

Johann Eck, *Response on Behalf of Hieronymus Emser*¹

David Bagchi

INTRODUCTION

The Background

After the Leipzig disputation ended in July 1519, the chaplain to Duke Georg of Saxony, Hieronymus Emser, wrote a pamphlet entitled *The Leipzig Disputation: Did It Support the Bohemians?*, which is included in this series. The purpose of the pamphlet, addressed as an open letter to the head of the beleaguered Catholic Church in Prague, was to dispel any suggestion that the majority Hussite Church in Bohemia could find succour in Luther's statements during the debate. Emser's treatment of Luther in this pamphlet was outwardly courteous, and consistently played down any culpability on his part. Luther's reply, *The Addition to Emser's Wild Goat*, was very different in tone.² The reason for Luther's aggressiveness is not clear. It is possible that an earlier meeting with Emser in July 1518, at a dinner party which ended badly, had convinced him that the court chaplain was not to be trusted.³ Equally, it is possible that Emser's close connection to Duke Georg, who had reacted so explosively to Luther's defence of Hus at the disputation, rang warning bells. For whatever reason, Luther convinced himself that Emser's apparently favourable attitude towards him was a trap. In his response, the *Addition to Emser's Goat*, he repeatedly recalled what he saw as a similar act of literary treachery from the early church, when Rufinus, under the colour of friendship, implied that Jerome was a supporter of Origenist heresy.⁴

¹ *Response on Behalf of Hieronymus Emser against Luther's Mad Hunt* (Leipzig: Martin Landsberg, 1519).

² *Ad aegocerotam Emserianum additio* (1519), WA 2: 658–679.

³ See the account in Martin Brecht, *Martin Luther: His Road to Reformation, 1483–1521* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1985), 240–41.

⁴ Luther makes this equation repeatedly in the *Addition*. See WA 2: 664. 6, 8, 29; 665: 2, 19, 28; and 666.2.

At the end of 1519, Luther's opponent at Leipzig, the Ingolstadt professor Johann Eck, published a defense of Emser in the form of an open letter to Emser's ordinary, the Bishop of Meissen. This was the *Response on Behalf of Hieronymus Emser against Luther's Mad Hunt*, translated here. While the judges of the Leipzig disputation (the universities of Erfurt and Paris) were still considering their verdicts, direct discussion of the debate by the original participants was theoretically off-limits. But Luther and Eck continued the debate nonetheless in an exchange of pamphlets. They also exploited secondary literary squabbles, like this one and that with Melanchthon, to further their respective causes. Luther did not reply directly to Eck's *Response*, but he continued a literary feud with Emser for another two years.

The Content of the *Response*

Eck had several objectives in writing the *Response on Behalf of Hieronymus Emser*. Specifically, he wished to undermine Luther's public reputation as a heroic underdog by portraying him instead as a demented bully who had launched a vicious and unprovoked "mad hunt" of Emser, who is here presented as a model priest—saintly, scholarly, and sincere. More generally, he wished to negate the advantage which the Wittenberg cause had gained from the post-disputation pamphlet campaign. Eck may well have won the debate itself, by cornering Luther into defending a heretical position; but in the ensuing media battle, he had been presented as an obscurantist and a scholastic, while Luther had been held up as a champion of humanism. At a time when the Reuchlin controversy was reaching its climax, this was disastrous for Eck's public reputation amongst humanists. His *Response* therefore bristles with satirical wordplay and classical allusions calculated to appeal to the humanist reader. Equally prominent are the repeated, derogatory references to Luther's status as a friar, ridiculing his habit and even his tonsure. This, too, was an attempt to improve his own

standing among humanists by associating Luther with the monastic and fraternal obscurantists traditionally satirized by the belletrists, not least by Erasmus himself. A final ploy was to portray Luther as someone “who prefers the branches to the roots,” and therefore fundamentally opposed to the humanist slogan *ad fontes*.

Although Eck was the foremost theological debater of his age, he demonstrates in the *Response* some awkwardness in adapting to the demands of written controversy. In the heat of argument, for instance, he frequently forgets that he is supposed to be writing to the Bishop of Meissen and addresses Luther directly instead, sometimes shifting from third- to second-person apostrophizing within the same sentence. Moreover, his letter quickly descends into a point-by-point refutation of Luther’s attack on Emser, lessening the *Response*’s value and intelligibility when read on its own, and preventing him from developing a more strategic critique. Only on one occasion does he successfully recall his earlier polemic against Luther’s “singularity” (the arrogant rejection of views held by so many for so long) which Luther would later admit was the “single strongest argument” ranged against him.⁵

Eck was not a natural satirist, and his attempts at wordplay are generally pedestrian and lacking in humour. His forte lay elsewhere, in the forensic dismantling of an opponent’s case by inexorable logic and by an almost total recall of the relevant authorities whether from Scripture, the Fathers, or Canon Law. (As the notes to the translation show, the accuracy of Eck’s citations is remarkably good by the standards of early sixteenth-century debate.) The heaping-up of authorities is, however, neither attractive nor practical in pamphlet warfare, which is why Eck is obliged repeatedly to refer the reader to the fuller treatment of these issues in a forthcoming treatise, the three-volume blockbuster, *The Primacy of Peter*. This was a compendious refutation of Luther’s *Explanation of His Thirteenth Proposition against*

⁵ See Luther, *The Misuse of the Mass* (1521), in LW 36: 134.

the Power of the Pope, which had argued that the Roman papacy was a recent institution tolerated by divine forbearance but not founded by divine right. *The Primacy of Peter* (“in which the falsity of his assumptions is detected and the weakness of his arguments is utterly laid bare and reduced to ashes”)⁶ was to be Eck’s definitive case against the arguments put forward by Luther at Leipzig. Unfortunately, the size and complexity of the work meant that it did not appear until 1521, from a Parisian press, by which time the relevance of the Leipzig disputation had been overtaken by Luther’s excommunication as a heretic and his outlawing as an enemy of the Holy Roman Empire.

Eck implies throughout the *Response* that the attempt by Luther and his colleagues effectively to re-run the Leipzig disputation in print before the court of public opinion while the matter was still *sub judice* was cheating—as indeed it was. It was a tactic which played to Luther’s strength as a compelling writer and to his Ingolstadt opponent’s weakness: “he is a fine debater with a pen in his hand,” complained Eck.⁷ The solution Eck proposed, on two occasions in the *Response*, was to challenge Luther to another “live” debate, this time before judges who could give an instant verdict, with the loser paying the costs. But Eck must have known that, after the mauling he had received at Leipzig, Luther would never agree to such an arrangement. Instead, Eck turned his attention to securing something far more definitive than a university’s condemnation of Luther, and the following year would see him in Rome advising on the issuing of a papal bull. It is sometimes said that the image of the wild boar trampling the Lord’s vineyard (Ps. 80:13 [Ps. 79:14 Vulg.]), with which *Exsurge Domine* opens, occurred to Pope Leo X while he was staying at his summer hunting lodge, pursuing those very beasts for recreation. A less picturesque possibility is that the wording was suggested by Eck, who in his *Response* had declared Luther to be the “singular wild beast”

⁶ Eck, *Response*, sigs Biiij^r–Biiij^v.

⁷ Eck, *Response*, sig. Biv^f.

mentioned in the same verse.⁸ If so, Eck must have been gratified that the instigator of the “mad hunt” against Emser had at last become the hunted.

The Printing History of the *Response*

Johann Eck’s *Response on Behalf of Hieronymus Emser* exists in two editions, with several examples from each still extant in research libraries around the world. The example in the Kessler Collection is a first edition, printed by Martin Landsberg in Leipzig in 1519. It is set in an attractive and highly legible roman typeface and the title page is decorated with the firm’s stock border decoration. This displays the logotype of Landsberg’s printing house in the top panel, with the initials “M.H.A.V.” (“Martin of Würzburg and Augsburg”—the towns in which he had worked previously), and in the bottom panel the arms of Leipzig. Putti, in various poses, decorate the side panels.

The second edition, which was also printed by Landsberg in Leipzig, was issued the following year. In appearance it is almost identical to the first edition, but contains a number of typesetting errors and other departures from the original. For instance, at sig. Bij^r, line 3, “protestatus est” becomes “potestatus est,” and at sig. Bij^v, line 32, “christus” becomes “cbristus.” At the very end of the work, Eck’s letter to the Bishop of Meissen of 28 October 1519 is rather puzzlingly changed to the corresponding date in 1520 (sig. Bvi^r, line 6). This suggests that the original formes for the 1519 edition had been broken up, possibly because the demand for a second edition was not anticipated, and/or because the Landsberg Press needed the type for another job. A copy of the first edition was then evidently used as a guide for the compositor of the second edition, who followed it almost exactly, except for some lapses here and there like the ones noted.

⁸ Eck, *Response*, sig. Bij^v.

A Note on the Translation

Eck's *Responsio* has not been translated into English before, to the best of my knowledge, but it has been rendered into German on at least two occasions. The first was by J.G. Walch in his monumental series *D. Martin Luthers Sämtliche Schriften*, vol. 18 (Halle: Gebauer, 1746), cols 1090–1114. (This translation was evidently based on the second, 1520, edition.) A more recent translation by Peter Fabisch can currently be found on the late Prof. Dr. Vinzenz Pfnür's Reformation history website, in the edited collection of Eck's letters.⁹ I am indebted to both translations, but have been obliged to depart from their readings occasionally.

As with many early sixteenth-century writings, the punctuation employed in the printed version of the *Response* seems rather arbitrary to us. The commonest separator used is the colon, which serves variously as a comma, semi-colon, colon, and full stop, and is occasionally inserted where we would use no punctuation at all. A species of pilcrow (specifically, a blind capital "C" with a vertical line to the right) is used to indicate a new idea, where we would employ a paragraph break, but on two occasions a line break is also used. Walch and Pfnür/Fabisch differ in their punctuation of their translations, and I have also felt justified in ignoring the original punctuation marks where to do so would make Eck's meaning less intelligible. The signatures of the 1519 edition have been included in this translation as a guide for anyone who wishes to consult the original.

A feature of the *Response*, in both its editions, is the extensive use of marginal notes. They are of two types. Some are designed to indicate to the reader, at a glance, the salient points being discussed, in much the same way as modern books use sub-headings. (One could imagine that they would also be useful in helping interrupted readers find their place again.) The other is to provide fuller references, as we would use footnotes. I have relegated all the marginalia to the footnotes, where the references, in particular, can be expanded. Square

⁹ Available at: <http://ivv7srv15.uni-muenster.de/mnkg/pfnuer/Eckbriefe/N096.html>. Date accessed: 19/08/17.

brackets indicate that the reference has been expanded or supplied where it was lacking in the original.

As noted above, the point-by-point approach adopted by Eck meant that he referred very frequently to Luther's attack on Emser, the *Ad aegocerotam Emserianum additio*. Unfortunately, the *Additio* has yet to be translated into English, and so I have cited it in the notes in the standard Weimar Edition of Luther's works (WA 2: 658–679). References to the text of Emser's *De disputatione Lipsicensi* are to the standard edition by F.X Thurnhofer.¹⁰

¹⁰ *Hieronymus Emser: De disputatione Lipsicensi, quantum ad Boemos obiter deflexa est*, Corpus Catholicorum 4 (Münster in Westphalia: Aschendorff, 1921), 29–40.

TRANSLATION

[Aī^f] The Response of Johann Eck on Behalf of Hieronymus Emser against Luther's Mad Hunt.

To God alone be the glory.¹¹

[Aī^v] In the name of the Lord Jesus, Johann Eck wishes the most reverend lord, Lord Johann von Schleinitz, most worthy bishop of the illustrious church of Meissen, his worshipful lord, salvation in the Lord Jesus.¹²

The holy council of Elibitanum soundly decreed that no bishops, priests, or deacons should take part in hunting (as is reported in the Decretals under the heading of the council of Aureliensis).¹³ And Saint Augustine declared the art of hunting to be the most evil of all, as did Bernard.¹⁴ Jerome on Psalm 90 [Vg.; Psalm 91, EVV] states: "Esau was a hunter because he was a sinner, and we do not find anywhere in the holy scriptures any hunter who was holy. We find fishermen who are holy."¹⁵ These authorities are pertinent, reverend bishop, because Martin Luther—priest, theologian, and monk—has become a hunter. He does not pursue wild boars, stags, or little mules through fields, groves, and sunny meadows. Instead, an innocent man is hunted: Hieronymus Emser, conspicuous in God's church for his integrity, wisdom, and learning. And he hunts him not with baying dogs nor with slavering Molossian hounds,

¹¹ In an earlier exchange of pamphlets, both Luther and Eck had accused the other of seeking, through the Leipzig Disputation, his own glory rather than God's. See Eck's *Expurgatio adversus criminationes F. Martini Lutter* (1519) and Luther's counter-blast, the *Epistola super Expurgatione Ecciana* (1519), *passim*. This dedication was clearly meant to remove any doubts about Eck's priorities.

¹² Johann von Schleinitz (c. 1470–1532) served as bishop of Meissen from 1518 until his death. He was to become an implacable foe of Luther's. See Traugott Bautz, ed., *Biographisch-Bibliographisches Kirchenlexikon* 9 (Herzberg: Verlag T. Bautz, 1995), cols. 271–72.

¹³ Marginal note: "Concilia." Eck's slightly mangled reference is to the synod of Eliberitanum (Elvira), near Granada, which took place in the early fourth century. Eck has taken the chain of anti-hunting references that follows from canon law.

¹⁴ Marginal note: "Augu[stinus]." For the reference, see Gratian's Decrees, Pars I: D. 86, c. 9, in Emil Friedberg, ed., *Corpus iuris canonici*, 2 vols (Leipzig: Tauchnitz, 1879–81), 1:300.

¹⁵ Marginal note: "Hiero[nymus]." For the reference, see Gratian's Decrees, Pars I: D. 86, c. 11, in *Corpus iuris canonici* 1:300.

but with miserable writings, slanderous words, impudent insults, trifles, nonsense, lies, and other fearful monstrosities of this sort.¹⁶ For by these arts—detraction, slander, and satire—Luther intends to make his name great, regardless of his order and his vows.

You ask, most worthy prelate, “Why does Luther sharpen his Theonine tooth against my priest, a man known for honesty and sound morals?”¹⁷ I reply, “Your neighbors, the schismatic and heretical Bohemians (I do not speak here of the faithful Bohemians, who are worthy of all praise), think that they have found a champion of their errors. They pestered God with their little prayers in public for Luther to emerge from the Leipzig disputation victorious over me. But God does not hear sinners. They even infiltrated some men of their own type to attend the Leipzig disputation. Luther then said, at the urging of these most villainous sycophants, that some of the Hussite articles condemned by the Council of Constance were most Christian and evangelical. But Emser, fearing [**Aij**’] that heretics and schismatics would have cause to insult the faithful or to congratulate themselves on having found such a champion, sent a letter to the administrator of the Catholic Church in Prague, by which this good man, a most faithful upholder of the truth of the faith we hold in common, might have something with which to encourage and stir up his brethren and suppress the vainglorious boasting of the schismatics.¹⁸ But Emser wrote with such seriousness and modesty that no good and prudent man could disapprove of his writing. Yet how did Luther respond to this? If he were concerned with saving as many souls as he has sent to their destruction, he ought to have been extremely grateful. But the impatient friar, stirred up by his customary malice, wrote biliously against him, and the matter descended into tragedy and fable. In so impudently hunting this Aegocerotia, against all brotherly love, he also exposed

¹⁶ Marginal note: “Luther’s custom.”

¹⁷ Eck alludes to a verse from Horace, in which the “Theonine tooth” indicated sharp, insulting wit. If the expression refers to a satirist or wit, no firm identification with any known Theon of antiquity can be established. See *Epistles* book 1, number 18, l. 82 in Horace, *Satires, Epistles and Ars Poetica*, Loeb Classical Library (London: William Heinemann, 1926), 374.

¹⁸ Marginal note: “Why Emser wrote.”

our faith to Bohemian ridicule.¹⁹ Other Wittenbergers wrote most mordantly against me with weapons dipped in poison.²⁰ But they always say, “Do not touch me,”²¹ and refuse to be engaged with in the slightest. But then this monk, the most biting of all, readied himself to hunt me as well. But he will need dogs to catch me, for he cannot follow my tracks. I have determined to destroy this hunt of Luther’s²² and to entangle him in his own snares, ropes, and nets, putting my hope in him who will deliver us “from the snare of the hunters and from a sharp word.”²³

Luther claims to marvel that Emser has become his champion, by excusing him from Eck’s accusation that he [Luther] had championed the Bohemian faction. But Emser, in his letter, had no intention of championing the lying monk. Rather, concerned for the position of the Bohemian Catholics vis-à-vis the schismatics, he explained that Luther had condemned the Bohemians’ break with the Roman church. Therefore, Emser is the champion of the faith, not of Luther. He should not be compared with Joab. And utterly intolerable is this comparison: on the basis of such a serious, sincere, and Christian letter, Luther dares to equate this blameless and upright priest to the traitor Judas.²⁴ This man, commissioned in the army of Christ, wrote for the benefit of the faith, for the encouragement of the faithful, and for the destruction of schismatic error. But the Cuculla in his festering malice ascribes it to Emser’s “envy,” who out of hatred for Luther gave his soul to the devil. What will this

¹⁹ Eck here echoes the name-calling of the Emser-Luther dispute. Luther had referred to Emser as a wild goat (*aegoceros* in Latin), which he had resolved to hunt. This image was inspired by Emser’s heraldic arms, prominently featuring a wild goat, which appeared on the title page of his published letter. Emser would eventually repay Luther in kind by referring to him as the bull-calf (*Stier* in German) of Wittenberg. Eck (who like Emser was a secular priest) instead chose to draw attention to Luther’s status as a friar, referring to him in this pamphlet as “Cucullus” (“the cowl-bearer”) after his habit. Another insulting name, “Bardocucullus,” referred to a longer variant of the cowl of Gallic (“*bardic*”) origin. The gender shift to “Cuculla/Bardocuculla” was a further insult, and reflected Luther’s own alternative nickname for Emser—“*aegocerota*,” or wild nanny-goat.

²⁰ This is presumably a reference to Melancthon, whom Eck attacked in his pamphlet *Excusatio Eckij: ad ea quae falso sibi Philippus Melancthon . . . super theologica disputatione Lipsica adscripsit* (1519), translated elsewhere in this series.

²¹ John 20:17.

²² Marginal note: “The reason for writing.”

²³ Marginal note: “Psal.” [Ps 90:3, Vg.; 91:3, EVV].

²⁴ Marginal note: “Luther should be compared to a slanderer.”

unrestrained monk not dare to do? [Aij^v] Emser certainly had no wish to harm anyone in his letter, but to be of use to the faithful. Yet the Bardocuculla attacks him with enough acerbity to challenge Lucian himself.²⁵ In typical fashion Luther quite histrionically jests that Emser has left his wild goat without hay, and that therefore his pedigree must be faulty. This is the sort of silly game any fool can play with any prince, no matter how noble. But believe me, Luther, Emser can put hay on his horns when the need arises.²⁶

Then he imagines that he is “between a rock and a hard place.” But I know that he has already been swallowed by Scylla and Charybdis, when he was forced to concede to me the title of champion of Catholic truth and pass on the torch.²⁷ God grant that when a favorable judgment is issued by the University of Paris, he will admit defeat (not to Eck, for I do not seek my own glory, but to the truth) and leave off misleading simple Christians and filling them with errors.²⁸ He seems to appoint himself master and head of all the faithful, when he says, “My Christ lives and reigns.”²⁹ That is true. But Luther will feel this “living and reigning” even more clearly, when Christ punishes him for the many heresies, scandals, and perverse doctrines he has caused to arise in the church—unless he should repent. How dare Luther suggest that Christ is the author of this insane hunting and cursing? As if our gentle master would ever teach such unrestrained cursing and abrasive slander!

Then he says, “My Emser, I shall ignore your false flattery and your Judas kiss.” He dared to say the same thing of me, falsely, namely that at Leipzig I had not cited any texts

²⁵ Lucian of Samosata was a satirist of the second century famed for his biting wit.

²⁶ Marginal note: “Emser’s Aegoceros.” The wordplay concerning hay and horns refers to the heraldic arms that appeared on the title page of Emser’s *The Leipzig Disputation*. An accompanying verse declared Emser’s wild goat to be *sine foenu*—without hay. This was an allusion to the ancient practice of covering the horns of fierce bulls with straw to prevent damage or injury. It achieved proverbial status through Horace’s line, “He has straw on his horns—run far away!” (*Satires* 1:4, 33). Luther’s implication was that a truly noble heraldic beast would be undomesticated and therefore have hay on its horns.

²⁷ Here Eck refers back to Luther’s reply to Emser, taking a hypothetical admission of defeat at face value. See WA 2:660.7–9.

²⁸ The text reads “*deus dei*,” but this must be a typesetter’s slip for “*deus det*” (“May God grant”). This error was retained in the second edition. Marginal note: “What Eck seeks.”

²⁹ Marginal note: “Christ reigns.” See WA 2:660.18.

from holy scripture and could not deal with those that were cited. But once the disputation proceedings, taken down by extremely accurate notaries, are published, the verdict of the famed University of Paris will reveal how falsely the arrogant friar has spoken. Then he argued that Emser, by calling him “Catholic,” wished to prevent Lutheran doctrines from being approved by the Bohemians.³⁰ In objecting on the basis of *partibus ex puris*—a schoolboy error—the hunter creates for himself an imaginary syllogism, purely so that he can attack Emser the more freely.³¹ But the candid reader will understand Emser’s letter well enough: he did not want heretics to insult the faithful by boasting that they have the Catholic doctor Luther as a champion of their faction, and so he reported how insistent Luther was in denying the fact at Leipzig.

Luther then accuses Emser of using as a touchstone the principle that “whatever [Aiiij^r] pleases Bohemians is heretical.”³² With lies like this Luther inverts and corrupts the words of a priest of God. It is how he treats holy scriptures as well. Emser never said any such thing in his letter. It is all in Luther’s dreams, so that with the greater shamelessness he can insult an innocent man. This is how the boastful Thraso struts and captures the public ear.³³ We know well enough that no one is so weak (or so erroneous) in spirit that nothing that is good can please him, as Emser and Bede state.³⁴ For this reason the Bardomonachus

³⁰ Marginal note: “Luther described by Emser as Catholic.”

³¹ The “puerorum *partibus ex puris*” fallacy of which Eck accuses Luther was to make the first statement of a syllogism of particular rather than universal application: putting the universal statement, “all men are mortal,” first will lead to a valid syllogism, but putting the particular statement, “Socrates is a man,” first will not. The fallacy was usually designated “*ex puris particularibus (nihil sequitur)*,” but Eck may have had the version cited by Peter of Spain in mind, “*Partibus ex puris sequitur nil.*” See Petrus Hispanus, *Summulae logicales* (Hildesheim: Georg Ohms Verlag, 1981), 122.

³² Marginal note: “What pleases the Hussites.” See WA 2:661.24–27.

³³ Thraso was the braggart soldier in Terence’s comedy *The Eunuch*.

³⁴ Marginal note: “Bede.” The Venerable Bede had declared that heretics typically include orthodox truth in their writings, in order to snare the unwary into accepting their falsehoods: “*nulla porro falsa doctrina est, quae non aliqua vera intermisceat.*” See Bede’s commentary on Luke 17:12 in J.A. Giles, ed., *Venerabilis Bedae Commentaria in Scripturas Sacras* (London: Whittaker, 1844), 5:244–45.

should attribute his inventions not to “Eckian or Emserian dialectic” but to Lutheran ravings and lies.³⁵

We need not defend ourselves against “reasoning” of this sort.³⁶ But he invents this foolishness and then attributes it to us, so that he can pass himself off as a learned man and us as mere blockheads. It is idiotic to ask, as you do, “Why you are not equally known as ‘the champion of the Jews.’”³⁷ I answer Luther thus: if I had found him describing any articles of the Jews that had been condemned by the church as “Catholic,” I would have described him as being a champion of the Jews, as much as I described him as a champion of the Bohemians. So it is in vain that he keeps harping on the fact that everything that pleases the Bohemians is heretical, and everything that displeases them is Catholic. No one could come to that conclusion unless they were as thick as a plank, just as Luther is.

He says that letters are sent to him from various parts of the world by distinguished supporters of his arrogance, begging him not to recant. They will soon see for themselves how fully this makes them “champions of error” as well. For it is not only those who do evil but those who consent, who are worthy of death.³⁸ For Emser was moved to write not by mere suspicion but by factual evidence. It is notorious that the Bohemians offered public prayers for Luther. It is notorious and evident that they rejoiced over Luther. It is notorious that they sent Luther congratulatory letters. This barrack-room lawyer ought to have remained silent rather than exclaim that theologians oppose heresy only out of fear and mistrust.³⁹ This mighty hunter Nimrod (whom the interlinear gloss on Genesis 10 describes as

³⁵ WA 2:661.27–31. “*Bardomonachus*” is a play on “*bardocucullus*” (see above). Luther was of course an Augustinian friar, not a monk, but the insult allows Eck to align himself with humanist criticism of monastic obscurantism.

³⁶ WA 2:662.1.

³⁷ WA 2:662.5f.

³⁸ Marginal note: “Paul to the Romans” [Rom 1:32].

³⁹ WA 2:662.24–28.

“a deceiver of souls”) invents his prey at will.⁴⁰ And so he hunts goat-deer and other such figments of his imagination.

False also is the claim that theologians use two points of reference, namely what pleases heretics and what displeases them.⁴¹ But it is true that what the all too puffed up and arrogant monk said at the Leipzig disputation—that some Hussite articles [Aii^y] condemned by the holy general Council of Constance are most Christian and evangelical—is a sacrilege and a diabolical championing of the errors of heretics. What faithful person does not understand that this will only please the heretics and let them boast, while insulting Catholics?⁴²

This is what Luther, the new doctor of grammatico-theology, teaches with his new theology: that he is the one and only true theologian, while Eck and others are not theologians. The Bardocuculla once again hallucinates that I have no knowledge of scripture.⁴³ In his usual, histrionic, manner, he accused me of having adduced no arguments for three weeks other than from the Hussite articles. The masters of Leipzig University and all future readers of the disputation proceedings will recognize that as slanderous invention.

Then the scheming hunter unleashes a Molossian hound. He alleges that when Master Emser wrote, he did not condemn all Luther’s teachings but only those erroneous ones that please the Bohemians, which are falsely attributed to Luther.⁴⁴ But Master Emser never put this in his letter. Luther dreamt this while sleeping on his straw bed. But let us examine the horned dilemma of this horned hunter. He posits that Emser wished to say that other teachings had pleased the Bohemians than those that they had read in Luther’s books, and that Luther published half-baked and erroneous books and sermons and circulated them to

⁴⁰ Marginal note: “On the book of Ge[nesis].”

⁴¹ WA 2:662.33–36.

⁴² Marginal note: “Why the Hussites still persist.”

⁴³ WA 2:663.3.

⁴⁴ WA 2:663:6–8. Marginal note: “Luther’s erroneous teachings.”

seduce the poor people.⁴⁵ Emser, however, makes these claims nowhere in his letter. Luther invented them in order to create his horned argument by lying—I mean “hunting.” Luther says, if it is true that the Bohemians support his teachings, and if Emser claims that they do so wrongly, because Luther has refused to champion the Bohemians, then one of two things follows: either Emser is an impudent liar or Luther must revoke his teachings.⁴⁶ But David says, “I will break the horns of sinners but the horns of the righteous shall be lifted up.”⁴⁷ Therefore, this mighty hunter’s goat horns will be broken, for it is certain that Emser has not lied.⁴⁸ But let us see if Luther has not lied. He denies that he is the champion of the Bohemians, and yet he both says and writes that the most damnable articles of the Hussites are “most Christian.” This he has repeated so often with his blaspheming mouth that the monk dares to write this quite shamelessly, despite the fact that I proved that such a statement amounted to defending the heresy of Huss. He writes that he wishes that his words might be pleasing [Aiv^r] to Bohemians and even to Turks and Jews. It is certain that they are, at least when you show contempt for the Roman pontiff and make him equal in status to that of any little mass-priest.⁴⁹ But what praise, Luther, might be pleasing to the wicked? And what will you do, if you are also found well-pleasing to the devil, who prowls around like a lion, seeking whom he may devour?⁵⁰ But he raises another horn which, as in Daniel, makes war with the saints.⁵¹ If the Bohemians are of the same mind as me, he says, then they are of the

⁴⁵ WA 2:663.9–11.

⁴⁶ WA 2:663.11–14.

⁴⁷ Marginal note: “Psal” [Ps 74:11, Vg.; 75:11, EVV].

⁴⁸ Here Eck further develops Luther’s notion of himself as the hunter and Emser as a goat in a playful but rather confusing way. Alluding to the common notion of the “horns of a dilemma” (two equally unacceptable alternatives between which a disputant must choose), Eck describes Luther’s dilemma as “goat-horned” (*capricornus*). Again, Eck’s description of Luther as “a mighty hunter” (*robustus venator*) equates him to Nimrod (Gen 10:9), where the description is not complimentary.

⁴⁹ In his *Additio*, Luther argued that the monarchical high priesthood of Aaron found its fulfilment in the New Testament in Christ’s priestly office, not in the Petrine succession (see WA 2:669.24–34). For Eck, this relegated the pope to the status of an ordinary mass-priest (*sacerdos sacrificulus*).

⁵⁰ I Pet 5:8.

⁵¹ Marginal note: “Dan.” [Dan 7:21].

right mind.⁵² On the contrary, I say if the Bohemians are of the same mind as you, then they are of the same mind as they have always been. (Or does he deny that the Bohemians are heretics? I hear that he has been pouring out poison of this sort along with his friend Philipp Melanchthon.⁵³ “It is no heresy to disbelieve indelible character, transubstantiation and the like”:⁵⁴ this is how the Wittenbergers argue, so that among them are no heretics, even though they say that in the holy sacrament of the altar one eats the element of bread, just as one does ordinary food!)⁵⁵ Therefore, this foolish hunter confuses Bohemian and Catholic articles, and the rejected and the condemned. So it is certain that the Bohemians boast that in these articles, in which they dissent from the Catholic Church, they have Luther as their champion—and indeed that he is the most Hussite of them all.⁵⁶

There is no need for Master Emser to be granted “a memory of Eckian proportions” in order to enable him to remember his own line of argument.⁵⁷ His own powers of memory, together with his genius and erudition, easily overshadow Luther’s. May you be a witness, Bishop Johann, most beloved of God, of the powers of memory that Emser demonstrated when he preached so fluently at your consecration. Eck could, however, afford to spare Emser such memory as Luther’s colleague Karlstadt possesses—and still have a better memory than Luther!⁵⁸ (But any glory or honor for my powers of memory should be accorded not to me but to the God who made me.)

⁵² WA 2:663.27.

⁵³ Eck had been involved in a quarrel with Melanchthon as a result of the latter’s report on the Leipzig Disputation addressed to Johann Oecolampadius, which had been critical of Eck. See the edition of *Excusatio Eckii*.

⁵⁴ This thesis is cited verbatim from the list of propositions debated by Melanchthon as part of his examination for the degree of *baccalaureus biblicus*. This disputation took place on September 9, 1519. See Robert Stupperich, ed., *Melanchthons Werke in Auswahl*, 1:25, ll. 1–2.

⁵⁵ Marginal note: “It is a new heresy to believe that one can deny transubstantiation without heresy.”

⁵⁶ Marginal note: “Champion of the Hussites.”

⁵⁷ WA 2:664.4–5.

⁵⁸ Marginal note: “Karlstadt’s memory.” Eck criticized Karlstadt for wishing to consult his books during the Leipzig Disputation rather than relying on memory. See Erwin Iserloh, *Johannes Eck (1486–1543): Scholastiker, Humanist, Kontroverstheologe*, Katholisches Leben und Kirchenreform im Zeitalter der Glaubensspaltung 41 (Münster-Westfalen: Aschendorffsche Buchdruckerei, 1981), 34.

Luther is a dreamer. Not the one of whom the patriarchs said, “Behold, a dreamer comes,”⁵⁹ but he of whom the Lord God said, “Do not listen to the words of that dreamer.”⁶⁰ He dreams that Master Emser wishes that the Bohemians might boast of their foreign doctrines and errors in Luther’s name. I see no such thing in Emser’s letter. But he would detest that Lutherine boasting, which claims that “many very Christian French, Italian, English, German, and Spanish people” also boast of his teachings.⁶¹ So what? Birds of a feather flock together, and everyone has their own poison.⁶² On the contrary, most gracious bishop, I respond that I am ready to dispute Luther’s errors at the universities of Rome, Naples, Bologna, Paris, [Aiv^v] Toulouse, Louvain, Cologne, or Vienna.⁶³ Let Luther decide the location and the procedural details. If I lose, I shall pay all the costs, plus the expenses incurred by the Lutheran side. But it is Luther who will lose. He alone should revoke his errors, lest there be scandals in the church of God, and lest the people of God be led astray. This is the royal way by which I shall hunt Luther so that, in accordance with Jeremiah’s prophecy, the wild desert donkey—one should have said “the donkey in the desert”—may become a lion’s prey.⁶⁴ And thus it will become plain which one of us is the “son (and lord) of darkness.”⁶⁵

Our hunter then unleashes other hounds. Luther shamefully denies the fact that the schismatic Bohemians offered up public and daily (though profane) prayers for him, when he

⁵⁹ Marginal note: “Gene.,” i.e., Gen 37:19.

⁶⁰ Marginal note: “Deut.,” i.e., Deut 13:3.

⁶¹ WA 2:664.20–22.

⁶² The Latin proverbs that Eck uses are “*mulus mulum scabit*” (“one mule scratches another,” a reference to mutual flattery) and “*similes habent labra lactucas*” (“as the lips, so the lettuce”).

⁶³ Marginal note: “He will dispute.” In 1516 Eck had debated at Bologna the question of whether charging interest at 5% was usurious and had attempted to repeat the performance at Vienna. (See Erwin Iserloh, *Johannes Eck*, 20–22.) He clearly thought that his stock was still high in these places.

⁶⁴ This short sentence is rich in allusion and wordplay. Eck is referring principally to Sir 13:23 (“As the wild donkey is the lion’s prey in the desert, so are the poor devoured by the rich”), here misattributed to the prophet Jeremiah. In Christian interpretation, the “wild donkey in the desert” (*onager in heremo*) became the *onager heremita*, a type of the hermit monk who seeks solitude in the desert. See for instance Eucher of Lyons’ *Liber de spiritualibus formulis*, a spiritual glossary of biblical terms (Eucher, *Commentarij in Genesim, et in libros Regum* [Rome: Paulus Manutius, 1564], 330). The term could easily be used pejoratively, especially as Jerome, for instance, glossed the depiction of Ishmael (the “wild man whose hand is against everyone and every man against him,” Gen 16:12) as an onager. (See P. de Lagarde, ed., *Jerome: Quaestiones hebraicae in libro Geneseos* [Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, 1868], 26, ll. 14–20.) Eck builds on this association of images to continue the idea of hunting, while also ridiculing Luther, who was an Augustinian “eremite” or hermit, as a donkey.

⁶⁵ WA 2:664.29.

fought me at Leipzig, but it is true and beyond any shadow of doubt.⁶⁶ He knows this well enough. Who doubts that the Bohemians supported Luther over the specific points debated at Leipzig? Only someone more stupid than Coroebus.⁶⁷ He criticizes Emser for having written that Luther was “Catholic.”⁶⁸ If, Luther, you consider the name “Catholic” to be unworthy of you, then I reply that we ought to give you a name that suits you, namely, “Hussite.” Are you not already baptized with this worthy name? But how has Master Emser sinned? He did not say that you had defended the condemned Hussite articles (for that Hussite putrefaction and filth flows from you), but that you had said (at least openly, though perhaps you think differently in your heart) that it displeased you that the Bohemians had broken with the unity of the church, and that in this they had acted evilly. If deep down in his heart Master Emser really does believe you to be a heretic, then I swear by this right hand that he is not far from the truth. Nonetheless, he observes the tenor of your words, as they are written, in which you deny that you are a champion of the Bohemians. But call a halt to your poisonous hunt, while you consider this, Luther: do those words of yours really come from the heart, or do they come only from your lips? For it is you, Luther, who will be like that man who from the same spring drinks water both sweet and bitter.⁶⁹ Luther calls Emser his Rufinus, thus likening himself to Jerome.⁷⁰ If he wishes he can make himself King of Beans!⁷¹ Rufinus, as Gennadius said, was a great doctor of the church—although I must say that, like Giovanni

⁶⁶ WA 2:664.39–665.1.

⁶⁷ According to Erasmus, Coroebus was a man so lacking in wits that he undertook an impossible task (to count the waves in the sea) with insufficient resources (he was unable to count beyond five). See *Adages* 2.9.64.

⁶⁸ Marginal note: “Luther honored with the name ‘Catholic’ by Emser.” WA 2:665.8–13.

⁶⁹ Luther had accused Emser of this (WA 2:665.13–14). The allusion is to Jas 3:11, though Eck alters the image from that of a spring impossibly pouring forth both fresh and salt water.

⁷⁰ Marginal note: “Luther wishes to be Jerome.” Luther makes this equation repeatedly. See WA 2:664. 6, 8, 29; 665.2, 19, 28; and 666.2. The church historian Rufinus of Aquileia (c.345–c.410) was originally a friend of Jerome’s. They fell out when Rufinus, in his preface to a translation of the work of Origen, claimed that Jerome was strongly influenced by the Alexandrian. For Jerome, this was tantamount to being accused of heresy. See Henry Chadwick, “Jerome and Rufinus: controversy about Origen,” in Chadwick, *The Church in Ancient Society: From Galilee to Gregory the Great*, Oxford History of the Christian Church (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 433–45. Luther believed that Emser was accusing him of heresy under the guise of defending him from that same charge.

⁷¹ The *rex fabarum* was a lord of misrule appointed by lot at Christmas. Often associated with educational establishments, the tradition was particularly strong at the English universities. See John Brand, *Observations on Popular Antiquities* (London: Charles Knight & Co., 1841), 1:17.

Pico della Mirandola, I have always preferred Jerome to him.⁷² However, it is evident that Emser is innocent and never [Bi^r] contradicted himself, and that this ridiculous Cucullus is just shadow-boxing. Master Emser does not persecute dream-Bohemians, but those who have set themselves against the Roman church as schismatics and heretics—unless Luther impudently declares the entire church itself to be a dream.⁷³ But why should he so captiously and sophistically assume that Master Emser would judge Lutheran doctrine to be true? He makes jests like this, but he will be caught by his own nets. Where—anywhere—does Emser claim your teachings to be true? I believe that if he were asked to give his considered opinion on your perverse doctrines, he would at once judge them on the basis of his learning to be sacrilegious and damnable. The madness of this Cucullus is to be marvelled at, when he claims that we will be found unjust liars for regarding the Bohemians as heretics.⁷⁴ In that case the entire Christian world would be a liar, together with the Catholics in Bohemia and others who also regard the Hussites as heretics. Luther should stop his lying accusations against a decent and learned man like Emser. There is no lie so big that it would make Luther blush to tell it. Nor does he write privately, so that the birds of the air may carry his words to Emser.⁷⁵ But through the printing press he publishes his letter in a thousand copies. Why should he not proclaim himself a new prophet, seeing that God must have endowed him with the discretion of spirits, the mind of Christ, and the deepest divine mysteries?⁷⁶ For who has known the mind of the Lord, and who has been his counsellor?⁷⁷ The law and the prophets

⁷² Marginal note: “Rufinus. Gennadius. Pico.” In claiming that “*Rufinus fuit magna pars doctorum ecclesiae*,” Eck takes a slight liberty with Gennadius’ more modest claim: “*Rufinus, Aquileiensis ecclesiae presbyter, non minima pars doctorum ecclesiae*.” See Ernest Cushing Richardson, ed., *Hieronymus, Liber de viris illustribus; Gennadius, Liber de viris illustribus*, Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur 14/1 (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs’sche Buchhandlung, 1896), 67, ll. 28–29.

⁷³ Luther had accused Emser of attacking “Bohemians formed by him in his sleep” (WA 2:665.24–25).

⁷⁴ WA 2:665.37.

⁷⁵ WA 2:666.7. The reference is to Eccl 10:20.

⁷⁶ Marginal note: “Luther the prophet.”

⁷⁷ Rom 11:34.

were until John the Baptist.⁷⁸ But I judge that Luther, by his foul, monstrous doctrines will plumb the depths of Hell sooner than he will come to any knowledge of the discretion of spirits and of the depths of God.

Emser asserted on the authority of Bede that heretics mix truth and falsehood. Augustine, Jerome, and Gregory say the same.⁷⁹ Thus even John Hus, of damnable memory, did say some things that are true. But Luther rises up as if Emser had contradicted the holy Council of Constance and declared some of the Hussite articles wrongly condemned.⁸⁰ He should show us where Master Emser ever said this, where he is supposed to have challenged the holy council. He must think that there are others as obstinate and impudent as he, who reject the church fathers, the decrees of the Roman pontiff, and canons of the holy councils as freely, or rather as casually, as he does. But as far as I am concerned, he alleges two lies against me. First, that I showed contempt for the Council of Nicaea.⁸¹ In this he most clearly slanders me. As [Bi^v] was recorded by the notaries and as the whole of Leipzig knows, throughout the entire course of the disputation, not only did I never reject or condemn any council, but I never rejected any of the holy doctors. Let us consider who has more respect for the ecclesiastical doctors. Is it Luther, who rejects them so casually and elevates his own opinions over the saints of old, contrary to the final canon of Saint Clement?⁸² Or is it Eck, who honors their words and venerates their authority? (I grant, however, that I do reject the teaching of a holy doctor, where it conflicts with the teaching of the majority.) The second slander is that I dared correct the Holy Spirit and re-interpret the Council of Constance.⁸³ This is absolutely untrue: the articles cited by me were manifestly above board. I do not believe

⁷⁸ Luke 16:16 (cf. Matt 11:13). This verse concludes, “since then, all have entered the kingdom of God violently,” and Eck may have cited it as an implicit condemnation of Luther.

⁷⁹ Marginal note: “Bede. Augustine. Jerome.”

⁸⁰ WA 2:666.12–17.

⁸¹ Marginal note: “The Council of Nicaea.” WA 2:666.23–24.

⁸² Marginal notes: “Eck venerates the ecclesiastics whom Luther contemns” and “Clement.” For the reference to Clement, see Gratian’s Decrees Pars I: D. 37, c. 14, in *Corpus iuris canonici* 1:139.

⁸³ WA 2:666.24–25.

that Luther has ever seen the declaration made by those deputed by the council to examine the articles, but I have both seen and read it. As always, Luther prefers the branches to the roots.⁸⁴ If he had seen it, he would know that although only thirty articles of Huss and Jerome of Prague were condemned, the council examined and discussed almost three times that number of errors in their writings. This appears in Henry of Piro's report.⁸⁵ Similarly, forty-five articles of John Wycliffe were condemned, but 223 articles had previously been examined at Oxford in England, a copy of all of which I have with me.⁸⁶ Luther has made a rod for his own back. If I had re-interpreted even one article of the council, he would have accused me of daring to correct the Holy Spirit, which suggests that you believe that the Council of Constance was directed by the Holy Spirit.⁸⁷ Why therefore do you dare, under the devil's influence, to call "most Christian and evangelical" articles that have been condemned under the direction of the Holy Spirit? What Erinys has seized you? What Furies drive you? What blaspheming lust has puffed you up? The present age will judge between our writings, and future ages will do so even more happily. For my book on *The Primacy of Peter* will shortly appear, and daily I see quires of Luther's trifles being carried away in boxes from perfume shops.

But let us examine the beautiful argumentation of the grammatico-theologian. He says to Emser, "You admit that I am Catholic. If so, you must equally admit that my teachings are Catholic."⁸⁸ But consider the case of Cyprian, and you will soon see how mangled and

⁸⁴ Marginal note: "Luther's knowledge." The Leipzig Disputation was portrayed by the Wittenbergers as a clash between humanists and, in Eck, a scholastic obscurantist. Here Eck portrays himself as a better humanist than Luther, who did not consult the primary sources.

⁸⁵ Marginal note: "Henry of Piro." Henricus Henrici de Piro (d. 1438) was a canon lawyer trained at Cologne and Bologna, who took part in the Council of Constance. He is not to be confused with his more famous nephew, the Carthusian Henricus Brunonis de Piro (1403–1473), who was still a child when the council sat. See Robert Feenstra, "Henricus Brunonis de Piro († 1473): professeur de droit civil et Chartreux," *Tijdschrift voor Rechtsgeschiedenis* 64 (1996), 3–46, esp. 2–3.

⁸⁶ Marginal note: "Wycliffe's articles."

⁸⁷ Marginal note: "The Council of Constance." In this sentence, Eck begins by referring to Luther in the third person but soon changes to the second person.

⁸⁸ WA 2:667.5–6. Marginal note: "Luther's feeble inference." The word translated "feeble" is *frigida*, the Latin for "cold," but used in this context to mean "unconvincing." Eck had taken strong exception to Luther's use of

invalid this statement is. Cyprian was a Catholic martyr; but you would not regard his teaching, that those baptized by heretics should be re-baptized [Bij^r], as Catholic. Master Emser was too trusting of Luther's craftiness in making out that he did not assert his teachings obstinately and that he was prepared to recant them if anyone could offer better. This he claimed in his writings. This he spoke with his own mouth. And this was why Master Emser judged him to be Catholic, even though his teachings were perverse, so Bernard.⁸⁹ Augustine purges Cyprian from suspicion of heresy in book two of *Against the Donatists Concerning Baptism*.⁹⁰ See, reverend Bishop, how imperfect Luther's understanding of such matters is!

When Master Emser reported that the Bohemians had in public offered up to God daily (though profane) prayers in support of Luther, Luther became incandescent with his customary rage.⁹¹ He reproved Emser for calling sacred things profane and divine worship mendacious. This doctor of grammatico-theology seems unaware that the holy things of any sect should be called "most execrable." But every Catholic is well aware of the solemnities by which heretics celebrate, confect, baptize, and so on—these "holy" things are in reality profane, as the Lord said through the prophet, "I will curse your blessings."⁹² Master Emser's words ring loud and clear, but Luther corrupts and perverts them with such calumny of God to satisfy both his envy and his lust for blasphemy. Why, Luther, do you boast that you pray

this word to characterize the decrees of canon law that supported papal primacy: "*probatur ex frigidissimis Romanorum Pontificorum decretis*." See Luther, *Disputatio et excusatio adversus criminationes D. J. Eckii* (1519) (WA 2:161.35–36). This clear allusion to an earlier dispute he had had with Luther suggests that Eck may have prepared at least some of the marginal notes himself.

⁸⁹ The definition of heresy in canon law was not doctrinal error alone, but the obstinate assertion of error. Among many iterations of this point in Bernard of Clairvaux can be found this one from Ep. 193: "[Abelard] proves himself to be a heretic not so much by his error as by his pertinacious defence of error." See J. Mabillon, ed., *S. Bernardi abbatis primi Clarae-Vallensis opera omnia, nova editio*, in J.-P. Migne, ed., *Patrologiae Latina* vol. 182 (Paris: Garnier, 1879), col. 359.

⁹⁰ Marginal note: "Augu." See Augustine, "De baptismo contra Donatistas," in Michael Petschenig, ed., *Sancti Aureli Augustini scripta contra Donatistas*, Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum 51 (Vienna: F. Tempsky; Leipzig: G. Freytag, 1908), 177–78.

⁹¹ WA 2:667.10–13.

⁹² Marginal note: "Malach." [Mal 2:2].

for Eck and Emser?⁹³ Christ commanded, “Let not your left hand know what your right is doing.”⁹⁴ Yet here he is, boasting of prayers said by him for his enemies. I made diligent inquiries whether Luther ever celebrated Mass at Leipzig, since many great feast days occurred during the disputation. I cannot be certain that he celebrated Mass even once during these three weeks, though in this respect he is to be praised, if he abstained in observance of the *sententia* of the Supreme Pastor, Leo X.⁹⁵ But my prayer is that Luther’s prayers do me no harm: God, the searcher of our hearts,⁹⁶ knows what is in our prayers for one another. But Luther invites prayers for his errors even from the Turks.⁹⁷ Such are his intercessors and such are his doctrines—erroneous, impure, temerarious, scandalous, and heretical. This vainglorious Thraso, this sacrilegious huntsman, boasts that he has captured the Aegocerota by tracking him with Molossian hounds, as once he was tracked by Albanian dogs (which the histories tell us are the most ferocious of all).⁹⁸ If only that had happened! This huntsman has so far breathed only threats, or has become a goat-stag, with a horn upon his nose.⁹⁹ Whoever fears him should flee: this Lutheran evil spews forth its immodesty and all kinds of disease, wishing to capture, disembowel, and flay our Aegocerota.

But Master Emser, as befits someone who is outstandingly learned in sound theology, provides well-rounded arguments in his letter to persuade [Bij^r] and convince the reader that

⁹³ Marginal note: “Luther’s boasting.” The reference is to WA 2:667.12–18, where Luther admits that “there is no one for whom I more ardently pray than for Johann Tetzl, the author of this tragedy (may his soul rest in peace), and for you [Emser] and for Eck and for all my adversaries.” Luther spoke only of praying for his opponents, not of saying Mass for them. Eck, as a secular priest, would naturally have associated intercession with the saying of Mass; Luther, as a religious, would perhaps more naturally associate regular intercession with the daily offices, outside a eucharistic context.

⁹⁴ Marginal note: “Math” (i.e., Matt 6:3).

⁹⁵ Marginal note: “Luther is to be praised.” I have not been able to identify the *sententia* to which Eck refers.

⁹⁶ Cf. Rom 8:27.

⁹⁷ WA 2:667.18–20.

⁹⁸ WA 2:667.22–25. Several ancient historians, including Pliny, Strabo, and Solinus, recorded that Alexander the Great was given one or more dogs of extraordinary fierceness and size by the king of Albania (not the modern Balkan state but a kingdom bordering the Caspian Sea). It was reported that an Albanian dog was able to kill a lion or even an elephant. See Solinus, *Polyhistor* (Cologne: E. Cervicornus, 1520), xxxix^v.

⁹⁹ The goat-stag (*hircocervus*) was an example used by the classical philosophers of a creature that could be imagined but did not exist. Luther had already accused Emser of being a non-entity in this way. Eck repays the compliment, adding for good measure a rhinoceros horn to the already composite animal.

primacy over the church is by divine right, just as much as it was in the synagogue under Aaron. This argument is adequately developed in our book *The Primacy of Peter*. There is no need for me to provide additional help for someone who is already victorious; but I consider that, on the question of the upper and the lower millstone, Master Emser was following the Interlinear Gloss, which interprets the lower millstone as fear and therefore as the Old Law, since it was a law based on fear.¹⁰⁰ (I remember reading a great deal about this. However, this hunter, with his biting hounds, needs to be captured today.) For in truth the synagogue was passive and weighed down with great burdens,¹⁰¹ when compared with the church, the bride of Christ.¹⁰² So Master Emser is right to state that, as Aaron was appointed prelate over all the priests, so in the church (which is greater than the synagogue) there should be a high priest set above all others. But then envy enters the heart of the obsessed Luther, so that he finds fault with Emser for not making the new priesthood superior to the old, the fulfillment of the sign superior to the sign itself, or the truth superior to the prefiguration of the truth.¹⁰³ But these are mere dreams and nightmares, which you will not read in Emser's letter. Luther has willfully invented them out of his disease-ridden imagination. Why can it not be that primacy over priests once existed in figure and in sign and exists now in fullness and truth? To this, Luther has no answer other than insults, injuries, and strange verbal monstrosities that allow him to evade the truth and in his mindless folly to drink deep of the cup of vanity. This is the whole reason why he avoids the judgment of his case: for he fears that his cunning, trickery, and impostures, which now he wretchedly covers with his excessive verbiage of scurrilous insults, will be exposed when subjected to judgment.¹⁰⁴ The statement of the apostle, that Christ is the true high pontiff and Aaron but a shadow, is very well known

¹⁰⁰ Marginal note: "Deut." [Deut 24:6].

¹⁰¹ Marginal note: "The Synagogue."

¹⁰² Marginal note: "The Church."

¹⁰³ WA 2:668.15–29.

¹⁰⁴ Marginal note: "Luther fears a judgment."

to us.¹⁰⁵ But Emser developed this idea to argue that though the primacy then existed only in a shadow of what was to come, it was nonetheless a true primacy. The magnificence of priestly vestments is merely an outward matter, though I certainly do not disapprove of the use of costly garments by priests in divine worship.¹⁰⁶

The hypocrite then ties a Gordian knot: in the Old Testament there was one high priest, but now there are two, Christ and his vicar.¹⁰⁷ Luther raves like this in a continual delirium. As if a master and his representative should be counted as two! It in no way compromises Christ's headship but rather complements it, allowing him to communicate with the faithful in a tangible manner.¹⁰⁸ Then Luther most damnably [Bijf] insults the "new theologians" for disdaining to regard the holy Son of God as a monarch.¹⁰⁹ There never was such a theologian, and no one ever disdained any such thing—outside the imputations of this manufacturer of lies. He then adds an argument worthy of Lutheran ingenuity, for I know the man well, who misleads himself and his supporters with sophisms like this: "It is impossible," he declares, "for all people on earth to seek to have their bishops confirmed at Rome."¹¹⁰ O Luther, most stupid of men! Who was ever so foolish as to say that, by divine right, all bishops ought to be confirmed at Rome, in the way Luther understands it? But I

¹⁰⁵ Marginal note: "Ad Heb" (Heb 7–9).

¹⁰⁶ In his original letter, Emser had argued that the divine institution of the Aaronic high priesthood was confirmed by the fact that Christ himself did not blush to subject himself to the high priest Caiaphas, even to the point of death. Luther objected to this line of argument on the grounds that it accorded too much honor to the Old Testament priesthood and not enough to the high priest of the New Testament, namely Christ. Emser had also cited the gorgeous decoration worn by Aaronic priests as proof of divine institution: "Therefore, it cannot be denied that Aaron's pontificate was instituted by God. And it was added by the same God, to the glory and ornament of that priesthood, that it should be adorned with robes twice-dyed in purple, the finest linen, and silver, jewels, and gold." To this, Luther objected that such pomp and ceremony was inappropriate to the followers of Christ, who urged those who would be great to be the least of all. For Emser's argument, see Thurnhofer, *Hieronymus Emser: De disputatio Lipsicensi, quantum ad Boemos obiter deflexa est*, 37. For Luther's response, see WA 2:668.21–669.16. [cited above, f.n. 5]

¹⁰⁷ Reading "*sum, sacerdos*" as "*sum[mus] sacerdos*." For Luther's argument that the Aaronic priesthood cannot presage both Christ's primacy and the pope's, see WA 2:669.24–29.

¹⁰⁸ Marginal note: "Christ the head of the Church."

¹⁰⁹ WA 2:669.29–34.

¹¹⁰ WA 2:669.35–39.

shall consider this matter in my book *The Primacy of Peter*, where I deal with Luther's fantasies at greater length.

This monk needs a dose of mind-medicine, for he is constantly raving in perpetual madness of this sort. For instance, Master Emser said that the papacy is established as much by the interpretation of sacred councils as by the command of Christ to "Feed my sheep."¹¹¹ At this, Luther goes completely mad, raving because he denies any council created the divine right of the papacy.¹¹² But Emser never said that a council created the divine right of the papacy. He said that a council *declared* the papacy to be by divine right. In the same way, the Council of Nicaea declared the Son's consubstantiality with the Father, against Arius' treachery: it did not create the consubstantiality.¹¹³ This is why the very learned Master Emser said that councils had declared the papal monarchy to be by divine right. To this he quickly added the divine institution itself, namely the command, "Feed my sheep." [John 21:17] But there is much more about that verse in my book *The Primacy of Peter*. Because I deal appropriately with his carping sophistries in that book, I shall not detail here Luther's perverse insults or his interpretations, which are contemptuous of all archbishops and bishops.¹¹⁴ But I wish that you, most worthy Bishop Johann, and all you bishops, who are most beloved of God, may continue to discharge the great spiritual government committed to you, in such a way that this upstart monk will never be able to convict those invested with the pontifical regalia of either tyranny or neglect. But you will see the extent of Luther's ignorance set out in my book *The Primacy of Peter*. And if God grants him a better spirit, he will repent of the blasphemy, the impudence, and the error of his farrago of words.

¹¹¹ CC 4:37–38.

¹¹² WA 2:670.1–5.

¹¹³ Marginal note: "Nicaea." The word Eck uses for the consubstantiality formula is the Greek word *homoousion* transliterated.

¹¹⁴ WA 2:670.7–18. Here Luther argues that the dominical command to Peter, "Feed my sheep," implies a ministry of service to the Christian flock, not domination and primacy over it.

Next, this mad huntsman makes a mountain out of a molehill (or rather out of his mouldy little thoughts), namely that the church of Christ existed for twenty years after the crucifixion before the church at Rome was founded.¹¹⁵ But this is dealt with in my book *The Primacy of Peter*, where the falsity of his assumptions is first detected, and then the weakness of his arguments is utterly [Biiij^v] laid bare and reduced to ashes—except perhaps in the island of the Hussites, which is defended by such enchantments that it is not possible to burn it by fire.¹¹⁶ Then Luther solemnly charges Master Emser with self-contradiction, for first declaring Peter’s primacy to be by divine right, and then by saying that in human affairs matters proceed slowly.¹¹⁷ Friar, remove the stupidity from your shaven head! Can you not see that the dignity of the Roman pontiff is a human matter, but that this power has been sustained by divine right? And do these facts contradict one another, you “weeder and sower of villainies?”¹¹⁸ For this power is indeed a human matter in that it pertains to human salvation, but the granting of this power is a divine matter. The histrionic huntsman considers it unworthy that Master Emser should give the example of the penitent thief.¹¹⁹ Perhaps it was not the most apposite example, but I can prove his point that delay does not always make

¹¹⁵ WA 2:670.37–671.4.

¹¹⁶ Marginal note: “The Hussite island incombustible.” The designation of landlocked Bohemia as an island of Hussites is startling, but it would have rung true for German Catholics. In his coloured broadsheet map for pilgrims to Rome, printed at the turn of the century, Erhard Etzlaub represented Bohemia as a tinted circle in the middle of German lands, carefully demarcated by forests and clearly a destination to be avoided by pious travellers. See Etzlaub, *Das ist der Rom-Weg von meyllen zu meyllen* ([Nuremberg], c. 1500). Johann Cochlaeus (who would later rank alongside Eck as one of Luther’s most dogged opponents) also drew attention to Bohemia’s isolation in his historical geography of Germany written for schoolboys: “The Bohemians are surrounded on all sides by German peoples, but they themselves do not speak German. . . . The Hercynian forest encircles it completely, like a natural wall. . . . The region itself is defended by the might of noblemen, innumerable fortresses, and even the very forest, so that it is impossible to root out this treacherous progeny of heretics who—in addition to their other thoroughly abominable and execrable practices—even frequent public baths, where they defile themselves in promiscuity.” See Karl Langosch, ed., *Johannes Cochlaeus: Brevis Germanie descriptio (1512)*, *Ausgewählte Quellen zur deutschen Geschichte der Neuzeit 1* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1960), 110–12.

¹¹⁷ WA 2:671.5–7.

¹¹⁸ Eck’s insult, “*sartor satorque malorum*,” seems to be a misremembering or adaptation of “*sartor satorque scelerum*,” from Plautus’ comedy *The Captives* (Act III, scene 5), so I have shown it as a quotation. “Sartor” here is a contracted form of “*sarritor*,” unrelated to the more common word “*sartor*” meaning “patcher” or “mender.” See Charlton A. Lewis and Charles Short, eds., *A Latin Dictionary* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1879), “Sartor I. and II.”

¹¹⁹ WA 2:671.14–15.

things worse. Caiaphas and Balaam are terrifying examples for Luther, who resists with such singularity and obstinacy the truth revealed by the Holy Spirit in sacred scripture and the sacred councils, so that it can be said of him that he is the singular wild beast who has ravaged the Lord's vineyard.¹²⁰

In his usual way, Luther also falsely accuses Master Emser of saying that Peter's primacy was idle for twenty years. This he never said. Rather, Emser proposed that it was no hindrance to the Roman church, if for twenty years Peter were delayed from giving it its preeminence. Who but a demented person could infer from this that Peter's primacy was idle, when it was being exercised in Jerusalem and then in Antioch? (There is more about this in my book *The Primacy of Peter*.) But to this he adds the destructive argument, which he did not shrink from adducing at Leipzig either, that Saint Peter suffered himself to be sent, as an inferior, in Acts 8[:14].¹²¹ Such was the argument of the most treacherous Arius, when he declared the Son to be less than the Father, because he was sent by the Father.¹²² Luther appealed to the invalid defence that Peter gave an account of himself in Acts 10, as if a superior must never explain himself, even for the avoidance of scandal.¹²³ This is how the doctor of grammatico-theology mistreats holy scripture. And this is how our falsifier corrupts a third text of holy scripture, when blasphemously he dares to assert that Peter's judgment was altered or confirmed on the authority of James.¹²⁴ Not even a grammatical theologian

¹²⁰ Marginal note: "Psal[m 80:13 (79:14 Vulg.)]. "Singularity" is a charge Eck frequently levelled at Luther in his writings of 1519. This reference to the *singularis ferus* ("the singular wild beast" in the Douai-Rheims translation of the Vulgate) is an early adumbration of the preamble of the papal bull of condemnation against Luther, which Eck would be entrusted with promoting in Germany in the following year, *Exsurge Domine*.

¹²¹ Marginal note: "Luke" (as author of the Acts of the Apostles). WA 2:671.30–31.

¹²² Marginal note: "Arius."

¹²³ WA 2:671.31–32.

¹²⁴ WA 2:671.32–35. The reference is to Acts 15:13–21.

could take this to mean that any aspect of Peter's judgment was altered. Jerome put the matter well when he said that Peter was the principal in this decree concerning the Jewish laws.¹²⁵

I consider unimportant the jests that this buffoon spews forth concerning these wrongly and most foully understood places of scripture. **[Biv^r]** Let Luther meet me in a debate before judges, and then we will see whose opinions concerning the divine right are more in accordance with holy scripture.¹²⁶ For Luther is a fine debater when he has a pen in his hand, with which he can defend his poisonous propositions; but he runs away from the prospect of judgment. His most impudent lie of all is his claim that his proposition concerning Peter's primacy is identical with that of the Council of Nicaea.¹²⁷ Here he is a bigger liar than any Thessalonian or Cretan, because he has never even seen the canons of the Nicene council. I, on the other hand, prove in my book *The Primacy of Peter* that the Roman pontiff was granted primacy over the universal church by the authority of the Nicene council.¹²⁸ In the book I refer the candid reader, for the better comprehension of Luther's lie, to the canons of that council, to the epistle of Julius against the Arians, and to the acts of the Sixth Council of Carthage. With equal mendacity he croaks that I avoided this point at Leipzig.¹²⁹ The whole of Leipzig knows this remark to be pure Lutheran, that is, pure fiction. This is why I have shut his wicked mouth, with respect to the holy Council of Nicaea, in my book *The Primacy of Peter*.

I have often said it before and I say it again: Luther can never engage with any matter in a truly sound way, because he clings to the branches more than the roots. I met with equal arrogance, when Luther's grammarian, Philipp Melanchthon, declared that the books of

¹²⁵ Marginal note: "Jerome." Here Eck quotes verbatim Jerome's words from Letter 112, ch. 8, to Augustine. See Isidore Hilberg, ed., *Sancti Eusebii Hieronymi Epistulae. Pars II: Epistulae LXXI–CXX*, Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum 60 (Vienna: F. Tempsky; Leipzig: G. Freytag, 1912), 375, l. 28; 376, l. 1.

¹²⁶ Marginal note: "Eck's offer."

¹²⁷ WA 2:672.5–6.

¹²⁸ Marginal note: "The Council of Nicaea."

¹²⁹ WA 2:673.34–35.

Maccabees had been declared non-canonical by a formal decision of the church, when he had never so much as looked at any church canon relating to which biblical books are to be received: if they were not so arrogant and were prepared to be taught by Eck, they might learn something. If not, let them show me the canon. To my knowledge, there isn't one. He says nothing to the point when he says, "I do not fear your very strong and very noisy Eck."¹³⁰ If that is so, let us meet and dispute before judges, who will give a decision on the spot. It is equally pointless to accuse me of being unable to teach holy scripture well.¹³¹ It is enough for Luther that he is, unfortunately, well able to teach errors, scandals, heresies, and all that is most pestilential. He boasts that he has been quite worn down by the scholastic doctors:¹³² I doubt that he has ever understood even one of them. How very true are those words of Jeremiah [49:16a], "Your arrogance has deceived you."¹³³ But though as a scholar Luther is weak, as a biter he is strong.

Finally he gets to the nub of the matter and would show Emser that he did not spew forth at Leipzig all the material that he had at his disposal.¹³⁴ But compare his (error-strewn) book on the power of the pope with the record of the disputation, and you will see that he had indeed vomited up all that he had to say about the Acts of the Apostles and about councils.¹³⁵ Nor does it matter that this fraudulent champion lied that I presented my case against him for four days on end, [Biv^v] for the truth of the matter will be obvious when the disputation report is read, namely that that sophist and Proteus, while he was acting as respondent, cleverly took the part of opponent and turned all his stronger weapons against me, so that when finally it was his turn to defend, what little ammunition he had left was weak. I refer to the notaries' reports. With no less arrogance he plays the Cretan, when he describes my

¹³⁰ Marginal note: "Luther." WA 2:672.31–32.

¹³¹ WA 2:672.36–38.

¹³² WA 2:673.1.

¹³³ Marginal note: "Jeremiah."

¹³⁴ WA 2:673.34–36.

¹³⁵ Eck is presumably referring to Luther's *Resolutio Lutheriana super propositione sua decima tertia de potestate papae* (WA 2:181–240).

arguments as hollow and trivial, and me as unworthy of Karlstadt, who brought forth such productive answers to my “trivial” objections.¹³⁶ How dare you lie so openly, you threefold thief who deserves a good thrashing? What web of deceit is this, that you now call this man Karlstadt “productive,” when you had earlier deplored his sterility? Why did you permit a man so weak, so unconvincing, and so forgetful to descend into the arena of battle? Ask anyone in Leipzig, and they will tell you about the extent of Karlstadt’s ability—not his ability in learning, which is small, but his ability to read out of books, in schoolboy fashion. Both Luther and his lying will be exposed when the disputation is published. But I am absolutely convinced that Luther himself never wanted a disputation, from which he would rather have fled.¹³⁷ We know who it is who hates the light and who flees the judgment. And certainly I had hoped to hear the meaning of holy scripture set out, but instead I was forced to listen to an exposition of the Hussite articles. And I believed that I was to dispute with a Catholic and religious doctor of theology, but instead found that my business was with a Hussite.¹³⁸

Then the plague-ridden Luther vomits up something else, daring to claim that to this day the argument concerning the Council of Nicaea has not yet been resolved, because the fathers there made a decree contrary to an article of the Council of Constance. Good God! Is there nothing that this desperate and mad monk dare not do? He characterizes the most sacred councils as making decrees that conflict and oppose each other. How contrary to the Holy Spirit, who led and taught both councils? I have already said that the Bardocuculla has never seen the decrees of Nicaea. I shall add to that and say that the primacy of the Roman church is most clearly approved by the Council of Nicaea and that the article of the Council of Constance affirmed it, as is more fully demonstrated in my book, *The Primacy of Peter*. Here

¹³⁶ WA 2:673.36–674.7. I take *cretisat* to mean “he plays the Cretan,” i.e., “he lies.”

¹³⁷ Marginal note: “Luther flees from disputation.”

¹³⁸ Here Eck alludes to a passage from the *Addition*, which follows a similar pattern: see WA 2:674.5–10.

it will be evident that the Council of Nicaea is not Luther's Tydeus:¹³⁹ if he wants a champion, he would do better to ask some apostate Arian!

He abuses holy scripture with such malice, arguing that primacy among the apostles was held first by Judas and then by Matthias, that this Cuculla is worthy only of pitch, brimstone, and fire [cf. Isa 34:9].¹⁴⁰ Why would anyone try to follow such absurd and profane thinking? In the same way it shames me to repeat his view that the Roman [Bv^r] pontiffs sought this primacy in order to have tyrannical power for themselves.¹⁴¹ If so, by that power (which was given only for edification) they would have destroyed rather than built. This I firmly believe, with holy mother church, that Peter was constituted by Christ as pastor of the universal church. I believe that this power is also possessed by all who sit in Peter's chair. Again, I honor the Lord God's command, "You will not curse a ruler of your people, for whoever curses a prince will die."¹⁴² It does not please me at all when an erring pontiff is flattered: he should be warned and gently corrected. For in all things, Christ is to be preferred above any mere human. So Paul reprehended Peter, and Jethro was wiser than Moses [Gal 2:11–13; Exod 18:24]. But what Luther babbles forth with such temerity, that there is no

¹³⁹ In his *Addition*, Luther had claimed that the Council of Nicaea was his "Tydeus" against all arguments in favor of divine right defences of Roman primacy (WA 2:674.15–16). Tydeus was a warrior whose legendary defeat of all the commanders of the city of Thebes in single combat is recalled in Book 4 of the *Iliad*. Luther's appeal to the council was based on Canon 6, which confirmed only that Rome had primacy over neighboring Italian churches "by ancient custom" (i.e., not by divine right) and recognized that the sees of Alexandria and Antioch exercised similar metropolitan jurisdiction by custom. See G. Alberigo et al., eds., *Conciliorum Oecumenicorum Decreta* (Bologna: Istituto per le Scienze Religiose, 1973), 8–9. In his *Explanation of the Thirteenth Proposition*, Luther cites as his source an ecclesiastical history (presumably one of the numerous continuations of Eusebius), thus supporting Eck's contention that Luther had not seen the text of the Nicene Council itself. Luther's summary of the canon is however accurate. See *Resolutio Lutheriana super propositione XIII de potestate papae*, 1519 (WA 2:238.3–11).

¹⁴⁰ Marginal note: "Judas the first apostle, according to Luther." In the section of the *Addition* to which Eck refers, Luther satirizes Eck's scholastic way of arguing by proposing and defending an absurd notion following similar logic: Matthias was the last and least of the disciples; but Jesus said that the last shall be first; since Matthias replaced and therefore succeeded the traitor Judas, then Judas must have been the first and foremost disciple before him. See WA 2:674.25–675.15.

¹⁴¹ WA 2:675.27–30.

¹⁴² Here Eck joins to Exod 22:28 some of the wording of Exod 21:17, but substituting "prince" for "your father and mother." The commandment to honor one's parents was commonly assumed throughout the Middle Ages and beyond to enjoin respect for all in a position of authority, and so Eck would have seen this alteration as consonant with the spirit, if not with the letter, of scripture. See Pierre Janelle, ed., *Obedience in Church and State: Three Political Tracts by Stephen Gardiner* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1930), 180.

power in the church except for the curtailing of sin,¹⁴³ is utterly false, for this power is as much for the promotion of the good as for the inhibition of evil. If it were not, how could any innocent boy be confirmed, or any righteous youth be ordained? The penitent, who had made satisfaction for sin, will no longer seek to receive the holy sacrament of the Eucharist. It is of the greatest importance that the abuses of the Roman curia be discussed openly, for they are rampant, as Luther says.¹⁴⁴ But his manner of correcting them is not acceptable, for up to now he has never voiced his criticisms of the Roman pontiff privately to his face but has straightaway told the church.¹⁴⁵ Here he would do well to observe the apostle's command, "Rebuke not an elder but entreat him as a father" [I Tim 5:1], which he ignores. At length he pours out his usual poison, arguing that there is no distinction of degree (*maioritas*) in the church.¹⁴⁶ He bases this on Christ's words, "Whoever would be great (*maior*) amongst you must be your servant" [Matt 20:26], but he understands them wrongly, as I demonstrated at the Leipzig disputation and in my book *The Primacy of Peter*.

Finally Luther, worn out by hunting, complains that the Leipzig disputation resulted only in the fruits described by the apostle in I Timothy 6. But let Luther (or one of his canons who disseminate Lutheran errors) tell me: whose fault is that if not Luther's and his supporters?¹⁴⁷ Why did they not await the judgment of the illustrious University of Paris in silence? Had you been concerned with the truth of faith, you would have done so. What you aimed at was not that but wisps of transitory glory, popular acclaim, and empty show. And since this did not happen, [Bv^v] you decided to expunge the ignominy you received and adopt this most bitter and envious style of writing! May God and all the saints be my witness that

¹⁴³ WA 2:676.16–21.

¹⁴⁴ WA 2:676.22–30.

¹⁴⁵ Eck appears to be alluding to Matt 18:15–17, which sets out a procedure for correcting erring brethren: a private stage ("*corripe eum inter te et ipsum solum*": Eck has "*arguerit Romanum pontificem inter se et illum*"); a semi-public stage involving witnesses; and the public stage in which the entire Church is involved ("*Dic ecclesiae*": Eck has "*dicit Ecclesiae*").

¹⁴⁶ WA 2:678.3–7.

¹⁴⁷ Marginal note: "The unlearned Lutheran canons."

I—entirely unvanquished in the disputation—have merely repaid his insults. For myself, I wished for nothing more than that the whole truth might be laid bare by the judgment of Paris. I disputed so that I did not have to write. But things turned out quite differently. Because I have disputed, it has become the more important for me to write, lest the errors, heresies, and perverse doctrines broadcast by the Lutherans gain a fictitious victory and lead the simple folk astray. But listen to what this professed monk has to say: “We did not know that we were in the midst of wolves.” In whose midst was Luther at Leipzig? Councillors of the illustrious prince and lord Georg, duke of Saxony, and the senate of Leipzig University! This most blasphemous of all men dared to call them wolves and to liken them to dogs and pigs.¹⁴⁸ And the vice by which he strives so officiously to gain glory for himself, he attributes to others. I—may God be my witness—have sought only the truth, and therefore, I have awaited the judgment. The Cuculla does not seek the truth but glory. The evidence is his many biting, slanderous, and arrogant writings with which this boastful Thraso sings of his victory before it is awarded. I would rather he had remained quiet in a spirit of gentle humility and (like me) awaited the judgment of Paris in perfect tranquillity. He could and still can find in Eck a man who is ready to make peace, if only he would in silence await the determination of the truth of our statements by the Christian masters of that Athens of the Christian world, namely the University of Paris.

I would like, most magnificent bishop, to touch briefly in passing on the way in which I have seen Master Hieronymus Emser suffer such mockery and injury at Luther’s hands. Neither his wide-ranging and deep learning, nor his integrity of life (which is well known and evident to you), nor the honor of his priestly status, nor his careful foresight, deserved such impudent and biting invective. The unbiased reader, having seen Emser’s letter, will readily

¹⁴⁸ Marginal note: “Luther calls the Leipzigers wolves.” The reference is to *WA* 2:678.27–31, where, in disgust at the Leipzigers’ partisanship, Luther cites Jesus’ command not to give holy things to dogs nor to cast pearls before swine (Matt 7:6).

endorse all that I have just said. And so you will forgive me, all who read the present work, and above all you, most worthy bishop, if Luther the biter has himself been bitten, for there is no other way to deal with such a wild and hateful huntsman. I have had to force myself to use greater violence against him than my kindheartedness would normally allow. May God almighty achieve that which he promised through the prophet, [Bvj^r] namely that, having been reprimanded, that huntsman Luther will be mollified, and that hunters after peace and salvation will follow on his heels. “I will send them,” says Jeremiah [16:16–17], “many hunters, and they will hunt them from every peak and from every hill and from every rocky cavern, for my eyes are upon all their ways.”

Farewell, worthy bishop. From Ingolstadt, 28 October, in this year of grace 1519.

Finis.