

GIOVANNI TORTORIELLO

Scala Christus est

*Spätmittelalter, Humanismus,
Reformation*

135

Mohr Siebeck

Spätmittelalter, Humanismus, Reformation

Studies in the Late Middle Ages,
Humanism, and the Reformation

edited by Volker Leppin (New Haven, CT)

in association with

Amy Nelson Burnett (Lincoln, NE), Johannes Helmrath (Berlin),
Matthias Pohligh (Berlin), Eva Schlotheuber (Düsseldorf),
Klaus Unterburger (Regensburg)

135



Giovanni Tortoriello

Scala Christus est

Reassessing the Historical Context
of Martin Luther's Theology of the Cross

Mohr Siebeck

Giovanni Tortoriello, born 1989; 2012 BA, University of Salerno; 2015 MA, University of Salerno; 2020 doctor of philosophy in Romance Studies, Martin Luther University, Halle-Wittenberg; October 2021–September 2022 postdoctoral researcher, Martin Luther University; October–December 2022, postdoctoral researcher, University of Erfurt.



This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation program under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No 676258.

Dissertation to obtain the doctoral degree of the Philosophical Faculty II of the Martin Luther University Halle-Wittenberg.

ISBN 978-3-16-161472-9 / eISBN 978-3-16-161720-1
DOI 10.1628/978-3-16-161720-1

ISSN 1865-2840 / eISSN 2569-4391 (Spätmittelalter, Humanismus, Reformation)

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data are available at <http://dnb.dnb.de>.

© 2023 Mohr Siebeck Tübingen. www.mohrsiebeck.com

This book may not be reproduced, in whole or in part, in any form (beyond that permitted by copyright law) without the publisher's written permission. This applies particularly to reproductions, translations and storage and processing in electronic systems.

The book was typeset by epline in Bodelshausen using Times typeface, printed on non-aging paper by Gulde Druck in Tübingen, and bound by Buchbinderei Spinner in Ottersweier.

Printed in Germany.

Preface

This book is the result of four years of intense research, which culminated in a doctoral dissertation, successfully defended at the Faculty of Philosophy of Martin Luther University in Halle-Wittenberg on 6 November 2020. I would like to thank all the people who made this work possible and enriched my life and work with their friendship, support, and enthusiasm.

First of all, I gratefully acknowledge the funding received from the European Union through a Marie Curie ITN project entitled “The History of Human Freedom and Dignity in Western Civilization”. The participation in the European project has been a rewarding and enriching experience that has given me the opportunity to attend conferences on both sides of the Atlantic, to share ideas, projects, and ambitions with colleagues and friends, and, above all, to mature as a researcher and as a person.

My sincere thanks go to my supervisor, Prof. Dr. Friedemann Stengel: without his support, constructive criticism and, above all, the constant desire to challenge conventional ideas and open up new research perspectives, this work would not have been possible. I would also like to thank my two examiners of the doctoral committee, Prof. Dr. Bernd Roling and Prof. Dr. Robert Fajen, whose feedback, criticisms, and suggestions have been helpful in correcting and improving this work. The engaging conversations with all the supervisors and partners of the EU project have significantly contributed to my academic growth and to the realization of this work.

My deepest thanks to my former fellow Early Stage Researchers (Andrea, Elisa B., Elisa Z., Ilaria, Johannes, Karen, Kristian, Laurel, Michael, Morten, Renze, Sara, and Valeria) for their sincere friendship, enthusiasm, and enriching conversations. My deepest thanks also go to the participants of Prof. Stengel’s *Doktorandenkolloquium* in Church History (Baptiste, Christiana, Deborah, Hauke, Hirohito, Nora, and Thea) for their feedback and stimulating criticism. Further thanks are due to Conrad, for sharing my daily need for good coffee.

I would like to thank all the members and staff of the *Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt* and of the *Interdisziplinäres Zentrum für Pietismusforschung* (IZP) in Halle, where I spent many hours studying and researching, and all the professors, staff, and collaborators of the Canterbury Cathedral Archives, the Warburg Institute in London, and the University of Münster, where I spent stimulating periods of research. Special thanks to Frau Annegret Jumm-

rich, for her support in solving any bureaucratic problem and her outstanding work ethic.

I would like to thank my parents, Francesco and Francesca, and my brother Giacomo for their love and support. To Francis and Nicola, without whose help this journey would not have even begun, proving that friendship can be demonstrated with small gestures; to all the friends – those of a lifetime as well as those I have met over the years on trips to Europe and the USA – who directly or indirectly, through a chat or a laugh, have supported me on this journey. To them I dedicate this work and my deepest gratitude for all the affection and love that surrounds me.

Gotha, December 2022

Giovanni Tortoriello

Table of Contents

Preface	V
Abbreviations	XI
Introduction	1

Part I: The Discourse on Human Nature in the Renaissance and the Reformation

Chapter 1: Two Trials, Multiple Interpretations: Reuchlin, Luther, and the Discursive Context of the Early Sixteenth Century	17
1.1 Competing Christologies on the Eve of the Reformation	18
1.1.1 Martin Luther's Theology of the Cross in the Heidelberg Disputation	18
1.1.2 Between <i>Sola Gratia</i> and <i>Prisca Theologia</i> : Reshaping Christian Identity in the Late Fifteenth Century	26
1.2 A "Positive Misunderstanding"?	37
1.3 "Jewish Books Must be Destroyed": The Aftermath of the Reuchlin Affair	40
1.4 Overcoming Scholastic Theology: The Reformation of the University Curriculum in Wittenberg, the Support for Reuchlin, and Luther's Secret	47
1.5 Intersections and Juxtapositions between the Trials of Luther and Reuchlin	58
1.6 A Polarized Discursive Context	65
Chapter 2: Platonic <i>Anima</i> and Pauline <i>Spiritus</i> : Erasmus' Concept of Human Nature	67
2.1 Irenism and <i>Philosophia Christi</i> in the Letter to Paul Volz	69
2.2 <i>Homo prodigiosum quoddam animal</i> : Erasmus' Theological Anthropology in the <i>Enchiridion</i>	77
2.3 Origen, Plato, and the Allegorical Reading of the Bible	92

2.4 The Moral Level of Erasmus' <i>Pietas</i> and His Critique of the Ceremonies of the Monks	96
2.5 Erasmus' <i>Enchiridion</i> and Luther's Early Theological Anthropology . .	102
 Chapter 3: Spirit and Flesh: Luther's Critique of Erasmus' Anthropology	105
3.1 The Dialectic between Flesh and Spirit in Luther's <i>Dictata super Psalterium</i>	106
3.2 The "Aristotelian Erasmus": Luther's Two-Fold Critique of the Soteriology of Erasmus and Biel	118
3.3 Divine Justice and Pagan Wisdom: Demarcating the Boundaries of Revelation	130
3.4 Body, Soul, and Spirit: Ockhamism and anti-Erasmianism in Luther's Anthropology	142
3.5 Erasmus and Luther: Reception, Assimilation, and Transformation . . .	152
 Chapter 4: <i>CRUX Sola Est Nostra Theologia</i> : Luther's Theology of the Cross in Context	155
4.1 "Dionysius, Whoever He May Have Been": Luther and the Debate on the Dionysian Corpus in the Early Sixteenth Century	156
4.2 <i>Solus Amor</i> and <i>Amore Solo</i> : Ficino and the Mystical Ascent to the One through Love	166
4.3 <i>Pax Philosophica</i> and Divine Union in Pico's <i>De Ente et Uno</i>	176
4.4 <i>Theologia Negativa More Scolastico</i> : Eck's Commentary to Dionysius' <i>Mystical Theology</i>	184
4.5 <i>Scala Christus Est</i> : Luther's Theology of the Cross and the Ascent to God through Christ's Humanity	198
4.6 Eck and Luther: Two Competing Theologies	205
 Part II: <i>Theologus Gloriam</i> vs. <i>Theologus Crucis</i> : From the Christian Kabbalah to Luther's <i>Sola Scriptura</i>	
 Chapter 5: <i>Solam Scripturam Regnare</i> : The Development of Luther's Scriptural Argument	209
5.1 The <i>Sola Scriptura</i> Argument and Luther's Grammar of Exclusion . . .	212
5.2 The Bible in Translation: The Overcoming of the Vulgate in the Early Modern Times	216

5.3 Patristic, Medieval, and Sixteenth-Century Influences in the <i>Dictata super Psalterium</i>	230
5.4 The Indulgence Controversy and the Development of Luther's Scriptural Argument	235
5.5 <i>Sola Scriptura</i> and the Manifold Interpretations of Scripture	246
Chapter 6: The Spirit and the Letter: The Debate on Biblical Hermeneutics in Context	
6.1 In Spirit and in Faith: Grammar, Theology, and <i>Sapientia Crucis</i> in Luther's <i>Operationes in Psalmos</i>	250
6.2 Origen and Jerome the Public Targets, Erasmus the Unnamed Enemy: Luther's Front Against Allegory	262
6.3 Luther Pro Erasmus: The Dispute between Erasmus and Jacques Lefèvre on Heb. 2:7	282
6.4 Luther Against Erasmus: The Controversial Interpretation of Gal. 2:11–14	289
6.5 The <i>Goat</i> in Leipzig and the <i>Bull</i> in Wittenberg: The Spirit and the Letter in the Luther–Emser Debate	293
6.6 “Idle Spirits” and “Theologians of Glory”	309
Chapter 7: Vera Cabala Dominis Nomini: Luther's Theologia Crucis and the Christian Kabbalah	
7.1 The Influence of the Christian Kabbalah in Luther's <i>Dictata super Psalterium</i>	316
7.2 <i>Vera Cabala Dominis Nomini</i> : Competitive Discourses at the Edge of the Reformation	325
7.3 <i>The Lord and Our Lord: Deus absconditus</i> , the Tetragrammaton, and the Cross of Christ	330
7.4 <i>Theologus Gloriam</i> vs. <i>Theologus Crucis</i>	337
7.5 <i>Theologia Crucis</i> : Luther's Rejection of the Christian Kabbalah	343
Conclusions	345
Bibliography	353
Index of Names	383
Index of Subjects	389

Abbreviations

- Allen Opus Epistolarum Des Erasmi Roterodami, eds. P. S. Allen et al., 12 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1906–1958)
- ASD Erasmus Desiderius, *Opera omnia Desiderii Erasmi Roterodami* (Amsterdam: North Holland, 1969)
- AWA Archiv zur Weimarer Ausgabe der Werke Martin Luthers: Texte und Untersuchungen, 10 vols. (Cologne: Böhlau, 1981)
- CR Philip Melanchthon, *Corpus reformatorum: Philippi Melanchthonis opera quae supersunt omnia*, eds. Karl Bretschneider and Heinrich Bindseil, 28 vols. (Halle: A. Schwetschke & Sons, 1834–60)
- CWE Erasmus Desiderius, *Collected Works of Erasmus* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1974)
- EAS Erasmus of Rotterdam, *Ausgewählte Schriften*, ed. Werner Welzig, 8 vols. (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2006.)
- LW Luther's Works – American Edition, eds. Jaroslav Pelikan and Helmut T. Lehman, 55 vols. (St. Louis: Concordia, 1955–2002)
- RSW Johannes Reuchlin *Sämtliche Werke*, eds. Widu-Wolfgang Ehlers, Hans-Gert Roloff, and Peter Schäfer.
- vol. II.1. *De arte cabalistica libri tres: Die Kabbalistik*, eds. Widu-Wolfgang Ehlers and Fritz Feldentreu: Hebrew text edited by Reimund Leicht (Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Frommann-Holzboog, 2010)
- WA Doctor Martin Luthers Werke: Kritische Gesamtausgabe, 72 vols. (Weimar: Verlag Hermann Böhlaus Nachfolger, 1930–2007)
- WA Br Doctor Martin Luthers Werke: Kritische Gesamtausgabe. Briefwechsel, 18 vols. (Weimar: Verlag Hermann Böhlaus Nachfolger, 1930–1985)

Introduction

The news of the death of Martin Luther on February 18, 1546 sparked new debates on the life and soul of the most controversial man in sixteenth century Europe. While some believed Luther to be the last prophet before the second coming of Christ, others thought him to be none other than the Antichrist. Was the dying Luther surrounded by demons and finally caught by the Devil for his eternal punishment, or did he die quietly, waiting for eternal peace in heaven? Two biographies depicting the life and death of the former Augustinian monk who had changed Christendom forever appeared soon after his death. Philipp Melanchthon (1497–1560), Luther’s long-time colleague in Wittenberg and the new leader of the Wittenberg movement after Luther’s death, portrayed a clear and vivid image of Luther as the last prophet aroused by God in order to fight against the heresy of the Antichrist. In Melanchthon’s narrative, all the principal protagonists of the Reformation disappear. The men who had helped Luther in reforming the Church were still men. Luther, on the other hand, was a divinely inspired prophet, whose coming prefigured the end of times. The narrative of Luther’s opponents was diametrically opposite. In reaction to Melanchthon’s *De Vita Lutheri*, Johannes Cochlaeus (1479–1552) published his *Commentaria Johannis Cochlaei, De Actis et Scriptis Martini Lutheri Saxonis* in 1549, in which he described Luther as a demonic man who was indeed born of a sexual union between his mother, Margarathe, and a demon.¹

Seemingly, a new life began for Luther immediately after his death, a life replete with references, quotations, appropriations, and misappropriations.² In the years following his death, Luther’s legacy remained contested, since the *gnesiolutherani* questioned Melanchthon’s authority, accusing him of betraying Luther’s original message. After the second half of the sixteenth century, Luther’s name was appropriated towards the construction of orthodoxy.³ Also,

¹ For an English translation of Melanchthon’s and Cochlaeus’ biographies of Luther, see: Philipp Melanchthon and Johann Cochlaeus, *Luther’s Lives: Two Contemporary Accounts of Martin Luther*, ed. and trans. Elizabeth Vandiver, Ralph Keen, and Thomas D. Frenzel (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002). The Latin text of Melanchthon’s life of Luther can be read in the sixth volume of CR.

² For an overview of Luther’s reception in German literature, see: Norbert Mecklenburg, *Der Prophet der Deutschen: Martin Luther im Spiegel der Literatur* (Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler, 2016).

³ Stefan Michel, *Die Kanonisierung der Werke Martin Luthers im 16. Jahrhundert*, Spät-

in the following centuries, the name Martin Luther, so closely associated with the wider notion of Reformation, was used as a signifier, a marker of orthodoxy, of continuity with the religious and spiritual tradition of the sixteenth-century Reformation. In the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, Luther's theology and its relation to the other reformers (Philipp Melancthon, Andreas von Karlstadt, Thomas Müntzer) continued to be a matter of contention in the theological debates of the time.⁴

The emergence of the historical-critical method in the nineteenth century marked the beginning of a renewed interest in Luther and the Reformation as an historical phenomenon. Leopold von Ranke's monumental *Deutsche Geschichte im Zeitalter der Reformation* (1839–1847) is arguably one of the greatest achievements of nineteenth-century historiography.⁵ In 1883, on the occasion of the 400th anniversary of Luther's birth, efforts to create a critical edition of Luther's works began. What became known as the *Weimarer Ausgabe* is a collection of more than 120 volumes,⁶ followed by the new volumes published in the *Archiv zur Weimarer Ausgabe der Werke Martin Luthers: Texte und Untersuchungen*.⁷ In the early twentieth century, the so-called *Luther Renaissance* gave a definitive impetus to the establishment of Luther research as an academic endeavor in its own right.⁸

One of the most fascinating and controversial themes to have dominated the theological as well as historical debates regarding Luther in the twentieth century concerns what Luther himself labelled as "the theology of the cross" (*theologia crucis*). The term itself was coined by Luther in a famous disputation held on April 26, 1518, in Heidelberg. Prominent theologians of the twentieth

mittelalter, Humanismus, Reformation (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016). For further discussion on how Luther's life and works were interpreted in the sixteenth century, see also: Robert Kolb, *Martin Luther as Prophet, Teacher, and Hero: Images of the Reformer, 1520–1620*, Texts and Studies in Reformation and Post-Reformation Thought (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1999).

⁴ For recent discussions on this topic, see: Dorothea Wendebourg, *So viele Luthers ... Die Reformationsjubiläen des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts* (Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2017).

⁵ For a critical discussion of Ranke's work as historian, see: Michael-Joachim Zemlin, *Geschichte zwischen Theorie und Theoria: Untersuchungen zur Geschichtsphilosophie Rankes*, Epistemata: Reihe Philosophie (Würzburg: Königshausen und Neumann, 1988).

⁶ Martin Luther, *D. Martin Luthers Werke: Kritische Gesamtausgabe* (Weimar: Böhlau, 1883). Hereafter quoted as WA.

⁷ *Archiv zur Weimarer Ausgabe der Werke Martin Luthers: Texte und Untersuchungen* (Cologne: Böhlau, 1981). Hereafter quoted as AWA.

⁸ For further discussion on the Luther Renaissance, see the contributions in the following collected volume: Heinrich Assel, *Der andere Aufbruch: Die Lutherrenaissance – Ursprünge, Aporien und Wege: Karl Holl, Emanuel Hirsch, Rudolf Hermann (1910–1935)*, Forschungen zur systematischen und ökumenischen Theologie (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1994). See also: Karl Kupisch, "The 'Luther Renaissance'," *Journal of Contemporary History* 2 (1967): 39–49; Mecklenburg, *Der Prophet der Deutschen*, 145–65.

century have drawn from this expression coined by Luther to discuss the role of Jesus and his suffering on the cross in Christian theology. The dialectical theologian Karl Barth (1886–1968), just to mention one of the most influential figures of twentieth-century theology, appropriated Luther’s expression “theology of the cross”, discussing its meaning and significance in the dramatic theological context of the first half of the century.⁹ In the 1970s, the German reformed theologian Jürgen Moltmann (b. 1926) provoked new discussions on the significance of the theology of the cross with the publication of his book *Der gekreuzigte Gott*,¹⁰ as well as with an article on the contemporary significance of the theology of the cross.¹¹ This vivid debate has also generated new publications in systematic theology, which compared Luther’s *theologia crucis* with other twentieth-century accounts of the theology of the cross.¹² Some works have even paralleled Luther’s *theologia crucis* with William Shakespeare,¹³ Soren Kierkegaard,¹⁴ Blaise Pascal,¹⁵ twenty-first century Pentecostalism,¹⁶ or feminist theology.¹⁷ This list could probably be infinitely extended.

The present study aims to investigate Martin Luther’s theology of the cross within its own historical context. This is not to say that the huge amount of systematic or theological discussions regarding Luther’s *theologia crucis* has not been accompanied by historical research. Indeed, the opposite is true. In the late nineteenth century, Albrecht Ritschl (1822–1889) put Luther’s theology of the cross in contraposition with Aristotelian scholastic metaphysics.¹⁸ In the

⁹ Michael Korthaus, *Kreuzestheologie: Geschichte und Gehalt eines Programmbegriffs in der evangelischen Theologie*, Beiträge zur historischen Theologie (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007).

¹⁰ Jürgen Moltmann, *Der gekreuzigte Gott: Das Kreuz Christi als Grund und Kritik christlicher Theologie* (München: Chr. Kaiser, 1972).

¹¹ Jürgen Moltmann, “Gesichtspunkte der Kreuzestheologie heute,” *Evangelische Theologie* 33 (1973): 346–65. For further discussion on Moltmann’s *theologia crucis*, see: Korthaus, *Kreuzestheologie*, 218–301.

¹² See for instance: Rosalene Clare Bradbury, *Cross Theology: The Classical Theologia Crucis and Karl Barth’s Modern Theology of the Cross* (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2011).

¹³ Tibor Fabiny, “The ‘Strange Acts of God’: The Hermeneutics of Concealment and Revelation in Luther and Shakespeare,” *Dialog* 45 (2006): 44–54.

¹⁴ Craig Hinkson, “Luther and Kierkegaard: Theologians of the Cross,” *International Journal of Systematic Theology* 3 (2001): 27–45.

¹⁵ Graham Tomlin, *The Power of the Cross: Theology and the Death of Christ in Paul, Luther and Pascal* (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2007).

¹⁶ David J. Courey, *What Has Wittenberg to Do with Azusa? Luther’s Theology of the Cross and Pentecostal Triumphalism* (London: T & T Clark, 2015).

¹⁷ Deanna A. Thompson, *Crossing the Divide: Luther, Feminism, and the Cross* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2004); Elisabeth Moltmann-Wendel, “Zur Kreuzestheologie heute: Gibt es eine feministische Kreuzestheologie?,” *Evangelische Theologie* 50 (1990): 546–57.

¹⁸ See especially: Albrecht Ritschl, *Theologie und Metaphysik: Zur Verständigung und Abwehr*, 2 ed. (Bonn: A. Marcus, 1887). For Ritschl’s interpretation of Luther, see Frank Hofmann, *Albrecht Ritschls Lutherrezeption*, Die lutherische Kirche, Geschichte und Gestalten (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1998).

early twentieth century, Walter von Loewenich (1903–1992), while following Ritschl in interpreting Luther’s theology of the cross in contraposition to scholastic metaphysics, asserted, contradicting Ritschl, that the theology of the cross represented the core of Luther’s theology and could not be anchored to a certain moment in Luther’s life.¹⁹ From the second half of the twentieth century, Gerhard Ebeling’s existential interpretation of Luther has become more and more influential. Heiko Oberman and his followers have tried to recalibrate our understanding of Luther’s theology of the cross in its relationship with Luther’s nominalist background. Since the late nineteenth century, every single interpreter of Luther has discussed the role of the theology of the cross in Luther’s thought, and tried to situate it in its historical context.

The capillarity and pervasiveness of the discussions on Luther’s theology of the cross beg a critical engagement with this huge amount of secondary literature. Throughout the present work, I discuss both the assumptions and presuppositions that moved historical debates about Luther, but also the results that historians of the Reformation have reached in placing Luther in his own historical context. For now, it should be sufficient to highlight two main assumptions, which are widely shared in secondary literature: 1) Luther’s theology of the cross emerged as a reaction to scholastic theology; 2) Luther’s critique of scholasticism merged, and to a certain extent overlapped, with the simultaneous critique against scholasticism by sixteenth-century humanists. These two presuppositions generated a huge amount of discussion: When did Luther break with scholasticism? How did humanism help Luther to overcome scholasticism? Was Luther himself a humanist? How should one conceptualize the relationship between humanism, scholasticism, and the Reformation?

This way of problematizing Luther’s theology of the cross can be traced back to the very first time in which Luther used the expression *theologia crucis*, namely the Heidelberg Disputation. From among the audience, the Dominican Friar Martin Bucer (1491–1551), then student of the theological faculty in Heidelberg and later one of the key protagonists of the sixteenth-century Reformations, was favorably impressed by Luther’s theology. In a letter to Beatus Rhenanus (1485–1547), he advanced the idea that Luther’s theology was quite close to that of Erasmus of Rotterdam. According to Bucer, while Erasmus did so more cautiously and Luther more virulently, both made a common critique of scholastic theology.²⁰

The first historiographer of the Reformation, Philipp Melancthon, the painter of “Luther the prophet”, helped to reinforce this narrative. However, he did not limit himself to reinforcing the narrative of a common front against scholasticism in the early years of the Reformation; he also created an outright his-

¹⁹ Walther von Loewenich, *Luthers Theologia crucis*, Forschungen zur Geschichte und Lehre des Protestantismus (München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1929).

²⁰ WA 9.160–69.

toriological paradigm. As noted by James Michael Weiss, in his biography of Luther, Melanchthon used a series of literary *topoi* to represent Luther's theology in the contraposition between the *studia humanitatis* and the "barbarous" teaching of the scholastics. The theology of Luther, who sided with the former, was in continuity with the reformation of customs and morals endorsed by Erasmus.²¹ In 1557, Melanchthon wrote an oration in memory of Erasmus for Bartholomaeus Calkreuter of Cross.²² As a good astrologer, Melanchthon emphasized that the position of the stars at Erasmus' birth, on 28 October 1467, indicated his intelligence, eloquence, and charm. After describing Erasmus' life, his studies, and his erudition, Melanchthon emphasized a contraposition between Erasmus' love for learning and the hypocrisy of the "few ignorant monks" who opposed him. Endorsed with God-gifted eloquence, Erasmus rebuked the envy of his enemies. Luther's prophetic teaching emerged in this context. As Melanchthon put it: "Later the entire body of Church doctrine was cleansed again by the voice of the reverend Doctor Luther; the fact that the Apostolic books and old histories were already in people's hands was a preparation for this".²³ In Melanchthon's narrative, Erasmus' scholarship, in which the renewal of classical culture and the study of the original text of the Bible go hand in hand, was propaedeutic to Luther's theology. Without Erasmus, Luther could not have rediscovered the true evangelical message. The disagreement between the two men is minimized as "some difference in judgement", mostly due to their different character, which, however, did not preclude the possibility of Erasmus recognizing Luther as a better interpreter of the Scripture than everybody else.

Melanchthon's description of the *studia humanitatis*, which reshaped the intellectual landscape of Europe in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, and, in doing so, created the intellectual conditions for the Reformation to prosper, was conceptualized in the nineteenth century in terms of the relationship between Humanism and Reformation. The word *humanism* does not belong to the context of the early modern period. The earliest known quotation can be attributed to the German theologian Johann Friedrich Abegg (1765–1840), in 1798. The term was popularized by the German theologian and pedagogue Friedrich Immanuel Niethammer (1766–1848). For Niethammer, *humanism* designated an educational curriculum based on the study of ancient Greek and Latin literature.²⁴

²¹ James Michael Weiss, "Erasmus at Luther's Funeral: Melanchthon's Commemorations of Luther in 1546," *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 16 (1985): 91–114.

²² CR 11. 264–71. For the English translation I follow: Philipp Melanchthon, *Melanchthon: Orations on Philosophy and Education*, ed. Sachiko Kusukawa and trans. Christine F. Salazar, Cambridge Texts in the History of Philosophy (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).

²³ Cf. *Ibid.*, 253.

²⁴ To track the occurrences of the term "humanism" in early nineteenth-century Germany,

The debates regarding the notion of humanism permeated the nineteenth century. Friedemann Stengel has recently investigated how the understanding of humanism was shaped by the philosophical, theological, and political debates of the time. Stengel pointed out that Niethammer's understanding of humanism as an historical category was further developed in the following years by other scholars, notably the historian of literature Ludwig Wachler (1767–1838) and the Evangelical theologian and Church historian Wilhelm Zimmermann (1807–1878). It was, however, the historian Karl Hagen (1810–1868) who more clearly conceptualized the historical category of humanism as an intellectual movement of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. For Hagen, the Reformation of the sixteenth century is the result of three movements which opposed the Catholic Church and scholastic theology, namely a popular, a religious, and a humanistic movement. Distinguishing between an “Italian humanism” which was in opposition to religion as such, and a “German humanism” which opposed the Catholic Church, but was not anti-Christian, Hagen could place Martin Luther alongside the “German humanists”, whose main representative Hagen recognized in Erasmus of Rotterdam.²⁵

Stengel noted that, in describing humanism as a pedagogical movement that criticized the Church, Hagen transferred the political debate of his time in the context of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.²⁶ In the mid-nineteenth century, around the period of the political revolts of 1848, the debates on humanism assumed an increasingly political connotation. It is well known that Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels distinguished between atheism as a form of “theoretical humanism” and communism as a “practical humanism”. Humanism was no longer conceptualized as a movement in opposition to the Church, but as an atheistic concept.²⁷

One of the prominent figures among the young Hegelians, Arnold Ruge (1802–1880), brought back humanism in the domain of historiography. For Ruge, humanism must be conceived as a pedagogical program. In the early modern period, the humanists restored the essence of the “spirit” of ancient Greece and Rome. In his *Die Loge des Humanismus* (1851), Ruge labeled theology as a form of mythology, and depicted humanism as an important factor in overcoming the archaic forms of religion. In so doing, humanism helped Christianity to discover its true essence. Indeed, unlike Marx and Engels, for Ruge,

I follow: Hubert Cancik, “Humanismus,” in *Humanismus: Grundbegriffe*, ed. Hubert Cancik, et al. (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2016), 9–16. For further discussion, see also: Martin Vöhler, “Von der ‘Humanität’ zum ‘Humanismus’: Zu den Konzeptionen von Herder, Abegg und Niethammer,” in *Genese und Profil des europäischen Humanismus*, ed. Martin Vöhler and Hubert Cancik, *Humanismus und Antikerezeption im 18. Jahrhundert* (Heidelberg: Winter, 2009), 127–44.

²⁵ Friedemann Stengel, “Was ist Humanismus?,” *Pietismus und Neuzeit* 41 (2015): 154–211.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 179.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 179–80.

humanism was not an atheistic concept. On the contrary, just like religion, he saw humanism as helping human beings to find their true essence. Reading history through the eyes of a *processus infinitus*, a process immanent in the historical development, Ruge equated the spirit of humanism with the spirit of the Reformation as two emancipatory forces.²⁸

The debates regarding humanism, its role throughout history, its value for humanity, and its relationship with religion dominated nineteenth-century discourse. In the second half of the century, the notion of humanism was poised to become a prominent historiographical concept. Two names stand out: Georg Voigt (1827–1891), and Jacob Burckhardt (1818–1897). In 1859, Voigt published his *Die Wiederbelebung des classischen Alterthums oder das erste Jahrhundert des Humanismus*. Like Niethammer, Voigt conceived humanism within the framework of the revival of Greek and Roman culture. In a recent article, in which he analyzed the many histories of philology published during the nineteenth century, Denis J. J. Robichaud has argued that it is impossible to understand Voigt's conceptualization of humanism as an educational movement in opposition to scholasticism, without taking into consideration the previous histories of philology, in which philologists studied fifteenth-century humanists as antecedents of their own discipline.²⁹ Moreover, Paul Grendler has noted that Voigt highly appreciated humanism, and pictured Francesco Petrarca not only as the founder of the movement, but almost as a heroic figure, the initiator of modern individualism, who battled against the conservative forces represented by the Catholic Church and medieval scholasticism.³⁰ At the same time, moved by a strong normative approach, Voigt criticized the humanists (Giovanni Boccaccio, Coluccio Salutati, Marsilio de' Marsili), partly because they failed to follow in the footsteps of Petrarch to fulfill their high standard ethical values, but maybe – as Grendler suggested – also because Voigt believed that an “atheistic spirit” sparked from fifteenth-century Italy and permeated the whole humanist movement.³¹

In 1860, Jacob Burckhardt published his *Die Cultur der Renaissance in Italien*.³² It was not well received at the time of the publication, but in the first half of the twentieth century, it became one of the most influential texts in Renaissance historiography. Burckhardt's Thesis is well known: he presented the Ren-

²⁸ Ibid., 182–88.

²⁹ Denis J. J. Robichaud, “Competing Claims on the Legacies of Renaissance Humanism in Histories of Philology,” *Erudition and the Republic of Letters* 3 (2018): 177–222.

³⁰ Paul F. Grendler, “Georg Voigt: Historian of Humanism,” in *Humanism and Creativity in the Renaissance: Essays in Honor of Ronald G. Witt*, ed. Christopher S. Celenza and Kenneth Gouwens, Brill's Studies in Intellectual History (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 293–325.

³¹ For the presence of a “pagan spirit” in Florence, see *ibid.*, 312–13. For Voigt's criticism of fifteenth-century humanists, see *ibid.*, 317.

³² Jacob Burckhardt, *Die Cultur der Renaissance in Italien: Ein Versuch* (Basel: Schweighauser, 1860).

aissance as a period of regeneration, the beginning of a new era in stark contraposition with the “dark” Middle Ages. Paul Grendler noted that, despite the frequent perception that they were in conjunction with one another, Burckhardt and Voigt differed greatly in their account of humanism. This was because while Voigt equated humanism with the study of antiquity, Burckhardt saw the revival of Greek and Latin culture as one part of humanism, a movement he viewed as having emerged from the Italian genius.³³

Nineteenth-century debates on humanism created a fertile ground for new debates in the twentieth century, from Martin Heidegger’s *Letter on Humanism*³⁴ to Louis Althusser’s *Anti-humanism*,³⁵ without neglecting the political debates regarding the relationship between socialism and humanism.³⁶ From an historiographical point of view, the contribution of three scholars laid the foundation for our understanding of humanism in historical research: Hans Baron (1900–1988), Eugenio Garin (1909–2004), and Paul Oskar Kristeller (1905–1999). Baron, a German who escaped from Nazi-Germany and spent most of his career in the United States, studied under Ernst Troeltsch, one of the leading nineteenth-century historians of the Reformation. Baron has become famous for coining the term *civic humanism* in his work, *The Crisis of the Early Italian Renaissance*.³⁷ Moved by a strong normative approach,³⁸ which he vindicated as necessary to distinguish the positive and negative contributions of certain movements in the development of history, Baron described humanists as the founders of modern political values. The emergence of a republican state in early fifteenth-century Florence, and its resistance against the “tyrannical” Gian Galeazzo Visconti of Milan, assumed for Baron the value of an epoch-changing event, that separated the Middle Ages from the Renaissance. The new

³³ Grendler, “George Voigt: Historian of Humanism,” 320.

³⁴ For a recent account, see: Alfred Denker, “Martin Heideggers ‘Brief über den Humanismus.’ Eine biographische und werkgeschichtliche Einordnung,” in *Heidegger und der Humanismus*, ed. Alfred Denker and Holger Zaborowski (Freiburg; München: Karl Aber, 2017), 9–19.

³⁵ For the reception of Heidegger in France in the second half of the twentieth century, see: Tom Rockmore, *Heidegger and French Philosophy: Humanism, Antihumanism, and Being* (London; New York: Routledge, 1995).

³⁶ Florian Baab, *Was ist Humanismus? Geschichte des Begriffes, Gegenkonzepte, säkulare Humanismen heute*, Ratio fidei (Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 2013), 129–32.

³⁷ Hans Baron, “The Crisis of the Early Italian Renaissance: Civic Humanism and Republican Liberty in an Age of Classicism and Tyranny,” (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1955). For an assessment of Baron’s academic career, see: Riccardo Fubini, “Renaissance Historian: The Career of Hans Baron,” *The Journal of Modern History* 64 (1992): 541–74. For a recent discussion of Baron’s Thesis, see: James Hankins, “The ‘Baron Thesis’ after Forty Years and Some Recent Studies of Leonardo Bruni,” *Journal of the History of Ideas* 56 (1995): 309–38.

³⁸ This has been noticed by Christopher Celenza who pointed out that “in Baron’s view, the historian could, indeed must, make *judgments* about past figures and past epochs”. Cf. Christopher S. Celenza, *The Lost Italian Renaissance: Humanists, Historians, and Latin’s Legacy* (Baltimore; London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2004), 37.

hero, the father of Western political values, was no longer Petrarch, but Leonardo Bruni.³⁹

The opposing views of humanism as an intellectual movement of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries by Eugenio Garin and Paul Oskar Kristeller represent the two most influential conceptualizations of humanism as an intellectual phenomenon of the early modern period. For Garin, fifteenth-century humanism completely broke with the Middle Ages. Humanists discovered a new way of approaching history and, in doing so, a new understanding of the human being emerged. According to Garin, the rediscovery of classical antiquity and new concepts of human dignity are indissolubly joined together.⁴⁰ On the other hand, Paul Oskar Kristeller paid more attention to the continuity between humanism and the Middle Ages. Unlike Garin, Kristeller did not conceptualize humanism as a philosophical movement; rather, he defined it primarily as a philological movement.⁴¹ James Hankins has pointed out that the opposing understanding of humanism of Kristeller and Garin mirror their different philosophical backgrounds; whereas Garin was influenced by existentialism, Kristeller upheld neo-Kantianism.⁴²

At the beginning of the twentieth century, the term “humanism” received the connotation which later generations of scholars would use in historical research on the early modern period. Meanwhile, the relationship between humanism and the Reformation received huge attention. In a survey of the historiography of the Reformation published in 1940, Wilhelm Pauck described the relationship between humanism and the Reformation as one of the major themes of research in Reformation Studies. Pauck distinguished between the different types of national humanisms: in France, while the “Christian humanism” of Jacques Lefèvre d’Étaples was an incentive for the transition from the Middle Ages to the Reformation, Pauck assumed “the secular Italian humanism” to be the main “modernizing” factor;⁴³ in England, Pauck believed that there was no break between humanism and the Church, noting that the most prominent humanist of the country, John Colet, was “primarily a Christian and a Church man and sec-

³⁹ Ibid.

⁴⁰ Eugenio Garin, *L’umanesimo italiano. Filosofia e vita civile nel Rinascimento*, Biblioteca di cultura moderna (Bari: Laterza, 1952); *Medioevo e Rinascimento. Studi e ricerche*, Biblioteca di cultura moderna (Bari: Laterza, 1954).

⁴¹ Paul Oskar Kristeller, *Renaissance Thought: The Classic, Scholastic, and Humanist Strains*, Rev. and enl. ed., Harper Torchbooks (New York: Harper & Row, 1961).

⁴² James Hankins, “Garin and Paul Oskar Kristeller: Existentialism, Neo-Kantianism and the Post-War Interpretation of Renaissance Humanism,” in *Eugenio Garin: Dal Rinascimento all’Illuminismo*, ed. Michele Ciliberto (Rome: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 2011), 481–505. For further discussion on the approaches of Garin and Kristeller, see also: Celenza, *The Lost Italian Renaissance*, 28–57.

⁴³ Wilhelm Pauck, “The Historiography of the German Reformation during the Past Twenty Years,” *Church History* 9 (1940): 305–40.

ondarily a Platonist and a Humanist”,⁴⁴ in the Netherlands, although the main stress within humanism was upon education, it had, thanks to Erasmus, a special “biblical character”,⁴⁵ finally, following Gerhard Ritter’s investigation of medieval universities, Pauck pointed out that humanism was an important factor in the transition from the Middle Ages to the Reformation. He assigned a much more prominent role to Luther, however, who, equipped with the Bible, would liberate Christianity from scholasticism. Pauck concluded: “Thus it happened that primarily the Reformation and only secondarily Humanism shaped the character of early modern German civilization”.⁴⁶

Two main scholars contributed to the configuration of contemporary research on the relationship between humanism and the Reformation: Bernd Moeller (1931–2020) and Lewis Spitz (1922–1999). In 1959, Bernd Moeller published his *Die deutschen Humanisten und die Anfänge der Reformation*. Moeller described humanism and the Reformation as different in content, but similar in that both were forward-looking movements in opposition to scholasticism. Quoting Martin Bucer’s *resumé* of the Heidelberg Disputation to prove his point, Moeller introduced an expression which had huge success in subsequent scholarship: “productive misunderstanding” (*productive Mißverständnis*). According to Moeller’s account, Bucer was wrong in claiming that Luther’s and Erasmus’ theology coincided; however, this arbitrary account of the events in Heidelberg had a positive result, since it helped Luther and the entire Reformation movement to win the support of the humanists. For Moeller, humanism helped to pave the way for Luther’s theology, and supported Luther in the early years of the Reformation. Thus, he summarized the relationship between the two movements with another expression which has become very popular: *ohne Humanismus, keine Reformation*.⁴⁷

In 1963, Lewis Spitz published his work *The Religious Renaissance of the German Humanists*.⁴⁸ The book is a collection of a series of published articles, which Spitz dedicated to several so-called German Humanists, from Rudolph Agricola to Johannes Reuchlin. The last one of these prominent figures of early modern Europe is no less than Martin Luther. Spitz described German humanism as a movement characterized by “a romantic cultural nationalism and religious enlightenment” and both these aspects “were of tremendous importance to the Reformation movement”.⁴⁹ After noting the lack of a common definition of the term humanism itself, Spitz noted that humanism can be understood both

⁴⁴ Ibid., 316.

⁴⁵ Ibid., 316–17.

⁴⁶ Ibid., 317.

⁴⁷ Bernd Moeller, “Die deutschen Humanisten und die Anfänge der Reformation,” *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 70 (1959): 46–71.

⁴⁸ Lewis William Spitz, *The Religious Renaissance of the German Humanists* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1963).

⁴⁹ Ibid., 2.

Index of Names

- Abegg, Johann Friedrich 5–6
Abdallah the Saracen 83
Adrian, VI Pope, see Florensz, Adrian
Adrian, Matthew 53
Aesticampianus, Johannes 52–53
Agricola, Rudolph 10, 40, 268
Agrippa von Nettesheim 38, 41, 319
 note 30
Albertus Magnus 26, 158, 191–92
Alexander of Hales 199
Althusser, Louis 8
Alvarus, Pelagius 76
Ambrose, Bishop of Milan 128, 280
Amerbach, Bonifacius 72
Amerbach, Johannes 120
Ammonius 32 note 42, 168
Anaxagoras 25, 198–200
Andreas von Karlstadt 2, 19, 54, 60, 123,
 155, 186–87, 206, 230, 241–42, 249,
 252, 287, 314–15, 349, 352
Antoine of Lorraine, Duke 191
Antonini, Giles (Giles of Viterbo) 36–37,
 46, 119, 235
Aquinas, Thomas 26, 76, 105, 122, 126,
 note 89, 133, 142, 158, 159 note 10,
 182, 191–92, 196, 199, 219, 228, 232,
 236–37, 268, 283, 290
Arcesilas 168
Aretino, Pietro 28
Aristotle 52, 72, 117, 123, 127–29, 156,
 176–182, 187–88, 192, 195–200, 219,
 277, 286–87, 297, 299, 321, 349–50
Arndt, Johannes 298
Arnoldi, Bartholomaeus 133, 345–46,
 351
Athanasius 284
Augustine of Hippo 20, 52, 57–58, 61,
 67, 79, 118–131, 134, 142, 146–47,
 152, 155, 168, 186–87, 192, 213–14,
 230–31, 235, 238, 242, 244, 250, 264,
 268, 270–71, 283–86, 289–90, 303–4,
 307–8, 317, 321, 323, 334
Augustus, Caesar Emperor 51
Aurogallus, Matthew 229
- Balthasar, Hans Urs von 191 note 131
Balma, Hugh of 191
Barbaro, Ermolao 40, 71–72
Barnabas 289, 291
Baron, Hans 8
Barth, Karl 3, 160
Basil of Caesarea 277
Beier, Leonard 20, 345
Benno of Meissen 294
Bernhardi, Bartholomäus 120
Bernard of Clairvaux 146 note 145, 160–
 61, 189, 319
Beroaldo, Filippo the Younger 193
 note 136
Bessarion, Cardinal 179–181,
Biel, Gabriel 13, 22–23, 26, 76, 106, 118,
 120, 122, 126 note 89, 130, 133, 141,
 143, 155, 347
Blount, William Lord Mountjoy 71, 77
Boccaccio, Giovanni 7
Bonaventure, Saint 76, 158, 160, 164,
 189, 191, 199, 319
Böschenstein, Johannes 325
Braun, Johannes 135 note 115
Brucioli, Antonio 230
Brucker, Johann Jacob 29 note 35
Bruni, Leonardo 9
Brunner, Emil 160
Bruno, Giordano 38
Bucer, Martin 4, 10, 38, 65, 124, 309,
 346
Bullinger, Heinrich 313

- Burekhardt, Jacob 7–8
 Burgos, Paul of 233, 317
 Buonaccorsi, Biagio 177
- Caesar, Julius 51
 Cajetan, Thomas de' Vio Cardinal 64,
 211, 237–41, 244–45, 290
 Calkreuter of Cross, Bartholomaeus 5
 Calvin, John 230
 Campana, Augusto 12
 Capito, Wolfgang 267
 Carneades 168
 Catiline 121
 Cellarius, Johannes 54
 Champier, Simphorien 190–91
 Chrysostom, John 192, 242, 277, 284
 note 123
 Cicero 79–80, 98, 168, 240,
 Claudius, Emperor 139
 Clement VI, Pope 237–40
 Clement of Alexandria 86 note 66
 Colet, John 9, 77, 92
 Conrad, Wimpina 235, 237
- Damasus I, Pope 319
 Della Volta, Gabriele 19, 235
 De' Medici, Cosimo 27, 180
 De' Medici, Giovanni see Leo X, Pope
 De' Medici, Lorenzo 27–8, 37, 40, 166,
 177
 Dionysius, the Areopagite 85, 157–58,
 161–74, 181–84, 187–198, 200–202,
 205–206, 241, 303–304, 318–19, 321,
 332, 338, 349–51, 354
 Dorp, Martin 139
 Durandus, Guillaume 75
- Eck, Johannes 13, 19, 54–55, 59, 61, 63,
 155–56, 164–66, 184–198, 201–206,
 211, 231, 241–45, 251, 260, 270, 287,
 294–96, 299, 313–14, 332, 338, 349–52
 Eckhart, Meister 158
 Emser, Hieronymus 13, 41, 55, 59, 74,
 83 note 52, 93, 211, 229–30, 250–51,
 293–310, 313, 319, 322, 337, 349–51
 Engels, Friedrich 6
 Erasmus, Desiderius 4–6, 10, 13, 37–40,
 46–48, 56–65, 67–103, 106, 115, 123–
 35, 138–41, 143, 145, 150–53, 155,
 158, 164, 185–87, 192–93, 201, 211,
 223–28, 230–33, 235, 246–47, 249–50,
 262–93, 299, 302–10, 315–16, 327,
 330, 332, 346–51
 Eriugena, John Scotus 158
 Eusebius of Caesarea 192
- Fabricius, Roman censor 121, 127–28
 Fabri, Johannes 265
 Ferdinand II, King of Aragon 190
 Ficino, Marsilio 11, 13, 18, 24 note 22,
 27–30, 32 note 42, 34–41, 69, 77–82,
 86–92, 102, 156, 158, 165–82, 190–91,
 193–95, 205–6, 222, 332, 338, 348–50
 Filelfo, Francesco 28
 Flavian, Patriarch of Constantinople 243
 Florensz, Adrian (Pope Adrian VI) 290
 Franck, Sebastian 249, 252
 Frederick III (Emperor) 40, 51
 Frederick, Elector of the Palatinate (the
 Wise) 19, 51, 53, 56 note 125, 60–61,
 127, 156, 235, 309, 325
 Froben, Johann 69, 74, 139, 211, 265,
 280
- Galatinus, Pietro 48
 Gallus, Thomas 191
 Gansfort, Wessel 40, 160
 Garin, Eugenio 8–9, 12 note 60, 82
 note 52, 177
 George of Saxony, Duke 293–94
 George of Trebizond 73, 179
 Gerbellius, Nikolaus 211
 Gerson, Jean 107, 159 note 11, 160–61,
 166, 189, 195, 242
 Giustiniani, Agostino 222–23, 246
 Gratius, Ortvinus 46–49, 51, 65
 Gregory of Nazianzen 128, 199
 Gregory of Nyssa 86 note 66
 Grosseteste, Robert 158, 191
- Hagen, Karl 6
 Hägglund, Bengt 160
 Harnack, Adolf von 160
 Heidegger, Martin 8
 Hilary of Poitiers 31–33, 128, 254, 268,
 280, 303

- Hilduin 158
 Hispanus, Peter 52, 184
 Hooker, Richard 159 note 9
 Hugh of St. Cher 233
 Hunzinger, Wilhelm August 106–7
 Hus, Johann 244

 Iamblichus 36, 166–68
 Iserloh, Erwin 160

 Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples 9, 41, 57, 62–64, 73, 108, 127, 158, 190–91, 206, 222–23, 230, 233–35, 246, 251, 260, 281–88, 303, 315, 317, 324–25, 343–44
 Jerome of Stridon 56–59, 79, 124–29, 132–33, 151–52, 186–87, 192, 213–14, 220–25, 228, 230, 232, 234, 242, 264, 268–69, 277, 280, 283, 289–93, 298, 303–4, 308, 310, 317, 319, 349
 Jesus of Nazareth 3, 30, 33, 42, 46, 80, 94, 97, 111, 147, 163–64, 192, 201, 206, 242, 251, 261–62, 271, 273, 275, 277, 279, 282–89, 304, 312, 319–20, 322, 324, 330, 333, 338–39, 341, 344–45, 348, 351
 Johann von Dalberg 45 note 81
 Johann von Hoogstraten 46, 48–51, 64–65, 313, 327, 347
 Johann von Kitzscher 51
 Johann von Paltz 162
 Johann von Staupitz 19, 27, 119, 161–62, 199, 231
 John of Ragusa 224
 John of Scythopolis 191 note 131
 John Paul II, Pope 105
 John the Baptist 29, 274
 Julian, Emperor (The Apostate) 181

 Kristeller, Paul Oskar 8–9, 12, 24 note 22, 78–79, 86–87
 Kunigunde of Austria, Duchess 44

 Landino, Cristoforo 27
 Lang, Johann 52, 57–8, 60, 121 note 66, 123, 153
 Latomus, James 53, 156–57, 270
 Lazzarelli, Ludovico 190–91
 Lemlein, Asher 43

 Leone da Spoleto, Pier 167–68
 Leo X, Pope 19, 27–28, 37, 48, 64–65, 74, 166, 193 note 136, 199, 212, 214–15, 223, 235, 237, 241, 348
 Limperger, Tilman 138
 Linacre, Thomas 72–73, 77
 Loans, Jacobus Jehiel 40
 Loewenich, Walter von 4
 Lombard, Peter 52, 70, 122, 187, 202, 233, 237, 323
 Lotter, Melchior 295
 Luke, Evangelist 157
 Luther, Martin 1–6, 10–14, 17–27, 37–42, 46–47, 49–65, 68–69, 74–75, 102–3, 105–53, 155–66, 185–88, 192, 198–206, 209–19, 223, 226–47, 249–65, 272–74, 276, 278, 280–82, 287–352

 Manetti, Giannozzo 220–21
 Manutius, Aldus 134
 Marcion 286
 Marsili, Marsilio de' 7
 Marschalk, Nicolaus 50
 Martini, Raymond 46 note 82
 Martinus I, Pope 157
 Marx, Karl 6
 Maximilian I, Emperor 44–45
 Maximus the Confessor 157, 191
 Melancthon, Philipp 1–2, 4–5, 40, 46, 53–54, 60, 65, 72 note 15, 152, 226, 229, 295, 309, 325
 Meleto, Francesco da 245
 Mithridates, Flavius 40
 Moeller, Bernd 10–12, 38
 Moltmann, Jürgen 3
 More, Thomas 77, 83
 Mosellanus, Peter 287
 Murner, Thomas 296
 Müntzer, Thomas 249, 252

 Nathin, Johannes 119
 Nicholas V, Pope 221
 Nicholas of Cusa 36, 75 note 22, 158, 187–89, 198, 205–6, 324–5, 338, 344, 350
 Nicholas of Lyra 218–19, 233–34, 251, 290, 317, 334
 Niethammer, Friedrich Immanuel 5–7

- Numenius 168
 Olivétan, Pierre Robert 230
 Origen of Alexandria 31–33, 69, 79,
 86 note 66, 93–94, 102, 124–25, 133
 note 106, 151–52, 186–87, 232, 264,
 275, 277–81, 291–92, 303–4, 306,
 308–10, 348–49
 Orpheus 187, 198
 Orsini, Clarice 27
 Osiander, Andreas 314

 Pagnini, Sante 222–23
 Paracelsus 38
 Parmenides 24–25, 178, 180, 197–98,
 200
 Pauck, Wilhelm 9–10
 Paul, Apostle 20, 33, 56, 76, 80–81, 92–
 93, 95, 98–100, 115, 120, 125–31,
 134–38, 140–41, 146, 149–52, 157,
 159, 163–65, 167–69, 175, 187, 191–
 93, 196–98, 201–2, 231, 239, 263, 271,
 276, 279–80, 284–86, 288–93, 298,
 303–6, 308, 327, 338, 348–50
 Pellikan, Konrad 226
 Peter, Apostle 76, 239, 242, 272–73,
 289–92, 327
 Peter of Ravenna 50–51
 Peter of Spain, *see* Hispanus, Peter
 Petrarca, Francesco 7, 9, 11, 28
 Phaethon 277
 Philo of Alexandria 303
 Philippi, Johaannes 134
 Pico della Mirandola, Gianfrancesco 46,
 82 note 52, 83, 176, 191
 Pico della Mirandola, Giovanni 12–
 13, 18, 27–28, 30–41, 46, 48, 51, 55
 note 120, 59, 62–64, 67–69, 71–74,
 77–85, 92, 99–102, 156, 166, 176–85,
 187, 190–93, 195–96, 198–201, 205–6,
 222, 293, 303, 306, 310, 319–20, 325,
 327, 329, 332, 337–338, 340 note 90,
 342, 344, 348–51
 Pirckheimer, Willibald 59, 74, 250
 Plato 24–25, 29–30, 35–38, 71, 78–79,
 86–89, 91–93, 95, 102, 106, 141, 143–
 44, 156, 166–69, 171–72, 176–81, 187,
 192, 195–200, 278, 331, 349

 Plethon, Georgius Gemistos 179–81
 Pliny 52
 Plotinus 30, 32 note 42, 36, 167–70,
 178–81, 192
 Poliziano, Angelo 27, 71–72, 177
 Pomponazzi, Pietro 24 note 22
 Porchetus 46 note 82, 312
 Porphyry 32 note 42, 52, 166, 178
 Prierias, Sylvester 211, 236–37, 241–42,
 244–45
 Proclus 36, 157, 166–69, 178

 Radini Tedeschi, Tommaso 295, 297
 Raymond von Gurk, Cardinal 293
 Rashi (Solomon ben Isaac of Troyes)
 218–19
 Regulus, Marcus Atilius 127–28
 Reisch, Gregor 138
 Renaudet, Augustin 222 note 38
 Reuchlin, Johannes 10–11, 13, 17–18,
 27–28, 37–42, 45–51, 53, 56, 58–59,
 61–65, 155–56, 184–85, 191 note 130,
 201, 206, 222, 225, 230, 233–35, 239,
 246–47, 278–79, 293, 303, 313–16,
 319–20, 324–27, 329–30, 332–33,
 337–38, 340 note 90, 341–44, 347,
 351
 Rhenanus, Beatus 4, 265, 346
 Ricasoli, Bindaccio 169 note 46
 Ricci, Paolo 190
 Ritschl, Albrecht 3–4
 Ritter, Gerhard 10
 Rubianus, Crotus 47
 Ruge, Arnold 6–7

 Salutati, Coluccio 7
 Salviati, Benigno Giorgio 48
 Saraceno, Giovanni 158, 165
 Savonarola, Girolamo 176, 245
 Scholarios, Gennadius 179, 180 note 91
 Schulz, Hieronymus 199
 Schwenckfeld, Caspar 246
 Scotus, Duns 26, 75–76, 267
 Seneca 80, 138–39
 Sforino, Obadiah ben Jacob 40
 Smalley, Beryl 217
 Socrates 80, 87, 89–90, 101, 134–35,
 178, 197–98, 350

- Spalatin, Georg 49, 51–53, 56, 58, 60,
 126–31, 153, 186, 265, 325–26, 345–47
 Spener, Philipp Jacob 298
 Spenser, Edmund 159 note 9
 Spitz, Lewis 10–11, 68
 Stapulensis, Faber, see Jacques Lefève
 d'Étaples
 Stunica, Jacobus Lopis (Diego López de
 Zúñiga) 228

 Tacitus, Cornelius Publius 192–93
 Tantalus 277
 Tartaretus 52
 Tauler, John 107, 158, 160–62, 166, 203–
 4, 219
 Tetzl, Johann 235, 237
 Theophylactus 284
 Tyndale, William 78 note 28, 230
 Tongern, Arnold von 46, 49, 313
 Traversari, Ambrogio 158, 165
 Trismegistus, Hermes 36, 83, 180, 187,
 190–92, 196–98, 349–50
 Troeltsch, Ernst 8, 160
 Trutvetter, Jodocus 132–33, 135
 note 115, 141, 145, 345–47, 350–51
 Turmeda, Anselm 83 note 55

 Ulrich von Hutten 46–47, 59, 61, 65,
 309
 Uriel von Gemmingen, Archbishop of
 Mainz 44–45

 Valla, Lorenzo 12, 62–64, 67, 158, 164,
 192–93, 220–21, 246, 349
 Vesalius, Johannes 62–63
 Victor von Carben 45
 Visconti, Gian Galeazzo 8
 Vogelsang, Erich 160–61
 Voigt, Georg 7–8

 Wachler, Ludwig 6
 Wimpfeling, Jacob 83 note 52, 293
 Wyclif, John 27, 67

 Ximenez de Cisneros, Francisco 227–28

 Zack, John 294
 Zasius, Ulrich 185
 Zimmermann, Wilhelm 6
 Zoroaster 180, 349
 Zúñiga, Diego López see Stunica, Jacobus
 Lopis
 Zwingli, Huldrych 12, 38, 313–14, 325

Index of Subjects

- Allegory 92–95, 112–13, 117, 135, 210
note 4, 249–282, 293–309, 334–38,
348–49
- Antichrist 1, 164 note 32, 244–46, 301–2
- Anticlericalism 73, 96–102, 255–57,
271–74, 297–98
- Aristotelianism
– concordance with Platonism and Her-
meticism 176–82, 187, 195–98, 349–
50
– Luther’s critique of 23–26, 39, 117,
123, 127–30, 200–6, 242, 321
– Erasmus’ critique of 70–77, 276–78
- Augustinianism 118–22, 231
- Conscience 132–41, 143–44, 149, 202–5,
213, 263–64, 304, 328
- Christology 18–37, 153–65, 225–26,
285–87
- Church Fathers
– in the Early Roman controversialists
185–87, 299
– in Erasmus 92–96, 277–78, 283–84,
289–90
– and Luther’s *Sola Scriptura* argument
213–14, 242–44, 298–300
- Conciliarism
– in the Early Roman Controversialists
236–37, 241–43
– in Luther 237–41, 243–44
- Concupiscence 89, 140
- Cross, Theology of the 2–4, 18–26, 196–
206, 337–44, 349–54
- Deification (*deificatio*) 35–36
- Facientibus quod in se est*
– in Gabriel Biel 22
– Luther’s critique of 20–23, 118–23
- Heidelberg Disputation
– Martin Bucer’s interpretation of 3, 38,
346
– 19th and 20th century interpretation of
2–4, 10
- Humanism
– 19th century construction of 6–8
– Garin’s and Kristeller’s interpretation
of 9
– and Reformation 9–14
- Jacob’s Ladder
– in Erasmus 86
– in Luther 117, 200–1, 332
– in Pico 85
– in Reuchlin 201
- Justification, doctrine of 11, 21–23, 35–
36, 80 111–31, 145–46, 249, 322, 327–
28, 351
- Kabbalah
– and magic 34–35, 222, 326–28
– Kabbalistic interpretation of Scripture
31–32, 222–23, 337
– Eck’s critique of 190–91
– Erasmus’ critique of 267, 278–81
– Luther’s critique of 311–44
- Law and gospel 23, 123–29, 231, 252,
264, 302–5, 310, 316–17, 322–23
- Leipzig Debate 19, 54 note 117, 155–
56, 164–65, 186–88, 198, 206, 241–
44, 251, 260–61, 287, 294–95, 299,
349
- Mysticism
– and scholasticism in Eck 188–90
– in Ficino 172–75
– in Pico 182–83

- Luther’s use of 108, 162–63, 203–4, 318–19
 - Luther’s critique of 163–66, 204–6
- Nominalism 21, 26–27, 105, 142–43
- Original sin
- Erasmus’ understanding of 82–86, 90–91, 95–97, 226–27, 249
 - Luther’s understanding of 21–22, 118–41, 249, 331
- Pelagianism 22–23, 113–14, 129–130, 226–27, 347
- Platonism
- and Hermeticism 34, 223
 - in Pico–Ficino controversy 177–81
 - in the young Luther 106–7
- Prisca Theologia
- Eck’s interpretation of 191–92
 - in Ficino and Pico 26–37, 166–69
- Reason
- reason and will in Ficino 86–88
 - in Erasmus’ *Enchiridion* 88–94, 101–2
 - in Luther 108–9, 112
- Scholasticism
- in Eck 188–90, 195–96
 - in Pico 182
 - Erasmus’ critique of. 70–76, 265, 270–71, 277–78
 - Luther’s critique of 47–63, 113, 120–23, 198–200, 236–42, 265, 319–21, 326–27, 345–46
- Scripture
- German translations of 228–29
 - Kabbalistic interpretation of 30–32, 201, 321–25, 342–43
 - Letter–Spirit distinction 250–62, 274–81, 293–311
 - polyglot translations of 223–28
 - tropological interpretation 107, 111–12, 117, 146–50, 210, 263–64, 281, 304, 310, 317
 - vernacular translations of 230
- Sola Scriptura
- Luther’s development of 212–16, 235–47
 - Early Roman controversialists critique of 251–52
- Spirit and flesh
- in Ficino 91
 - in Pico 82–84
 - in Erasmus 81–82, 89–95, 140–41
 - in Luther 140–41, 144–53
 - in Ockham 142
- Synderesis
- in Eck 189, 195
 - in Jerome 132
 - scholastic discussions on 132–33
 - in Luther 112, 133–44
- Will, freedom of
- in Eck 186–87
 - Luther’s denial of 21–22, 120–22, 336, 347