

---

Cambridge

---

Texts in the

---

History of

---

Political

---

Thought

---

# The Radical Reformation

---

Edited by

---

Michael

---

G. Baylor

---



CAMBRIDGE TEXTS IN THE  
HISTORY OF POLITICAL THOUGHT



THE RADICAL REFORMATION

# CAMBRIDGE TEXTS IN THE HISTORY OF POLITICAL THOUGHT

*Series editors*

RAYMOND GEUSS

*Lecturer in Philosophy, University of Cambridge*

QUENTIN SKINNER

*Regius Professor of Modern History in the University of Cambridge*

Cambridge Texts in the History of Political Thought is now firmly established as the major student textbook series in political theory. It aims to make available to students all the most important texts in the history of western political thought, from ancient Greece to the early twentieth century. All the familiar classic texts will be included, but the series seeks at the same time to enlarge the conventional canon by incorporating an extensive range of less well-known works, many of them never before available in a modern English edition. Wherever possible, texts are published in complete and unabridged form, and translations are specially commissioned for the series. Each volume contains a critical introduction together with chronologies, biographical sketches, a guide to further reading and any necessary glossaries and textual apparatus. When completed the series will aim to offer an outline of the entire evolution of western political thought.

*For a list of titles published in the series, please see end of book*

# THE RADICAL REFORMATION

EDITED AND TRANSLATED BY

Michael G. Baylor

*Professor of History  
Lehigh University  
Bethlehem, Pennsylvania*



CAMBRIDGE  
UNIVERSITY PRESS

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS  
Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore, São Paulo, Delhi

Cambridge University Press  
The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 8RU, UK

Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York

[www.cambridge.org](http://www.cambridge.org)

Information on this title: [www.cambridge.org/9780521379489](http://www.cambridge.org/9780521379489)

© Cambridge University Press 1991

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception  
and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements,  
no reproduction of any part may take place without  
the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 1991  
Eighth printing 2008

Printed in the United Kingdom at the University Press, Cambridge

*British Library cataloguing in publication data*

The radical reformation.

1. Germany. Christian church, history  
I. Baylor, Michael G.

274.306

*Library of Congress cataloging in publication data*

The Radical Reformation / edited and translated by Michael G. Baylor.

p. cm – (Cambridge texts in the history of political thought)

Translated from German.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 0 521 37073 6 (hardback) – ISBN 0 521 37948 2 (paperback)

1. Anabaptists – Doctrines – History – 16th century – Sources.
2. Church and state – Anabaptists – History – 16th century – Sources.
3. Church and state – Europe – History – 16th century – Sources.
4. Reformation – Sources. 5. Peasants' War. 1524-1525 – Sources.

I. Baylor, Michael G., 1942–. II. Series

BX4931.1.R23 1991

270.6–dc20 90–20416 CIP

ISBN 978-0-521-37948-9 paperback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or  
accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to  
in this publication, and does not guarantee that any content on such  
websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

---

---

## Contents

<i>Preface</i>	<i>page</i> vii
<i>List of abbreviations</i>	x
<i>Introduction</i>	xi
<i>Chronology 1521-1528</i>	xxvii
<i>Bibliographical note</i>	xxxiii
1 Thomas Miintzer, <i>The Prague Protest</i>	1
2 Thomas Miintzer, <i>Sermon to the Princes</i> (or An <i>Exposition of the Second Chapter of Daniel</i> )	11
3 Andreas Karlstadt, <i>Letter from the Community of</i> <i>Orlamunde to the People of Allstedt</i>	33
4 Conrad Grebel, <i>Letter to Thomas Miintzer</i>	36
5 Andreas Karlstadt, <i>Whether One Should Proceed Slowly</i>	49
6 Thomas Miintzer, <i>A Highly Provoked Defense</i>	74
7 Felix Manz, <i>Protest and Defense</i>	95
8 Anonymous, <i>To the Assembly of the Common Peasantry</i>	101
9 Hans Denck, <i>On the Law of God</i>	130
10 Hans Hut, <i>On the Mystery of Baptism</i>	152
11 Michael Saltier, <i>The Schleithem Articles</i>	172
12 Balthasar Hubmaier, <i>On the Sword</i>	181
13 Hans Hergot, <i>On the New Transformation of the</i> <i>Christian Life</i>	210
Appendices: Programs of the Peasants' War	227
a <i>The Eleven Muhlhausen Articles</i>	227

## Contents

---

b	<i>The Twelve Articles of the Upper Swabian Peasants</i>	231
c	<i>The Memmingen Federal Constitution</i>	239
d	<i>The Document of Articles of the Black Forest Peasants</i>	243
e	<i>The Forty-six Frankfurt Articles</i>	246
f	<i>Michael Gaismair's Territorial Constitution for Tyrol</i>	254
	<i>Biographical notes</i>	261
	<i>Index of subjects</i>	272
	<i>Index of proper names</i>	282
	<i>Index of biblical references</i>	289



## Preface

This work brings together a variety of writings – published and unpublished tracts, letters, declarations, and lists of articles – illustrative of both the rich diversity and the fragile unity that existed in the political thinking of some major radical reformers of the early Reformation in Germany. To give the volume a coherent focus, the texts selected for translation have been drawn from a single decade, the 1520s. They concern the central event of that decade for German society, the Peasants' War of 1524–26, the most massive European popular upheaval before the French Revolution. During the period 1521–27, as Reformation radicals confronted the issue of revolution, and subsequently had to deal with the reality of a failed revolt, the basic patterns of the radicals' thought about society and politics were established.

Politics for the radical reformers was inseparable from religion, as it was for the vast majority of sixteenth-century Europeans. The texts assembled here are “premodern” in the sense that their criticisms of existing social and political arrangements, their legitimations of change, and their visions of an alternative society are animated by Christian ideas and values. But rather than attempting to categorize the writings in terms of a theological typology (Anabaptist, Spiritualist, etc.), I have presented them in roughly chronological order. This arrangement is appropriate to the inchoate nature of Reformation radicalism during the 1520s and to the evolution that radical thought underwent over the decade. Before 1525 no radical aimed at establishing a separatist church or “sect.” This alternative emerged only after the failure of the Peasants' War. The sole exception to a

## Preface

---

chronological ordering comes at the end. Hans Hergot's *On the New Transformation of the Christian Life* was published a few months before Balthasar Hubmaier's *On the Sword*; presenting Hergot's writing last allows Hubmaier's work to be juxtaposed with *The Schleithelm Articles*, which set forth a position that Hubmaier sought to refute, and allows Hergot's work to serve as a recapitulation of some central themes of the collection. The documents appended to the writings present some of the programs of the peasantry and the urban artisan classes during the upheaval of 1525. They show the relationship between the religio-political convictions of the radical reformers and the concrete aspirations of the commoners during the Peasants' War. In many cases the radicals directly participated in, or influenced the framing of these programs.

Some of the writings presented here have been translated before, but all these translations are new, done from the best German editions of the texts. The combination of accuracy and readability in translating is elusive. In the interest of readability I have felt free to divide sentences, alter punctuation, add paragraph divisions, and occasionally eliminate redundancies.

The radicals usually cited Scripture in a general way – ordinarily their references are to whole chapters or psalms. Often I have offered more specific verse references, which have been enclosed in square brackets, as has editorial material in the texts. But the radicals insisted that specific scriptural verses must be understood in context; sometimes they wanted a reader to examine whole chapters or psalms. The Vulgate's nomenclature has been modernized according to *The New English Bible with the Apocrypha*.

This book owes much to the generous help I have received from several individuals and institutions. The preparation of the volume was made possible in part by a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities, whose support enabled me to spend the academic year 1988–89 in Germany. While there I benefited from the library resources of the University of Tübingen, both the main library and that of the Historisches Seminar. All the personnel of the Historisches Seminar were kind and helpful, but I owe a particular debt of gratitude to Professor Dr. Hans-Christoph Rublack, who did a great deal to make my year enjoyable and profitable. He facilitated the move from the U.S., shared office space, suggested secondary literature, and offered his expertise in translating difficult passages.

## Preface

---

The seminar we taught together in the summer of 1989 on the political theory of the radical reformers was a pleasure. I worked through first drafts of the translations with Dieter Jellinghaus of Stuttgart, who offered numerous corrections and suggestions. My wife, Carol Baylor, and my parents, Murray and Elisabeth Baylor, also suggested many stylistic improvements. Dr. Robert W. Scribner of Clare College, Cambridge, shared with me a draft translation of *To the Assembly of the Common Peasantry*. Professor Ulrich Bubenheimer of Heidelberg gave generously of his great knowledge of Thomas Müntzer, and I profited from our discussions about Karlstadt. I also discussed Müntzer with Dr. Dieter Fauth, who lent me source materials. Dr. Gerhard Günther of Mühlhausen encouraged me and provided me with a copy of his manuscript analyzing *The Eleven Mühlhausen Articles*. Professor Joe Dowling, chair of Lehigh University's Department of History, reduced my teaching load to give me more time to work on the book.

## Abbreviations

The following abbreviations are used in the notes:

- FB* *Flugschriften der Bauernkriegszeit*, ed. Adolf Laube and Hans Werner Seiffert, 2nd revised edn. (Cologne/Vienna, 1978)
- MSB* *Thomas Müntzer, Schriften und Briefe. Kritische Gesamtausgabe*, ed. Günter Franz with the collaboration of Paul Kirn (*Quellen und Forschungen zur Reformations-geschichte*, 33) (Gütersloh, 1968)
- QGTs* *Quellen zur Geschichte der Täufer in der Schweiz*, vol. I, Zurich, ed. Leonhard von Huralt and Walter Schmidt (Zurich, 1952, 1974); vol. II, Ostschweiz, ed. Heinold Fast (Zurich, 1973)
- PSMB* *Thomas Müntzer: Politische Schriften, Manifeste, Briefe*, ed. Manfred Bensing and Bernd Rüdiger (Leipzig, 1973)
- WA* *D. Martin Luthers Werke, Kritische Gesamtausgabe*, vol. Iff. (Weimar, 1883ff.)
- WA Br* *D. Martin Luthers Werke, Briefwechsel*, 18 vols. (Weimar, 1930–85)

# Introduction

## I. The radical Reformation

Radicalism in the sixteenth-century Reformation first appeared in the stormy early years of the movement in Germany and Switzerland. Especially from 1521, the year when Luther was condemned at the Diet of Worms, a powerful current of popular evangelicalism convulsed society. During the early 1520s a cause which had begun with the defense of Luther in his conflict with Rome entered a phase of rapid proliferation. Evangelical preachers appeared in numerous towns, gaining a widespread following among the laity. And, contrary to popular stereotype, the laity did not always follow clerical leaders. From urban bases the Reformation quickly spread to the countryside. With this rapid growth, the reform movement inevitably became more diversified and its message more diffuse. Influential new centers of evangelical theology appeared, such as Zurich where Ulrich Zwingli emerged as the dominant figure. In addition to those of Wittenberg and Zurich, a variety of other Reformation programs were also initiated at the local level. Here preachers and laymen advanced their own understanding of slogans initially made popular by Wittenberg theologians ("the pure gospel," "Christian liberty," "the priesthood of all believers," etc.). As the Reformation spread – through a flood of printed literature, but, more importantly for lay commoners, through sermons, public debates, and less formal oral channels – it also absorbed preexisting socio-economic grievances and political aspirations, and gained a revolutionary momentum. This popular movement

culminated in the Peasants' War of 1524–26, or, as it has also been termed, the Revolution of the Common Man.

Reformation radicalism must be considered in the fluid context of this powerful social movement. The radicals are commonly viewed as a fringe element in the Reformation – “marginal” reformers or “reformers in the wings.” But during the early 1520s they were the ideologists of the popular evangelicalism that swept Germany and Switzerland. Like the popular Reformation, the radical reformers were driven by a fervent, impatient desire to see sweeping reforms made on the basis of religion. The radicals also insisted that Reformation meant much more than changes in devotional practices and ecclesiastical institutions; public life as a whole was urgently in need of Christianization. Two other important features of this popular evangelicalism are reflected in the themes of Thomas Müntzer's *Prague Protest*: bitter anticlericalism and apocalypticism. The clergy as a whole – but especially prelates, theologians, and monks – were held responsible for the pervasive corruption of Christendom. Müntzer, like many commoners, charged the clergy with preaching a false faith designed to sustain their privileged position in the decayed social order. The social counterpart of this anticlericalism was an exaltation of the “common man” – a term which the popular Reformation and the radical reformers used to designate, not the destitute lower classes, but the modestly propertied peasants and artisans who had no share in government. Radicals held that the common man, rather than the monk or priest, was the better Christian, a model of simple but genuine piety, better able than the clergy to understand the essential message of the gospel. Secondly, *The Prague Protest* and the popular Reformation were suffused with apocalyptic expectations, a conviction that history had reached its “harvest time,” and that God was about to intervene directly in the culmination of human affairs. Anticlericalism and apocalypticism were both strong emotional forces, contributing to the urgency of the commoners' demands for change. But it is doubtful if either can explain the distinctive politics of the radical Reformation.

As a popular movement, radicals stood at the center, not at the periphery of the Reformation. But the commoners' cause was not the whole of the Reformation. The radicals came to differ with other, more moderate, “magisterial” reformers over matters of scope and strategy, as well as in their underlying attitude toward the popular

movement and the prevailing structure of politics. The magisterial reformers rejected traditional ecclesiastical authority but did not question the authority of existing secular governments. They wanted reform with the approval and backing of princes and urban magistrates. They hoped, as Luther did, for a princely authorization that would leave much control in the hands of the clergy, or they felt it legitimate, as Zwingli did in Zurich, to pressure an oligarchical city council to institute change. But in the last analysis the magisterial reformers asserted a basic Erastianism. Rejecting traditional ecclesiastical authority, they clung more firmly to existing secular authority, which they held to be ordained by God. They also deeply distrusted the common man and feared that his participation in politics would lead to anarchy. They were willing to proceed only as far as authorization would allow. The ecclesiastical counterpart to this view of secular authority was the magisterial reformers' view that the power to proclaim the meaning of the gospel – and to advise secular authorities about the interpretation of Scripture – should remain in the hands of a university-trained, properly ordained clergy. Reformation radicalism was, in the first instance, “internal dissent” within the Reformation – opposition to the paradigm for change set forth by such magisterial reformers as Luther and Zwingli.

Nowhere was this internal opposition more forcefully expressed than in Müntzer's savage criticism of Luther. Beginning with his *Sermon to the Princes*, and reaching a climax with his *Highly Provoked Defense*, Müntzer's attack on Luther was simultaneously personal, theological and political. Although his final work acknowledged Luther as having inaugurated the Reformation, Müntzer excoriated him as a vain academic who led a pampered life, as the theologian of a morally flaccid faith which relied on a literal view of Scripture, and as the toadying accomplice of secular rulers whose primary aim was the exploitation of their subjects. In Müntzer's view, and in that of the radicals generally, a Reformation guided by the magisterial reformers did not go far enough; it was incapable of bringing about the sweeping improvement of society which they sought. By remaining at the disposal of existing elites, the magisterial vision of reformation failed to perceive how deeply Christian society was flawed.

Recently it has been suggested that while there were Reformation radicals – a heterogeneous group of internal critics and dissenters –

there was no “radical Reformation” in the sense of a positive movement with any cohesiveness of thought and action. Was there no more to Reformation radicalism than a heuristically useful but negative “unity in opposition”? There does not seem to be an identifiable set of theological doctrines that radicals shared and that set them apart. What are commonly claimed as distinctive emphases in radical theology – biblical literalism, opposition to sacerdotal and sacramental thinking, moral earnestness, and reliance on personal experience and direct revelations – do not clearly distinguish the radicals from the magisterial reformers. The same is true for the notion that the magisterial reformers sought to reform an existing institutional church, while the radicals aimed to reinstitute an apostolic church. In addition, efforts to construct a theological typology of the radical Reformation commonly emphasize its fundamental internal differences and tensions – e.g. those between so-called “Spiritualists” (such as Müntzer and Andreas Karlstadt in Saxony), who held that the believer may receive divine revelations independently of Scripture, and “Anabaptists” (such as Conrad Grebel or Felix Manz in Zurich), who were committed to a biblical literalism. But such categories fail to do justice to an early Reformation theological context that was as fluid as the social context. Anabaptism, formerly regarded as the most unified strand of the radical Reformation, is now seen as emerging from diverse origins, and for some early Anabaptists (e.g. Hans Hut and Hans Denck) Müntzer’s influence was formative. In recent research Karlstadt too has emerged as an important influence on the Zurich radicals who were among the progenitors of Anabaptism. In short, distinctions between Spiritualists and Anabaptists are of doubtful value, especially during the early and mid-1520s, and the possibility of constructing a distinctive theology for the radical Reformation as a whole seems remote.

Despite the absence of theological unity, the radical Reformation had more cohesiveness than that of a common opposition to magisterial reformers. In the first place, many radicals thought of themselves as constituting a unified movement or informal party. At a time when communication and transportation were slow and uncertain, they sought contact and dialogue with one another. The *Letter to Thomas Müntzer* from the Zurich radicals around Conrad Grebel, for all the disagreements it mentioned, also expressed a striking awareness of a shared identity, a sense of solidarity with



Müntzer and other radicals in Saxony and Thuringia that overrode theological differences. Müntzer himself developed a network of contacts and communications with fellow radicals. He was in contact with Karlstadt and sought to win him for a political alliance. When Müntzer left Thuringia in the fall of 1524 he met with Hans Hut, probably with Hans Denck, and perhaps with his Nuremberg publisher Hans Hergot. After leaving Nuremberg, Müntzer traveled to southwestern Germany and Switzerland where he made contact with other radicals, including Balthasar Hubmaier. Similar networks of mutual contacts can be established for other radicals, suggesting that they had a sense of common identity.

In some cases this subjective sense of unity was no doubt misguided. Müntzer's efforts to win Karlstadt to a political alliance is a case in point. Nevertheless, on certain basic issues it is possible to find agreement among radicals that provided the basis for their sense of identity. This agreement was not monolithic, of course. It lacked the ideological uniformity that an organized political party or church can provide. As a political movement rather than an institution, the identity of the radical Reformation is to be found primarily in terms of two issues. Radicals were in rough agreement about a strategy for bringing about Reformation and an underlying conception of politics which it implied.

In contrast to the magisterial reformers' reliance on the support of the secular authorities and on postponing change until it was won, the radical reformers were the theorists and executors of immediate Reformation through direct action from below, a strategy which is defended in Karlstadt's tract, *Whether One Should Proceed Slowly*. Radicals took the view that each community had the right to restructure its life immediately according to the gospel as understood by the community. Like Karlstadt, the radicals also held that zealous Christians (the "elect" in the community, whether the pastor or pious laymen) had the obligation to initiate changes even if others disagreed – or, as the radicals saw it, did not "yet" understand the reasons for change. They embarked on a campaign of Reformation through provocation: shouting down sermons by those they held to be preaching something other than the pure word of God; engaging in iconoclastic assaults on images and shrines they regarded as embodying blasphemous practice and superstitious belief; transforming old usages and initiating new ones without asking the permission of

superior authorities. Some refused to have their children baptized or to pay tithes and other dues, demanding that laws be changed so as to conform to the gospel.

This strategy contained no principle for compromising or adjudicating differences with those who disagreed. The radicals were convinced of the righteousness of their cause and, like the popular reformation for which they spoke, assumed that collective forms of decision-making would bear them out. But despite their image as wild-eyed fanatics, some radicals took the view that everything need not be changed at once. Müntzer at Allstedt and Hubmaier at Waldshut were critical of infant baptism yet retained the practice for parents who wanted it. Nevertheless, Müntzer at Allstedt, Karlstadt at Orlamünde, and the radicals around Grebel at Zurich all identified the magisterial reformers' justification of a gradualist approach – postponing reforms in order not to offend the weak – as a pious hypocrisy contrived to conceal their subservience to secular authorities.

The strategic differences between magisterial and radical reformers were symptomatic of a more fundamental difference in their politics, especially in their attitudes toward the authority of existing secular rulers. Above all, what gave the radicals their coherence as the Reformation's "left wing" was the rejection of a hierarchical conception of politics in which legitimate authority, whether secular or ecclesiastical, devolved from the top down. Instead, the radicals' vision of politics was rooted in notions of local autonomy and community control which also implied an egalitarianism. The radicals were the most articulate theorists of a "grass-roots" paradigm of Reformation, one based on principles of communalism that grew out of the late Middle Ages. In addition to asserting traditional communal rights to administer certain local affairs, the radical Reformation stood for the right of each local community to hear the gospel preached in pure form and regulate its life according to the gospel. The radical Reformation also advocated community control over the local church, including the rights of each congregation to choose its own minister and to control the use of ecclesiastical payments. In 1522 Luther had indicated support for this kind of communal Reformation; by 1524 he opposed it.

At first the radicals did not explicitly repudiate the existing authorities. Both Müntzer's *Sermon to the Princes* and Felix Manz's *Protest and*

*Defense* were appeals set before secular rulers to do what God had ordained for them. But the radicals also made the legitimacy of government conditional. The most characteristic feature of the radical Reformation was that, unlike the magisterial reformers, radicals made the legitimacy of existing political authority contingent on its willingness to serve the gospel and the needs of the community. Müntzer's *Sermon to the Princes* was also an ultimatum: if existing rulers did not carry out the proper functions of government, the community would assume the power to do this. Müntzer's final treatises of 1524 document how this contingent acceptance of secular authorities was, for some radicals, transformed into support for popular insurrection.

## II. Politics and religion in radical thought

The radical reformers saw themselves as pious Christians seeking to live their faith. But it would be false to stress the religious character of their thinking in opposition to the political. The Christian faith and church were so integral to social life that thinking about religion was also inherently political thinking. Religious discourse in the sixteenth century had an unavoidable dimension of political reference, just as ideas about political authority and the polity were articulated in religious language. To say that the radical reformers saw themselves as "religious" rather than "political" in the modern sense is inaccurate; the distinction is anachronistic.

The sacrament of baptism, for example, became a focal issue for early Reformation radicals. Their opposition to infant baptism was based on more than rigorous biblicism. Baptism was a sacrament with socio-political implications. It was a rite of admission into the polity of Christians, an agreement to a social contract. The practice of infant baptism became, for radicals, compelling evidence of how corrupt Christendom had become. To admit infants to the polity transformed the Christian community into something infantile. To refuse to have one's child baptized, as did Hans Hut and others, was to repudiate the bonds connecting both parent and child with church and society. An opponent of infant baptism such as Felix Manz might protest to the Zurich council that he had never taught rebellion; but the authorities saw him as propagating subversive ideas that threatened the whole structure of authority and obedience.

Few radicals shared Luther's notion, designed to meet the political situation in Saxony, that there was a sharp division between "spiritual" and "worldly" kingdoms, and that secular rulers performed functions which had nothing to do with the Christian faith. More typical for the radicals was the view expressed by Hans Hergot that there should be "one shepherd and one flock": God's religious and political commandments were one; authority should be Christian, derived from and governing the community; and the existing divisions of "temporal" and "spiritual" authority should be done away with. State and society were not clearly separated in radical thought. Society was seen in religio-political terms, without a notion of "civil society" anterior to politics.

Nor were the radicals interested in political theory as an abstract set of doctrines about government. Instead, their writings contained a set of norms for living, practical values and principles about how socio-political life should be conducted among people who call themselves Christians. In this sense, their political theory was implicit, a sense of social morality embedded in everyday life. In its essentials this moral economy was simple and conservative, constructed from traditional notions. Christians should live together in harmony and peace (*Friede*) as brothers and sisters, and practice charity (*brüderliche Liebe*) toward one another; the well-being of the commonweal should take precedence over the private advantage of the individual (*Gemeinnutz geht vor Eigennutz*); and if disputes arise they should be settled by divine law (*das göttliche Recht*), a standard of justice derived from Scripture.

Such principles were hegemonic values, shared by virtually all in the society. But they had a different specific meaning for the radical reformers and the commoners than for the magisterial reformers and the governing authorities. What gave the ideas of the radicals political force was that many commoners shared their view that the moral economy of society was dislocated, and that the behavior of the clergy and secular rulers contradicted the values they professed. Many commoners shared both the radicals' ideal of an egalitarian and autonomous local community as the place where these traditional values were to be realized, and shared their strategy of reforming the local community without the authorization of superior authorities. By 1524 this popular communal Reformation was being realized in several places, with or without the consent of local authorities. As the popular Reformation also came to articulate social and economic grievances,

some authorities sought to suppress it. In this context the radical Reformation faced the political issue that generated the greatest tension, that of the legitimacy of “active resistance,” i.e. illegal or revolutionary violence. Here the fragile unity of the radical Reformation came apart. Some radicals rejected any use of coercion as a violation of Christian norms and urged the commoners to resolve differences with their lords peacefully, through negotiation. Others adopted a position they regarded as justified by the Bible, or natural law, or common sense – the right of self-defense. Christians need not always turn the other cheek; repressive violence may be met with counter-violence. Radicals holding this view provided the Peasants’ War with its ideological leadership.

The question that divided the radicals was not that of revolutionary violence in the modern sense. Those who sanctioned violence, like Müntzer or the author of *To the Assembly of the Common Peasantry*, justified it on defensive grounds rather than in terms of creating a new social order. Some commoners in 1524 and 1525 may have had little need for this legitimization of their rebellion; but one should not assume that those who participated in the Peasants’ War were a monolithic, revolutionary party completely certain of the rightfulness of their actions. And those radical reformers who supported the rebellion performed other ideological functions beyond supplying a justification for violence.

The apocalyptic dimension in the thought of Müntzer and other radicals, often taken as the central, determining feature of their political thought, may have been important mainly for its function in mobilizing the commoners. Müntzer’s convictions that history had entered the Last Days, that the corruption of Christendom had reached an ultimate peak, and that the time had arrived for the elect, the commoners, to rise up and separate themselves from the godless, their ecclesiastical and secular rulers – all this lent a powerful sense of urgency to action, but that may be all. There is scant evidence that either Müntzer or other leaders of the uprising were motivated by specifically millenarian dreams of a perfect society, the earthly realization of the kingdom of God, which would endure for a thousand years. Beyond their function as mobilizers, Reformation radicals sought to provide spiritual and moral guidance for the insurrection, sometimes acting as secretaries, chaplains, and charismatic spiritual advisers to peasant armies. They cautioned troops to be

mindful that they were fighting for the honor of God and not for selfish, material or “creaturely” motives. And, as in the case of *To the Assembly of the Common Peasantry*, they presented arguments for the necessity of solidarity. Their warnings about what the failure of the uprising would lead to – an even harsher system of arbitrary princely oppression – were an accurate prediction of German politics in the age of absolutism.

Radical reformers, both those who defended violence and those opposing it, also made a significant contribution to individual political programs which were drawn up during the Peasants’ War. In late 1524, in the spring of 1525 – and in the case of Michael Gaismair in Tyrol, in 1526 – the political vision of some radicals solidified as they began to think about alternatives to existing institutions and political principles. Some radical reformers developed political theories that promoted the principles of popular sovereignty, republicanism, and civil equality.

Müntzer’s final treatises presented no proposals about government beyond an implicit theory of popular sovereignty in temporal and ecclesiastical affairs: God gave both the power of the sword and the power to remit sin to the community of Christians. As the Peasants’ War unfolded, the principle of popular sovereignty led to a variety of republican constitutional theories. For the author of *To the Assembly of the Common Peasantry* the clear alternative to existing principalities ruled by hereditary monarchs – associated, in the work, with both tyranny and blasphemy – was a Swiss-style republicanism, a decentralized polity with elected leaders. Gaismair also proposed a republican constitution for Tyrol, one with a hierarchy of elective government that extended from the local community to the central government of the territory. Unlike the Tyrol, some regions in Upper Germany lacked an existing territorial assembly that could serve as an institutional model to be recast on popular lines. In these territories republicanism took the form of a *Bund* – a covenant, federation or league that would link the local communities of a territory. *The Memmingen Federal Constitution* and *The Document of Articles of the Black Forest Peasants* set forth the fundamentals of such a *Bund* and the penalties for refusing to adhere to it.

The principle of civil equality also emerged during the Peasants’ War. Radicals moved from rejecting clerical privilege to the rejection of noble privilege as well; their republicanism led them to break with a

concept of authority based on social estate. A basic feature of Gaismair's Tyrolean constitution, in particular, was the elimination of all "freedoms" – i.e. privileges and immunities – which some individuals enjoyed at the expense of others. Hans Hergot as well as Gaismair described publicly financed social welfare systems that local government should provide to care for the needy. But the civil equality envisaged by radicals did not mean the elimination of economic inequalities. Gaismair's program, for example, did not call for the expropriation of noble property. Although he set forth statesmanlike plans for the economic development of the whole territory, Gaismair nowhere mentioned land reform or redistribution. Sebastian Lotzer and Christoph Schappeler, who gave *The Twelve Articles* its final form, proposed moderate and conciliatory means for resolving property differences between the local community and the claimants to economic resources that the community had alienated.

Although some radical reformers advanced principles of popular sovereignty, republicanism, and civil equality, they were not advocates of democracy in the modern sense. The central social assumption in such programs as Gaismair's or Hergot's was of a male-dominated polity composed of modestly propertied householders – the "common man" as the term was then used. Women and the considerable number of those without property were excluded. Nevertheless, the programs of the Peasants' War implied a transformation of the existing political and social orders so sweeping that they were revolutionary. This is true even of conciliatory programs such as *The Twelve Articles* – or, in an urban context, the influential *Forty-six Frankfurt Articles* – to say nothing of the more radical programs, such as Gaismair's. But the revolutionary goal of sixteenth-century radicals was neither modern democracy nor socialism; their aim was an egalitarian Christian communalism.

### III. The radical Reformation after the Peasants' War

In most parts of the empire, the Peasants' War was crushed in a series of battles in May 1525; the Tyrol, where the insurrection continued until 1526, was an exception. Elsewhere the great slaughter of peasant armies at Böblingen (12 May), Frankenhausen (15 May) and Zabern (17 May) was the decisive military turning-point. Except for the few who refused to concede defeat – such as Hans Hut, who continued to

preach resistance into the summer of 1525, or Hans Römer, who plotted to seize Erfurt at the end of 1527 – the issue of violence went underground, at least for a time. It resurfaced again briefly among revolutionary Anabaptists at Münster in 1534–35. How did the crushing defeat affect the radical Reformation? In general, the defeat resulted in new divisions. The tenuous unity of a widespread popular movement, based on the hope that Christian society as a whole might be sweepingly transformed in favor of the common man and the local community, collapsed. The radical Reformation, marked from the beginning by internal tensions, broke apart.

Among the issues that radicals now had to confront was one of interpreting the defeat and salvaging what they could. For many, defeat did not alter their fundamental vision. Rather it could be explained in terms of the vision and had lessons to teach. Some, like Hubmaier, accepted Luther's judgment that the military defeat was a confirmation that the commoners' cause was inspired by the devil. But for many radicals the rulers' brutal repression of the commoners was a confirmation that existing authorities were as unchristian as the radicals had maintained. Perhaps typical was the view of Michael Sattler, who referred to the prevailing structure of ecclesiastical and secular power simply as "the abomination." Mystical principles, derived in part from Müntzer, provided Denck and Hut with a vocabulary to explain the defeat. It was due to attachment of the "creaturely" – to greedy, selfish interests – and a failure to cleave to spiritual values. Hut and Hergot evidently took the defeat as confirmation that they were indeed living at the time of the Apocalypse.

Those writing in the immediate aftermath, especially Denck and Hut, returned to the fundamental dissatisfactions with the magisterial reformers, particularly Luther, that had generated the radical Reformation. In different ways both took up the criticism of the magisterial Reformation's moral unproductiveness, its failure to transform individual and social behavior. Denck used the issue of "divine law" – a subject charged with political significance since it had been a basic motto and demand of the Peasants' War – to polemicize against Luther's understanding of justification. For Denck the test of faith was behavior, and without moral improvement there could be no Reformation worthy of the name. He also came to the mystical and antinomian conclusion that once the real, spiritual meaning of divine law as a law of love had been taken to heart, the



believer would be freed from all external, written laws and regulations. Love issues, and can revoke, all laws. Such views were subversive – intended to call into question the basis of existing law and to liberate the faith of the commoner from the constraints of an official church.

In Hans Hut's work on baptism the appeal to the religious potential of the common man and the attack on the moral failures of the learned clergy were more explicit. Hut argued for an understanding of the gospel that was independent of Scripture and learning, derivable from nature and from the labor of commoners. For Hut the essential message of his "gospel of all creatures" was a law of suffering: just as nature suffers, as it is transformed through work to suit human aims, mankind must suffer as it is transformed by the action of God to suit divine purpose. Both Denck and Hut were influenced by Müntzer's mysticism, with Hut's gospel of suffering representing the passive converse of the activism of Denck's law of love. In both writers there was more than a moralizing "privatization" of the radical Reformation as dissent was driven inward. Hut's view, that the authentic message of the gospel is one of suffering, offered consolation in the aftermath of the Peasants' War. And his conception of baptism was an admonition to surviving groups of radicals to prepare themselves for the consequences of their refusal to conform. What neither Denck nor Hut provided was a strategy for the survival of the radical Reformation under conditions of persecution. This was the contribution of radicals from southwestern Germany and Switzerland.

By 1527 the authorities' military mop-up and the immediate judicial retribution for the rising were giving way to more systematic efforts to track down leaders and root out surviving pockets of continuing disobedience and radical religiosity. The authorities commonly stigmatized those they were pursuing as "Anabaptists" – practitioners of "rebaptism," a crime punishable by death. Anabaptism, the most cohesive strand of radicalism emerging from the Peasants' War, sprang from diverse sources. As anything like an organized movement, it began during the uprising itself. Even that part of the movement which developed in upper Germany and Switzerland – especially in the city and the canton of Zurich – in the months after January 1525, was marked by internal tensions. Some, especially those from cantonal villages, advocated a communal Reformation and the right of self-

defense. Others, especially those from Zurich who were disappointed by Zwingli's version of a communal Reformation, called for nonresistance and for separation from the existing polity. Some early Anabaptists shifted from one position to another. After the Peasants' War, these two views solidified into opposing camps. In addition to differing over the legitimacy of force, each represented an alternative strategy for the survival of the radical Reformation.

The sectarian implications of nonresisting separatism were first clearly formulated by Michael Sattler in *The Schleithem Articles*. By passing over such divisive issues among Anabaptists as whether Christians were to pay taxes to ungodly authorities, Sattler profiled more sharply the sectarian mentality. True Christians were to separate themselves, insofar as possible, from "the world," the existing polity. They were not to swear oaths, become magistrates, bear arms, or participate in assemblies or religious services that were popish or "neo-popish" (i.e. those of the magisterial reformers). Instead, Christians were to gather themselves into purified communities of true believers committed to the discipleship of Christ. These communities were defined sacramentally through the baptism of mature believers and the administration of the Lord's Supper, "the breaking of the bread," as a ritual celebration of the community of true Christians. The "ban," a combination of exile and excommunication, was used to punish backsliders. The community's pastor was to be chosen and supported by the community. The renunciation of force, taken from Christ's command not to resist evil (Mt. 5:39), was a moral principle that functioned both to sever the bonds with society at large and to define the group internally.

Balthasar Hubmaier's *On the Sword* offered a refutation of the scriptural basis of non-violent separatism and argued for the legitimacy of Christians using instruments of coercion, "the sword." Hubmaier did not grant the powers of coercion to Christian governments reluctantly, aware that moral values are inevitably corrupted by coercion but accepting the necessity of its use. His defense of force was positive. Once one accepted the notion that it is better for a Christian than a non-Christian to judge disputes among Christians (however sinful such contentions may themselves be), it followed for Hubmaier that judges must have the means to enforce their judgment in order to protect the innocent.

However, Hubmaier assigned the right to employ coercion not to

the Christian community as a whole but to magistrates whom God has called to perform this function. Hubmaier legitimized the coercive power exercised by such magistrates while simultaneously insisting that the Christian community had no right to take extralegal action against the authorities if they proved to be ungodly or tyrannical. There is nothing of the earlier radicals' conditional allegiance to existing authorities. In the end Hubmaier reaffirmed a conception of politics that was conventional for theologians – the existing political authorities are ordained by God; no active resistance against them is justified.

As strategies, the views of Sattler and Hubmaier were both partly successful. Hubmaier's aim was to try to preserve an Anabaptism that was not divorced from the larger polity, by finding a pious protector, a prince who would tolerate reformed communities in his territory, and who would have the power of the sword to protect them. Hubmaier's program for survival was one capable of succeeding in special circumstances, but the key to its success lay not with the radicals but with the magistrates. Princely tolerance could prove reversible, as Hubmaier himself discovered in Moravia. When it did, the most that radicals could count on was permission to go elsewhere in search of another temporary haven. Sattler, the renegade Benedictine influenced by monastic ideals of withdrawal from the world, formulated a survival strategy which was more self-reliant. Nonresisting separatism enabled some concealed groups of radicals to survive persecution and permitted some radical ideals to be retained. But the effort to transform society as a whole was largely sacrificed. Since the use of force even for self-defense was renounced, the ability to survive persecution depended on the extent to which authorities either remained ignorant of a group's existence, or were lax about enforcing laws against dissenters.

In contrast to Sattler or Hubmaier, Hergot's *On the New Transformation of the Christian Life* offered no clear program for survival; there is only the hope of an imminent and divinely produced upheaval that would result in a transformed society. The apocalypticism also contained a revolutionary impulse in Hergot's lack of a clear distinction between the hand of God and the hand of the common man as the agent of this change. Without strategic concerns, Hergot's work nevertheless functioned in another way that was important for the continuation of the radical Reformation – as a reminder of the political and

## *Introduction*

---

social values for which the Peasants' War had been fought. This reminder took the form of prophecy. Hergot's account of his prophetic vision – of a Christian society oriented exclusively toward the honor of God and the well-being of the commonweal – may in fact have been written during the rebellion. Although Hergot's utopian vision included a hierarchical order of elective world government, the upper levels of his republican political system were abstract, a speculative superstructure without a clear function other than that of delineating a world of peace and unity. Hergot's real interest and the values to which he gave most convincing testimony lay at the local level, that of the *Flur* or agrarian village. He characterized the local community in terms of economic self-sufficiency and liberation from urban exploitation; the absence of privilege and the presence of a publicly financed system of charitable assistance; political autonomy built on the community's choice of its own leader; and the rejection of a system of divided temporal and spiritual overlordship. The work expressed concretely the common man's understanding of the social and political implications of the religious principles which animated the radical Reformation and the Peasants' War.

In the aftermath of the Peasants' War it was inevitable that there would be confusion and division as radicals tried to fathom the meaning of the defeat for their cause, and to devise new ways of continuing their struggle. Hergot's work provided a compass, oriented toward the socio-political values for which the conflict had been fought, and it provided a measure against which to test new strategies. His unusual, prophetic vision of a transformed Christian society was perhaps the most richly detailed statement of the political ideas and values of the radical Reformation.

## Chronology 1521–1528

1521

- |             |   |
|-------------|---|
| 3 January   | Luther excommunicated by Pope Leo X.  |
| 16 April    | Müntzer leaves Zwickau following civil unrest.  |
| 16–18 April | Luther appears before the Diet of Worms.  |
| 4 May       | Luther goes into hiding at Wartburg castle.   |
| 8 May       | Emperor Charles V signs the Worms Edict declaring Luther and his followers imperial outlaws.                                      |
| June        | Müntzer travels to Bohemia.   |
| November    | Müntzer's <i>Prague Protest</i> .   |
| December    | Death of Pope Leo X, followed by election of Adrian VI.   |
| 25 December | Karlstadt at Wittenberg does away with vestments and the notion of the Mass as a sacrifice, distributing communion in both forms. |
| 27 December | The so-called “Zwickau prophets” arrive at Wittenberg and urge more radical change.   |

1522

- |                  |  |
|------------------|--|
| January–February | Civil unrest in Wittenberg.  |
| 21 January       | Imperial governing council issues the Nuremberg Edict prohibiting ecclesiastical innovation. |
| 24 January       | A community chest is introduced at Wittenberg.   |
| 9–16 March       | Luther returns from the Wartburg castle to Wittenberg and preaches “Invocavit Sermons”       |

## *Chronology*

---

	against Karlstadt's reforms.
Lent	Followers of Zwingli at Zurich publicly violate the laws on fasting.
27 August	Imperial knights, led by Franz von Sickingen and Ulrich von Hutten, attack the archbishop of Trier.
Autumn	Preacher Simon Stumpf at Höngg near Zurich calls for a refusal to pay the tithe.
1523	
29 January	First Zurich Disputation between Zwingli and a representative of the bishop of Constance begins the official Reformation at Zurich.
February	Karlstadt leaves Wittenberg for Orlamünde.
March	Luther's <i>On Secular Authority, The Extent to Which it Should be Obeyed</i> .
March	Müntzer arrives at Allstedt in electoral Saxony, and introduces a German liturgy.
July	Unrest at Mühlhausen leads to adoption of the Mühlhausen Recess.
14 September	Death of Pope Adrian VI, followed by election of Clement VII.
26–28 October	Second Zurich Disputation completes the division between Zwingli and his radical followers led by Grebel and Manz.
1524	
24 March	Destruction of the Mallerbach chapel near Allstedt by Müntzer and his followers.
26 May	First peasant uprising in the Black Forest and at Forchheim, Franconia, mark the beginning of the Peasants' War.
June	Luther's <i>Open Letter to the Princes of Saxony Concerning the Rebellious Spirit</i> (i.e. Müntzer).
13 July	Müntzer's <i>Sermon to the Princes</i> preached at Allstedt castle.
July	Karlstadt's <i>Letter from the Community of Orlamünde to the People of Allstedt</i> rejects Müntzer's offer of political alliance.

## *Chronology*

---

31 July–1 August	Interrogation of Müntzer and Allstedt councilors at Weimar; Müntzer ordered to close Allstedt press, dissolve his Christian League, and not forestall the prosecution of the Mallerbach culprits.
7 August	Müntzer flees Allstedt, arrives a week later at Mühlhausen in Thuringia.
19 August	Rebellion in Mühlhausen.
September	Karlstadt and Westenburg expelled from electoral Saxony.
5 September	The Zurich radicals around Grebel write their <i>Letter to Thomas Müntzer</i> .
22–23 September	<i>The Eleven Mühlhausen Articles</i> , influenced by Müntzer and Pfeiffer.
27 September	Müntzer and Pfeiffer expelled from Mühlhausen.
November	Karlstadt's <i>Whether One Should Proceed Slowly</i> printed at Basel with the help of Westenburg and Manz, then distributed in Zurich by Manz.
November/December	Müntzer's <i>Highly Provoked Defense</i> printed at Nuremberg by Hieronymous Hölzel.
December/January	Manz writes his <i>Protest and Defense</i> to the city council of Zurich.
1525	
15 January	Disputation at Zurich on infant baptism results in the condemnation of those opposing it.
17–22 January	First adult baptism at Zurich.
21 January	Denck expelled from Nuremberg following his involvement in the heresy trial of three “godless” painters.
6 March	Upper German peasant armies assemble at Memmingen, and form a Christian Union of the Allgäu, Baltringen and Lake Constance armies on the basis of <i>The Memmingen Federal Constitution</i> .
19 March	Lotzer's and Schappeler's <i>The Twelve Articles</i> published at Memmingen.

## Chronology

---

13–20 April	<i>The Forty-six Frankfurt Articles</i> , influenced by Gerhard Westerburg.
17 April	The peasants of Württemberg and Franconia conclude the Treaty of Weingarten with the Swabian League.
May	<i>To the Assembly of the Common Peasantry</i> printed at Nuremberg.
5 May	Death of Saxon elector Frederick the Wise; Luther's <i>Against the Heavenly Prophets</i> and <i>Against the Robbing and Murdering Hordes of the Peasants</i> printed.
8 May	The peasant army of the Black Forest sends <i>The Document of Articles</i> , attached to <i>The Memmingen Federal Constitution</i> , to the city of Villingen near Freiburg im Breisgau.
9 May	Peasant uprising in Tyrol.
12 May	Defeat of Württemberg peasant army at the battle of Böblingen.
13 May	Rebellious peasants in Tyrol choose Gaismair as leader.
15 May	Defeat of Thuringian peasant army at Battle of Frankenhhausen; Müntzer captured, Hut escapes.
17 May	Defeat of Alsatian peasant army at Battle of Zabern.
27 May	Beheading of Müntzer and Pfeiffer outside the walls of Mühlhausen.
4 June	Defeat of Franconian peasant army at Battle of Ingolstadt.
9 June	Army of the Swabian League occupies Memmingen; Schappeler flees.
Summer	Hut continues to advocate rebellion.
3 September	Peasant uprising in East Prussia.
5 December	Hubmaier flees as Waldshut is conquered by Austrian troops.
1526	
February	Gaismair's <i>Territorial Constitution for Tyrol</i> .
7 March	The Zurich council introduces the death



## *Chronology*

---

	penalty for the crime of “rebaptism”; Manz, Grebel, Blaurock, and others sentenced to life imprisonment.
March	Renewed peasant uprising in the bishopric of Salzburg.
26 May	Hut baptized by Denck at Augsburg.
May/June	Grebel dies of the plague in the Gray Leagues, Switzerland.
July	Hubmaier arrives at Nikolsburg, Moravia and begins to develop an Anabaptist communal reformation under princely protection.
27 August	The First Diet of Speyer issues a recess interpreted by the evangelical estates as allowing the introduction of the Reformation.
29 August	Battle of Mohács, King Louis II of Hungary and Bohemia killed. Ferdinand of Austria becomes king.
1527	
5 January	Manz executed by drowning at Zurich.
February	Sattler’s <i>The Schleithem Articles</i> .
6 May	Sack of Rome by a German imperial army.
May	Debate at Nikolsburg between Hut and Hubmaier leads to Hut’s imprisonment, then flight.
20 May	Sattler executed by burning at Rottenburg am Neckar, Hergot by beheading at Leipzig.
June	Hubmaier’s <i>On the Sword</i> written at Nikolsburg to refute the nonresisting and separatist <i>Stäbler</i> group.
16 June	Visitation instructions issued in electoral Saxony to construct an evangelical church on a territorial basis.
August	The so-called “Martyrs’ Synod” of Anabaptist leaders at Augsburg.
Autumn	Denck dies of the plague at Basel.
September	Hut arrested in Augsburg.
December	Hut dies in an Augsburg prison.

## *Chronology*

---

1528

4 January

Imperial governing council at Speyer issues a mandate threatening Anabaptists with the death penalty.

10 March

Hubmaier executed by burning at Vienna.