

# AP European History

## UNIT 2 Materials



*The Reformation(s)  
and the  
Wars of Religion*



# AP EUROPEAN HISTORY

## *Essential Content*

### **Unit 2**

#### *Reformation(s) and Religious Wars*

#### **THE STUDENT WILL:**

1. Identify the problems facing the Catholic Church at the beginning of the sixteenth century.
2. Identify Martin Luther's objections to Catholic doctrines and practices and explain the essential doctrines of the Lutheran faith.
3. Compare and contrast the doctrines and practices of the religious movements:  
Catholicism / Lutheranism / Calvinism / Anglicanism / Radical Sects
4. Explain how political concerns shaped the course of the Reformation, especially in the Holy Roman Empire, England, and France.
5. Explain the extent to which the Council of Trent embraced and rejected reform and evaluate the success of the Counter-Reformation, including the impact of the Jesuits.
6. Explain Henry VIII's motivations for splitting from the Catholic Church and summarize the course of the English Reformation.
7. Identify the causes, key individuals, and events of the French Wars of Religion.
8. Summarize the causes, course, and consequences of the Thirty Years' War.

#### **IMPORTANT PEOPLE:**

Johann Tetzel  
Martin Luther  
John Calvin  
Ulrich Zwingli

Henry VIII  
Mary I  
John Knox  
Thomas Cranmer  
Ignatius Loyola  
Teresa of Ávila

Catherine de Medici  
Henry IV (France)  
Elizabeth I (England)  
Philip II (Spain)  
Gustavus Adolphus  
Cardinal Richelieu

# AP EUROPEAN HISTORY

## *Unit Plan and Pacing Guide*

### Unit 2

#### *Reformation(s) and Religious Wars*

	<b>ASSIGNMENTS</b> <i>(to be completed BEFORE each class meeting)</i>
<b>DAY ONE</b> <i>The Crisis of Catholicism</i>	<b>Kagan, 317-320 OR Wood, 67-71</b>  <a href="#">Document 2.1</a> (Tetzel, "Grace Through the Sale of Indulgences")  <b>YOUTUBE:</b> <a href="#">Causes of the Reformation</a> <a href="#">What is Purgatory?</a>
<b>DAY TWO</b> <i>Luther's Reformation</i> <a href="#">Luther's Reformation</a> <a href="#">Luther's Doctrines</a>	<b>Kagan, 320-327 OR Wood, 71-74</b>  <a href="#">Document 2.2</a> (Luther, "Ninety-five Theses") <a href="#">Document 2.3</a> (Luther's Writings on the New Testament)  <b>Optional</b> (for additional context): <a href="#">Document 2.4</a> (Erasmus, "On the Freedom of the Will")
<b>DAY THREE</b> <i>The Radical and Counter Reformations</i>  <b>YOUTUBE:</b> <a href="#">Calvinism</a> <a href="#">Counter-Reformation</a>	<b>Kagan, 328-334, 337-339 OR Wood, 74-78, 80-82</b> (English Reformation)  <b>MAP QUIZ</b>  <a href="#">Document 2.6</a> (Acts of the Council of Trent) <a href="#">Document 2.7</a> (Spiritual Exercises of Ignatius Loyola) <b>PRINT</b>
<b>DAY FOUR</b> <i>The Tudors and the English Reformation</i>  <b>YOUTUBE:</b> English Reformation <a href="#">Part I</a> <a href="#">Part II</a>	<b>Kagan, 334-339, 362-368 OR Wood, 78-80, 82-88, 99-101</b>  <a href="#">Document 2.8</a> (Henry VIII, <i>Defense of the Seven Sacraments</i> ) <a href="#">Document 2.9</a> (Act of Supremacy) <a href="#">Document 2.10</a> (Knox, <i>First Blast of the Trumpet</i> ) <a href="#">Document 2.11</a> (Martyrdom of Thomas Cranmer) <a href="#">Document 2.12</a> (Elizabeth I, <i>Act Against Jesuits and Seminarists</i> )
<b>DAY FIVE</b> <i>Religious Wars</i>  <b>YOUTUBE:</b> <a href="#">French Wars of Religion</a> <a href="#">The Thirty Years' War</a>	<b>Kagan, 351-358, 369-376 OR Wood, 90-95, 102-106</b>  <a href="#">Document 2.13</a> (Edict of Nantes)
<b>ASSESSMENT</b>	<b>MULTIPLE CHOICE TEST</b> <b>DBQ</b>

# Johann Tetzel, Grace for Sale Through Indulgences

Source: <http://biblelight.net/tetzel.htm>

Document

2.1

**Source: Martin Luther, *Wider Hans Worst*, 1541. (WA 51, 538.)**

It happened in 1517 that a Dominican monk named Johann Tetzel, a braggart, caused a great stir. Maximilian once sentenced him to drowning in the River Inn - presumably because of his great virtue - but Duke Frederick rescued him in Innsbruck from the punishment of being drowned. Duke Frederick reminded him of this incident when he began to denounce us Wittenbergers. Actually, he admitted it quite openly. This same Tetzel now began to peddle indulgences. With might and main he sold grace for money as dearly or as cheaply as he could. At the time I was preacher here in the cloister and was filled as a new doctor with an ardent love for the scriptures.

When many people from Wittenberg ran after indulgences... I did not know - as surely as my Lord Christ has redeemed me - what indulgences were, but no one else knew either. I carefully began to preach that one could do something better and more certain than to purchase indulgences. On an earlier occasion I had already preached here in the castle against indulgences, but was not very graciously received by Duke Frederick, who was fond of his collegiate church. Now, to speak about the real cause for the 'Lutheran scandal', at first I let everything continue its course. Then it was reported to me, however, that Tetzel was preaching some cruel and terrible propositions, such as the following:

He had grace and power from the Pope to offer forgiveness even if someone had slept with the Holy Virgin Mother of God, as long as a contribution would be put into the coffer.

Furthermore, the red Cross of indulgences and the papal coat of arms on the flag of the churches was as powerful as the Cross of Christ.

Moreover, even if St. Peter were here now he would have no greater grace or power than he had.

Furthermore, he would not want to trade places in heaven with St. Peter, for he had redeemed more souls with his indulgences than Peter with his sermons.

Furthermore, if anyone put money into the coffer for a soul in purgatory, the soul would leave purgatory for heaven in the moment one could hear the penny hit the bottom.

Also the grace of indulgences is the grace by which man is reconciled with God.

Furthermore, it is not necessary to show remorse or sorrow or do penance for sins when purchasing indulgences or a letter of indulgence. He even sold indulgences for future sins. Such abominable things he did abundantly. He was merely interested in money...

---

**Source: *Luthers Schriften*, herausg. von Walch. XV, 446.**

After Tetzel had received a substantial amount of money at Leipzig, a nobleman asked him if it were possible to receive a letter of indulgence for a future sin. Tetzel quickly answered in the affirmative, insisting, however, that the payment had to be made at once. This the nobleman did, receiving thereupon letter and seal from Tetzel. When Tetzel left Leipzig the nobleman attacked him along the way, gave him a thorough beating, and sent him back empty-handed to Leipzig with the comment that this was the future sin which he had in mind. Duke George at first was quite furious about this incident, but when he heard the whole story he let it go without punishing the nobleman.

---

**Source: Friedrich Myconius, *Historia reformationis*, p. 14.**

At the time a Dominican monk named Johann Tetzel was the great mouthpiece, commissioner, and preacher of indulgences in Germany. His preaching raised enormous amounts of money which were sent to Rome. This was particularly the case in the new mining town St. Annaberg, where I, Friedrich Myconius, listened to him for over two years. The claims of this uneducated and shameful monk were unbelievable. Thus he said that even if someone had slept with Christ's dear Mother, the Pope had power in heaven and on earth to forgive as long as the money was put into the indulgences coffer. And if the Pope would forgive, God also had to forgive. He furthermore said if they would put money quickly into the coffer to obtain grace and indulgence, all the mountains near St. Annaberg would turn into pure silver. He claimed that in the very moment the coin rang in the coffer, the soul rose up to heaven. Such a marvellous thing was his indulgence. In sum and substance: God was no longer God, as he had bestowed all divine power to the Pope: "Tu es Petrus, tibi dabo claves, quodcunque." And then there were the masters of the Inquisition, who banished and burned those saying conflicting words.

---

**Source: The Text of a Sermon on Indulgences by Johann Tetzel**

What are you thinking about? Why do you hesitate to convert yourself? Why don't you have fears about your sins? Why don't you confess now to the vicars of our Most Holy Pope? Don't you have the example of Lawrence, who, compelled by the love of God, gave away his inheritance and suffered his body to be burned? Why do you not take the example of Bartholomew, Stephen, and of other saints who gladly suffered the most gruesome deaths for the sake and salvation of their souls? You, however, do not give up great treasures; indeed you give not even moderate alms. They gave their bodies to be martyred, but you delight in living well and joyfully. You priest, nobleman, merchant, wife, virgin, you married people, young person, old man, enter into your church which is for you, as I have said, St. Peter's, and visit the most holy Cross. It has been placed there for you, and it always cries and calls for you. Are you perhaps ashamed to visit the Cross with a candle and yet not ashamed to visit a tavern? Are you ashamed to go to the apostolic confessors, but not ashamed to go to a dance? Behold, you are on the raging sea of the world in storm and danger, not knowing if you will safely reach the harbor of salvation...

You should know that all who confess and in penance put alms into the coffer... will obtain complete remission of all their sins. If they visit, after confession and after the Jubilee, the Cross and the altar every day they will receive that indulgence which would be theirs upon visiting in St. Peter's the seven altars, where complete indulgence is offered. Why are you then standing there? Run for the salvation of your souls! Be as careful and concerned for the salvation of your souls as you are for your temporal goods, which you seek both day and night. Seek the Lord while he may be found and while he is near...

Don't you hear the voices of your wailing dead parents and others who say, 'Have mercy upon me, have mercy upon me, because we are in severe punishment and pain [in Purgatory]. From this you could redeem us with a small alms and yet you do not want to do so.' Open your ears as the father says to the son and the mother to the daughter . . . , 'We have created you, fed you, cared for you, and left you our temporal goods. Why then are you so cruel and harsh that you do not want to save us, though it only takes a little? You let us lie in flames so that we only slowly come to the promised glory.' You may have letters which let you have, once in life and in the hour of death . . . full remission of the punishment which belongs to sin. Oh, those of you with vows, you usurers, robbers, murderers, and criminals - Now is the time to hear the voice of God. He does not want the death of the sinner, but that he be converted and live...

**Source: W. Köhler, *Dokumente zum Ablassstreit*, pp. 125-26.**

---

The above are quoted from *The Reformation*, by Hans J. Hillerbrand, published by Harper & Row, publishers, Copyright 1964 by SCM Press Ltd and Harper and Row, Inc., Library of Congress catalog card number 64-15480, pp. 41-46.

# Martin Luther's Ninety- Five Theses (1517)

Document

2.2

**Source:** *Works of Martin Luther: Adolph Spaeth, L.D. Reed, Henry Eyster Jacobs, et Al., Trans. & Eds.(Philadelphia: A. J. Holman Company, 1915), Vol.1, pp. 29-38*

Out of love for the truth and the desire to bring it to light, the following propositions will be discussed at Wittenberg, under the presidency of the Reverend Father Martin Luther, Master of Arts and of Sacred Theology, and Lecturer in Ordinary on the same at that place. Wherefore he requests that those who are unable to be present and debate orally with us, may do so by letter.

In the Name our Lord Jesus Christ. Amen.

1. Our Lord and Master Jesus Christ... willed that the whole life of believers should be repentance.
2. This word cannot be understood to mean sacramental penance, i.e., confession and satisfaction, which is administered by the priests.
6. The pope cannot remit any guilt, except by declaring that it has been remitted by God and by assenting to God's remission...
7. God remits guilt to no one whom He does not, at the same time, humble in all things and bring into subjection to His vicar, the priest.
21. Therefore those preachers of indulgences are in error, who say that by the pope's indulgences a man is freed from every penalty, and saved;
27. They preach [human doctrines] who say that so soon as the penny jingles into the money-box, the soul flies out [of purgatory].
28. It is certain that when the penny jingles into the money-box, gain and avarice can be increased, but the result of the intercession of the Church is in the power of God alone.
30. No one is sure that his own contrition is sincere; much less that he has attained full remission.
31. Rare as is the man that is truly penitent, so rare is also the man who truly buys indulgences...
32. They will be condemned eternally, together with their teachers, who believe themselves sure of their salvation because they have letters of pardon.
33. Men must be on their guard against those who say that the pope's pardons are that inestimable gift of God by which man is reconciled to Him;
36. Every truly repentant Christian has a right to full remission of penalty and guilt, even without letters of pardon.
42. **Christians are to be taught** that the pope does not intend the buying of pardons to be compared in any way to works of mercy.
43. **Christians are to be taught** that he who gives to the poor or lends to the needy does a better work than buying pardons;
44. Because love grows by works of love, and man becomes better; but by pardons man does not grow better, only more free from penalty.
45. **Christians are to be taught** that he who sees a man in need, and passes him by, and gives [his money] for pardons, purchases not the indulgences of the pope, but the indignation of God.
46. **Christians are to be taught** that unless they have more than they need, they are bound to keep back what is necessary for their own families, and by no means to squander it on pardons.
48. **Christians are to be taught** that the pope, in granting pardons, needs, and therefore desires, their devout prayer for him more than the money they bring.

49. **Christians are to be taught** that the pope's pardons are useful, if they do not put their trust in them; but altogether harmful, if through them they lose their fear of God.
50. **Christians are to be taught** that if the pope knew the exactions of the pardon-preachers, he would rather that St. Peter's [Basilica] should go to ashes, than that it should be built up with the skin, flesh and bones of his sheep.
54. Injury is done the Word of God when, in the same sermon, an equal or a longer time is spent on pardons than on this Word.
55. It must be the intention of the pope that if pardons, which are a very small thing, are celebrated with one bell, with single processions and ceremonies, then the Gospel, which is the very greatest thing, should be preached with a hundred bells, a hundred processions, a hundred ceremonies.
62. The true treasure of the Church is the Most Holy Gospel of the glory and the grace of God.
75. To think the papal pardons so great that they could absolve a man even if he had committed an impossible sin and violated the Mother of God -- this is madness.
76. We say, on the contrary, that the papal pardons are not able to remove the very least of venial sins, so far as its guilt is concerned.
82. To wit: -- "Why does not the pope empty purgatory, for the sake of holy love and of the dire need of the souls that are there, if he redeems an infinite number of souls for the sake of miserable money with which to build a Church? The former reasons would be most just; the latter is most trivial."
86. Again: -- "Why does not the pope, whose wealth is today greater than the wealth of the richest Crassus<sup>1</sup>, build just this one church of St. Peter with his own money, rather than with the money of poor believers?"
92. Away, then, with all those prophets who say to the people of Christ, "Peace, peace," and there is no peace!
93. Blessed be all those prophets who say to the people of Christ, "Cross, cross," and there is no cross!
94. Christians are to be exhorted that they be diligent in following Christ, their Head, through penalties, deaths, and hell;
95. And thus be confident of entering into heaven rather through many tribulations, than through the assurance of peace.

### **Questions to Consider:**

1. What problems did Luther have with the sale of indulgences?
2. According to Luther, what must a Christian do in order for his or her sins to be remitted?
3. What suggestions did Luther make to the Church and the papacy?
4. What was Luther's purpose in writing this document? What did he seek to accomplish?
5. Pick one of these theses that you found to be especially thought-provoking. Be prepared to share it with the class, along with your reflections on it.

---

<sup>1</sup> Marcus Licinius Crassus was the richest man in Rome in the first century B.C. His name is synonymous with wealth.



# Writings of Martin Luther

Document

2.3

## From Martin Luther's Preface to the New Testament

Source: <http://www.scrollpublishing.com/store/Luther-New-Testament.html>

"From all this you can now judge all the books and decide among them which are the best. John's Gospel and St. Paul's Epistles, especially that to the Romans, and St. Peter's first Epistle are the true kernel and marrow of all the books. They ought rightly be the first books and it would be advisable for every Christian to read them first and most. ...John's Gospel is the one, tender, true chief Gospel, far, far to be preferred to the other three and placed high above them. So, too, the Epistles of St. Paul and St. Peter far surpass the other three Gospels—Matthew, Mark, and Luke.

"In a word, St. John's Gospel and his first Epistle, St. Paul's Epistles—especially Romans, Galatians, and Ephesians—and St. Peter's first Epistle are the books that show you Christ and teach you all that it is necessary and good for you to know—even though you were never to see or hear any other book or doctrine. Therefore St. James' Epistle is really an epistle of straw, compared to them. For it has nothing of the nature of the Gospel about it."

## Luther's Treatment of the 'Disputed Books' of the New Testament

Source: <http://www.bible-researcher.com/antilegomena.html>

Explanatory notes, such as an introduction and footnotes to the material below, are available by following the above link.

The English translation and notes are derived from the American edition of Luther's Works, vol 35 (St. Louis: Concordia, 1963), pp. 395-399.

## Preface to the Epistles of St. James and St. Jude (1522)

Though this epistle of St. James was rejected by the ancients, I praise it and consider it a good book, because it sets up no doctrines of men but vigorously promulgates the law of God. However, to state my own opinion about it, though without prejudice to anyone, I do not regard it as the writing of an apostle; and my reasons follow.

In the first place it is flatly against St. Paul and all the rest of Scripture in ascribing justification to works. It says that Abraham was justified by his works when he offered his son Isaac; though in Romans 4 St. Paul teaches to the contrary that Abraham was justified apart from works, by his faith alone, before he had offered his son, and proves it by Moses in Genesis 15. Now although this epistle might be helped and an interpretation devised for this justification by works, it cannot be defended in its application to works of Moses' statement in Genesis 15. For Moses is speaking here only of Abraham's faith, and not of his works, as St. Paul demonstrates in Romans 4. This fault, therefore, proves that this epistle is not the work of any apostle.

In the second place its purpose is to teach Christians, but in all this long teaching it does not once mention the Passion, the resurrection, or the Spirit of Christ. He names Christ several times; however he teaches nothing about him, but only speaks of general faith in God. Now it is the office of a true apostle to preach of the Passion and resurrection and office of Christ, and to lay the foundation for faith in him, as Christ himself says in John 15, "You shall bear witness to me." All the genuine sacred books agree in this, that all of them preach and inculcate [treiben] Christ. And that is the true test by which to judge all books, when we see whether or not they inculcate Christ. For all the Scriptures show us Christ, Romans 3; and St. Paul will know nothing but Christ, I Corinthians 2. Whatever does not teach Christ is not apostolic, even though St. Peter or St. Paul does the teaching. Again, whatever preaches Christ would be apostolic, even if Judas, Annas, Pilate, and Herod were doing it.



But this James does nothing more than drive to the law and to its works. Besides, he throws things together so chaotically that it seems to me he must have been some good, pious man, who took a few sayings from the disciples of the apostles and thus tossed them off on paper. Or it may perhaps have been written by someone on the basis of his preaching. He calls the law a "law of liberty," though Paul calls it a law of slavery, of wrath, of death, and of sin.

Moreover he cites the sayings of St. Peter: "Love covers a multitude of sins," and again, "Humble yourselves under the hand of God;" also the saying of St. Paul in Galatians, "The Spirit lusteth against envy." And yet, in point of time, St. James was put to death by Herod in Jerusalem, before St. Peter. So it seems that this author came long after St. Peter and St. Paul.

In a word, he wanted to guard against those who relied on faith without works, but was unequal to the task in spirit, thought, and words. He mangles the Scriptures and thereby opposes Paul and all Scripture. He tries to accomplish by harping on the law what the apostles accomplish by stimulating people to love. Therefore, I will not have him in my Bible to be numbered among the true chief books, though I would not thereby prevent anyone from including or extolling him as he pleases, for there are otherwise many good sayings in him. One man is no man in worldly things; how, then, should this single man alone avail against Paul and all the rest of Scripture?

Concerning the epistle of St. Jude, no one can deny that it is an extract or copy of St. Peter's second epistle, so very like it are all the words. He also speaks of the apostles like a disciple who comes long after them and cites sayings and incidents that are found nowhere else in the Scriptures. This moved the ancient fathers to exclude this epistle from the main body of the Scriptures. Moreover the Apostle Jude did not go to Greek-speaking lands, but to Persia, as it is said, so that he did not write Greek. Therefore, although I value this book, it is an epistle that need not be counted among the chief books which are supposed to lay the foundations of faith.

## **Preface to the Revelation of St. John (1522) <sup>7</sup>**

About this book of the Revelation of John, I leave everyone free to hold his own opinions. I would not have anyone bound to my opinion or judgment. I say what I feel. I miss more than one thing in this book, and it makes me consider it to be neither apostolic nor prophetic.

First and foremost, the apostles do not deal with visions, but prophesy in clear and plain words, as do Peter and Paul, and Christ in the gospel. For it befits the apostolic office to speak clearly of Christ and his deeds, without images and visions. Moreover there is no prophet in the Old Testament, to say nothing of the New, who deals so exclusively with visions and images. For myself, I think it approximates the Fourth Book of Esdras; <sup>8</sup> I can in no way detect that the Holy Spirit produced it.

Moreover he seems to me to be going much too far when he commends his own book so highly -- indeed, more than any of the other sacred books do, though they are much more important -- and threatens that if anyone takes away anything from it, God will take away from him, etc. Again, they are supposed to be blessed who keep what is written in this book; and yet no one knows what that is, to say nothing of keeping it. This is just the same as if we did not have the book at all. And there are many far better books available for us to keep.

Many of the fathers also rejected this book a long time ago; <sup>9</sup> although St. Jerome, to be sure, refers to it in exalted terms and says that it is above all praise and that there are as many mysteries in it as words. Still, Jerome cannot prove this at all, and his praise at numerous places is too generous.

Finally, let everyone think of it as his own spirit leads him. My spirit cannot accommodate itself to this book. For me this is reason enough not to think highly of it: Christ is neither taught nor known in it. But to teach Christ, this is the thing which an apostle is bound above all else to do; as Christ says in Acts 1, "You shall be my witnesses." Therefore I stick to the books which present Christ to me clearly and purely.

# AP EUROPEAN HISTORY

## MAP 2.1 THE PROTESTANT REFORMATION



**Shade in each area according to the predominant religion:**

Roman Catholic, Lutheran, Calvinist, Church of England (Anglican), Eastern Orthodox, Muslim  
*Also note centers of "radical sects," such as Huguenots and Anabaptists (use letters or symbols).*

You will be held accountable for knowing the dominant religious faction in the following regions:

England	Scotland	Ireland	Iceland	The Netherlands	Norway
Sweden	Holy Roman Empire	France	Spain	Ottoman Empire	Portugal
Papal States	Austrian Empire	Russia	Poland		

**The following maps should help you in the construction of your map:**

<http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/mod/map16rel.gif>  
[http://go.hrw.com/venus\\_images/0317MC14.gif](http://go.hrw.com/venus_images/0317MC14.gif)

# Document 2.4

## From Erasmus, “On the Freedom of the Will”

Source: [http://wadsworth.com/history\\_d/special\\_features/ilrn\\_legacy/wawc1c01c/content/wciv1/readings/lutheras.html](http://wadsworth.com/history_d/special_features/ilrn_legacy/wawc1c01c/content/wciv1/readings/lutheras.html)

*In 1524 and 1525, seven years after Martin Luther began the Reformation, Erasmus of Rotterdam (1466–1536) and Luther held a “debate” in print entitled *On Free Will and Salvation*. Erasmus initiated this exchange in the form of an open letter in early 1524, and Luther replied in 1525. Erasmus, despite his own criticisms of the excesses and corruption of many Roman Catholic clergymen, felt that the Church was absolutely necessary. Humanity required guidance to avoid sin, Erasmus reasoned, and the best guidance was the accumulated wisdom of the ages, as embodied in the teachings of the Church.*

*For Erasmus, any reform of the Church had to begin by examining its role in shaping individual morality. He felt this depended on the individual Christian’s acceptance of free will (the notion that humans are free to choose their actions without divine coercion or predestination). In **On the Freedom of the Will**, Erasmus argues that the Bible can be obscure, ambiguous, and seemingly contradictory on the question of free will, but that on the whole the Bible and Church tradition favor free will.*

*Luther, conversely, felt that the nature of each individual was largely predetermined in the mind and plan of God, and that the Church was only a teacher or guide, not a true mold of man’s nature. In his response of 1525, **The Bondage of the Will**, Luther does more than argue for predestination. He also strongly asserts the clarity and sufficiency of the Bible (without commentary or church doctrine) on this issue and on all other essential points of faith.*

### On the Freedom of the Will

A Diatribe or Discourse

by Desiderius Erasmus of Rotterdam

#### **Erasmus Acknowledges His Limitations and States His Point of View**

In the Name of Jesus.

Among the difficulties, of which not a few crop up in Holy Scripture, there is hardly a more tangled labyrinth than that of “free choice,” for it is a subject that has long exercised the minds of philosophers, and also of theologians old and new, in a striking degree, though in my opinion [their efforts have produced] more labor than fruit.

More recently, however, it has been revived by Carlstadt and Eck, in a fairly moderate debate, and now it has been more violently stirred up by Martin Luther, who has put out an *Assertion* about “free choice” and although he has already been answered by more than one writer, it seemed good to my friends that I should try my hand and see whether, as a result of our little set-to, the truth might be made more plain.

Here I know there will be those who will forthwith stop their ears, crying out, “The rivers run backward” — dare Erasmus attack Luther, like the fly the elephant? To appease them, if I may be allowed to ask for a little quiet, I need say no more by way of preface than what is the fact, that I have never sworn allegiance to the words of Luther. So that it should not seem unbecoming to anybody if at any point I differ publicly from him, as a man surely may differ from another man, nor should it seem a criminal offense to call in question any doctrine of his, still less if one engages in a temperate disputation with him for the purpose of eliciting truth.

Certainly I do not consider Luther himself would be indignant if anybody should find occasion to differ from him, since he permits himself to call in question the decrees, not only of all the doctors of the Church, but of all the schools, councils, and popes; and since he acknowledges this plainly and openly, it ought not to be counted by his friends as cheating if I take a leaf out of his book....

### ***His Dislike of Assertions***

... I see some people endowed who are so uncontrollably attached to their own opinion that they cannot bear anything which dissents from it; but they twist whatever they read in the Scriptures into an assertion of an opinion which they have embraced once for all. They are like young men who love a girl so immoderately that they imagine they see their beloved wherever they turn...

As far as I am concerned, I admit that many different views about free choice have been handed down from the ancients about which I have, as yet, no fixed conviction, except that I think there to be a certain power of free choice. For I have read the *Assertion* of Martin Luther, and read it without prejudice... And yet, although he expounds his case in all its aspects with great ingenuity and fervor of spirit, I must say, quite frankly, that he has not persuaded me....

### ***The Obscurity of Scripture***

For there are some secret places in the Holy Scriptures into which God has not wished us to penetrate more deeply and, if we try to do so, then the deeper we go, the darker and darker it becomes, by which means we are led to acknowledge the unsearchable majesty of the divine wisdom, and the weakness of the human mind....

Therefore, in my judgment on this matter of free choice, having learned what is needful to know about this, if we are in the path of true religion, let us go on swiftly to better things, forgetful of the things which are behind, or if we are entangled in sins, let us strive with all our might and have recourse to the remedy of penitence that by all means we may entreat the mercy of the Lord without which no human will or endeavor is effective; and what is evil in us, let us impute to ourselves, and what is good, let us ascribe wholly to divine benevolence, to which we owe salvation, and that no harm can come to us from a God who is by nature just, even if some things happen that seem to us amiss, for none ought to despair of the pardon of a God who is by nature most merciful. This, I say, was in my judgment sufficient for Christian godliness, nor should we through irreverent inquisitiveness rush into those things which are hidden, not to say superfluous... How many questions, or rather squabbles, have arisen over the distinction of persons, the mode of generation, the distinction between filiation and procession; what a fuss has been raised in the world by the wrangle about the conception of the virgin as Theotokos! I ask what profit has there been so far from these laborious inquiries, except that with the loss of harmony we love one another the less, while seeking to be wiser than we need....

### ***The Dangers Inherent in Luther's Teachings***

...For the most part, men are by nature dull-witted and sensual, prone to unbelief, inclined to evil, with a bent to blasphemy, so that there is no need to add fuel to the furnace. And so Paul, as a wise dispenser of the Divine Word, often brings clarity to bear, and prefers to follow that which is fitting for one's neighbors rather than the letter of the law: and possesses a wisdom that he speaks among the perfect, but amongst the weak he reckons to know nothing, save Jesus Christ, and him crucified. Holy Scripture has its own language, adapted to our understanding. There God is angry, grieves, is indignant, rages, threatens, hates, and again has mercy, repents, changes his mind, not that such changes take place in the nature of God, but that to speak thus is suited to our infirmity and slowness. The same prudence I consider befits those who undertake the task of interpreting the Divine Word. Some things for this reason are harmful because they are not expedient, as wine for a fevered patient. Similarly, such matters might allowably have been treated in discussion by the learned world, or even in the theological schools, although I should not think even this to be expedient save the restraint; on the other hand, to debate such fables before the gaze of a mixed multitude seems to me to be not merely useless but even pernicious.

I should, therefore, prefer men to be persuaded not to waste their time and talents in the labyrinths of this kind, but to refute or to affirm the views of Luther...

## INTRODUCTION TO THE DISPUTATION

### *Luther is Opposed Not Only by Scripture but Also by Weighty Authority of the Church Fathers*

Now, since Luther does not acknowledge the authority of any writer, of however distinguished a reputation, but only listens to the canonical Scriptures, how gladly do I welcome this abridgment of labor, for innumerable Greek and Latin writers treat of free choice, either as a theme or incidentally, so that it would be a great labor to collect out of them what each one has to say either for or against free choice, and to explain the several meanings of each individual opinion, or to resolve or approve their arguments — a tedious and long-winded affair, and as regards Luther and his friends, quite useless, especially as they not only disagree among themselves, but often contradict their own doctrine.

Yet in the meantime let the reader be admonished that if we shall seem to give equal weight with Luther to the testimonies and solid arguments of Holy Scripture, he should also bear constantly in mind so numerous a body of most learned men who have found approval in so many centuries down to our own day, whom not only their skill in divine studies but also godliness of life commend. For some of them gave testimony with their blood to that doctrine of Christ which they defend with their writings; such among the Greeks were Origen, Basil, Chrysostom, Cyril, John of Damascus, Theophylact; among the Latin Fathers, Tertullian, Cyprian, Arnobius, Hilary, Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, to say nothing meanwhile of Thomas, Scotus, Durandus, Capreolus, Gabriel, Aegidius, Gregory, Alexander, the skill and force of whose dialectic, in my opinion, no one can afford to despise, not to mention the authority of so many universities, councils, and supreme pontiffs.

**From the time of the apostles down to the present day, no writer has yet emerged who has totally taken away the power of freedom of choice, save only [Manichaeus](#) and [John Wyclif](#).** For the authority of [Laurentius Valla](#), who comes nearest to agreement with them, has not much weight among theologians. The doctrine of Manichaeus, indeed, though it has long been exploded and repudiated by common consent of the whole world, yet I am inclined to think less useless to piety than that of Wyclif. For Manichaeus ascribes good and bad works to two natures in man in such a way that we owe good works to God in consequence of our condition, and yet against the power of darkness he leaves cause for imploring the aid of the Creator, that with this aid we may sin more lightly, and more easily do good works. Wyclif, however, ascribes all things to sheer necessity, and what room does he leave either for our prayers or for our endeavors?

So to return to my first theme, if the reader shall see that my own argument meets the other side with equal weapons, then let him also consider whether more weight ought not to be ascribed to the previous judgments of so many learned men... so many saints... martyrs... theologians... universities, councils... bishops and popes — or to trust instead the private judgment of this or that individual.

**...I confess that it is right that the sole authority of Holy Scripture should outweigh all the votes of all mortal men. But the authority of the Scripture is not here in dispute.** The same Scriptures are acknowledged and venerated by either side. **Our battle is about the meaning of Scripture....**

### *How Can Inspiration and Authority Be Tested?*

**Moreover, if we grant that he who has the Spirit is sure of the meaning of the Scriptures, how can I be certain of what he finds to be true for himself? What am I to do when many bring diverse interpretations, about which each swears he has the Holy Spirit?** And since the Spirit does not furnish the whole truth to anyone, even he who has the Spirit may be mistaken or deceived in some single point. So much for those who so easily reject the interpretation of the Fathers in Holy Scripture and oppose their views to ours as if delivered by an oracle. **Finally, even supposing that the Spirit of Christ could have allowed his people to err in trivial matters on which the salvation of men does not greatly depend, how can it be believed that for more than thirteen hundred years he would have concealed the error in his Church and not have found anybody among so many saintly men worthy to be inspired with the knowledge of what these people claim to be the chief doctrine of the whole gospel?**

Truly — to conclude this argument — what such people choose to claim for themselves is their own affair. I claim for myself neither learning nor holiness, nor do I trust in my own spirit. I shall merely put forward with simple diligence those considerations which move my mind. If anybody shall try to teach me better, I will not knowingly withstand the truth...

## **PART I. SCRIPTURE PASSAGES THAT SUPPORT FREE CHOICE**

I have completed half of this book, in which, if I do but persuade the reader that it would be better not to contend too superstitiously about things of this kind, particularly before the multitude, there is no need for the kind of argument for which I now gird myself, in the hope that truth may everywhere prevail, by comparison of Scriptures, as fire comes from striking flint.

### ***Definition of Free Choice and Discussion of Ecclesiasticus 15:14-17***

In the first place, it cannot be denied that there are many places in the Holy Scriptures which seem to set forth free choice. On the other hand, others seem to take it wholly away. Yet it is clear that Scripture cannot be in conflict with itself, since the whole proceeds from the same Spirit. First, then, we shall survey those passages which confirm our position; then we shall try to resolve those which seem to make for the opposite point of view. **By free choice in this place we mean a power of the human will by which a man can apply himself to the things which lead to eternal salvation, or turn away from them.**

Among the texts that support free choice, priority is usually given to a passage in the book called Ecclesiasticus, or the Wisdom of Sirach, ch. 15(:14-17):

“God made man from the beginning, and left him in the hand of his own counsel.  
He added his commandments and precepts. If thou wilt observe the commandments, and keep acceptable fidelity forever, they shall preserve thee.  
He hath set water and fire before thee; stretch forth thine hand for which thou wilt.  
Before man is life and death, good and evil; that which he shall choose shall be given him.”

**I do not think anyone will object against the authority of this work that, as Jerome points out, it was not formerly received into the canon of the Hebrews, since the Church of Christ has received it into its canon with common consent, nor do I see any reason why the Hebrews should have thought fit to exclude this from their canon when they accept The Proverbs of Solomon and The Song of Songs...** This passage, therefore, declares that Adam, the head of our race, was so created as to have an uncorrupted reason which could discern what should be sought and what avoided. But there was added will, also incorrupt but nevertheless free so that it could turn itself from good and incline toward evil. In the same state were the angels created before Lucifer and his companions renounced their Creator. In those who fell, the will was so thoroughly perverted that they could not return to better things, while in those who remained faithful, their will was so established in good that it could not henceforth turn aside into iniquity.

### ***Man Before and After the Fall: The Forgiveness of Sins Restores Freedom of Choice Through Grace***

In man the will was so upright and free that, apart from new grace, he could continue in innocence but, apart from the help of new grace, he could not attain the happiness of eternal life which the Lord Jesus promised to his followers. And although all these things cannot be proved by the plain witness of the Scriptures, yet they have been most convincingly argued in the orthodox Fathers. **In the case of Eve, however, not only does the will seem to have been corrupt, but the reason also or intellect, the source of all good and evil, for the serpent seems to have persuaded her that the threats were vain with which the Lord had forbidden them to touch the Tree of Life.**

**In Adam, the will seems rather to have corrupted by immoderate love toward his spouse, whose desire he preferred to satisfy rather than the commandment of God.** Nevertheless, I think that in this his reason, from which the will is born, was also corrupted. **This power of the soul with which we judge... is obscured by sin, but not altogether extinguished...**

But, by the grace of God, when sin has been forgiven, the will is made free to the extent that, according to the views of the Pelagians, even apart from the help of new grace it could attain eternal

life, so that just as it could do homage for salvation received to God who created and restored free will, according to the orthodox, so it is possible for man, with the help of divine grace (which always accompanies human effort), to continue in the right, yet not without a tendency to sin, owing to the vestiges of original sin in him. Thus, as the sin of our progenitors has passed into their descendants, so the tendency to sin has passed to all, though grace by abolishing sin so far mitigates it that it may be overcome, but not rooted out. Not that grace is incapable of destroying it altogether, but that it was not expedient for us.

### ***Different Kinds of Grace, and Three Views of Its Relation to Free Choice***

What, then, is free choice worth in us after sin and before grace? About this point ancient and modern writers differ amazingly, as each is concerned with a different aspect of the problem. Those who would avoid despair and complacency, but who would inspire men to hope and endeavor, attributed more to free choice. [Pelagius](#) taught that once the human will was freed and healed by grace there was no need of new grace, but that with the help of free will a man might attain to eternal salvation, but that man owed his salvation to God, without whose grace the will of man was not effectively free to do good. And this very power of the soul, with which a man embraces good when he knows it, and turns away from its opposite, is a gift of the Creator who might have made him a frog instead of a man....

On the other hand, those who, at the other extreme from Pelagius, attribute most of all to grace and practically nothing to free choice, yet do not entirely remove it, for they deny that man can will the good without peculiar grace, they deny that he can make a beginning, they deny that he can progress, they deny he can reach his goal without the principal and perpetual aid of divine grace. Their view seems probably enough in that it leaves man to study and strive, but it does not leave aught for him to ascribe to his own powers. But harder is the opinion of those who contend that free choice is of no avail save to sin, and that grace alone accomplishes good works in us... so that our will does nothing more than wax in the hand of the craftsman when it receives the particular shape that pleases him. These seem to me so anxious to avoid all reliance on human merit that they pass *praeter casam* [i.e., they go too far], as we say. Hardest of all seems the view of all those who say that free choice is a mere empty name, nor does it avail either in the case of the angels or in Adam or in us, either before or after grace, but it is God who works evil as well as good in us, and all things that happen come about by sheer necessity...



# Document 2.6

## Acts of the Council of Trent (1563)

World Civilizations Resource Center: <http://college.cengage.com/history/world/resources/students/primary/trent.htm>

### Introduction

*As the Protestant challenge to Catholicism progressed successfully into the 1540s, calls for a general council to address the question of church reform and to develop strategies to meet the Protestant threat grew louder, especially from Emperor Charles V (r. 1519-1556). Under duress, Pope Paul III (r. 1534-1549) opened the first session of the Council of Trent in 1545. Paul recognized the need for reform but resented imperial pressure to call for a council that might rival papal authority within the church. The Council of Trent met sporadically over the next three decades in three sessions (1545-1547, 1551-1552, 1562-1563) broken up by political infighting, papal deaths, and outbreaks of plague. If disjointed, the council nevertheless resulted in a spectacular resurgence for Catholicism and, with the parallel development of the Jesuit order, capped a period of retrenchment and renewal known as the Catholic Reformation. At Trent, Catholic leaders rejected all attempts to compromise with Protestantism and retained the basic positions of the Roman Church, including the Latin Mass, the veneration of saints, the cult of the Virgin Mary, and the notion that salvation required both faith and good works. **They defended Catholic theology and emphasized reforms, ordering an end to abuses of power and corruption within the clergy and establishing seminaries to educate priests.** Finally, the council came out strongly in support of papal power, strengthening the authority of the papacy. **In short, the Catholic Reformation, and especially the Council of Trent, stopped the momentum of the Protestant Reformation and set the stage for an escalation of religious warfare throughout Europe. Catholics began to regain large parts of the continent, and by 1650 at least half of all Protestants had reconverted.***

### DEFENSE OF THE CATHOLIC FAITH

The universal Church has always understood that the complete confession of sins was instituted by the Lord, and is of divine right necessary for all who have fallen into sin after baptism; because our Lord Jesus Christ, when about to ascend from earth to heaven, left **priests**, his own **vicars**, as **leaders** and **judges**, before whom all the mortal offenses into which the faithful of Christ may have fallen should be carried, in order that, in accordance with the power of the keys, they may pronounce the sentence of forgiveness or of retention of sins. For it is manifest that priests could not have exercised this judgment without knowledge of the case....

**This holy Council enjoins on all bishops and others who are charged with teaching, that they instruct the faithful diligently** concerning the intercession and invocation of saints, the honor paid to relics, and the legitimate use of images. Let them teach that the saints, who reign together with Christ, offer up their own prayers to God for men; that it is good and useful suppliantly to invoke them, and to have recourse to their prayers and aid in obtaining benefits from God, through his Son, Jesus Christ our Lord, who is our sole Redeemer and Saviour....

If any one saith that the New Testament does not provide for **a distinct, visible priesthood**; or that this priesthood has not any power of consecrating and offering up the true body and blood of the Lord, and of forgiving and retaining sins, but is only an office and bare ministry of preaching the gospel; or that those who do not preach are not priests at all; **let him be anathema**....

If any one saith that in the Catholic Church there is not a hierarchy instituted by divine ordination, consisting of bishops, priests, and ministers; **let him be anathema**.

If any one saith that the **sacraments** of the new law were not all instituted by Jesus Christ, our Lord; or that they are more or less than seven, to wit, baptism, confirmation, the eucharist, penance, extreme unction, orders, and matrimony; or even that any one of these seven is not truly and properly a sacrament; **let him be anathema**....

## **ADVOCACY OF CHURCH REFORM**

Such instruction shall be given in accordance with the form which will be prescribed for each of the sacraments by this holy Council in a [catechism](#), which the bishops shall take care to have faithfully translated into the vulgar tongue, and to have expounded to the people by all parish priests. They shall also explain in the said vulgar tongue, during the solemnization of mass, or the celebration of the divine offices, on all festivals or solemnities, the sacred oracles and the maxims of salvation....

It is to be desired that those who undertake the office of bishop should understand what their portion is, and comprehend that they are called, not to their own convenience, not to riches or luxury, but to labors and cares, for the glory of God. For it is not to be doubted that the rest of the faithful also will be more easily excited to religion and innocence if they shall see those who are set over them not fixing their thoughts on the things of this world, but on the salvation of souls and on their heavenly country...

This Council not only orders that bishops be content with modest furniture, and a frugal table and diet, but that they also give heed that in the rest of their manner of living, and in their whole house, there be nothing seen which is alien to this holy institution, and which does not manifest simplicity, zeal toward God, and a contempt of vanities.

It strictly forbids them, moreover, to strive to enrich their own kindred or domestics out of the revenues of the Church; seeing that even the canons of the apostles forbid them to give to their kindred the property of the Church, which belongs to God....

**Source:** Acts of the Council of Trent, in James Harvey Robinson, ed., Readings in European History, (Boston: Ginn, 1904), 2:156-161.

## **Questions to Consider**

1. In what ways do these decrees illustrate the desire for reform within the Catholic Church? In what ways do they illustrate a desire for continuity?
2. How did the acts in this document put the Catholic Church in a better position to combat Protestantism?

# From the Spiritual Exercises of Ignatius Loyola

Medieval Sourcebook (Fordham University): <http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/source/loyola-spirex.asp>

Document

2.7

*Many of the opinions of Ignatius Loyola, founder of the Jesuit Order, are in this document setting out rules for the order and for the Christian life. Note, as you read, what issues brought up by the Protestant Reformation he is protesting or countering.*

## TO HAVE THE TRUE SENTIMENT WHICH WE OUGHT TO HAVE IN THE CHURCH MILITANT

### Let the following Rules be observed:

**FIRST RULE:** All judgment laid aside, we ought to have our mind ready and prompt to obey, in all, the true Spouse of Christ our Lord, which is our holy Mother the Church Hierarchical.

**SECOND RULE:** To praise confession to a Priest, and the reception of the most Holy Sacrament of the Altar once in the year, and much more each month, and much better from week to week, with the conditions required and due....

**FOURTH RULE:** To praise much Religious Orders, virginity and continence, and not so much marriage as any of these.

**FIFTH RULE:** To praise vows of Religion, of obedience, of poverty, of chastity and of other perfections...

**SIXTH RULE:** To praise relics of the Saints, giving veneration to them and praying to the Saints; and to praise Stations, pilgrimages, Indulgences, pardons, Crusades, and candles lighted in the churches....

**EIGHTH RULE:** To praise the ornaments and the buildings of churches; likewise images, and to venerate them according to what they represent.

**NINTH RULE:** Finally, to praise all precepts of the Church, keeping the mind prompt to find reasons in their defense and in no manner against them.

**TENTH RULE:** We ought to be more prompt to find good and praise... the ways of our Superiors....

**THIRTEENTH RULE:** To be right in everything, we ought always to hold that the white which I see, is black, if the Hierarchical Church so decides it, believing that between Christ our Lord, the Bridegroom, and the Church, His Bride, there is the same Spirit which governs and directs us for the salvation of our souls. Because by the same Spirit and our Lord Who gave the ten Commandments, our holy Mother the Church is directed and governed.

**FOURTEENTH RULE:** Although there is much truth in the assertion that no one can save himself without being predestined and without having faith and grace; we must be very cautious in the manner of speaking and communicating with others about all these things.

**FIFTEENTH RULE:** We ought not, by way of custom, to speak much of predestination; but if in some way and at some times one speaks, let him so speak that the common people may not come into any error....

**SIXTEENTH RULE:** In the same way, we must be on our guard that by talking much and with much insistence of faith, without any distinction and explanation, occasion be not given to the people to be lazy and slothful in works, whether before faith is formed in charity or after.

**SEVENTEENTH RULE:** Likewise, we ought not to speak so much with insistence on grace that the poison of discarding liberty be engendered. So that of faith and grace one can speak as much as is possible with the Divine help for the greater praise of His Divine Majesty, but not in such way, nor in such manners, especially in our so dangerous times, that works and free will receive any harm, or be held for nothing.

**EIGHTEENTH RULE:** Although serving God our Lord much out of pure love is to be esteemed above all; we ought to praise much the fear of His Divine Majesty, because not only filial fear is a thing pious and most holy, but even servile fear -- when the man reaches nothing else better or more useful -- helps much to get out of mortal sin. And when he is out, he easily comes to filial fear, which is all acceptable and grateful to God our Lord: as being at one with the Divine Love.

# Document 2.8

## From Henry VIII, *Defense of the Seven Sacraments*<sup>2</sup> (1521)

### Conclusion

We have in this little book, gentle reader, clearly demonstrated, I hope, how absurdly and impiously Luther has handled the holy sacraments. For though we have not touched all things contained in his book, yet so far as was necessary to defend the sacraments (which was our only design), I suppose I have treated, though not so sufficiently as might have been done, yet more than is even necessary. . . .

But that others may understand how false and wicked his doctrine is, lest they might be so far deceived as to have a good opinion of him, I doubt not but in all parts there are very learned men . . . who have much more clearly discovered the same, than can be shown by me. And if there be any who desire to know this strange work of his, I think I have sufficiently made it apparent to them. For seeing by what has been said, it is evident to all men what sacrilegious opinions he has of the sacrament of our Lord's Body, from which the sanctity of all the other sacraments flow: who would have doubted, if I had said nothing else, how unworthily, without scruple, he treats all the rest of the sacraments? Which, as you have seen, he has handled in such sort that he abolishes and destroys them all, except Baptism alone. . . .

What everybody believes, he alone by his vain reason laughs at, denouncing himself to admit nothing but clear and evident Scriptures. And these, too, if alleged by any against him, he either evades by some private exposition of his own, or else denies them to belong to their own authors.<sup>3</sup> None of the Doctors are so ancient, none so holy, none of so great authority in treating of Holy Writ, but this new doctor, this little saint, this man of learning, rejects with great authority.

Seeing, therefore, he despiseth all men and believes none, he ought not to take it ill if everybody discredit him again. I am so far from holding any further dispute with him that I almost repent myself of what I have already argued against him. For what avails it to dispute against one who disagrees with everyone, even with himself? Who affirms in one place what he denies in another, denying what he presently affirms? Who, if you object faith, combats by reason; if you touch him with reason, pretends faith? If you allege philosophers, he flies to Scripture; if you propound Scripture, he trifles with sophistry. Who is ashamed of nothing, fears none, and thinks himself under no law. Who contemns the ancient Doctors of the church, and derides the new ones in the highest degree; loads with reproaches the Chief Bishop of the church. Finally, he so undervalues customs, doctrine, manners, laws, decrees and faith of the church (yea, the whole church itself) that he almost denies there is any such thing as a church, except perhaps such a one as himself makes up of two or three heretics, of whom himself is chief. . . .

### QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER:

1. On what grounds has Henry VIII disputed Martin Luther?
2. How would you describe Henry VIII's general opinion of Martin Luther as a person?

---

<sup>2</sup> Luther reduced the Seven Sacraments of the Catholic Church to three (Baptism, Penance, and the Eucharist)

<sup>3</sup> Luther questioned the apostolic authorship of the Epistle of James, which, conveniently for Luther, emphasized the importance of good works for the attainment of salvation. For further reading, see Luther's [Preface to the New Testament](#) and [Preface to the Epistles of St. James and St. Jude](#)

## Document 2.9

### From *The Act of Supremacy* (1534)

Albeit the king's majesty firstly and rightfully is and ought to be the supreme head of the Church of England, and so is recognized by the clergy of this realm in their Convocations. . . be it enacted by authority of this present Parliament, that the king our sovereign lord, his heirs and successors, kings of this realm, shall be taken, accepted, and reputed the only supreme head in earth of the Church of England. . . and shall have and enjoy, annexed and united to the imperial crown of this realm, as well the title and style thereof, as all honors, dignities, pre-eminences, jurisdictions, privileges, authorities, immunities, profits, and commodities to the said dignity of supreme head of the same Church. . . and that our said sovereign lord, his heirs and successors, kings of this realm, shall have full power and authority from time to time to visit, repress, redress, reform, order, correct, restrain, and amend all such errors, heresies, abuses, offenses, contempts, and enormities, whatsoever they be...to the pleasure of Almighty God, the increase of virtue in Christ's religion, and for the conservation of the peace, unity, and tranquility of this realm....

#### QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER:

What was established by this Act? By whose authority was it established?

Did Henry VIII still hold the same opinion about the Catholic Church as he had thirteen years before?

What events precipitated this Act? [Your textbook would be a big help, here]

## Document 2.10

### From John Knox,

#### *The First Blast of the Trumpet Against the Monstrous Regiment of Women*<sup>4</sup> (1558)

I fear not to say, that the day of vengeance, which shall apprehend that horrible monster Jezebel of England, and such as maintain her monstrous cruelty, is already appointed in the counsel of the eternal. And I verily believe that it is so nigh, that she shall not reign so long in tyranny as hitherto she has done,<sup>5</sup> when God shall declare himself to be her enemy, when he shall pour forth contempt upon her according to her cruelty, and shall kindle the hearts of such as sometimes did favour her with deadly hatred against her, that they may execute his judgments. And therefore, let such as assist her take heed what they do; for assuredly her empire and reign is a wall without foundation.<sup>6</sup> I mean the same of the authority of all women. It has been underpropped this blind time that is past, with the foolishness of people, and with the wicked laws of ignorant and tyrannical princes. But the fire of God's word is already laid to those rotten props (I include the pope's law with the rest), and presently they burn, albeit we espy not the flame. When they are consumed (as shortly they will be, for stubble and dry timber cannot endure the fire), that rotten wall, the usurped and unjust empire of women, shall fall by itself in despite of all men, to the destruction of so many as shall labour to uphold it. And therefore let all men be advertised, for the trumpet has once blown.

Praise God, ye that fear him (Ps. 22:23).

#### QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER:

What events caused John Knox to write this treatise?

Do you find anything illogical about Knox's argument?

---

<sup>4</sup> Source: <http://www.swrb.ab.ca/newslett/actualNLs/firblast.htm#FN146> [Contemporary English Version]

<sup>5</sup> This prediction of Knox as to the speedy termination of Queen Mary's reign, whom he here styles Jezebel of England, proved correct. She died in the sixth year of her reign, on the 17th of November, or within seven or eight months of the publication of *The First Blast*.

<sup>6</sup> *Marginal note*: The authority of all women is a wall without foundation

# Document 2.11

## The Martyrdom of Archbishop Thomas Cranmer

### From Foxe's *Book of Martyrs*

From the Christian Classics Ethereal Library: <http://www.ccel.org/f/foxe/martyrs/fox116.htm>

#### CHAPTER XVI, Persecutions in England During the Reign of Queen Mary

*Thomas Cranmer served as the Archbishop of Canterbury (the highest office in the English Church) under Henry VIII and Edward VI. During his tenure, he promoted a number of modest reforms within the Church of England and authored the Book of Common Prayer, the service book of the Anglican Church. Cranmer fell into disfavor under the reign of Mary I, Henry VIII's Catholic daughter who is otherwise remembered as "Bloody Mary."*

*The following excerpts are taken from Foxe's Book of Martyrs, a Protestant chronicle of [mostly] English Protestant martyrs, published early in the reign of Elizabeth I, who re-established Protestantism in England.*

#### Archbishop Cranmer

The death of Edward, in 1553, exposed Cranmer to all the rage of his enemies. Though the archbishop was among those who supported Mary's accession, he was attainted at the meeting of Parliament, and in November adjudged guilty of high treason at Guildhall, and degraded from his dignities...

Treason was a charge quite inapplicable to Cranmer, who supported the queen's right; while others, who had favored [Lady Jane](#) were dismissed upon paying a small fine. A calumny was now spread against Cranmer that he complied with some of the **popish** ceremonies to ingratiate himself with the queen, which he dared publicly to disavow, and justified his articles of faith. The active part which the prelate had taken in the divorce of Mary's mother had ever rankled deeply in the heart of the queen,<sup>7</sup> and revenge formed a prominent feature in the death of Cranmer....

Cranmer was gradually degraded, by putting mere rags on him to represent the dress of an archbishop; then stripping him of his attire, they took off his own gown, and put an old worn one upon him instead. This he bore unmoved, and his enemies, finding that severity only rendered him more determined, tried the opposite course, and placed him in the house of the dean of Christ-church, where he was treated with every indulgence.

This presented such a contrast to the three years' hard imprisonment he had received, that it threw him off his guard. His open, generous nature was more easily to be seduced by a liberal conduct than by threats and fetters. When Satan finds the Christian proof against one mode of attack, he tries another; and what form is so seductive as smiles, rewards, and power, after a long, painful imprisonment? Thus it was with Cranmer: his enemies promised him his former greatness if he would but recant, as well as the queen's favor, and this at the very time they knew that his death was determined in council...

*[Unaware that he was going to be executed, regardless, Cranmer recanted his Protestant teachings and affirmed the authority of the Catholic Church and the Pope. Cranmer's recantation was printed and distributed throughout England, causing him public embarrassment in addition to his private remorse.]*

"Let him that standeth take heed lest he fall!" said the apostle, and here was a falling off indeed! The **papists** now triumphed in their turn: they had acquired all they wanted short of his life. His recantation was immediately printed and dispersed, that it might have its due effect upon the astonished Protestants. But God counter-worked all the designs of the Catholics by the extent to which they carried the implacable persecution of their prey. Doubtless, the love of life induced Cranmer to sign the above declaration: yet death may be said to have been preferable to life to him who lay under the stings of a goaded conscience and the contempt of every Gospel Christian; this principle he strongly felt in all its force and anguish.

The queen's revenge was only to be satiated by Cranmer's blood, and therefore she wrote an order to Dr. Pole, to prepare a sermon to be preached March 21, directly before his martyrdom, at St. Mary's, Oxford. Dr. Pole visited him the day previous, and was induced to believe that he would publicly deliver his

---

<sup>7</sup> Cranmer had supported Henry VIII's decision to divorce Mary's mother, Catherine of Aragon.



sentiments in confirmation of the articles to which he had subscribed. About nine in the morning of the day of sacrifice, the queen's commissioners, attended by the magistrates, conducted the amiable unfortunate to St. Mary's Church. His torn, dirty garb, the same in which they habited him upon his degradation, excited the commiseration of the people. In the church he found a low mean stage, erected opposite to the pulpit, on which being placed, he turned his face, and fervently prayed to God.

The church was crowded with persons of both persuasions, expecting to hear the justification of the late apostasy: the Catholics rejoicing, and the Protestants deeply wounded in spirit at the deceit of the human heart. Dr. Pole, in his sermon, represented Cranmer as having been guilty of the most atrocious crimes; encouraged the deluded sufferer not to fear death, not to doubt the support of God in his torments, nor that Masses would be said in all the churches of Oxford for the repose of his soul. The doctor then noticed his conversion, and which he ascribed to the evident working of Almighty power and in order that the people might be convinced of its reality, asked the prisoner to give them a sign. This Cranmer did, and begged the congregation to pray for him, for he had committed many and grievous sins; but, of all, there was one which awfully lay upon his mind, of which he would speak shortly.

During the sermon Cranmer wept bitter tears: lifting up his hands and eyes to heaven, and letting them fall, as if unworthy to live: his grief now found vent in words: before his confession he fell upon his knees, and, in the following words unveiled the deep contrition and agitation which harrowed up his soul.

"O Father of heaven! O Son of God, Redeemer of the world! O Holy Ghost, three persons all one God! have mercy on me, most wretched caitiff and miserable sinner. I have offended both against heaven and earth, more than my tongue can express. Whither then may I go, or whither may I flee? To heaven I may be ashamed to lift up mine eyes and in earth I find no place of refuge or succor. To Thee, therefore, O Lord, do I run; to Thee do I humble myself, saying, O Lord, my God, my sins be great, but yet have mercy upon me for Thy great mercy. The great mystery that God became man, was not wrought for little or few offences. Thou didst not give Thy Son, O Heavenly Father, unto death for small sins only, but for all the greatest sins of the world, so that the sinner return to Thee with his whole heart, as I do at present. Wherefore, have mercy on me, O God...

"And now forasmuch as I am come to the last end of my life... I shall therefore declare unto you my very faith how I believe, without any color of dissimulation: for now is no time to [beat around the bush]...

"First, I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth, etc. And I believe every article of the Catholic faith, every word and sentence taught by our Savior Jesus Christ, His apostles and prophets, in the New and Old Testament.

**"And now I come to the great thing which so much troubleth my conscience, more than any thing that ever I did or said in my whole life, and that is the setting abroad of a writing contrary to the truth, which now here I renounce and refuse, as things written with my hand contrary to the truth which I thought in my heart, and written for fear of death, and to save my life, if it might be; and that is, all such bills or papers which I have written or signed with my hand since my degradation, wherein I have written many things untrue. And forasmuch as my hand hath offended, writing contrary to my heart, therefore my hand shall first be punished; for when I come to the fire it shall first be burned.**

**"And as for the pope, I refuse him as Christ's enemy, and Antichrist, with all his false doctrine."**

Upon the conclusion of this unexpected declaration, amazement and indignation were conspicuous in every part of the church. The Catholics were completely foiled, their object being frustrated, Cranmer, like [Samson](#), having completed a greater ruin upon his enemies in the hour of death, than he did in his life.

Cranmer would have proceeded in the exposure of the popish doctrines, but the murmurs of the idolaters drowned his voice, and the preacher gave an order to "lead the heretic away!" The savage command was directly obeyed, and the lamb about to suffer was torn from his stand to the place of slaughter, insulted all the way by the revilings and taunts of the pestilent monks and friars.



With thoughts intent upon a far higher object than the empty threats of man, he reached the spot dyed with the blood of [Ridley](#) and [Latimer](#).<sup>8</sup> There he knelt for a short time in earnest devotion, and then arose, that he might undress and prepare for the fire. Two friars who had been parties in prevailing upon him to abjure, now endeavored to draw him off again from the truth, but he was steadfast and immovable in what he had just professed, and publicly taught. A chain was provided to bind him to the stake, and after it had tightly encircled him, fire was put to the fuel, and the flames began soon to ascend.

Then were the glorious sentiments of the martyr made manifest; then it was, that stretching out his right hand, he held it unshrinkingly in the fire until it was burnt to a cinder, even before his body was injured, frequently exclaiming, "This unworthy right hand."

---

<sup>8</sup> Nicholas Ridley and Hugh Latimer, Cranmer's cohorts who were also martyred during the reign of Mary I.

# Document 2.12

## ***Act Against Jesuits and Seminarists***

**Passed during the reign of Elizabeth I (1585)**

Gee, Henry, and William John Hardy, ed.,  
*Documents Illustrative of English Church History*  
(New York: Macmillan, 1896), 485-92.

[Hanover Historical Texts Project](#)

Scanned and proofread by Heather Haralson, May 1998.

Posted by Raluca Preotu, July 1999.

Proofread and pages added by Jonathan Perry, March 2001.

Whereas divers persons called or professed Jesuits, seminary priests, and other priests, which have been, and from time to time are made in the parts beyond the seas, by or according to the order and rites of the Romish Church, have of late years come and been sent, and daily do come and are sent, into this realm of England and other the queen's majesty's dominions, of purpose (as has appeared, as well by sundry of their own examinations and confessions, as by divers other manifest means and proofs) not only to withdraw her highness's subjects from their due obedience to her majesty, but also to stir up and move sedition, rebellion, and open hostility within the same her highness's realms and dominions, to the great endangering of the safety of her most royal person, and to the utter ruin, desolation, and overthrow of the whole realm, if the same be not the sooner by some good means foreseen and prevented:

For reformation whereof be it ordained, established, and enacted by the queen's most excellent majesty, and the Lords spiritual and temporal, and the Commons, in this present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same Parliament, that all and every Jesuits, seminary priests, and other priests whatsoever made or ordained out of the realm of England or other her highness's dominions, or within any of her majesty's realms or dominions, by any authority... from the see of Rome, since the feast of the Nativity of St. John Baptist in the first year of her highness's reign, shall within forty days next after the end of this present session of Parliament depart out of this realm of England, and out of all other her highness's realms and dominions, if the wind, weather, and passage shall serve for the same, or else so soon after the end of the said forty days as the wind, weather, and passage shall so serve.

And be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid, that it shall not be lawful to or for any Jesuit, seminary priest, or other such priest, deacon, or religious or ecclesiastical person whatsoever... to come into, be, or remain in any part of this realm, or any other her highness's dominions, after the end of the same forty days, other than in such special cases, and upon such special occasions only, and for such time only, as is expressed in this Act; and if he do, that then every such offence shall be taken and adjudged to be high treason; and every person so offending shall for his offence be adjudged a traitor, and shall suffer, lose, and forfeit, as in case of high treason.

And every person which after the end of the same forty days... shall wittingly and willingly receive, relieve, comfort, aid, or maintain any such Jesuit, seminary priest, or other priest, deacon, or religious or ecclesiastical person... shall also for such offence be adjudged a felon, without benefit of clergy, and suffer death, lose, and forfeit, as in case of one attainted of felony.

### **QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER:**

What was the purpose of this Act? What people and/or actions are outlawed by it?  
For what reason(s) did Elizabeth and Parliament pass this Act?

# Document 2.13

## *The Edict of Nantes*

The History Guide: <http://www.historyguide.org/earlymod/nantes.html>

Henry, by the grace of God king of France and of Navarre, to all to whom these presents come, greeting:

Among the infinite benefits which it has pleased God to heap upon us, the most signal and precious is his granting us the strength and ability to withstand the fearful disorders and troubles which prevailed on our advent in this kingdom. The realm was so torn by innumerable factions and sects that the most legitimate of all the parties was fewest in numbers. God has given us strength to stand out against this storm; we have finally surmounted the waves and made our port of safety, -- peace for our state. For which his be the glory all in all....

We have, by this perpetual and irrevocable edict, established and proclaimed and do establish and proclaim:

I. First, that the recollection of everything done by one party or the other between March, 1585, and our accession to the crown, and during all the preceding period of troubles, remain obliterated and forgotten, as if no such things had ever happened....

III. We ordain that the Catholic Apostolic and Roman religion shall be restored and reestablished in all places and localities of this our kingdom and countries subject to our sway, where the exercise of the same has been interrupted, in order that it may be peaceably and freely exercised, without any trouble or hindrance....

VI. And in order to leave no occasion for troubles or differences between our subjects, we have permitted, and herewith permit, those of the said religion called Reformed to live and abide in all the cities and places of this our kingdom and countries of our sway, without being annoyed, molested, or compelled to do anything in the matter of religion contrary to their consciences, . . . upon condition that they comport themselves in other respects according to that which is contained in this our present edict.

VII. It is permitted to all lords, gentlemen, and other persons making profession of the said religion called Reformed, holding the right of high justice [or a certain feudal tenure], to exercise the said religion in their houses....

IX. We also permit those of the said religion to make and continue the exercise of the same in all villages and places of our dominion where it was established by them and publicly enjoyed several and divers times in the year 1597, up to the end of the month of August, notwithstanding all decrees and judgments to the contrary.

XIII. We very expressly forbid to all those of the said religion its exercise, either in respect to ministry, regulation, discipline, or the public instruction of children, or otherwise, in this our kingdom and lands of our dominion, otherwise than in the places permitted and granted by the present edict.

XIV. It is forbidden as well to perform any function of the said religion in our court or retinue... in our city of Paris. or within five leagues of the said city....

XXI. Books concerning the said religion called Reformed may not be printed and publicly sold, except in cities and places where the public exercise of the said religion is permitted.

XXII. We ordain that there shall be no difference or distinction made in respect to the said religion, in receiving pupils to be instructed in universities, colleges, and schools; nor in receiving the sick and poor into hospitals, retreats and public charities.

[Source: James Harvey Robinson, ed., *Readings in European History* 2 vols. (Boston: Ginn, 1906), 2:183-185.]

# **UNIT 2 STUDY GUIDE:**

## ***The Protestant Reformation(s)***



Problems in the Catholic Church (Sixteenth Century):

YouTube: [Causes of the Reformation](#)

### **Martin Luther's Reformation**

YouTube: Martin Luther's Reformation  
What is Purgatory?

Johann Tetzel

Martin Luther

95 Theses

Frederick of Saxony

Charles V

[Diet of Worms](#) (1521)

German Peasants' Revolt (1524-1525)

[Peace of Augsburg](#)  
(1555)

*cuius regio, eius religio* (\_\_\_\_\_)

Choices: \_\_\_\_\_ or \_\_\_\_\_

### **Counter-Reformation**

YouTube: [The Counter-Reformation](#)

***Ignatius Loyola***

Society of \_\_\_\_\_ (a.k.a., \_\_\_\_\_)

***Teresa of Avila***

**Council of Trent (1545-1563)**

**What Changed?**

**What Didn't Change?**

### **THE EUCHARIST**



**TRANSUBSTANTIATION**  
(Roman Catholic)

**CONSUBSTANTIATION**  
(Luther/Calvin)

**MEMORIAL**  
(Zwingli/Anabaptists)

YouTube: [Transubstantiation Explained](#)

# PROTESTANT REFORMATION GRAPHIC ORGANIZER

<b>CATHOLICISM</b> (The Status Quo)	<b>ENGLAND</b> (Conservative Reform)	<b>LUTHER</b> (Moderate Reform)	<b>CALVINISM</b> (Radical Reform)
<a href="#">WATCH ON YOUTUBE</a>	<a href="#">WATCH ON YOUTUBE</a>	<a href="#">WATCH ON YOUTUBE</a>	<a href="#">WATCH ON YOUTUBE</a>
<p>What are some Catholic doctrines with which Protestant reformers disagreed? Be sure to note which reformer in cases that are specific to one Protestant sect.</p>	<p><b>Henry VIII</b></p> <p>Defense of the _____ Sacraments</p> <p>Act of _____</p> <p>Abolished _____</p> <p>Pilgrimage of Grace</p> <p>Thomas Cranmer</p> <p>Archbishop of _____</p> <p>Book of _____</p> <p>_____ VI (r. 1547-1553)</p> <p>_____ I (r. 1553-1558)</p> <p>_____ I (r. 1558-1603)</p>	<p>_____ Theses</p> <p>OPPOSED the Sale of _____</p> <p><b><u>LUTHERAN DOCTRINES</u></b></p> <p>Sola _____</p> <p>Sola _____</p> <p>Justification by _____ alone</p> <p><b>GOOD WORKS</b></p> <p>Sola _____</p> <p>Book of James:</p> <p>An "Epistle of _____"</p> <p>Priesthood of _____</p> <p><b>Support for Secular Authority</b></p> <p>What movement did Luther oppose in 1525?</p>	<p>_____ of God</p> <p>Pre- _____</p> <p>T _____</p> <p>U _____</p> <p>L _____</p> <p>I _____</p> <p>P _____</p> <p><b>Calvinists in</b></p> <p>England _____</p> <p>Scotland _____</p> <p>John _____</p> <p>France _____</p>

# Religious Wars

## French Wars of Religion

YouTube: [French Wars of Religion](#)

Catholics vs. \_\_\_\_\_  
(French Calvinists)



Thousands of Huguenots Killed



Henry IV

\_\_\_\_\_ of Navarre (Huguenot) \_\_\_\_\_ Dynasty

"Paris \_\_\_\_\_" (Converted)

Henry was a \_\_\_\_\_, a pragmatist who considered concerns of state to be more important than fighting over religion.

The **Edict of \_\_\_\_\_**, Henry proclaimed limited toleration for French Calvinists (*later rescinded by his grandson, Louis XIV.*)

<b>The Thirty Years' War (1618-_____)</b>	<b>PRIMARY BATTLEGROUND:</b> _____	<b>MASSIVE DESTRUCTION</b> <i>Over 50% dead in some areas</i>
_____ Phase		
_____ Phase		
_____ Phase		
_____ Phase		
<b>The Peace of _____ (1648)</b>		
YouTube: <a href="#">The Thirty Years' War</a>		