounds. Here the festival of All Saints is particularly important, on which "cantantur etiam veneri defunctorum, et in nocte officium simul matutinale et matutinalis missa solemnissime pro fidelibus defunctis ...." C. Hir., col. 1146. Particularly prominent is the role of alms: twelve needy are to be given abundant bread, meat and wine, but special compassion is to be had on other needy who might come. Besides this, if there is any food or drink left over during the feast of All Saints, it is to be given to the poor. Ibid.

54 Besides the above-mentioned alliance with Cluny, St. Peter's was part of the Hirsau fraternity beginning around 1093. "Circa idem tempus (1093) novum Monasterium S. Petri ad confarternitatem Hirsauigensem suscipitur." SA, p. 7 (1093). St. Peters and St. Blasien also formed a "Gebetsgemeinschaft" around 1110. Mayer, Geschichte, p. 13. St. Blasien was very active in prayer fraternities, and several exemplars of fraternal agreements between St. Blasien and other monasteries are still extant. The documents agree essentially in content: they are in fact almost word-for-word copies. The St. Peters/St. Blasien agreement must have read much like the following, between St. Blasien and Reichenau. The two monasteries agree that " quando altera alteri breves pro defunctis suis ratribus miserit, in proximo capitulo pronuntietur ac post capitulo verba mea non sine pulsatione campanarum cantetur, prebenda etiam eadem tantum die detur et in libro vitae scribatur. Postea vero agantur septem missae septemque vigiliae et totiem diebus verba mea post matutinum. Unusquisque etiam missam unam debet cantare sacerdos; qui vero sacerdos non est quinquaginta psalmos. Quod si plures fuerint eadem omnibus communiter fiat oratio singulae vero singulis dentur prebenda. Et ut inviolabitter omni in reliquum tempore teneatur, oportunitum videtur, ut hanc confirmationis cartam utraque congregatio in sua regula habeat scriptam." Printed in P. Geuenich, "Vebemerungverträge als Zeugnisse des monatlichen Reform des 11. Jahrhunderts in Schwaben," Ztschrift für die Geschichte des Oberrheins, 123. band (N. F. 84. band), 1975, (pp. 17-30), p. 24. The Journal hereafter cited as ZGO. The St. Blasien agreement involves more liturgy than is described in the C. Hir. Cf. Ch. 78, cols. 1145-1146.
An abridged version of the Liber Vitae is still extant: "Necrologium minus Monasterii S. Petri Nigrae Silvae," in Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Necrologia Germaniae, tomos 1., ed. by F. L. Baumann, pp. 334-338. A comparison of several names contained therein with the Rotulus shows that donors recorded in the Rotulus were in fact recorded in the Liber Vitae. E.g., Necrol., Jan. 16: "Ob. Cuono n.c.m. qui, quicquid predii apud Nortwile et Merdningen habuit, s. Petro dedit." p. 334. In the Rotulus, p. 149, we find "Cuono de Falchensteina quicquid alodii apud Nortwile habebat, pro salute animae suae una cum fratre suo Lancelino S. Petro donavit, presente uxore sua ita, neq non et alud predium apud Merdingen. . . ." See also, as e.g. Necrol., March 13; Rotulus, p. 149; Necrol., October 12; Rotulus, p. 146.


"Ecclesia S. Petri collapsis prae vetustate parietibus per Dominum Gozmann restaurata, et a Domino Hermanno Episcopo Constant. dedicata est." SA, p. 24 (1148); see also Rotulus, p. 168. J. Mayer describes Gozmannus as "ein frommer und thätiger, von heiligem Eifer erfüllter Mann . . ." Geschichte, p. 20, but he does not cite a source. I have failed to discover such a description in the sources I consulted.


"Anno MCCXXXVIII . . . locus idem voragine ignis fuit totaliter desolatus parietisque monasterii collapsi . . ." Baumann, "Geschichtlichen," p. 73. See also SA, p. 37 (1238).

Monumenta, p. 289.

"Monasterium ante undequadraginta annos flammis absumptum velut phoenicem et cineribus suscitavit pristinoque splendori restituit." Ibid., p. 289; SA, p. 41 (1275).
"Eclipsis solis sterilitatem terrae, et tandem pestem causat."
Ibid., p. 31 (1192).

The wealth of liturgical detail that is legislated in the Constitutions Hirsaugienses has to be read to be appreciated. The details are so many, the eventualities covered by legislation so complete, that one comes to the realization that being an observant Hirsaup monk did in fact demand full concentration on how to perform the liturgy properly. Such a total dedication to a liturgical praising of God, however, demands a self-enclosed setting. When the complete monastic concern is what psalm is to be said, and when, and how often, or when a full bow is called for, an unhappy intrusion such as a plague or a famine will quickly render that concern anachronistic. The raison d'être of the monastic life remains, and even is intensified by such natural disasters, but the highly artificial atmosphere, required by the Cluniac passion for liturgy, cannot be sustained.

Mayer, Geschichte, pp. 32-33.

Ibid., p. 39.

Ibid., pp. 43-44.

See Ibid., p. 45; p. 47.

The sale of property began in earnest following the fire in 1238. Abbot Arnoldus had to sell property in 1256 "ob multa, quibus exustum monasterium gravabatur, debita." SA, p. 38 (1256). Through the building of new facilities under Abbot Walther I debts were contracted which continued to weigh on the monastery for many years. See Mayer, Geschichte, pp. 35-36.


beruf wurde zu einem Privileg des Land- und Stadtdels." Schreiner, Münchtm, p. 50.


75. Rudolf Reinhardt notes that work on the "Constitutional history" (Verfassungsgeschichte) of the Benedictine Order would be furthered by a critical publication of the chapter decrees and research into the application of the decrees in individual cloisters. He then notes, "Doch stehen der Befriedigung derartiger Wünsche nicht nur das mangelnde Interesse an der wenig bekannten Institution, sondern auch die aus ihrer Verfassung (wechselnde Präsidenten, wechselnder Tagungsort) resultierenden Mängel in der archivischen Überlieferung entgegen." R. Reinhardt, "Die Steuerliste des Provinzialkapitels OSB Mainz-Bamberg vom Jahre 1501," Theologische Quartalschrift, 140 (1960), pp. 321-328. Not only is notice concerning chapter attendance rare and hard to come by, as we found in attempting to trace St. Peters' record in this regard, but also, in the case of St. Peters, there are not enough internal records which would make possible a conclusion about the application of chapter decrees.


While the famines were undoubtedly severe, the report of children being killed and salted away to be eaten strains credulity. "Fames grassabatur dirissima: multi liberos tum proprios tum alios mactabant, et sale conditos comedebant." The chronicler adds his heartfelt comment: "A fame, peste, et bello libera nos Domine!" SA, p. 91 (1438).

Hoc ipso anno, quo die quove casu nescio, Monasterium nostrum 2da vice, quantum nobis constat, igne perit cum Ecclesiis, ornamentis, privilegiis papalibus et regis, ita, ut de eius recuperatione spem habuerit nemo. Fundatores nostri aliquamdiu in loco non consecrato quieverunt." SA, pp. 90-91 (1437).

Baumeister states in his SA that the restoration of the monastery began with Abbot Conradus, in 1443. In his earlier works, however, Baumeister is more circumspect. In his Annales Monasterii S. Petri in Nigra Silva, 2 vols. (Manuscript, 1754), vol. 1, p. 507. Baumeister states as follows. "De restitutione Ecclesiae tantum clare loquuntur adducta MSS. Monasterium autem, ut credibile est, a Conrado et Successoribus eius successivo utcunque est restitutum; quis enim credat tam insignes Praesules sibi succedentes tanto tempore fuisse sine Monasterio? quis credat Conrado sibi absque hoc Mitram sibi imponi passum? Ego minime." Clearly Baumeister had no hard evidence pointing to the fact that Abbot Conradus actually began to restore the monastery, but rather concluded that he must have begun this work, or he would not have received the mitre from the Papal See. See also Baumeister's Compendium, vol. 1, p. 285, where the argument is repeated.


"Sixtus IV P.P. pro reformatione S. Ordinis nostri sollicitus sanxit, ut singulis trienniis in singulis provinciis capitula provincialia habeantur et in iis abbates, Priors, etc. conveniant, reformationi ordinis intendant, Monasteriiis Visitatores deputent etc. Rebellibus excommunicationis poenam imponant etc. Inter alios apud summum Pontificem delati sunt Abbates S. Blauii, S. Trutpert, et S. Petri, quod non compareant, visitatores non admittant, etc. quare gravissimas in eiusmodi transgressores statuit poenas." SA, pp. 110-111.

The depressed economic state of the monastery is evident from diocesan records, such as the record of the investiture of Abbot Petrus II, which states that only seven florins were given "quia mon. est depaupertatum." Manfred Krebs, "Die Investiturprotokolle der Diöze Konstanz aus dem 15. Jahrhundert," FDA, Jahrgang 66-74 (1939-1954), p. 645. See also R. Reinhardt, ed., "Ein Beitrag zur Verfassungsgeschichte der Deutschen Benediktiner im 15. Jahrhundert," Theologische Quartalschrift, 138 (1958), pp. 207-217, and A. Bruno, "Eine Steuerrolle für die Benediktinerabteien der mainzischen Provinz vom Jahre 1493,"
SMGBO 20 (1899), pp. 102-122. These tax lists show St. Peters to have been taxed well below the average for Benedictine monasteries in the diocese of Constance.

84 F. L. Baumann notes that the only surviving Necrologium which contains materials dating from the eleventh century comes to us from Grémelpach's hand; the originals are now lost. Abbot Petrus appears to have copied the older accounts word for word. Baumann cites the evidence in "Geschichtliches," pp. 66 ff.

85 "Eodem anno Petrus Abbas Collectanea sua a Crusio laudata contexuit, fragmentaque post incendium collegit, fundationis nostrae initium, fata, Librum vitae cum variis Donationibus, genealogiam, Fundatorum, et Catalogum Abbatum complectentia." SA, p. 120 (1497).

86 Along with the dedication of the church came a perpetual indulgence of 100 days for the faithful who visited the church in a penitent manner. See SA, pp. 122-123 (1500).


88 The chapel "ad Tiliam" began "non citra insignia prodiga, et successu temporis, dum Patres nostri divina ibidem celebrant, in celebrem peregrinationem excrevit." SA, p. 126 (1503).

89 See SA for these respective years.

90 "Hac prodigia (the portents above) excipit magna pestilentia per totam germaniam..." SA, p. 125 (1502). Regarding the peasants the Annals state "Hoc anno in agro Spirenii periculosa rusticorum sedition sub titulo der Bundschuh nascitur, sed haec vice quasi in incunabulis opprimitur." Ibid., p. 126 (1502).

91 R. Reinhardt, "Die Steuerliste des Provinzialkapitels OSB Mainz-Bamberg vom Jahre 1501," Theologische Quartalschrift, 140 (1960), pp. 321-328. See the list on p. 327. The monasteries were to be taxed according to their relative means.


93 Dom Schmitz, speaking of the era of the Melk reform (after 1414), states that "Jusqu'alors les rites clunisiens, tels que l'union d'Hirsau les avait reçus, étaient en vigueur dans la plupart des monastères allemands." Histoire, III, p. 186. There is no evidence that Abbot Petrus ever accepted other rites, and in fact the internal evidence would suggest that that the Hirsau observance remained in force at St. Peters during Abbot Petrus' rule.

Anno 1517 quo Martinus Lutherus dogmata sua spargere caepit, ingens erat annonae caritas ultra annum durans... Terrae motus multis in locis ingenti cum damno sentiuntur. Secuta est etiam apud multos mortalis capitis aegrimonia et eversio mentis." SA, p. 133 (1517).


Mayer, Geschichte, p. 76.

Hoc anno in festo corporis Christi in pago Lehen prope Friburgum per Joannem Fritz rebellio rusticana, dicta der Bundschuh, initium sumit, quae tamen morte damnatis auctoribus quasi in cunis suffocata est." SA, p. 131 (1513).

SA, p. 131 (1515).


See SA, p. 133 (1518).

Given the lack of the familiar phrase "pro anima suae" or "pro anniversario perpetuo," these donations would seem to have been motivated by economic motives. Even in the tenth century self-donations were often made for such reasons. As wards of the monastery, the poor were looked after in times of want. "Kam eine Missernte, wollte eine ausbrechende Hungersnot den Bauer mit seiner Familie dem Hungertode ausliefern, der Bauer hatte einen Ausweg." Jorden, Clu. tot., p. 57.

Hoc anno brevi temporis spatio peste, ni fallor, sex e confratribus nostris morte sublati sunt, quorum nomina ad nos misit antiquum Necrologium Güntersthal... Sa, p. 135 (1519). See the Necrologium listing in Mayer, Geschichte, pp. 242243.

Mayer, Geschichte, pp. 7071.

Ein Theil der Bauern erklärte: ... jetzt ... solle hieraus eine Verpflichtung werden, das sei 'wider Herkommen und ihnen unleidlich.' Der Abt rief gegen diesen mehrfachen Ungehorsam die Ensisheimer Regierung an, und die Bauernschaften wurden vor diese citirt. Jene aber wandten sich an den Markgrafen und fanden bei diesem williges Gehör; er bestärkte sie in ihrer Widersetzlichkeit." Ibid.

Mayer, Geschichte, p. 71.

Ibid.

Ibid., p. 72.

In der Brandschatzung, die den Besiegten aufgelegt wurde, finden sich Waldau, Ror und Ibenthal angegeben, während es von St. Peter, Eschbach und Rechtenbach heisst: 'will der apt von St. Peter verantworten.' Ibid. See A. Poinsignon, ed., "Brandschatzung im Breisgau nach dem Bauernkrieg von 1525;" ZGO 37 (1884), pp. 84, 94. In September 1525, Ferdinand of Austria demanded a payment of six florins per household. Ibid., p. 81.

The Annals state "De monasterio nostro nihil nobis in specie notum est, nisi quod Dominus Abbas aufugerit." SA, p. 139 (1525).

The Annals list the event as having occurred in 1525. Mayer lists the date as 1526. Cf. SA, p. 139 (1525) with Mayer, Geschichte, p. 72.

Ibid.

SA, p. 142 (1528).


The letter is found in: Kirchensachen, no. 135 (1519, März 3).

... Raten und anwalten auch anderer so der berurt
unnser frundt zu Ime beschryben die Reformation Inn Irem gotzhus furzunemen/und anders so darzu noturffig zuhannden verhelfffen . . ." Ibid.

122 The letter in found in: Abteilung 14 (Urkunden), no. 2 (1519, 4. Mai).

123 "Haec reformatio, ni fallor, est Bursfeldensis . . . per quam . . . multa Monasteria integrati regulari sunt restituta . . ." Baumeister, Compendium, p. 318, note a., 1521.


126 Wenn ein Abt, Bischof oder weltlicher Landesfürst um Reformierung eines Klosters beim Generalkapitel bat, so ist das noch lange nicht einem Beitritt oder einer Aufnahme in den Verband gleichzusetzen. Oft war es noch recht weit von einer Aufnahme entfernt, und die ernsten Schwierigkeiten, die sich erst jetzt ergaben, zogen sich zeitweilig mehrere Jahre hinaus." Ibid.

Zeller notes that out of the entire diocese of Constance, only the Abbot from Weingarten and a representative from St. Gall attended the chapter. "Liste," p. 193.

Schmitz, Histoire, II, p. 156.


See Schmitz, Histoire, VI, pp. 168-169. Schmitz suggests that the subjective turn of the Melk and Bursfeld reforms owes something to the spirituality of the Devotio Moderna. Klaus Arnold argues that Trithemius' De triplici regione has no connection with that movement. Cf. Arnold, Trithemius, pp. 9 and 42.

Johannes Trithemius, De triplici regione clausuralium (Mainz, 1498).


Ibid., p. 452.

Schmitz, Histoire, VI, pp. 168-169; 256-257.

See Paulus Volk, Urkunden zur Geschichte der Bursfelder Kongregation (Bonn, 1951), p. 139.


The Necrologium is very sparse up to the rule of Abbot Petrus III, listing mostly the names of deceased Abbots and, as indicated above, it contains a gap from 1519 to 1544.

Johannes Molitoris is listed as a conventual at St. Peters (d. 1471); Krebs, "Investiturprotokolle," p. 788. Nicolaus Foler, OSB was established with the living from Weilheim (d. 1467); Ibid. Conrad Schonegg is listed as dean of Herzogenbuchsee (d. ca. 1454); von Müllinen, Helvetia Sacra, p. 99. So is Johannes Keller, (d. ca. 1467); Ibid.

The Necrologium reads only "ob. 17. Aug.", without giving a year. He died sometime before March, 1521. See Protocollum Proclamat.

144 "Johannes Eberlin ex Lorch Augustens. dioc. nona Maii (1494)." Mayer, Matrikel, p. 114, no. 2.

145 SA, p. 133 (1518).


147 "Joannes Stock de Friburgo vicissima nona Augusti (1506)." Ibid., p. 171, no. 26.

148 Bartholomaeus Funstle, who died in an unknown year (1518?) may possibly be the same as the following. "Bartholomeus Funster de Sancto Gallo Constant. dioic. XIII Septembris (1479)." The B.A. degree was granted in 1481. Ibid., p. 69, no. 27. Petrus Krebs, listed in the Necrologium for the year 1502, may be the same as the following. "Petrus Crebs de Alzeia, 15 Maii, 1456. baccalarius artium viae antiqua, 8/10, 1460." The span of time between the degree and the date of Krebs' demise renders this identification more doubtful. The identifying addition "de Alzeia" is missing in the monastic record. Joannes Keller, dean at Herzogenbuchsee, may be the same as "Joannes Keller de Schauffhusen, 1443." No degree is given. For Krebs and Keller, see Gustav Toepke, Die Matrikel der Universität Heidelberg von 1386 bis 1662, 3 Bände (Heidelberg, 1884-1893), I. band, pp. 288 and 239 respectively. A fourth brother from St. Peters, Johannes Molitoris (d. 1471) is impossible to identify, since the monastic record does not give his place of origin. As a result, there are 10 possibilities (i.e. within the correct time limits) for Heidelberg, 4 possibilities for Freiburg, and 5 for Basel. Tübingen was not yet founded in 1471.


150 As against Kenneth Davis, Anabaptism and Asceticism, (Scottdale, Pa., 1974), pp. 113 ff.
CHAPTER III


3 "It is unhistorical to see the initial and long-lasting general anti-Roman agitation, of which Luther was the most powerful exponent, as signifying general agreement with all that Luther now means to us. On the contrary, we have to distinguish sharply between the battle against Roman encroachments and various abuses in the Church, and dogmatic belief. \(\text{Ibid.}\), p. 278.

4 K. F. Vierordt, Geschichte der evangelischen Kirche in dem Grossherzogthum Baden, (Karlsruhe: Braunschen Hofbuchhandlung, 1847), vol. 1, pp. 111-113. Also present were J. Brenz, M. Frecht and F. Friedlieb (known as Irenicus), all of whom became Protestant reformers.

5 "Infolge der Heidelberger Reise Luthers im Sommer 1518 und des Erscheinens seiner Flugschriften in den nächsten Jahren wurden seine Gedanken auch im südwestlichen Deutschland bekannt und verbreitet." H. Bartmann, "Die badische Kirchenpolitik unter den Markgrafen Philipp I., Ernst und Bernhard III. von 1515 bis 1536," ZGO, N. F. 69, (1960), p. 7. The significance of printing cannot be overestimated when one is considering the spread of Reformation ideas. Luther was an undisputed master of the printed pamphlet, one of the central weapons of the age. The sermon on indulgences (1517) was printed ten times in three years, the sermon on the estate of marriage (1519) was printed thirteen times in four years, etc. See Vierordt, Geschichte, p. 117. Luther's writings were to see nearly two-thousand editions in the eight years between 1517 and 1525. Lortz, Reformation, p. 394.

6 In this discussion we are limiting the listing of Freiburg alumni to those who continued to work in and around Freiburg as evangelical preachers. Numerous graduates of Freiburg became reformers elsewhere. To list a few, M. Zell, W. Capito, C. Hedel, Johann Stumpf, U. Rhegius, B. Hubmaier, etc. In the cases of these men, it is by no means clear that their education at Freiburg contributed to their later espousal of the evangelical cause. Cf. P. Albert, "Die reformatorische Bewegung zu Freiburg bis zum Jahre 1525," Freiburger Diözesan-Archiv (hereafter FDA), 1919, p. 2, n. 1. Also Vierordt, Geschichte, pp. 80 ff.

8"Die Quellen zur Geschichte der reformatorischen Bewegung zu Freiburg fließen ... sehr spärlich. Die amtliche städtische Uberlieferung ist mangelhaft und dürftig, da die sonst sehr inhaltsreichen Rats- und Briefbücher aus diesen Jahren verloren sind; an bürgerlichen Aufzeichnungen ist gar nichts vorhanden." [Ibid.], p. 5, n. 1.


10"... die grosse Masse aber stand der Bewegung durchaus teilnahmslos ..." [Ibid.]

11"[The Reform] was the result of the zealous efforts of a minority ... Overwhelmingly concerned with the problem of the emperor and still hopeful that it could maintain a tenuous peace with the bishop, the Rat served as a brake on the projects of the reformers. In the end it had not created policy, it had acquiesced in the decision of the militant." Miriam Chrisman, Strasbourg and the Reform (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1967), p. 175.

12Ernst of Baden was one of three sons of the Margrave Christoph I of Baden (1475-1527). In 1515, Margrave Christoph divided his lands among his sons: Philipp I received Baden, Lahr and Mahlberg; Bernhard III received property in Sponheim and lands in Luxembourg; Ernst received property in the Breisgau, namely the margraviate of Hochberg and the territories of Uesenberg, Rötteln, Badenweiler and Sausenberg. Bartmann, "Kirchenpolitik," p. 2, n. 3.


15"Als er aber aus den Akten der mit Spannung erwarteten Disputation, die ... Eck zu Leipzig gegen Luther hielt, die extremen Ansichten des Wittenbergers über päpstlichen Primat und Unfehlbarkeit der Konsilien zu lesen bekam, wurde er stutzig." [Ibid.], p. 9.

16"Noch in den Jahren 1520 und 1521 drückt er sich mit grossem Lob über den Reformator aus, den er den Phönix unter den theologen nennt ..." Vierordt, Geschichte, pp. 119-120.
"Ich bin Beiden gut, ziehe aber doch den Erasmus vor." *Ibid.*, p. 120.


28. "... er bitte daher auch denselben, bei der alten Kirche Geboten, Satzungen, Ordnungen und Gewohnheiten nach der Weise der Eltern ... zu verbreiten ..." Albert, "Bewegung," p. 35.


"Nicht nur die Frauen hörten seine Predigten gern, auch Mitglieder des Rates, der Stadtschreiber und selbst der Bürgermeister zählten bald zu seinen begeistertsten Verehrern." Sussan, Otter, p. 13.

Albert, "Bewegung," p. 70.

Vierordt, Geschichte, p. 175 ff.

Albert, "Bewegung," p. 76.

Ibid., p. 74.

Ibid., p. 38.

See the Ordnung der Exekution über die verbotenen Bücher, printed in Ibid., pp. 38-39.

Ibid., p. 38.

Potter, Zwingli, p. 98.


Potter, Zwingli, p. 103.

Ibid.


Vierordt, Geschichte, pp. 166-167.

"Der eine droht mir, er wolle mich in St. Martins Turm bringen, wenn er den Gewaltsbrief vom Bischof habe; der andre will vermeinen, man solle mich auf einen Karren schmieden und nach Konstanz führen; der dritte droht mir, mich bei dem Haar über die Kirchenmauer zu ziehen, wenn ich mehr davon redete ..." Quoted in Albert, "Bewegung," p. 49.

52"... so hoffe ich in der Schweiz sagen zu dürfen, was im Evangelium steht." Ibid.

53Sussan, Otter, p. 13.

54... der unterwist allenthalben das gemein unverstendig volk (in) der lutterischen opinion und gib(t) also in ewangelischem schin underrichtung und ursach zu ungehorsam und pundschuchischer handlung." Quoted in Albert, "Bewegung," p. 44.

55Ibid., pp. 45-47.

56... dass urch alle jede Götstere manns und frauenpersonen ... in guter geistlicher Reformation ... gehalten werden." Quoted in Bartmann, "Kirchenpolitik," pp. 3-4.

57Vierordt, Geschichte, pp. 161-162.

58"Markgraf Ernst bezog bis zu seinem Lebensende keine klare Stellung in religiösen Dingen . . . ." Bartmann, "Kirchenpolitik," p. 36.


60"... was unser gdger Herr der Margraf mit jm' und einem Gotshus fürnemme . . . ." Manuscript in GLA, abt. 14, 2. Letter from Freiburg Rat to the Regents in Upper Alsace, March 7, 1522.

61"die von des Margraffen wegen im Gotshus ligen . . . ." Ibid.

62... haben wir als Castvogt unnd schirmher / die unterthanen / by billichem Rechten zuhandhaben / etlich Reysigen dahin gelegt . . . ." Manuscript in GLA, abt. 14, 2. Letter from Margrave Ernst to the Freiburg Rat, March 7, 1522.

63"Wo wir aber durch den Abt oder yemand anders vergwisst werden / das die unterthanen / sollichs gwalts mit besorgt bedorfften / weren wir willig / die Reisigen abryten-zulassen / und das Gotshuss des kosten zuentladen . . . ." Ibid.

64... alles das, so sie mit dem Margraffen, und er mit Inen gehandelt haben, mundlich anzeigen sollen . . . ." Manuscript in GLA, abt. 14, 2. Letter from Freiburg Rat to the Regents in Upper Alsace, March 8, 1522.
65"Und wolt dem abt anzeigen, das er bis dohyn mit gedult ver- 
zire, ... wir vermeynen Ime des bald abzuheffen." \footnote{Manuscript in 
GLA, abt. 14, 2. Letter from Regents in Upper Alsace to the Freiburg 
Rat, March 9\textsuperscript{a}, 1522.}

66GLA, abt. 14, 2. Letter from Margrave Ernst to the Regents, 
March 24, 1522.

67"... die aptye zu sandt peter In unser vorderm schirm allweg, 
lenger dan sich machen gedäfchtnis stecht, gewesen, und noch ist und 
wir noch haben hohe und nydre oberkeyt." \footnote{Manuscript in GLA, abt. 
14, 2. Letter from Margrave Ernst to the Regents, March 28, 1522.}

68"... und damit verursachen, K.M. derselben und anderer 
artikeln halb zuclagen, als wir auch uff dem Jungst gehaltener Rechstag 
zu Wormbs In by wesen yv unser herren und freund Churfursten und 
fursten K.M. geclagt haben ...

69"... wir von Ir M. darInn endscheids und Rechts wartig syn 
lassen wir es daby nochmals plyben, und wellet K.M. endscheids 
darInns erwarten, und dem selben hierInns noch komen und ist deshalb 
nit von nodten uns deshalb In wyter dysputation oder handlung zu- 
begeben ...

70"... durch die Regenten zu Ensisheim ettwas impillich schatzung 
uff sy gelegt wird, dass sy und Ir vorderm bysshare überhebt gewessen, 
und derglichen nye gegeben haben ...

71"... und besonder durch Iren herrn den apt, der sy doch 
pillicher davor schirmen und handhaben solt ...

72"Deshalb Ir underthanig pyt und anruff an uns wer, wir als Ir 
Castvogt schirmer und her wolten sy vor solhem gwalt, und zu recht 
schirmen und handhaben ...

73"... als aber uns uns solh shriben, von Regenten bys uff 
diesen tag, keyn antwurt ward und aber nichtdermynder die unter- 
thanen In sorgen gestand, haben wir ettl ich reissigen gen sandt peter 
gelegt." \footnote{Ibid.}

74"... nit ungeburlich wie die apt mit unworheit furgibt .

75"... das aber sy die schlissel dem keller abgerissen, und 
eynem, unter Inen geben haben sollen, hat die gestalt, das der apt 
(als der so geneygt alles das uns wydrig und leyd ist zuhanden) dem 
prior und Convent geschrieben (dess handtschrift wir haben) den 
unsern nichts werden zu essen, noch sy trynken zugeben, deshalb die 
unsern uss der nodt istt verursachet, die schliessel selbs zu nemen, 
das sy ouch doch mit kheinen gwalt oder Zwang gethan und als noch 
mals der Convent als der durch uns bericht ward, us was ursachen die 
reissigen alda legen, sich essen und tringken gutwillig zugeben bewilligt,
haben die unsern die schliessel Innen wyder geben, oder zum wenigsten Inen zu geben angebotten, dann unser meynung nye gewesen und noch nit ist, das gotzhus In einich weg, zubeschweren ..." 76* 81

76* . . sollen schaipfen unnachpurlichen schriift gegen uns bringen lassen, und wenig bedacht dye frundlich nachpurschaft, wir bysshar gegen euch gern halten haben und noch gern halten wolten . . ." 77* 82

77* Cf. further letters in GLA abt. 14, 2.

78* See Mayer, Geschichte, p. 72.

79* . . widder alt gebruch unnd Harkomen gelegt . . ." 79* 83

79* GLA abt. 14, 2. Margrave Ernst to Freiburg Rat, March 7, 1522.

80* Already in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, monks are no longer called "brothers" but rather "cloister lords." See Schreiner, Untersuchungen, p. 63.


82* Ibid., p. 15.

83* . . der predikant zu Kentzingen lutherische ketzerische Ding predige." 83* 84

83* Quoted in Ibid., p. 14.

84* "Nur was hierin stehe, habe der predikant gelernt." Quoted in Ibid.

85* . . Meister Jakob uns nichts als Liebes und Gutes erwiesen und nichts als bruderliche Liebe und christliche Ordnung in seinen Predigten und Unterweisungen gelehrt hat." 85* 86


87* "Doch könne er dem Wunsche seiner Bürger nur unter der Bedingung entsprechen, dass sie das Abendmal nicht unter beiderlei Gestalt nähmen, nicht deutsch taufen und auch keine deutsche Messe lesen Liessen." Ibid., p. 15.

88* . . dass man den Meister Jakob weder hören noch sehen wolle." 88* 89

89* Ibid.
"Mag ein frommer Christ wohl urteilen, ob sie ketzerisch sind. Ich überantworte sie Ew. fürstlichen Gnaden, weil ich erkenne, dass Ew. Gnaden christlichen Gemüts und mit höchsten Fleiss der christlichen Wahrheit begierig und bereit ist, bis in den Tod beständig zu sein, und sich befließt, die falschen Lehren und Lügen auszurotten." Quoted in Ibid., p. 16.

"... als das Schwert und der Harnisch des heiligen katholischen Glaubens, als Vollstrecher kaiserlichen Zornes, als Strahl des Bannes und der Acht wider die Ketzer." Ibid., p. 17.


"Die wenige, die hartnäckig auf ihrer vorgefassten Meinung beharrten, verloren rasch allen Anhang und Boden in der Stadt." Ibid., p. 59.

"Luthers Deist, sagte er, 'erzeuge Feindschaft, Hader, Reibung, Sekten, Gehässigkeit und Mord'." Ibid., p. 60. Zasius appears to have returned fully to the Catholic fold by 1524. Ibid., p. 59.

"Luthers Opinion verführe zum Aufruhr, zur Ketzerei und zum Bundschuh." Quoted in Sussen, Otter, p. 21.

"Wir kennen Luther und seine Lehren nicht. "Redet er aber die Wahrheit, so thut er es aus Christus. Christum aber kennen wir. Wir sind auf den Namen Christi getauft, in seinem Namen wollen wir selig werden." Quoted in Ibid., p. 22.

"Die lutherische Opinion und Sect habe sich trotz aller Befehl und Mandat von Kaiser und Erzherzog in Kenzingen eingestellt." Ibid., p. 22.

"Hat der Prädikant so grosse Liebe zu Euch, als er vorgibt, warum ist er nicht freiwillig ins Exil gegangen, um Euch und Eure Kinder vor solchem Elend zu bewahren? Ihr würdet auch ohne ihn fromme Christen sein können, wie Eure Voreltern es ohne Zweifel auch gewesen sind." Quoted in Ibid., p. 25.

"Der Überraschte Fürst riet ihnen, den Prädikanten auf seiner Feste in sicherem Verwahr zu lassen, tadelte aber die Bürger, dass sie so zahlreich und bewaffnet herüber gekommen seien. Da dieses leicht als Ungehorsam gegen den Erzherzog, welcher den Markgrafen wenige Wochen zuvor besucht hatte, ausgelegt werden könne ... " Ibid., p. 26.
100. Ibid., p. 27.

101. "Vier Wochen lang speiste er deren nie weniger als fünfzig bis sechzig." Ibid., p. 28.


103. ... dazu kam noch die soeben gemachte Erfahrung, dass Oesterreichs Macht am Oberrhein, im Elsass und Breisgau in diesen Wirren sich keineswegs als achtunggebend erwiesen hatte. Drohungen und grosse Worte waren es, die kaiserliches Regiment zu Ensisheim stets zur Hand hatte. Ohne Freiburgs Hilfe hätte man sich schwerlich an die festen Mauern Kenzingens gewagt." Ibid., p. 32.

104. Vierordt, Geschichte, pp. 174-175. Archduke Ferdinand finally allowed the exiled to return home, following an appeal by the city of Freiburg on behalf of the 350 children left homeless in Kenzingen. Ibid. The exiles returned September 19, 1526. Sussan, Otter, p. 38.

105. There were seven arrested from Kenzingen, "Unter jenem Erzketzer ist wohl der Stadtschreiber von Kenzingen gemeint ... Auf dem Aschenhaufen der verbrannten deutschen Evangelien und lutherischen Schriften, die man in seinem Hause und in den Wohnungen der übrigen Bürger gefunden, musste er niederknien, und nun schlug ihm, in Gegenwart seiner Frau und seiner Kinder, der Scharfrichter am 7. Juli 1524 den Kopf ab." Ibid., p. 175.


107. "Besonders war die Stimmung der markgräflichen Bauern eine sehr erbitterte." Sussan, Otter, p. 32.

108. "Freiburg habe Kenzingen schmählich überzogen und ins Verderben gestürzt. Aber in kurzer Zeit werde Freiburg, welches das Gotteswort 'verdrucken' wolle, auch überzogen und ins Verderben gestürzt werden." Quoted in Ibid.

109. See Ibid., pp. 32-33 for a re-print of the letter.

110. "Aus all diesen Handlungen muss ersehen, dass E.F.G. Unterthanen gegen uns und die Unserigen ganz verbitterten ... sind." Ibid., p. 35.

111. "Auch sind wir Euch freundliche und gnädige Nachbarschaft zu zeigen wohl geneigt." Ibid., p. 36.

Vierordt, Geschichte, p. 197.

Bergsten, Hubmaier, pp. 107-111. The case of Waldshut is very interesting for us since the town was not only reformed by Balthasar Hubmaier but also participated in the Peasants' War on the side of the peasants and then became an officially Anabaptist town, again through Hubmaier. Waldshut, like Kenzingen, was under Austrian control, but unlike Kenzingen, it was on the frontier of the Hither-Austrian territory. Waldshut received much support from Zurich, both religiously and politically. Waldshut defiance of Austrian might also happened to coincide with the uprising of the peasants, which allowed the Waldshut movement to survive longer than was the case in Kenzingen.

Hartfelder, Geschichte, pp. 300-301. "Freiburg... war so gut bekannt wegen seiner gut katholischen, der neuen Bewegung abgeneigten Gesinnung, dass die aufstandischen Bauern des Grafen Sigmund von Lupfen keinen Beswerdebrief an diese Stadt abgeben liessen, während sie sonst bei allen mõglichen Städten und Herrschaften klagten."

Auch suchte Freiburg die bedrohten Herrschaften und Klõster zu ermutigen und stellte seine Unterstõtzung in Aussicht. Ibid., p. 301.

Ibid.

Ibid. See also Bergsten, Hubmaier, p. 114.

In Ensisheim war aber wenig Lust vorhanden, das ketzerische Waldshut so leichterdings davonkommen zu lassen; man wünschte vielmehr, an der ungehorsamen Stadt ein 'Exempel' zu statuiren..." Hartfelder, Geschichte, p. 302.

... the most forceful reason for the Austrians' delay in suppressing the Waldshut rebellion was, undoubtedly, Zürich's intervention in support of the little town..." Bergsten, Hubmaier, p. 121.

Gleichzeitig aber gehen 100 bewaffnete Knechte von Freiburg nach dem bedrohten Wüllingen ab..." Hartfelder, Geschichte, p. 303.

Ibid., pp. 276-277.

Ibid., p. 305.

... ziemlich die ganze Bevölkerung des nördlichen Kaiserstuhles sich erhoben hatte." Ibid., p. 284.

Ibid., pp. 284-287.

127 "Wenn Markgraf Ernst bereit sei, ihr Herr als Stellvertreter des Kaisers, den sie allein über sich dulden wollten, zu sein und die Bauernartikel zu halten, so wollten sie ihn als "Herrn ansehen und ihm seine Schlüssel lassen." "Ibid., p. 291.

128 "Markgraf Ernst fand diese Reden mit Recht 'erbärmlich zu hören' . . ." "Ibid.

129 "Nirgends in dem Österreichischen Breisgau waren die Untertanen unzufriedener als in dem Städtchen Staufen." "Ibid., p. 294.


132 "Im Osten, auf den Bergen und im Thal, lagerten die Schwarzwälder . . . Im Süden standen die Bauern aus der oberen Markgrafschaft, vermutlich mit Schaaren aus dem südlichen Breisgau . . .; im Westen und Norden standen die vom Kaiserstuhl, der Herrschaft Hochberg und der Ortenau . . ." "Ibid., p. 312.

133 "Baumeister reports that Margrave Ernst took refuge in Freiburg along with eight abbots. " . . . Ernestus Marchii Hochbergensis una cum octo abbatibus Friburgum fugit . . .", and Baumeister adds further that Jodocus was among these eight. " . . . octo enim abbates . . . quos inter et Dominus Jodocus erat . . . etc." Baumeister, Compendium, p. 324.

134 "The fact that St. Peters was spared suggests that there were some monks who remained in the monastery and that they were successful in protecting the monastery. K.F. Vierordt documents two cases where monks successfully prevented the plunder of their monasteries by making concessions to the peasants. The Abbot of Salmansweiler, who had fled his monastery, allowed his monks "das Evangelium ohne allen menschlichen Zusatz den Bauern zu predigen . . ." Vierordt notes that "Dadurch verschaffte er seinem Kloster eine sehr leidliche Behandlung." Vierordt, Geschichte, p. 218. The Abbot of St. George near Hornberg remained in his monastery and prevented plunder by feeding the peasants out of the monastery provisions. "Ibid. It is safe to assume that St. Peters' monks cooperated with the peasants, given the sparing of the cloister. Baumeister also reports that the tenants (inqui-
lini) of St. Peters, Kirchzarten and Ebnet all had to swear obedience to the peasants. Presumably such an oath would have been required also of the monks on pain of plunder and destruction. "Die veneris post Dominam Jubilate rusticorum turma e S. Georgii monasterio in Furtwangen, et inde ad S. Petrum, Kirchzarten, et Ebnet veniunt, quorum inquilini omnes obedientiam eis iurato ponderunt." Baumeister, Compendium, pp. 323-324.


136"Sie hingen jetzt zu Kirchzarten 'allein aus brüderlicher Liebe, das Wort Gottes und das heilige Evangelium dem gemeinen Volk zu predigen, auch aller Oberkeit geistlicher und weltlicher, laut des heiligen Evangelli gehorsam zu sein.'" Ibid., p. 310.

137"... sie könne nicht ohne Wissen und Willen ihrer Herrschaft Oestreich sich in solche Händel einlassen." Ibid., p. 311.

138"Es war ein schöner Maiabend, die Herren sassen, wie gewöhnlich, auf dem Münsterplatz vor ihrem Gesellschaftshause ..., als plötzlich einige hundert Schlüsse aus Hakenbüchsen die Wegnahme des Blockhauses verkündeten." Quoted in Ibid., p. 313.

139"... liess es am 23. Mai 300 bewaffnete Bauern in die Stadt." Ibid., p. 314.

140"... die Lehre und das Wort Christi aufzurichten ..." Ibid., p. 215.

141"... gleich als ob die Christenmenschen dies vorher nicht gethan hätten." 'Quoted in Ibid., p. 329.

142 Ibid., p. 321.

143"... um ihre Haltung während des Krieges zu rechtfertigen." Ibid., p. 326.

144"... er habe ihre Entschuldigung vernommen und sei für diesmal damit zufrieden." Ibid.


146See Ibid., p. 349 ff. for a listing of the articles agreed upon. The differences in the agreements drawn up between Margrave Ernst and his subjects and Ferdinand and his subjects are interesting, particularly at the point of religion. In both cases the right of the community to choose its own pastor was denied, but the Margrave's agreement read.
"Die Pfarrer sollten den Gemeinden 'das heilige Evangelium und Gotteswort nach der heiligen Schrift predigen,' damit dieselben von 'Laster, Aufruhr, Sunden und Ueppigkeit' abgewandt und zu gutem Gehorsam gewiesen würden." *Ibid.*, pp. 349-350. Ernst apparently still held the view (so strongly argued in Kenzingen) that the "Pure Word of God" would lead to moral reformation and good citizenship among the folk. The Austrian agreement, on the other hand, states curtly that "In kirchlhen Dingen durfte keine Aenderung vorgenommen werden." There is no talk here concerning the troublesome phrase "preaching the Word of God," but rather no change is to be tolerated, period.


152 The search for the elusive name of Michael Sattler in the monastic record has apparently been going on for some time. In Baumeister's Synopsis Annalium, at the bottom of page 143 at the conclusion of the description of Abbot Jodocus' rule, stands the pencilled comment of some anonymous researcher: "Michael Sattler postea Wiedertaufer, antea monachus in St. Peter fuisse dicitur ante 1531." (Michael Sattler, later an Anabaptist, formerly a monk in St. Peters, would have been mentioned before 1531).

153 In this connection, it is significant that Hans Kuenzi reports that his friend, the ex-monk Michael, had come to him asking "that I teach him to work, for he wished to eat bread from his own hand, without presumption ..." See *QGT* zu, p. 201. We shall return to this presently.
CHAPTER IV


"Haetzer's testimonials . . . show that the estrangement from Zwingli was brought about not by dogmatic reasons . . . but by a consideration of church policy." J.F.G. Goeters, "Ludwig Haetzer, a Marginal Anabaptist," MQR, 29 (Oct., 1955), p. 253.

"A new situation was created by Zwingli's decision (in 1523), for it is evident that Grebel believed that Zwingli had put the state in a position of dominance in the life of the church. The Scripture was not to have its rightful and supreme place." Bender, Grebel, p. 99. Cf. Williams, Radical, pp. 89-90; 92-95.

J.H. Yoder, Täufer und Reformation in der Schweiz, I. (Die Gespräche zwischen Täufern und Reformatoren, 1523-1538). (Karlsruhe:
Verlag H. Schneider, 1962), Cf. number 30, "Der zwinglische Ursprung des Täuferturns," pp. 160-166. Yoder differs from Bender on the question of when the split occurred between Zwingli and Grebel, and also differs with Bender's emphasis on Biblicism as the root cause of the disagreement. "... there were not two clearly defined camps, divided on the question of state versus biblical authority. Zwingli was no less biblicistic and no less impatient than Grebel. Grebel was no more legalistic and no less considerate for the 'weak' than Zwingli."  Yoder, "The Turning Point in the Zwinglian Reformation," MQR 32 (April, 1958), p. 135. Yoder places Zwingli's "turn" in December of 1523. Zwingli accepted the state's refusal, and thus revealed that his announced willingness to stand by his convictions come what may... had only been a bluff. Grebel chose the other path, preferring Zwingli's intentions to his actions. Once this issue was clear he could see that it had already been latently present in October."  Ibid., p. 138. Thus Yoder arrives at essentially the same conclusion as did Bender, but Zwingli's "turn" is placed slightly later and the question at issue between them is "unity of the state" versus "faithfulness" as opposed to Bender's "dominance of the state" versus "predominance of Scripture".


7 Cf. also Fritz Blanke, Brothers in Christ, trans. by J. Nordenhang (Scottsdale, Pa.: Herald Press, 1961). "In the emergence of the Anabaptist church of Zollikon we have to do with the birth of a community of purely religious character."  Ibid., p. 42.

8 Walton, Theocracy, pp. 1-16.

9 "The evidence found in Zwingli's early works indicates that he had already made the connection between the problems of politics and the solution offered by the Christian faith before he came to Zürich... Zwingli's intensive study of the Old Testament... no doubt reinforced his willingness to accept the existing corporate theory of society and enabled him to identify the people and the government of Zürich with the children of the New Covenant."  Ibid., p. 36.

10 "Zwingli wanted a purification of religious practices on the basis of scripture, but he sought to implement it through the established government, not by the rash actions of individuals."  Ibid., p. 43.

11 Ibid., p. 208.

12 "It is... clear from the evidence at hand that there was no 'radical party' in Zürich in 1522 and 1523... and that Grebel was certainly not the leader of any such party."  Bender, Grebel, p. 87.

"A significant number of men present at Froschauer's home were subsequently identified with Conrad Grebel. Heini Aberli, Bartholomew Pur, and Hans Ockenfuss broke the fast and were mentioned by Grebel as his followers when he wrote to Thomas Müntzer in September, 1524." Walton, Theocracy, p. 61.


Ibid., p. 96. See Stayer's discussion of the controversy in Ibid., pp. 93-96.


"Wie ein Zeitgenosse wohl zu Recht bemerkte, war die grosse Zahl der ungebildeten Laien, und vor allem die Bauern, wohl nicht so sehr an den differenzierten theologischen Überlegungen der führenden Reformatoren interessiert als vielmehr am Kampf gegen den Klerus .... Luther und Zwingli wurden populär als Exponenten dieses Kampfes verstanden ..." Haas, "Der Weg," pp. 57-58.

Die Gemeinde war der Ort, wo Gottes Wort wirkte. Und weil der Kleriker gegenüber dem Laie vor Gott nichts voraus hatte, so sprach man der Gemeinde das Recht zu, die Priester zu überprüfen." Haas, "Der Weg," p. 58. The tithe issue also rested in part on the late-medieval reforming movement, for it was often argued that tithes should be withheld from unworthy priests and monks. Cf. Goeters,
"Vorgeschichte," pp. 256-257. A protest against the accumulation of benefices and absentee pastors may also have played a part. Trithemius, in urging church reform, stated what was undoubtedly a popular sentiment when he said, "he who carries the burden and concern is worthy to receive the sustenance. . . . Indeed, the sheep were not instituted for the sake of the pastor, but the pastor for the sake of the sheep." (Qui onus portat et curam, dignus est recipere sustentationem . . . Non enim propter pastorem oves, sed propter oves pastor constitutus est.) Trithemius, *Institutio Vitae Sacerdotalis* (Mainz, 1494), p. B vi, verso.


26 The town of Witikon agreed to continue paying its tithe to the chapter "unless others stopped giving them, in which case they would no longer be committed." Quoted in Stayer, "Reublin and Brötli," p. 84.


32 Haas, "Der Weg," p. 60. "... es waren im wesentlichen die gleichen Pfarrer vor und nach der reformatorischen 'Wende', welche die Gemeinden betreuten."

33 Stayer, *et al.*, "Monogenesis to Polygenesis," p. 97. "Goeters' contribution amounts to much more than an earlier dating of the tensions between Zwingli and the radicals, hence a return to the standpoint of Bender and Blanke. It puts the spotlight in the proto-Anabaptist movement on issues and people who constitute a serious embarrassment to the Swiss Brethren as previously conceived."

Goeters notes that after June 1523 "gibt es aus seiner (Grebels) Feder kein gutes Wort mehr über seinen Lehrer." "Vorgeschichte," p. 258.


"Die Disputation vom Oktober 1523 ist das Datum für das Bündnis zwischen den Radikalen in Zürich und den radikalen Reformierten ausserhalb Zürichs." Stayer, "Anfänge," p. 34.

Zwingli's decision was underlined clearly in December of 1523, when the Council moved not to allow the celebration of the Lord's Supper in both kinds. Zwingli acquiesced to this decision, much to the scorn of the radicals. Cf. Grebel's letter to Vadian, TA, zu. I, p. 8.


"Er war der erste bedeutendere Führer des radikalen reformierten Kongregationalismus ..." Ibid., p. 36.

"In zahlreichen Bauernartikeln zur Zeit der Unruhen tauchte die Forderung auf, die Gemeinde sollte ihren Pfarrer selbst wählen. Damit bekundeten die Bauern, welchen Schluss sie aus der antiklerikalen Kampagne gezogen hatten." Haas, "Der Weg," p. 60.

Zwingli shared the radicals' desire for the establishment of a church according to Scriptural principles; the decisive questions separating Zwingli from the radicals were questions concerning the tempo of the reform and the control of the reform, and in these matters Zwingli deferred to the magistracy. It is because of their insistence on unilateral and immediate reform that the radical reformers earn the name "radical."

"As a result of Zwingli's spiritualistic emphasis with relation to the sacraments, baptism (whether of infants or of believers) was to him
of secondary importance. He regarded faith as the necessary element.

... It was only his quarrel with the Anabaptists which caused him to seek a Scriptural and practical foundation for infant baptism ... In the beginning of the Reformation, doubts about pedobaptism were commonplace." Translation from Bergsten, Hubmaier (Estep), pp. 80-81.

Ibid., pp. 366-367; 110-111.

... only Reublin was imprisoned in August and required to make explanations to a commission of the clergy and government of Zürich. If Brüti was then not yet active in Zollikon, he must have arrived soon afterward, since he signed Grebel's letter to Müntzer of early September." Stayer, "Reublin and Brüti," p. 88.

Following Haetzer's reference to Canon Law, Goeters reproduces the following excerpt from the fourth Distinctio of the Third Part, canon CXLI: "Nulla præter baptismum salus promittitur infantibus, quia infantes, si per sacramentum, quod ad hoc divinitus institutus est, in credentium numeram non transseant, in tenebris manent." Goeters, Haetzer, p. 48. (Salvation is promised to infants in no way except through baptism, because if infants do not pass over into the number of the believing by means of this sacrament, which is divinely instituted for this, they remain in darkness.) Cf. Grebel's letter to Müntzer, where Grebel speaks of those who continue in the old ceremonies of baptism and the Supper, "thus despising the divine Word and following the papal word as well as the word of the antipapal preachers ... ."


"Ist die Kindertaufe in 'papstlichen Rechten' geboten, so ist sie eine Erfindung des Papsttums und somit ein 'teuflischer Greuel'." Goeters, Haetzer, p. 48.


According to Bender, these discussions would have taken place between mid-October and mid-December, 1524. Bender, Grebel, p. 128.

"Die Kindertaufeggegen traten mit der These an: 'Baptismum infantium ... summam abominacionem, ex cacodemone pontificae Romano esse' ... Christus hat die Kindertaufe nicht ausdrücklich geboten, die Apostel haben sie nicht gelübt, selbst Johannes Täufer hat nur Erwachsene getauft, somit ist die Praxis der Kindertaufe nicht zulässig." Goeter, Haetzer, p. 51.
"Baptismus . . . Christi cognitionem antecedebat." "Baptismus omnino successit in locum circumcisionis." Quoted in Ibid., p. 52.

"Licebit ergo eos infantes, qui ad fidem educantur, non minus aqua tingere." Quoted in Ibid.

This was Zwingli's "Wer Ursache gebe zu Aufruhr."

Goeters, Haetzer, p. 53; Stayer, "Reublin and Brötli," p. 88.

Goeters, Haetzer, p. 53.

See Zieglschmid, Chronik, pp. 4647. This translation is from Bender, Grebel, p. 137. See Bender's discussion in Ibid., pp. 136-137; p. 264, n. 3.

Ibid., p. 137. "... damit ist die absänderung von der welt unnd von Iren 'bosen wercken anbrochen." Zieglschmid, Chronik, p. 47.

... entwickelten die Radikalen in Zürich unter Führung von Grebel, Mantz und Castelberger 1524 eine proto-sektierische Mentalität. ... " Stayer, "Anfänge," p. 37.

This is Haas' central thesis in "Der Weg."

"Damit erklärten sie die Kindertaufe für nichtig . . . Bei der Einführung der Wiedertaufe mögen Zwinglis Argumentationen mit der Johannestaufe und insbesondere Act. 19, 1-7, das er einmal angeführt hatte, eine Rolle gespielt haben." Goeters, Haetzer, pp. 53-54. The point that the radicals wished to make was not, of course, that re-baptism was desirable, but rather that baptism following confession of faith is the Scriptural form of baptism. Cf. Felix Mantz' references to Matthew 28:19 and Mark 16:16 in his "Protestation", TA, zu. I, pp. 24-25.


For the Zollikon story, see F. Blanke, Brothers. For this period, see pp. 21-32.

Stayer, "Reublin and Brötli," p. 88.

"Most of the baptisms were administered by Brötli, others . . . by Blaurock and Mantz . . . . Conrad Grebel, who already at the beginning of the week had left for Schaffhausen, evidently did not baptize anyone in Zollikon." Blanke, Brothers, p. 29.
"He apparently hoped to win the preachers of Schaffhausen, since those of Zürich had rejected his proposals." Bender, Grebel, p. 139.


Stayer, "Reublin and Brötli," p. 92.

Bergsten, Hubmaier, pp. 212-213; (Estep, pp. 156-157).

"... denn er ist wider den Zwingli dess touffs halb und wirt wider in schriben ... ". _TA_ zu. I, pp. 33-34.

Bergsten, Hubmaier, pp. 254-256; (Estep, pp. 188-190).

Bergsten, Hubmaier, p. 303; (Estep, p. 229).


Stayer, "Reublin and Brötli," p. 93.


See Bergsten, Hubmaier, pp. 157-165; (Estep, pp. 115-121).

This situation was complicated by the fact that Waldshut supported the rebellious peasants of the Klettgau, who were subjects of Zürich. Bergsten, Hubmaier, pp. 233-241; (Estep, pp. 173-176).

"When Waldshut . . . began at the end of January, 1525, to give active support to the cause of the rebel peasants, the Reformation movement in Waldshut became, once more, directly bound up with the movement of social revolution in South Germany." Bergsten, Hubmaier, (Estep), p. 173.

86. The Stühlingen peasants met in Hallau in summer of 1524 to plan their attack on the Count of Lupfen's castle; Hallau also convened disgruntled peasants in early 1525, and a list of grievances was drawn up. Listed among the grievances is opposition to serfdom based on "the Word of God" and the insistence that tithes should support the local pastor directly. Stayer, "Reublin and Brötli," p. 94.

87. Ibid., pp. 9596. The Büach area is also the scene of Michael Sattler's later evangelizing for the Anabaptist cause.

88. Ibid., p. 96.

89."(Hofmeister) schreibt nämlich ferner, dass er öffentlich vor dem Rat geäußert habe, Zwingli irre von dem Ziel, wenn er meine, die kleinen Kinder müssten getauft werden." Bergsten, Hubmaier, pp. 268-269; (Estep, pp. 200-201).

90. Stayer, "Reublin and Brötli," p. 97, n. 92.

91. Ibid., pp. 97-98.

92. Ibid., pp. 98-99.

93. Bender, Grebel, pp. 142-143.

94. Ibid., p. 143. The ME, IV, p. 401, states that Grebel "baptized several hundred in the Sitter River at the edge of the city."

95. Ibid., pp. 144-145. Zwingli's opposition was instrumental in the suppression of the Anabaptist movement generally. "Erst aufgrund dieser theologischen Absicherung, die durch Zwingli gegeben wurde, kamen die Beschlüsse gegen die Täufer zustande." Haas, "Der Weg," p. 64.

96."Grebel und Hubmaier scheinen an eine massgebende täuferische Reformation gedacht zu haben, die Zwinglis Richtung den Rang ablaufen konnte." Ibid.

97. Aberli had connections with the Zürich soldiers helping to defend Waldshut in 1524, and he later took Hubmaier into his home in Zürich. Stayer, Anabaptists and the Sword, (Lawrence, Kan.: Coronado Press, 1972), pp. 104-105.


99. Ibid., pp. 110-111. The St. Gall Council, after its mandate of June 7 against Anabaptism, prepared for an armed revolt of major
proportions. "A special militia of 200 men was sworn in to handle a possible revolt." ME IV, p. 402.

100 Stayer, Sword, p. 113.

101 "Im Strudel der darob entstandenen Massenbewegung gingen Grundsätze unter, die der Grebelkreis ursprünglich hochgehalten hatte; denn der Antiklerikalismus führte viele Vorstellungen im täuerischen Sammelbecken zusammen: die Bereitschaft zum Aufstand im Kampf für das Gemeindeprinzip, die Möglichkeit des bewaffneten Widerstands, die Massentaufen, die nur noch einen Bruchteil des ursprünglichen Gesin- nungswandels erkennen liessen, das öffentliche Abendmahl, das die Grenzen der brüderlichen Liebe recht weit steckte." Haas, "Der Weg," pp. 64-65.


103 There were exceptions north of Zürich, such as in the pacifism demonstrated by Ulrich Teck and Jakob Gross in Waldshut, which caused them to be expelled from the city as undesireables. Bergsten, Hubmaier, p. 322.

104 Grebel and Mantz always maintained a pacifistic stance. Blaurock, on the other hand, is an unknown quantity on the issue. Some of his actions hint at an acceptance of coercive action. Cf. Stayer, Sword, p. 112, n. 51.

105 Blaurock and Mantz both worked for a time in and around Chur. Bender, Grebel, p. 149. Mantz was arrested in Chur and ejected in mid-July, 1525. ME I, p. 592.

106 Teck and Gross (Cf. supra, n. 125) were expelled from the Grünningen area on the 20th of September, after preaching and baptism. Bender, Grebel, p. 152. Gross testified later that he was expelled from Waldshut for not helping out in the attack on Radolfzell during the Peasants' War. TA, el. I, 63-64.

107 Three Zollikoners mentioned in this connection are Marx Bosshart, Fridli Schumacher and Hans Oggenfuss. Bender, Grebel, p. 149.

108 The pastor at Hinwyl, Hans Brennwald, had been involved in the peasants' uprising earlier in 1525, but in reply to Grebel's urging he now stated that "My lords have issued a writing on the question of baptism, and I intend to be obedient to my lords." Quoted in Ibid., p. 150. The pastor Ulrich Zingg from Dürnten, although he expressed himself against infant baptism, nevertheless did not do away with the practice in his own parish. Grebel also had talks with pastor Benedikt Landenberger, apparently to no avail. Ibid., pp. 151-152.
110. "Der Druck der Obrigkeit erzwang es, dass die Bauernbewegungen niedergeschlagen wurden. Das bedeutete unter anderem, dass es aussichtslos war, die Gemeindestruktur ... gegen den Willen der Obrigkeit durchzusetzen ... Für eine wohl sehr grosse Zahl von Täufern und tauerischen Sympathisanten war deshalb gerade das Ziel unrealisierbar, das für sie die Attraktivität der Bewegung ausgemacht hatte." Haas, "Der Weg," p. 68.
111. Ibid., pp. 69-70.
112. "Je mehr die Eidverweigerung um sich griff ... umso mehr stellte sich die ganze Bewegung politisch abseits ...". Ibid., p. 70.
115. Testimony of Valentin Gredig, in TA, zu. I, p. 68. " ... wann einer ein Christen sin rock abforderd, sülle er im den mantel dartzu gäben."
117. " ... sie fürchtete, durch die falschen Lehren verführt zu werden." Ibid., p. 76. The beginnings of this attitude are seen in ovo in Grebel's letter to Münster. "In der Aussage, dass das Abendmahl nicht in 'templen' gefiert werden solle, wo es den Menschen eine falsche fromme Ehrbietung einflösse, kann man bereits eine vage Vorwegnahme der für den Separatismus charakteristischen Verweigerung des Kirchenbesuchs entdecken." Stayer, "Anfänge," p. 38.
119. Ibid., p. 78.
121. "Brüder Michel im wyssen mantel wil von dem wydertouff stan und ist jetz so vil bericht, dass er bekennt, unrecht gethon, und wil wyderraffen sin leer, so er dess touffs halb prediget hat etc. Hat hinweg geschworn." TA, zu. I, p. 73.
It is interesting that the biographers Bossert and Kohler state only that Sattler became an Anabaptist "in 1525." Wiswedel says in "summer" of 1525. This caution was thrown to the winds by later historians.


Blanke, Brothers, p. 57.

TA, zu. I, p. 73, n. 2.

Yoder, Legacy, p. 15, n. 1.


Ibid., p. 5.

"Es darf als gesichert gelten, dass er sich bereits im Februar oder März 1525 der jungen Täuferbewegung anschloss." Haas, "Sattler," p. 115.

Cf. TA, zu. I, p. 41; p. 49.

This is Yoder's translation of the phrase. Yoder, Legacy, p. 15, n. 1.

The primary sense of the stehent von combination appears to be desisting from activity, but desisting from an opinion is implied in some testimony. E.g., "Hans Kuntzi von Klingnow . . . sige toufft von Ulin Tecken von Waldshut, wolle ooch gern davon stan, wann er mit der gottlichenn geschrifft berichtet werd." Clearly Kunzi will not "desist from being rebaptized", but will rather abandon his belief concerning rebaptism. The sense of desisting from an opinion is explicit in the following: " . . . das sy von stülichem irem für namen,[i.e. Vernehmen] mit stan wollen . . ." TA, zu. I, p. 131. Thus, an alternative understanding of Brother Michael's March 25 testimony is the one suggested by Dr. Meihuizen, namely, "On March 25 he declared himself willing to drop the issue of baptism, even to recant what he had said about it." H.W. Meihuizen, "Who were the 'False Brethren' mentioned in the Schleitheim Articles?" MQR 41 (July, 1967), p. 207.
133 TA, zu. I, p. 73, n. 2; p. 74.

134 Ibid., p. 47.


136 Ibid., p. 59.

137 "... alle die ... sich habent lassenn touffenn, es syge wib oder man, stöllint gebenn zu bus 1 march silbers ... Aber die, so sidhar getoufft hetting, stöllint, so man sy weist, vencklichenn angenomen werden." Ibid., p. 60.

138 There are two exceptions here. Felix Mantz had remained in prison since his first arrest earlier in the year, and Anthony Roggenacher had been arrested slightly before the larger group, on March 8-11.

139 Ibid., pp. 67-69.

140 Kym is questioned concerning his "disobedience" to the Zürich authorities which he demonstrated in going to fight for Duke Ulrich of Württemberg. A noncitizen would not have been thus accused. Cf. Ibid., p. 69, n. 7.

141 Some 44 persons are identifiable as having received baptism in the documents for this time period. Although witnesses sometimes confess that they have baptized more people than they can identify by name, still the baptism of a foreign monk would surely have been as memorable as, e.g. the baptism of "old Wysshanns Hottinger's wife," or the baptism of "a cabinetmaker from Erlibach."


145 Augsburger, "Sattler," p. 8, n. 37. Augsburger cites Egli in this connection, but there is no mention of Sattler in Egli's document. H. Bender draws no such conclusions in his work on Grebel. Regarding
the November 18 document, Bender states: "It is worth noting in passing that the only reference to any connection between Grebel and the noble Michael Sattler . . . is found in this mandate." [Grebel, p. 156.]

146 As Augsburger has noted, Sattler's willingness to recant is "difficult to understand in relation to his having left the monastery because of his beliefs, and in relation to his behavior at his martyrdom." [Sattler," p. 5.

147 Meihuizen, "False Brethren," p. 207.

148 Yoder, Legacy, p. 16, n. 2.


150 Teck plainly objected to swearing the Urfehde for the Zürich authorities, who wished to expel him, added that "If he does not wish the swear, he should be left in prison." (Ob aber er nit schweren wülte, sol er also in gfenngnuss blyben). TA, zu. I, 136. Teck swore the required oath. He does not appear in the list of prisoners in March, 1526. Cf. Ibid., p. 178.


152 Ibid., p. 114.

153 "Und ouch mit dem Zwingli gredt werde, dass er biderb lüt zu red lasse komenn und einem armen gsellen sn red nit im hallss erstecke . . .". Ibid.

154 "... wir bitend uweri wisheid, das ir lasind us gan ein gesprech uf einen afenlihen tispitaz, das darzu komi, wer da lust und wilent habe, sich ze underrichten mit der götlichen gschrift." Ibid., p. 116.

155 "... alle, die ... erhallten wülend, das der kinder touff vomm tüfzel erdacht und der widertouff rächt sye, und daby vermelneh, rächt gethan haben, das sy sich wider touffen lassen, und sy nitt unrächt gethan, und das man die kinder nitt sülle touffen; das dieselben alle sampt und sunders uff das offen gespräch kummen sülind . . .". Ibid., p. 389. Cf. Vogt Berger's suggestions to the Zürich Council, Ibid., p. 115. Berger clearly expected no great doctrinal change to emerge from the disputation. He suggests that all Anabaptists be forced to be present, since the disputation will tire them and make their repentance so much the easier: "... so wurdent sy vonn stunnd ann iren fil milt und mütg und wurd der ruw in sy kann." Ibid.

157 The other two presidents were Wolfgang Joner and Conrad Schmidt. See Bullinger, Reformationsgeschichte, pp. 295-296.


159 Ein jeder, gelernt und ungelert, gnugsam on alli verhindrung sin ihrer worten. TA, zu. I, p. 132.


161 Cf. Hubmaier's testimony from April, 1526. "Es segindouch der Kürsiner Roggenacher und Hottinger by im gsin, als man das letscht gespräch han wölf, und begertind, das er mit inen hinuff giegen uff die disputatz." Ibid., p. 194.


165 The relevant documents here are numbers 120-124 in Ibid., pp. 120-128. The testimony and sentencing of Heini Merger (number 131) does not appear to belong to the above series, although the terminus a quo makes such dating a possibility. Cf. Ibid., p. 134, n. 1. Note Harold Bender's discussion of the evidence in Grebel, p. 156-159.

166 TA, zu. I, pp. 123-124. One other defendant, Margaret Hottinger, made a statement; no special evidence was brought against her by the witnesses.

167 If Zwingli had no stronger evidence to bring against the Brethren than what he produced at this trial, it is easy to see why he found the struggle with the Brethren so difficult..." Bender, Grebel, p. 159.

See Ibid., pp. 137; 178. There is notice of her recantation only on the first of May, 1526. Ibid., p. 183.

Kessler reports that many pious, honourable people from distant places attended the disputation in order to hear both sides of the question. TA, osts. II, p. 612.

Teck was exiled from Waldshut for his pacifism; although he was willing to carry weapons, he would kill no man. He was arrested in Grüningen and exiled, and was then arrested again in Zürich, presumably. See Ibid., p. 109. Teck baptized at least one person from Grüningen, Jakob Schufelberg. See Ibid., p. 284.

... wie es geschrieben stadt, ich bin ein gutter hirtt, ein gätter hirt setzt sin sell vir eine schaff. Also ich och, min lib und leben und min sell setz ich och vir mine schaff, min lib im turn und leben im schwerd öder für ... " TA, zu. I, p. 125.

Wytter ist zu mir einer kon, ist auch ein münch gisn, unnd mich gebetten unnd der liebe ermant, das ich in stült leeren arbeitten, dann er sich gern mit einer hand das brott essen wöllt, on fürwyzt, dess ich im leysten wolt nach dem bevelch gots; darby ist vermeindt, er syg der Michel, der vormals och üwer gefangner gisn ist, im ist aber nit also, daruss ir mir dester genergyzt zutrungen hand, unnd der selb gantz inn stillem wäsen by unns gewandlet ist unnd nüt vom touff gehandlet, unnd ist och nit toufft. Dann er eben ein mall zu (Lucke) mit inen brudrer gisn ist nach miner darschickung, von wägen einer junffrouwen, do ist er gebetten worden zu lesenn, daby ist etwa menges gisn ... " Ibid., pp. 201-202.

Yoder, Legacy, p. 16, n. 2.

Ibid.


Ibid., pp. 174; 176; 178.

Ibid., p. 174, n. 3.

According to eyewitnesses, captured later, it was Brennwald who discovered the open window through which all the prisoners escaped. Ibid., p. 191.

Ibid., pp. 198-199.

... darumb ich uch och bitt unnd erman, das ir mich zu miner husfrowen unnd kinder komen lassind, dann ich mich, ob gott wil, in syner warhailt flyssiger hallten wil ... " Ibid., p. 202.

... das ich dem Frytag widerstanden hab, das hab ich uch der liebe thon, dann inn lasters unnd böser wyss gestrafft unnd ermant han, hallt er nit cristelnch empfangen." Ibid., p. 201.

184. The Kuenzi in question appears to have been Kuenzi the elder. Hans the younger does not identify who baptized him. [Ibid.], pp. 197-198.

185. The records concerning Teck are sparse. He is reported as having baptized two men: one from Grünningen and Kuenzi. Although the dates of these baptisms are not given, it would follow that the Grünningen baptism occurred prior to Teck's arrest there and that the Kuenzi baptism would have come following the expulsion from Zürich, i.e. between November 1525 and April/May 1526.

186. Winckler and Brennwald are both questioned along with the other Anabaptist prisoners in March, 1526. [TA, zu. I, pp. 175-176. Winckler, however, recants at this time and is released. He does not appear in the list of prisoners sentenced on March 7. Brennwald was sentenced to life imprisonment at that time. [Ibid.], p. 178.

187. Some time after his release in March, 1526, Conrad Winckler became a thoroughly convinced Anabaptist. In the end, if the number of testimonies are any indication, Winckler baptized more people than Brennwald, Kuenzi and Sattler combined. There can be no doubt that Kuenzi, Brennwald and Winckler worked together very effectively in the Büllach area. See [Ibid.], numbers 246, 247, 249, 290, 291, 295, 304. For Kuenzi and Winckler's work in the Regensberg area, see [Ibid.], numbers 281 and 287.

188. Virtually nothing is known about "Muntprat from Constance." All of his documented activity took place near Büllach. Cf. the evidence against Hans from Waldkirch which places Muntprat some six miles from Büllach, near Flaach. [TA, osts. II, p. 48; [Ibid.], n. 8. We may in fact be faced with a pseudonym in this case.


190. [Ibid.

191. "Die habint in gelert, ouch die anderen, wo dann sy zusamenn komenn syennt ... ". [Ibid.], p. 273.

192. [Ibid.], p. 273, n. 5.

193. [Ibid.], p. 198.

194. [Ibid.], p. 166.

195. [Ibid.], pp. 80, 82.
196 Ibid., p. 175.

197 He was accused of baptizing so many people that he did not know the number. He was sentenced to death by drowning on January 20, 1530. Ibid., pp. 332-334.
CHAPTER V

1 See TA, el. I. pp. 62-67. The prisoners were Jörg Tucher, Jadob Goss, Wilhelm Echsel, Matthias Hiller and Jorg Ziegler. Hiller was later arrested with Sattler, tried with him and executed. Cf. TA, zu. I. pp. 251-252.

2 Cf. TA, el. , p. 67.


8 "... ein Waldshut in grossem Massstab." Ibid.

9 Ibid., pp. 42-43.

10 "Damit ist aber die Wirkung von Schleithem (die Einheit der Täuftums) mit seinen Voraussetzungen verwechselt worden." Ibid., pp. 43-44.

11 "Die 'falschen Brüder' sind also Bucer, Capito und andere ihrer Art." Ibid., p. 44.

12 "Schleithem bedeutet nicht so sehr eine Krise der Sammlung, Straffung und Sichtung eines schon zweifährigen Täuftums sondern erst dessen Geburt." Ibid., p. 45.


15. "Von Anfang an hat Bucer die Stadt als ein unteilbares 'christliches Gemeinwesen' betrachtet, als ein 'corpus Christianum' im kleinen ...." Ibid.


17. Ibid.


20. Wolfgang Capito, writing to the city of Horb, says of "Michael and his following" that "It is true that when they say that outer baptism following confession (of faith) is necessary for salvation they are in error." Capito clearly understood Sattler to be requiring this baptism for salvation. There is absolutely no ground for Yoder's translation of this phrase. Yoder's rendering is "It is true that, if they believe baptism upon confession etc." (Legacy, p. 89.) The original text reads "Es ist wol war, wo sy zur seligkeit fur notwendig achten den usserlichen tauff noch der bekantnuss, si jrren sey." TA, el. I, p. 84. This construction with "wo" is paralleled in the following sentence. In this case Yoder translated "wo" as being "when", not "if".


"Von einer Einladung Sattlers zur Mitarbeit an der Strassburger Reformation ist nirgends die Rede." **Ibid.**

"... die Initiative zu dem Gespräch zwischen ihm und Bucer/Capito ging von Sattler aus, der seine gefangenen Glaubensgenossen Hiller, Tucher, Gross und Echsel aus dem Kerker befreien wollte und zu diesem Zweck die Rechtmässigkeit seiner Lehre darlegte." **Ibid.**, pp. 32-33. The sources quoted by Deppermann here originate in Sattler's letter to the reformers. Sattler makes clear, first of all, that the points to follow were points "which I together with my brothers and sisters have understood out of Scripture ..." **TA**, el. I. p. 68. Translation from Yoder, *Legacy*, pp. 21-22. Secondly, in conclusion Sattler states: "Be mercifully considerate, I pray you, of those who are in prison and do not permit a merciful judgement to be superseded by a blind, spiteful, and cruel one. Those who are in error (if that they were) are not to be coerced but after a second admonition to be avoided." **TA**, el. I. p. 70. Trans. in Yoder, *Legacy*, p. 23.

Deppermann, "Reformatoren," p. 33.

This statement is argued point for point in considerable detail. See **Ibid.**, pp. 34-37.


"Der Übergang von einer lokalen Spaltung zu einer lebensfähigen Bewegung ist ... kirchengeschichtlich weit wichtiger als die Kristallisation der ersten Kerngruppe oder die erste Verkündigung einer neuen Idee." **Ibid.**, p. 37.

... eine lebensfähige übernationale Ordnung für das süddeutsch-schweizerische Täuftum erstmals in der 'Brüderlichen Vereinigung' von Schleitheim im Februar 1527 geschaffen worden ist." **Ibid.**

Yoder has recently attempted to identify both "free church" and "state church" streams in Bucer's thought. "D'une part, il y a le Bucer de la cité. L'Evangile de l'amour soutient la paix de la cité ... D'autre part, le Bucer de la discipline fraternelle voit en l'Evangile l'amour qui interpelle le frère et l'amène à se repentir. La croissance spirituelle à laquelle on invite le frère ne peut lui être imposée."

pp. 504-505. In spite of these efforts, the central "free church" trait in Bucer's thought, namely the urging of church discipline which Yoder claims was present already in 1524, was apparently also placed under the injunction of 1 Timothy 1:5 when Bucer and Sattler spoke together, for one of the issues on which Bucer and Sattler disagreed was "the ban." Cf. TA, el. I, p. 68. Yoder's effort to discover the tensions inherent in Bucer's thought has not required modifications to Deppermann's delineation; "Bucer the free-churchman" remains elusive using Yoder's own methodology.


34 "Welcher glaubt und täufft würt, der wûrt selig ... Christus ist das houpf sines lybs, das ist des glûubigen oder gemain ... Die vorgesehen, berûfften, gloubigen sollen glichformigen sin dem ebenbild Christi. Christus ist ein verachter inn der welt, also oach die sinen; er hatt kein rych inn diser welt, sûnder das weltlich ist wider sin rych." TA, el. I. pp. 68-69.

35 Jakob Gross, one of the prisoners for whom Sattler appealed in his letter to Bucer and Capito, had been exiled from Waldshut for his refusal to defend the city by killing another human being. Cf. supra, chapter D., p. 18, n. 128. On Hubmaier's political views, see Stayer, Sword, pp. 104-108; 141-146.


37 TA, el. I, p. 68.

38 Yoder, Legacy, p. 23.

39 "Wann galt den Täuferführern zum erstenmal die Spaltung zwischen der Täuferbewegung und dem werdenden Landeskirchentum ... als abgeschlossen und unwiderruflich?" Yoder, "Kristallisationspunkt," p. 37.


Cf. Ibid., p. 74, n. 15.

Yoder's translation begins in a misleading way: "Especially prominent in this movement is that Michael etc." Legacy, p. 19. The original reads "Praecipueus in hac re est Michael etc." The phrase in the original refers not to Sattler's prominent place in the movement, but rather Sattler's prominence in the matter of legalism. Yoder's phrase "will not flatter anyone for a hair," Legacy, p. 20, is strange. Much is made of the interpretation of this phrase, in Ibid., n. 11, but the original has no mention of hair. In any case, the Latin of the original is difficult and obscure. "Video autem, proh Christe, homines istos ad aedificationem, maxime apud pusillos conscientiae esse perniciosissimos, dummodo contritos iam corde atque deo humiliatos ad quadrantem usque legi satisfacere adigunt. Nihil etenim Christo praeter viae solius osten
tionem in nobis relinquunt. Non sufficit ets gratia Christi Paulo olim promissa, verum carnifices hi stimulum exactore Mose legis clauo retun
dere conantur. O pharisaismum pessimum. Praecipueus in hac re est Michael iste olim Sancti Petri monachus, omnium pertinacissimus, qui neminem advertit, magistratorem omnem damnat; nulli comis, sive ad
momentum (etiam exdente caritate) blandus; verum terribilis et horrendus impetusque claremo pro sua importunitate accersitum, sive ultero acceden
tem iuxta monachatus sui conditionem aggreditur atque adducuntem sibi scripturas quasi mortuæ literæ sectatorem corripit, spiritumque sibi
pro adducto argumento quid sentiendum sit omnia reuelasse ad nutum
asserit proque sua opinione fundanda singula suo spiritu detorquet." TA, el. I. p. 73.

Ibid., p. 129, n. 5 Gross baptized Hans Huber of Lahr at some point. Ibid., p. 144.

... est miche in propinquo vicinus, homo certe, nisi seductus
ab his impostoribus fuisset, pius, quem olim quasi pro catechumene in
re fidei pro doni mei tenuitate in evangelio erudiebam. Hic nescio quo
spiritu ductus anabaptistis sese dedit omnino, meque interea quasi
impium seculi huius prudenter, qui terrenis inviolatus sim negotiis,
auersatus est penitus. Contigit autem ante aliquot dies, vt vox sua
puerulum enixa sit, quem ipse instinctu Michaelis aquae baptismo abluere
renuit. Quam ob rem praefecti atque senatus noster habitis consilii
causæque scrutinii, eum, vt puerum iuxta consuetudinem ad baptismum
mittat, iussurunt. Ibid., p. 73.

On Echel, see TA, el. I, p. 64. One can assume that Hiller
had been residing and working in Strasbourg (he was a furrier) since
he was baptized in Starsbourg by Gross, i.e. he did not come to Stras-
bourg as a "missionary".

That Gross was previously not known to some local Anabaptists
is clear from Tucher's testimony. Cf., Ibid., pp. 62-63.
48 TA, osts. II, p. 27.

49 For textual information see Ibid., p. 26, n. 3; Yoder, Legacy, pp. 33-34.


54 TA, osts. II, p. 631; Bender, Grebel, pp. 161-162.

55 On the sentencing of Mantz and Blaurock, see TA, zu. I, pp. 224-228.

56 ME, I, pp. 354-359.

57 Jenny, Schleitheimer, p. 33.

58 Ling, or Weningger, had been exiled from Zürich with Michael Sattler. He was from the Schaffhausen area, and may have lived in Schleitheim. Cf. TA; zu. II, p. 41, n. 1; p. 575, n. 15. Weningger wrote a strong defense of "separation" sometime before 1535. See Ibid., pp. 108-113.


60 Leopold Scharnshlager in a tract dating around 1540; a letter to Menno Simons in which a teacher is identified, in whose house Michael Sattler composed his articles, 1555; a Chronicle dating from 1610; a history of the Anabaptists, 1672. See Ibid., pp. 15-16.

61 Jenny, Schleitheimer, 27-33.

62 "Auf alle Fälle ergibt sich aus unserer Vergleichung, dass Sattler zu den führenden Geistern jener Täuferkreise gehört ... die hinter dem Schleitheimer Bekenntnis stehen." Ibid., p. 33.

64 Stricker, "Sattler," pp. 16-17. Our analysis of Sattler's writings confirms Stricker's conclusion.


67 Jenny, Schleitheimer, pp. 7-8; Yoder, Legacy, pp. 32-33.


71 Yoder, Legacy, p. 31.

72 Ibid., p. 32.

73 As noted by Yoder in his letter to Deppermann, MGB, 25 (1973), pp. 43-44:

Now that you have abundantly understood the will of God as revealed through us at this time, you must fulfill this will, now known, persistently and unswervingly... Watch out for all those who do not walk in simplicity of divine truth, which has been stated by us in this letter in our meeting, so that everyone might be governed among us by the rule of the ban, and that henceforth the entry of false brothers and sisters among us might be prevented." From the concluding letter accompanying the Schleitheim Articles, Yoder, Legacy, pp. 42-43.

The towns of Horb, where Sattler was arrested, and Rottenburg, where he was tried, both lay in the Domain of Hohenberg, a political district under Austrian jurisdiction. The Domain of Hohenberg was ruled directly by Count Joachim von Zollern, acting as regent for Archduke Ferdinand. Ferdinand's letter is found in the Tiroler Landesarchiv, "Von der königlich Majestät," II, 25r-25v. As Ferdinand understood it, the arrest involved persons who had been rebaptized as well as those who had performed the rebaptisms. "... wie euch... altes Lutherischen Pfaffen auch sonder Personen halb die sich durch denselben Pfaffen von neuen tauffen haben lassen und zum tafin fennkunus kommen sein..."

Claus-Peter Clasen, Die Wiedertäufer im Herzogtum Württemberg und in benachbarten Herrschaften (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer Verlag, 1965), p. 2, n. 5. Of these eight, four escaped in early March, 1527. Von Muralt/Schmid, Quellen, p. 253. Klaus von Gravenbeck reports that the prisoners tried at Rottenburg "had previously been in prison for thirteen weeks and on the Friday before Cantate had been brought before the court..." Wolfenbüttel, Bü, recto; translation by Yoder, Legacy, p. 76. Cantate being May 19 in 1527, the Friday previous is May 17, the beginning of the trial. Subtracting thirteen weeks (91 days) from this date gives the date of February 16, or the day on which eight Rottenburgers were arrested, prior to Schleitheim. Thus the "thirteen weeks" does not apply to Sattler.

Felix Mantz had been drowned for his Anabaptism in Zürich on January 5, 1527.

Yoder, Legacy, p. 39.

Some fifteen persons were arrested at this time in Rottenburg. Clasen, Wiedertäufer, p. 2.

"Item zu Horw sind sechszehn-man und einliff wiber gefangenn..." TA, zu. I, p. 250.

See the official charges, translated in Snyder, "Rottenburg," pp. 213-215, where it is reported that "In particular Veit Fering dared to multiply his disrespect for the magisterial authority by baptizing Hanns Lenndlin and Jacob Ziegler a second time, after Count Joachim von Zollern and the aforementioned officials of the domain of Hohenberg had arrested some of the accused persons for participation in these actions . . ."


Snyder, "Rottenburg," p. 213.

Anshelm, Chronik, p. 186; translation in Yoder, Legacy, p. 80. "On the eighth day she courageously let herself be taken to the Neckar and be drowned. She would rather have gone into the fire with her husband."

TA, zu. I, pp. 117-120. There was a Beguine house in Aarau about which little is known. It was still in existence as late as 1509. See Arnold Nuescheler, "Die Argauischen Gotteshäuser," Argovia, XXVIII, p. 55. See also: Lüthi, Boner, Edlin and Pestalozzi, Geschichte der Stadt Aarau (1978), especially section II by G. Boner, "Von der Stadtgründung bis zum Ende der Bernerzeit." The word Beguine was used rather loosely in the sixteenth century. It could indicate actual Beguines, or Beghards, or even Franciscan Tertiarys. See W. Merz, Geschichte der Stadt Aarau in Mittelalter (1925), p. 256. A common function of the Beguines was that of serving as "Marthas" (domestic labour) in the local monasteries.


The letter is signed "in the tower at Binsdorf" but is undated. Koehler, "Brüderlich," p. 324.


... der Rebly in der Herrschaft ein solches Feuer schon angezündt, welches je langer, je heftiger werden dörfte, wann die gefangene nicht bald ihre Straffe impfiengen, zumalen sie zum Theil eine zahlreiche Freundschaft hatten." C. F. Sattler, Geschichte, p. 170.
94. ... die Regierung zu Insprugg nicht gut hiesse, dass jemand ohne Urthel und Recht verdammt werden sollte... " Ibid.
95 ME, IV, p. 429.
96 C.F. Sattler, Geschichte, p. 170; ME, IV, p. 429.
97 "weil es Gottes Ehre, Erhaltung des wahren Glaubens und ge-
gründeter Christlicher Ordnung betreffe..." Sattler, Geschichte, p. 170.
98 They were Georg Farner and Balthasar Stumpp. Ibid.
99 "Und warend da riechter 24 von Uberlingen, von Stocka, von
Zell, von Echingen, von Ennza, von Villingen." Heinrich Hugs Villinger
100... auf die anden tauff khain pessere straff volgen mag
dan dass die Dritt tauff welche mit dem gemelten gefangenen im Negger
gebraucht und das Sy erdrennckt werden." Tiroler Landesarchiv,
Von der königlichen Majestät II, 42r. Paraphrased in C.F. Sattler,
Geschichte, p. 171.
101 Ferdinand appears willing to suspend due process in Sattler's
case since (a) he wished to make an example of this presumed leader,
(b) Sattler should have known better, having been a monk, and (c)
Sattler had probably induced "simple folk" to follow his example. See
102 A translation of this document is in Snyder, "Rotenburg,"
pp. 211-213.
103 TA, zu. I, p. 251, n. 10.
104 ... die obbemelten vier personen mit sampt deß gefangnen
zu Rotenburg, namlich 7 man und 8 wiber... " Ibid., p. 251.
105 As mentioned by Ferdinand in his letter of May 15, cited above
n. 101. Ferdinand repeats the facts concerning several Anabaptists
arrested at Horb and then says "concerning which it has been decreed
that these prisoners stand trial along with those from Rotenburg." ("...
darauf zie verordnun gethan haben dieselbigenen neben und mit
denen von Rotenburg für Recht zustellen.")
106 See Snyder, "Rotenburg," p. 213.
107 It is clear that charges were originally read against the twenty-
one prisoners named in the official charges. Von Gravenbeck reports,
however, that three recanted following the initial reading of those
charges, including Veit Veringer. Veringer subsequently retracted his
recantation, and was condemned to death. The other two, however,
may not have had to appear further in court as defendants. See Yoder,
Legacy, p. 76.
See Snyder, "Rottenburg," pp. 222-227, where these questions are dealt with in detail.

Klaus von Graveneck, Ayn newes wunderbarlichs geschicht von Michel Sattler zu Rottenburg am Neckar, sampt andern 9. manner, seiner lere und glaubens halben verbrannt, unnd 10. weybern ertrenckt. Anno M. D. xxvii. This document is found in the library at Wolfenbüttel; photocopy in the Goshen College Historical Library.


Primarily in ML, IV, pp. 29-38; translated in ME, IV, pp. 427-434. See also "Das Blutgericht in Rottenburg am Neckar," Christliche Welt (1891), pp. 502-506; 526-529. Also by Bossert, "Die Täuferbewegung in der Herrschaft Hohenberg," Blätter für Württ. Kirchengesch., VI (1891); VII (1892), passim.

See Snyder, "Rottenburg," p. 216.

As found in Ibid., pp. 213-215.

See Snyder, "Rottenburg," pp. 216-217, nn. 44 and 46.

Klaus von Graveneck, who arrived part-way through the second day of the trial, witnessed Sattler's speech. Thus C.F. Sattler's account, which has Sattler speaking immediately following Hoffmann, must have telescoped the events of both days into one connected account.

As documented in von Graveneck's account.

The charges and Sattler's reply will be discussed in more detail below, in Chapter 7.

Yoder, Legacy, p. 73.

Ibid., pp. 74-75.

Reublin's account is the most accurate on this point. See Snyder, "Rottenburg," p. 219, n. 51.

... mag ich nicht begriffen, das es möge geiin, wie irs mitt allen articklen, nämlich zum touff, nachmal, gwalt oder schwert, aydt, bann und aller gebotten gottes gebrüchen." TA, el. I, p. 68.

... von eitlichen artickeln, so ich mitt sampt minen brüderen und schwesteren verstanden haben us der schrifft..." Ibid.
124 See below, Chapter 7.

125 As early as 1526 Reublin was active in his hometown of Rotten- burg and in the neighboring town of Horb. According to Gustav Bossert, Reublin baptized in about thirty-five homes in Horb alone. Bossert, "Täuferbewegung," (1889), p. 83.
CHAPTER VI

1ME, iv, p. 427. Parish records from Staufen in the Breisgau, which might have contained verifying information, are not available, having been destroyed during the Thirty Years' War.

CHAPTER VII


5 Earliest text is the printed version found in Wolfenbüttel library. See Snyder, "Rottenburg," part III. Translation of the "popular" von Gravenec account is in Yoder, Legacy, pp. 67-76.


7 Text and translation in Snyder, "Rottenburg," sections II and IV.

8 The Ausbund is the earliest hymn book of the Swiss Brethren which was collected in its present form in 1583. See ME, I, pp. 191-192.

9 Hymn number 7 is identified in the Ausbund as having been written by Sattler. Yoder, however, raises doubts as to this possibility. Cf. Legacy, p. 149, n. 14. Hymn number 136, on the other hand, is not identified as having been written by Sattler in the Ausbund. The identification with Sattler occurs in the 18th century collection Guldene Aepffel ir Silbern Schalen (first edition 1702), where the Ausbund hymn no. 136 is printed as Sattler's farewell song. Besides this late identification, this hymn appears in a collection of Bohemian Brethren hymns printed in 1531. It is not clear whether the Bohemian Brethren borrowed from the Anabaptists or vice versa. Cf. the discussion of Augsburger, "Sattler," p. 32 ff.; R. Wulkan, Lieder der Wiedertäufer (Berlin, 1903); R.R. Duerksen, "Anabaptist Hymnody of the Sixteenth Century," (unpublished dissertation, Union Theological Seminary, New York, 1956).

10 This short document is anonymous. The possibility of Sattler's authorship arises since the Schleitheim Articles and this Order are copied by the same hand and are both found in the Bern archives. See D. Gratz, Bernese Anabaptists, (Scottdale, Pa.: Herald Press, 1953), pp. 25-26; Yoder, Legacy, p. 53, n. 99. The German text is found in E. Müller, Geschichte der Bernischen Täufer (Frauenfeld, 1895; Nieuwkoop, 1972), pp. 37-38, translation in Yoder, Legacy, pp. 44-45.

The possibility of Sattler's authorship arises only because of this tract's inclusion in a 1533 pamphlet including other Sattler materials. The document is signed with the initials M.L., which Kohler took to indicate Martin Luther. A more likely possibility is Martin Link (Weninger), an associate of Sattler. See Yoder, Legacy, pp. 100-101; p. 105, n. 6; p. 107, n. 36. German text in Kohler, "Brüderlich," p. 333-337; English translation in Yoder, Legacy, pp. 101-105.

These three writings were included in a collected printing of Sattler materials, dating approximately from the late sixteenth/early seventeenth century. Beyond this inclusion there is no convincing evidence of Sattler's authorship. On the printed booklet or Sammelband, see R. Friedmann, "The Schleitheim Confession and other Doctrinal Writings of the Swiss Brethren in a Hitherto Unknown Edition," MQR, 16 (April, 1942), pp. 82-98. The three writings were translated first by J.C. Wenger for the MQR (October, 1946; January, 1947; October, 1947). Wenger conjectures that Sattler was the author on the basis of internal thematic similarities. Augsburger wished to credit Sattler with authorship, claiming "adequate ground" for such a conclusion. "Sattler," p. 42. For our purposes, the more critical line taken by Friedmann and Yoder is appropriate. Cf. Yoder, Legacy, p. 100. The three tracts are translated in Legacy, pp. 108-132.

This writing was first identified by Ludwig Keller as having been written by Michael Sattler. The document carries the initials M.S. at its conclusion. See Yoder, Legacy, p. 150; p. 175, nn. 1 and 2. H.W. Meihuizen assumes that Sattler was the author of this tract and further states that the Strasbourg reformers knew of the booklet's existence. The reference given by Meihuizen, namely Martin Bucer's Getreue Warnung, does not in fact support Sattler's authorship of this booklet. Rather Bucer is clearly referring to an account of Sattler's trial. Yoder, Legacy, p. 13; p. 17, n. 6. Translation of this tract in Legacy, pp. 151-175.

"... von etlichen artickeln, so ich mitt sampt minen brüderen und schwesteren haben us der schrift ..." (Italics mine). TA, el. I, p. 68. Yoder's translation reads "several points" for "etlichen artickeln," (Legacy, pp. 21-22) which blurs the obvious fact that Sattler came to Bucer and Capito with a collection of essential Anabaptist articles in hand, namely dealing with baptism, Supper, etc. as Sattler goes on to indicate (see infra, n. 16). We may think of Sattler having a "rough draft" of the Schleitheim Articles in hand, already in Strasbourg.

Yoder, Legacy, p. 22.
... mag ich sollichs in minem verstandt und conscientz nicht begritten, das es möge gsin, wie irs mitt allen articklen, namlich zum touff, nachmal, gwalt oder schwert, aydt, bann und aller gebotten gottes gebrüchen." (Italics mine). TA, el. I, p. 68. I have followed Yoder's translation except for the italicized portion. Here Sattler clearly speaks of articles concerning baptism, etc. There is no reason for failing to render this clearly in the English translation.

M. Chrisman notes the prevalence of this theme in Bucer's sermons. "He returned again and again to the fact that the true message of Christ lay in the love of one's neighbor, 'For that is His command, that we believe in His Son and love one another.'" Miriam Chrisman, Strasbourg and the Reform (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1967), p. 124.

1. Christ came to save all of those who would believe in Him alone. 2. He who believes and is baptized will be saved; he who does not believe will be damned. (Mark 16:16)." Yoder, Legacy, p. 22.

The word used consistently by Sattler is glauben and variations thereof. This may be rendered "faith" or "belief" depending on the context.

Bucer reported of Sattler that "He also answered concerning baptism is such a way that you can see that he only rejected that infant baptism, through which one thinks to be saved." (Italics mine). Legacy, p. 19; TA, el. I, p. 110. The translation is Yoder's except for the italicized word (geantworte in the original) which should obviously be rendered "answered" rather than "spoke" as Yoder would have it. The original gives the sense that Sattler had been questioned about baptism and had then answered in a certain way. Bucer clearly recalls his conversation with Sattler more as a questioning of an Anabaptist leader than as an "ecumenical dialogue."

Cf. the first article of Schleitheim: "Baptism shall be given to all those who have been taught repentance and the amendment of life and (who) believe truly that their sins are taken away through Christ . . . . hereby is excluded all infant baptism . . . ." Yoder, Legacy, p. 36.

Ibid., p. 22.

"Es ist wol war, wo sy zur seligkeit fur notwendig achten den usserlichen tauff noch bekantnuss, si jren sey." TA, el. I, p. 84. (Italics mine). Legacy, p. 89. Yoder's translation is not adequate here. We cannot be rendered "if": Capito was not in doubt as to how Sattler and his followers believed. He knew that Sattler held outer baptism, the baptism of water, to be necessary for salvation, and this is what the sentence in the original states clearly. The adjective usserlichen, not translated by Yoder, is central to Capito's meaning and intent. The reformers could not comprehend the insistence on the rite of water baptism following confession since the essential baptism, in
their view, was the inner, spiritual baptism. With regard to this question Hans Denck, in his readiness to spiritualize the signs of grace, stands much closer to Bucer and Capito than does Sattler.


27. Ibid., p. 22.

28. Ibid., pp. 22-23.

29. Ibid., p. 23.

30. Yoder, Legacy, p. 35; TA, zu. II, p. 27. The writer of the letter expresses concern for those whose consciences were "sometime confused," and hopes that "you might not always be separated from us as aliens and by right almost completely excluded . . ." Yoder, Legacy, p. 35. The tone and the context suggests that the writer is addressing himself to those Anabaptist groups who might have had mistaken notions concerning one or more points dealt with at Schleitheim. That the writer is addressing himself to wayward Anabaptists is further suggested by the fact that he says "and thus be again united with us," a usage which certainly does not suggest Bucer and Capito, with whom there had never been "union" of any sort.

31. Ibid.

32. The fact that the "false brothers" are "among us" suggests persons within the re-baptizing fellowship, rather than Bucer and Capito.

33. The reference to "false brothers and sisters" points away from the two Strasbourg reformers and indicates rather a congregational context.

34. Yoder, Legacy, pp. 35-36.

35. Ibid., p. 36.

36. Ibid., p. 37.

37. Ibid.

38. Purity can be re-established by the repentance and forgiveness of the erring member as well as through expulsion of the unrepentant.
39 Ibid. (Italics mine).

40 ... all those who have fellowship with the dead works of darkness have no part in the light. Thus all who follow the devil and the world, have no part with those who have been called out of the world unto God." Ibid. The distinctive feature of the Schleitheim view of the Supper is not the fact that the Zwinglian view is followed although this is significant, of course. But the emphasis here is on the persons celebrating the Supper; questions of divine presence or remembrance are strictly secondary. Not everyone who celebrates a Supper of remembrance will be celebrating the Lord's Supper, for the true Supper is only celebrated in the "united" church.

41 ... everything which has not been united with our God in Christ is nothing but an abomination which we should shun." Ibid., p. 38.

42 Ibid.

43 Ibid., p. 37.

44 Ibid., p. 38.

45 On the use of Vereinigung, see Ibid., p. 48, n. 31; p. 49, n. 37; p. 50, n. 45; p. 51, nn. 52, 53, 59; p. 53, n. 95.

46 This article is the only article which received no mention in the Strasbourg letter.

47 He is to be "a person according the rule of Paul, ... who has a good report of those who are outside the faith." Ibid., p. 39.

48 "The office of such a person shall be to read and exhort and teach, warn, admonish, or ban in the congregation, and properly to preside among the sisters and brothers in prayer, and in the breaking of bread, and in all things to take care of the body of Christ ... ." Ibid.

49 "But should a shepherd do something worthy of reprimand, nothing shall be done with him without the voice of two or three witnesses. If they sin they shall be publicly reprimanded, so that others might fear." Ibid.

50 Ibid.

51 Ibid., p. 38.

52 Cf. Sattler's trial statement, as reported by von Gravenec: "If the Turk comes, he should not be resisted, for it stands written: thou shalt not kill. We should not defend ourselves against the Turks or our other persecutors, but with fervent prayer should implore God that He might be our defense and our resistance." Ibid., p. 72. Although
Sattler quotes the sixth commandment (Exodus 20:13), the argument he employs follows from the verse quoted in article IV of Schleitheim: "you shall not resist evil." (Matt. 5:39). Cf. the same argument in the Strasbourg letter: "Christians are fully yielded and have placed their trust in their Father in heaven without any outward arms." Ibid., p. 23. The teaching that the Turk was not to be resisted would have appeared particularly seditious to the Austrian authorities in 1527.

53 Ibid., p. 39. Cf. Sattler's request to Bucer and Capito for a merciful judgment of his imprisoned comrades. "Those who are in error (if that they were) are not to be coerced but after a second admonition to be avoided. Christians admonish benevolently, out of sympathy and compassion for the sinful, and do not legalistically coerce persons this way and that." Ibid., p. 23.

54 Ibid., p. 39.

55 Ibid., pp. 39-40.

56 Ibid., p. 40.

57 Ibid.

58 Ibid.

59 Ibid., p. 22.

60 As noted above, Sattler says in the Strasbourg letter, among other such statements, "The foreknown and called believers shall be conformed to the image of Christ." Ibid., p. 22. In the letter to the church at Horb Sattler speaks of the "surefooted and living way of Christ, namely through cross, misery, imprisonment, self-denial, and finally through death ..." Ibid., p. 58. Further on in the letter he says again "Be mindful of your predecessor, Jesus Christ, and follow after Him in faith and obedience, love and longsuffering." Ibid., pp. 61-62.

61 Ibid., p. 40.

62 Ibid.

63 Ibid., p. 41.

64 Ibid.

65 Ibid., p. 42

66 Yoder, Legacy, pp. 42-43.

67 In his letter to Horb, Michael Sattler says: "Be mindful of our meeting, and what was decided there, and continue in strict accordance therewith. And if something should have been forgotten, pray the
Lord for understanding." Ibid., p. 62. This is a reference to a meeting where a comprehensive position was worked out, most likely Schleitheim. Sattler, although he allows for the possibility of something having been omitted, knows of no such omissions at the time of writing. Cf. Ibid., p. 65, n. 34. Here again, the group decision calls for unconditional obedience.

68 As noted by Yoder, Gespräche, p. 97: "Die Ausdrücke des Textes selbst . . . bekunden eindeutig, dass damals in Schleitheim -- wenigstens nach der Ansicht des Schreibers -- viel mehr vorgegangen ist als blos die Bestätigung einer Position, die schon vorher bekannt und deutlich herausgearbeitet vorlag. Das Ereignis ist für ihn ein Werk der Heiligen Geistes, der eine vorher nicht vorhandene Einheit geschenkt hat (vgl. besonders die passive Konstruktion, "sind vereinigt worden"; als Handelnder kann nur Gott gedacht sein), und zwar in Bezug auf den Atinomismus." Cf. supra., n. 45.

69 Yoder, Legacy, p. 35. While it is evident that some differences were ironed out at Schleitheim among the participants, it is also evident that the Articles were directed to persons who were "sometime confused," i.e. to persons of a slightly different opinion with whom the framers were hopeful of uniting, and that "unity" was achieved also by the exclusion and separation from those "who do not walk in simplicity of divine truth, which has been stated by us in this letter in our meeting . . . ," as the postscript says. Ibid., p. 43. Thus there is little reason to be enthusiastic about unity having been achieved during the course of the meeting at Schleitheim. Cf. Yoder, Gespräche, pp. 98-99; Legacy, p. 47, n. 25. Certainly minor differences were worked out among Anabaptists of similar persuasion, but had Denck, Kautz and Hubmaier been present, no such unanimity would have been conceivable. The fact that unity was achieved through exclusion is at least as significant as the fact that unity was achieved through consensus.

70 Cf. Yoder, Legacy, p. 65, nn. 34, 37.

71 Ibid., p. 43.


73 Cf. article II on the ban, Ibid., p. 37.

74"Watch out for all who do not walk in simplicity of divine truth, which has been stated by us in this letter in our meeting, so that everyone might be governed among us by the rule of the ban, and that henceforth the entry of false brothers and sisters among us might be prevented. Put away from you that which is evil . . ." Ibid., p. 43.
75 Ibid.

76 This is particularly true for article V on the shepherd. We know that Sattler presented an article on the oath to Bucer and Capito. Although we do not know how the article was argued in Strasbourg, a discussion such as the one in article VII is likely, given that the injunction in the New Testament is clear and given Sattler's principle that the "commands of Christ" are to be obeyed "in simplicity." At his trial Sattler said "We hold that one should not swear allegiance to government for the Lord says in Matthew 5: 'You should swear no oath, but your speech shall be yea, yea, nay, nay.'" Ibid., p. 72.

77 Yoder, Legacy, pp. 60-61.

78 "I cannot forget you although I am not present in the body, but constantly am in care and watching over you as my fellow members, so that not one might ever be drawn away and robbed from the body, whereby the entire body and all its members would be saddened ..." Ibid., p. 56.

79 Ibid. Examples could be multiplied. E.g., "Dear brothers, note what I write, whether it is of the Lord, and apply yourselves to walk accordingly." Ibid., p. 58.

80 Ibid., p. 56.

81 Ibid., p. 63.

82 "Be mindful of your predecessor, Jesus Christ, and follow after Him in faith and obedience, love and longsuffering. Forget what is carnal, that you might truly be named Christians and children of the most high God ..." Ibid., pp. 61-62.

83 Ibid., pp. 57-58.

84 Ibid., p. 62.

85 Ibid., p. 58.

86 Ibid., p. 59.

87 Ibid.

88 Ibid., p. 22.

89 Ibid., p. 61. Sattler also exhorts the brothers to meet frequently for prayer and the celebration of the Lord's Supper, "and this all the more fervently, as the day of the Lord draws nearer." Ibid., p. 62.

90 Ibid., p. 58.
Ibid., p. 63. Cf. the passage from Esdras just quoted by Sattler: "... behold the number of the marked ones at the supper of the Lord. O Zion, ... keep the reckoning of those who have fulfilled the Law of the Lord ..." Ibid., p. 62.


93 "Christians are fully yielded and have placed their trust in their Father in heaven without any outward or worldly arms," Ibid., p. 23.

94 "The worldly are armed with steel and iron, but Christians are armed with the armor of God ..." Ibid., pp. 40-41.

95 Ibid., p. 59. Sattler writes in conclusion: "Guard yourselves against false brothers for the Lord will perhaps call me, so now you have been warned. I wait upon my God." Ibid., p. 63.

Ibid., p. 60.

97 Ibid., pp. 58-59.

That Sattler had met resistance on this point is clear, for he says: "There are some, where this is put to them, who blame God, though most wrongly, as if He were not willing to keep them in His protection. You know whom I mean. Watch out that you do not be partakers with such." Ibid., p. 59.

99 Ibid.

100 Ibid., p. 60.

101 Ibid., p. 82.

102 Archduke Ferdinand defined "heresy" simply as any offense "against the twelve articles of our Christian faith and against the seven sacraments." The death penalty was to be death by fire. H.W. Schraepler, Die Rechtliche Behandlung der Täufer (Tübingen, 1957), pp. 19-20; Cf. p. 40, n. 135.


104 The fact that a report of Sattler's pre-trial hearing was appended to the draft of the general charges leads to this possibility.

105 The one clear exception is the specific mention of Veit Feringer's baptism of two men against the orders of Count Joachim. These baptisms took place after a group of the Anabaptists were already in prison. Cf. Snyder, "Rottenburg," pp. 214-215.

107"... auch wider ir pflicht und aid, damit sy der ku. Mt. als irem rechten nattürlichen herren unnd landfürsten zum thail geloht unnd geschworen seyend ..." Ibid., p. 445.

108Sattler's reply is identical at his hearing and also at his trial according to both C.F. Sattler and von Graveneck.


110The pre-trial hearing, von Graveneck and C.F. Sattler all contain the allusions to Mark and I Peter. Von Graveneck, however, reports that Sattler also said "infant baptism is not useful toward salvation, for it stands written, that we live only by faith." Yoder, Legacy, p. 71. It is this reference -- quite untypical for Sattler -- that Bucer later seized upon as demonstrating that Sattler "only rejected that infant baptism, through which one thinks to be saved. For, as a printed booklet concerning him reports, he proved his point by arguing that faith alone can save." Ibid., p. 19. If we grant that the reference in question was not interpolated by von Graveneck, then we must also go on to say that Bucer has failed to understand Sattler's thought on this point, for with Sattler, faith alone (i.e. belief or trust) can never save. Cf. Schleitheim: "They have esteemed that faith and love may do and permit everything ... since they are 'believers.'" Ibid., p. 36.

111Snyder, "Rottenburg," p. 212.

112The caveat appears in Sattler's pre-trial statement as well as in von Graveneck's account. It is thus well documented in spite of its absence in C.F. Sattler.

113Cf. von Graveneck: "Paul says to Timothy that Christ is our mediator and advocate before God." Yoder, Legacy, p. 72.

114Medieval Catholicism taught that on death, souls proceed directly to heaven, hell or purgatory according to the merits of each individual. This is clearly expressed by St. Thomas, Summa Theologiae, Suppl. to III, Q. 69, art. 3: "... as soon as the soul is set free from the body it is either plunged into hell or soars to heaven, unless it be held back by some debt, for which its flight must be delayed until the soul is first of all cleansed." R.M. Hutchins, ed., Great Books of the Western World, vol. 20- (Toronto: Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1952), p. 887. The immediate continuation of the life of the soul after death in heaven, hell or purgatory means that the living Church comprehends both the living and the dead, saints, the dead in purgatory and the living faithful. Thus the Blessed Virgin and the Saints are understood to have proceeded directly to heaven where they can be entreated through prayer to intercede for the living and the dead. Further, the suffering of those in purgatory can be alleviated through the prayers
of the living. Cf. Summa Th., Suppl. to III., Q. 72, art. 1, 2, 3; Q. 71, art. 2, 3, 6.

Michael Sattler's statement that all mortals, no matter how holy, do not arrive in heaven prior to judgement and the resurrection thus undermines the entire medieval concept of a Church encompassing the living and the dead as active members, and focusses attention rather on the living church of the saints on earth. Such an emphasis is generally found within a context of high eschatological expectation. It appears that Sattler holds to a kind of psychopannychism, or "sleep of the soul" doctrine, although those who die in the faith are called "blessed," and Sattler implies that the souls of the faithful dead await the judgement in a special place. In the letter to Horb Sattler says "... it is better for my sake to be released and with Christ to await the hope of the blessed." Yoder, Legacy, p. 61.

Ibid., p. 72.

Snyder, "Rottenburg," pp. 212-213.

Ibid., p. 218.

The full charge and reply appears only in von Graveneczk. The pre-trial report is abbreviated; C.F. Sattler's account also contains only an abbreviated charge and does not record a reply.

Yoder, Legacy, pp. 72-73.

The pre-trial report says here "... he would rather have the Turk than those who now call themselves Christians on the ground that the Christians of this time are now living in such a way that they should not be called Christians ..." Snyder, "Rottenburg," p. 212.

The popular Reformation of the Emperor Sigismund (c. 1438) contains a "true story" in which a knight has a dispute with a Turk. The knight urges the Turk to convert, whereupon the Turk answers: "I see that according to your Bible Christ has redeemed you with His death and chosen you for eternal life. But observing your actions I also see that not one of you truly loves Christ, nor do you desire to live by His word. In fact, you deny Him. You take away your neighbor's goods and wealth; you destroy your fellow man's dignity; you even claim his person for your own. Is this done according to your savior's word and command? Now you plan to come across the sea and wage war upon us, and gain eternal life by vanquishing us. But you deceive yourselves. It would be a far better deed were you to remain at home and do battle with the false Christians in your midst, showing them the way to righteousness!" G. Strauss, Manifestations of Discontent in Germany on the Eve of the Reformation (Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press, 1971), p. 8. The same theme appears in Luther's Treatise on Good Works (1520). "If the Turk destroys cities, country, and people, and lays waste the churches, we think a great injury has been done Christendom ... But when faith collapses, love grows cold, God's word is neglected, and all manner of sin takes
control, nobody thinks of fighting. In fact, pope, bishop, priests, and clergy, who ought to be the generals, captains, and standard-bearers in this spiritual warfare against Turks of a far deadlier spiritual kind, are themselves the very princes and leaders of such Turks, of a devilish army. . . ." Martin Luther, "Treatise on Good Works," Luther's Works, American edition, 55 vols., ed. by J. Pelikan and H. T. Lehmann, vol. 44 (Phila.: Fortress Press, 1966), p. 70. Series cited hereafter as LW.

122 Snyder, "Rottenburg," pp. 213; 218.

123 Yoder, Legacy, p. 72.

124 Snyder, "Rottenburg," pp. 218.

125 I Timothy 4:3 had been used as a text arguing against monasticism already in 1520, by Luther. It was frequently used in the intervening years in the popular literature. Cf. infra, Ch. 8, n. 28.

126 "Some brothers, I know who they are, have fallen short of this love. They have not wanted to build up one another in love, but are puffed up and have become useless with vain speculation (Wissenheit: knowledge) and understanding of those things which God wants to keep secret to Himself." Sattler to Horb, Yoder, Legacy, pp. 59-60. Cf. also Schleitheim: "Christ is simply yea and nay, and all those who seek Him simply will understand His Word." Yoder, Legacy, p. 42.

127 Ibid., p. 58.
CHAPTER VIII


2 RB, Ch. 73, p. 337.


4 "Nos etiam legem habemus quam praecipit nobis Dominus Deus per famulum suum Benedictum, secundum quam nos vivere oportet ..." Trithemius, Regimine, Busaeus, p. 397.


400

Trithemius made the following statement, which later appeared in print, to the assembled abbots of the province Mainz-Bamberg, at the chapter of 1493: "Non omnia Deo placent, quae per summum Pontificem in terra geruntur... Summum pontificem, ut vicarium Christi verum amplector, colo et veneror, cuilius facta nequaquam reprehendo, sed hominem esse scio: qui ut homo, et falli potest et fallere." Trithemius, *Liber Penthicus de ruina monastici ordinis*, Busaeus, p. 816.


See *TA*, el. I, p. 1, n. 3 and ff.


See, for example, Jakob Otter, *Die Epistel Sancti Pauli an Titum* (1524), pp. L i verso, N iii verso, P iii recto.


"... er also selig ist durch den rechten glauben, das er herauss werd faren in die werck des glaubens und geysts ...." *Ibid*.

In a rousing speech to the assembled citizens of Kenzingen, their mayor reminded them that "ist der ganzen Bürgerschaft bekannt, wie die Obrigkeit seither vergebens Gotteslästerung, unmässiges Zutrinken und andere üppige Laster abzustellen versucht hat. Erst seitdem das reine Gotteswort hier verkündigt, und die Bürgerschaft also ernstlich unterwiesen wird, sind diese Dinge abgekommen." Quoted in Sussan,
Otter, pp. 14-15. For some examples of Otter's emphasis on such works, see Titum, pp. B ii verso, E i verso, F iii verso, M i recto, H iv verso, L i verso, etc.

17"Das Evangelium ist nit anders denn die predig, das Christus hab sich selbs geben fur uns, das er uns erlisst von sünden, das alle die das glauben, sollen gewisslich auch erlisst seyn und also an jn selb verzweyfeln, sich nur alleyn an Christo halten und uff jn verlassenn." Otter, Titum, p. L iv recto.

18The Twelve Articles, composed in March 1525, claimed to be based on scripture in all their particulars: "if any one or more of the articles here set forth should not be in agreement with the Word of God, as we think they are, such article we will willingly recede from when it is proved really to be against the Word of God by a clear explanation of the Scripture." Translation from Kyle Sessions, ed., Reformation and Authority (Lexington, Mass.: Heath, 1968), p. 19.

19"Zum allersten so wollen wir, dass das Gottwort durch das heilig Evangely dem gemeinen Mann verkündt und gepredigt werd." Heinrich Schreiber, Der deutsche Bauernkrieg, Gleichzeitige Urkunden, II (Freiburg i. Br.: Wangler, 1864), p. 100.


22TA, osts. II, p. 418.


24Cf. Ibid., pp. 40, 46.

25"Gott hat kain ansehen der Person, gilt im der hyrt gleich sovil als der kaiser, der messmer sovil als der bapst." Ibid., p. 71.

26"... wir thund laider noch nit vyl Evangelyscher werck: daz maul gat nun, hertz und frid wollen nit hernach, wil noch kain rechte Christeliche ordnung auff gericht werden, das den armen gehoffen wurde. da ist noch grosse klag, jamere und not bey vil frumen menschen." Goetze, Lotzer, pp. 85-86.

27"... als mich Got berlüfft von seynem wort zu zeugen, und ich den Paulum gelesen... hab ich mich bekert, und ayn Eeweyb nach

28 "Moreover, I greatly fear that these votive modes of life of the religious orders belong to those things which the Apostle foretold: 'They will be teaching lies in hypocrisy, forbidding marriage and enjoining abstinence from foods . . . ' in "The Babylonian Captivity of the Church," LW, vol. 36, pp. 7677. In the Black Forest area, Sebastian Lotzer used the same text in similar fashion in 1523 in "Ain christlicher sendbrief . . ." Goetze, Lotzer, p. 39. By 1527 the passage was the subject of extended written debate. See the book by Caspar Schatzger, Wider herr Hansen von schwwartzenbergs neulich aussgangen pfechlin etc. (n.p., 1527).


30 This complaint was also popular among the common people. See, for example, Johan Eberlin von Günsburg, Die 15. Bundgenossen, in Arnold Berger, ed., Die Sturmtruppen der Reformation (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1964). In Eberlin's utopian "Wolfaria," all monasteries were to be converted into schools for the teaching of morals to children. Ibid., p. 145 ff. The anomaly of priests and monks being forbidden to marry but allowed to have concubines is a repeated theme for Lotzer. See Goetze, Lotzer, pp. 56-57, 64. On this latter theme, see also Jakob Otter, Titum, pp. C iv verso and D i recto. The sometimes low morality of monks and nuns concerned the common people perhaps even more than it did the monastic reformers. At any rate, low moral standards made mandatory tithes all the harder to bear.

31 "... und mich gebetten unnd der liebe ermant, das ich in sälzt leeren arbettyen, dann er sich gern mit einer hand das brott essen wöllt, on fürwytz . . ." TA, zu. I. p. 201.

32 Interesting here is the anonymous pamphlet titled Ain Schöner Dialogus wie ain bawr mit ain strawen bruder münch redt/ das er die Kutten von jm würfft/ und dem Münch arbayt zugeben (n.p., 1525). The monk complains that no one gives him any more to eat. "Bin ich vor dreyen tagen fünff dörfer aussgelaufen/ und nit meer dann ain Käss ersamelt." (A ii recto). The peasant replies that God commanded Adam to work and to eat the bread from the sweat of his brow: is not the monk also a child of Adam? Yes, replies the monk, but the Pope
has freed the monks from all work. The peasant then instructs the monk, reproaching all monks for their immoral lives and quoting more scripture in support of work. The monk replies that monks must work too: "O bawr, unser kainer geet im Closter müssig, müssten singen, betten, fasten, auffsteen unnd Messhalten." (A iii recto). The peasant replies artlessly: "Ja unsers millers Esel, schreyt zu morgens auch auf der mysten, das die magt erwachet." (Yes, our miller's donkey also brays in the morning on the dung heap, in order to wake the maid). He refutes the value of monastic "work" and ends by convincing the monk: ". . . von der müssigen Kütten, ist nye kain gutts kommen. Also freund, ich gey hyn zu arbayten, So ich zu der ernden herwider kunn, will ich dir dein essen ab verdienen." (A iii verso).

In Johann Eberlin's Utopian state of Wolfaria, all begging monks are to be killed on sight. Berger, Sturmtruppen, p. 146.

In a less satirical vein, Lotzer places the blame for an uproar in Memmingen directly on the clergy, who are quite ready to fleece the sheep, but not to feed them. Goetzte, Lotzer, p. 82. Jakob Otter also suggests that if clerics refuse to work, then let them also not eat. Otter, Titum, p. Q ii recto. Cf. also Hubmaier's conclusion in April of 1524: "Wer da nit sucht in dem schweyss seyns angesichts sein brot, der ist im bann, achn unwidrig der speyss, die er yest. Hie werden verflucht alle müssiggenger, geb wer sie syen." Gunnar Westin and Tosten Bergsten, eds., Balthasar Hubmaier Schriften (Gütersloh: Mohn, 1962), p. 74. Hereafter TA, HS.

33 Hubmaier was present at the second Zurich disputation, October, 1523, and spoke for the Zwinglian side. "During the disputation Hubmaier quoted Deuteronomy 12:32, reflecting his understanding of the Scriptures, 'Everything that I command you you shall be careful to do; you shall not add to it or take from it.' Both Zwingli and Grebel also agreed, starting from this premise, that the Word of God was binding not only in dogmatic matters but also in the details of practical discipleship and worship. . . . While it is true that Grebel was a biblicist in a more narrow and Zwingli in a broader sense, their attitudes toward the Bible were basically the same. Hubmaier himself also appealed to this common biblical authority." Bergsten, Hubmaier, Barnes/Estep, p. 84.

34 Hubmaier's first printed work, the Achtzehn Schlussreden, follows Zwingli quite closely on this point. Note especially points four and eleven. TA, HS, pp. 69, 73.

35 Grebel writes to Thomas Müntzer "that which is not taught by clear instruction and example we shall regard as forbidden to us -- just as if it stood written, Do not do this . . ." TA, zu. I, p. 15; trans. by J. C. Wenger, Conrad Grebel's Programmatic Letters of 1524 (Scottsdale, Pa.: Herald Press, 1970), p. 19. To quote Grebel again, "operate only according to the Word, and draw and establish from the Word the rites of the apostles." TA, zu. I, p. 16; trans. in Wenger, Letters, p. 23.

36 Felix Mantz, in his Petition of Protest and Defense, appeals to the Zwinglian principle: "Your shepherds have often asserted that the
Scriptures must be allowed to speak for themselves to which we may not add nor subtract anything. . . . we have never been treated according to this principle." TA zu. I, pp. 23-24. Trans. by E.H. Correll and H.S. Bender, "Conrad Grebel's (sic) Petition of Protest and Defense to the Zürich Council in 1523," Goshen College Record Review Supplement (Jan., 1926), p. 23.


38 Conrad Grebel writes to Müntzer that he is happy to have found someone "who ventured to point out to the evangelical preachers their deficiency: how in all the major articles (of the faith) they practice false sparing, and follow their own notions . . ." Wenger, Letters, p. 17.


41 Yoder, Legacy, p. 42.

42 Ibid., p. 22.

43 In the Schleitheim Articles the ban is to be used in the true church, i.e. among those "who have given themselves over to the Lord, to walk after (Him) in His commandments." Ibid., p. 37. Things which are "flatly counter to the command of God" are to be shunned. Ibid., p. 38. In the Letter to Horb the faithful are warned concerning those who "act against the command and the law of God." Ibid., p. 56. Lack of perseverance in the true path "would break and dissolve (God's) eternal, veritable, righteous and life-giving commandments." Ibid., p. 58. Many who suffer in the flesh "forget all (of Jesus') commandments," Ibid., p. 59. The goal "has been set in the letter of Holy Scripture." Ibid., p. 60.

45. Yoder, Legacy, p. 42.

46. Ibid., p. 38. At his trial Sattler, replying to a charge that he has taught non-resistance to the Turks, answers "If the Turk comes he should not be resisted, for it stands written: 'thou shalt not kill.' " Ibid., p. 72.

47. One of the "instruments of good works" is "Every day to live up to the commandments of God." RB, ch. 4, p. 299.

48. RB, ch. 7, p. 301.

49. RB, ch. 2, p. 294.


52. "Verum sicut miles voluntatem domini sui procul absentis scire non potest nisi per nuncios et epistolam, ita monachus aeterni regis praecepta non intellcet nisi per sacras lectiones atque sermones et Evangelicas scripturas." Ibid., p. 426.

53. RB, ch. 4, p. 298.

54. Although the allusion to Matt. 5:34-37 seems clear, Butler does not note the fact in his index. Cf. Butler, Regula, pp. 21 and 184.

55. Yoder, Legacy, pp. 41-42.


57. RB, ch. 7, p. 303.

58. RB, ch. 4, p. 298.

59. The list of questions for provincial visitators put together at Petershausen (1418) includes one asking specifically whether monks keep arms in the monastery. "Item si monachi in monasterio arma teneant." Zeller, "Provinzialkapitel," p. 67. The fact that such a question needed to be included indicates that the problem did exist, and needed to be corrected.

60. "Non debet monachus occidere quemquam, non tantum gladio, sed nec actione." Trithemius, Regimine, Busaeus, p. 265. Cf. also Trithemius' brief excursus on Matthew, chapters 5, 6 and 7, which are said to furnish the monastic pattern of life. Ibid., p. 188.
61"Non est contra Dei praeceptum iurare, sed dum usum iurandi facimus, periurii crimen incurritus. Nunquam ergo iuret, qui periurare timet. Sed inter iuramentum et locutionem fidelium nulla debet esse differentia." **Ibid.**, p. 279.

62"Sed quid an liceat monacho iurare in veritate, vel non?" **Ibid.**

63"Verumtamen, ut arbitror, propter honestatem monacho iurare non expedit, nisi in maxima necessitate, quia cuius verba semper debet esse vera, iurare non debet." **Ibid.**

64"... monachi sermo debet esse, secundum praeceptum Domini, est, est, non, non ..." **Ibid.**, p. 280.

65"... so doch alle Christlich ler, werck und leben kurzt, klärich und überflüssig begryffen ist in den zweyen stucken, glauben und lieben ..." Otter, **Titum**, p. P ii recto.

66"... wer nit durch das wort gottes, was er geboten und gelert hat, hynein gat in schaffstal ... der ist ain dieb und eyn mörder." Goetze, Lotzer, pp. 27-28.

67 Sattler's "Letter to Horb," Yoder, **Legacy**, pp. 60; 62.


69"Mit dem applass ... waisst die geschrifft gar nichts von ..." **Ibid.**

70 **Ibid.**, p. 31.

71 **Ibid.**, p. 65.

72"Dann Christus verbeü ß uns an vil enden der hailigen geschrift, das wir in kainen weg nichts von noch zu seinem götlichen wort thon sollen ..." **Ibid.**

73 See article five of Lotzer's "beschyrn buchlin," Goetze, Lotzer, pp. 51-52.

74 Translation in Sessions, **Authority**, p. 17.

75 **Ibid.**

76"Dann kain grössere sünd geschehen möcht, dann das hailigest wort gotes vervolgen, und das seib nit annemen, wie dann yetz laider geschicht balder gästlicher und weltlicher stendt." Goetze, Lotzer, p. 80.
"Die werck synd alleyn gut, die uns Gott geheyssen, und die alleyn böss, die er uns hat verbotten. Hie fallend fysch, fleysch, kutten, blatten." TA, HS, p. 73.


Cf. Bergsten's comments in TA, HS, p. 28.

etlich in offenlicher kirchen mir in diser Artikel eingeredt und mich ein blut sauffer, der da nichts thue denn das schwert der Obrigkait beschirmen, aussgeschryen." Ibid., p. 277.

Hubmaier did not always consistently use his principles, as for example in his work 'On the Sword.'\(^{1}\) Klaassen, "Simplicity," p. 147.

Yoder, Legacy, pp. 39-40.

Dom Butler summarizes St. Benedict's references to Christ in the Rule: "... the appeal to the example of our Lord brings us to the final touchstone of the spiritual life, which in all its forms must be for Christians a following of Christ. This St. Benedict knew well; and so his Rule begins with Christ, ever dwells on Christ, and ends with Him. The aspirant to the monastic life is addressed as one going to serve as a soldier of Christ (Prologue); the monk is by faith to see Christ in all ...; in self-denial he follows Christ, in obedience he imitates Him, by patience he shares His sufferings, by love of Him will He come to perfect charity; he is to place nothing before the love of Christ, nor deem anything dearer to him than Christ; and finally, the last words of the Rule proper ... are that he is to prefer nothing whatsoever to Christ. And this is the sum of St. Benedict's teaching on the Spiritual Life." Butler, Monachism, p. 57.


"Vita quippe Christi nobis in exemplum proponitur, ut quemadmodum ille ambulavit, ita et nos ambulemus." Trithemius, Regimine, Busaeus, p. 188. Similar statements in Trithemius' commentary on the Rule are too numerous to cite.

"Ecce IESUS est via ad vitam. Iesus est ostium ad ovile sanctorum. IESUS est iter venendi ad Patrem. Si non vis errare, ipse via est. Si non vis falli ipse est veritas; si non vis mori, ipse est vita aeterna. Cognitio Salvatoris vita est. Quomodo autem in hac vita sit ambulandum B. Ioannes brevi sermone exprimit, dicens: 'Qui se dicit in Christo manere, debet, sicut ille ambulavit, et ipse ambulare.' Ipse Dominus ait: 'Qui sequitur me, non ambulat in tenebris, sed habebit lumen vitae perpetuae.' Haec igitur est ardua via ad vitam aeternam Dominum IESUM imitari." Trithemius, Epistola XIV, Busaeus, p. 948.

"Otter gives thanks to God who "will doch . . . mich nit zwingen zu seinen gubber, die er selb geben hat, und sie von mir nit für gut haben, sie geschehen denn auss freyheit des geysts, der yetz durch den glauben selig gemacht hat, das not der mensch seyn seligkeyt in solche werck setze." Ibid., p. E iv verso.

"Aber vil tieffer, die weysen, heyligen, gelerten, geystlichen, die vor der welt und in selbs frumm synd, uff jre werck bauwen." Ibid., p. K iii recto.

The Black Forest troop frequently included this threefold "Gospel" in its correspondence with Freiburg. Cf. Schreiber, Urkunden II, pp. 89; 105.

Lotzer refers to a central Imitatio text: "Christus: wer nit sein creutz auff sich nimpt, und volgt mir nach, der ist mein nit wertt." Goetze, Lotzer, p. 45. But Lotzer fails to develop this thought in the direction of "following Christ." Rather he speaks generally about accepting all things from God in faith and patience. In his Entschuldigung, Lotzer says that Christians should do as Christ did, and flee rather than accept the power and honour of the world. This has a direct parallel in Sattler, but Lotzer's point is not Nachfolge (as in Sattler) but is a reproach to those who "oppose the Gospel." Ibid., p. 85.

Lotzer's beschyrm büchlin of thirty one articles begins with articles on faith and love. The scripture citations on faith are called the "true foundation": "wer disen grund hat, dem schadt nichts." Ibid., p. 49. True faith is followed by works of love: "wa die liebe des nechsten nitt volgedt mit den werckenn, da ist ein todter glaub." Ibid., p. 50.


Wenger, Letters, p. 25.

While I agree with J. A. Oosterbaan's central point concerning the congruence of thought between Müntzer and Denck I can find no justification for including Grebel in the list of those who emphasize Christ as example. While Grebel does mention Müntzer's distinction between the "sweet" and "bitter" Christ, thus proving that he had read Müntzer's book, still Müntzer's line of thought is nowhere to be found in Grebel's letter, which follows a doggedly literalistic/ceremonial line. Cf. J. A. Oosterbaan, "The Reformation of the Reformation: Fundamentals of Anabaptist Theology," trans. by E. Bender and N. Kopp, MQR 51 (July, 1977), pp. 171-195; N.B. p. 185.

At one point it is reported of Blaurock that he did emphasize the living of a new life following baptism, but the report fails to mention a "following of Christ" as a guide to that new life. See TA, zu. I, pp. 42-43.
Correll/Bender, "Petition," p. 25.


The central emphasis seems to be against the preachers "die als Diebe und Mörder Christo vorlaufen, die unter einem falschen Schein unschuldig Blut vergiesen." Ibid.

". . . mit dem Wassertauft verpflichten sy sich, fürhin jr leben zu besser un Christo nachzuvolgen." TA, HS, pp. 189-190.

"Der schlecht und ainfaltig will Gottes ist, das wir uns seinen geliebten Son Christum Jesum fürbilden und seinem leben und leer nachvolgen . . ." Ibid., p. 413. Cf. Ibid., pp. 408, 418, 422.

"Dann wo Christus ist und lebt, daselbs bringt er mit im auff dem rucken sein crützt, darvon gibt er einem yedlichen Christen ein aigens crützlen ze tragen unnd im nach zevolgen." Ibid., p. 325.

"Demnach ist eins Cristenns leben nun auf leyden gericht, damit er Cristo etlicher mass im leiden gleich werde, desselben leyden erfulle an seinem leib unnd mit seinem Creutz, jm nachvolge den weg, welchen Er unns beraitett hat, und ist uns den mit seinem Creutz und leiden selbs vorgangen." Ibid., pp. 489-490.

CHAPTER IX

1 Yoder, Legacy, p. 22.

2 Ibid., p. 41.


4 "Christ is despised in the world, so are also those who are His . . ." Ibid., p. 22. "Christ has suffered (not ruled) and has left us an example, that you should follow after in his steps." Ibid., p. 40.

5 "Those who are spiritual are Christ's . . . Christians are fully yielded and have placed their trust in their Father in heaven . . ." Ibid., pp. 22-23. "If you will not be drawn according to the will of your Father, you cannot be an heir to His possessions." Ibid., p. 58.

6 The "living way of Christ" is to walk "through cross, misery, imprisonment, self-denial, and finally through death." Ibid.

7 Ibid., pp. 61-62.

8 "... there are few who are willing to persevere in the chastisement of the Lord, whereas the majority when they suffer something minor in the flesh, become dull and slack, and no more look upon the Prince of our faith and its perfecter Jesus." Ibid., p. 59.

9 "... why do you prefer a 'brief and passing rest to the blessed, measured chastisement and discipline (for your salvation) of the Lord?'" Ibid., p. 58. "If you love God you will rejoice in the truth and will believe, hope, and endure everything that comes from God." Ibid., p. 59. At his trial, Michael Sattler indicated his willingness to accept death, saying "What God wills, that will come to pass." Ibid., p. 73.

10 Ibid., p. 36. "Christians are the members of the household of God and fellow citizens of the saints, and not of the world. But they are the true Christians who practice the teaching of Christ with works." Ibid., p. 23. (I have altered Yoder's translation somewhat by rendering mit wercken literally.) Cf. TA, el. I, p. 69. "Forget what is carnal, that you might truly be named Christians and children of the most high God; persevere in the discipline of your heavenly Father. . ." Ibid., p. 62.

11 Ibid., p. 22.

12 Ibid., p. 23.

"Christ was to be made king, but He fled and did not discern the ordinance of His Father. Thus we should also do as He did and follow after Him . . ." Ibid., p. 40.

Ibid., p. 41.

Ibid., p. 72.

"Martin Bucer called Sattler "a leader in the baptism order" and Wolfgang Capito said that "we were not in agreement with him as he wished to make Christians righteous by their acceptance of articles and an outward commitment. This we thought to be the beginning of a new monasticism." Yoder, Legacy, pp. 19 and 87. Oettilinus, who also knew Sattler personally, opposed Sattler "because of the monasticism of his position." TA, el. I, p. 73.

RB, Prologue, p. 293.

The classic New Testament text for the ascetic tradition is Mark 8:34: "If any man would come after Me, let him deny himself and take up his cross and follow Me."

RB, Prologue, p. 291.

RB, Ch. 7, p. 302.

Ibid.

RB, Ch. 4, pp. 297-298.

RB, Ch. 49, p. 322.

"In the first sentence of the Rule the saint speaks of obedience; to obedience he devotes a whole chapter; it is frequently referred to elsewhere; it is part of the vow taken by the novice; it is to be exercised in an heroic degree." McCann, Benedict, p. 108.

"The third degree of humility is, when anyone submits himself with obedience to his superior for the sake of the love of God, after the example of the Lord, of whom the apostle says: 'He was made obedient even unto death.' RB, Ch. 7, p. 302.

"If you follow the advice of a tender father and travel the hard road of obedience, you will return to God, from whom by disobedience, you have gone astray." RB, Prologue, p. 291. Basilius Steidle,
commenting on this passage, notes the following. "The attitude that is
decisive in all this is the monk's obedience. . . . It consists, nega-
tively speaking, in a painful renunciation of his inherent right to
self-determination -- positively considered, in a joyful oblation of his
whole self to Christ. Of course, the unattained and unattainable proto-
type of obedience is the Lord himself." Steidle, Rule, p. 57, n. 3.
Dom Butler notes regarding obedience, "It is the temper of obedience,
much more than the actual obediences, that is of value. This is the
fruit and the outward expression of humbleness of heart and renuncia-
tion of self-will; and these two things are what St. Benedict relies on
principally for the ascetical element in his monks' lives." Butler,
Monachism, p. 140.

29 "After he has climbed all these degrees of humility, the monk
will quickly arrive at the top, the charity that is perfect and casts out
all fear." RB, Ch. 7, p. 304.

30 "Non ergo refugias viam salutis, quoniam sic Christus praecessit,
sic quoque nos eum sequi oportet, quia per multas tribulationes oportet
nos intrare in regnum Dei." Trithemius, Regimine, Busaeus, p. 203.

31 Ibid., p. 252.

32 "Omnes cupimus vivere et regnare cum Christo, sed non omnes
pati volumus cum Christo." Ibid., p. 172.

33 Busaeus, pp. 410-413.

34 "Haec est via angusta, quae ducit ad vitam, propriam videlicet
non amasse voluntatem." Regimine, Busaeus, p. 322.

35 "... multi humilitatem ostendunt in operi, multi apparent
humiles in sermone, pauci autem sunt humiles in corde, quia veri humiles
fiunt salvi, sed angusta est via, quae ducit ad vitam, et pauci inveniunt
eam; quia soli humiles salvantur. Ibid., p. 337.

36 "Obedite ergo fratres charissimi praepositis vestris cum omni
humilitate, et sinceritate, ut illius mereamur fieri imitatores, qui factus
Deo patri obediens usque ad mortem, mortem autem crucis, Dominus
noster Jesus Christus. . . ." Ibid., pp. 327-328.

37 Ibid., pp. 359 ff.

38 E.g. Regimine, Busaeus, pp. 198 ff.

39 "Haec est perfecta et regia via ad vitam, propriam videlicet
abnegare voluntatem, et seque Christum." Ibid., p. 268.

40 "Noli decipere animam tuam. nemo potuit hic gaudere cum mundo
et postea regnare cum christo. Per multas etenim tribulationes oportet
nos intrare in regnum dei. . . . Contende per angustam viam ad
vitam ingredi; hoc est carnis desideria non perficere. mundum odire;
spiritu vivere. Ad militandum deo contra vicia carnis vocatus es; noli ante victoriarm quiescere; noli a pugna desistere; quia nemo coronabitur nisi victor. In hac ... vita non est certa victoria; sed continua "pugna. Qui perseveraverit usque in finem; salvus erit." Trithemius, Institutio, C v verso.

41 "Nihil adeo corruptit hominem, quam voluntas propria carnalis, quae spiritu Dei non ducitur." Trithemius, Regimine, Busaeus, p. 348.

42 "Obedientiae arma ideo fortissima sunt, quia compellunt hominem abnegare sibi: fortissima, quia nihil est quod diabolus plus odit, quam obedientiam veram." Ibid., p. 160.

43 ... obedientiae arma ad elidendum diabolum, qui in mentibus resedet superborum, validissima sunt: quia nihil Deo adeo gratum est, et daemonibus horrendum, sicut obedientia vera monachorum." Ibid.


45 "Beatus qui cum vita bellum gerit et cum Deo pacem tenet. Qui voluerit esse amicus Dei, praeerat se ad sustinendas mundi persecutiones necessae est, quia qui ex Deo est vinctum mundum. Mundus enim, quod suum non est, semper odio habuit. ... Mali nihil habent in caelo, vos nihil in huo mundo. 'Quem enim voluerit amicus fieri huius mundi inimicus Dei constituitur.' (Iacobi 4). Nemo enim potest Deo placere et mundo." Ibid., pp. 287-288.

46 "Nemo enim militans deo. negociis secularibus se implicat. Nemini feceris injuriam; sed disce patieter ferre illatam; exemplo domini tui qui pendens in cruce pro persecutoribus suis exoravit; ut non perirent. Pacem cum omnibus hominibus habeas ..." Trithemius, Institutio, p. C v recto.

47 "Quare pacem, videlicet Dominum IESUM CHRISTUM, qui solus est pax vera, et sequere eam." Trithemius, Regimine, Busaeus, p. 174.

48 "Iubemur orare pro perseverentibus, et calumniabantibus nos, ut perfecti simus, siquid pater noster coelestis perfectus, et bonus est, permittens solem suum oriri super bonus et malos ..." Ibid., p. 313.

49 "Si pacifici sunt filii Dei, proculdubio contentiosi, non aluid, nisi filii sunt Diaboli." Ibid., p. 311.

50 "Das, was für ihn die Hauptsache ist, ist seine dualistische Weltanschauung, welche er aus dem Kloster mitgebracht hatte. Fast klingen seine Worte wie die eines Hirschauer Münchs unter Wilhelm..."

51 Jean Seguy, "Sattler et Loyola: Ou Deux Formes de Radicalisme Religieux au XVIe Siècle," in The Origins and Characteristics of Anabaptism, ed. by Marc Lienhard (The Hague: Nijhoff, 1977), pp. 105-125. Seguy notes the striking resemblance in Christology: "... dans l'un et l'autre cas, d'ailleurs, la personne du Christ est centrale au fonctionnement de la pensée." p. 115. Likewise the struggle between Christ and Satan is central to both Sattler and Loyola: "... tous deux se rencontrent cependant au centre de leur pensée pour présenter la lutte entre le Christ et Satan comme divisant le monde en deux camps ennemis." p. 116. The result of this shared "cosmic vision" is that for both Sattler and Loyola there is a necessity of following Christ into battle. "En tant que soldat du Christ, le chrétien doit en effet passer là où passe aussi son 'capitaine souverain.' C'est le prix de la gloire, cette dernière étant aussi peu fréquemment évoquée par Ignace que par Sattler." p. 117. Finally, for both Sattler and Loyola this shared vision leads to elitism, although Loyola maintains the distinction between precepts and counsels and Sattler does not. "Pour Sattler, la centralité du Christ définit une église de purs en rupture avec le catholicisme et les Églises de la Réforme 'magistérielle.' Pour Ignace le même thème dégage une élite à l'intérieur du catholicisme." p. 118. My findings lead to similar conclusions regarding Sattler and his Benedictine background.

52 Yoder, Legacy, p. 25, nn. 18 and 19.

53 For Otter, the "spiritual" person is one who has faith and who loves his neighbor; the "fleshy" person has no faith and does not love his neighbor. The stress for Otter falls on faith. Cf. Otter, Titum, p. N. in verso.

54 For Lotzer the opposition of the "flesh" to things of the "spirit" is essentially the "fleshy" reaction against the hearing of the Word of God: The stress for Lotzer thus falls on the Word. Cf. Goetze, Lotzer, pp. 37, 52, 64.


57 ... sin meynung allweg gewässen und noch sig, das dhein crist ein oberer sin und nit mit dem schwert richten nochjemans todenn noch straffen solt ... " Ibid., p. 216.
58. "... dann er darumb dhein geschrifft hette." Ibid.


60. Harold Bender relies on these phrases in arguing that "Grebel bases his rejection of the sword and war ... upon the thought of the suffering church." Bender, Grebel, p. 179. Cf. Ibid., p. 201 ff., p. 205. Cf. also supra, chapter 8, n. 108.


62. There are ready parallels for Grebel's statements in Müntzer, but Grebel's statement concerning sheep for the slaughter directly parallels the following statement in Müntzer's Von dem gedichteten Glauben: "... der son Gotis wie ein milues leblin, das seinen mundt nicht aufgeglohn hat, do es geschlachtet ward, und so die sunde der werlt getragen hat, das wir mit yme schaff unserns todtschläns den gantzen tag durch und durch sollen warnhmen, wie wir in unsern leiden nicht sollen murren und kurren wie gymnende hunde, sundern wie schaff seiner weyde, die er uns mit dem saltz seiner weyssheit in leiden und nicht anders vortregt." Gütther Franz, Thomas Müntzer, Schriften und Briefe (Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1968), pp. 221-222.

63. "... such a man, we declare, on the basis of God's Word, shall not be killed ..." Wenger, Letters, p. 29. (Italics mine). It is even more obvious in the postscript to Müntzer that Grebel does not base his non-resistance on the "thought of the suffering church." Grebel, on hearing a report that Müntzer advocates attacking the princes with violence, does not appeal to the "suffering church" but says rather "If you wish to defend war, the tablets, the singing, or other things which you do not find in express words [of Scripture] ..., [then] I admonish you ..., that you desist ...." Ibid., p. 39. (Italics mine). Here "war" is unceremoniously lumped together with "tablets and singing" on the basis of the literal Word. Grebel's rationale has nothing to do with a "persecuted minority."

64. "All men cling [to the negligent scribes and doctors] because they preach a sinful sweet Christ, and they lack the power to discern, as you point out in your booklets -- which have richly instructed and strengthened us, who are poor in spirit." Wenger, Letters, p. 25.

65. "Wer den bittern Cristum nicht wil haben, wirt sich am honig todfressen." Müntzer, Glauben, Franz, p. 222. The same theme is present, but less prominent, in the Protestation. "... die ausser- welten sollen und mussen christiformig werden und mit mancherley leyden und sucht Gottis werck in achtung haben." Ibid., p. 227.

66. For Müntzer's comments concerning "ceremonies" and baptism, see the Protestation, Franz, pp. 227 ff. "Darumb das viel leute das werck Gottes nicht erkennen, meinen, man kunde so leichtlich zum christenglauben kommen, wenn sie nur dran dencken, was Cristus gesagt hat. Nein, nein, lieber mensch, du must er dulden und wissen, wie dir Got sel bern dein unkraut, disteln und dorner aus deinen frucht- baren lande, das ist aus deinem hertzen, reutet." Ibid., p. 233.
Grebel writes: "While we were taking note of and lamenting these things your writing against spurious faith and baptism was brought to us, and we were more fully informed and confirmed. It made us wonderfully happy to have found one who was one with us in a common Christian understanding, and who ventured to point out to the evangelical preachers their deficiency: how in all the major articles (of faith) they practice false sparing, and follow their own notions. . . ." Wenger, Letters, p. 17. (Italics mine). Grebel then launches directly into his central themes--quite foreign to Müntzer--of the "divine Word" and the "divine rites." One can only conclude that he had read, but not understood, Müntzer.

Cf. Hans-Jürgen Goertz, "The Mystic with a Hammer: Thomas Müntzer's Theological Basis for Revolution," trans. by E. Bender, MQR 50, (April, 1976), pp. 83-113. "In the inner order, where salvation is effected and the assurance of salvation is attained, [man's cooperation with God] is limited to mortification and suffering submission to the divine work, but outwardly it appears in man's activity in resisting oppression by the "world"--that is, in transforming, changing, or even annihilating the existing "worldly" condition." p. 102.


"Aber Christus mocht allain mit warhait sagen: Mein reych ist nit von diser welt, wann er ist on sünd entpfangen und geboren, ein unschuldigs lemblin . . ." Ibid.

"Yetz sehen solch Brüeder die warhaut und mresden bekennnen, das unser reych von diser welt sey . . ." Ibid.


TA, HS, p. 437.

Yoder, Legacy, p. 40.

"Also wolt er sagen: Ich bin nit erwolt noch gesetzt zum richter. Er ist mein ambt nit. Es gehört andern zü." TA, HS, p. 439.

77. Weaver, "Discipleship," pp. 274 ff.

78. In the Kurze Entschuldigung of 1526, Hubmaier argues that the monastic vows have been instituted because the true meaning of the baptismal vow has not been understood. "Ja ich bekenn, das ich nichts halte auf München, pfaffen und Nunner gütst. Wann so wir der Tauffgütst nach lebten, hetten wir tag und nacht gnütg zeschaffen . . . ." TA, HS, p. 274. For Hubmaier, the baptismal vow should indicate that the candidate is serious about the Christian life; there is no need of a monastic vow to call forth seriousness of purpose.


80. The RB is not overtly mystical, although St. Benedict does say that after the monk has climbed all the degrees of humility he will attain "the charity that is perfect and casts out all fear." RB, Ch. 7, p. 304. Trithemius is more clearly mystical in emphasis. His handbook for monks of the Bursfeld Union, De triplici Regione clausalium, con-cludes with exercises designed to lead the monks to the highest spiritual realm, that is, the contemplative.

81. While the inner Word provided the necessary means for 'deification,' the historical Jesus served as an outer witness to the ethical and moral conduct required of the believer." Werner Packull, Mysticism and the Early South German-Austrian Anabaptist Movement (Scottdale, Pa.: Herald Press, 1977), pp. 48-49.

82. See the discussion by Walter Klaassen, "Spiritualization in the Reformation," MQR 37, (April, 1963), pp. 67-77.

83. This typology was originated by George H. Williams, ed., Spiritual and Anabaptist Writers (Phila.: Westminster Press, 1957), p. 28 ff.

84. The separation of Spirit and Word was accepted by the Zwinglian and Radical Reformations as fundamental. It must, however, be understood that this separation is not antipodal in the sense of a complete severance, but tensional; and that by consequence there can be only degrees of spiritualization, the tension between Scripture and Spirit increasing in direct proportion to the spiritualization." Ibid., p. 76.

85. Although Walter Koehler tends to fall into the old Schwärmerei categories, he notes that Sattler's view cannot be equated with either that of the literalists or that of the spiritualists. Cf. "Brüderlich," pp. 286 ff.

86. TA, el. I, p. 73.

87. Yoder, Legacy, p. 70.

89 Yoder, Legacy, pp. 35-36.

90 Ibid., p. 36.

91 Ibid., p. 60.

92 Ibid.


94 Yoder, Legacy, p. 60.

95 Ibid., pp. 22-23.

96 It is in this context that the comments of Denck's colleague, Ludwig Haetzer, make some sense. He calls Sattler a "shrewd and wicked rascal, from whom he had hoped something better." The report comes from Bucer, who adds that Haetzer "praised God that we left baptism free." Yoder, Legacy, p. 18. The spiritualist Haetzer, who was obviously acquainted with Sattler at first hand, had been led to expect that Sattler was also of the spiritualist persuasion. But Sattler would not abandon "externals" in total reliance on the "spirit." Thus Sattler did not "leave baptism free," i.e. essentially optional, but rather required it. Haetzer was apparently expecting something else.

97 For Trithemius, deeds reveal the heart. "Monachus autem dolum in corde non gerat, sed verax appareat in omnibus; et qualis est in opere, talis etiam sit in corde." Regimine, Busaeus, p. 277. Abbot Delatte notes: "If humility be really in the heart it will appear in the body also, and will regulate all its movements; it will be like a new temperament, a nature made in humility replacing the old. This external manifestation is a thing natural and necessary: it is the very consequence of our oneness of being." Delatte, Rule, p. 127. Klaus Schreiner notes that "Spätmittelalterliche Reformmönche betonten zu Recht die enge Verbindung zwischen äusserer Form und innerer Gesinnung, von 'homo exterior' und 'homo interior.' Schreiner, "Münchtum," p. 59.

98 Benedictine commentators agree unanimously on this point. Trithemius says that love grows through practice and custom. "... Monachus ex consuetudine bona velut naturaliter incipiet amare, quod prius timebat, et quae facebat antea cum timore formidinis, custodire incipiet cum amore dulcedinis." Regimine, Busaeus, p. 399. Abbot Delatte, notes that in chapter 4 through 7, St. Benedict's subject "is the individual and his means of supernatural perfection ..." Delatte, Rule, p. 61. Abbot Justin McCann notes "In fact, the purpose of all ordinances of the Rule is the same, the purification of the soul and the development of its true life." McCann, Benedict, p. 109. Dom Schmitz concurs. "Toute l'ascèse de saint Benoît est essentiellement 'religieuse,'
c'est-à dire qu'elle n'est pas 'un simple moralisme recherchant le progrès moral pour lui-même' mais pour Dieu, auquel elle doit nous 'relier' comme à notre principe et à notre fin." Schmitz, Histoire, II, p. 327.


100 Klaus Arnold, in his authoritative biography of Trithemius, describes the "regio spiritualis" of Trithemius' De triplici regione as being the region in which "haben die Mönche das Ziel, die höchste Seelenruhe und wilhle Lösung von der Welt in der mystischen Betrachtung des Leidens Christi, erreicht." Arnold, Trithemius, p. 41. Arnold calls the spirituality of Trithemius' work an "authentic expression of the ideal of piety in the Bursfeld congregation and the Benedictine order before the Reformation -- an ideal which comes out of the spiritual tradition of medieval monasticism . . ." Ibid., p. 42.

101 The spiritual exercises that form the last half of De triplici regione are prayers and meditations designed for each part of the monastic day. There are prayers and thoughts for rising, for leaving one's cell, entering church, at holy water, before the sacrament, etc. For the Bursfeld fathers, who commissioned and authorized the work, the Liturgy has become a vehicle of subjective devotion, prayer and growth.


103 Ibid., p. 77.

104 Ibid.

105 The doctrine of the purification of the soul through ascetic practice, and the subsequent ascent of the soul through the purgative, illuminative, and contemplative stages, can be traced back to Origen. It remained the accepted understanding well beyond the sixteenth century. See Fry, RB 1980, pp. 34-41.

106 The borrowing may have been indirect since the Prologue and chapters 17 of the RB depend heavily on the Rule of the Master. See ibid., pp. 91-92.

107 Yoder, Legacy, p. 37.

108 Ibid., p. 35.

109 Ibid., p. 38.

110 "... as Christ the Head is minded, so also must be minded the members of the body of Christ through Him . . ." Ibid., p. 41. (Italics mine).
111. ... be sincere and righteous in all patience and love of God, so that you can be recognized in the midst of this adulterous generation of godless men, like bright and shining lights which God the heavenly Father has kindled with the knowledge of Him and the light of the Spirit." Ibid., p. 56.

112."Remember the Lord who gave you a coin (for He will again require the same with interest), lest that one talent be taken away from you. ... walk as befits and becomes the saints of God." Ibid.

113."Guard, guard yourselves against such, so that you do not also learn their abominations ..." Ibid.

114."Further, He admonishes us therefore to go out from Babylon and from the earthly Egypt, that we may not be partakers in their torment and suffering, which the Lord will bring upon them." Ibid., p. 38.

115."... that she might be holy and irreproachable before God and men, separated and purified from all idolatry and abomination, so that the Lord of all lords might dwell among them and (that she might) be a tabernacle to Him." Ibid., p. 58.

116. For St. Benedict, the goal spoken of most often is simply salvation. This is not absent in Trithemius, but the contemplative and unitive aims are interposed.

117. The secondary literature emerging from Mennonite circles consistently denies that the "Anabaptists" (i.e. the Swiss Brethren) taught "perfectionism." For Harold Bender "The practice of church discipline ... is alone sufficient evidence to support [the] rejection [of this charge]." "Walking in the Resurrection," MQR, 35 (April, 1961), p. 109 Insofar as "perfectionism" is defined as "being totally without sin," Bender's point in well taken, but the use of the term in describing the early Anabaptists is somewhat different in scope and intent. In Sattler's writings the point is that the believer is expected to remain without sin. In the Letter to Horb Sattler prays that the grace of the Spirit "keep you flawless, without sin." Yoder, Legacy, p. 63. And again, in the very article concerning the ban in the Schleitheim Articles Sattler says it is to be applied among the baptized who "still somehow slip and fall into error and sin, being inadvertently overtaken." Ibid., p. 37 (Italics mine). The Horb congregation is to be "humble and sympathetic with the weak and imperfect." Ibid., p. 59. This is amazing language! Clearly sin may occur among the regenerate, but the expectation is that it need not and should not. The ban is for extraordinary cases -- for the "weak and imperfect." It seems to me that the term "perfectionism" fits this teaching extremely well.

118. Heinold Fast argues for a Lutheran background to the Anabaptist call for "radical repentance which completely changes the life and leads it along a new path." "The Dependence of the First Anabaptists on Luther, Erasmus, and Zwingli," MQR, 30 (April, 1966), p. 105.
This leaves a somewhat mistaken impression. C.J. Dyck notes, quoting
the Luther scholar Paul Althaus, that a "once for all" conversion leading
to a visibly regenerated life was essentially foreign to the Protestant
reformers, given their pessimistic anthropology and inclusive ecclesiology.
Dyck notes that the Anabaptist stress on conversion and regeneration
"stands in sharp contrast to the theology of the major reformers ...."
C.J. Dyck, "The Life of the Spirit in Anabaptism," MQR 47 (October,
1973), pp. 312-313.

119 Zielgschmid, Chronik, p. 47 ff.

120 Mantz writes in his Petition of 1524 that baptism shall be given
to anyone "who having been converted through God's Word and having
changed his heart how henceforth desires to live in newness of life ...."
ff., passim.

121 See Blaurock's advice to Marx Bosshart, TA, zu I, pp. 42-43.

122 Grebel writes to Münzter, "today everybody wants to be saved
by a make-believe faith, without faith's fruits ..." Wenger, Letters,
p. 15.

123 For Hubmaier faith must bear fruit in works. "Der glaub gat
nit mussig, sonder ist arbeitsam inn allen gätten Christlichen wercken." 
TA, HS, p. 161.

124 Kuenzi writes to the Zürich council "die cristen sich nit sond
glych stellen diser wallt, sunder inn einem nuwen lebenn wandlen." TA,
zu I, p. 201. Cf. the testimonies of the converts Hans Grossman and
Hans Flamer in ibid., pp. 302 and 314 respectively.

125 Cf. the testimonies of Winkler's converts, Hanss Meyger von
Sewen and Peter Fuchs in ibid., pp. 272-273 and p. 271 respectively.
Winkler himself testified that "wellicher den alten mentschen hett lassen
vallen, von sünden und lastern gestanden und den nuwen mentschen an
sich nimbt, den touffind sy ouch ...." Ibid., p. 313.

126 Roggenacher, who baptized Carli Brennwald, has a more visible
pneumatic emphasis than is the case in Grebel, but he stresses the new
life nonetheless. See TA, zu I, pp. 166, 175, 60.

127 Gross describes baptism as "nichts anders dann ein enderung
Cf. TA, zu I, p. 263.

128 Cf. especially C.J. Dyck, "Life of the Spirit."; Walter Klaassen,
(April, 1961), pp. 130-139; Harold Bender, "Resurrection."; and Blanke,
Brothers in Christ.
The deep emotion connected with repentance and baptism in Zollikon is well documented by Blanke, Brothers. Cf. the direct appeal to the Spirit by Rudolf Hottinger in TA, zu. I, p. 43. Likewise Felix Kleinast could not promise to desist from preaching "for he did not know what God wished to work through him." Ibid., p. 98. Felix Mantz apparently had a vision of scripture. Cf. Ibid., pp. 217, 223, 225; this experience is downplayed strenously by Ekkehard Krajewski, "The Theology of Felix Mantz," MQR 36 (Jan., 1962), pp. 79-80.

George Blaurock is openly pneumatic in claiming that the Holy Spirit sent him to proclaim God's Word (TA, zu. I, p. 110) and, more specifically, in claiming that God had sent him to Zollikon. Ibid., p. 126. Anthony Roggenacher was "moved in his heart" to publicly confess his sins at a mass meeting in St. Gall. Ibid., p. 166. Roggenacher also speaks of living the new life "als vil im gott gnad gebe." Ibid., p. 175, 60. It was Roggenacher who baptized the weeping Carlî Brennwald, later Michael Sattler's associate in the Büllach area. Ibid., pp. 165-166.

Zwingli and Hofmeister charged the Anabaptists, Mantz specifically, with teaching that the only ones allowed into the fellowship are those "so on sund sich selbs wusstend." Ibid., p. 215; 122-123. Mantz, significantly, does not deny the charge of "sinlessness" in his reply, but rather affirms that those who wish to be obedient to the Word and to follow Christ must be joined by baptism. Ibid., p. 216. We may make the same point again as above, n. 117: while sin is undeniably a possibility, it is not to be expected as a rule. What is expected is success in discipleship, through the Spirit. The Zürich Anabaptists are more optimistic in their anthropology that is Humbaier, who denies Zwingli's charge at length. Cf. TA, HS, p. 120.
CHAPTER X


3 Yoder, Legacy, p. 19

4 Concerning Denck, Werner Packull notes that "The mystical focus on the transcultural logos on the one hand, and the imitative focus on the human Christ as the great exemplar and pedagogue on the other, were fundamentally incompatible with an acceptance of the vicarious nature of Christ's work." Mysticism, p. 179.

5 Yoder, Legacy, p. 19.


Ibid., p. 87.

Ibid., p. 90.

Harry McSorley, *Luther: Right or Wrong?* (Toronto: Newman Press, 1969). McSorley notes that there have been two basic mentalities present in the church. The first "seeks to affirm before all else the absolute primacy of the divine will..."; the second "insists on safeguarding... the free will of man in salvation. Otherwise... God alone will bear the responsibility -- if he alone has free will -- for sin and salvation alike..." Ibid., p. 124.

"Does the faith in Christ which frees us from sin involve a free decision on the part of man? To this we must answer with all Catholic theologians and with the great majority of Protestant exegetes in the affirmative." Ibid., p. 46. God's causality, says McSorley, "is a dynamism which is able to work in us both our willing and our working, according to God's good pleasure, and yet, it is able to work this in us so that we do it freely!" Ibid., p. 90. Regarding John Cassian's Semi-Pelagianism, Owen Chadwick notes that "Later centuries found it natural to use the paradoxical language that God was at once the goal and the way to the goal." Owen Chadwick, *John Cassian* (Cambridge: University Press, 1950), p. 138.


Evans, *Pelagius*, p. 111.

"Grace is defined as doctrina and exemplum in such a way that freedom of choice is not destroyed but is preserved and lifted up so that it may be itself." Ibid., p. 120.


"A just God can give an unfair start to no-one. And he can command nothing which any man is unable to perform: the existence of a divine command necessarily implies ability in all to whom it is given to
obey it. All men can keep the commandments of God "if they will."
Ibid., p. 183.

18 Brown, Augustine, p. 342.

19 "One would be judged according to one's fulfillment of an
intelligible system of law. The law was intelligible, just. Man only


21 Ibid., p. 212.

22 "... he who wills has voluntas, he who is able has potestas." 
Ibid., p. 237. "We say that any man has in his power that which he
does if he wills ..." Ibid.

23 Ibid., p. 245.

24 Ibid., pp. 245-246.

25 Chadwick's paraphrase of Augustine's position in Cassian,
p. 110.

26 Augustine, "Grace and Free Will," trans. by R.P. Russell in
The Fathers of the Church, vol. 59 (Washington: Catholic University


28 Ibid., p. 260.

29 Ibid., pp. 270-271.

30 Chadwick, Cassian, p. 112 ff.

31 John Cassian, "Conferences," Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers,

32 "... does God have compassion upon us because we have
shown the beginning of a good will, or does the beginning of a good
will follow because God has had compassion upon us?" Ibid., p. 427.

33 "It cannot be doubted that there are by nature some seeds of
goodness in every soul implanted by the kindness of the Creator: but
unless these are quickened by the assistance of God, they will not be
able to attain to an increase of perfection ..." Ibid., p. 429.

34 "... two angels are said to be attached to each one of us,
I.e., a good and a bad one, while it lies at man's own option to choose
which to follow. And therefore the will always remains free in man

35 "And so the grace of God always co-operates with our will for
its advantage, and in all things assists, protects and defends it . . ." 
Ibid., p. 430.

36 Ibid.

37 Ibid., p. 432.

38 Ibid., p. 434.

39 "... how God works all things in us and yet everything can
be ascribed to free will, cannot be fully grasped by the mind and
reason of man." Ibid., p. 435.

40 "The Semi-Pelagians professed homage to Augustine and all
his works except in the matter of predestination and irresistible grace .
..." Chadwick, Cassian, pp. 113-114.

41 Brown, Augustine, p. 348.

42 Cf. Chadwick's discussion in Cassian, pp. 77-103.

43 God's helping grace is mentioned by Cassian primarily when
he sees the needs of an antidote to pride. Ibid., p. 122. "The abbot
is primarily a spiritual father to each monk; the monastery is a schola,
or place where training is given; the purpose is to lead men to future
salvation through the practice of the ascetic life. Hence the importance
of the abbot and of the three virtues [obedience, silence, and humility];
these are the monk's primary means of salvation, according to Cassian's

44 "That through the sin of the first man, free choice was so
warped and weakened that thereafter no one is able to love God as he
ought, or believe in God, or do anything for God that is good, except
the grace of God's mercy prevent [praevenire] him." Henry Bettenson,
Documents of the Christian Church, 2nd ed. (London: Oxford University

45 Brown, Augustine, p. 398.

46 "... Cassian we know was St. Benedict's spiritual book of
predilection. In two places in the Rule he tells his monks to read
Cassian, and the Index Scriptorum to my edition of the Regula [p. 176]
shows that the references to Cassian are more numerous, and also more
considerable, than to any other author; and if references be examined,
it will appear that St. Benedict was familiar with Cassian's writings,
and was saturated with their thought and language in a greater measure
than with any other, save only the Holy Scriptures." Butler, Monachism,
47 "Whereas Cassiodorus, in urging his community at Vivarum to a diligent study of the Institutes and Conferences, had warned the monks against the erroneous theology of grace, Benedict made no reservations." Chadwick, Cassian, p. 171.

48 Abbot Paul Delatte is openly apologetic in his comments on the following statement in the Prologue: "... implore the help of God to accomplish every good work you undertake." Delatte says "This clear statement, at the very beginning of the Rule, makes short work of any Pelagian or Semi-Pelagian corruption of the truth... The words of St. Benedict are profoundly wise and are in agreement with the teaching of the Council of Orange: 'The assistance of God must ever be asked even by the baptized and the saints, that they may be able to reach a good end or to persevere in good.'" Delatte, Rule, p. 5. In fact, St. Benedict does not speak to the crucial question of prevenient grace anywhere in the RB, nor does Delatte's quote from the Council of Orange speak to that question. The observations in Fry, RB 1980, pp. 66 and 158, can be recommended for their balance. See also Steidle, Rule, pp. 23-32; 128 ff.

49 RB, prologue, p. 291.

50 Ibid., pp. 292-293.

51 See the references listed in Fry, RB 1980, p. 566, s.v. grace.

52 See McSorley, Luther, pp. 117-122.


54 Cf. McSorley's discussion in Luther, pp. 130-182. For St. Thomas "The will is free, and the natural desire for the good persists despite sin." Thomas Aquinas, Nature and Grace, ed. by A.M. Fairweather (Phila.: Westminster Press, 1954), p. 22. After making appropriate distinctions, St. Thomas explains how sin "diminishes" the good of nature. "The good of human nature is threefold. First, there are the principles of which nature is constituted... Secondly, since man has from nature an inclination to virtue, as was stated above [I-II, Q. 51, a. 1], this inclination to virtue is a good of nature. Thirdly, the gift of original justice, conferred on the whole human nature in the person of the first man, may be called a good of nature. Accordingly, the
first-mentioned good of nature is neither destroyed nor diminished by sin. The third good of nature was entirely destroyed through the sin of our first parent. But the second good of nature, viz., the natural inclination to virtue, is diminished by sin." Summa Theologica, I-II, Q. 85, a. 1. In Anton Pegis, ed., Basic Writings of Saint Thomas Aquinas, vol. 2 (New York: Random House, 1945), p. 695. Cf. also Q. 85, a. 2.

55 Concerning God's justice, St. Thomas makes a distinction between "absolute necessity" and "conditional necessity." Salvation or reprobation thus involves the exercise of human will. "Reprobation by God does not take anything away from the power of the person reprobated. Hence, when it is said that the reprobated cannot obtain grace, this must not be understood as implying absolute impossibility, but only conditional impossibility; just as it was said above that the predestined must necessarily be saved, yet by a conditional necessity, which does not do away with the liberty of choice [I, Q. 19, a. 3]. Whence, although anyone reprobated by God cannot acquire grace, nevertheless, that he falls into this or that particular sin comes from the use of his free desire. Hence it is rightly imputed to him as guilt." Summa Theologica, I, Q. 23, a. 3, reply obj. 3; in Pegis, vol. 1, pp. 242-243. McSorley explains by saying "because God knows and wills that someone will attain such a goal, predestination is certain. But because God wills that he be directed to such a goal according to free will, this certitude does not impose necessity on the one predestined." McSorley, Luther, p. 157. The Nominalists go even further in tempering predestination. Cf. infra, n. 58.

56 "As was stated above, grace may be taken in two ways [Q. 109, a. 2, 3, 6 and 9]. First, as a divine help, whereby God moves us to will and to act; secondly, as a habitual gift divinely bestowed on us. Now in both these ways grace is fittingly divided into operating and cooperating. . . . in that effect in which our mind is moved and does not move, but in which God is the sole mover, the operation is attributed to God; and it is with reference to this that we speak of operating grace. But in that effect in which our mind both moves and is moved, the operation is not attributed only to God, but also to the soul; and it is with reference to this that we speak of co-operating grace." Summa Theologica, I-II, Q. 111, a. 2; in Pegis, vol. 2, p. 1005. concerning habitual grace, St. Thomas notes that "inasmuch as it is the principle of meritorious works, which proceed from free choice, it is called co-operating grace." Ibid., p. 1006.

St. Thomas also utilizes the distinction between "condign" merit and "congruous" merit in order to argue for the exercise of man's free will toward achieving virtue. "If [man's meritorious work] is considered as regards the substance of the work; and inasmuch as it proceeds from free choice, there can be no condignity because of the very great inequality. But there is congruity, because of an equality of proportion; for it would seem congruous that, if a man does what he can, God should reward him according to the excellence of His power." Summa Theologica, I-II, Q. 114, a. 3; Pegis, vol. 2, p. 1042.
57"Hence it is clear that man cannot prepare himself to receive the light of grace except by the gratuitous help of God moving him inwardly." Ibid., Q. 109, a. 6; Pegis, p. 988.

58Heiko Oberman, "Facientibus Quod in se est, Deus non Denagat Gratiam: Robert Holcot O.P. and the beginnings of Luther's Theology," in Oberman, Reformation, pp. 125-126, passim. McSorley says that with the "Neo-Semipelagians" "one pole of the biblical dialectic is exaggerated, namely the biblical imperatives or conditionals which imply man's freedom and the need for his activity." McSorley, Luther, p. 206.

59Cogently demonstrated by Paul Vignaux, "On Luther and Ockham," in Ozment, Reformation, pp. 107-118.

60Ebeling, Luther, pp. 156-157.

61RB, Prologue, p. 292.

62"Ex debito salvamur, an ex gratia? Certe ex gratia. Ait enim Paulus ad Romanos 4:16 'Ideo ex fide, ut sequendum gratiam firma sit promissio omni semini.' Si ergo ex gratia salvamur, quid opus est merito? Dicit namque idem Apostulus, ad Romanos 3:28 'Arbitramur enim hominem iustificari per fidem sine operibus legis.' Dicendum est, imo credendum, quoniam per gratiam medianti merito salvamur, quia meritum ex gratia est: gratia enim opus sanctum, per quod quis meritum accumulat, praevenit, dicente Domino: 'Sine me nihil potestis facere.' [Jn. 15:5]. Qui ergo gratiam non habet, nec bene facere potest. Ait enim Apostulos, ubi supra. 'Iustificari gratis per gratiam ipsius, per redemptionem, quae est in Christo Iesu.' [Rom. 3:24]. Vides, quoniam gratia salvantur fideles? Quod vero ait. Arbitramur hominem iustificari per fidem sine operibus legis, de lege Mosaica, non Evangelica interiorem, et ideo profuit aperte, 'per fidem,' id est, caritate formatam, quia, ut Iacobus dicit, 'fides sine operibus mortua est.'" Trithemius, Regimine, Busaeus, p. 200.

63Trithemius says "The law was given in order that grace be sought, grace was given in order that the law be fulfilled." (Lex data est, ut gratia quaeretur, gratia data est, ut lex impleatur.) Trithemius, Regimine, Busaeus, p. 156. Concerning faith and works Trithemius says "We believe in Christ, and that is good, if we follow Christ's examples. For if we do not follow Christ with works of piety we flatter ourselves in vain concerning faith alone." ("In Christum credimus, bene est, si Christi sequamur exempla. Nam si Christum pietatis operibus non sequimus, frustra nobis de sola fide blandimur.") Trithemius, Sermones, Busaeus, p. 419.

64RB, Prologue, p. 293.

65Trithemius concludes the long section quoted above in n. 62 with the following: "Nunc ergo, quoniam ex gratia Dei fideles salvantur, nihil asperum, nihilque grave esse poterit, quod gratia Dei praevenitur,
sic nec durum quantumcumque sit, opus videri debet, per quod quis Dei regnum promereri poterit." Trithemius, Regimine, Busaeus, p. 200. Josef Sudbrach notes that the theme of grace is central for Johannes von Kastl. The central meaning of grace for him is "eine von Gott geschenkte Hilfe, um verdienstlich zu handeln." Also nicht die seinshafte Wirklichkeit der Gnade, in der uns neues, göttliches Leben geschenkt wird, steht im Zentrum der Vorstellung, sondern . . . die moralische Wirkung, die es uns ermöglicht, so zu handeln, wie es zum Heil notwendig ist." "Suche," p. 429.


67 "For God does not deal, nor has he ever dealt, with man otherwise than through a word of promise, as I have said. We in turn cannot deal with God otherwise than through faith in the Word of his promise. He does not desire works, nor has he need of them; rather we deal with men and with ourselves on the basis of works. But God has need of this: that we consider him faithful in his promises . . ." Ibid., p. 42.

68 Ibid., p. 116.

69 McSorley calls the Nominalist school of Ockham and Biel "the greatest single negative influence on Luther's Reformation theology." Luther, p. 190.

70 "In nature, with regard to God, there is only a concupiscent love, which, in every activity, is evil." Vignaux, "Luther and Ockham," p. 110.

71 "Luther is incorrect when he isolates Gregory of Rimini's position from that of all other scholastics and when he identifies the Scotists and Thomists in general with the teaching of the moderni: that by following the natural dictate of reason alone man could merit the first grace. The Reformer is likewise in error in implying that 'the Scholastics' taught that 'heaven is attained without grace'. Not even Ockham or Biel held such a crass doctrine." McSorley, Luther, pp. 207-208.

72 Ebeling, Luther, p. 157.

73 "Judgement of Martin Luther on Monastic Vows," LW 44, p. 286.

74 Ibid., p. 289.

75 Steven Ozment, "Homo Viator: Luther and Late Medieval Theology," in Ozment, Reformation, p. 149.

76 Ibid., pp. 148-149.
77 Ibid., p. 149.

78 Hochstraten says: "As if Christ does not take the trouble to distinguish and choose, but simply assumes even the most foul bride . . . As if He requires from her simply those internal acts of believing and trusting and does not care about her righteousness and the other virtues which righteousness produces! . . . As if a certain mingling of righteousness with iniquity and of Christ and Belial were possible!" Quoted in [Ibid.], pp. 150-151.

79 Yoder, Legacy, p. 36.

80 "Aber das sindt die waren christen, die die leer Christi thündt mitt wercken." [TA], el. I, p. 69.

81 Yoder, Legacy, p. 58.

82 Ibid., p. 22.

83 "Follow after [Jesus] in faith and obedience, love and long-suffering. Forget what is carnal, that you might truly be named Christians. . . ." [Ibid.], pp. 61-62. See also n. 85 below.

84 Ibid., p. 36. "Merckent, jr glieder gottes in Christo Jesu, der glaub an himmlischer vatter durch Jesum Christum ist nit also gestalt. . . ." [TA], osts. II, p. 28.

85 "... all who have not entered into the obedience of faith and have not united themselves with God so that they will to do His will, are a great abomination before God . . ." Yoder, Legacy, p. 38.

86 See, for instance, the study of Alvin Beachy, The Concept of Grace in the Radical Reformation (Nieuwkoop: B. de Graaf, 1977). "Grace is God's act whereby He renews the divine image in man through the Holy Spirit and makes the believer a participant in the divine nature. . . . once received, the gift of grace so understood did enable one to rise higher in the scale of Christian perfection than was generally thought possible where the forensic concept of grace prevailed." [Ibid.], p. 5.

87 Secondary studies, particularly those mentioned above in notes 1 and 2, have documented in detail the early Anabaptist (Swiss Brethren) emphasis on repentance, faith and actual righteousness, invariably in connection with baptism.


89 The decree on justification states that "in adults the beginning of that justification must proceed from the predisposing grace of God through Jesus Christ . . . whereby, without any merits on their part,
they are called; that they who by sin had been cut off from God, may
be disposed through His quickening and helping grace to convert them-
selves to their own justification by freely assenting to and cooperating
with that grace; so that, while God touches the heart of man through
the illumination of the Holy Ghost, man himself neither does absolutely
nothing while receiving that inspiration, since he can also reject it, nor
yet is he able by his own free will and without the grace of God to
move himself to justice in His sight." H. J. Schroeder, trans., Canons
Decrees of the Council of Trent (St. Louis: Herder, 1950), pp. 31-32.
The decree goes on to state that justification is "not only a remission of
sins but also the sanctification and renewal of the inward man through
the voluntary reception of the grace and gifts whereby an unjust man
becomes just..." Ibid., p. 33.
CHAPTER XI

1 Sattler clearly has a very corporeal conception of the Body of Christ, for the community of saints is a visible, tangible community. Nevertheless the "spiritual" component is specifically present, especially in the Schleitheim Articles. The salutation begins "May joy, peace mercy from our Father, through the atonement of the blood of Christ Jesus, together with the gifts of the Spirit -- who is sent by the Father to all believers to [give] strength and consolation and constance in all tribulation until the end. Amen, be with all who love God . . . wherever they might be gathered in unity of spirit in one God and Father of us all . . ." (Italics mine). Yoder, Legacy, pp. 34-35. The phrase "unity of the spirit" in particular runs like a leitmotiv through the introductory letter. Since Sattler is writing primarily to those who had already been physically "united" by water baptism, this constant usage suggests that for Sattler "unity in spirit" is a higher ecclesiological criterion than is mere water baptism. Cf. Yoder, Legacy, p. 49, n. 37; p. 50, n. 45 for the consistent use of the term Vereinigung.

2 Michael Novak, inspired by Robert Friedmann's Hutterite Studies, noted that "If, for a moment, we conceive of 'the Roman Catholic Church' only as a generic name like 'the Protestant Church,' and look upon the different modes of Catholic life as sects or denominations within the larger whole, the relationships between evangelical Anabaptist piety and Franciscan piety seem more striking." "The Free Churches and the Roman Church," Journal of Ecumenical Studies 2 (Fall, 1965), pp. 432-433. In looking at the "Benedictine view of community" we will be considering Benedictine monasticism very much as a separate group or "sect" within the larger Catholic Church.

3 See RB, ch. 58, pp. 327-328. "The person to be received shall make public profession in the oratory, of his stability, amendment of life, and obedience." Ibid., p. 328.

4 "And if, upon mature deliberation, he promises to observe the whole Rule and to obey whatever commands he is given, he shall be admitted as a member of the community . . ." Ibid., p. 327.

5 Cf. RB, ch. 44, p. 320; chs. 23-29, pp. 310-312.

6 "The monastery ought to be so arranged that, if possible, it may have all necessaries within its precincts -- water, a mill, a garden, and the wherewithal to work at several trades. Then the monks will have no occasion for rambling abroad, which is not good for their souls." RB, ch. 66, p. 334.

7 RB, ch. 64, pp. 331-333.

8 Yoder, Legacy, p. 36.
As paraphrased by Capito, in *Legacy*, p. 95.

RB, ch. 4, p. 298. The Prologue speaks directly to the matter of repentance. "Therefore, in consideration of the evils which we have to redress, [our Lord] has given us the days of our life, and prolongs them to afford us an opportunity of making peace wth him. 'Dost thou not know,' says the Apostle, 'that the patience of God inviteth thee to repentance?'" Ibid., pp. 292-293.


Michael Novak considers the rejection of celibacy to have been a possible sign of reforming zeal. "That the spirituality of the monastery should have continued through their sermons and writings to influence their flocks is hardly surprising; neither is it surprising that those most zealous for a life of perfection should have been among those protesting abuses in the monasteries, and been among those reacting most strongly against the practice of celibacy." Novak, "Free Churches," p. 434. Such a conclusion seems particularly appropriate in Sattler's case. There is some evidence to suggest that although marriage was accepted within the Anabaptist brotherhood, it retained the stamp of "an old fashioned ascetic morality" rather than adopting Luther's "naturalistic" understanding. See James Stayer, "Polygamy as "Inner-Worldly Asceticism": Commissie tot Uitgave van Documenta Neerlandica, Bulletin nos. 12 and 13, 1980-81, p. 67. Among the Swiss Anabaptists, a man's wife was commonly referred to as his "eheliche Schwester" or "wedded sister."

Although St. Benedict's claims are not exclusive, as are Sattler's, still the Rule consistently places salvation as the end goal. See especially the Prologue.


"By this are meant all popish and repopish works and idolatry, gatherings, church attendance, winehouses, guarantees and commitments of unbelief, and other things of the kind, which the world regards highly, and yet which are carnal or flatly counter to the command of God." Ibid., p. 38.
17. Ibid., pp. 42-43.
18. RB, ch. 23, p. 310.
19. RB, ch. 24, p. 311.
20. RB, ch. 28, p. 312.
21. RB, ch. 58, p. 327.
26. RB, ch. 64, p. 332.
27. RB, ch. 68, p. 335.
28. RB, ch. 4, pp. 298-299.
30. RB, ch. 5, p. 300.
32. Steidle, Rule, p. 54.
33. RB, ch. 2, p. 294.
34. RB, ch. 5, p. 300.
35. "Whenever any matter of moment is to be debated in the monastery, the abbot is to assemble the whole community, and to lay open the business before them: and after having heard their opinions, and maturely debated with himself, he may resolve on what he judges most profitable." RB, ch. 3, p. 296.
36. " . . . in the cover letter which Michael Sattler wrote to accompany the seven articles adopted by the meeting at Schleitheim . . ."
the claim to a hearing made for the Seven Articles of the Brotherly Union is based upon the fact that, in the meeting, persons who had previously been of another opinion had been led to unity 'without contradiction.' This itself was the demonstration that God had been at work, and thereby also the guarantee of the adequacy of the positions taken." John H. Yoder, "The Hermeneutics of the Anabaptists," MQR 41 (Oct., 1967), p. 304.

37"... nihil est ... quod Deo plus quam obedientia placeat." Regimine, Busaenus, p. 157.

38"Nontandum autem quod non semper teneor obedire Abbati meo, si ea praecipit, quae non promisi . . ." Ibid., p. 217.

39"Debet ergo monachus praecipitis Abbatis omnibus obedire, quae non sunt contra Dei honorem vel animae salutem, aut certe ultra regulam, quam professus est." Ibid., p. 309.


41Regarding "heretics" Otter says "Es sol und müß mit der geschriiff zögon, und nit mit gewalt und schwerdtschlegen, damit sie nit verderbt, sunder gebessert, und zäm glauben widerum gewysen werden." Ibid., p. P iv, recto. He goes on to quote Matthew 18, but Otter's central concern is orthodoxy rather than ethics.

42"... under dem Christen hauffen nit yederman recht Christen ist, ja in eyner yeden gemeyn, der mynder theyl . . ." Ibid., p. N i, verso. Therefore the central characteristic of Christians must be love and forgiveness. Cf. the following pages in Otter's sermon.

43"So doch die heylig Cristelich kirch nicht anders ist dann die versamlung aler glaubigen menschen, so in der gnad des hailigen geist versamlet sind . . . versamlet im hailigen gaist, ist ain hailige Christelich kirch, die wayst allain got." Goetz, Lotzer, p. 33.

44Lotzer, like Otter, also quotes Matthew 18 concerning the ban, but his application of the passage parallels the Anabaptist usage more closely: he suggests that open sinners should be banned. Cf. Ibid., pp. 58-59; 72.

45See Ibid., pp. 27, 33-34, 36, 43, 47-48.

46Ibid., p. 57. Cf. especially the Letter to Bucer and Capito.

47"Nun mag der text den verstand nit leyden, das Petrus der felss sey, Sunder den felssen, den er bekennt hat ain sun des lebendi-gen gotes sey Jesus cristus: der ist der felss, den die porten der hell nit haben mügen übergwälttigen . . ." Goetz, Lotzer, pp. 67-68. On binding, loosing, and church discipline, see p. 68.
H.-J. Goertz argues that although the Schleitheim Articles turned away from overt revolution, they nevertheless continued other revolutionary impulses. Goertz notes that of the various peasant demands and precedents, the free election of a pastor by the congregation, the direct support of that pastor by the congregation, the rejection of the oath, and the establishing of a "brotherhood" utilizing the ban are all features which re-appear in the Schleitheim Articles. Goertz concludes, "die Täufer verwarfen jetzt zwar die Forderungen der einst aufbegehrenden Bauern, untergründig aber bewahrten sie ihnen ihre Solidarität." H.J. Goertz, Die Täufer: Geschichte und Deutung (Munich: C.H. Beck, 1980), p. 22.

Lotzer makes the fairly common point that the Saints do not save, only Christ does. Ibid., p. 30. But concerning the honouring of the saints, he makes a distinction between the living saints and the dead saints, identical to the point Sattler made at his trial. "Es sind zwayerlay haylagen: die ersten sind im fayisch frumb glaubig Cristen, denen soll man alle eer beweysen, den armen tewlich helfen und radten, So thät mans Got selbs. die andern seind die abgestorbenen hailigen, bedürffen unsres götis nit, sy seynd selig und reych." Ibid., p. 60.


Ibid., p. 24. The outlines of this view can be seen already in Grebel's letter to Müntzer: "Scripture describes baptism for us as signifying that through faith and the blood of Christ our sins are washed away: to the one baptized that his inner self has been changed, and that he believes, both before and afterward. It signifies that one should be and is dead to sin, and walking in newness of life and spirit; also that he shall certainly be saved by the inward baptism if he lives his faith according to this significance." Wenger, Letters, pp. 29, 31

See TA, HS, p. 136.

... welcher glaubt, der lasst sich täuffen und disputiert nit weytter, dann er syeht die ordnung Christi vor augen ..." Ibid., pp. 142-143.


Ibid., p. 23.

Und ob du dich darynn Ubersehest (vergehest), das du dich aber nach der Regel Christi, Matth. am XVIII. ca. [v. 15 ff.], weilest straffen lassen, darmit du von tag zä tag im glauben ... auffwachsest." TA, HS, p. 139.

In his Eliche Schlussreden vom Unterricht der Messe (1525) Hubmaier maintains that the Supper, besides being a remembrance, is a supper of unity. "Wie nur ain kernlin sein aygen mel nit behalt, sonder es gibts dem andern, und ein weinkernlin sein gesafft im nit
behelt, sonnder dem andern mittaylt, also sollen wir christen auch thun, oder wir essen und trincken unwändiglich von dem tüssch Christi." TA, HS, p. 103.
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