

Teaching material provided by



GUIDE TO MARTIN LUTHER'S
DE SERVO ARBITRIO (1525)

1. Sources and literature

The dispute between Erasmus and Luther is evident in their correspondence since 1516. Important letters are printed in German translation in *W²* (Martin Luthers Sämtliche Schriften, hg. v. Johann Georg Walch, vol. 18: Reformations-Schriften, 1888), and the editorial introductions to the editions trace the discussion. In 1524, Erasmus published his treatise *De libero arbitrio διατριβή sive collatio* (VD16 E 3147), to which Luther responded in 1525 with *De servo arbitrio* (VD16 L 6660). Erasmus' *Diatribē* has not yet been edited in the Amsterdam edition (Opera Omnia Desiderii Erasmi [ASD]), so that researchers have to use either the Leiden edition (Desiderii Erasmi Roterodami Opera Omnia, vol. 9, 1706, 1215–1248 [LB]) or Johann von Walter's edition (Erasmus, *De libero arbitrio diatribe sive collatio*, 1910), which also forms the basis of the Latin-German study edition in Erasmus' *Ausgewählte Schriften* (ed. Werner Welzig, vol. 4, 1969, 1–195 [AS]). Luther's book was edited in 1908 in WA 18:551–787 by Albert Freitag, with a detailed introduction; both the edition and the introduction are still usable, and because WA 18 is often cited in the research literature, it is advisable to have this edition at hand. In twentieth-century Germany, many also used the edition in *Luthers Werke in Auswahl* published by Otto Clemen (vol. 3, 1929, 94–293 [Cl]). As part of *Studienausgabe* of Luther's writings published in the late 1970s and 1980s, the Latin text was re-edited, with the introduction and commentary reflecting more recent research (vol. 3, 1983, 170–356 [LStA]). All three editions mentioned (WA 18 – Cl 3 – LStA 3) can be used and cited for academic work. The authoritative English translation is that published by Philip S. Watson in *Luther's Works* (vol. 33, 1972 [LW]). Erasmus' and Luther's tracts are available in one volume in English translation: *Luther and Erasmus: Free Will and Salvation*, translated and edited by E. Gordon Rupp and Philip S. Watson, 1969. And there is a selection from Erasmus' three contributions to the controversy together with a selection from Luther's *De servo arbitrio* in English translation: *Erasmus and Luther. The Battle over Free Will*, ed. Clarence H. Miller, 2012.

Those seeking basic information about *De servo arbitrio* can consult not only the introductions to the editions and translations, but also the accounts of Luther's biography and theology, where the book and the controversy to which it belongs are discussed. In addition, there are numerous monographs and articles that either deal with *De servo arbitrio* or discuss the writing in other contexts. Many of these are studies of systematic theology, because Luther's controversy with Erasmus invites discussion of a number of fundamental questions: the relationship between divine governance (*praedestinatio*) and human freedom (*liberum arbitrium*), the nature and understanding of the Bible (*claritas scripturae*), the distinction between the hidden and revealed God (*deus absconditus/revelatus*), and the certainty of faith (*assertio*). The following selection is arranged by publication date and contains contributions that are oriented toward either church history or systematic theology:

- Karl Zickendraht, *Der Streit zwischen Erasmus und Luther über die Willensfreiheit*, 1909
- Ferdinand Kattenbusch, *Deus absconditus bei Luther* (in: *Festgabe für D. Dr. Julius Kaftan zu seinem 70. Geburtstag*, 1920, 170–214)
- Erdmann Schott, *Luthers Lehre vom servum arbitrium in ihrer theologischen Bedeutung* (*Zeitschrift für Systematische Theologie* 7, 1930, 399–430)
- Martin Doerne, *Gottes Ehre am gebundenen Willen. Evangelische Grundlagen und theologische Spitzensätze in De servo arbitrio* (*Lutherjahrbuch* 20, 1938, 45–92)

- John Dillenberger, *God Hidden and Revealed: The Interpretation of Luther's Deus Absconditus and its Significance for Religious Thought*, 1953
- Hans Joachim Iwand, *Die Freiheit des Christen und die Unfreiheit des Willens* [1957] (in: Id., *Um den rechten Glauben. Gesammelte Aufsätze*, 1959, 247–268)
- Hellmut Bandt, *Luthers Lehre vom verborgenen Gott. Eine Untersuchung zu dem offenbarungsgeschichtlichen Ansatz seiner Theologie*, 1958
- Rudolf Hermann, *Von der Klarheit der Heiligen Schrift. Untersuchungen und Erörterungen über Luthers Lehre von der Schrift in "De servo arbitrio"* [1958] (in: Id., *Studien zur Theologie Luthers und des Luthertums*, 1981, 170–255)
- Alfred Adam, *Der Begriff "Deus absconditus" bei Luther nach Herkunft und Bedeutung* (*Lutherjahrbuch* 30, 1963, 97–106)
- Harry J. McSorley, *Luthers Lehre vom unfreien Willen nach seiner Hauptschrift De Servo Arbitrio im Licht der biblischen und kirchlichen Tradition*, 1967 (English translation: *Luther: Right or Wrong? An Ecumenical-Theological Study of Luther's Major Work, The Bondage of the Will*, 1969)
- Klaus Schwarzwäller, *Sibboleth. Die Interpretation von Luthers Schrift De servo arbitrio seit Theodosius Harnack. Ein systematisch-kritischer Überblick*, 1969
- Klaus Schwarzwäller, *Theologia Crucis. Luthers Lehre von der Prädestination nach De servo arbitrio*, 1525, 1970
- Hermann Dörries, *Erasmus oder Luther. Eine kirchengeschichtliche Einführung* (in: *Kerygma und Melos, Festschrift Christhard Mahrenholz*, 1970, 533–570)
- Gottfried Krodel, *Erasmus-Luther: One Theology, One Method, Two Results* (*Concordia Theological Monthly* 41, 1970, 648–667)
- Otto Kuss, *Über die Klarheit der Schrift. Historische und hermeneutische Überlegungen zu der Kontroverse des Erasmus und des Luther über den freien oder versklavten Willen* (in: *Schriftauslegung. Beiträge zur Hermeneutik des Neuen Testaments und im Neuen Testament*, ed. Josef Ernst, 1972, 89–149)
- Eberhard Jüngel, *Quae supra nos nihil ad nos. Eine Kurzformel der Lehre vom verborgenen Gott, im Anschluß an Luther interpretiert* [1972] (in: Id., *Theologische Erörterungen*, vol. 2: *Entsprechungen: Gott – Wahrheit – Mensch*, 2002, 202–251)
- Brian A. Gerrish, "To the unknown God." *Luther and Calvin on the Hiddenness of God* (*Journal of Religion* 53, 1973, 263–292)
- Robert D. Shofner, *Luther on the 'Bondage of the Will': An Analytical-Critical Essay* (*Scottish Journal of Theology* 26, 1973, 24–39)
- John W. O'Malley, *Erasmus and Luther, Continuity and Discontinuity as Key to Their Conflict* (*Sixteenth Century Journal* 5/2, 1974, 57–65)
- Bernhard Lohse, *Marginalien zum Streit zwischen Erasmus und Luther* [1975] (in: Id., *Evangelium in der Geschichte. Studien zu Luther und der Reformation*, 1988, 118–137)
- Dietrich Kerlen, *Assertio. Die Entwicklung von Luthers theologischem Anspruch und der Streit mit Erasmus von Rotterdam*, 1976
- Heinrich Bornkamm, *Martin Luther in der Mitte seines Lebens. Das Jahrzehnt zwischen dem Wormser und dem Augsburger Reichstag*, 1979, 368–405

- Georges Chantraine, *Erasmus et Luther – libre e serf arbitre. Étude historique et théologique*, 1981
- Marjorie O'Rourke Boyle, *Rhetoric and Reform: Erasmus' Civil Dispute with Luther*, 1983
- *Humanismus und Reformation – Martin Luther und Erasmus von Rotterdam in den Konflikten ihrer Zeit*, ed. Otto Hermann Pesch, 1985 [essay collection]
- Günter Bader, *Assertio. Drei fortlaufende Lektüren zu Skepsis, Narrheit und Sünde bei Erasmus und Luther*, 1985
- James D. Tracy, *Two Erasmuses, Two Luthers: Erasmus' Strategy in Defense of De Libero Arbitrio* (*Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 78, 1987, 37–60)
- Joachim Mehlhausen, *Forma Christianismi. Die theologische Bewertung eines kleinen katechetischen Lehrstücks durch Luther und Erasmus von Rotterdam* (*Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 87, 1990, 437–455)
- Reinhard Brandt, *Die ermöglichte Freiheit. Sprachkritische Rekonstruktion der Lehre vom unfreien Willen*, 1992
- *Widerspruch. Luthers Auseinandersetzung mit Erasmus von Rotterdam*, ed. Kari Kopperi, 1997 [essay collection]
- Robert Rosin, *Reformers, the Preacher, and Skepticism. Luther, Brenz, Melanchthon, and Ecclesiastes*, 1997, 79–150
- Henning Graf Reventlow, *Die Rolle der Kirchenväter im Streit zwischen Erasmus und Luther. Eine neue Besinnung* (in: *Die Patristik in der Bibelexegese des 16. Jahrhunderts*, ed. David C. Steinmetz, 1999, 49–70)
- Thomas Reinhuber, *Kämpfender Glaube. Studien zu Luthers Bekenntnis am Ende von De servo arbitrio*, 2000
- Melanie Beiner, *Intentionalität und Geschöpflichkeit. Die Bedeutung von Martin Luthers Schrift "Vom unfreien Willen" für die theologische Anthropologie*, 2000
- Robert Kolb, *Bound Choice, Election, and Wittenberg Theological Method. From Martin Luther to the Formula of Concord*, 2005
- Thomas Kaufmann, *Luther und Erasmus [2005]* (in: *Luther Handbuch*, ed. Albrecht Beutel, 32017, 173–183)
- Gerhard O. Forde, *The Captivation of the Will. Luther vs. Erasmus on Freedom and Bondage*, 2005
- Theodor Mahlmann, *Die Interpretation von Luthers De servo arbitrio bei orthodoxen lutherischen Theologen, vor allem bei Sebastian Schmidt (1617–1696)* (in: *Luthers Erben. Studien zur Rezeptionsgeschichte der reformatorischen Theologie Luthers*, eds. Notger Slenczka and Walter Sparr, Tübingen, 73–136)
- Markus Matthias, *Zur Auseinandersetzung um Martin Luthers "De servo arbitrio" im 16. Jahrhundert* (*Luther-Bulletin* 19, 2010, 40–67)
- Eilert Herms, *Opus Dei gratiae: Cooperatio Dei et hominum. Luthers Darstellung seiner Rechtfertigungslehre in De servo arbitrio* (*Lutherjahrbuch* 78, 2011, 61–135)
- Klaus W. Müller, *Zur "voluntas Dei abscondita" bei Martin Luther. Tradition und Innovation* (*Lutherjahrbuch* 84, 2017, 118–169)

- Willem van Vlastuin, *Sola Scriptura: The Relevance of Luther’s Use of Sola Scriptura in De Servo Arbitrio* (in: *Sola Scriptura. Biblical and Theological Perspectives on Scripture, Authority, and Hermeneutics*, eds Hans Burger et al., 2018, 243–259)
- Stephen Paulson, *Luther’s Outlaw God*, vol. 1–3, 2018–21
- Patrick Bahl, “Solus spiritus”? Luthers Rede vom Heiligen Geist in “De servo arbitrio” zwischen Abgrenzungsargumentation und Unterscheidungslehre (*Lutherjahrbuch* 88, 2021, 69–112)
- Luther und Erasmus über Freiheit. Rezeption und Relevanz eines gelehrten Streits, eds Jörg Noller and Georg Sans, 2020 [essay collection]
- Miikka Ruokanen, *Trinitarian grace in Martin Luther’s The Bondage of the Will*, 2021
- Markus Matthias, *Der Briefwechsel zwischen Martin Luther und Erasmus von Rotterdam. Eine sprachlich-rhetorische Analyse* (in: *Briefkultur der Reformationszeit*, ed. Johannes Schilling, 2023, 273–298)
- Patrick Bahl, *Bibelhermeneutik im Willensstreit. Auslegungsgeschichtliche Beobachtungen unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des exegetischen Schlagabtausches über Ez 18* (*Lutherjahrbuch* 92, 2025, 137–161)
- Olli-Pekka Vainio, *Bound Choice* (in: *Id., Luther under Scrutiny. Knowledge, Will, and Metaphysics*, 2025, 69–97)
- Olli-Pekka Vainio, *Metatheological Ramifications of the Debate between Erasmus and Luther. Reflections on Systematic-Theological Positions* (*Lutherjahrbuch* 92, 2025, 294–306)

2. A chronology of the debate between Luther and Erasmus

The following list contains only a few (mostly Latin) quotations. The correspondences of Erasmus (Allen = *Opus epistolarum Desiderii Erasmi Roterodami*, ed. Percy S. Allen), Luther (WA.Br = *D. Martin Luthers Werke. Kritische Gesamtausgabe*, section 4: Briefwechsel) and Melanchthon (MBW = *Melanchthons Briefwechsel. Kritische und kommentierte Gesamtausgabe*, ed. Heinz Scheible) contain many more passages referring to the debate between Luther and Erasmus.

Fourth and fifth centuries

Theologians in the Western Mediterranean, especially Augustine, establish voluntarism as a key theological concept.

High and Late Middle Ages

Scholastic theologians develop a doctrine of justification that preserves the sovereignty of divine grace while acknowledging the importance of human participation in the process of salvation. This doctrine assigns a role to free will (*liberum arbitrium*) in the process.

Fifteenth century

Renaissance humanism emerges, offering a view of humanity that blends elements of both optimism and pessimism about human nature. This perspective varies in its emphasis on human ability and acceptance of Christian doctrines regarding sin and grace.

Summer 1516

Luther studies Erasmus' *Novum Instrumentum* (VD16 B 4196) and uses it for his lecture on the Epistle to the Romans, without criticizing its content.

October 19, 1516: Luther to George Spalatin

“Quae me in Erasmo, homine eruditissimo, movent, haec sunt, [...] quod in apostolo interpretando iustitiam operum seu legis seu propriam (ita enim appellat apostolus [Rom. 10:3]) intelligit ceremoniales illas et figurales observantias, Deinde de peccato originali (quod utique admittit) non plane velit apostolum loqui cap. V ad Romanos. [...] Ego sane in hoc dissentire ab Erasmo non dubito, quod Augustino in scripturis interpretandis tantum posthabeo Hieronymum, quantum ipse Augustinum in omnibus Hieronymo posthabet. [...] Nequaquam igitur iustitia legis seu factorum tantum est in ceremoniis, sed rectius etiam in universi decalogi factis. [...] Officium itaque et amici et Christiani facias precor et Erasmus de iis certum face. Cuius auctoritatem sicut spero et cupio futuram celeberrimam, ita metuo, ne per eandem multi sibi accipiant patrocinium defendendae illius literalis, id est mortuae intelligentiae, qua plenus est Lyranus commentarius et ferme omnes post Augustinum” (WA.Br 1:70,4–37, no. 27). Spalatin forwards this criticism to Erasmus (Allen 2:417–49, no. 501), but does not receive a reply.

March 1, 1517, Luther to John Lang

“Erasmus nostrum lego, et indies decrescit mihi animus erga eum; placet quidem, quod tam religiosos quam sacerdotes non minus constanter quam erudite arguit et damnat in-

veteratae huius et veterosae incitiae; sed timeo, ne Christum et gratiam Dei non satis promoveat, in qua multo est quam Stapulensis ignorantior: humana praevalent in eo plus quam divina. Quanquam invitus eum iudico, facio tamen, ut te praemoneam, ne omnia legas, imo accipias sine iudicio. Tempora enim sunt periculosa hodie, et video, quod non ideo quispiam sit christianus vere sapiens, quia Graecus sit et Hebraeus, quando et Beatus Hieronymus quinque linguis monoglosson Augustinum non adaequarit, licet Erasmo aliter sit longe visum. Sed aliud est iudicium eius, qui arbitrio hominis nonnihil tribuit, aliud eius, qui praeter gratiam nihil novit' (WA.Br 1:90,15–26, no. 35).

January 18, 1518, Luther to Spalatin

“Ego denique apud eos, id est omnes, qui bonas literas vel oderunt studio vel nesciunt ignavia, Erasmus summis laudibus semper effero atque tueor quod possum, omni industria cavens, ne evomam ea, in quibus dissentio, ne mea quoque voce suam invidiam in illum confirmet. Quanquam sint quam multa in Erasmo, quae mihi ad cognitionem Christi longe aliena videantur. Si tamen ut theologus, non ut grammaticus loqui debeo, alioquin nihil eruditius, nihil ingeniosius viderit vel ipse Hieronymus, tanto praedicatus ab Erasmo praeconio. Atque hoc meum de Erasmo iudicium si alteri faeceris notum, tum scias amicitiae iura te violasse” (WA.Br 1:133,17–26, no. 57).

March 5, 1518

Erasmus sends Luther's theses on indulgences to Thomas More (Allen 3:239,37, no. 785).

Summer 1518

In the preface the new edition of the *Enchiridion*, Erasmus subtly approves of Luther's criticism of indulgences (Allen 3:366,185–367,212, no. 858)

September 4, 1518

Through Wolfgang Capito, Erasmus comes into contact with Luther. Erasmus approves of Luther's theses on indulgences: “quam videlicet honorifice, quam candide tuam veniarum istam disputationem miratur” (WA.Br 1:197,2–198,3, no. 91).

October 17, 1518

Erasmus expresses his sympathy for Luther's criticism of indulgences to John Lang: “Eleutherium audio probari ab optimis quibusque; sed aiunt illum in suis scriptis sui dissimilem esse. Puto illae conclusiones placuerunt omnibus, exceptis paucis des purgatorio; quod isti nolunt sibi eripi” (Allen 3:409,12–15). He criticizes Prierias' “insulsissimam responsionem” (409,16). At the same time, however, he cautions against approaching the necessary renewal of the Papal Church too openly: “haud scio an expediat hoc vlcus aperte tangere” (410,19–20).

March 28, 1519

Luther praises Erasmus and wants to establish friendly relations with him (WA.Br 1:361–363, no. 163).

April 14, 1519

Erasmus expresses both sympathy and distance toward Luther in his letter to Frederick the Wise: “Lutherus mihi tam ignotus est quam cui ignotissimus, vt suspectus esse non queam, quasi faueam amico. Huius lucubrationes nec tueri meum est nec improbare, vt quas hactenus non legerim nisi carptim. Certe vitam hominis nemo qui nouit non probat; quae cum longissime absit ab omni suspicione auariciae atque ambitionis, et morum innocentia vel apud ethnicos fauorem inuenit. Quam non congruit mansuetudini theologicae, protinus ac ne perlecto quidem libro tam immaniter debacchari in nomen ac famam probi viri; idque apud imperitam plebeculam, quae prorsus caret iudicio! praesertim cum ille disputanda proposuerit, cum omnium iudicio sese submiserit, quorum oportuit et quorum non oportuit. Nemo monuit, nemo docuit, nemo reuicit. Tantum vociferantur haeticum, seditiosis clamoribus ad lapides prouocant. Dicas eos sitire sanguinem humanum, non salutem animarum. Quo inuisius est hereseos nomen auribus Christianis, hoc minus committendum est vt temere in quenquam impingatur. Non statim quiuis error haeresis est, neque protinus hereticum est quicquid huic aut illi displicet. Neque semper fidei negocium agunt qui praetexunt huiusmodi splendorum titulos. Imo plerique suum agunt negocium, vel questui suo consulentes vel tyrannidi. Quin praecipiti ledendi studio sepe criminantur in alio quod ipsi domi probant” (Allen 3:530,66–87, no. 939).

April 22, 1519

Erasmus speaks favorably of Luther to Melanchthon: “Martini Lutheri vitam apud nos nemo non probat, de doctrina variant sententiae. Ipse libros illius nondum legi. Quaedam admonuit recte, sed vtinam tam feliciter quam libere!” (Allen 3:540,33–35, no. 947).

May 30, 1519

Erasmus responds kindly to Luther’s letter of March 1519 (Allen 3:605–607, No. 980). Erasmus finds himself suspected of being a sympathizer of Luther. However, it seems he views Luther critically.

October 19, 1519

After being accused of sympathizing with Luther during his time in Leuven, Erasmus explains his relationship with Luther in a letter to Cardinal Albrecht of Mainz. The letter is intended for wider distribution and can therefore be considered a public statement: “Lutherus mihi tam ignotus est quam qui ignotissimus; cuius libros nondum vacauit legere, nisi quod carptim degustauit quaedam. Si bene scripsit, nihil mihi debetur laudis; sin secus, nihil est quod mihi imputetur. Illud video, vt quisque vir est optimus, ita illius scriptis minime offendi: non quod probent omnia, opinor, sed quod hoc animo illum legant quo nos legimus Cyprianum ac Hieronymum, imo etiam Petrum Lombardum, nimirum ad multa conuenientes. Libros Lutheri editos dolebam; et cum cepissent primum ostendi libelli nescio qui, pro viribus obstabam ne ederentur, praecipue ob hoc, quod vererem ne quid tumultus ex his oriretur. Scripserat ad me Lutherus epistolam bene Christianam, mea quidem sententia, et respondi, obiter admonens hominem ne quid seditiose, ne quid in Romanum Pontificem, ne quid arrogantius aut iracundius scriberet, sed doctrinam Euangelicam animo sincero cum omni mansuetudine praedicaret. Id feci ciuilitate, quo magis proficerem. Ad-

didi hie esse qui illi fauerent, quo magis ad horum iudicium sese accommodaret. Haec quidam stultissimi sic interpretati sunt quasi Luthero fauerem: cum istorum nemo hominem adhuc monuerit, ipse solus admonui. Ego Lutheri nec accusator sum nec patronus nec reus. De spiritu hominis non ausim iudicare; est enim difficillimum, praesertim in partem peiorem. Et tamen si illi fauerem vt viro bono, quod fatentur et hostes; si vt reo, quod iuratis etiam iudicibus permittunt leges; si vt oppresso, quod dictat humanitas – si vt oppresso ab his qui simulato praetextu deuotis animis tendunt aduersus bonas literas, quae tandem esset inuidia, modo ne causae me admiscerem? Postremo Christianum est, opinor, sic fauere Luthero vt, si innocens est, nolim eum improborum factionibus opprimi; sin errat, velim sanari, non perdi: hoc enim magis congruit cum exemplo Christi, qui iuxta Prophetiae testimonium linum fumigans non extinxit, neque baculum confractum comminuit” (Allen 4:100,38–101,68, no. 1033).

November 1519

In his letter accompanying a new edition of his *Colloquia*, Erasmus defends his correspondence with Luther, which became public knowledge through the publication of his letter from May 1519 (→ Allen 3, no. 980): “Non me pudet respondisse Lutherio; qui prouocatus responderem et Turcae. Bonis illius faueo, non malis; imo Christo faueo, non illi. Et sic respondeo vt illum de multis admoneam. Admonui ciuilitate, quod ita plus profici sciam. Sic, opinor, illi fauent permulti, quemadmodum Cyprianus fauit Tertulliano, multi Lactantio, plures Origeni. Quod tamen citra fraudem Lutherii dictum velim. Ego illius nec accusator sum nec patronus nec iudex. Viderint ii quibus hanc prouintiam nominatim delegauit Rhomanus Pontifex. Quanquam quae tandem inuidia sit extra causam fauere primum viro bono (quod fatentur et hostes), deinde pectori quod, etiamsi iustis de causis exasperatum plus iusto incanduit, tamen alio vocatum possit esse egregium organum Christi, qui non extinxit linum fumigans, sed excitauit; longe dissimilis istis qui perdere malunt quam mederi, opprimere quam docere. Permittit legum seueritas etiam iuratis iudicibus vt faueant reo. Dictat humanitas vt faueatur oppresso. Haec loquor et a causa Lutherii alienissimus, et ab omni genere dissidii, vt si quis alius, auersus, Porro epistolam, quae parum bene intellecta et peius interpretata dedit occasionem huic suspicioni, et ipse Lutherius aeditam dolet; id quod proximis suis literis liquido testatur” (Allen 4:121,27–122,47, no. 1041).

1520

In numerous letters and conversations, Erasmus advocates that Luther’s case be heard before an arbitration tribunal and that a settlement be reached (Allen no. 1156, et al.). He considers it possible “rem sic esse componendam, ut et Pontifex auferret laudem clementiae et Lutherus obedientiae” (Allen 4:482,32–33, no. 1199). On November 5, 1520, Erasmus speaks with Elector Frederick the Wise in Cologne. He agreed in part with Luther: “cum esset interrogatus Coloniae a duci Fridrico cur damnaretur Lutherus quid peccasset respondit: Multum peccavit, qui tetigit ventres monachorum et coronam papae” (WA.TR 1:55,33–35, no. 131). However, he also criticizes Luther’s “immodica maledicentia et arrogantiae species” to the Elector (Spongia aduersus aspergines Hutteni: ASD 9/1:182,420–28). During this period, Erasmus is warned by the imperial advisor bishop Aloisius Marlianus, “ne me admiscerem Lutheri negoti” (Allen 4:459,10–11, no. 1195). Rather than the growing

criticism of his hesitancy to take sides against Luther, it is Erasmus' reading of *De captivitate Babylonica ecclesiae* that makes him increasingly critical of Luther (ASD 9/1:182,424; Allen 4:444,7, no. 1186; 494,25, no. 1203; 537,38, no. 1217). However, he does not yet actively participate in the campaign against Luther and his followers.

August 1, 1520

In his response to a letter from Luther that has since been lost, Erasmus once again addresses the disputes surrounding Luther and the accusation that Erasmus sympathized with him (WA.Br 2:155–59, no. 321). The distance Erasmus puts between himself and Luther in this letter is clearer than in his letter from May 1519. Erasmus advises Luther not to fuel the conflict and to keep Erasmus' name out of it.

September 9, 1520

In a letter to Gerhard Geldenhauer, Erasmus criticizes the excommunication bull and the campaign against Luther: “Male metuo misero Luthero: sic vndique feruet coniuratio, sic vndique irritantur in illum principes, ac praecipue Leo Pontifex. Vtinam Lutherus meum sequutus consilium ab odiosis illis ac seditiosis abstinisset! Plus erat fructus ac minus invidiae. Parum esset vnum hominem perire: si res haec illis succedet, nemo feret illorum insolentiam. Non conquiescant donec linguas ac bonas literas omnes subuerterint. Iam Capnionem rursus aggrediuntur, tantum odio Lutheri: qui me dissuadente nomen illius suo negocio admiscens, et illum degrauavit invidia, et sibi nihil omnino profuit. Disputauit Ecius; Hoochstratus promiserat nescio quos syllogismos, quibus omnes cedere cogentur. Disputabant atque etiam scribebant Louanienses. Expectabatur iudicium Academiae Parisiensis, et ecce res de repente in Bullam et in fumum exitura videtur. Excusa est Bulla formidabilis, sed quam Pontifex vetuit publicari. Vereor ne res in grauem tumultum exeat. Qui haec suadent Pontifici, dant illi mea sententia consilium, non dico quam pium, sed certe periculosum. Res e pessimis fontibus primum orta est, deinde pessimis rationibus hucusque prouecta. Ex odio bonarum literarum et stoliditate monachorum primum orta est haec tragoedia. Deinde magnis conuiciis, maliciosis conspirationibus huc vesaniae res progressa est. Quo tendant nulli dubium est, nimirum vt oppressis his literis quas illi nesciunt, impune regnent cum sua barbarie. Ego me huic tragoediae non misceo. Alioqui paratus est vel episcopatus, si velim in Lutherum scribere. Mihi dolet sic obrui doctrinam Euangelicam, nosque cogi tantum, non doceri; et doceri ea a quibus abhorrent et sacrae literae et sensus communis” (Allen 4:339,7–340,34, no. 1141).

September 13, 1520

In a letter to Pope Leo X, Erasmus evaluates Luther in a benevolent yet distant way: “Lutherum non noui, nec libros illius vnquam legi, nisi forte decem aut duodecim pagellas, easque carptim. Ex his quae tum degustavi, visus est mihi probe compositus ad mysticas literas veterum more explanandas, quando nostra haec aetas immodice indulgebat argutis magis quam necessariis quaestionibus. Bonis igitur illius faui, non malis, imo gloriae Christi in illo faui. Ferme primus omnium odoratus sum periculum esse ne res exiret in tumultum; a quo sic abhorruui semper vt nemo magis. Proinde minis etiam egi cum Ioanne Frobenio typographo, ne quid operum illius exeuderet. Scripsi tum crebro tum diligenter

amicis, admonerent hominem vt in scriptis meminisset Christianae mansuetudinis, seruiretque semper Ecclesiae tranquillitati” (Allen 4:345,13–24, no. 1143).

“Luthero ne tum quidem patrocinar cum vtcunque liberum esset fauere. Tantum impetendi modum improbabam, non Luthero consulens sed auctoritati theologorum. Videbam rem ex odio linguarum ac bonarum, vt vocant, literarum natam. Videbam acerbis odiis et seditiosis apud populum clamoribus rem geri, quibus nihil aliud efficiebant quam vt nobilitarent opera Lutheri, et vulgus hominum ad auiditatem legendi prouocarent. Si prius refellissent Lutherum et animis hominum exemissent, deinde libros exussissent, totum Lutherum citra tumultum orbis abolere poterant, siquidem id merebatur quod isti praedicant. Libera ac generosa ingenia doceri gaudent, cogi nolunt. Hoc consilium pro theologis aduersus Lutherum faciebat, nisi quidam perperam interpretarentur” (346,67–78).

November 17, 1520: Luther to Lazarus Spengler

“Erasmus und ich, will’s Gott, wollen wohl eins bleiben. Das ist wohl wahr, daß ich mit Philippo insgeheim zuweilen disputiere, wie nah oder weit Erasmus von dem Weg sei; das hat er auch und jedermann von mir zu tun ungefährlich und freundlichen Gewalt. Ich will niemand am ersten angreifen; mir ist genug, mich, so ich angegriffen werde, beschützen” (WA.Br 2:217,18–23, no. 353).

January 1521

In his *Assertio omnium articulorum M. Lutheri per bullam Leonis X. novissimam damnatorum* Luther claims that the question of free will is of primary importance. In defense of his article 36 (i.e., “Liberum arbitrium post peccatum res est de solo titulo, et dum facit, quod in se est, peccat mortaliter”, see WA 7:142–49) he states that this article is “omnium optimus et rerum nostrarum summa” (148,16). After having interpreted several Biblical statements on the question of free will, he concludes: “Male enim dixi, quod liberum arbitrium ante gratiam sit res de solo titulo, sed simpliciter debui dicere, ‘liberum arbitrium est figmentum in rebus seu titulus sine re’. Quia nulli est in manu sua quippiam cogitare mali aut boni, sed omnia (ut Viglephi articulus Constantiae damnatus recte docet) de necessitate absoluta eveniunt” (146,4–8).

May 10, 1521

In a lengthy letter, Erasmus attempts to convince Justus Jonas to distance himself from Luther and openly criticizes Luther (Allen 4:486–493, no. 1202).

May 24, 1521

Erasmus complains to William Warham about the imminent danger posed by Luther: “Ingentes turbas excitauit Lutherus; nec video finem, nisi Christus nostram temeritatem ita vertat, quemadmodum noctua solet Atheniensium stulta consilia bene fortunare. Vellem Lutherus aut tacuisset quaedam aut aliter scripsisset. Nunc vereor ne sic vitemus hanc Scyllam vt incidamus in Charybdim multo perniciosiorem. Si istis qui ventris ae tyrannidis suae causa nihil non audent, res succedit, nihil superest nisi vt scribam epitaphium Christo nunquam reuicturo” (Allen 4:497,22–29, no. 1205).

May 27, 1521

In the dedication preface addressed to Beatus Rhenanus in the *Epistolae ad diversos*, Erasmus prepares his public change of position toward Luther: “At rursus horum temporum ratio fecit vt me eius consilii poeniteret. Iam pridem magnis odiis flagrabant studia tuentium linguas ac bonas literas, et istorum qui sibi stultissime persuadent decedere suis commodis quicquid accrescit prouentui melioris literaturae. Mox Lutherana tragoedia in tantam exarsit contentionem, vt nec loqui tutum sit nec tacere. Rapiuntur in diuersum omnia, etiam quae optimo animo scribuntur: ne tempus quidem perpenditur quo scripsit aliquis, sed quod suo tempore recte scribebatur, transferunt in tempus incommodissimum” (Allen 4,499,42–50, no. 1206).

June 1521

In a letter to the theologians of Leuven, Erasmus distances himself from Luther and hints at the possibility of making a public statement: “Hactenus in illum non scripsi. Verum est. [...] Et tamen pro mea virili non deero, neque tranquillitati Ecclesiae Catholicae, neque veritati Euangelicae, neque dignitati Romani Pontificis, cum licebit. Et fortassis plus adferam momenti quam ii qui putant his tumultibus rem posse confici. Illud nobis videndum, ne sic oderimus Lutherum vt illius odio perdamus et ea quae sunt optima; et ita seruiamus dignitati nostrae vt non laedamus autoritatem Euangelicae veritatis, et ita faueamus hominum gloriae ne quid officiamus gloriae Christi” (Allen 4:539,138 and 539,146–540,153, no. 1217).

September 9, 1521, Luther to Spalatin

“Neque Capitonis neque Erasmi iudicium me tantillum mouet. Nihil alienum opinione sui apud me faciunt. Quin et hoc veritus sum, ne quando mihi cum alterutro negotium fieret, quando Erasmum a cognitione gratiae longinquum esse viderem, qui non ad crucem, sed ad pacem spectet in omnibus scriptis. Hinc omnia putat ciuili et beneuolentia quadam humanitatis tractanda gerendaque. Sed hanc non curat Behemoth neque hinc quicquam sese emendat” (WA.Br 2,387,2–7, no. 429).

October 1521

Erasmus leaves the Netherlands and moves to Basel.

April 1522

Erasmus mentions his plan to write against Luther and the accusations of Pelagianism against himself to Johannes Glapion, the emperor’s confessor: “Iam aggressus eram nonnihil libelli De finiendo negotio Lutherano; sed valetudo interruptit omnia studia. Interim oratione literisque permultos temperaui, mire Lutheri addictos. Epistolis etiam aeditis declarauit mihi nihil vnquam foederis fuisse cum vlllo Lutherano, sed seditiosum negotium mihi semper displicuisse. Iam hoc toti Germaniae sic notum est, vt nullus impendio Lutheranus mihi bene velit, quidam minitentur dentatos libellos, alii lacerent conuiciis, Pelagianum appellantes et palponem, non Euangelicae doctrinae praeconem. Me certe neque vita neque mors distrahat ab obedientia Ecclesiae et a synceritate fidei Christianae” (Allen 5:48,20–29, no. 1275).

May 28, 1522: Luther to an unknown recipient

“De praedestinatione sentire Mosellanum cum Erasmo antea novi; totus enim Erasmius est. Ego contra sentio Erasmum minus de praedestinatione scire vel scire sese ostentare, quam hactenus Sophistarum scholae sciverunt. Neque est, ut timeam, casurum me, nisi mutem sententiam. Non est Erasmus in hac re formidabilis, sicut neque in summa ferme tota rerum Christianarum. Potentior est veritas quam eloquentia, potior spiritum quam ingenium, maior fides quam eruditio. [...] Non provocabo Erasmum, sed neque provocatus semel atque iterum mox referiam. Tamen non videtur mihi consultum, ut vires eloquentiae suae in me instituat. Metuo enim non inveniet in Luthero Fabrum Stapulensem, neque possit gloriari, sicut de illo gloriatur: ‘Omnes gratulantur mihi, victum esse Gallum.’ Quod si se commiserit huius aleae, videbit Christum nec portas inferi nec potestates aeris formidantem. Et occurram balbutientissimus eloquentissimo Erasmo cum fiducia, nihili etiam habitae eius auctoritate, nomine et favore. Ego novi, quod sit in hoc homine, quandoquidem et Satanæ cogitationes noverimus, quamquam expecto, ut in dies magis revelet id, quod in me alit” (WA.Br 2:544,7–545,29, no. 499).

1522/23

In an exchange of letters with Pope Adrian VI, Erasmus discusses possible courses of action against Luther and the Protestant movement (Allen, nos. 1324, 1329, 1338, 1352). The Pope demands that Erasmus openly oppose Luther and come to Rome. Erasmus, on the other hand, proposes a combination of church reforms and efforts to reach an understanding.

February 1, 1523

In a letter to Marcus Laurinus, Erasmus discusses the question of free will in more detail, distancing himself from Luther. This passage reveals that Erasmus had previously shown little interest in the subject and could not fathom why it was so important to Luther. “Superest adhuc vnum crimen omnium maximum. In Paraphrasi, qua explico nonum caput Apostoli Pauli ad Romanos, tribuo minimum quiddam libero arbitrio, videlicet sequutus Originem et Hieronymum. Principio quum paraphrasis sit commentarii genus, quum profitear me in plerisque sequi probatos ac priscos interpretes, quid admissum est piaculi, si sequor alicubi Originem et Hieronymum, autores, vt arbitror, in sacris literis non asperandos? Atque id factum est ante quam Lutherus prodidisset dogma suum, siue Vuicleuiticum, Quicquid facimus siue boni siue mali, esse necessitatis absolutae. Nam mea Paraphrasis excusa est Louanii, anno millesimo quingentesimo decimoseptimo; et aliquot mensibus erat Antuuerpiae scripta prius quam excuderetur. Atque interim quidam appellatur totus Erasmius, quod de libero arbitrio mecum sentiat et a Luthero dissentiat: sed tamen huic datur venia, quod iuuenis bonae spei breui sit aliter sensurus. Hic rursus appello meum aequum iudicem, quum hoc scripserim ante proditum Lutheri dogma, quum idem sentiant omnes theologi tum veteres tum recentes, Origines, Hieronymus, Chrysostomus, Hilarius, Arnobius, Scotus, Thomas, cur ego, velut autor huius sententiae, vocor in ius? et quur qui dissentit a Luthero vocatur Erasmius potius quam Hilarius aut Hieronymianus? praesertim quum eam quaestionem non susceperim pertractan-

dam in Paraphrasi, sed obiter transilierim, quemadmodum fecit ipse Paulus, qui non dignatur illic respondere percontatori improbo? Et tamen vide, lector, quanto minus illic tribuam libero arbitrio quam tribuant vel veteres vel recentiorum scholae. Suspicio enim haec esse verba quibus offenduntur ex capite nono. Quum enim proposuissem improbam quaestionem obiectam Deo, quae conatur illi impingere iniusticiam, 'Imo,' inquam, 'nonnihil est in voluntato conatuque [nostro] situm: licet hoc ita sit exiguum vt ad Dei gratuitam beneficentiam nihil esse videatur. Nemo damnatur nisi sua culpa: nemo seruatur nisi Dei beneficio. Eo dignatur quos vult, sed ita vt sit de quo gratias agas, non sit quod queraris'. Haec in Paraphrasi.

Videbam hinc Scyllae periculum illiciens ad fiduciam operum, quam ego pestem religionis maximam esse fateor. Illinc videbam Charybdim, malum etiam formidabilius, quo nunc non pauci tenentur, dicentes, 'Obsequemur animo nostro; siue torquemus nosipsos, siue indulgemus animo, tamen eueniet quod semel statuit Deus'. Itaque sermonem meum moderatus sum, vt minimum quiddam tribuerem libero arbitrio, ne fenestram aperirem tam capitali socordiae, vt abiecto omni conatu vitae melioris, quod suo animo collubitum fuerit quisque faceret. Et tamen haec scribebam, ignarus fuisse quenquam qui funditus tolleret omnem liberi arbitrii vim; quod dogma, etiamsi mihi constaret esse verum, nolim tamen nudis verbis in vulgus serere. Nunc quis nescit de fato disputatum inter philosophos ante Christum natum? et hinc ad nos venerunt quaestiones inexplicabiles, de praescientia, de praedestinatione Dei, de libero hominis arbitrio, de futuris contingentibus: in quibus arbitrator optimum esse non admodum anxie versari, quando abyssus est imperuestigabilis. Malim ea inculcare quae nos hortantur ad modis omnibus conandum optima: nihil tamen interim nobis arrogantes, etiamsi quid esse nostrum possit, sed totum iudicium deferentes Christo, cum bona fiducia de illius benignitate potissimum concepta." (Allen 5:225,926–226,979, no. 1342)

March 11, 1523

Through Spalatin, Erasmus writes to Frederick the Wise. The letter is preserved in Spalatin's translation. Erasmus expressed his concern that the church's violent actions against Luther were endangering the renewal of Christianity. He writes: "Ich forcht des Luthers nicht, sondern zwey ding bewegen mich. Wenn der Luther solt zu poden geen, so wurd wider keyn Gott noch keyn mensch mit den munchen kunnen auszkummenn. Folgend, so kan der Luther nicht vmbkummenn on das es vergee dann mit im ein grosser teyl der Evangelischenn lutterckeit" (Allen 5:251,30–34, no. 1348).

June 20, 1523, Luther to John Oecolampad

"Quid Erasmus in rerum spiritualium iudicio sentiat aut simulet, testantur erius libelli abunde tam primi quam novissimi. Ego etsi aculeos eius alicubi sentio, tamen, quia simulat, se non esse hostem palam, simulo et ego, me non intelligere suas astutias, quamquam penitus intelligam, quam ipse credat. Ipse fecit, ad quod ordinatus fuit: linguas introduxit et a sacrilegis studiis avocavit. Forte et ipse cum Mose in campestribus Moab morietur, nam ad meliora studia (quod ad pietatem pertinet) non provehit. Vellemque mirum in modum abstinere ipsum a tractandis scripturis sanctis et paraphrasibus suis, quod non sit par istis officiis et lectores frustra occupat et moratur in scripturis discendis. Satis fecit,

quod malum ostendit; bonum ostendere (ut video) et in terram promissionis ducere non potest” (WA.Br 3:96,14–25, no. 626). Erasmus soon knows about the content of Luther’s letter (Allen 5:329,52–58, no. 1384).

August 31, 1523

In a letter to Zwingli, Erasmus criticizes Luther’s doctrine of justification: “Lutherus proponit quaedam enigmata in spetiem absurda: ‘omnia opera sanctorum esse peccata, que indigent ignoscente Dei misericordia’; ‘liberum arbitrium esse nomen inane’; ‘sola fide iustificari hominem, opera nihil ad rem facere’. De his contedere, quomodo velit intelligi Lutherus, non video quem fructum adferat. Deinde video in plerisque illi addictis miram peruicaciam. Et in Lutheri scriptis quantum maledicentiae, sepe preter rem” (Allen 5:327,9–16, no. 1384).

September 1523

In his *Spongia*, Erasmus rejects Ulrich von Hutten’s *Expostulatio* and explains his position on Luther. Erasmus initially sympathized with Luther but has now turned against him. Erasmus confirms, “neutri factioni velle inuolui” (ASD 9/1:162, 953).

September 4, 1523

Erasmus promises King Henry VIII of England that he will publicly turn against Luther (Allen 5:330,11–12, no. 1385).

October 1, 1523

Luther writes to Konrad Pellikan, that Erasmus has launched literary attacks on Luther and his supporters, but Luther does not wish to respond with an open counterattack. The letter reveals Luther’s critical attitude toward Erasmus. He refers to Erasmus’ criticism of his high regard for assertions and uses this criticism against him: “Ego habeo, qui causam defendat, etiamsi totus mundus in me solum insaniat, id quod Erasmus in me vocat pervicaciam asserendi” (WA.Br 3:160,23–24, no. 661).

fall 1523

In his hymn *Now Rejoice, Dear Christians*, Luther uses formulations in his description of the sinner’s situation that also play a role in *De Servo Arbitrio*, such as “dem teuffel ich gefangen lag” (WA 35:423,6), “Es war kein gutts am leben meyn, / Die sund hat mich besessen” (423,11–12), and “Der frey will hasset Gotts gericht, / Er war zum gutt erstorben” (423,15–16).

November 21, 1523

Erasmus informs John Augustanus Faber that his planned treatise against Luther will address the question of free will (Allen 5:350,14–15, no. 1397).

February 13, 1524

Erasmus informs Pope Clement VII that he is working on his treatise with the title “De libero arbitrio adversus Lutherum” (Allen 5:399,53–55, no. 1418).

March 1524

In a new edition of his *Colloquia*, Erasmus adds a dialogue between a representative of the papal church and a Luther sympathizer. This dialogue shows that Luther's followers affirm the church's creed and that there is no fundamental disagreement between the papal church and Luther (ASD 1/3:361–374).

April 15, 1524, Luther to Erasmus

Luther praises Erasmus' philological achievements but also criticizes his reluctance toward the Papal Church and rejection of the Reformation. He would like to avoid an open confrontation: "Hactenus stilum cohibui, utpene pungeres me, cohibebitur etiam, scripsi in literis ad amicos, quae tibi quoque lectae sunt, donec palam prodires" (WA.Br 3:270,38–40, no. 729). He wishes: "Satis morsum est, nunc providendum est, ne consumamur ab invicem" (271,65).

May 8, 1524, Erasmus to Luther

In his reply to Luther's April 1524 letter, Erasmus openly criticizes Luther: "Tua quaedam legens valde pertimesco, ne qua arte deludat Satanas animum tuum" (WA.Br 3:285,5–6, no. 740), but he does not want to openly oppose him ("Nihil adhuc in te scripserim, facturus id magno principum applausu, nisi vidissem hoc absque iactura evangelii non futurum", 285,14–16), even though such criticism could benefit the Gospel ("Fortasse Erasmus scribens in te magis profuerit evangelio", 285,24).

September 1524

Erasmus' *De libero arbitrio* is simultaneously published in Basel and Antwerp. On September 6, Erasmus informs the English king of this: "exiit in lucem libellus De libero arbitrio" (Allen 5:541,4, no. 1493). The same day he also informs Melanchthon about the publication (MBW.T 2:167–176, no. 341).

September 1524

In his preface to Ecclesiastes in the partial edition of the Wittenberg Old Testament translation, Luther uses the book as evidence against free will: "Nu dis buch solt billich den titel haben, das es widder den freyen willen geschrieben were, Denn es alles dahyn zeucht, das aller menschen, rad, anschlege, vnd furnemen vmb sonst vnd vergeblich sind, vnd ymer anders hynaus gehet, denn wyr wöllen vnd dencken, auff das er vns lerne gelassen stehen, vnd Gott lassen alleyne alle ding, vber, widder, vnd on vnsern wissen vnd rad thun" (WA.DB 10/2:104,24–106,2). This may be a response to Erasmus' *De libero arbitrio*.

September 30, 1524

Melanchthon informs Erasmus of his assessment of *De libero arbitrio* and Luther's expected reaction: this moderate work will receive an equally moderate response from Luther (Allen 5:555,42–61, no. 1500).

1525

Luther's *De servo arbitrio* is published in Wittenberg and reprinted several times in 1525 and 1526 in other places. In 1526 Justus Jonas publishes his German translation. The Latin text is reprinted in the Luther editions of the sixteenth century and both the Latin and the German text are reprinted in several single editions (1591: VD16 L 6672; 1602: VD17 15:727288H; 1664: VD17 12:116961K; 1707: VD18 14080206).

early 1526

Erasmus receives Luther's *De servo arbitrio* and responds with outrage in his letters to Luther's criticism (Allen 6:269,24–34, no. 1670; 364,8–9, no. 1723).

February 1526

The first part of Erasmus' *Hyperaspistes* is published.

April 11, 1526, Erasmus to Luther

In response to a lost letter from Luther defending *De servo arbitrio*, Erasmus regrets that Luther has discredited himself as a person and theologian with his book, which has confused the public debate (WA.Br 4:46–48, no. 992).

July to November, 1526

Luther lectures on Ecclesiastes (Qohelet). His lecture is printed in 1532 based on transcripts under the title *Annotationes in Ecclesiasten* (WA 20:1–203). For Luther, the Old Testament book of Ecclesiastes demonstrates that the world and human life are completely controlled by God. However, with reference to his doctrine of the three estates and vocation he also asserts that human beings are responsible for acting in the roles God has assigned to them.

March 30, 1527

Erasmus tells Thomas More that Luther's arguments can be reduced to two points: "Sed amor in me tuus non fert quorundam insolentiam, gestientium quasi non habeam quod Lutero respondeam. Aliis grauioribus molestiis sum excercitatus vt ista leuicula facile contemnam. Si refert respondisse, iam in Diatriba et Hyperaspiste dissolutum est quicquid ab illo potest adduci. Tantum habet duas arces, per legem nihil effici nisi cognitionem vel agnitionem potius peccati, et per Adae peccatum sic esse vitiatam humani generis massam vt nec Spiritus Sanctus in ea quicquam operetur nisi malum. Ab his deiectus concidet" (Allen 7:7,47–54, no. 1804).

September 1527

The second part of Erasmus' *Hyperaspistes* is published.

October, 1527

The publication of the second part of Erasmus' polemical reply is reflected in some passages of the correspondence of Luther and Melancthon. Here are two quotes that show how Erasmus was seen. On October 2 Melancthon writes to Luther: "Legi bonam partem Erasmici voluminis recens editi de libero arbitrio. Longa et confusa disputatio est, quam

non multi de vulgo intelligent, vt video. In eo vno est, vt sententias a te citatas callide in-
tepretetur, ne dissentire credantur a iudicio rationis humanae. Ego, etiamsi velis respon-
dere, nollem tamen te properare. Velim autem te, si quando videretur, non confutationem
huius operis (nam istos ἀντιπάλους λόγους non facile intelligunt, nisi exercitatissimi in
hoc ipso genere), sed tuae sententiam simplicem enarrationem instituere. Id non esset tibi
difficile factu, et extra pugnam minus esset habitura acerbitatis oratio” (WA.Br 4,256,2–10,
no. 1152).

On October 19 Luther writes to Justus Jonas (please note that Luther’s wife did understand
Latin): “Gratulor tibi, optime Iona, de tua palinodia, qua nunc tandem Erasmus illum
tuum suis pingis coloribus, viperam illam letalibus aculeis refertam recte cognoscis, quem
ante multis nominibus praedicabas. Gaudeo te ex unius Hyperaspistae lectione tantum
profecisse et tuum de illo mutasse iudicium. Cumque ego hanc epistolae tuae partem leg-
erem uxori, continuo illa inquit: Ist nicht der teur Manne [sc. Erasmus] zur Kröten wor-
den? Sihe da! Gaudet et ipsa idem te nunc mecum sentire de Erasmo. Intelligis, mi Iona,
recte quidem sensisse, qui praeceperunt neminem ante supremum diem laudandum”
(WA.Br 4:268,1–269,9, no. 1160).

July 24, 1529: Melanchthon to Joachim Camerarius

“Περὶ Ἐράσμου quod mones [...], ne quid ad illum amplius scribam, geram tibi morem. Et
scis me antea non magnopere ambivisse eius amiciciam. Vide, quantum iudicii sit nostris
inimicis: Illum amant qui multorum perniciosissimorum dogmatum semina in suis libris
sparsit, quae quidem longe graviores tumultus aliquando excitatura erant, nisi Lutherus
exortus esset ac studia hominum alio traxisset. Tota illa tragoedia περὶ δείπνου κυριακοῦ
ab ipso orta est. Quam aequus ubique est Ario et illius factioni, quam nos hic constantis-
sime improbavimus. Quae litera in illius libris est digna viro christiano de iustificatione, de
iure magistratum? Horum locorum perfectam tractationem a magnis viris requiro. Sed
tollant eum qui non norunt” (MBW.T 3:550,28–551,39, no. 807).

1533 (?)

In a 1527 print of Erasmus’ New Testament, Luther adds marginal notes primarily com-
menting on the annotations. Several of these notes criticize Erasmus’ theology and charac-
ter, for example: “Ego non sum Candidus Lector, Nec tu candidus scriptor” (WA 60:204,28).

March 1534

In 1534, a correspondence between Amsdorf and Luther regarding Erasmus is published
(WA.Br 7, no. 2093). Luther’s letter (translation: LuthQ 37, 2023, 313–34), which is more
than ten pages long, is a critical assessment of Erasmus as a person and a theologian. Eras-
mus answer Luther’s criticism with his *Purgatio aduersus epistolam non sobriam Martini
Lutheri* (VD16 E 3481).

May 12, 1536

Melanchthon acknowledges Erasmus’ influence on his *Loci theologici*, but remains cautious
(Allen 11:322–324, no. 3120; MBW.T 7:114–116, no. 1735). Melanchthon emphasizes his in-
terest in preserving church doctrine and distancing himself from doctrinal disputes. How-

ever, between the lines, it becomes clear that Melanchthon does not agree with Erasmus on theological matters.

June 22, 1537

Melanchthon emphasizes to Veit Dietrich that he and Luther agree on predestination but approach it differently in their language. He adds that uneducated people overemphasize Luther's pointed statements: "Alioquin enim magnopere optarim eos articulos, de quibus quaedam videtur esse dissimilitudo, diserte et utiliter explicari. Scis me quaedam minus horride dicere, de praedestinatione, de assensu voluntatis, de necessitate obedientiae nostrae, de peccato mortali. De his omnibus scio re ipsa Lutherum sentire eadem, sed ineruditi quae eius φορτικώτερα dicta, cum non videant quo pertineant, nimium amant. Nec ego cum illis pugnandum mihi esse duco. Fruantur suo iudicio. Mihi tamen concedant homini peripatetico et amanti mediocritatem minus stoice alicubi loqui" (MBW.T 7:464,10–18, no. 1914).

July 9, 1537, Luther to Capito

"De tomis meorum librorum disponendis ego frigidior sum et segnior, eo quod Saturnina fame percitus [driven by Saturnian hunger, Saturnus = Kronos] magis cuperem eos omnes devoratos. Nullum enim agnosco meum iustum librum, nisi forte de Servo arbitrio et Catechismum" (WA.Br 8:99,5–8, no. 3162).

1540/41

In his Genesis lecture on Gen. 26:9 (WA 43:457,32–463,17), Luther includes a pastoral digression on predestination and prescience, which emphasizes "non esse inquirendum de praedestinatione Dei absconditi", but rather "ea acquiescendum esse, quae revelatur per vocationem per ministerium verbi" (463,11–13). Luther refers to his *De servo arbitrio* (458,35–36: "Sic igitur in libello de servo arbitrio et alibi docui") for the distinction between Deus absconditus and revelatus, and he quotes "Quae supra nos, nihil ad nos" (458,40).

1546

De servo arbitrio is printed in vol. 2 of the Wittenberg edition of Luther's Latin writings, reprinted in 1551 and 1562.

1557

De servo arbitrio is printed in vol. 3 of the Jena edition of Luther's Latin writings, which is reprinted in 1567, 1582, and 1603.

1577

The Formula of Concord substantiates Luther's assertion of servum arbitrium with regard to "cooperatio voluntatis nostrae in hominis conversione" with a quotation from Luther's *On the Supper of Christ* and notes: "Hoc negotium D. Lutherus in libro suo De servo arbitrio contra Erasmum egregie et solide explicuit, atque hanc sententiam piam et invictam esse demonstravit" (FC SD II:44; BSLK 889,26–30).

3. Erasmus of Rotterdam
De libero arbitrio διατριβή sive collatio

OUTLINE

Introduction (LB 9:1215^A–1221^A; AS 4:2–37)

1. Praefatio (LB 9:1215^A–1218^C; AS 4:2–21)
2. Prooemium (LB 9:1218^C–1221^A; AS 4:20–37)

liberum arbitrium can be defined on the one hand: “liberum arbitrium hoc loco sentimus vim humanae voluntatis, qua se possit homo applicare ad ea, quae perducunt ad aeternam salutem aut ab iisdem avertere”

First main section: Bible passages that prove liberum arbitrium (LB 9:1221^A–1230^A; AS 4:36–91)

1. Old Testament (LB 9:1221^A–1227^A; AS 4:36–73)

liberum arbitrium can be defined on the other hand: “voluntas, qua eligimus aut refugimus, hactenus depravata fuit, ut suis naturalibus praesidiis non posset sese revocare ad meliorem frugem, sed amissa libertate cogebatur servire peccato, cui se volens semel addixerat”

2. New Testament (LB 9:1227^A–1230^A; AS 4:72–91)

Second main section: Bible passages that appear to contradict liberum arbitrium (LB 9:1230^A–1241^D; AS 4:90–156)

1. Passages from the Old and New Testaments (LB 9:1230^A–1235^C; AS 4:90–121)
2. On the Bible passages in Luther’s *Assertio omnium articulorum* of 1521 (LB 9:1235^C–1237^F; AS 4:120–137)
3. Further passages from the Old and New Testaments (LB 9:1237^F–1241^D; AS 4:136–157)

Conclusion (LB 9:1241^D–1248^D; AS 4:156–195)

in view of the Biblical evidence liberum arbitrium is finally defined: “homo totam salutem suam divinae gratiae ferre debeat acceptam, cum perpusillum sit, quod hic agit liberum arbitrium, et hoc ipsum, quod agere potest, sit divinae gratiae, qui primum condidit liberum arbitrium, deinde liberavit etiam ac sanavit”

4. Martin Luther
De servo arbitrio

4.1. OUTLINE

Preface (LStA 3:177,1–180,15; WA 18:600,1–602,37; LW 33:15–19)

First main section: Response to Erasmus' introduction (LStA 3:180,16–234,39; WA 18:603,1–666,13; LW 33:19–110)

The right and necessity of assertio (LStA 3:180,17–183,22)

The clarity of Scripture – first discussion (LStA 3:183,23–186,23)

The essence of Christianity (forma Christianismi) (LStA 3:186,24–194,28)

The necessity of public debate about the essence of Christianity (LStA 3:194,29–196,17)

Erasmus' advocacy of compulsory confession to secure peace in the world is incompatible with Christian freedom (LStA 3:196,18–203,17)

The paradox of mere necessity (LStA 3:203,18–210,11)

Concluding remarks on the first part of Erasmus' introduction (LStA 3:210,11–211,5)

The witnesses to the truth and the hiddenness of the Church (LStA 3:211,6–221,12)

The clarity of Scripture – second discussion (LStA 3:221,13–230,3)

Rejection of Erasmus' definition of liberum arbitrium (LStA 3:230,4–234,39)

Second main section: Refutation of Erasmus' scriptural evidence for liberum arbitrium
(LStA 3:235,1–301,27; WA 18:666,13–733,21; LW 33:110–212)

1. Old Testament texts that appear to speak in favor of liberum arbitrium (LStA 3:235,1–256,39)

Sir. 15:14–18 (235,1–244,10)

Gen. 4:7 (244,11–33)

Deut. 30:15+19 (244,34–246,7)

Deut. 3:30 (246,8–247,2)

Hermeneutics of Imperatives (247,3–250,28)

Ezek. 18:23 and Ezek. 33:11 (250,29–254,30)

Deut. 30:11–14 (254,31–256,23)

Review of Erasmus' treatment of the Old Testament passages (LStA 3:256,24–39)

2. New Testament texts that appear to speak in favor of liberum arbitrium (LStA 3:256,40–267,18)

General characterization of Erasmus' treatment of the New Testament (256,40–257,3)

Matth. 23:37 (257,3–258,30)

Matth. 19:17 and comparable statements (258,31–260,5)

praecepta and meritum (260,6–264,30)

Luke 23:23 (264,31–265,18)

John 1:12 (265,19–266,21)

Rom. 2:4 (266,22–267,4)

Further passages from Paul (267,5–11)

Luther agrees with Wyclif's 'omnia necessitate fieri' (267,11–18)

3. Biblical evidence for servum arbitrium, reinterpreted by Erasmus (LStA 3:267,18–301,27)
 - against tropological mitigations (267,21–270,30)
 - Ex. 4:21 – “Ego indurabo cor Pharaonis” (270,30–283,8)
 - Rom. 9:16 – Paul on the induratio Pharaonis (283,9–291,6)
 - concluding remarks on induratio Pharaonis (291,7–8)
 - Gen. 25:23 – Jacob and Esau (291,8–295,20)
 - Isa. 45:9 – Potter and clay (295,21–301,27)

Third main section: Erasmus' arguments against Luther's remarks on Art. 36 in his 'Assertio omnium articulorum' of 1521 (LStA 3:301,28–326,2; WA 18:733,22–756,23; LW 33:212–246)

- Gen. 6:3 – Spirit/flesh (LStA 3:301,29–303,37)
- Gen. 8:21 – malum cordis (LStA 3:303,38–304,26)
- Isa. 40:2 – Grace or reckoning? (LStA 3:304,27–307,18)
- Isa. 40:6 – Flesh/Spirit – totus homo (LStA 3:307,18–313,10)
- Jer. 10:23 (LStA 3:313,11–314,21)
- Prov. 16:1+4, Prov. 21:1 (LStA 3:314,22–316,13)
- John 15:5 (LStA 3:316,14–322,10)
- Further examples provided by Erasmus (LStA 3:322,11–324,21)
- Conclusion (LStA 3:324,22–326,2)

Fourth main section: Luther's attack on liberum arbitrium (LStA 3:326,3–351,13; WA 18:756,24–783,17; LW 33:246–288)

Luther's approach (LStA 3:326,3–13)

1. Paul (LStA 3:326,13–343,41)

- Rom. 1 (326,13–329,28)
- Rom. 3:10–12 (329,29–331,22)
- Rom. 3:19–20 (331,23–335,21)
- Rom. 3:21–25 – Justification (225,22–339,32)
- Rom. 4 – Abraham (339,33–341,2)
- Rom. 5 – Adam (341,2–13)
- Review of the passages from Paul discussed so far (341,14–342,6)
- Rom. 8 – Flesh and Spirit (342,7–343,16)
- Rom. 10:20 (343,17–41)

2. John (LStA 3:343,42–351,13)

- Introduction: John as the 'liberi arbitrij uastator' (343,42–344,2)
- John 1:5–16 (344,2–346,10)
- Nicodemus (346,11–31)
- John 14:6 (346,31–347,43)
- John 3:18 (348,1–33)
- John 3:27 (348,34–349,19)
- John 6:44 (349,20–350,6)
- John 16:19 (350,7–15)

Summary remarks (350,15–351,13)

Luther's concluding remarks (LStA 3:351,13–354,31; WA 18:783,17–786,20; LW 33:288–293)

Admonition to Erasmus (LStA 3:354,32–356,9; WA 18:786,21–787,14; LW 33:294–295)

4.2. DETAILED STRUCTURE OF LUTHER'S DE SERVO ARBITRIO

Preface

(LStA 3:177,7–180,15; WA 18:600,1–602,37; LW 33:15–19)

Greeting (177,1–6)

Why Luther responds late (177,7–179,5)

Why Luther responds at all (179,6–180,1)

Thanks to Erasmus (180,1–8)

Prayer to God for Luther and Erasmus (180,8–10)

Admonition to Erasmus (180,10–15)

First main section
Response to Erasmus' introduction
(LStA 3:180,17–234,39; WA 18:603,1–666,13; LW 33:19–110)

The right and necessity of assertiones (LStA 3:180,17–183,22; WA 18:603,1–605,34)

What are 'assertiones'? (180,22–181,25)

praise for Erasmus' love of peace (180,22–23)

criticism of Erasmus' error regarding assertiones → first statement: being a Christian = delectari assertionibus (180,23–26)

definition of asserere: constanter adhaerere, affirmare, confiteri, tueri atque invictum perseverare (180,26–29)

subject of asserere: quae nobis traditae sunt divinitus in sacris literis (180,29–30)

no assertiones in cases of doubtful and unnecessary matters → that would be foolish and impious (180,30–181,6)

Christianus = assertor → taking sides in the conflict between the ancient philosophical schools (scepticism ↔ stoicism) (181,7–8)

scriptural argument with Paul → second statement: Tolle assertiones, et Christianismum tulisti (181,8–18)

foolish and appropriate asserere (181,18–20)

those who deny asserere, deny religion (181,20–25)

skepticism versus certainty (181,26–182,23)

an attempt to excuse Erasmus, with a word of caution (181,26–182,2)

distinction between arbitrari and loqui with regard to liberum arbitrium (182,2–6)

Erasmus combines skepticism regarding religious teachings with submission to the authority of the Church (182,6–12)

Christian faith allows for skepticism, but not in every aspect of it (182,12–17)

certainty is indispensable in matters of necessity (182,17–23)

submission to authority versus understanding of Scripture (182,24–183,3)

Erasmus' declaration of submission (182,24–25)

submittere both to Scripture and to the precepts of the church? (182,25–32)

third statement: no faith without certainty and understanding → Christianus anathema sit, si non certus sit et assequatur, id quod ei praescribitur, quomodo enim credet id quod non assequitur? (182,32–36)

assequi does not mean "sceptico more dubitare" or "perfecte nosse ac videre" (the latter would imply, on the one hand, "unum assecutus, omnia assecutus" and, on the other hand, "qui non assequitur, nullam partem creaturae unquam assequitur"), but "certo apprehendere", i.e. to firmly grasp the core truth of Christian faith in the Bible (182,36–183,3)

difference between dogmata christiana and opiniones hominum (183,4–22)

Erasmus equates the two and states: Quae supra nos, nihil ad nos (183,4–9)

Erasmus presents himself as a mediator (183,9–11)

Erasmus should drop the accusation of stubbornness and allow the Reformation to delight in assertiones (183,11–20)

fourth statement: Spiritus Sanctus non est scepticus, nec dubia aut opiniones in cordibus nostris scripsit, sed assertiones ipsa vita et omni experientia certiores et firmiores (183,20–22)

The clarity of Scripture – first discussion (LStA 3:183,23–186,23; WA 18:606,1–609,14)

Erasmus' distinction between necessary and unnecessary dogmata christiana (183,23–184,4)

Luther's judgment on this distinction (184,4–8)

Luther's distinction between deus and scriptura dei → many things hidden with regard to God, nothing hidden in Scripture (184,8–14)

consequences of such a mistaken opinion among the scholastics → contempt of Scripture (184,14–19)

admitted: multa loca in scripturis obscura (184,19–21)

but: clarity of the basic teachings in Scripture → trinity and Christology (184,21–185,4)

the main points in Scripture (res) are evident, despite that the words (signa) are not always easy to understand (185,4–13)

the mysteries of God in Scripture are revealed and proclaimed (185,14–22)

the cause of concealment is the blindness of the heart (185,22–30)

in the scriptural evidence he provides, Erasmus confuses the inscrutable God and the proclamation of Scripture (185,31–37)

Erasmus' examples of inscrutable statements of scripture and teachings of the church (185,37–186,4)

the scholastic complication of dogmatic arguments contrasts with the simple statements of Scripture (186,4–13)

duplex claritas/obscuritas scripturae: externa (in uerbi ministerio posita) – interna (in cordis cognitione sita) (186,13–23)

The dispute over the essence of Christianity (forma Christianismi) (LStA 3:186,24–194,28; WA 18:609,15–620,37)

general assessment of Erasmus' remarks (186,24–189,14)

Erasmus' statements are insufficient in content, even incorrect (186,24–187,26)

general assessment (186,24–29)

this program is atheistic and frivolous (186,29–187,3)

Erasmus suppresses the three crucial questions: about God's foreknowledge, about the relevance of human will for salvation, and about the freedom of human agency (187,3–8)

Erasmus proves to be ignorant of the essence of Christianity (187,8–26)

the positive statements in Erasmus' definition of the forma Christianismi are contradictory (187,27–188,13)

brief summary of Erasmus' forma Christianismi (187,27–30)

critical review of this summary (187,30–35)

the question of the capacity of the claimed powers remains open (187,35–188,4)

Erasmus' final answer is contradictory and causes confusion (188,4–13)

Erasmus' definition of the forma Christianismi fails to address the connection between knowledge and practice (188,14–189,14)

practical examples of the absurdity of Erasmus' proposal (188,14–31)

Erasmus states what needs to be done without exploring the forces required to do so → *summa temeritas* (188,32–36)

compared to the scholastics, Erasmus surpasses their absurdity (188,36–189,1)

Erasmus' self-confidence has confused him (189,1–5)

in worldly matters, this presumption might be tolerable, but in spiritual matters, deliberate ignorance about *posse*, *scire*, *facere* is intolerable (189,5–14)

the material debate: Luther's *summa rerum Christianarum* (189,15–191,18)

first part of Luther's *summa*: what human will can do (189,15–39)

Christians must know whether their will can achieve salvation (189,15–19)

who is ignorant about this is not a Christian (189,19–23)

the determination of human capabilities in relation to God shows us God and his capabilities (189,23–25)

those who do not know God's power do not know God himself, and those who do not know God cannot worship him (189,26–28)

the clear determination of God and man results in the *certissima distinctio* of both → it determines the right worship of God (189,28–32)

to denounce this knowledge as speculative is unacceptable (189,32–33)

Erasmus' *forma Christianismi* offers a correct insight: all good things are to be attributed to God – but Erasmus merely talks about this without considering the consequence: *uoluntatem nostram nihil agere* (189,33–39)

second part of Luther's *summa*: God's necessary foreknowledge (189,40–191,18)

the question that is to be considered (189,40–41)

Erasmus does not address the issue properly by examining its implications (189,41–190,15)

the scholastics have asked all the necessary questions regarding *liberum arbitrium* (190,15–21)

Christians must know: *Deus nihil praescit contingenter, sed omnia incommutabili et aeterna infallibilique voluntate et praevidet et proponit et facit* (190,22–24)

this lightning bolt strikes down *liberum arbitrium* (190,24–27)

actually, Erasmus' concept of God implies this insight (190,27–191,2)

consequence for human action: it is under the influence of the all-determining will of God (191,3–9)

the power of God's will in comparison to the will of man (191,9–13)

definition of '*contingenter fieri*' (191,13–18)

Consequential problems arising from the insights of Luther's *summa* (191,19–194,28)

the absurdity of the scholastic distinction between *necessitas consequentiae* and *necessitas consequentis* (191,19–192,20)

the testimony of ancient poets and everyday experience for *necessitas* (192,21–193,7)

can Christians ignore what poets and the people know? (192,21–23)

Virgil on the power of fate (192,23–30)

the poets knew that no one is master of his own life (192,30–33)

in proverbs, the people testify to their knowledge of the deity and its *praescientia* and *praedestinatio* (192,33–193,4)

the supposedly wise have distorted this knowledge (193,4–7)

the necessity of all events is also the reason for the credibility of the promise of salvation (193,8–25)

Erasmus' opinion would extinguish Christianity altogether (193,26–194,4)

admonition to Erasmus (194,5–14)

criticism of the scholastics, with whom Erasmus must not confuse Luther (194,14–28)

Public debate about the essence of Christianity is necessary and possible (LStA 3:194,29–196,17; WA 18:620,38–623,27)

Luther against Erasmus: the *sacra* must be *aperta* (194,29–195,8)

Erasmus' example: avoid paradoxical speech about God's omnipresence (195,9–24)

Luther's response: Christians have to learn appropriate speech about God's omnipresence (195,25–196,14)

the problematic way in which the scholastics speak about God (196,14–17)

Erasmus' advocacy of compulsory confession to secure peace in the world is incompatible with Christian freedom (LStA 3:196,18–203,17; WA 18:623,28–630,18)

instead of distinguishing between external order and the individual's conscience, Erasmus advocates the problematic papal practice of binding consciences through compulsory confession in order to promote morality (196,18–197,17)

Erasmus' interest in external peace conflicts with Christian faith (197,18–198,2)

while the disorder of the world challenges Christians, they focus on the life to come (198,3–19)

the lack of external peace in the world is partly due to the Word of God, which clashes with the God of this world (198,20–36)

because God is at work in the tumults of the world, Erasmus' attempt to secure external peace through moralism is futile (198,37–199,15)

the lack of external peace is a lesser evil compared to eternal damnation → Christians would rather lose the world than God (199,16–200,9)

Christian freedom (*libertas Christiana*) is incompatible with compulsory confession and human traditions (200,10–23)

carnal abuse of freedom does not justify restrictions on Christian freedom (200,23–201,7)

Erasmus' request to teach the truth with consideration for the situation conflicts with Christian freedom, which asserts: "*Veritas et doctrina semper, palam, constanter praedicanda, nunquam obliquando, caelandave est*" (201,8–202,11)

the alleged authority of church fathers and councils does not make human traditions binding on individuals' consciences → Christ is the sole authority (203,1–17)

The Reformation's teachings on justification and election and the paradox of mere necessity (LStA 3:203,18–210,11; WA 18:630,19–638,11)

Erasmus argues against the “paradoxon” “*Quicquid fit a nobis, non libero arbitrio, sed mera necessitate fieri*”, claiming that it endangers religion and morality (203,18–204,2)

for Luther, this paradox is not a human invention, but divine word (as Paul, the Synoptics, and John attest) and therefore to be proclaimed (204,2–19)

Erasmus relativizes scripture and interferes with God's work (204,20–205,5)

Luther refutes Erasmus' religious and ethical objections (205,6–23)

there are two reasons why the Reformation doctrine of justification and election, which seems paradoxical to Erasmus, must be proclaimed → *humilitatio* and *fides* (205,24–206,29)

Erasmus' criticism of the Reformation doctrine of justification and election is also psychologically misguided because it arouses curiosity (206,30–207,2)

the paradox of *mera necessitas* is the flip side of the Reformation doctrine of justification and election → man does nothing for salvation, “*sed solus Deus operatur salutem in nobis*” (207,3–10)

God's inevitable work of salvation in human beings is not imposed from outside, but happens out of an inner necessity (207,10–208,7)

Luther's initial statement: “*Necessario uero dico, non coacte*” (207,10)

“*homo cum uacat spiritu Dei*”: living under sin (207,11–24)

“*mutata et blande assibilata per spiritum Dei uoluntas*”: living in the Spirit (207,25–33)

human beings “*sub deo huius seculi*” are inevitably dominated by the devil (207,33–40)

“*si fortior superveniat*,” human beings are inevitably determined by God's spirit and participates in “*regia libertas*” (207,40–208,2)

the human will as a riding animal (*iumentum*) either of God or of the Devil → “*Sic humana uoluntas in medio posita est, ceu iumentum, si insederit Deus, uult et uadit, quo uult Deus [...]. Si insederit Satan, uult et uadit, quo uult Satan, nec est in eius arbitrio, ad utrum sessorem currere aut eum quaerere, sed ipsi sessores certant ob ipsum obtinendum et possidendum.*” (208,2–7)

by relativizing the efficacy of *liberum arbitrium*, Erasmus himself asserts its ineffectiveness (208,8–34)

Luther, however, offers an interpretation that would allow for an appropriate use of the term *liberum arbitrium*, namely as *aptitudo passiva* (208,28–34)

but Luther rejects this interpretation and states, “*Nos omnia necessitate, nihil arbitrio libero facere, dum uis liberii arbitrii nihil est, neque facit, neque potest bonum, absente gratia*” (208,35–209,4)

liberum arbitrium is not a human possibility, but belongs to God alone → “*esse plane diuinum nomen*” (209,4–9)

Luther calls for a theological usage of language that attributes liberum arbitrium to God alone and no longer misleads people (209,9–210,3)

Luther suggests speaking of liberum arbitrium “non respectu superioris, sed tantum inferioris [...] rei” (210,4–11)

Concluding remarks on the first part of Erasmus’ introduction (LStA 3:210,11–211,5; WA 18:638,12–639,12)

the first part of Erasmus’ introduction (praefatio) deals with the controversial issue better than the subsequent explanations (prooemium and tractatio) and presents the alternative of verba Dei or hominum (210,11–18)

when Erasmus recommends proclaiming Christ crucified in the concluding passages of his praefatio, it reveals his moralistic misunderstanding of Christian faith, i.e., sine fide in operibus gloriari (210,18–211,5)

The witnesses to the truth and the hiddenness of the Church (LStA 3:211,6–221,12; WA 18:639,13–652,22)

what follows is a discussion of the second part of Erasmus’ introduction (the prooemium), which prepares readers for the main body of the *Diatribes* (211,6)

Lutherus unus ↔ the consensus of many centuries (211,6–212,36)

as witnesses of Christ, the saints stand against liberum arbitrium (212,33–213,16)

call to the advocates of liberum arbitrium to prove the Spirit and the power (213,17–214,27)

the miracles of the believers in liberum arbitrium (213,31–214,4)

the holiness of the believers in liberum arbitrium (214,5–27)

no saint trusted in liberum arbitrium (214,27–215,7)

back to the doctrine of liberum arbitrium (215,8–29)

request to at least name the power of liberum arbitrium (215,30–216,21)

proof of the Spirit is lacking – proof of tradition is obtained by deception (216,21–35)

where, then, are simplicitas and puritas doctrinae? (217,1–16)

Luther remains negative toward liberum arbitrium – the Fathers’ affirmative statements on liberum arbitrium stem from their weakness (217,17–218,24)

the whole true church before Luther did not err – the name and being of the church are not identical (218,25–219,27)

the hiddenness of the church in history (219,18–220,24)

the canon caritatis et fidei allows for correct judgment (220,25–221,12)

The clarity of Scripture – second discussion (LStA 3:221,13–230,3; WA 18:652,23–661,28)

how can there be certainty in the face of ambiguous institutional authority? (221,13–222,9)

in view of the problem, Erasmus seems to have drawn the only possible conclusion: recognition of the ambiguity of Scripture and skepticism (221,13–23)

respondeo: Erasmus replaces Scripture with hominum somnia (221,24–222,9)

inner and outer clarity of Scripture (222,10–31)

thesis of the double judgment for testing the spirits (222,10)

the inner judgment as the self-certainty of the enlightened person of his salvation → inner clarity of Scripture (222,10–16)