5-1-2017

Ad Gloriam Dei Humanism and Theology in David Chytraeus’ Regulae Studiorum

Timios Cook
Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, cookti@csl.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholar.csl.edu/phd

Part of the History of Christianity Commons

Recommended Citation
http://scholar.csl.edu/phd/38

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Doctor of Philosophy Dissertation by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.
AD GLORIAM DEI
HUMANISM AND THEOLOGY IN DAVID CHYTRAEUΣ’ REGULAE STUDIORUM

A Dissertation
Presented to the Faculty of
Concordia Seminary, St. Louis,
Department of Historical Theology
in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

By
Timios E. Cook
May 2017

Approved by
Robert Rosin                     Advisor

Robert Kolb                     Reader

Timothy Dost                    Reader
For Elizabeth
CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ........................................................................................................ x

ABSTRACT .......................................................................................................................... xi

CHAPTER ONE ..................................................................................................................... 1

THE PROBLEM OF THE DISSERTATION AND METHODOLOGY EMPLOYED ..... 1

INTRODUCTION .................................................................................................................. 1

Rationale, Significance, or Need for the Study ................................................................. 2

Purpose of the Dissertation ............................................................................................... 5

Hypothesis of the Dissertation ........................................................................................ 6

Elements of the Problem and Research Questions to be investigated ......................... 6

Limitations of the Study .................................................................................................. 8

Research Procedures ...................................................................................................... 9

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE ....................................................................................... 11

Biographical Studies ......................................................................................................... 11

Regulae Studiorum in the Secondary Literature ............................................................. 18

The Regulae Studiorum in Chytraeus’ Collected Correspondence ............................... 25

CONCLUSION ..................................................................................................................... 26

CHAPTER TWO .................................................................................................................... 28

THE CONFLUENCE OF HUMANISM AND THEOLOGY ............................................... 28

INTRODUCTION .................................................................................................................. 28

The Rise of the Liberal Arts in the Universities .............................................................. 29

Institutionalizing a New Method ..................................................................................... 33

Humanism and Confessionalization .............................................................................. 37
PART II: LUTHER AND MELANCTHON AT WITTENBERG .......................... 39
Martin Luther .................................................................................. 40
Philip Melanchthon ......................................................................... 44
CONCLUSION .................................................................................. 51
CHAPTER THREE ........................................................................ 52
DAVID CHYTRAUS ....................................................................... 52
INTRODUCTION ........................................................................... 52
Education ........................................................................................ 52
Luther and Melanchthon ................................................................. 55
EARLY YEARS AT ROSTOCK .......................................................... 57
The Regulae Studiorum ................................................................. 60
Chytraeus’ Character ..................................................................... 63
CONCLUSION .................................................................................. 66
CHAPTER FOUR ........................................................................... 68
DE RATIONE DISCENDI, ET ORDINE STUDIORUM RECTE INTITUENDO .... 68
INTRODUCTION ........................................................................... 68
Summary ........................................................................................ 68
Analysis .......................................................................................... 70
Regulae Utiles ................................................................................ 71
De Fine Studiorum ......................................................................... 73
Alter Studiorvm Finis .................................................................... 80
CONCLUSION .................................................................................. 82
CHAPTER FIVE ............................................................................... 84
DE STUDIO DIALECTICAE RECTE SUSCRIPTA ........................................ 128

Analysis ................................................................................................. 130

DE PRAECEPTIS RHETORICAE ................................................................. 136

Analysis ................................................................................................. 136

DE LINGUA GRAECA ............................................................................ 141

Analysis ................................................................................................. 141

DE HISTORIARUM LECTIONE RECTE INSTITVENDA ......................... 145

Analysis ................................................................................................. 146

DE POETIS .............................................................................................. 153

Analysis ................................................................................................. 153

CONCLUSION ......................................................................................... 163

CHAPTER SEVEN .................................................................................. 166

NATURAL AND MORAL PHILOSOPHY .................................................. 166

INTRODUCTION ...................................................................................... 166

DE INITIIS MATHEMATUM GEOMETRIA, ARITHMETICA, &C. ............ 167

Analysis ................................................................................................. 167

DE ARITHMETICA ................................................................................... 171

Analysis ................................................................................................. 171

DE GEOGRAPHIA ................................................................................... 174

Analysis ................................................................................................. 174

DE ASTRONOMIA .................................................................................. 177

Analysis ................................................................................................. 179

DE STUDIO DOCTRINAE PHYSICAE RECTE INCHOANDO ..................... 181
DE STUDIO THEOLOGIAE ET PIETATIS VERAE EXERCITIIS, POTIUS QUAM RIXIS DISPUTATIONUM COLEndo ................................................................. 233

Analysis ............................................................................................................. 238

Chytraeus’ Confession of Doctrine ................................................................. 242

The Trinity ....................................................................................................... 243

Original Sin .................................................................................................... 244

Christ ............................................................................................................... 246

Justification ................................................................................................... 249

The Gospel ..................................................................................................... 251

Lord’s Supper ................................................................................................. 252

Freedom of the Will ...................................................................................... 254

Predestination ............................................................................................... 255

CONCLUSION ................................................................................................. 258

Conclusion ..................................................................................................... 260

I. ...................................................................................................................... 260

II. .................................................................................................................... 264

III. .................................................................................................................. 266

BIBLIOGRAPHY ............................................................................................. 269

VITA ................................................................................................................ 285
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Reading and writing about David Chytraeus’ approach to education has given me ample opportunity to reflect on my own course of learning and all those involved. This dissertation would not have been possible without the support, encouragement, and advice of many who in God’s grace have helped me to grow as a scholar during the last several years. In the first place, I would like to thank my advisor Dr. Robert Rosin for his encouragement in pursuing this topic and his wisdom and guidance during my writing and research. I would also like to thank Dr. Robert Kolb and Dr. Timothy Dost for the knowledge and counsel they offered. I am grateful as well to the conversation partners that I have had over the years of studying and writing, especially Casey Carmichael, Richard Serina, and Currie Bishop. Their questions and encouragement have helped me to stay the course during research and writing and deepen my understanding of Chytraeus. Finally, immense gratitude is due my wife, Liz, and my children, Thurman, Sophia, and Isabelle. Without their love, patience, understanding, and encouragement, this work could not have been accomplished.

Luther theologian David Chytraeus (1530–1600) devoted much of his career to education, serving especially at the University of Rostock. While today he is often remembered for his contributions to the Formula of Concord, in his own time he was highly regarded as an educator and was sought out beyond Rostock to design and implement curriculum reforms. Chytraeus was a student of Melanchthon and built both upon and beyond his mentor’s insights throughout his pedagogical works. This dissertation explores the nature and content of Chytraeus’ Regulae Studiorum, looking in particular at the confluence of humanism and Lutheran theology in his approach. The Regulae Studiorum is an encyclopedic treatment of the liberal arts curriculum, organizing the trivium, quadrivium, as well as law, medicine and theology into categories based on their purpose, while providing an overall method for navigating the course of studies. The purpose of the dissertation is primarily to present the Regulae Studiorum through an investigation of its theological and pedagogical elements. Such a study helps to show how Lutheran theology influenced the nature, approaches, and goals of liberal arts education in Lutheran parts of the German lands during the latter half of the sixteenth-century.
CHAPTER ONE
THE PROBLEM OF THE DISSERTATION AND METHODOLOGY EMPLOYED

Introduction

The sixteenth-century, the era of the Renaissance and Reformation, holds particular significance with regard to the question of the relationship between religion and education. It was, after all, during this time period that universities across northern Europe experienced curricular overhauls reflective of the developing relationship between the economic, political, and theological issues that rose to the forefront during the time and the pedagogical tools offered by humanism. In one sense, the Reformation itself began at the University of Wittenberg as an attempt to reform the curriculum. Luther had argued that scholastic methodology was in fact not only unsuitable, but actually damaging to the study of theology. Some might argue that late medieval universities were not as bad as Renaissance educators or Reformation theologians seemed to make them out to be. But since perception matters, the impressions given in the rhetoric would carry the day. And there is no doubt that Reformation curriculums changed education considerably. In the midst of the changes that took place on the basis of new theology the entire university curriculum was restructured. Wittenberg quickly became the model for reform across Germany and its chief architect, Philip Melanchthon became a highly sought-after consultant. His texts and rhetoric, dialectic, theology, and even natural philosophy helped to establish and disseminate the Wittenberg model. But in the end the task of transferring a Wittenberg approach beyond Wittenberg did not fall on Melanchthon’s texts alone, but rather on his students and their continuing work. This second generation of reformers carried on the work
of the first, navigating the difficulties of confessionalism as well as inter-Lutheran conflict in the chaos that mounted after Luther’s death. Struggle over doctrine and interpretation continued especially after 1550, as the need for unified confessions grew within the territories. David Chytraeus, a student and close friend of Melanchthon, offers an example of the dynamic between the Wittenberg approach and the resulting needs and interpretations of the new generation. A professor and six-time rector of the University of Rostock, initially called on Melanchthon’s recommendation, he was to establish a humanistic curriculum with Lutheran theology. The hallmarks of his wide-reaching approach are best represented by his famous *Regulae Studiorum*, a text that began as lectures on the basic method and rationale for learning and grew into an encyclopedia offering definitions and approaches to every subject in the curriculum. The question of the relationship between theology and methodology as it exists in this work is the subject of this dissertation.

Rationale, Significance, or Need for the Study

This study seeks to present the *Regulae Studiorum* by looking especially at the relationship between theology and methodology in Chytraeus’ work. After a brief sampling of the questions pertaining to the rise of humanism in the universities it will turn to questions concerning the influence of mentors, Melanchthon in particular, as well as his historical circumstances such as his education and goals for the University of Rostock where he taught, that may have impacted his overall approach. The majority of the dissertation will be devoted to an examination of David Chytraeus’ *Regulae Studiorum*.

While no in-depth study of the *Regulae Studiorum* has been previously undertaken, there are a number of reasons why such a study would be helpful for filling out perspectives on theology and education during the sixteenth-century. These issues range from the significance of
the text and author to the broader issue of the development of the liberal arts curriculum in the university. Chytraeus himself stands as an important Lutheran educator, both at the University of Rostock where he taught, and abroad, where his approach was adopted by other institutions. He was also an important theologian when it came to offering a moderating position in the midst of the intra-Lutheran disputes of the second half of the sixteenth-century. The *Regulae Studiorum* defines and provides approaches to the subjects making up the trivium, quadrivium, and arts of the higher faculties, including theology.

A study such as this helps shed light on the question of Philip Melanchthon’s continuing influence as an educator and theologian through his students. While Chytraeus shared a lifelong friendship with Melanchthon, and his own work borrows from, and closely resembles that of the former in many respects, he was, as Rudolf Keller has noted, not necessarily an epigone.\(^1\) Rather, he organized and compiled Melanchthon’s insights into a system suitable to be put into use at Rostock. Indeed there are points, particularly with regard to his approach to theology, where his approach is distinct. As such, the work fills a need for studies on sixteenth-century educators that show how their various approaches dealt with the task of education in terms of navigating confession and curriculum. Related to this are a number of the questions that arise in the literature on education in the sixteenth-century and the rise of the liberal arts in general such as: how the humanities were appropriated among territories of particular confession, what the goals of the curriculums were, and what purposes the universities served. The contents of the *Regulae* may not only illuminate Chytraeus’ influence at Rostock, but given the wide distribution of the text in northern Germany, such an examination might shed light on prescribed attitudes

concerning education and the arts wherever it was used.²

*Regulae Studiorum* is similar to a number of Renaissance era encyclopedias, perhaps the most well-known being the *Margarita Philosophica* of Gregor Reisch (1503).³ It also bears resemblance to other well-known works such the *Lucubrationes vel potius absolutissima kyklopaideia* of Joachim Ringelberg (1541), the first of such works to include “encyclopedia” in the title, as well as the *Encyclopaediae seu Orbis disciplinarum tam sacrarum quam profanarum of Pauli Scalichius* (1559). These works share as their subject matter discussions of arts commonly encountered in the university curriculum that made up the trivium, quadrivium, and moral philosophy. Additionally they contained extended treatments on the various divisions of natural philosophy. But *Regulae Studiorum* is also distinct from these works in a number of ways. An important difference is that it was written from a distinctly Lutheran perspective, rather than that of a Catholic theologian or humanist. As such, Chytraeus’ various entries on the subjects ought to reflect the perspective of his Lutheran faith. Another key difference is the inclusion of a section on theological study, setting it apart from previous works that chiefly considered the subjects under the rubric of natural philosophy. A final major difference is that the *Regulae* is a pedagogical text meant as a reference for guiding the reader through the process of learning the arts. Chytraeus’ definitions for all of the entries, theology included, are unified by his perspective as an educator on the task and goal of all learning. Students learn in order to properly apply their knowledge through speaking and writing [*cognitio rerum et facultas bene dicendi*], and most of all, to give glory to God. The book was meant to fill a need at Rostock. As

² Unfortunately, one of the many limitations of this study is that while this particular question can certainly be raised, it is not within the means of the researcher to offer any definitive answers regarding the specific use of the *Regulae* in curriculums and *schulordnungen* outside of Rostock.

³ See Andrew Cunningham and Sachiko Kusukawa, *Natural Philosophy Epitomised: Books 8–11 of Gregor Reisch’s Philosophical Pearl* (1503) (Surry: Ashgate, 2010).
a result, the entries in the *Regulae Studiorum* are not bare definitions of the arts, but are written in such a way that expounds upon their usefulness for both the church and state, and encourages a comprehensive and well-structured approach to learning.

**Purpose of the Dissertation**

This dissertation will fill an obvious space on the current scholarship shelf, so to speak. First, as noted, no in-depth study of Chytraeus’ educational writings has been undertaken despite, as will be demonstrated in the review of the secondary literature, his well-acknowledged significance as a theologian and educator. As a Lutheran reformer, he played an important role in mediating inter-Lutheran party disputes as well as influencing the directions that Lutheranism took in northern Germany, Austria, and Sweden. This dissertation means to present the theological and pedagogical elements of his famous *Regulae Studiorum*. On the one hand, this text represents an example of a Lutheran approach to encyclopedic texts on learning that hitherto had been represented mainly by Catholics. On the other, it is an example of how Chytraeus articulated the religious and pedagogical concerns he faced in his work as a professor and administrator at the University of Rostock. Such a study will help to underscore the point: no humanism, no Reformation, and no Reformation, no humanism. The Reformation brought with it developments in approaches to method and pedagogy. These were nuanced by Lutheran, Reformed, and Roman Catholic doctrine, mainly in respective territories (although there was always the possibility of a cross-pollination of ideas and methods) all the more so by the end of the sixteenth-century. As a humanist curriculum became common in the universities of

---

Protestants and Catholics alike, it became confessionalized, and methodology and dialogue within the curriculum reflects this. A study such as this helps provide groundwork for investigating the question of how theology and confession influenced one's understanding of the shape and purpose of the arts, both in the schools, and, as Chytraeus addresses in the *Regulae*, in the church and common life as well.

**Hypothesis of the Dissertation**

The dissertation hypothesizes that both Chytraeus’ humanistic leanings and Lutheran theology fueled and affected each other and offers a presentation of his *Regulae Studiorum* through an examination of this relationship. His Lutheran theology provides a unique orientation for his appropriation of the humanist classical learning and methodology encountered in the *Regulae*, providing coherence to his approach as a whole, and uniting the various parts of the curriculum toward a common goal. But more than simply uniting the various elements of the curriculum, Chytraeus’ *Regulae* appeared during the restructuring of the University of Rostock in the early 1560s, and would have also helped to express and cement the direction that he meant the school to take.

**Elements of the Problem and Research Questions to be investigated**

Although they are all interrelated, there are primarily three sets of areas that this dissertation will investigate. These are: The wider context of sixteenth-century Lutheran theology and education, Chytraeus in his historic circumstances, and finally Chytraeus’ work itself. Together these allow for a more thorough approach to putting together the connections between theology and pedagogy in Chytraeus.

The first group of questions are essentially those that deal with the rise of the liberal arts curriculum in the universities and the corresponding changes that accompanied this shift on
account the religious upheavals of the day. What were some of the important differences between the scholastics and the humanists? Why did the liberal arts, the trivium and quadrivium, begin to receive greater attention and what does this have to with the Reformation? How did these changes affect the way instructors thought about teaching and inquiry?

The second group of questions place Chytraeus within that context by looking at his relationships with his own instructors, his education, and his vocation at Rostock. Who were formative influences during his career as a student? What does he remember as important with regard to his own ideas? What circumstance in life may have influenced him to the positions he has adopted, both with regard to theology, and pedagogy?

The third group of questions consider Chytraeus’ actual approach in the *Regulae Studiorum*. What are the features of the *Regulae*? How does he understand its purpose and goal? What are the features of his approach? How does he understand the purpose and goal of theology? What is the relationship between the study of theology and the other arts and what does he mean by relationship? What is the relationship between ethics and learning and what is the significance for Chytraeus?

The dissertation will consider these questions in two sections. The purpose of the first section is establish context for developing questions about how to understand Chytraeus’ theology and methodology in the *Regulae Studiorum*. Following a review of Chytraeus and the *Regulae Studiorum* in the secondary literature, at the end of Chapter 1, Chapter 2 will begin with a survey of the literature that sets the stage for understanding Chytraeus’ contribution within the broader picture of the phenomenon of the humanist reforms of the scholastic curriculum, itself essentially the rise of the liberal arts curriculum. The central issues here are the conflicts between the scholastics and the humanists, not only in terms of method, but also in terms of competing
epistemologies and how, generally speaking, these were utilized by the Lutheran Reformers.

Chapter 3 will examine the Lutheran Reformers in greater detail with particular emphasis on their possible contributions to Chytraeus pedagogical and theological development. This chapter will offer more considerations on how Melanchthon may have influenced Chytraeus’ approach.

The chapters of section two will analyze the *Regulae Studiorum* of 1595. These chapters will be organized according to divisions that occur in the *Regulae* which was a three-part work.

Chapter 4 will address the *Ratio Discendi*, or Part I of the *Regulae*. Chapter 5 will cover Part II, *De Mediiis*. The longest section of the *Regulae*, Part III, *De Ratione Instituendi* addresses Chytraeus definitions and approaches to each of the arts individually. Chapters 6, 7, and 8 will address the four categories of arts that Chytraeus outlines in Part I (History, Moral Philosophy, Natural Philosophy, and Theology).

Limitations of the Study

There are two groups limitations to this particular study. The first concerns the materials available to the researcher. The *Regulae Studiorum* is listed in the catalogues of Lutheran schools in Lutheran towns and territories where it was used. And although the evidence for the *Regulae’s* use and influence is prolific, based on accounts of other scholars, this researcher unable to examine these other resources in order to comment on how these are used specifically.

The second concerns the central aims of the investigation, and self-imposed limit that necessarily restricts other directions and questions. So many interesting ideas arise that without

---

5 *Regvlae stdviorvm: sev de ratione & ordine discendi, in praecipvis artibvs, recte instituendo ... addito gemino indice* (Leipzig: Henning Gross, 1595).

6 For instance, Ann Moss, concerning Chytraeus’ work, notes, “His *De ratione discendi et ordine studiorum in singulis artibus recte instituendis* (Wittenberg, 1564) was probably the most widely based of the multitude of curriculum studies generated by the establishment of municipally controlled schools in Lutheran towns, nearly all of which published their prospectus, with more or less detail about the methods of study to be implemented.” Ann Moss, *Printed Commonplace-Books and the Structuring of Renaissance Thought* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1996).
this limit, this study would quickly balloon out of control. The purpose of the dissertation then is primarily to present the *Regulae Studiorum* through an investigation of its theology and pedagogical elements. Therefore the analysis will focus on the Chytraeus’ definitions and descriptions of each subject with particular emphasis on his discussions of its role in the curriculum as a whole and its use for the church and state. Because the *Regulae* is encyclopedic, many sections contain extended lists and descriptions of the written works pertinent to each subject that he considers. This includes texts of summary and method (both contemporary and those drawn from antiquity) as well as various other texts from antiquity. Often Chytraeus provides specific discussion on why these works have been included or what their relationship is to his overall approach. At other times they appear to be listed only as the author’s attempt to be thorough and inclusive. When appropriate to the question of theology and pedagogy, these works will be discussed. Otherwise they will be listed to illustrate the ranges of his approach.

Detailed examinations of other works, by Chytraeus or by other authors—for instance those Melanchthon or Gregor Reisch—are also beyond the scope of the study. This is not to say that other works will never be considered, or that questions concerning the relationship of this work to others in the genre, or the specific influences of others will not be raised. But it is simply not possible within the space of this dissertation to analyze such things in any great detail. This dissertation is meant to be a preliminary contribution, presenting a detailed study on one author as embodied in a particular work. As such it may play a role in laying some of the necessary groundwork for such comparisons to follow in other subsequent studies.

**Research Procedures**

This dissertation investigates the relationship between theology and pedagogy primarily through an examination of Chytraeus’ *Regulae Studiorum*. Because the subject of the book itself
concerns definitions of the arts and methodological approaches, there are several sets of questions guiding this study that arise naturally from the text. These begin with what Chytraeus means by education. A discussion of the outlines of what he understands as a curriculum of instruction makes up a large part of in Part I of the *Regulae*, and is revisited several times in his subsequent sections.

Part and parcel to a discussion of the curriculum for Chytraeus is what the goal of education ought to be. As will be seen, his goal [*finis*] of education [*cognitio rerum et facultas bene dicendi*] is driven by his anthropological assumptions. Man was created for the glory of the God, and his highest aim is true fear and love of his Creator. This goal, itself inseparable from the Gospel, gives all learning true meaning, since man was created to hear, learn, and speak about God, and live according to His precepts.

Coupled with treatments of Chytraeus’ curriculum and goals of education is an analysis of how the text functions as a model and guide for learning. In addition to a portion devoted to describing the tools and habits that make sound learning possible in Part II, each section of Part III is presented in such a way as to teach the reader how to navigate the materials necessary for learning each subject, from grammar to theology, in his curriculum.

Finally, how Chytraeus’ approach fits in its historic, religious, and social context, is also important for understanding the *Regulae*. Numerous scholars have written off Chytraeus as offering little more than what might be found in Melanchthon’s work. Still others have pointed out important differences between the two both theologically and pedagogically. Chytraeus was close to Melanchthon as a student and later provided a moderating voice in the midst of the scandal and controversy that swirled around his teacher in later years, but he was also an individual scholar in his own right, as the *Regulae Studiorum* will show.
Review of the Literature

An overview of the secondary literature that concerns either Chytraeus or his pedagogical or theological writing concerns three groups of literature: biographical studies and treatments of Chytraeus’ ideas, studies that consider the Regulae Studiorum or its sections in connection to some broader topic, and finally Chytraeus’ own mention of the Regulae in his writing.

Biographical Studies

Major biographical studies, of which there are only two, were published in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. However, a resurgence of interest began in the 1990s, to commemorate the 400th anniversary of his death. Four monographs as well as three collections of essays were published on various subjects, ranging from Chytraeus’ role at Rostock and specific histories of Rostock during the Reformation, to specific studies on his relation with the Dukes of Mecklenburg, archival studies, and genealogical studies. But while these studies are hardly abundant they did indicate the brief formation of a new, if short-lived, interest in Chytraeus as an important figure to look to regarding the confluence of humanism and the late Reformation.

In 1992 Rudolf Keller released his book on Chytraeus’ history of the Augsburg Confession.7 This study took up not only Chytraeus’ history of the Augustana and the Diet of Augsburg, but it dealt with the spurious manuscript which Chytraeus believed to be the original draft of the Confession. Soon after Keller came Thomas Kaufmann’s study on the University of Rostock and the confessionalization of Mecklenburg that was published in 1997.8 Chytraeus as

---


8 Thomas Kaufmann, Universität und lutherische Konfessionalisierung: die Rostocker Theologieprofessoren und ihr Beitrag zur theologischen Bildung und kirchlichen Gestaltung im Herzogtum Mecklenburg zwischen 1550 und 1675 (Gütersloh: Gütersloher, 1997).
both churchman and rector is the central figure of the book, and some of his more well-known orations on the task of theology and preaching are highlighted.\(^9\) Otfrid Czaika’s examination of the relationship between Chytraeus’ Rostock and Sweden was published in 2002.\(^10\) Reminding us that the Baltic regional sense of place is another vital part of the Chytraeus story, Cziaka’s study was based on records of Swedish students and correspondence between David Chytraeus and Swedish contacts, especially Chancellor Erik Sparre and Kings Erik XIV and Johann III. He argues that the relationship between Chytraeus and the monarchs led to an extraordinarily high number of Swedish students. Wittenberg theology was exported from Rostock, and as result, the university played a significant role in the direction that Lutheranism took in Sweden. From the 1550s forward, Rostock overtook Wittenberg as the choice for Scandinavian students studying abroad.\(^11\) Daniel Benga’s dissertation, published in 2006, examined Chytraeus’ oration on the state of the church in the east.\(^12\) Although this oration had been mentioned in all the previous studies, what had been lacking was a detailed look at the important role that Chytraeus and Rostock had in communications with the eastern churches—to the point where it could almost be said that they were rediscovered.

Karl-Heinz Glaser edited two important collections of studies which were commissioned by the German city of Kraichtal, Chytraeus’ birth place. The first was published in 1993, a

\(^9\) Kaufmann, *Universität und lutherische Konfessionalisierung*, 260–84. Kaufmann includes *Oratio de studio theologiae, exercitiiis verae pietatis et virtutis*, and *Oratio de studio theologiae recte inchoando*. Printed numerous times individually they are also included in Part III of the *Regulae Studiorum*.

\(^10\) Otfrid Czaika, *David Chyträus und die Universität Rostock in ihren Beziehungen zum schwedischen Reich* (Helsinki: Luther-Agricola-Gesellschaft, 2002).


\(^12\) Daniel Benga. *David Chytraeus (1530–1600) als Erforscher und Wiederentdecker der Ostkirchen seine Beziehungen zu orthodoxen Theologen, seine Erforschungen der Ostkirchen und seine ostkirchlichen Kenntnisse* (Wettenburg: VVB Laufersweiler Verlag, 2006).
collection of essays on both of the Chytraeus brothers, titled *David und Nathan Chytraeus: Humanismus im konfessionellen Zeitalter*. The second, edited again by Glaser and published in 2000, looks only at David, and is titled *David Chytraeus (1530–1600): Norddeutscher Humanismus in Europa*. Glaser also edited a third collection of essays released three years later dealing with the Reformation in Kraichgau titled *Reformation und Humanismus in Kraichgau*.

As the titles of these essays suggest, the common thread is the interaction between humanism and theology in Chytraeus’ life and work, as well as in the late Reformation more broadly. However, the essays do not look specifically at his writings on education.

With the exception of two dissertations published around the turn of the twentieth-century that took up Chytraeus as a historian, the older studies of Chytraeus are all very similar in scope and content. They present him as an important churchman and scholar, who had adopted the irenic nature and humanist leanings of his mentor Melanchthon, and held fast to Lutheran theology in the midst of controversy to offer a moderating voice. The first biographical sketch of Chytraeus is found in the work of Melchior Adams. Published in 1653, *Vitae Germanorum Theologorum* is a compilation of lives of several prominent Lutheran theologians of the sixteenth-century. It appears to be based largely on the orations delivered by Johann Goldstein and Christoph Sturz at Chytraeus’ funeral. References to this early work appear frequently in the footnotes of the works of Chytraeus’ major biographers O. F. Schütz, and Otto Krabbe, showing


its importance as an early source. However, later works that had access to these orations tend to cite them directly.

The first thorough biographical study of David Chytraeus is that of Otto Schütz.\textsuperscript{17} This monumental study, written and published in parts over the course of several years was finished in 1728. Schütz undertook his work on Rostock under the auspices of the Faculty of Theology, and draws heavily from church and school records, as well as correspondence, making it the first comprehensive historical examination of the life and work of Chytraeus. Volume one of the four-volume study is almost entirely dedicated to Chytraeus’ publications, introducing various editions, publishing dates and briefly sketching out their contents. On the whole, it is highly detailed work, whichdevotes large sections to exploring the late Lutheran controversies and Chytraeus’ involvement. The defining focus of the work is the concern with Chytraeus the theologian, and the spread of Lutheranism during the latter half of the sixteenth-century. As a theologian, Schütz was keenly interested in the role that the University took in this process. Its four volumes contain valuable appendices of correspondence, and thorough outlines of Chytraeus’ publications, making it an important source for later studies.

Schütz scoured not only Chytraeus’ popular texts and commentaries, but the hundreds of pages of orations and correspondence that David Chytraeus the younger compiled and published posthumously.\textsuperscript{18} He laid the foundations for all subsequent study. Drawing heavily from this

\textsuperscript{17} Otto Friedrich Schütz, \textit{De vita Davidis Chytraei theologici historici et polyhistoricus rostochiensis commentariorum libri quattuor} (Hamburg, 1728).

\textsuperscript{18} \textit{DAVIDS CHYTRAEI THEOLOGI AC HISTORICI EMINENTISSIMI, Rostochiana in Academia Professoris quondam primarii EPISTOLAE; Ob miram rerum varietatem stylique elegantiam cuiuis lectu iucundissimae; Nunc demum in lucem editae A DAVIDE CHYTRAEO Authoris filio.} (Hanoviae, 1614); \textit{DAVIDIS CHYTRAEI THEOLOGI AC HISTORICI EMINENTISSIMI, Rostochiana in Academia Professoris quondam primarii ORATIONES; Quarum seriem sexta abhinc pagina exhibet. Nunc demum in lucem editae A DAVIDE CHYTRAEO Authoris filio.} (Hanoviae, 1614). These titles will be abbreviated hereafter as \textit{Epistolae and Orationes} respectively.
work is a short biography by Theodor Pressel that condenses Schütz’ four volumes into roughly forty pages. Pressel succinctly sketches out Chytraeus education, his tenure at Rostock, and his work as churchman and reformer with specific sections on his reforming efforts in Austria and involvement in the development of the Formula of Concord.

The next major biography after Schütz belongs to a rector of Rostock, Otto Krabbe. Completed in 1870, in many ways it dovetails with his 1854 history of the University of Rostock, in which he traces the development from its founding in the fifteenth-century to the death of Chytraeus. Krabbe devoted more than half of this book to the latter half of the sixteenth-century, during David Chytraeus’ tenure. His biography of Chytraeus is a more detailed look at the famous Lutheran rector, and a continuation of his thesis from his history of Rostock, that the person and influence of David Chytraeus was essential to the shape and importance of the University, persisting to his day. It is also the first study available in German, allowing perhaps for a wider readership for those interested in this important Reformation figure.

Two notable studies that look in detail at Chytraeus’ written scholarship consider him as a historian. Both were dissertations completed at the University of Rostock around the turn of twentieth-century. First came Peter Paulson’s Rostock dissertation published in 1897, David Chyträus als Historiker, a smaller study focusing mainly on the Saxon Chronicon. Chytraeus’ strength, he maintains, lay not in dogmatics, but church history, and the historical field.

---

19 Theodor Pressel, _David Chyträus, nach Gleichzeitigen Quellen_ (Elberfeld, 1862).
20 Otto Krabbe, _David Chyträus_ (Rostock: Stiller’sche Hofbuchhandlung, 1870).
22 Peter Paulson, _David Chytäus als historiker, ein beitrag zur kenntnis der deutschen historiographie im reformationsjahrhundert_ (Rostock: Carl Himstorffe Buchdruckerei, 1897).
23 Paulson, _David Chytäus als historiker, 13–14_. “Die Stärke des Chyträus ligt überhaupt nicht auf dogmatischem, sondern auf kirchenhistorischem, überhaupt auf historischem Gebiet.”
suggests that Chytraeus could be said to have founded a historical school at Rostock through his promotion of history and role in attracting other historians.24 As for his particular understanding of history, Paulson sums up Chytraeus’ approach succinctly, noting that his importance lay less in his attention to the historical facts and more in the attention paid to the particular aspirations, genius, and character of the of historical persons under study. In this Chytraeus went beyond Melanchthon. The point of history was to show the truthfulness, justice, and goodness of God in humanity, and to demonstrate that evil is punished but good is rewarded. History functions by working on the conscience, exhorting people to avoid evil and imitate justice.25

The second was Detloff Klatt’s dissertation on Chytraeus as historian.26 Published in Rostock around a decade after Paulson, Klatt acknowledges that the limited scope of Paulson’s work needed to be expanded, and that the biographies of Schütz and Krabbe, for what they were worth, did not broach the question of Chytraeus as humanist and the implications therein in a way that he felt adequate. Klatt’s two-part work examined Chytraeus as a lecturer and writer of history in the first half, and his material and research in the second half expanded significantly

24 Paulson, *David Chytäus als historiker*, 12.


Das sind die Gesichtspunkte, die Chyträus für die Historie und die Beschäftigung mit ihr aufstellt. Aufs engste schliesst er sich in seinen geschickt philosophischen Anschauungen denen seines Lehrers Melanchthon an, dessen Bearbeitung der Karionschen Chronik er auch seinen universalhistorischen Vorlesungen zu gründe legte. Doch ist Chyräus an mehreren Punkten über Melanchthon hinausgegangen. Vorwiegend vom religiös-ethischen Standpunkt aus wird die Geschichte aufgefasst. Sie ist die Auswirkung der Wahrhaftigkeit, Gerechtigkeit und Güte Gottes in der Menschheit, nach Massgabe der zehn Gebote: Der Übertreter wird bestraft, der Gerechte, der sich an die Gebote hält, belohnt. So ist die Geschichte eine gewaltige Mahnerin an die Gewissen der Menschen, das Böse zu meiden und der Gerechtigkeit nachzustreben.”

beyond Paulson’s study of *Chronicon Saxonia* to include his genealogies, chronologies, speeches, letters, commentaries and his histories of Saxony and of the Augsburg Confession. Klatt approached Chytraeus as a mediator between the Reformation and humanism whose attitudes about the study of history are a product of the confluence of humanism and Reformation theology in his person.\(^{27}\) But he also understood Chytraeus as primarily a humanist rather than a theologian, and notes that he was humanist to the end of his life and that although he did not abandon theology, he often groaned under it.\(^{28}\)

More recently Chytraeus’ theology has received attention primarily in the context of his relationship to Melanchthon either with regard to methodology or controversy. Marcel Nieden offers a brief look at the Wittenberg influence in one of Chytraeus’ early theological orations on Melanchthon’s *Loci Theologici* from 1549.\(^{29}\) Robert Kolb examines Chytraeus’ own understanding of *necessitas* and the key differences between his approach and those of Luther and Melanchthon in the controversy surrounding their formulations of divine and human responsibility in conversion.\(^{30}\) Olli-Pekka Vainio includes a section in his study on Lutheran


conceptions of justification that considers how Chytraeus treated its definition in various editions of his catechism.\textsuperscript{31} Another study of Chytraeus’ catechisms, providing a more in-depth look at the editions and approach was published by Susi-Hilde Michael.\textsuperscript{32} Irena Backus looks at Chytraeus’ \textit{Explicatio Apocalypsis} chiefly outlining the significance of Chytraeus’ concept of history, and perceptions as a historian, for the parallels he attempted between the fourth century and his own age in his commentary.\textsuperscript{33}

\textit{Regulae Studiorum} in the Secondary Literature

Although the \textit{Regulae} has never been the subject of a detailed study, reference to the work appears regularly in the secondary literature, suggesting its importance. \textit{Regulae Studiorum} often appears in such sources under the first title it was published under, \textit{De Ratione Discendi}. The earliest instance appears in a 1561 bulletin written by Chytraeus himself and later published in a collection featuring the work of faculty members at Rostock.\textsuperscript{34} It is an advertisement announcing a lecture series for incoming students. The title of the series was \textit{De ratione discendi}. Chytraeus writes.

As blind unaware of the road, in unknown regions, overgrown indeed by thorns and briars, easily wander on the journey, and almost never reach the desired end without a guide: likewise are students without a sure method and order wandering blindly ... Indeed, many in general do not know what course of study they should be directed to, and what method to properly take that course up with, and what method and order they obtain and uphold for them. Although in all sorts of activity order is necessary ... nevertheless especially in the proper approach to literary study, a certain order and

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
\bibitem{31} Olli-Pekka Vainio, \textit{Justification and Participation in Christ: The Development of the Lutheran Doctrine of Justification from Luther to the Formula of Concord (1580)} (Boston: Brill), 173–79.
\bibitem{34} David Chytraeus, \textit{SCRIPTA IN ACADEMIA ROSTOCHIENSI PUBLICE PROPOSITA, AB ANNO CHRISTI 1560 usque ad Octobrem anni 1563. & inde ad initium anni 1567} (Rostochii, 1567), 93–95.
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method is beneficial, which shows the proper and expedient way, like a shortcut to erudition.  

While it is unclear from the bulletin announcement as to whether these lectures had existed previously, or were drawn up specifically to meet the need Chytraeus mentions at the time during the early 1560s, it is likely that they at least built upon earlier and similar work from Chytraeus’ ten-year service in the Rostock Academy for incoming students. The content of the *Regulae* may have become well-known to students at Rostock even before the first editions of *De Ratione* were printed. The first edition of the lectures was not printed locally but appeared under the same title in 1564 from the Wittenberg printer, Laurenzius Seuberlich. Over the years *De Ratione* would be expanded upon and eventually renamed *Regulae Studiorum*.

*Regulae Studiorum* is mentioned twice in funeral oration written by Johannes Goldstein. The first instance presents it in the context of Chytraeus’ work in founding the Julian Academy

---


36 David Chytraeus, *De ratione discendi et ordine studiorum in singulis Artibus recte instituendo* (Vitebergae: Laurenzius Seuberlich, 1564).

for Duke Julius of Brunswick as the principle text for instituting a rationale for learning and teaching. The second describes Chytraeus’ wide learning and teaching ability from theology to philosophy and history, and Goldstein remarks that the Regulae Studiorum has demonstrated the route for sure learning to students and is “truly a golden book, that communicates by ample method the descriptions of virtue and rules for life.” In Adam Melchior’s chapter on Chytraeus the Regulae is again mentioned in the context of founding the Julian Academy in the exact same description and wording that appears in Goldstein, as much of the contents of Melchior’s chapter are simply excerpts from Goldstein.

In Schütz, Regulae Studiorum is sketched over the length of a chapter. He essentially provides just an outline with no analysis. It is however, a very detailed outline, taking into account virtually all of book’s headings and subheadings. In addition, he highlights some of the more well-known texts and authorities that Chytraeus recommends in his sections and often provides clues to the dates of composition for individual sections by linking them with titles published separately under the same or similar name. Although Schütz declines to offer a more detailed analysis of the work, its genesis, or its impact, he does at least show the Regulae’s importance as he names it as Chytraeus’ best work after the Saxon Chronicles. Schütz’s chapter functions effectively as a concise guide to the book.

---

38 Orationes, 760. “Anno sequenti Rittershusium euocatus, Julio Ducu Brunsuicensi Academiam Iuliam condituro, in deliberatione de Academiae legibus, Professoribus, officiiis docentium & disceretium ratione instituta, fideliter inservuit, & formam Academiae integram & ectionum in singulis artibus ordinem ac modum, qui deinde magna ex parte, in Studiorum regulas translatus est, descripsit.

39 Orationes, 764. “Certum discendi ordinem & rectam ac compendiariam viam ad salutarem eruditionem, & singularum artium nucleos, in libro, cui titulus est Regulae studiorum, adolescentibus studiosis monstrauit. Vere etiam libellus aureolus est, qui virtutum descriptiones & vitae regulas, amplissima metodo tradit.”

40 Adams, Vitae Germanorum, 688, 696.

41 Schütz, De Vita, 218–33.

42 Schütz, De Vita, 218. “Nunc de libro Chytraei optimo, cui post Chronicon Saxoniae primas tribuo partes.”
Another early assessment of the *Regulae* is found in Krabbe’s biography. Krabbe situates his discussion in the context of Chytraeus comprehensive activity as a scholar and lecturer in a chapter that focuses on Chytraeus’ *Lehrtätigkeit*, noting that the methodological approach, or dialectic, is Melanchthon’s, while his theology is Luther’s. This duality, according to Krabbe, underlies the development and direction of his pedagogy. Another factor that Krabbe deems essential to his thought is Chytraeus’ perspective as historian, a suggestion that foreshadows the future work of Paulson and Klatt. Krabbe maintains that for Chytraeus the purpose of studying history is to learn both examples of virtue and divine providence. Krabbe understands this historical perspective to be illustrated by the *Regulae Studiorum*, which shows Chytraeus drawing out in an encyclopedic and methodological manner his position on subjects for study, thus creating a rationale and method in studies of the various disciplines. Krabbe is aware that it was a work in progress—a gradual development that included material published over a length of time. He includes in his description a brief summary of the contents, although not nearly as thorough as what can be found in Schütz.

---


45 Krabbe offers the earliest description of the development and use of the *Regulae*. He says, “Aus jenen
In Paulson, the *Regulae Studiorum* illustrates Chytraeus’ erudition and versatility. He goes as far to say that it is the text that showcases him as both a successor to Melanchthon and even a second *Praeceptor Germaniae*. Klatt understands the *Regulae* in the same way and refers to it numerous times in his footnotes as representative of the comprehensive range of Chytraeus’ knowledge. He states that Chytraeus strove for to provide a whole picture of science and like Melanchthon desired for the arts to come together with the subjects acting as *loci* into a well-ordered whole in the service of theology, which stands at the head.

---


In the previously noted collections of essays edited by Heinz-Glaser the *Regulae* is only mentioned once, appearing in Thomas Kaufmann’s essay on the work of David Chytraeus and his younger brother Nathan at Rostock. Kaufmann situates the *Regulae Studiorum* alongside Chytraeus’ *Regulae Vitae*, catechism and his *Onomasticon*, as basic academic texts that were widely known and in double digit printings on account of their widespread use. He notes that in the generation after Melanchthon, hardly any can outdo Chytraeus in terms of the structuring and orderly consolidation of confessionally Lutheran universities.49

Finally, there are also references to sections of the *Regulae Studiorum* that have appeared mainly as sections of chapters in other works on theology or education in the sixteenth-century, suggesting that imitation is not only the sincerest form of flattery but also an identification of value and importance. For example, Ann Moss highlights Chytraeus’ unique approach to a Melanchthonian systematic reading in her study on commonplace-books noting both the inclusive nature of how he employed his of reading across all subjects as well as his perspective on how such reading trains the student in virtue.50 She indicates that this feature of his analysis is rather unique, and that the evaluation of selections of text for the student’s commonplace

---


headings is itself an exercise in virtue. Janis Kreslins showcases *De Ratione Discendi* as a prime example of Chytraeus’ non-specialized literary approach in his essay on Rostock’s place among universities in the north in the sixteenth-century, pointing out that Chytraeus had transplanted certain features of the system that Melanchthon had developed at Wittenberg. Kreslins finds *De Ratione Discendi* scholastic because of its comprehensive qualities, humanistic because of the literary approach made up the foundation of the program and Lutheran because of the ideas the program reinforced about the connections between knowledge and religion. Irena Backus includes a section on Chytraeus in her chapter on Protestant and Catholic Historians. She examines his *De Lectione historiarum recte instituenda* that was printed both as a preface to his *Chronologia Historiae* and appears in Part III of *Regulae Studiorum*, and contends that Chytraeus has systematized a Melanchthonian approach to history while also observing some of the key similarities and differences between the two. Robert Preus provides a brief sketch of Chytraeus ten rules in *Oratio de Studio Theologiae recte Inchoando* as an example of Lutheran theological prolegomena. Finally, Robert Kolb offers an overview of the same oration as an illustration of Wittenberg theological methodology at work in a student of Melanchthon.

---

53 Kreslins, “A Safe Place in a Turbulent World,” 34.
54 Irena Backus, “Protestant and Catholic Histories of the Early Church,” in *Historical Method and Confessional Identity in Era of the Reformation (1378–1613)* (Boston: Brill, 2003), 338–43
The *Regulae Studiorum* in Chytraeus’ Collected Correspondence

In the hundreds of letters collected and published by David Chytraeus the younger in the decades after his father’s death, the use of the *Regulae Studiorum* as a complete published work is mentioned specifically only two times. Both letters appear in conjunction with reform efforts that Chytraeus was assisting with. The first mention is in a letter penned in 1574 to Hieronymus Osius, the rector of the Academy in Graz, concerning his work in establishing a school order. The *Ordinem studiorum* that Chytraeus authored was to be based in part on his *Ratione Discendi*, which he indicates in the letter. Although the letter omits details on the specific content or final shape of the *Ordo*, it does offer a number of clues concerning how it might be read. Chytraeus admits that his own efforts are incomplete and requests that Osius and Johann Marbach polish the final product, in particular the section on grammar. In terms of trimming the *Ratione* to fit the needs of the school in Stiria he suggests that all of Part II might be discarded. *De Studio Theologiae*, one of the longest and most well known sections of part three is also mentioned. Chytraeus, although was resistant to adapting any of it, did point out that sections could be left to the judgment and wishes of Osius.57

Another Chytraeus letter from around the same time concerns negotiations about a possible appointment to the University of Helmstadt.58 Otto Krabbe wrote that because of the resources that Duke Julius was able to muster, as well as Julius’ personal wish to secure Chytraeus, the

57 *Epistolae*, 211. “Ordinem studiorum scholae, quem isthic delineare coeipi, sed non penitus absolui, optarim a te et D. Marbachio diligenter et attente perlustrari, ac eam praecipue partem, quae primam institutionem Grammaticam in classib. continet, ex Argentinensi forma et vestrae industriae ac experientiae iudicio, exquisite ac accurate limari et expoliri. Secunda pars, de finibus studiorum et mediis ad ea recta ducentibus ex libello de ratione discendi meo descripta, tota fortasse omitti potest. De studio Theologiae, quod professionis meae maxime proprium est, cunctantius fere quam de vila caeterarum artium aliquid compono. Sed tamen vbi de iudicii et voluntate vestra cognouero, eam quoque partem attexam.”

58 For a more recent study that accounts for Chytraeus role in the establishment of Helmstedt University see Peter Baumgart, *Universitäten im konfessionellen Zeitalter: Gesammelte Beiträge* (Münster, 2006).
prospect of the appointment put the Rostock faculty into genuine worry of losing him to Helmstadt.\textsuperscript{59} Correspondence contained in Otto Schütz’ biography between Martin Chemnitz and Jacob Andrea indicates that in setting up the Academy Julius had hoped that if it were not possible to secure Chytraeus for a permanent employment, then at the very least, he wanted to him to compose the statutes.\textsuperscript{60} Although delayed by illness, Chytraeus did become thoroughly involved in deliberations ranging from the appointment of professors to the founding of the curriculum and it is on that point where his \textit{Regulae Studiorum} is mentioned as playing a role.\textsuperscript{61} Beyond these two instances there are a handful of other references to the text—less than five actually—but these were mentioned in passing and are not connected to specific uses.

\textbf{Conclusion}

This opening chapter has introduced the \textit{Regulae Studiorum} as an important, but largely overlooked text in Chytraeus’ corpus of work. It stands alone in its comprehensive to the arts, and as such is a natural starting place to begin to investigate the relationship between theology and pedagogy in Chytraeus’ approach as an educator. While his biographers were well aware of the significance of the text, and while Klatt and Paulson took interest in the question of how his theology and humanism were related in his historical writing, none have posed the question of how this relationship may be viewed against the whole canvas of the arts in the curriculum. This

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{59} Krabbe, \textit{David Chyträus}, 298.

\textsuperscript{60} Martin Chemnitz to Jacob Andrea, Sept 5, 1575. “Ego admodum sollicitus sum, ut recte constituantur omnia: sua si igitur vocandum D. Chytraeum. Ac spero, ipsum, si non prorsus in Schola Julia manere poterit, ad tempus tamen operam suam nostrati Academiae accommodaturum Princips abs te petit exemplar statutorum vestrae Academiae.”. Quoted in Schütz, \textit{De Vita}, 339.

\textsuperscript{61} Goldstein briefly summarizes Chytraeus’ involvement, “in deliberatione de Academiae legibus, Professoribus, officiis docentium & discentium ratione instituta, fideliter inseruuit, & formam Academiae integram, & lectionum in singulis artibus ordinem ac modum, qui deinde magna ex parte, in Studiorum regulas translatus est, descripsit.” \textit{Orationes}, 760.
is the chief question this dissertation poses in considering the *Regulae Studiorum*. Such as a task is also an important first step for raising other questions as well, such as the relationship of his work to Melanchthon’s, or the educational movements of his generation, as this chapter has discussed. The following two chapters will begin to set the stage for the study by presenting the issues pertinent to the historical context in which the *Regulae* was composed.
CHAPTER TWO
THE CONFLUENCE OF HUMANISM AND THEOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter will establish the pedagogical and theological backdrop against which to place Chytraeus and his Regulae Studiorum. It will proceed in two parts. First it briefly sketch some of the issues raised in the secondary literature concerning the relationship between humanism and education. This serves as an outline for the broader context and wider issues, such as the increasing importance of the studia humanitatis and the circumstances that led to and maintained an emphasis on the humanities in universities after the Reformation. The rise of humanism in the universities meant not only that the study of theology would change, but that academic inquiry across the curriculum would follow suit. It would be nice to think scholars stood first and alone in bringing change, but such a romantic view is tempered by the hard reality of daily life. In fact, this process did not occur from forces internal to the universities only, but was spurred by political and economic factors as well.

The second part of this chapter briefly looks at the role that Luther and Melanchthon played in establishing a new intellectual climate at the University of Wittenberg. Wittenberg itself is an example of the changes that New Learning offered for university study. Luther set in motion a wave of reforms that would attempt to eliminate scholasticism, rooting out one method and introducing another. Melanchthon worked alongside Luther in tempering and refining the direction that the reforms took, eventually leading to a reorientation toward both Aristotle as well as natural philosophy as whole that could be considered to support rather than depart from
Lutheran theology. Chytraeus’ work is in many ways the reception of earlier ideas about education and curriculum in a more mature form, interpreted and adapted for Rostock with the *Regulae*.

The Rise of the Liberal Arts in the Universities

A brief outline of humanism and scholasticism and the nature of the controversies between the two as well as the outcomes is helpful for understanding the overall impact of New Learning in the sixteenth-century. The rise of the humanist curriculum in the universities in the North is the story of the birth of what would in time give shape to the modern liberal arts curriculum, which was adopted and adapted by educators during the Reformation, replacing and reforming the traditional scholastic curriculum. The subjects and approaches that were emphasized in Reformation and post-Reformation universities had their roots in the conflict between these two. The Reformation helped to shape this curriculum just as the curriculum influenced the course and shape of the Reformation.

An important distinction, as Paul Oskar Kristeller argued, came in the classification and organization of their systems of thought.¹ While humanism was essentially the *studia humanitatis*, and would embrace the wide liberal arts, it rested upon a core interest in grammar, poetry, rhetoric, history and moral philosophy, rather than any sort of comprehensive philosophical system, as scholasticism claimed for itself.² These are merely subjects for study,


² Humanism in this study refers to German humanism and humanists. Lewis W. Spitz says, “Although the German humanists and reformers represent a wide diversity of types, they were all concerned in one way or another with certain common problems and subject to certain common influences. Among the problems were their relation to scholasticism, their reaction against the formalization of religious life and the loss of existential immediacy, their criticism of church practices, of rote sacramentalism, of the hierarchy, and of sacerdotalism.” Lewis Spitz, *The Religious Renaissance of the German Humanists* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1963), 7.
not systems. Foundational for scholasticism, on the one hand, was dialectic, a system of logic that was understood by the scholastics to be a suitable tool for investigating anything and everything. It was entrenched at universities, resisting humanist efforts to move from the peripheral and enter the curriculum mainstream. Kristeller defined humanism in the university setting to be a reform effort emphasizing the value of what would be essentially entry-level subjects or the basics of serious university education. This should be managed by the faculty of the liberal arts, but that was not easily done. Scholastics sought to hold the methodological line and resisted. In addition, the scholastics held authority in the three higher faculties of Medicine, Law, and Theology. Following Kristeller, later scholars have generally tended to understand the conflict between the scholastics and the humanists in the universities as somewhat exaggerated and often misunderstood. Kristeller himself contended that the relationship between the two ran more along the lines of inter-departmental squabbles over method, rather than a clashing of rival philosophies. Still, method is no small matter.

James Overfield took a different line. He approached Kristeller’s definition by proposing that such inter-faculty wrangling might be understood in terms of distinct periods in order to contextualize and explain this as a gradual escalation of conflict. Kristeller’s portrayal of the clash applied to the first of three periods, the late fifteenth-century. This was a result of a northward diffusion of humanists, trained in Italy, who attempted reform in their own faculties but were frustrated and gained no real traction. Overfield notes that at this point humanism’s lack of footing in the university engendered little controversy. The second period, which lasted to around 1515, saw a rise of the humanities in the university curriculum beginning officially with

---

Wittenberg in 1502. This was due to a rise in princely support for the New Learning. For instance, those trained in the rhetoric became eminently useful in the expanding princely courts. This meant the humanities become a priority, valued for more than their preparatory function for entry into other areas. While Overfield points to an intensifying of the conflict during this period, his interpretation even of the Reuchlin affair, often cited as an example of the level of hostility between the two parties, is understood as an example of anti-Semitism rather than inter-faculty conflict. The third and final period coincides with the Reformation when the controversy burned most brightly because of the religious element, which subsequently took center stage. So how did humanism, or at least certain elements of humanism become associated with religion and religious controversy? Overfield clearly does not see the problem Kristeller had proposed.

For Erika Rummel, the key to understanding the disagreement between the two groups does not center merely on the threat that the arts faculties’ gradual rise to prominence entails. Rather, she describes a slow but steady process whereby the arts faculty began to trespass into the hallowed grounds of the three higher faculties of Medicine, Law, and Theology. Although this incursion was not limited to theology, the very fact that the lower faculty would attack what had been the methodological basis for the task of theology, the scholastic method and thereby attack centuries of tradition, was intolerable. The scholastics, as noted, maintained that dialectic was not only suitable, but was the best possible method for the thorough investigation of anything including theology. The humanists disagreed, maintaining that textual and linguistic skills—in other words understanding what the words on the page actually said, as well as developments in historical method, examining what those words said with regard to the context.

---

in which they were written—could serve better than dialectic with regard to theology. If this was humanists’ emphasis, then it also raises an important question: what text ought to be the central source for theological study? Crucial for the humanist method was the contention that the foundations of all serious study ought to begin with the original sources. In the case of theology, this would be Scripture. Method would then grow out of what sources suggested.

But there were a few who went further than simply exchanging one approach for another, or using the humanist tools of grammar to augment scholastic dialectic. Martin Luther, for example, condemned scholastic dialectic as a suitable theological tool, arguing explicitly against the conclusions that one reached when one employed the scholastic method. “It is an error to say that no one becomes a theologian without Aristotle. This counters what is commonly said. Moreover, no one becomes a theologian unless it is without Aristotle … In short, all Aristotle is to theology as darkness is to light.”⁵ For Luther it is not mere confidence in one method over another, but an explicit rejection of dialectic as an appropriate tool in theology. If Aristotelianism was useless, than the conclusions that one reached by employing it with equally flawed.⁶ For Rummel therefore, the controversy between the scholastics and the humanists became much more than mere interdepartmental squabbles. It became much more serious than a grammarian suggesting that language studies were a helpful tool, but now these became attacks on professional competence, rejections of intellectual traditions and ultimately a rejection of the authority structure of the Catholic church. And all this flared up in an environment long primed


for explosion by centuries of unanswered calls for broader church reform.

Charles Nauert shows that humanism’s methodological incursion into theology was replicated in the other two faculties as well. The intrusion of the humanists into the three upper faculties of Medicine, Law, and Theology, had its basis in arguments about grammar. While the dialectic of scholastic theology was at the heart of humanism’s attack with regard to theology, humanists also went after the centuries of commentaries and glosses commonly used in all three faculties. Both medicine and law were based on ancient texts: the Corpus Iuris Civilis for law and Hippocrates and Galen for medicine. Nauert says,

Humanists now wanted to intervene at the very outset of the interpretive process by insisting, as grammarians, that the grammarian—the humanist expert on languages and on the reconstruction of texts—had to establish the text itself and explain to those who could not read the original what the words really meant. Only then, even if one conceded the appropriateness of applying dialectical method to a revealed text, could any more sophisticated explication begin. For the humanists, the proper understanding of the ancient text was the right way to get to the proper understanding of the discipline. Dialectic, the method for discovering truth in any discipline, was absolutely secondary. Note that while this is an assault on method, it is also an assault on the authority and tradition that rested upon that method.

Institutionalizing a New Method

The humanist assault on method resulted not only from intensifying disagreements about style, but also from a struggle between competing epistemologies, or at least the rejection of

---


9 Dialectic will be reintroduced in a new form after Agricola however. Especially for Melanchthon, dialectic functions as the method by which material is explored in both teaching, learning, and properly ordering the material.
scholastic epistemology. This is the point that Bruce Kimball makes in his book, *Orators and Philosophers*. The orators and the philosophers are his characterizations for the humanists and the scholastics. The title is meant to call to mind the old stereotype that while the former was merely way of speaking, the latter was a system of thought. But Kimball is not interested in that *per se*. He is interested in the epistemological question of where each side finds truth. The philosophers sought to equip others to pursue knowledge, and truth is thus discovered by the proper application of their dialectic. Therefore the chief aim of education is to school the student with this method. With it he will be able to investigate any subject. For the orators, on the other hand, truth is not what can be discovered with the clumsy tools of the scholastics, but is contained in the words of the ancients. The issue is not discovery, but proper recognition and application. Therefore the chief aim of humanist education is to learn how to hear and retrieve this content and communicate, as Hanna Holborn Grey put it, with eloquence. The content, the language, and the presentation, must be appropriate to the given circumstance. For Kimball, the history of liberal arts is an uneasy and often misunderstood alliance between these two parties with the orators initially holding the upper hand. With his belief in the value of an established overall structure he finds the tilt towards orators disastrous for the West in terms of intellectual life. So for Kimball the fifteenth and the sixteenth centuries harbor watershed developments during this time when the Medieval university and the spirit of inquiry that it nurtured were upset and ceased to exist as it once had. As a result, the continued search and need for the

---


philosophers’ stability prompted instead a dogmatism that abounded until the Enlightenment.\textsuperscript{12}

Whether or not one agrees with Kimball in whole or in part, it is worth considering briefly the impact of the epistemology of the humanists on the curriculums and the culture. A collaborative effort of Anthony Grafton and Lisa Jardine looks at the development of the liberal arts curriculum as it related to the social, political, economic, and cultural changes that characterized the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.\textsuperscript{13} Essentially they argue that the demands of a changing society resulted in the success of the humanists, rather than the intrinsic merit of one curriculum over the other. Ideas have consequences, but ideas also have contexts.

The older system [scholasticism] had perfectly fitted the needs of the Europe of the high Middle Ages, with its communes, its church offices open to the low born of high talents and its vigorous debates on power and authority in state and church. The new system, we would argue, fitted the needs of the new Europe that was taking shape, with its closed governing elites, hereditary offices and strenuous efforts to close off debate on vital political and social questions. It stamped the more prominent members of the new elite with an indelible cultural seal of superiority, then equipped lesser members with fluency and a learned habit of attention to textual detail and offered everyone a model of true culture as something given, absolute, to be mastered, not questioned — and thus fostered and all its initiates a properly docile attitude towards authority.\textsuperscript{14}

Humanist education, with its emphasis on the text as a source of authority and culture fit well with the sorts of social structures which were beginning to take shape. Classical culture was both mature and alien, but provided a source of style and truth for those that were properly trained. Epistemology changes with method, and method changes with epistemology. Walter Rüegg describes how this change affected the arts curriculum:


\textsuperscript{14} Grafton, \textit{From Humanism to the Humanities}, xiii–ix.
Humanism conquered the universities … [and] in the consolidation of its triumph, the *humaniora* lost their original impetus and their character changed. The central task of the humanistic university became the application of its objective results rather than the intellectual and moral experience of the scholar or student in his individual interaction with the ancient authors. This was the main idea underlying Melanchthon’s inaugural address at Wittenberg: to seek out in the ancient authors the sources of the *artes*, and to seek out in the Bible and in the writings of the church fathers the sources of theology.  

Rüegg goes on to sketch a picture of radical change in the relationship that the humanists held with the ancients. For early humanists such as Petrarch, the ancients were partners in conversation—they called books [particular authors] friends. Petrarch wrote to his pen pal Cicero. These interpreters engaged in dialogue with the ancients. But by the beginning of the sixteenth-century the ancients had come to be understood as repositories of truth that could be mined with the application of proper methodology. While the purpose of this was to expedite learning, there had developed, as Walther Ong put it, “a decay in dialogue”—this both between the master and his ancient friends, and the master and his students. For Peter Ramus, texts of the ancients could only really be understood with and through the process of analysis, and the visual form manifesting this process replaced dialogue. Thus texts ultimately become objects for analysis and compartmentalization, rather than partners in dialogue. The *Regulae Studiorum* provides an example of exactly this. Chytraeus has organized, although distilled or dehydrated

---


16 Walter Ong, *Ramus, Method, and the Decay of Dialogue: From the Art of Discourse to the Art of Reason* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1958): 8–9. “A study of Ramism, therefore, makes it possible to discern the nature of subconscious drives which have been obscured elsewhere and which often call for radical revision in our ways of viewing intellectual history. For example, Ramism specialized in dichotomies, in “distribution” and “collocation” (*dispositio* rather than judgment or *judicium*), in “systems” (a philosophical “system” was a new notion generated in the Renaissance), and in other diagrammatic concepts. This hints that Ramist dialectic represented a drive toward thinking not only of the universe but of thought itself in terms of spatial models apprehended by sight. In this context, the notion of knowledge as word, and the personalist orientation of cognition and of the universe which this notion implies, is due to atrophy. Dialogue itself will drop more than ever out of dialectic. Persons, who alone speak (and in whom alone knowledge and science exist), will be eclipsed insofar as the world is thought of as an assemblage of the sort of things which vision apprehends—objects or surfaces.”
may describe it better, the whole of classical learning, texts, method, and all, into one book.

Humanism and Confessionalization

Erika Rummel sketches some peculiarities of humanism in her study on its institutionalization.17 While the question about the effect of humanism on the Reformation has been addressed, especially in response to Bernd Moeller, she reverses the question, asking what effect the Reformation had on humanism, in both Catholic and Protestant territories. She argues that in universities on all sides of the Reformation, humanism was refashioned, or, it would be said, “confessionalized,” in order to meet the particular needs of that territory. Of course to do this, she needs to explain how something like humanism, which as Kristeller argued is a literary movement rather than a philosophical or religious movement, can be confessionalized in the first place. To this end Rummel casts Erasmus as the model Christian humanist, who espoused a particular epistemology that stood between skepticism and dogmaticism. This sort of model humanist employed persuasion with regard to contested points of doctrine, rather than sharp disputation or dogmatic claims. No hard-put logic to nail things down. Furthermore, the humanists were accustomed to deferring to the authority of tradition and suspending firm judgments in order to accommodate contradictory opinions within that tradition. For example, in terms of religious truth, Erasmus deferred to the authority of the church. However, with humanists on both sides, there were differing opinions on precisely what tradition ought to be deferred to. Luther had no problem drawing from the church fathers, but only insofar as they agreed with his reading of God’s revelation, Scripture. But of course this is not what Erasmus has in mind when he talks about resting in the arms of the church, which he saw as a living

revelation. In the fierce battles over doctrine following Augsburg 1530, and with the need to clearly define confessional boundaries, Catholics and Protestants alike dismissed accommodation, instead utilizing humanistic philology and pedagogy in order to bolster their respective orthodoxies. At the same time, territorial princes relied on the humanists to do what they did best: formulate persuasive arguments rather than refutations, in hopes of achieving unity and peace on divisive religious questions.

Another question pertaining to the confessionalization of the curriculum is how the process relates to secular authority. This has been argued in Gerald Strauss’ *Luther’s House of Learning*.\(^{18}\) The development of the methods and infrastructures of learning that humanism contributed was a way for the state to better manage the populace. For Strauss, the education of the youth—or as he calls it “indoctrination”—was supposedly shown by the visitation records to ultimately be a failed project. But demonstrating the failure of the Lutheran efforts at catechesis is not his central interest. Rather, the ultimate significance of the Lutheran educational movement was that it represented a heretofore untried attempt among late medieval reform efforts which were aimed at elevating the cultural and moral standards of ordinary people. Of the dozens of reform movements of the Middle Ages, almost all of them, in spite of the efforts of various popes, involved religious orders, fraternities, and sororities.\(^{19}\) Failing that, it fell to

---

\(^{18}\) This thesis was debunked by Lewis Spitz when it debuted in 1972, see *The Pursuit of Holiness in Late Medieval and Renaissance Religion: Papers from the University of Michigan Conference*, ed. Charles Trinkaus and Heiko Oberman. (Leiden: Brill, 1974). Gerald Strauss pressed on with in a fuller study entitled *Luther’s House of Learning: Indoctrination of the Young in the German Reformation* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978). Similar arguments also appear in his study on Nuremberg, which looked at the city council’s interest in Lutheran anthropology as a way to forward their political agenda, and also his study on the reception of Roman law in the German lands. See, Gerald Strauss, *Nuremberg in the Sixteenth Century. New Dimensions in History: Historical Cities* (New York: Wiley and Sons, 1966); *Law, Resistance, and the State: The Opposition to Roman Law in Reformation Germany* (Princeton: Princeton University Prs, 1986).

governing authority to exert control over people who resisted or failed to show moral improvement.

In *Social Discipline in the Reformation*, R. Po-Chia Hsia examines the effect of the confessionalization of particular regions from the bottom up. He argues that the catechisms, used on the youngest members of society and in homes but which figured centrally in the schools, had great effect on the confessionalization of the territories. The effect of this on the universities was that they, too, became increasingly confessionalized. Their faculties of theology, as well as to some degree their overall curriculums, were affected by this trend, changing the character of universality that they had previously held.  

**Part II: Luther and Melanchthon at Wittenberg**

During the Reformation, Wittenberg stood as a prime example of an institution that implemented many of the changes noted thus far. It was founded in 1502 by Frederick the Wise with a charter that allowed for “the new establishment to provide for the study of the *scientiae, bonae artes* and *studia liberalia*: Included in the stated privileges of the university is the right to teach sacred theology.” Through the reform efforts of Luther and Melanchthon and also because of the commitment of their students, Wittenberg stood as the birthplace for a new educational paradigm that served as a pattern for other universities in the German lands. The elements of humanism were incorporated in different and important ways, especially with regard

---


to the study of theology. It is worth looking at some examples of the contributions of Luther and Melanchthon that were hallmarks of the program at Wittenberg and subsequently are seen clearly in Chytraeus’ approach in his *Regulae Studiorum*.

**Martin Luther**

More than two decades before Chytraeus enrolled at Wittenberg, Luther had begun to enact reforms and express ideas on education that had ripple-out and trickle-down effect, creating an environment for learning and providing ideas and presuppositions about education that, as a student, Chytraeus would have been immersed in.\(^{22}\) Lewis W. Spitz pointed out that “the percolation of an arts and humanism mentality into the theological faculties occurred just as it had been deliberately designed and planned by Luther, Melanchthon, Calvin, and the magisterial reformers.”\(^{23}\) Additionally, Luther’s evangelical theology provided a vitality and energy to such a curriculum, and benefitted in return, by emphasizing the connection between learning and piety.

As noted in the previous section concerning the conflict between the humanists and scholastics, the method for doing theology was extremely significant, and was vital in the shifting of Luther’s own theological paradigm. Helmar Junghans detailed the influence of Wittenberg humanists on Luther as he moved from reading Peter Lombard to the church fathers and the text of Scripture.\(^{24}\) Leif Grane has also shown that it was through exegesis, reading the text of Scripture, that Luther began to critically challenge the traditional scholastic approach and

\(^{22}\) For a thorough summary, see Fred P. Hall, “Influences of Luther’s Reforms,” in Ballor, *Church and School*, 49–66.


\(^{24}\) Helmar Junghans, *Der junge Luther und die Humanisten* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1985).
discover that it was incompatible with what the text actually said. He found it at odds with St. Paul and “consequently an obstacle to understanding the gospel.” Leif Grane, “Luther and Scholasticism,” in Harran, Luther and Learning, 52–68, 56. See also Brian Cummings, The Literary Culture of the Reformation: Grammar and Grace (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002).

Luther went on to press for an overhaul of the curriculum that promoted a theological methodology centered around the text of Scripture itself while at the same time rejecting scholasticism. But this did not mean that Luther completely shook off the vestiges of scholasticism such as the intellectual rigor or the terminology, least of all from his own person. Realistically, it is virtually impossible to change everything—and as language or concepts were still serviceable, there was no reason to abandon them. The matter of scholasticism and its fate in the curriculum would be dealt with more closely by Melanchthon as time wore on.

James Kittelson underscores the importance of the person of Luther for advancing humanist reforms at Wittenberg saying that “Luther did the one thing that the humanists could never accomplish, he institutionalized their educational ideals in both the lower schools and the universities.” That is the ripple-out and trickle-down impact. Kittelson highlights three ways this happened beginning with Luther’s personal push for reform at Wittenberg, a phenomenon that created a chain reaction across Germany. Next was the toppling of Catholic institutions within the territory, the monasteries and convents, which were dissolved to provide the necessary capital for the creation of an educational infrastructure. Finally, Luther provided personal leadership in the reform. In this third area lay the problem for future relations with the humanists—Luther’s theology.

___


26 James Kittelson, “Luther the Educational Reformer,” in Luther and Learning, 95–114, 98.

Despite differences with the scholastics over the tools that the liberal arts offered or their place in the curriculum, they were not necessarily in fundamental disagreement with humanists oriented toward Rome over key theological issues. Some humanists were not privy to using new learning to overthrow the church. Humanism was not the only factor in their thinking. Some sought to use new learning not to alter, but to reinforce Rome’s teaching, ascending the same mountain up a different face.²⁸ But theology is a significant point of departure for Luther.²⁹ His most basic critique of scholastic theology, as Lewis W. Spitz pointed out, was that “they do not weigh the seriousness of sin as heavily as they should … the scholastics follow Aristotle instead of the Scriptures … Aristotle bases sinfulness and righteousness and the extent of their actualization on what a person does.”³⁰ As Notger Slenczka has shown, Luther also rejected the Aristotelian anthropological assumptions that such a view built on. Rather than simply defining what it means to be human as a rational animal as in philosophy, Luther presented a theological definition that understood human beings in light of their source, who they are before God [hominem justificari fide]. Not a rejection of philosophy, but a fuller definition that put man in light of the narrative of salvation.³¹ As such, man in his sin cannot critically evaluate himself. This same critique generally held true regarding the anthropological assumptions of Rome-oriented humanists such as Erasmus. They neither knew nor understood the depths of sin or the


²⁹ As Timothy Dost has shown, Luther employed the tools that humanism had to offer to an end that reflects his theological and anthropological concerns. Timothy Dost, Renaissance Humanism in Support of the Gospel in Luther’s Early Correspondence: Taking all Things Captive (Burlington: Ashgate, 2001).


boundlessness of grace—greatly overestimating human potential—and therefore what it meant to be fully human. Obviously this affected how they understood education’s starting point as well as ultimate purpose. Where Luther emphasizes *Christus exemplar*, or the original acting upon a subject, and the implication that the reality of that truth imparts, Rome’s humanists were interested in a *Christus exemplum*, Christ as model to imitate, and what sorts of values could be taught in fostering attitudes of Christ-like behavior. This is also seen in the fact that Luther was interested in true doctrine as pedagogical material, as opposed to only examples of virtue that appeared in the good letters.\(^3\)

As a result, Luther attributed different values to education. Rather than its chief value serving the individual, Luther emphasized how the learned might better serve their neighbor both through their vocations, and as members of the community at large. In his study on Luther’s contribution to education, Gustav Bruce singled out three important Luther treatises on education. *Address to the German Nobility* (1520), *Letter to the German Councilmen in behalf of Christian Schools* (1524), and his *Sermon on Sending Children to School* (1530) all discuss the benefits of an educated society for both the church and the land.\(^4\) Luther points to ancient Roman education as producing competent virtuous men who benefited their country. “Their system,” Luther says in *Letter to the German Councilmen*, “produced intelligent, wise, and competent men, so skilled in every art and rich in experience that if all the bishops, priests, and monks in the whole of Germany today were rolled into one, you not have the equal of a single


\(^4\) The included sermon was intended as a treatise on a particular subject, rather than a preached sermon. Gustav Bruce, *Luther as an Educator* (Eugene: Wipf and Stock, 2002).
Roman soldier.” The main themes of this letter—that languages and reading both illuminate Scripture as well as ornament the human experience, and that learning is not the cause of piety, but enriches faith nonetheless by allowing human beings to more richly experience the gifts God has given them and better serve their neighbors—also thoroughly resonate throughout Chytraeus’ *Regulae*.

**Philip Melanchthon**

Melanchthon’s influence on Wittenberg’s curriculum, as well as that of many other institutions, was profound. He was one of the most influential educators of the sixteenth-century. Melanchthon served as a helmsman for incorporating the implications of Luther’s theology into practice in the curriculum, and he left behind a very concrete and developed pedagogical model and approach for his students to employ and adapt in their particular circumstances it around Germany. William Woodward, after Frederick Paulson, calls Melanchthon’s humanism the “nationalistic sort.” Leo Stern underscores Melanchthon’s efforts as representing the pinnacle of the synthesis between the Reformation and humanism. These are

---

34 Martin Luther, “Address to the Councilmen of All Cities in Germany that They Establish and Maintain Christian Schools,” *LW*, 45: 339–78. This is an interesting comparison—the most literate and cultured class Luther’s audience could conceive compared to one of the most illiterate and base classes they could conceive of, whose very salvation was in question. But at the time it was a question pressing enough that Luther, and Erasmus actually wrote on the subject. Martin Luther, “Whether Soldiers too can be saved,” *LW*, 46: 89–147; and Desiderius Erasmus, *Enchiridion militis Christiani* (1501), ed. Anne M. O’Donnell (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981).


37 Leo Stern, “Philip Melanchthon als Praeceptor Germaniae,” in *Philip Melanchthon als Praeceptor Germaniae* (Nieuwkoop: De Graf, 1964). See also Thomas Töpfér, “Philipp Melanchthons Loci communes:
all traits of the teacher are found in many of his students, especially Chytraeus. Chytraeus’ biographer Otto Schütz proposed that it would not be an error to say that Chytraeus was like a second Philip, having so absorbed the character, learning, and habits of Melanchthon that it was as if he had been born from him. In fact, Melanchthon does seem to be reflected in Chytraeus’ work through its overall form, structure and methodological approach, and his name appears frequently in Chytraeus’ pedagogical writing.

Melanchthon is remembered, among other things, for navigating the tricky course between philosophy and theology, and for his use of the former in service to the latter. Such was not without its difficulties, making his efforts an easy target for those looking to explain his apparent doctrinal capitulations, and his confusing or ambiguous language when it came to handling controversy. But the overall impact of his approach for the shape of the curriculum, as well as the formation of many of the graduates is without doubt. And although many of Melanchthon’s former students would become his critics, they, too, profited from his system of learning.

Melanchthon’s use of dialectic (and its close relationship to rhetoric) in carrying out the task of learning and teaching stands as one key to understanding his approach to all of the arts, especially theology, at Wittenberg. He writes

Paul taught the handling of the Word of God correctly. How can somebody do this, who does not know the correct method of distinguishing and systematizing things?

---

38 Schütz, De Vita, 30–31. “Hinc alterum quasi Philippum qui Chytraeum suo modo dixerit, non multum errabit; adeo optime et ingenium et studia et mores Praeceptoris cum discipuli conspirabant indole, ut alter propter alterum natus videretur.”


40 Robert Kolb, “Philipp’s Foes, but Followers Nonetheless: Late Humanism among the Gnesio-Lutherans,” in The Harvest of Humanism in Central Europe: Essays in Honor of Lewis W. Spitz, ed. Manfred P. Fleischer (St. Louis: Concordia, 1992), 159–78. See also Timothy Wengert “Reform of the Theological Curriculum,” in Ballor, Church and School, 17–34.
What can be more monstrous for the doctrines of the Church than mixing and muddling heterogeneous things such as the doctrine of Law and Gospel, the spiritual and the civil duties, the sacraments and the sacrifices? Without a frequent and well timed practice of dialectics no one can study these things with sufficient safety.\textsuperscript{41}

This attitude about dialectic as a tool for properly investigating, learning, and then teaching a subject was ubiquitous in his work during his career at Wittenberg. He composed several textbooks on dialectic (emphasizing its connection to rhetoric) such as \textit{De rhetorica libri tres} (1519), the \textit{Compendaria dialectices ratio} (1520), \textit{Institutiones Rhetoricae} (1521), \textit{Dialecticae libri quatuor} (1528), and \textit{Erotemata dialectices} (1547).\textsuperscript{42}

The importance that Melanchthon ascribed to dialectic was intertwined with his theology. Dialectic’s role in the task of doing theology is illustrated early on through what was essentially a precursor to a Lutheran systematic theology textbook, the \textit{Loci communes} (1521). This was an analysis of the topics and argument in Romans. In his study of St. Paul’s epistle, Melanchthon recognized Paul’s argument as a work of rhetoric with justification providing a central proposition \textit{[scopus]} for the interpreting all Scripture as well as laying out a way to organize, present, teach, and preach Christian doctrine.\textsuperscript{43} A distinct feature of Melanchthon’s overall approach to learning and investigation was this sort of rhetorical analysis. He approached biblical exegesis as a literary corpus that could be interpreted by means of a well-defined \textit{scopus}.\textsuperscript{44}


\textsuperscript{42} For an analysis of these works see Peter Mack, “Melanchthon,” in \textit{Renaissance Argument: Valla and Agricola in the Traditions of Rhetoric and Dialectic} (Leiden: Brill, 1993), 320–33.

\textsuperscript{43} John Schneider writes that “[Melanchthon] believed the \textit{scopus} must be more than just a point of orientation for the whole. For him, it most generally was the thesis, the terms of which must be handled dialectically, its proposition then paced within a rhetorical structure that made it the inference of on or more arguments.” John Schneider, “Melanchthon’s Rhetoric As a Context for Understanding His Theology,” in Maag, \textit{Melanchthon in Europe}, 141–60, 152.

\textsuperscript{44} Schneider, “Melanchthon’s Rhetoric,” in Maag, \textit{Melanchthon in Europe}, 154. Schneider points out that Melanchthon “did not imagine Scripture, conceptually, as a single, uniform writing, but as being a kind of
the humanities could be approached in this way. This translated to an approach to the arts that emphasized learning and teaching. Especially with regard to Christian doctrine one notes a concern for the communication of theological knowledge, preaching and teaching, not to mention the defense of true doctrine.\footnote{Robert Kolb has emphasized the didactic nature of Melanchthon’s approach in the \textit{Loci} saying that the “ordering the topics itself began the teaching process which was designed to lead them to think about conveying the message in preaching and teaching from Biblical text to hearers’ ears and hearts.”\footnote{Robert Kolb, “The Ordering of the Loci Communes Theologici: The Structuring of the Melanchthonian Dogmatic Tradition,” \textit{Concordia Journal} 23 (1997): 317–37, 325.} Such an approach was also expressly a foundational part of the theological statutes of 1533 that emphasized the teaching of pure doctrine, stating “We have established this teaching to be the true and perpetual consensus of the catholic church of God, to be piously and faithfully put forth, conserved and propagated.”\footnote{Quoted in Timothy J. Wengert, “Philip Melanchthon and Wittenberg’s Reform of the Theological Curriculum,” in Ballor, \textit{Church and School}, 17–34, 20.} Theological knowledge must be communicated through preaching and teaching. The necessity of communication carried over as a key element in Chytraeus’ overall approach as well.

The importance for dialectical/rhetorical analysis in theology and for relationship between Melanchthon’s theological perspectives and corresponding methodology influenced his overall attitudes about philosophy and the tools that it offered. This essentially functioned as a norm for properly orienting oneself toward the whole of philosophy. On theological grounds Melanchthon purposeful literary tradition (similar to that of the classics), the deepest meaning and purpose of which was illumined by its greatest orators. Melanchthon’s notion of Scripture (in the relevant doctrinal senses), then, had Paul’s rhetoric as the literal scopus of the whole. In that deeper sense, it was the whole. But in also had the rest—the diverse laws, histories, sayings and songs—as parts that were always in a dynamic relation to the center.

\footnote{Melanchthon’s use of rhetoric and dialectic shows especially in how he constructs propositions explicating and defending theology, as Charles Arand has shown in his analysis of Article IV. Melanchthon employed the same procedure in crafting his argument there as he taught in his own textbooks. Charles Arand, “Melanchthon’s Argument for Sola Fide in the Apology,” \textit{Lutheran Quarterly} 14 (2000): 280–308.}
had in his early years at Wittenberg agreed with Luther that Aristotle had nothing to offer in theology and ought to be excluded from the curriculum, even going as far as removing him from his own textbooks on rhetoric and grammar.\textsuperscript{48} Given the link between theology and the communication skills, such a move might well be expected. And yet, as John Schneider notes, Melanchthon’s early criticisms of philosophy “are not as severe as they sound.”\textsuperscript{49} For instance the “claim contained in his metaphor that philosophy was blind (rhetorically powerful as it was to his fellows) actually entailed the secondary one that philosophy saw basic things, especially in ethics, remarkably well.” This illustrates Melanchthon’s distinction between philosophy and theology in action. As Schneider points out, the distinction between the powers was possible because of Melanchthon’s approach to theology, working from the perspective that “it was the \textit{scopus} of Christian doctrine that counted as its essence, gave Scripture its qualities of unity, clarity and force—in sum, the most basic qualities contained in the expression, \textit{sola scriptura}.” And, with the distinction between theology and philosophy clearly made, “there could be no principled objection to placing “orations” of human culture in (emergency) service of Christ.”\textsuperscript{50} Tools and sources of philosophy, when used correctly, lent accuracy and precision.

Another angle of Melanchthon’s hallmark insistence on the necessity of precision in debate is shown by looking at his political rhetoric. Nicole Kuropka notes that Melanchthon’s funeral orations for Frederick the Wise and Martin Luther portray both men as ideal examples of statesmen.\textsuperscript{51} They did not exercise their authority by acting like tyrants but as orators whose

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
\bibitem{kuropka2011} Nicole Kuropka, “Melanchthon between Renaissance and Reformation: from Exegesis to Political Action,”
\end{thebibliography}
success was a result of the power and clarity of their ideas and speech. Kuropka notes that these were not typical laudatory orations but rather were specific arguments about the character of the men, delivered in moments of crises sparked by their deaths and were meant to exhort hearers to embrace a particular educational ideal as one that might secure both theology and politics.52

This ideal, as Kuropka has shown elsewhere, went along with Melanchthon’s evolving attitudes about the role of philosophy and the place of Aristotle in the curriculum. This reintegration was possible on account of Melanchthon’s conscious Law/Gospel approach that distinguished theology and philosophy and provided a methodology for both. His use of Aristotle was based on practical benefits such as how the philosopher aided clear thinking, learning, and speaking, not to mention his contributions in the realm of political thought. Kuropka argues that establishing a theological methodology not based in Aristotle was a necessary first step toward reintegrating him in the curriculum. But there were practical difficulties associated with Aristotle’s dismissal as Melanchthon witnessed during the 1520s. Dialectic and ethics suffered from the lack of methodological rigor that Aristotle could have provided—benefits that could be applied to all subjects including theology, and incorporated into a general methodology.53 Melanchthon observed that ecclesiastical struggles were caused by “a deficient orientation toward Holy Scripture and a complete lack of linguistic precision in such controversies.” Nevertheless Aristotle was not permitted to transgress the grounds of theological knowledge.54

in Maag, Melanchthon in Europe, 161–72.

52 Kuropka, “Melanchthon between Renaissance and Reformation,” in Maag, Melanchthon in Europe, 170.


54 Kuropka, “Philip Melanchthon and Aristotle,” in Dingel, Philip Melanchthon, 23. Kuropka states that “Aristotle is the primary master of theoretical knowledge, Cicero is the master of practical knowledge, and Paul is the master of theological knowledge!”
In her study on his natural philosophy, Sachiko Kusukawa shows how such a reorientation played out through Melanchthon’s approach, arguing that he essentially developed a Lutheran natural philosophy for Wittenberg.\textsuperscript{55} Natural philosophy, like his theological methodology and his dialectic, proceeded from a distinction of Law and Gospel.\textsuperscript{56} Understanding Law and Gospel as a starting point, as Kusukawa finds, is a far more fruitful way to approach the question of Melanchthon’s orientation toward natural philosophy than those that attempt to draw “an artificial line between science and religion.”\textsuperscript{57} On the other hand, she notes that the impetus behind his work was not an attempt to answer religious questions or, like the scholastics, to bolster Christian doctrine.\textsuperscript{58} Rather, his natural philosophy yet again reflects a desire for a methodology that promotes clarity of thinking and communication in all subjects. It was meant to defend the Gospel, both from the inferior methodology of the sects as well as from the dangers caused from political instability. Kusukawa states that “for Melanchthon, natural philosophy was a strong defense for Luther’s cause in that it provided a powerful argument against civil disobedience, an issue which Melanchthon believed with personal conviction to be jeopardizing their quest for Reform. Law was not Gospel, but it was necessary for establishing the message of the Gospel.”\textsuperscript{59}

\textsuperscript{55} Sachiko Kusukawa, \textit{The Transformation of Natural Philosophy: The Case of Philip Melanchthon} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995).

\textsuperscript{56} Kusukawa, \textit{The Transformation of Natural Philosophy}, 27. Kusukawa notes, “it is only as part of the larger movement of the Reformation that we may understand the attitudes of Luther and Melanchthon toward the teaching of natural philosophy.”

\textsuperscript{57} Kusukawa, \textit{The Transformation of Natural Philosophy}, 204.

\textsuperscript{58} Kusukawa, \textit{The Transformation of Natural Philosophy}, 202.

\textsuperscript{59} Kusukawa, \textit{The Transformation of Natural Philosophy}, 202.
Conclusion

The Wittenberg reformers established a perspective toward theology and the arts for navigating and learning them. Humanism’s successful incursion into the upper faculties put the emphasis on reading the literature of the original sources, as scholastic inquiry was replaced by a textual and grammatical emphasis with a view toward oratory. But the needs and pressures of society also facilitated this move. It was not simply a methodological in-house shift. Local politics played a role as orators themselves became more in-demand than they previously had been. Confessions of those in authority also played a role as princes and councils enlisted humanists to help promote their particular interests.

At Wittenberg, Melanchthon worked with Luther to develop and cultivate a curriculum that was meant to promote accurate thinking and skilled communicators. Rhetoric and dialectic were to guide the student in learning and then in applying and communicating a given subject. Preaching and teaching were goals that provided an orientation for learning from beginning to end. Wittenberg theology stood as an example of such a method by proceeding with justification by faith as a scope for the entire enterprise of theology. Students learned to read and communicate Scripture in a Law and Gospel way. This in turn gave meaning to the other subjects in the curriculum directed toward a better understanding of Scripture—knowledge of Astronomy, for example allowed for the reader to understand the references to the heavens in the Psalms for instance—as well as the practical knowledge that the providential gift that the subject provided for daily life. All of these elements may be seen threading their way through Chytraeus’ approach in the *Regulae Studiorum*. The focus shifts now to the next generation of humanists, sketching out Chytraeus’ early work at Rostock.
CHAPTER THREE
DAVID CHYTRAUEUS

Introduction

While an updated, detailed biography of David Chytraeus certainly might offer much, especially for providing a context for examining his role as a churchman and school organizer in the later years of his life, such a task is beyond the scope of this dissertation. It is enough to offer a very brief sketch of his early education and early work, and discuss his character, in order to continue fleshing out a backdrop upon which to examine the *Regulae Studiorum*. Otto Krabbe’s narrative of Chytraeus’ life and work during the restructuring of Rostock shows that the *Regulae* grew out of his early work, both in the academy and through his efforts to reform the curriculum at the University. In fact, the majority of his more well-known pedagogical texts were also published during this time—his first two decades in Rostock. Frequent mention of his Tübingen or Wittenberg professors in the *Regulae* also suggests that his student days were still fresh on his mind and that perhaps the sources for portions of the *Regulae* were notes that Chytraeus collected during his own student years at Tübingen, Heidelberg, and Wittenberg. This small slice of the larger biographical context is the most helpful for assessing the *Regulae Studiorum*.

Education

Born into the family of a Lutheran pastor, David was the first of Matthäus and Barbara (nee Neuberger) Kochhaffé’s eight children.¹ At the time of his birth, Matthäus had been serving a

parish in Ingelfingen, a predominantly Catholic village near Schwäbisch-Hall. The imperial edict to reinstate the Mass saw him and his family flee to Menzingen, a territory more congenial to the Reformation, after an attempt was made on his life by an irate imperial deputy during a sermon he preached on February 26, 1530. David was born later that day. Accounts of the incident describe his mother’s labor having been brought on by the terror of the attempted assassination of her husband.

Very little is known about his life before Rostock, and the existing accounts, which revolve almost entirely around his career as a student, are somewhat typical for those given for educators during the time. On the other hand, knowing the wide variety of the subjects that he studied alongside theology helps one understand the breadth of later encyclopedic interests. His precocious intellect may be illustrated by his rapid progress through school. At the tender age of seven he began study in the Latin school at Gemingen under the sponsorship of Peter von Mentzingen, a man to whom he felt he owed a great deal throughout his life. He began studying basic grammar local clergymen, first with the pastor Wolfgang Busius, and quickly moved on to more advanced courses in Latin, similar readings from Cicero and Sallust with pastor Franz Friedlieb. Chytraeus matriculated into the University of Tübingen at age nine. Under the humanists Joachim Camerarius and Melchior Volmar, he studied the Roman classics, Greek, and was introduced to the New Testament. The famous Aristotelian Jakob Schegk led him through Aristotle, Natural history, and Physics. Erhard Schnepf was especially influential in grounding Chytraeus in evangelical theology. A Magister artium at fifteen, the next stop along his

---

2 His families sponsor in Mentzingen, Chytraeus very nearly left Rostock to offer his services in gratitude for the care his family had received from Peter when he was younger, as well as the support that count had provided him during his education.


academic path was the University of Wittenberg, at the time the center of the Reformation movement in Germany.

With a letter from Georg Schwarzerd to his brother Philip Melanchthon, a letter from Johann Brenz to Luther, and a stipend from his family’s longtime benefactor Peter of Menzingen, the now fourteen-year-old Chytraeus made his way to Wittenberg in 1544.\footnote{Fuchs, “David und Nathan Chytraeus,” in Glaser, \textit{David und Nathan Chytraeus}, 33–46, 34.} During the two years before the university closed for the Schmalkaldic war, Melanchthon encouraged his study of Aristotle, natural philosophy, and medicine. He surveyed classical literature and natural philosophy with Paul Eber. Erasmus Reinholdus grounded his understanding of the connection between mathematics and astronomy. From Luther he heard a sampling the Genesis lectures.\footnote{Krabbe, \textit{David Chytäus}, 16–19.}

In 1546 the Wittenberg disbanded during the war, so Chytraeus, like many others, left the University for refuge in another city. For a semester he was guest at Heidelberg, where he took up study of the classical literature with Jakob Micyll, honing his knowledge of Greek and Latin, and developing a thorough knowledge of the authors.\footnote{Krabbe, \textit{David Chytäus}, 24.} He studied theology with Henricus Stolus, one of the only Lutherans on the faculty, and a man Chytraeus remembered later as a theologian of true piety, excelling in learnedness and dignity.\footnote{Krabbe, \textit{David Chytäus}, 25–26. See also Schütz, \textit{De Vita}, 45–47.} Chytraeus spent the next semester in Tübingen, an institution more congenial to Chytraeus’ theology, where he sat under the theologian Erhard Schnepf, and studied mathematics and astronomy under Philipp Imser.\footnote{Krabbe, \textit{David Chytäus}, 24; \emph{Orationes}, 448. “multis annis doctrinae coelestis studia in ea schola rexit Henricus Stolo, theologus vera pietate, doctrina et grauitate excellens.”}
Krabbe points out that although the natural sciences were still in their infancy, it was on account of scholars such as Melanchthon, that the natural sciences conceivably could coexist with theology and support a Christian worldview. Chytraeus adopted this viewpoint as well.\(^\text{10}\)

The final leg of Chytraeus’ education came as he both studied and taught his way up the B.A/M.A ladder during his final days at Wittenberg. When conditions at the university improved in 1548, Chytraeus returned and began lecturing on various subjects per Melanchthon’s recommendations. Melanchthon arranged for his first lectures to be held on the *Loci*, in private, to only four students. But word quickly spread of his abilities and during his remaining time at Wittenberg the numbers began to grow and he broadened his offerings to rhetoric and astronomy.\(^\text{11}\)

**Luther and Melanchthon**

Of the two great luminaries of Wittenberg, as Chytraeus referred to Luther and Melanchthon, he was personally far closer to Melanchthon than Luther. This is not surprising considering that Luther died shortly after Chytraeus’ enrolled at Wittenberg. Chytraeus had the opportunity to hear only the lectures on the last eleven chapters of Genesis and some of Luther’s sermons. However, Otto Krabbe writes that such brief exposure had a lasting effect however, particularly with regard to Luther’s interpretation of Scripture.\(^\text{12}\) One especially memorable sermon was delivered by Luther during the Christmas season in 1545. Especially striking for

---

\(^\text{10}\) Krabbe, *David Chyträus*, 27. “Bei Melanthon macht sich die Überzeugung geltend, daß die kosmische und tellurische Naturforschung wohl mit der Theologie zusammengehen könne, da kosmische und astronomische Kenntnisse nur dazu dienen könnten, die christliche Weltanschauung zu stützen. Diese Auffassung eignete sich Chyträus an, und mit dieser ging er unbefangen auf naturwissenschaftliche Studien ein, so weit überhaupt in dieser Periode einer rein äußeren Empirie, die zugleich von aristotelischer Denkweise bedingt wird, davon die Rede sein kann.”


\(^\text{12}\) Krabbe, *David Chyträus*, 17.
Chytraeus was Luther’s emphasis on the Son of God being born “for us,” and the implications that entailed.\footnote{Orationes, 656. “Ita Lutherum memini, cum die natali Christi annum 1546 inchoante, dictum Esaiae, cap. 9: Puer natus est nobis, enarraret, bonam horae partem in expendendo pronomine Nobis consumere, ac tum multa alia de emphasi ac pondere verborum sacrae scripturae exquirendo, monere: tum vero summam universae Theologiae in pronominum vi et applicatione collocare, demum (inquit) vere Christianus et beatus erit Theologus, qui intelliget et certo credet, hunc puerum Nobis natum esse. Hunc dominum esse justitiam Nostram, peccata Sibi remitti.”} Luther’s influence on Chytraeus came more through his work at the University of Wittenberg, and the perspectives Luther left in his writing were more influential overall for Chytraeus than in-person contact.

An entirely different story arises concerning Melanchthon. They were close from the moment of their first meeting that occurred in Melanchthon’s house, an account that has been often retold. Melanchthon was said to have handed the fourteen-year-old Chytraeus a copy of Thucydides in order to demonstrate to him that he indeed was a master of the arts, even at such a tender age. Encouraged, Chytraeus read the text, even explaining points of grammar along the way. Delighted with Chytraeus’ learning thus-far, Melanchthon told him that he indeed was a master, adding that he would be like a son to him.\footnote{Schütz, De Vita, 27. “Tu merito es Magister, et tu mihi filii loco eris.”} From this point on Chytraeus lived in Melanchthon’s house and ate at his table, while Melanchthon called him “my David.”\footnote{Krabbe, David Chytraeus, 15.}

Melanchthon’s influence on Chytraeus during his student years at Wittenberg is evident through his work with regard to his development as a humanist and theologian.\footnote{See also Stefan Rhein, “Ein Gruß aus Wittenberg: David Chytraeus und die Hausschule Melanchthons,” in David Chytraeus (1530–1600), 13–18; Rudolf Keller, “David Chytraeus (1530–1600),” in Scheible, Melanchthon in seinen Schulanern, 361–71.} As the architect of the Wittenberg curriculum, Melanchthon can be seen in the background of many of his students. Speaking generally, Chytraeus’ approach to the liberal arts follows Melanchthon’s model, understanding the arts in relation to their service to theology: grammar allows for the
interpretation of Scripture, rhetoric supports sermon writing, history benefits theology in terms of both understanding and application, and societal law dovetails with the Decalogue.\textsuperscript{17}

**Early Years at Rostock**

Despite numerous offers from other institutions, David Chytraeus would spend his entire career at the University of Rostock.\textsuperscript{18} He was highly instrumental in the reform process there, serving as both a professor and administrator. He lectured on theology and history, developed curriculums for home and elsewhere, and between 1563 and 1597 was elected as rector six times.\textsuperscript{19} Under his leadership the university prospered and became an important outlet for the Lutheran Reformation to the north and east.\textsuperscript{20}

Beginning with his lectures in 1551, Chytraeus spent his first ten years in the Academy of Rostock rather than the university proper, helping to establish a Melanchthonian curriculum at the request of Dukes Ulrich and Johann Albrecht.\textsuperscript{21} This was a prolific period of pedagogical writing. The seeds of numerous important works began to germinate during this time, growing from lectures delivered during the decade spent at the Academy. He was also witness to bitter theological controversy, at the center of which stood his mentor, Melanchthon. The structure and content of the *Regulae Studiorum* suggests that these factors combined to shape Chytraeus’ own approach to forging a Melanchthonian curriculum. While Chytraeus worked to establish the

\textsuperscript{17} Krabbe, *David Chytраus*, 26.


\textsuperscript{19} Toward the end of his life he referred to his duties, especially as rector in a lighthearted manner. In 1597, following his final election as rector, he ended a letter saying, “Bene et foeliciter vale, 21. Aprilis, cum quadriruduo ante, denuo me famulum communem Academiae, quem Rectorem nominant, collegae elegissent.” *Epistolae*, 930.

\textsuperscript{20} See Otfried Czaika, *David Chytраus und die Universität Rostock*; and Daniel Benga, *David Chytraeus (1530–1600) als Erforscher und Wiederentdecker*.

\textsuperscript{21} Krabbe, *David Chytраus*, 41.
method he had learned from Melanchthon, his personal distaste for controversy and the needs of the University of Rostock nuanced his approach, leading to some of the Regulae’s pedagogical and theological characteristics.

A particularly important oration that would be reprinted numerous times and would later even be included in modified form in the Regulae Studiorum was Chytraeus’ Antrittsrede entitled De studio theologia, exercitiis verae pietatis et virtutis potius quam contentionibus et rixis disputationum colendo. Delivered on April 21, 1551, it was well received by the Academy’s senior faculty members who, instead of complaining about the young age of the new docent, proclaimed that what Chytraeus expressed gave them hope for a better school.22 This inaugural oration illustrates two guiding principles in Chytraeus’ approach. First, he argues that if one presents a case clearly and carefully and in truth and piety, they will be more successful in winning over their opponents than they would be if the discussion were to devolve into a shouting match. Second, the issues up for debate must be carefully selected, so as not to encourage vague speculation or discord among the opponents.23 Such a perspective was quite unique in an age when it was common for interlocutors on all sides of an issue to publish stinging retorts to their opponent’s arguments, and allow debates to veer off course, or devolve into shouting matches. But Chytraeus’ outlook fit in well with the aims of the Dukes of Mecklenburg, who perceived internecine feuding among Lutherans as a threat not only to the

---

22 As quoted in Schütz, De Vita, 66. “Haec principa spem nobis faciunt scholae melioris. Quae insignia dona in hoc juvene Magistro, tunc annum duntaxat unum et vigesimum nato, efficiebant, ut nemo illum propter juvenilem aetatem contempi haberet.” Otto Krabbe contends that the oration allows one to see both Chytraeus’ own position on the matter as well as his reaction to contemporary struggles. Krabbe, David Chyträus, 48.

23 As will be discussed in Chapter 8, even though this oration was understood by biographers to be his earliest oration at Rostock, it is very likely that the existing published version was amended at a later date and thus incorporates a future perspective as well.
Gospel, but the stability of the lands they ruled.\textsuperscript{24} Chytraeus’ oration, eventually bound together with two later ones, \textit{Oratio de studio theologiae recte inchoando}, and \textit{Oratio de studio theologiae cum omnibus caeterarum Artium studioiis coniungendo: habita in promotione Doctorum Theologae} would go through numerous printings throughout the sixteenth-century, and would stand as the entry on theology in the \textit{Regulae Studiorum}.

Several other lectures he delivered during this time would become published and made widely available. Notes from his lectures on Melanchthon’s \textit{Loci} became the basis of his catechism, his first published work. Printed first in 1554 without Chytraeus’ knowledge or permission, the catechism would carry on through numerous editions and printings over the course of the century with wide dissemination.\textsuperscript{25} Next came his \textit{Regulae Vitae}, a Lutheran ethics based on Melanchthon’s approach to the subject, with commonplaces organized under the Decalogue. \textit{Regulae Vitae} was reviewed by Melanchthon and published first in Wittenberg in 1555. Lectures from this decade on Genesis, Zachariah, Malachi, Matthew, the Petrine Epistles, John, and Revelation also eventually became published commentaries.\textsuperscript{26} Outside of his exegetical work he also lectured on the histories of Herodotus and Thucydides, work that would also later be found as published commentaries.\textsuperscript{27} Finally, to meet the needs of incoming students, as

\textsuperscript{24} For an in-depth look at the state of the church in Mecklenburg during Chytraeus’ time, see Gary Michael Miller, “The Lutheran State Church in Mecklenburg, 1549–1621” (Ph.D. Diss., Yale University, 1998).

\textsuperscript{25} Krabbe says, Die Catechesis ist in so vielen Ausgaben erschienen, daß dieselben kaum jetzt noch zu übersehen sind. Concerning their content says “Ueberall führt die Catechesis gesunde lutherische Lehre im Anschluß an die heilige Schrift und das Bekenntnis der Kirche; die \textit{Loci} Melanthons sind bei ihrer Abfassung wesentlich benutzt, und hat dieser Umstand, sowie die Deutlichkeit, Uebersichtlichkeit und Präcision ihrer Lehrentwicklung nicht wenig dazu beigetragen, ihr die weite Verbreitung in der lutherischen Kirche zu verschaffen, deren sie sich fast während eines ganzen Jahrhunderts zu erfreuen gehabt hat.” Krabbe, \textit{David Chytäus}, 46. See also Schütz, \textit{De Vita}, 101 ff.

\textsuperscript{26} Pressel, \textit{David Chytäus}, 10–11; Krabbe, \textit{David Chytäus}, 50 ff.

\textsuperscript{27} David Chytraeus, \textit{Chronologia Historiae Herodoti & Thucididis} (Rostochij 1562). For a discussion of the series of lectures see Klatt, \textit{David Chytäus}, 31–32.
Krabbe notes, he began assembling lectures on method and the liberal arts. This work, as noted earlier, was published initially under the title *Regulas de Ratione Discendi et Ordine Studiorum* in 1563 and would eventually be retitled *Regulae Studiorum* much later.  

The Regulae Studiorum

The background context for the *Regulae Studiorum* began during Chytraeus’ time at the academy in the 1550’s to meet specific needs that he observed at Rostock. Otto Krabbe’s narration of the school reforms from the late 1550’s to early 1560’s show a steady increase in the momentum of the restructuring process that culminated in the 1563 Formula of Concord, an agreement between the dukes and the city of Rostock over finances and the future of University with the adoption of new school statutes. Central to Krabbe’s description of the process is the close relationship that Chytraeus held with Duke Johann Albrecht of Mecklenburg. Albrecht believed that he was obligated to support the University both to promote education and strengthen the life of the church in his territory. Chytraeus was a strong supporter in the matter.  

For Johann Albrecht and his coregent Ulrich, reforming the university went hand in hand with their efforts to finish the reform of Mecklenburg, a endeavour made finally possible with the deaths of the old guard—the more conservative Duke Heinrich and Duke Albrecht. These men had slowly introduced the Lutheran reformation in Mecklenburg over the course of two decades, but much was left to be done, including the dissolution of the existing Roman church and the

---


distribution of its traditional endowments. Duke Johann Albrecht and his brother Ulrich moved quickly to finish what their predecessors had begun, and restructuring the University was an important part of that process. The Dukes saw the University as filling the need, as Krabbe writes, for supplying churches and schools with godly and learned men, and contributing to the common order believed necessary for the structure and maintenance of the church. Chytraeus and other faculty members tasked with the project understood the goals in light of the spirit of the Reformation.  

Chytraeus embraced his role in carrying out this reform, not only rejecting offers elsewhere, but authoring works that directly supported the effort to build up Rostock.  

In 1555 Duke Albrecht of Prussia and Johann Albrecht of Mecklenburg settled an agreement that essentially provided the basis for Rostock University’s financial stability, as well as stating its purpose. An endowment project finally settled in 1557 ensured the school financial stability, as the school had lost previous endowments allotted to it before it turned to the Reformation. As with elsewhere in the territory, secularization of Rome’s church properties around Rostock provided for a portion of the funding. In 1560, Emperor Ferdinand officially confirmed of the privileges of the university. Next, as a part of initiatives to rebuild the theological faculty, Chytraeus and his colleague Simon Pauli were both granted theological doctorates in 1561.  

Finally, the 1563 Formula of Concord provided legal ground for the University to enact its own reforms and develop more independently as an institution. This was significant because up to this

---

30 Krabbe, David Chytřáus, 78.

31 Krabbe, David Chytřáus, 58. A genuine desire, as he wrote to Albrecht after declining an offer to Heidelberg (that he very much desired to accept, that he would stay to work with his colleagues collecting the pieces of the sad shipwreck of the Academy until in it was whole again. “tamen hujus scholae studia pro mea tenuitate fouere et tanquam fractae navis tabulas una cum caeteris collegis ex tristi naufragio colligere pergam, donec integra instauratio Cels: V. authoritate, virtute et felicitate aliquando perficiatur.” In total he would reject fifteen offers to other universities. Roughly one-third of these offers were extended during his first ten years at Rostock.

32 Krabbe, David Chytřáus, 92.
point the laws that had governed the university bore the character of the Catholic church, even though members of all faculties had been Lutheran since the 1550s. Chytraeus was elected the first rector of this newly organized university on June 7, 1563.\(^3\)3

Being tasked with the restructuring of the theological faculty and overseeing the restructuring of the other faculties as well, Chytraeus understood the importance of a body of educators unified by a common confession of faith. His conception of the bonds that connected the faculties, as Krabbe writes, was not related by abstract commitments to education or ideas about learning, but concretely related by the content of Christian faith which in turn was to provide direction for the studies.\(^3\)4 This faith was expressed in the Symbolic Creeds, the Augsburg Confession, and the Schmalkald Articles.\(^3\)5 The core of the theological curriculum was readings from the Old and New Testament, Chytraeus’ \textit{Catechism}, Melanchthon’s \textit{Loci} and \textit{Examen Ordinarium} and the Augsburg Confession.\(^3\)6 Another factor that helped to establish harmony within the faculty was the requirement that admission to the theological faculty would require younger members to first serve for a period of time on the arts faculty. Chytraeus had done this, and believed that it “strengthened and fortified the consciousness of their unity.”\(^3\)7

As will be seen in the chapters that follow, the \textit{Regulae Studiorum} expresses the very values that Chytraeus articulated in the reform process, showing it to be a product of his reform efforts at the university. The \textit{Regulae} prescribes definitions and directions for learning, literally the rules of study, which were not only in accord with the Lutheran faith, but emphasized the

\(^{33}\) Krabbe, \textit{David Chytäus}, 163–64.

\(^{34}\) Krabbe, \textit{David Chytäus}, 171.

\(^{35}\) Krabbe, \textit{David Chytäus}, 166.

\(^{36}\) Krabbe, \textit{David Chytäus}, 169.

importance of theology for learning and living. Practically speaking, the *Regulae* helped to fortify the confessional unity of the faculties and students at Rostock. Both the contents and the general date of its initial publication support such a proposition, as they coincide with the watershed changes of instituting a new curriculum for a thoroughly Lutheran renovation of the university. Understanding the *Regulae Studiorum* in light of the narrative of university reform along confessionally Lutheran lines helps to explain Chytraeus’ arguments about goals of studies, as well his pattern of relating each individual subject back to the role it can play in understanding Scripture.

**Chytraeus’ Character**

Whether his attitude was natural and inborn or learned, Chytraeus was, and is still, known for his aversion to theological controversy. Several of his biographers have pointed to the irenic nature of his character as simply part of his personality. But it is just as likely that this aspect of his character developed as a strategy to navigate the internecine feuding that threatened to fracture the Lutheran church during the latter half of the sixteenth-century. In 1556 Duke Albrecht arranged for his theologians, Chytraeus included, to assist in a mediation attempt between Melanchthon and his former colleague and student Flacius. Remarking on the situation, Chytraeus admitted that reconciliation between their followers would likely be impossible during their lifetimes because the conflict had become personal. Chytraeus’ words were twisted, and Pressel recounts that Melanchthon was left in deep depression after believing that Chytraeus had said that Melanchthon needed to be removed to end the internecine Lutheran feuding. Against his better judgment, because he had a feeling that this particular approach would make the situation worse, Chytraeus reluctantly attended the Colloquy of Worms in the summer of 1557 to present theses aimed at mediation between Melanchthon and Flacius. Chytraeus watched the
reconciliation crumble as Melanchthon responded to the proposals of the colloquy by saying that he would rather die publically than be strangled by the decrees that were presented there.\textsuperscript{38} While certainly no friend of Melanchthon, the Lutheran historian Frederick Bente writes that colloquy was worse than a failure and “brought their quarrels to a climax.”\textsuperscript{39} On this point he was correct. Neither was resolution found the following year at the Frankfurt Recess. The failed colloquies widened the gulf not only between Melanchthon and Flacius, but between their followers as well.

The methods and rules proposed in the \textit{Regulae Studiorum} show that Chytraeus believed rancorous arguments to be unnecessary and unhelpful, even hurtful. With church concord and unity of doctrine as a goal, he preferred to keep himself under control in the heat of an argument and to restrict debate to issues that would not sow more conflict. The \textit{Regulae} teaches a certain selectiveness in what qualifies as appropriate subject matter for debate based on consistent rules, an approach was meant to snuff out the embers of potentially vicious quarrels before they could be fanned into the flames and prevent honest discussion. In the \textit{Regulae}, as will be seen, he teaches dialogue partners to be judicious both about the questions they raised as well as the nature of their dialogue—both judgments are important.

Outside of the \textit{Regulae}, this attitude is illustrated by his opinion on the orthodoxy of Melanchthon. He deliberately did not openly profess a doctrinal difference between Melanchthon and Luther. Several examples in his letters suggest that during his lifetime Chytraeus strove to teach that Melanchthon ought to be understood in light of established Lutheran doctrine, rather than attempting to highlight the apparent inconsistencies in this thought. Tearing apart Melanchthon by highlighting the apparent ambiguous, or conciliatory nature of his language was


\textsuperscript{39} F. Bente, \textit{Historical Introductions to the Lutheran Confessions} (St. Louis: Concordia, 2005), 560.
a tactic favored by Melanchthon’s opponents, but Chytraeus saw this as serving only serving to further divide the church and undermine Lutheran teaching. Chytraeus purposely expressed a reverence for Melanchthon’s teaching as equal to that of Luther’s.\(^{40}\) He considered them equal luminaries of both Wittenberg and the church.\(^{41}\) In the case of examples where there is a readily apparent distinction between their positions on an issue, such as free will, Chytraeus maintained that Luther and Melanchthon ought to be read just as the church fathers are read, understanding that naturally there will be differences between how they say things.\(^{42}\) For example, Chytraeus once explained Melanchthon’s lack of doctrinal clarity in his remarks on the Lord’s Supper by looking at the context in which they were made, saying that it was because Melanchthon was attempting to use language that would appeal to both the Zwinglians and the Lutherans regarding the Lord’s Supper.\(^{43}\) The push for unity on that point between the two groups would have been a

\(^{40}\) Epistolæ, 147. “Philippi nomen doctrinam et merita erga Ecclesiam non minus semper amau, colui, et veneratus sum, quam aliorum quisquam, et reuerenter sancteque colam viri Dei Lutheri et Philippi nomen et scripta, donec in his terris viuam et deinceps in omni aeternitate, nec ab hac sententia vnumquam discessi aut discedam. Deo gubernante ... quam toti Ecclesiae Filii Dei gratulor, quae tristissimo, et profundo gemitu, multos iam annos deprauationem preciosissimi et carissimi depositi sincerae doctrinae deploret, et vetitatem ac pacem, quae Lutheri et Philippi concordibus operis olim constituta floruit, in integrum restitu

\(^{41}\) Epistolæ, 240. “Vtinam vero status Ecclesiae, puritate doctrinae, optimarum artium studiis, pace et disciplina florentis, qualem duo lumina vestrae illius metropoleos et totius Ecclesiae clarissima, Lutherus et Philippus ad instaurationem purae Evangelii doctrinae et verae Philosophiae, diuinitus excitati, et donis ad rem tantam necessariae copiose Spiritui Dei sancto instructi et ornati, coniunctis operis olim constituenterunt; deinceps quoque ad ommem posteritatem salus maneant, et propagnetur. A similar statement is found in Epistolæ, 981. “Nam me non inimicum, nec quidquam hostile cogitantem vel agentem, atrocius quidam odorunt et grauioribus iniurii, quam vlos hostes insectantur, et sermones, literas, dicta et facta, mihi affingunt, de quibus nunquam in omni vita, ne per febrim quidem somniaui. Mediocri diligentia et fide studui in hac Sarepta summam verae doctrinae, quam Witebergæ praecipuerunt morum θεοδιδάξτων Lutheri et Philippi viua voce et scriptis explicatam didici, retinere et propagare.”

\(^{42}\) Epistolæ, 1114. “Alibi vero contrarium dicit, prout diuersae occasiones sese obtulerunt, sicut in nostrorum etiam praecipuorum Lutheri et Philippi scriptis diuersas de Libero Arbitrio, Praedestinatione, vsu alterius speciei et similibus sententias, diuersis temporibus editas esse scimus.”

\(^{43}\) Orationes, 1116. “Agnosco autem in posterioribus Philippi scriptis, bono hau dubie non impio concordiae studio, ita temperatam et ambidextram esse de hoc articulorum formam, vt vtrique parti inter se dissidenti accommodata et apta sit, nec a Cinglianis neque Lutheranis reici queat. Filium enim Dei vere et substantialiter in Coena praesentem esse, et vere ibi efficacem esse, et nos sibi membra adiungere, vtrinque conuenit. Verum non de filii Dei, aut Christi secundum Diuinatatem, nec da Efficacia sed de Essentiae corporis et sanguinis Christi vera et substantiali in his terris praesentia vtrinque litigatur.”
work in progress, and the language that Melanchthon used would not have been final, but representative of the goals and issues of the time. Thus, when in 1599 Chytraeus was commissioned to revise Melanchthon’s 1552 church order for Mecklenburg, he added a lengthy addendum on doctrine, explaining, rather than purging or rewriting Melanchthon’s work. Reflecting in 1594, Chytraeus admits that it did not seem desirable to blame Melanchthon for the controversies begun by hordes of heretics who held Luther as their standard after his death. Instead, he would rather focus on the good things that Melanchthon had accomplished, admitting that the other church fathers also have offensive elements to their writings and yet we ought to focus on what is clear rather than dispute about what is ambiguous.

Conclusion

This look at Chytraeus early life and character suggests some directions for interpreting the *Regulae Studiorum*. Chytraeus acted as helmsman for the Melanchthonian-type reforms that were instituted within the first few decades of his work in Rostock. He restructured the university on the basis of the Lutheran faith and put to work the theology and methods that he learned during his student years. His defense of Melanchthon served to encourage unity during unstable

---

44 Miller, “The Lutheran State Church in Mecklenburg,” 102–104.

45 Epistolae, 868–69. “Institutus sum a puero, in Augustanae confessionis doctrina, et Lutherum ac Philippum aliquot annos viua voce docentes, audiui, Philippi etiam domesticus fui, nec vllam eo tempore significationem, vllius a Lutherou (quem summa obseruantia, vt coram vidi, celebat) dissensionis animaduerti. Etsi autem post illius mortem, multa, prorsus a Lutheri et Augustanae confess. primum exhibitae sententia, toto cuelo dissidentia, quidam sub illius nomine summa contentione propagarunt: et Lutherum ac ipsius confessionem sequentes, Marcionitas, Eutychianos, Vbiquitistas, Manichaeos, Monophysitas, ac nescio, quarum non tetterimarum haereson reos, sub Flaccianorum nomine traduxerunt ... Nec mihi quidquam esset optatius, quam intra metas illas a Philippo constitutas, Docentes in templis et scholis se continere et doctrinam vtil. ad verae pietatis aedificationem, omissis argutis disputationium, quas ille prateriti, populo proponere, nec adeo odiose et tragice velut haeretica damnare, quae a Lutherou tradita, Philippus sibi nominatim damnanda esse non iudicauit. Eam docendi rationem in schola, cuius auditor aliquando fuisti, hactenus verecunde secutus sum, ac de excellentibus donis praestantisimorum in virtuque parte virorum, reuerenter perpetuus sensor ac locuius sum, et benemerita eorum erga Ecclesiam gratus celebri. Cumque in omnium patrum scriptis multa desideremus, et naeuous multo foediores et si pertinaciter defendentur, plane intolerabiles, pietati ipsorum et meritis erga Ecclesiam condonemus: cur non de praeeceptorum quoque nostrorum scriptis candide iudicare potius, quam ambigua in deteriorem partem detorque velimus.”
times. It also shows that Chytraeus was not easily distracted in controversy and swept away in endless pamphleteering. His first-hand experience in the doctrinal controversies of the time helped him to shape his own approach to dealing with contentious matters, skills that he passed on to his students. The early years were character-building times for Chytraeus, and as will be shown in subsequent chapters, the *Regulae Studiorum* embodies not only his Lutheran faith, but all that he had learned and taught as he worked to build and unify the University. Now in the next chapter, the focus shifts to examining *De Ratio Discendi*, as the *Regulae Studiorum* was originally called.
CHAPTER FOUR
DE RATIONE DISCENDI, ET ORDINE STUDIORUM RECTE INTITUENDO

Introduction

*De Ratione Discendi* is the original title of *Regulae Studiorum*. While it essentially referred to the whole work for the first three decades of print, it is also the title of Part I of the three-part *Regulae Studiorum*, the title the work appeared under beginning in 1592. *De Ratione* functions as prolegomena on the educational endeavor itself by establishing what it is one is learning and why one is learning it. This discussion ranges from how one subject may relate to another on the pedagogical continuum, to how it directly impacts the life of the church and the civil realm. All this is directed by what Chytraeus teaches is the ultimate goal of education—giving glory to God. Finally, with these considerations established, Chytraeus gives a preliminary treatment on how one ought to approach learning, a topic that is expanded in the remainder of the *Regulae*. This chapter will proceed by first offering a summary of the section and follow with an analysis of the central themes and ideas.

Summary

*De Ratione Discendi* is divided into two main sections: Useful Rules (*regulae vtiles*), and Concerning the Goal of Studies (*de fine studiorum*). *Regulae Utiles* functions as an introduction to the subject, discussing the relationship between the overall goal of education and the life of the Christian. At the end of the section Chytraeus provides a brief outline for direction and contents of the *Regulae Studiorum* as a whole. Having thus established the great importance of both the arts and method, Chytraeus then poses the problem that his text means to correct, namely that a great many students are beginning their courses of study without a method at all and thus are wandering blindly through a veritable labyrinth of learning. A diligent scholar, he
explains, is not one who works himself to the bone by approaching his studies without a plan, hearing various daily lectures without preparation and piling up notes, or reading through countless pages everyday while plowing through a whole assortment of authors. That is a lot of effort wasted. Rather, the diligent scholar is one who undertakes his studies with a careful plan. Specifically, what Chytraeus refers to as the goal \([\text{finem et metam}]\) affects and directs the selection of an appropriate plan or method \([\text{medium}]\) to which the student can then assiduously apply himself.\(^46\) The purpose of this book, continues Chytraeus, is precisely this: to assist young students with a simple course of study that provides an order for learning and a straight and direct route to sound erudition.\(^47\) Chytraeus presents a basic, four-part overview for student reference.

I. On the end and goal of study which the students ought to refer to in all labors of study.

II. On the means, which will lead them to the goal, correctly chosen and carefully prepared.

III. On a prepared plan of study formulated in each subject, and on the literature in each subject, which is to be especially read and is worth the effort to be diligently learned by the students before other things.

III\(\text{I}\.\) On the distribution of work and study at particular times and hours, in order that the labor of learning is minimized, certain variety, which does not hamper study, continually restores the mind.\(^48\)

---

\(^46\) *Regulae Studiorum* (Hereafter abbreviated as *RS*.), 4. “Plurimi enim in studiis sine certa ratione & ordine temere vagantes ... velut caeci viae ignari, per studiorum labyrinthos incerto motu errant, nec meta & finem studiorum optatum assequi unquam possunt. Est autem DILIGENS SCHOLASTICUS, non qui assidue in studii sine certa ratione & ordine vagatur, qui omnes in schola lectiones quotidianae sine iudicio audit, omnia dictat excipit, & rapsodias proximas coacervat, vel quotidianum numerum paginarum perlegit, & per multos ac varios autores grassatur: Sed qui primum, Finem & metam, ad quam dirigenda sunt studia, prudenter prospicit: Deinde Media, ad Finem illum assequendum necessaria, recte eligit: Postea in Mediis illis parandis & tuendis praestat intentionem animi, curam, vigiliantiam, assiduitatem & laborem.”

\(^47\) *RS*., Preface 3. “Quare ut Adolescentum studia pro mea tenuitate aduuum: & certum Discendi Ordinem, & rectam ac compendiariam ad salutarem eruditionem viam.”

\(^48\) *RS*., Preface 4. I. De fine & meta studiorum, ad quam omnes discendi labores referre studiosi debent. II. De mediis, quae ad eum finem ductunt, recte eligendis, & sedulo parandis. III. De ratione instituendi studia in singulis
These four parts are addressed in the four parts of the *Regulae*. They are numbered accordingly with Part I being *Ratio Discendi*, establishing the goal of study; Part II, *De Mediis*, discusses elements of method in more detail; Part III, *De Ratione* on the plan and study and literature for each subject and a separately published; Part IV, *Appendix*, on the divisions of study.

Analysis

*De Ratione*, like many of Chytraeus’ pedagogical treatises and orations, begins by acknowledging the Divine gift of reason, defining it as it pertains to the subject matter at hand, and then explaining its function. Chytraeus likes to compare it to “rays” [*radios*] emitted from the mind of God. For instance, the 1554 dedicatory epistle of *Regulae Vitae*, Chytraeus’ famous treatise on the commonplaces of virtue using the Decalogue, describes the *radios* as light, wisdom, justice, and other virtues. He describes these as having been dispersed both as a testament to God and as a guide for human action and counsel, thus allowing men to sanction and distinguish actions, particular virtues, prohibit shameful acts, and discern punishment for violence.\(^49\) Another example may be found in the *Prolegomena* to his commentary on Genesis (1558), where Chytraeus says that God not only scattered rays of His light and wisdom into men’s mind in order that they might know him, but made himself known to Adam and Eve and revealed the promise of the Savior to them. Such knowledge has been made known to us, he

\(^{49}\) *Regulae Vitae*, A2. “Sparsit Deus in humanas mentes suae lucis, sapientiae, iusticiae, & caeterarum virtutum radios, ut sint firma et illustria testimonia, quae conferment, quod sit Deus, & doceant. Qualis sit, & hominum vitam, consilia & actiones gubernent. Nam certae & perpetuae noticiae in mente lucentes, quae sanctiun actionum ordinem ac discrimina, praeципiunt virtutem, prohibent inhonesta ac turpia, & poenas violantibus hunc ordinem decernunt, nequaquam casu in mentibus oriri aut ex atomis confluere potuerunt.”
immediately adds, through the teachings of the Prophets, Christ, and the Apostles and God wishes us to teach, hear, understand, and preach to others what has been revealed in these writings.\(^{50}\) In no place does Chytraeus advocate direct knowledge of God apart from Scripture. Reason and intellect are divine gifts that allow man to learn to read and write, in order to preach and teach the Gospel, as well as many other useful things, as he elaborates in this particular work.

**Regulae Utiles**

*Regulae Utiles*, Part I of the De Ratione and the first subheading of the treatise, presents an argument for Chytraeus’ particular approach and perspective concerning education. As noted, Chytraeus begins by saying, “God has scattered” \([Deus...sparsit]\) in His immense goodness rays of His wisdom and light in the minds of men in order to testify to man about Himself as the Creator \([ut testimonia de DEO conditore]\). Because he is introducing a text about learning and the arts, Chytraeus highlights reason as the ability to recognize numbers, priorities of principles, to judge consequences, and more. Reason, he continues, is the seed and norm of the arts, method, action in life, and all rational thinking.\(^{51}\)

Following this, Chytraeus discusses the importance of the language arts in particular. These

\(^{50}\) *In Genesin Enarratio Recens Recognita*, 1. “IDEO CONDICIT DEVS Homines, ut sit creatura uisibilis in hoc Mundo, cui sese, suam bonitatem, sapientiam, iusticiam & laeticet, & a qua uicissim agnoscatur & celebretur. Non enim impartit se & sua bona Deus nisi ijs, qui ipsum agnoscent, & ipsius sapientia & bonitate scientes laetantur. Vult igitur a nobis hominibus agnoscere Deus. Ac ut agnoscii possit, non solum radios suae lucis et sapientiae in mentes humanas sparsit: Sed etiam statim se expressa voce primis parentibus patefecit, & arcana promissionem de Filio Mediatore reuelauit, & postea certam doctrinam per Prophetas, Christum, & Apostolos traditam, scriptis mandauit, Quae vult a nobis legi, audiri, cogitari, alij proponi & explicari.”

\(^{51}\) *RS.*, i. “Deus aeternus Pater Domini nostri Iesu Christi, immensa bonitate, radios suae lucis & sapientiae, in mentes humanas sparsit, in prima creatione inferens mentibus notitis numerorum, ordinis principiorum, iudicii de consequentia, & ceteras, ut testimonia de DEO conditore, & semina ac normae artium, & Regulae Studiorum, consiliorum, & actionum in omni vita, & in summa omnium rationalium cogitationum metae essent ac gubernatrices.”
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disciplines function as the conduit through which the message of salvation has been passed down through the ages by the church as recorded in the books of Fathers, Prophets, and Apostles—words about God and what God has to say. Because of the gift of language, says Chytraeus, we are able to read, hear, learn, rightly understand, and teach to others.52

But learning languages, as with any other art, is complicated without good methodology. Chytraeus’ definition of method in the course of his argument centers on its role in facilitating learning calling it, “a certain and useful plan and order for learning.”53 But he also argues there is a moral imperative for good method, contending that the good things we learn as well as good methods for learning them, are both commanded by God and pleasing to him. Without such gifts there would be no understanding. This implies that pursuing a course of learning for any art or subject without having a method wastes time and causes confusion. Rather, there ought to be a “certain and ordered way, or divinely demonstrated method, that learning ought to follow.”54 Because both learning and method function as witnesses reflecting a natural knowledge of God, failing to take them seriously is an affront to the divinely offered good gift of reason. Chytraeus paraphrases Plato, noting that good things about God are scattered within the arts, and it is through God that good things are said and done.55

52 RS., ii. “Simul autem patefecit Deus sua voce, & tradidit humano generi peculiarem doctrinam de Filio suo, Domino nostro Iesu Christo, de reconciliatone hominum, de vita aeterna: suam doctrinam literis mandari, & libris certis per Patres, Prophetas & Apostolos comprehendi uoluit: Et huius doctrinae voce aeternam sibi Ecclesiam colligit, & aeterna bona nobis imperit. Ideoque Literas & Artes generi humano ostendit, & seruat linguarum & artium studia, non tantum ut sint fontes omnium bonorum, & nerui atque artus gubernationis, & ornamentorum vitae ciuillis, sed multo magis, ut hunc Librum per Prophetas & Apostolos scriptum, in quo vera de Deo & aeterna salute nostra, doctrina continetur, legere, audire, discere, recte intelligere, & aliis interpretari possimus.”

53 RS., iii. “Certam ac utilem rationem & ordinem discendi.”

54 RS., iii. “Ordinem & viam certam, seu μεθοδον diuinitus monstratam, sequi discentes oportet.”

55 RS., ii–iii. “Quod cum sine literarum, linguarum & multarum artium, quae in scholis traduntur, cognitione fieri nequeat; sciamus & haec nostra literarum & artium studia, & certam ac utilem rationem & ordinem discendi, seuerissimo Dei mandato praecipi, & placere Deo haec sua dona eximia, & gratam de Deo famam, ut Plato ait, in artibus sparsam esse: quae quidem ideo potissimum discendae sint, ut DEO GRATA DICERE, et Deo grata facere
Chytraeus concludes his opening argument by restating that the purpose of learning is to bring glory to God and serve the well-being of the church and ruling order. Given this, the arts should not be taken up lightly but rather approached with a sure order and method that will lead students to true and salutary erudition, like an Ariadnian thread that will be of great use to themselves and others.\textsuperscript{56}

**De Fine Studiorum**

*De Fine Studiorum*, expands the argument that Chytraeus presented in the first section, amplifying his call for a sure methodology across all the arts. Echoing Melanchthon, he teaches that the *finis* of study is what directs the student toward the sure path for achieving his objective. Seeing the end keeps one on course, moving effectively. Wandering on unfamiliar roads is not progress, but error, notes Chytraeus as he quotes Seneca in his opening paragraph.\textsuperscript{57} But for Chytraeus, as already noted, method is more than simply avoiding the potential for error and lost time on the part of the student. Method is an art in and of itself, a gift that ought to be employed properly and respectfully. At the same time he explicitly points out, perhaps to distinguish himself from contemporaries such as Peter Ramus, that while method is important, a perfect method is not the ultimate goal of learning. It is only a means to end. Instead, the goal and purpose of education, just as the purpose of all human existence is, “the true recognition and possimus.”

\textsuperscript{56} *RS.*, iii. “Ut autem studia nostra, Dei gloriae, & Ecclesiae ac Reipublicae saluti, cum fructu seruiant, nec inutili & inani contentione absumantur: Ordinem & viam certam, seu μεθοδον διουνίτις monstratam, sequi discentes oportet. Qua velut Ariadnes filo deducti, ad propositam verae & salutaris eruditionis metam, magna cum sua & aliorum utilitate & laude, perueniant.”

\textsuperscript{57} *RS.*, v. “Vt Viatores certum sibi oppidum, velut metam & scopum habent propositum, ad quem omnes discendi labores dirigantur: & una faciles & expedita ad Finem assequendum Via & Ordo semper in conspectu versetur. Qui enim quo destinavit, peruenire vult, unam sequi viam, non per multas vagari debet. Non ire istud, sed errare est, ait Seneca.”
celebration of God, according to the teaching of God made known in the books of the Prophets and Apostles, just as it was written, do all things to the glory of God.”

As will be seen numerous times throughout the Regulae, Chytraeus emphasizes the goal of knowing God through Scripture and emphasizes how each subject in the curriculum plays its own part in assisting the reader in understanding God’s Word.

Next, Chytraeus discusses two objectives functioning within the process of learning that are “nearest to” the final goal and purpose of education [proximi & immediati studiorum fines]. These goals, the cultivation of knowledge and speaking [cognitio rerum et facultas bene dicendi], have significant bearing on Chytraeus’ overall methodology functioning as the general end goal of study that every student ought to continually refer to no matter what particular subject they are learning. While put forth as a two-part goal, these function in tandem with one another, not separated but distinguished as two sides of the same coin, each playing a role in determining the general orientation for a student striving to encounter the elements specific to each art. Cognitio rerum refers to the acquisition of knowledge. This, Chytraeus describes, may be knowledge about God, customs, nature, sensing and judgment, and matters of right and wrong. Facultas bene dicendi applies to the art of communicating through writing and oratory.

But because communication requires application, and application requires studying and correctly interpreting appropriate models, facultas bene dicendi has immediate bearing on cognitio rerum.

---

58 RS., v. Finis autem non studiorum modo, sed etiam totius vitae humnae precipuus & ultimus esse debet GLORIA DEI, seu vera agnитio & celebratio Dei, iuxta doctrinam a Deo in libris Prophetarum & Apostolorum patefactam, sicut scriptum est, omnia ad gloriam Dei facite.”

59 RS., 1b. “DVO sunt autem proximi & immediati Studiorum Fines, ad quos, tanquam ad scopum, omnes discendi labores omnium autorum lectionem, omnes vigilias, lucubrationes, & studia omnia referri oportet, videlicet COGNITIO RERUM ET FACVLTAS BENE DICENDI: seu, ut recte de Deo, de moribus, de natura rerum, caeterisque rebus sentire ac iudicare, quaeque in bonis, quae in malis discenda sint, intelligere: Et ea, quae sentimus, perspicue & commode explicare & eloqui possimus ... Sapientiam recte sentientem & iudicantem de omnibus rebus ... Facultatem propria & perspicua oratione res bonas & vitae necessarias explicandi.”
This inter-relationship between the objectives of knowledge and communication is central in Chytraeus’ method, and although this is not explicitly presented and explained in *De Ratione* by Chytraeus it merits a brief discussion. The unstated, although perhaps obvious methodological implication of *facultas bene dicendi*, is that speaking or writing requires an application of the knowledge accumulated in the fulfillment of *cognitio rerum*. In other words, the students will have to employ some framework for judging how what they know applies to the particular circumstances they are writing in or about. They must learn how to apply knowledge appropriately. With that expectation—how to apply their knowledge appropriately—it matters where and how that knowledge is acquired. At a most basic level this regulates (even dictates) which texts are read. Chytraeus avoids lists at this point, saying only that students must read what is fruitful and useful. Basic but important limitations are therefore set on what the student reads on the basis of future need within whatever category of art he might be reading in. The notion of knowledge and learning for its own sake or scientific investigation for the purpose of broadening the understanding of subject for its own sake does not exist in Chytraeus’ thought. All discussions about learning and all scientific endeavors focus on their potential practical use and application.

Beyond what is read, is the matter of how it is interpreted—the connection between the students’ analysis of a text, and the cultivation of morals or virtues. In sections of Part II of the *Regulae*, he will make this connection explicitly: decisions made about a text and even one’s own writing are a practice that carries over into skill in making judgments in daily life. Reading and writing are character forming. The practice of forming judgment through the experience of

---

60 RS., 2a. “Primum igitur, in omnibus studiorum laboribus, & in omni cuiuscunque autors lectione suscipienda, cogitent studiosi, Quam inde utilitatem & fructum, vel rerum cognitionem & sapientiam adipiscendam.”
reading, extracting, and applying examples of virtue from a text has as much bearing as knowing what the definitions of those virtues are.

Next, Chytraeus offers general direction on selecting these texts. For all matters non-theological, sources ought to be drawn from the best of antiquity. He reminds his readers that even in antiquity there were certain authors whose wisdom was valued for its enduring quality and usefulness \[aetas & usus\]. The ancients respected and learned from the past Chytraeus observes, offering adages from Menander, who said, “when I was young I seemed very wise to myself, but knew nothing,” and Homer who said, “the minds of young are uncertain and unstable as if always blown in the breeze while the old man is situated in such a way as to see both the past and future.”61

Chytraeus then divides the arts into four roughly outlined categories: Theology, Ethics and Politics, Physics, and History—categories based their subject matter, order, and purpose. These categories, he says, contain all that is necessary for the life of the church, the state, and the private citizen. They are presented in the form of brief definitions and topics under four main headings with various subheadings.62 Methodologically speaking, the purpose of this division, is to serve by binding reference points in the students minds in order that they can recall the art and its purpose. Like the statue of Daedalus in Plato’s \textit{Meno}, the categories function as a mnemonic device, or synopsis, that can help a student in recalling because organization binds subject and matter together. Subject matter obviously is much more valuable if it can be remembered, or

---

61 \textit{RS.}, 2a–b. “Ac in tota studiorum ratione instituenda, non tam suis iuuenilibus cogitationibus, quam Praeceptorum, quos doctrina, aetas & usus discendi ac docendi erudiuit, sapientibus iudiciis nitantur. Verum est enim quod Menander ait, Cum iuuenis essem, videbar mihi valde sapere, sed nihil sapiebam. Et Homerus, Semper iuuenum virorum mentes pendulae ac instabiles velut in aere agitantur. Quibus autem senex interest, is simul ante & retro videt.”

62 \textit{RS.}, 2B. “Quater autem sunt praecipua ARTIUM GENERA, quae RERUM bonarum & Ecclesiae, Reipublicae ac singulis privatim necessariarum, DOCTRINAM continent.”
retained, just like the statue. The categories help to establish a relationship between the arts and their basic application in life that aids memory. Chytraeus compares the categories to studying a map before embarking on a journey: categories function as a guide to orient students so they know what they ought to expect when learning a particular subject. By this Chytraeus closely follows Melanchthon’s *loci* method in understanding such headings as functioning as the “source of amplification” of the topic.

Chytraeus describes the category of theology in one long sentence. Theology is the teaching about God revealed in Law and Gospel about the redemption of his people through Jesus Christ. The purpose of Theology is to show God’s direction in the most important matters in life (divine providence), true prayer, and steady consolation in all distresses on account of the reconciliation with God and the promise of eternal life on account of Christ.

The second category, Ethics and Politics, contains the subcategory Jurisprudence. Chytraeus understands the former broadly as encompassing the governance of civil morals in all walks of life, while the latter refers to the actual practice of upholding the ruling principle [*rationem regendae*], demonstrating judgment in the courts and legal systems of the state, is central to honest discipline and peace among men in a civil society. It is the practical

---

63 RS., 5a. “Valde autem prodest, in studiis, hoc modo, praeicipuarum Artium, quae rerum doctrinam continent, ordinem & fines ac usus, breuiter, una velut συνόψει, oculis subiici, & tanquam Daedali statuas ligari, & metis distinguiri. Nam & Artes ipsae facilius & rectius intelligi ac percipi possunt. Et in discentibus amor studiorum & cura discendi acuitur, & confirmatur voluntas progrediendi in studiis, quorum iam quasi regiones, quam late pateant, & metae certae prospiciuntur. Ac in legendis optimis autoribus semper initio spectandum est, ad quas Artium partes scripta illa pertineant.”


65 RS., 2b–3a. “I. Theologia, seu doctrina de Deo, patefacta in Lege & Euangelio, quae summan sapientiam, videlicet veram agnitionem veri Dei & redemptoris nostri Iesu Christi: & gubernationem vitae in rebus maximis, veram inuocationem, & firmas in omnibus miseriis consolationes de Reconciliatione cum Deo, & vita aeterna propter Christum donanda, ostendit.”

66 RS., 3a. “II. ETHICA ET POLITICA regens mores ciules in omni genere vitae. Et hinc orta IURISPRUDENTIA, quae rationem regendae Reipublicae & dijudicandi forenseis controversias, & omnes neros disciplinae honestae, ac pacis, inter homines, in hac ciulei societate, tuenda, monstrat.”
application of the philosophy itself.

The third category is broadly labeled Physics. It contains the subcategories of Medicine and Mathematics. Physics, says Chytraeus, is the study of all things created by God from the widest sweep—natures and causes—to heavenly bodies such as stars, meteors and planets, elements, down to living creatures, especially man. Within this all-encompassing sweep Chytraeus includes the subcategory of Medicine. Not only is medicine the study of God’s creation, but it now functions also in preserving and sustaining man in particular in order that he might fulfill his purpose, to proclaim the Gospel and other good teachings. Mathematics is another broad subcategory that focuses on numbers, figures and their properties and harmonies, especially the movements of heavenly bodies and their movements. Physics and mathematics both work in a kind of macro down to micro pattern. For instance there is regularity in the positions of the earth, from which calendrical distinctions are drawn. The regularity in Mathematics is significant, making it possible for things to be memorized to be learned, as well as certain predictions about that regularity to be made. It is also necessary for philosophy. Chytraeus reminds his readers of the adages of Plato who taught that numbers, or mathematics, was the “one chain” that bound the universe together and that he who desired to become wise without mathematics only courted fortune. So neglecting mathematics was neglecting the divine traces interspersed throughout the arts.\footnote{RS., 5a–b. “III. Doctrina PHYSICA, considerans naturam & causas omnium rerum a Deo conditarum, coeli, stellarum, Elementorum, meteorum, Plantarum, animanlum, & inprinis animae & corporum humanorum. Et hinc extracta ARS MEDICA, quae sola fere quicquid verae & eruditae Philosophiae naturalis adhuc superest, complectitur. Et valetudinem ac vitam homium tuetur. Propter hunc finem, ut vera de Deo, & aliis rebus bonis doctrina in hac vita disci & latem propagari, ac ut iuniores a senibus & sanis doceri & gubernari possint. Ad hanc classem artium MATHEMATA etiam referri vulgo solent, quae numeros, figuras, & earum proprietates, ac harmonias, & coelustium corporum, Solis, Lunae, ac reliquarum stellarum, motus ac effectiones, causas Eclipsium, distinctionem Dierum, Mensium & Anorum, causas inaequitatis dierum, situs & interualla omnium in terra locorum, inuestigant & patefaciunt. Hae praecipua & pulcerrima, & generosis mentibus ac coelo natis dignissima sapientiae humanae pars sunt: Nec sine aliqua horum cognitione quisquam vere inter eruditos censeri, aut}
Chytraeus lists History as the fourth and final category—the record and study of what has happened. Because history involves examination and communication, especially via writing, it is natural that this category also includes the disciplines of grammar, dialectic, and rhetoric. These establish the foundation for communication. Calling languages the fountain for all disciplines he urges the study of Greek, Latin, and Hebrew. Chytraeus holds poetry, the final subcategory of history, with particular regard because while its subject matter may range broadly, poetry has the potential, he notes, to delight and lure the reader through the devices such as cadence or elegant verse, embellished images, or historical and famous examples. In short, the sampling that verse can offer is like dessert. Recalling Erasmus, Chytraeus refers to poetry as offering spiced cakes or honey collected from the choicest flowers to communicate on any subject. Poetry enchants the listener or reader, and therefore is a valuable tool in communication.68

Beyond their function as mnemonic placeholders for recalling the classification of the arts, Chytraeus’ categories also function didactically how they are organized. The reverse order helps to illustrate the orientation that theology provides for learning the other arts. Theology takes

68 RS., “Quartam classem continet HISTORIA Rerum a Deo & Hominibus, in Ecclesia & Imperijs seu regnis mundi praecipuis, ab initio mundi usque ad nostrum aetatem gestarum. Cum autem haec quatuor inprimis homini in studijs versanti expetenda est, scriptis LATINIS & GRAECIS, partim etiam EBRAEIS CONTINEANTUR: Linguarum quoque Latinae inprimis et Graeae studia, ijs, qui ex ipsis fontibus, rerum doctrinam haurire cupiunt, diligenter susciendi sunt. Sunt enim Linguae velut fores ac thecae & arculae omnium siciplinarum, in quibus serviantur & custodiuntur. Et DICENDI ARTES, Grammatica, Dialectica & Rhetorica, superiorum istarum facultatum, quae vitam humanam gubernant, & tuentur necessaria adminicula sunt, & velut communia organa ac instrumenta, quibus in omnibus caeteris Artibus, quae rerum doctrinam continent, discendis & tradentis opus est. POETICA vero, ( ut Erasmus lib. 2. Ecclesiastae inquit) nihil aliud est, quam ex omnium disciplinarum deliciis ac medullis condita placent, seu ex electissimis quibusque flosculis compositum mellificium. Nam praestantes Poetae, ex omni disciplinarum genere, praeipuos & maxime illustres ac splendidos totius Philosophiae locos, ut de Deo & pietate ipsius debita, de poenis scelerum, de gubernatione imperiorum & morum, de natura rerum de fiderum motibus, vel res gestas magnum Principum aut aliorum, seligunt: Et adhibitis duabus rebus, quae praecipue alliciunt & defectant legentes, videlicit suauibus numeris seu carminibus concinniss, & picturis insignibus, seu exemplis historiciis & fabulosis, ac similitudinibus aptissimis, explicant & illustrant.”
priority not as the queen of sciences in the traditional sense as something only above, but rather theology is both the beginning and end of all learning as both cornerstone and capstone. There is nothing in Chytraeus’ definition of theology that would suggest that the other arts are necessary for the support of theology in the way that philosophy was traditionally understood. Instead Chytraeus’ definition focuses on the core of theological doctrine that is meant to be learned in catechetical study starting at a very young age and continued for life. Theology really permeates all. It gives meaning and purpose to the other arts and allows them to be understood in the right context. Ethics and medicine, the remaining two of the upper three faculties in university studies, come next because of their function in sustaining life. Theology, however, defines life. Ethics and jurisprudence are the science and discharge of God’s divine law and justice in world. They are necessary for maintaining order in a fallen world, for maintaining peace so that the Law and Gospel (Theology) might be preached. Medicine exists for the same reason. It preserves what one understands and sees defined by theology. Mathematics also looks at order and distinction, while history and the language arts allow for the truth about God to be recorded, preached and taught. Throughout the *Regulae’s* consideration of education Chytraeus pays homage to the traditional components but does so with a particular theological slant.

**Alter Stvdiorvm Finis**

The second half of Chytraeus two-part “immediate goals of study” is the development of the faculty or ability of communication [*facultas bene dicendi*]. Although, this has a number of important methodological implications, as has been noted, his discussion here is brief and limited rather directly to the chief concern of producing a person who is a proficient public speaker. Chytraeus hyperbolically comments that if an orator does not employ care in his technique, he might as well be mute as far as his audience is concerned. Or, if an orator can speak, albeit in a
rambling and disconnected manner, than he is like a painter with an unsteady hand. The images show that Chytraeus understood this as both art and craft—something that required natural ability to be further developed. His discussion of “how to” shows this is more than just natural born talent. The goal of education is someone who can communicate the things he knows well, and the steps that Chytraeus offers then describe what is required to develop that skill, to get to that point. “Speaking well” essentially summarize the path of the student in its complete form. First, the student learns the basics of the language arts. This includes languages, grammar, rhetoric and dialectic. These are the artisan-craftsmen’s working tools. Then, he begins to study a select number of the best authors in the languages in which he wishes to become proficient. For instance, he might read Luther for German and Cicero or Livy for Latin, all the while carefully noting the elements that made them great in order to employ those in their own imitations. Last, he turns to exercises in speaking and writing. Chytraeus calls writing [stilus] the best and most excellent master and impetus for speaking. Writing disciplines thought and speech.

The relationship between knowledge and application, and the selection and use of the great things that great men said, is a fundamental methodological question for Chytraeus and a topic that is revisited numerous times throughout the remainder of the Regulae as he discusses each of

69 R5., 5b. Nec vero multum interest, siue omnino aliquid mutus sit, siue oracionem, nulla arte & cura ac imitatione recte loquentium elaboratam, ursurpet. Vt enim pictor, si temere vagetur penicillo, & nulla arte manum in ducendis lineis regat, nunquam signate & apte imaginem propositae faciei exprimet: Ita in oratione, qui tumultuariam verborum congeriendam effundit, nec rationem certam & artem ad dicendum adhibet, de nulla re bona & graui apposite & dilucide ea quae cogitat, explicare poterit.”

the subjects contained in his four categories of arts. Selection and application require judgment on the part of the student, character formation that they practice continually as part of the learning process.\footnote{RS., 5a. “ALTER STVDIORVM Finis proximus & immediatus, est Facultas bene dicendi, seu recte, ordine & dilucide, animorum nostrorum sensa & cogitationes, de rebus bonis & vitae necessariss explicandi.”}

**Conclusion**

_De Ratione Discendi et Ordine Studiorum Recte Instituendo_, Part I of the _Regulae_

_Ordinum_ serves as a brief prolegomena to the whole. Essentially it is an argument both for the purpose of education, and primacy of a sure method. Chytraeus orients his approach to education through the divine command to “seek first the kingdom of God.”\footnote{RS., 1b. “Sit igitur haec prima cura & ultimus Finis omnium studiorum & actionum humanarum, ut veram de Deo doctrinam discamus, & Deum vera agnitione & invocatione, & totius vitae obedientia celebremus, iuxta dictum: Primum quaerite regnum Dei.”} The gifts of learning and education are sketched out in Chytraeus’ four categories of arts. True teaching about God, as Chytraeus clarified as he defined theology, is revealed both as and in the Law and Gospel. Learning equips a person with language in order to learn more as he reads, understands, and teaches the words of Holy Scripture. His theological approach to the categories of Ethics, Physics, and History, approached theologically, serve to summarize the gift of the arts and how they are part of God’s providential care of mankind. Human existence, Chytraeus maintains, benefits from these gifts in all aspects of life. They are a testament to an orderly creator whose reflections of benevolence and character are reflected in and through them. For Chytraeus this is so obvious that even the pagans were aware of it, at least in part, a point he drives home by repeatedly referencing Plato on the subject.

Emphasis on a sure method is legitimized by the importance of education. And education is
rooted in and built by method. Circular? Yes, but that is a kind of testimony to both being foundational. Neither can be neglected or excluded. Man’s purpose is to glorify God. The role of education is equip man to read the text of Scripture in order that he might live by its Word, and might preach and teach the Gospel. If the arts are indeed gifts from God given for the well-being of man in his daily existence learning them ought not to be taken lightly. Therefore students and instructors should consider their work to be a serious matter calling for thoughtful attention to how this might be properly accomplished. The “how” will be important for Chytraeus as he continues in chapters that follow.
CHAPTER FIVE

DE MEDIIS, QUAE AD OPTATAM STUDIORUM METAM, AC ERUDITIONEM VERAM DISCENTES RECTA PERDUCUNT

Introduction

In De Mediis, Part II of Regulae Studiorum, Chytraeus presents eight sets of general rules [regulas generales] under topics that serve students by providing a means for study and are meant to prepare students for both private and classroom work. These include the rules for sequence of the subjects [ordo], ordering of the parts of the art [methodi], listening [auscultatio], reading [lectio], memorization [memoria], writing [stilus], public speaking [pronunciatio], and examination and disputation [examina et disputationes]. This chapter will examine the aims and objectives that these rules address and they fit within Chytraeus’ system of education. An integral part of the Regulae Studiorum, Part II prepares the student to read and understand what follows next in Part III: the subjects in the curriculum. At the same time it must be noted that much of the advice given here is general and will be repeated in Part III, tailored by the particular needs of each subject. This repetition, while in many ways a natural consequence of such an ambitious book as the Regulae, serves methodologically as well. Chytraeus moves from the general guidelines in Part I to more particular and specific ones here, and this serves to reinforce how the rules are adapted and applied across the subjects.

Chytraeus’ Aims and Objectives

As previously noted, sixteenth-century humanist pedagogy in the north underwent a
gradual redirection in emphasis from the individual scholar to the rationale and method of learning, or from goals of education to the process of education. This has been examined by Lisa Jardine and Anthony Grafton, who characterized the change as a movement away from focus on the individual finished scholar to the refinement of systems and procedures that could be organized into textbooks that then could be disseminated throughout the region.\textsuperscript{1} Looking at the skills and procedures that equip the student to approach and master the task of learning and communicating, \textit{De Mediis}, like the rest of the \textit{Regulae}, showcases this phenomenon in Chytraeus’ scholarly efforts as he offers a structured approach to learning strategies that could maximize a student’s success organized under easily recalled topical headings. Referring to Part I of the \textit{Regulae} as a compendium to erudition, Chytraeus offers some general rules that, when followed, provide a way for perfectly ordinary students [\textit{adolescentes mediocribus ingenijs praediti}] to develop the desire and the good habits necessary to gain solid erudition so that they then might both serve and ornament the church and the territory.\textsuperscript{2}

Chytraeus’ rules are divided to correspond to his twin goals of knowledge and speaking. For instance, the sequence of the subjects to be learned, the purpose of method, how to listen, how to read and commit material to memory are all tools that help students to learn information, while writing, public speaking, examination and disputation help a student to properly apply and communicate that information. Next, the order in which Chytraeus presents the sections functions didactically as each rule sets the stage for the next. So the emphasis Chytraeus puts on

\textsuperscript{1} See Anthony Grafton and Lisa Jardine, “Northern Methodical Humanism: From Teachers to Textbooks,” in Grafton, \textit{From Humanism to the Humanities}, 122–160.

\textsuperscript{2} RS., 6b. “NVnc finibus & quasi Metis studiorum constitutis, QUAE VIA SIT ad eas proxima & quasi compendiaria, seu de Medijs, quae AD VERAM & solidam ERUDITIONEM ... assequendum recta ducunt, Regulas aliquot generales tradam: Quasi in discendo, Adolescentes mediocribus ingenijs praediti, & serio amore literarum flagrantes, constanti assiduitate & studio indefesso sequentur, paulo post maturos & solidos verae eruditionis fructus percipient, & Ecclesiae ac Reipublicae magno usui & praesidio ac ornamento erunt.
grammar, rhetoric and dialectic in section one concerning order in the curriculum introduces the foundational role that these play not only in education as a whole, but also in the other skill sets that the students must master to become successful. Section two explains that summary and order also govern each individual subject, explaining how methods and textbooks orient the students so that they learn the parts of the art in the right order can understand how each relates to the end of the art. Section three explains the role of the lecturer in explaining the parts and how his guidance and the dialectical preparation of his lecture aids the student’s understanding of subject. Good pedagogy makes a difference. Dialectic also plays a necessary role in reading—the subject of section four—as it forms the basis for the analysis and retention of the material, and the role this plays in the moral formation of the student. Section five, on memory, largely restates the role of dialectical reading, used now as an aid to understanding and remembering material that Chytraeus believes is a far better approach than relying on mnemonic tricks, gimmicks, or natural talent. Section six and seven explain the importance of dialectic in practicing writing and speaking. Finally, examinations and disputations allow the student to practice the skills of analysis, composition, and speaking under public pressure, while putting their skills in dialectic and rhetoric to the test. Almost all of these rules are restated in similar form in Chytraeus’ *Oratio De Studio Theologiae Rechte Inchoando* where Chytraeus presents his approach to theological study. This point will be explored in more detail in later chapters of this dissertation.

Theology and Humanism

*De Mediis* showcases Chytraeus’ humanism and on the surface employs language that presents the author as Lutheran by confession. The relationship between education and moral training showcased throughout his approach, especially with regard to textual analysis, offers an example of the difference between the early humanists and the humanist reformers in their
appropriation of humanism. Erika Rummel contends that the reformers typically borrowed the contributions of the earlier humanists that centered on language studies, grammar and rhetoric, while avoiding, for theological reasons, a great deal of what might be found in the classical sources themselves.³ That material that was not avoided was repurposed with emphasis, as Rummel states, “on the correction of faults rather than self-fulfillment,” and that “Protestant educators tended to stress the corrective more than the edifying function of education.”⁴ Her observation illustrates a fundamental religious difference between the generations of humanists, rather than a commitment to a “humanism.”

Chytraeus’ approach to the classical texts tends to blur the line between such distinctions because of his Melanchthonian understanding of moral philosophy and human reason within a Lutheran framework. Understanding moral philosophy as seated squarely under to topic of law, not Gospel, and sharing Melanchthon’s conviction that a natural knowledge of the law is possible, Chytraeus readily recommends texts from antiquity’s moralists as models for ethics, allowing the students to pick out the good from the bad in the texts themselves.⁵ As a result, Chytraeus resembles the older generations of humanists in a shadowy way, appropriating some of their attitudes and contributions, only to different ends, and understood in a different light. Even the teleological nature of education that older generations of humanists had emphasized is incorporated by Chytraeus but is understood and explained differently. Some earlier humanists in part had understood the arts function as conduits for man to regain the divine image by the exercise his own will in virtuous living (fleeing the world), a viewpoint that fit into the

³ Rummel, The Confessionalization of Humanism.
⁴ Rummel, The Confessionalization of Humanism. See her discussion of specific examples on pages 44–49.
framework of the nominalism of the late Middle Ages. Later Lutherans presented the arts in the context of the ancillary role they play in theology and reading God’s Word where salvation is revealed by the Gospel, thus reflecting God’s will for mankind and his role and work as the restorer of that lost image in and through Christ, not to mention God’s physical care of humanity through a Christian’s service to their neighbor. Thus, a so called separation between humanism and theology, or humanist learning for its own purposes, is absent in Chytraeus. Arts and learning serve theology. With this approach Chytraeus echoes Luther, using humanism as a tool for an evangelical purpose rather than reflecting others who stopped short and were satisfied with humanism’s pursuits—especially moral philosophy—for the cultivation of virtue. Here also he takes his cue from Melanchthon, following the patterns and goals that had been established at Wittenberg by the Preceptor beginning in 1529, with his “plan for the studies of a student of theology.” This plan utilized the humanist loci approach, with a focus on both knowledge and communication, the Regulae’s twin goals of education. Chytraeus neatly compartmentalizes the different parts of the curriculum and explains how they relate and contribute to the endeavor of study as whole.

---

6 Charles Trinkaus writes that “by God’s ordered power His covenant with believers meant that He would not withhold His grace from those who had done their voluntary best to live virtuously, according to the principle facere quod in se est.” But it also must be understood that this meant fleeing the world and spurning earthly things. See Charles Trinkaus, “The Religious Thought of the Italian Humanists: Anticipation of the Reformers or Autonomy?” in The Scope of Renaissance Humanism (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1983), 237–62.

7 It might also be suggested that such a distinction does not really exist. New learning for its “own sake” may simply more closely reflect the religious perspectives and concerns of the early humanists and late medieval nominalism, as Trinkaus suggested in his essay, “The Religious Thought of the Italian Humanists.”

8 Note the connection to humanism seen in the line up of intellectuals seen in Lewis W. Spitz, The Religious Renaissance of the North German Humanists (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1963). Coming at the end of the line after the likes of Celtis, Agricola, or Pirckheimer, Martin Luther shows an appreciation and debt to Renaissance humanism even as he does not “stop there” in humanism for the cultivation of virtue, but rather incorporates New Learning as a tool for an even more radical theological purpose.

9 Robert Kolb, “Pastoral Education in the Wittenberg Way,” 69, 70.
In the introduction to Part II, Chytraeus exhorts his readers to begin all study with prayer. Nothing can be done without the help of God, he says, and therefore each day’s study should begin with pious and ardent petition “that the Son of God, The Logos, the fount of all wisdom and salutary doctrine, should teach, guide, and aid us, so that our work in the Lord does not go in vain.”

Chytraeus hints that similar advice can even be found among the pagans, noting that Plato taught that all tasks are easier if undertaken in faith, especially learning, with a pious student imprinting the day’s lessons into his mind like a seal into soft wax. On one level, this example is not unlike the piety that one might generally find in earlier humanists, except that on a deeper, different level Chytraeus is a Lutheran theologian, and the remark ought to be understood in that light. Without a distinction between Law and Gospel, the Roman Catholic understanding of the connection between erudition and piety tended to favor the belief that the former proceeds the latter, thus emphasizing human will and the cultivation of piety that brings man closer to God, rather than referring to a resulting status before God (by imputed righteousness on account of Christ) where the piety does not precede to cause but springs from and follows on. But for the Lutheran Chytraeus, true faith in God, is both the impetus and goal of learning. Beginning each day with prayer is a constant reminder of that goal of study, the serious work that the student undertakes on a daily basis, and thus the necessity of a sound approach.

Another aspect that does not necessarily showcase his Lutheranism, but rather Chytraeus’

---

10 RS., 6b. “Cum autem nulla hominum studia sint felicia & salutaria, nisi Deo ea iuuante, ut ipse filius Dei inquit: Sine me nihil potestis facere: singulis diebus STVDIA nostrae ORDIAMVR a pia & ardenti PREICATIONE, qua petamus, ut Filius Dei λόγος, fons omnis sapientiae & doctrinae salutaris, ipse nos doceat, regat & adiuuet, Ne labor in Domino noster inanis eat.”

11 RS., 7a. “... ac ut Plato in Theateto ait: ἐξ πᾶω ἐπιδόσιν ἐξει, in omnibus facil proficit, si accedat monstrator fidelis: ut enim cerea molli sigillum, ita teneris adolescentum ingenii ars omnes facilius imprimi & instillari possunt. Ita autem omnia studia & labores erunt faciores & feliciores, se Dei auxillum, quod omnibus vera fide petentibus expositum & promptum est ...”
proximity to Melanchthon, who had a keen interest in the connection between human anatomy and divine providence, is that several of Chytraeus’ general rules are introduced by an explanation of how the rule makes use of a particular God-given sensory faculty, such as vision or hearing, or faculty of the mind, such as logic.\textsuperscript{12} His explanations of the senses and their purposes, as well as the exercises that he recommends to develop them, suggest that his pedagogy is sensitive to his assumptions about how humans were created by God and how the arts serve in ways respective to their needs as creatures.\textsuperscript{13} At the same time this position is not distinct from the pious formulations of other humanists, unless understood against the context of the goals of study presented in Part I of the \textit{Regulae}.

The Eight Rules

As far as the organization of the \textit{De Medii} is concerned, with little exception, Chytraeus explores each rule, from \textit{ordo} to \textit{disputationes}, with a very simple arrangement. He begins with a general introduction that serves to summarize the rule, offering a basic definition, and then suggesting points on its utility. Finally, Chytraeus explains the individual parts. This usually includes examples of exercises or literature pertinent to the rule.

\textbf{Ordo}

The opening section by Chytraeus on the order of the subjects bears resembles an oration


\textsuperscript{13} See Charles Trinkaus, \textit{In Our Image and Likeness: Humanity and Divinity in Italian Humanist Thought} (South Bend: University of Notre Dame, 1970). While Chytraeus in Rostock is far from Italy in several ways, he does seem to share the broader perspective on education having a Genesis-Theological connection.
by his mentor Philip Melanchthon, *On the Order of Learning*. Chytraeus presents a rationale for the order of the subjects taken up in the schools and an argument for the importance of the inferior arts. He proceeds, as did Melanchthon, saying “the straightest road to establishing true and solid erudition is not the one that wanders rashly and without order through various arts and authors, but that advances with a certain order through a course of education, and that teaches the arts necessary for life that are advanced by steps from the lowest arts to the highest and most learned.” The inferior arts may be deemed inferior, or lesser, but that is no reason to discard or ignore them. They are connected to and support the superior arts.

At the same time, one must begin with the primary or foundational topics. Students must first master the basic speaking arts [*Dicendi Artes*]. These include basic Greek and Latin grammar, as well as dialectic and rhetoric. Chytraeus distinguishes them from studies in more advanced speaking and composition. He explains that the basic speaking arts function as an instrument or tool to guide the student toward the higher arts, describing the basics as necessary as heat and air are for the body. Latin and Greek grammar allow access to the fountains of all knowledge contained in the classics and Scripture. Dialectic and rhetoric then teach the fundamentals of judgement and speaking. Catechesis, or the elements of Christian doctrine, Arithmetic and History are to be taken up next after the speaking arts through textbooks of

---

14 For an English translation of Melanchthon’s oration, see Sachiko Kusukawa, *Orations on Philosophy and Education* (Cambridge: University Press, 1999), 3–8. Chytraeus borrows the description of the course of learning as a set of steps as well as the quote from Xenophon, “Nihil ita utile aut pulchrum inter homines existit, ut ordo.”

15 *RS.*, 7b. “Rectissima ad veram & solidam eruditionem comparandam via est non per varias artes & autores temere & sine ratione vagari: sed ordine certo per ciculum doctrinarum incedere, & artes vitae necessarieas discere, & quasi per gradus ab inferioribus artibus ad superiores & cognatas traduci.”

16 *RS.*, 8a. “Prima igitur adolescentum solidae eruditionis amore flagrantium cura sit, ut DICENDI ARTES, non tamquam fines studiorum, in quibus tota aetas consumenda sit, sed velut instrumenta & organa, ad superiores artes vitae gubernatrices, recte discendas, non minus, quam hoc aere & igne ad vitam corporis sustentandam opus est, necessarias: Grammaticen seu cognitionem sermonis linguae latine & Graecae, qua omnium doctrinarum fontes continentur: DIALECTICEN & RHETORICEN seu Methodum recte de quacunque re iudicandi & dicendi.”
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summary and method. Chytraeus recommends that exercises in writing are assiduously included at this time as well. These are to be followed by ethics, mathematics, and physics.\textsuperscript{17} After these courses the students are ready to select one of the three superior subjects of theology, law, and medicine, selecting one to devote themselves to completely.\textsuperscript{18} The subjects Chytraeus includes combine both traditional trivium and quadrivium topics with others—history and ethics or moral philosophy—that were emphasized especially in Renaissance humanism’s effort to counter an overemphasis on logic. Yet logic (dialectic) remains, putting Chytraeus in line with Melanchthon who once pressed to keep Aristotle in the university curriculum. Hebrew is not mentioned at this particular point in the \textit{Regulae}, but the Lutheran Reformation supported that as well.\textsuperscript{19}

Interspersed between descriptions of each level of studies are repeated warnings about speeding through the course and racing on to the higher arts before the lower disciplines have been mastered. Specifically, Chytraeus cautions students not to be in such a hurry to the superior arts in an untimely manner, but instead he admonishes them to master the entry level philosophy courses and inferior courses, staying there until they are thoroughly learned, and the students can demonstrate their mastery of the material through examinations.\textsuperscript{20}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{17} RS., 8b. “Praeterea Arthmeticen & Chronicon seu Epitomen Historiarum mundi & ante omnia Catechesin seu elementa verae de Deo doctrina, singula ex singulis libellis, eruditam methodum & summan artis continentibus, perdiscant. Et stili exercitia assidua adiungant ... Deinde, Praeceptorum iudicio se ad Ethicen, Mathemata, Physicen, descendam conferant.”

\textsuperscript{18} RS., 8b. “Postremo, mediocri cognitione linguarum & artium inferiorum, qua fundamenta & fontes sunt superiorum, & mediocri scientia dicendi ac scribendi comparata, totos sese dedant uni ex supremis artibus, THEOLOGIAE, IVRI vel ARTI MEDICAE, quae vitam humanam gubernant & tuentur ...”

\textsuperscript{19} Witness, for example, Melanchthon’s supporting role (even before joining the faculty at Wittenberg) of Johannes Reuchlin and other humanists in the flap with Pfefferkorn and his supporters culminating in \textit{Epistolae Obscurorum Virorum}, a satirical attack on scholasticism in support of Reuchlin.

\textsuperscript{20} RS., 8b. “Nec intempestiuem ad superiores disciplinas properent, sed tantisper in hisce incunabulis Philosophia & inferiorum artium & linguarum studijs immorentur, donec penitus eas cognoverint, & usu aliquo iudicum confirmarint ...”
\end{flushright}
Methodi et summae artium

Typical of the later sixteenth-century northern humanists was a value put on a well-planned, methodical approach to the subjects. In this section, Chytraeus describes the place or role for texts presenting a method and summary of a subject in the course of learning it. Chytraeus states that the summary [summa] of the topics that pertain to a particular art, and its rules [ratio] and the ordering of the topics according to those rules [methodos] are set together in books of method and summary. In short, the mastery of the topics, rules, and order is prerequisite to further reading in a subject area.

Just like the exploded diagram, itself a Renaissance innovation, such textbooks allow the student to see the connections of the parts of the whole, become familiar with those parts and the reasons for its ordering, and then undertake carefully planned study of the subject. By this time printing is common and books abound so it is possible simply “to look it up.” Indeed, the Regulae as a whole meant in part to serve this purpose. Yet value remains in memory work, especially with regard to learning how to think in a well-ordered way. So Chytraeus urges that these parts and the reasons for their ordering be memorized by the student. After this, the parts are meant to be studied until the student understands and can explain them perfectly. There are no shortcuts here, as Chytraeus recommends the texts be read and reread until they are perfectly understood and fixed in the mind.

---

21 RS., 9a–b. “Cum omnes artes bisariam tradantur; initiio enim summae ratium, certa ratione & Methodo in compendium contracta, discentibus proponi ...”

22: RS., 9b–10a. “... postea, singulae partes uberiorus ac copiosias evolui, & subtilius ac perfectius explicari solent; sine dubio haec utilissima & maxime necessaria recte discendi ratio est, ut Adolescentes initio eos praeipue libellos, qui breues & eruditas summam seu Methodos artium continent, ordine & diligenter cognoscent, & in singulis artibus unicum tantum libellum, qui eruditam methodo in compendium contractam artis illius summam tradit, tantisper elegant & elegant, nec prius ex manibus deponent, donec integre & familiarissime perspectum & cognitum animo infixerint. Inprimis vero SERIEM LOCORVM, seu partium cuiusque artis, definitionibus eruditis, explicatarum, memoriae infigant: vt initia, progressiones & metas singularum artium videant, & cum aliquousque progressi sunt,
Memorizing the contents of these textbooks and understanding the order of the parts is the first step that students take in approaching an art. They function as a guide when reading individual authors who make up the canon of the subject in hand. Without the organization that this approach provides, Chytraeus warns that the students will not be able to learn the art in a full and solid manner, and as a result will not be of useful service to their communities.

Chytraeus recommends using texts that offer organized summaries of a subject's requisite knowledge and are fashioned in a way to reinforce the principles of rhetoric and dialectic. Drawing on experience, the author will have gleaned appropriate texts from within the subject area for useful information and organized these under topics \([\text{loci}]\), “like gems from the rubble” to reveal how they can be used in general life. For this, authors will select the best examples of precepts that best shape the student. The contents ought to be assembled simply, clearly and without useless sophistry from only the best authors. Such examples can be timeless, and when employed appropriately are useful for addressing with contemporary issues. Finally, Chytraeus says that the authors mix in rhetorical hooks from those accounts, maxims, opinions, parables, and other allusions assembled with the most delightful variety to capture and engage the mind while simultaneously instilling the art with necessary precepts. He endorses Philip

23 RS., 9b. “Et quoscunque, posta legent autores, Poetas, Philsophos, Oratores, Historicos, & alia scripta: semper ad illas artium methodos referant, & ad quam partem artis pertineant prudenter considerent.”

24 RS., 10a. “Imo sine hac ratione, nullas artes integre ac solide discent, nec ullam eorum studia Reipublicae utilitatem asserre poterunt.”

25 RS., 10b. “Primum, Prudentia & dexteritas, qua ex longissimis aliorum voluminibus, praeceptuos & utilissimos Locos seligit, ut velut gemmae ex turba inutilium aut obscurarum praeceptionum erutae clarius conspici possint: Et necessaria tantum praecepta, & ad formandum judicium de maximis rebus inprimis utilia, omissis inanibus caullationibus, & argutij difficilioribus, propria & perspicua oratione, aptissimo ordine, & neruoasa brevitate tradit & explicat, & usum in communi vita ostendit. Deinde, illustria exempla praeceptis adiungit, sumta ex optimis autoribus, & praesentium temporum controviersis, & continenta grauissimorum rerum doctrinam, in quibus artium usus, & vis ac utilitas praeceptorum, in iudicando, & dicendo, de maximis rebus vitae necessariis, conspici potest. Postremo, illecebras miscet ex quadam Historiarum, Dictorum, Sententiarum, Similitudinum & altarum
Melanchthon’s books that were currently in use as examples of such methodological textbooks that rightly earned all admiration and love of the students.26

Chytraeus closes this section with a list of other books that fall into the category of method and summary. While it is not exhaustive be any means, the run down provides a few examples of texts that fit both the descriptions given in this section as well as the precepts outlined in Ratione Discendi regarding such texts. The books include grammars and dialectics written by Philip Melanchthon—his Rhetorica, Elementa Doctrinae Ethicae, Initia Doctrinae Physicae and De Anima—as well as the works of the prominent mathematician Johannes Frisius and his Arithmetica Gemmae and also Iodocus Vuillichius’ Elementa Geometriae Euclidea, Libellus de Sphaera, De Anno, De Dimensione Terrae and Theoricae Planetarum. For theology, law, and medicine Chytraeus lists Melanchthon’s Examen Ordinandorum, Loci Theologici, Justinian’s Institutiones Imperiales, and Leonhardt Fuchs’ commentaries on Galen.27

Auscultatio

Chytraeus’ opening remarks concerning the role of listening in learning are selected from Plutarch’s De Auditu where Plutarch explains to Nicander that the ears of the youth are the only means that virtue has for gaining entrance into the body.28 Like Plutarch, Chytraeus refers to the

allusionum dulcissima varietate: Quae cum natura animos capiant, & delectent, simul necessaria artium praecepta ... instillant.”

26 RS., 10b. “Maxime accommodati & utiles sunt Philippi libelli, quibus admirationem & amorem omnium studiosorum conciliat.”


28 RS., 11b. “Verissimum est Plutarchi dictum, unica ansa seu manus, quae eruditio & virtus vera apprehendi
ears as gateways for learning. Man may learn about God, about all good teaching, and about all the duties of virtue by hearing.29

Although much erudition can be attained through careful reading, Chytraeus says that for the young, listening is much more important. Following Cicero, Chytraeus believes the youth ought to be guided by the judgment of the instructor in the interpretation of the material and even warns that it can be dangerous for the student to attempt to teach themselves when they are just beginning.30

Chytraeus also notes that the role of the listener reflects expectations placed upon the speaker. The listener must give the speaker his undivided attention throughout the entire lecture. His task is to attempt to listen to the lecture in its entirety while committing the important elements to memory.31 For this reason, the lecturer in turn must structure his presentation with utmost diligence, focusing on useful topics and presenting material clearly and in order so as to make the student’s task manageable. Teachers ought to use appropriate and pleasant examples for illustrations or historical anecdotes, and thus they instruct the students not only about a particular subject, but they also demonstrate the proper form of composition and oration.32

& percipi potest, sunt AVRES adoescentum purae & attentae.”


30 R.S., 12a. “Nulla enim ars sine Interprete, ut Cicero inquit, & sine aliqua exercitacione, quam Praeceptoris iudicio & voce regi oportet, percipi potest. Et perniciosissima Adolescentum in studiis versantium pestis est, cum ipsi sibi praeceptores esse, & ἁποδιδαχτοί videri cupiunt...Etsi autem muti etiam Magistri, seu Libri priuatum lecti, tum plura, tum eruditoria fere docent, quam praeceptores, qui in schola audiuntur: tamen iuuenibus in primis, ad eruditionem comparandam, multo utilior & magis necessaria est Auscultatio, quam Lectio.”

31 R.S., 12a–b. “Quare diligenter & attente audient studiosi, de praeceptorum iudicio, Lectiones ipsis utiles: easque domi repetent, & memoriae commendabunt, & cum aequalibus de locis obscurioribus saepe conferent. Nec deferent incohatam lectionem, aut scripti explanationem, donec ad finem deducta, integre precepta ac cognita fuerit.

32 R.S., 12b. LECTORES etiam, non modo assiduatem & diligentiam in docendo praestent, & proixitatem nimiam vitent, verum etiam ad discentium utilitatem, & auditorum captum, & artium ac scriptorum, in quibus explicandis versantur, varietatem, & subiectam materiam, enarrandi rationem dextre accommodent. Nam unumquodque genus artium & scriptorum suam quandam & peculiarem desiderat. In DICENDI ARTIBUS
The basic parameters required of the lecturer are cues that students ought be aware of while listening that assist in proper interpretation of the material. He offers a few brief descriptions organized by genre in order to illustrate his point. For instance, in didactic writing, such as what one may find in Cicero or Aristotle, in Paul’s *Letter to the Romans*, or in Melanchthon’s *Loci Theologici*, one expects a particular teaching or idea to be examined through customary topics such as what the thing is, what its parts are, its causes, its effects, its cognates, and its opposites. Historical writing, whether sacred or pagan will present a chronology and series of rulers or institutions, narrations about events, legal precepts and catalogues of virtue and vice, and finally the results and penalties of wickedness. Orations and letters will first state the subject and then the principle arguments, employing serious language, illustrations and ornamentations to make their case. Poetry, concludes Chytraeus, can accommodate any subject. These are just a few of the kind of *loci*, or topics, that guide students as they learn.

Chytraeus concludes his consideration of the topic of listening with a bit of practical advice. Before attending a lecture, he advises students to read privately on the subject to be given

praeeptae maxime necessaria prudenter eligi, & quanta fieri potest breuitate & perspicuitate declarari debent, adhibitis illustribus & iucundis exemplis, quae vel insignes, vel historias simul continant: & monstrandus est usus praeceptorum, ut iuxta artis normam, orationes & scripta aliorum retexere & dijudicare, & sua recte componere discant.”

33 RS., 13a–b. “IN BONIS AVTORIBVS ENARRANDIS, primum considerari debet, ad quod Genus Artium, seu ad quam partem Philosophiae, & ad quod Genus causae scripta pertineant, ut Propositio seu scopus & argumentum operis perspicue monstretur: & series membrorum omnium ad illius generis locos, ordine & dextre referatur. DIDACTICA scripta, ut Ciceronis libri Philosophici, de Natura Deorum, de officij & pleraque Aristotelis scripta, Item, Epistola ad Romanos, Loci Theologici, Et in Summa, libri quibus artium quorumcunque doctrina explicatur, ad Locos generis Didascalici, seu methodi Dialectiae, An sit, Quid sit, Quae partes vel species, Quae causae, Qui effectus, Quae cognata, Quae pugnantia, exigendi sunt. HISTORIAE sacrae ac Ethnica juxta Eliae dictum de 6000 annorum mundi & Monarchiarum serie, in suas classes, seu temporum articulos includuntur, & narrationes ipsae, ad praeceptae Decalogi, seu locos communes virtutum & vitiorum, & γνώμας de gubernatione consiliorum, & de Euentibus & scelerum poenis referantur. In ORATIONIBVS & EPISTOLIS plerisque loci generis Deliberatiui, ordinem enarrandi monstrant: ut primum Status causae, deinde principalia argumenta, & membra & singulorum Partes, Affectus, vis & pondera verborum, Phrases, figuae & ornamenta explicentur. In POETIS, omnia vel ad doctrinam de moribus & poenis scelerum ...”
in order to become familiar with it. With that sort of preparation on the basics of a subject, one can devote more concentration to listening to the lecturer’s interpretation of the difficult elements of the issue and follow his argument.\textsuperscript{34} This also aids memory, as the topics of the subject are covered multiple times.

**Lectio Autorum**

Chytraeus’ humanist training shines through in this section as he integrates selections from Quintilian’s *Institutio Oratoria* into and alongside his own as a methodical approach to reading in the form of six “useful recommendations.” Through these he explains how to diligently and attentively read the best authors in any category of subjects.\textsuperscript{35}

The first of the six recommendations addresses the issue of reading summaries and methodologies. The advice here on reading echoes what Chytraeus just said about listening in the previous section. He reminds his students again that each subject area has its own collection of texts of this kind, the purpose being to provide students with an overview of the art that can function like a map, directing the readers to the topics of knowledge and examples of elegance, while keeping in mind the final goal of the particular art. Therefore students should read through such texts first when taking up a new subject.\textsuperscript{36} Getting an overview allows them to construct the

\textsuperscript{34} *RS.*, 14a. “Nunc unicam admonitionem adiungam, ut maiore cum fructu studiosi, Philosophiae & aliarum artium Professores audiant: multum prodesse, ut ante publicam lectionem, domi privato studio, ea, quae publice enarrabit interpres, diligenter legant & expendant, adhibitis etiam commentarijs, perinde ac si ipsis de eadem materia lectio habenda esset. Ita enim maiori cum attentione Professores audient, & de locis difficilibus ac obscuris postea dexterius & utilius cum interprete conferre, & muta eruditionem augere & confirmare poterunt.”

\textsuperscript{35} *RS.*, 14b. “Diligens et attenta optimorum sui cuiusq; generis autorum lectio, de qua sex utiles admonitiones ordine recitabo.”

\textsuperscript{36} *RS.*, 14b. “Cum classes seu genera praecipuarum artium distincta sint: & paulo ante praeceptum sit, ut singularum Methodi & summæ diligenter animis insingantur: Semper initio studiosi, Quoscunque libros in manus sument perlegendos, cogitent, ad quam classem Artium, seu ad quam partem Philosophiae, & ad quas singularum Artium seu Methodorum partes, scripta illa referre debeant.
right approach to learning the subject. With this knowledge in hand, a student then will be able to identify the well-known works of antiquity in their respective categories, the first step in constructive reading. For instance, *De Officiis, De Amicitia, De Finibus bonorum,* and *Tusculanae Quaestiones* all are examples of the second category—Ethics and Moral Philosophy—while Aristotle’s *De Animalibus* and Theophrastus’ *De Plantis* belong to the third category—Physics.

The second recommendation continues to advise about indiscriminant reading. Chytraeus notes that although there appear to be an almost infinite number of books, the best ones are few, and ought to be read and reread. He also warns against attempting to read several books at once, and recommends instead multiple readings of the same book. After mastering the summary, Chytraeus counsels the student to read a few select authors within the given subject. The opinions gained from those then serve as the norms for judging all things pertaining to the subject. They are also serve to shape his own perspective on the subject.

---

37 RS., 14b. “Ita enim facilius velu σομαρποεῖς, ad certas metas reuocari, tota discendi ac legendi ratio poterit: Et quam ex singulis libris utilitatem vel ad rerum cognitionem & sapintiam alendam, vel ad recte dicendi ac scribendi facultatem, refere lectores possint, intelligetur.”

38 RS., 15a. “Exempli causa Ciceronis libelli de officijis, de Amicitia, de Finibus bonorum, Tusculanae Quaestiones, pertinent ad securdam classem artium, ad doctrinam Ethicam. Libri de Animalibus Aristotelis, Theopratii de plantis, Doscordes, &c. pertinent ad teriam classem, ad Doctrinam Physicam, Arati Phaeonomena, Procus, Euclides, Ptolemaeus, ad Mathemata. Topica Ciceronis sunt pars Dialecticae de locis argumentorum. Libelli de Copia Erasmi, sunt pars Rhetorices de figuris amplificationum. Liber de conscribendis Epistolis, repetit praecepta Rhetorices, accommodata ad Epistolae conscribendas, &c.”

39 RS., 15a. “Ex omni scriptorum turba, & varietate illa librorum infinita, CERTOS quosdam & PAVCOS, eosque OPTIMOS AVTORES initio studiosi eligant, quos saepe multumque legant, & diligenter ac attente relegant, & adhibito observationis ac imitationis studio, tantisper evoluant, donec & sententias eorum omnes, seu doctrinam de rebus, quas suspecterunt explicandas, familiariter sibi notam reddiderint, & genus orationis proprium ac perspicuum, aliqua ex parte imitentur, & exprimant.”

40 RS., 15b. “Vere enim experientur discentes, se multo ampliores ac recte de rebus vitae necessarijs sentiendi ac iudicandi facultatem, & ad recte dicendum ac scribendum, utilitates, ex uno aliquo autore bono, ter aut quater relecto percipere, quam ex tota, reliqua Bibliotheca, seu infinitis libris quos obiter & cursim perlustrarunt.”

41 RS., 15b–16a. “Deinde certos quosdam & pauca Austores, qui erudite & integre, omnes doctrinae partes illius explicarunt: penitus sibi & familiarissime notos reddant. Quorum sententias, velut normam iudiciij, de omnibus rebus ad eam doctrinam pertinentibus, consultans & sequantur. Et quorum sermonem proprium ac perspicuum, in
general suggestions with a concise listing of the books in each subject that the students ought to read after mastering the texts of method and summary.

Remarking on the inconsistency and volatility of human nature, Chytraeus argues that students will not thoroughly learn the material if they are constantly skimming through various authors. Neither will students be able to collate successfully the examples of eloquence that would aid his own writing. This advice has stood the test of time, as Chytraeus shows that the major authors from antiquity did not believe in undirected reading thinly spread in the attempt for variety. For example, he observes that Pliny wrote that “one ought to read deeply, rather than broadly,” an exhortation that Chytraeus, following Melanchthon and other humanists, including Luther, interprets to mean reading from the smallest pool of the best authors in a subject. He says that Seneca recommends that one should not draw from many books, but take from the best books. More, he stated that certain selected readings are useful, and although variety delights, he who would arrive somewhere needs to travel along one road should not wander along many, for mere movement would not be progress, but error. Martial offers similar advice saying that the man who lives everywhere essentially lives nowhere. Quintilian compares reading to digestion,}

---

42 RS., 18a. “Cum autem in hac naturae humanae inconstantia & volubilitate, adolescentibus inprimis difficilimum sit, uni alicui Autori vel cogitationi diu immorari: & omnes varietate delectentur: plurimi etiam eruditionis famam ex promiscua & tumultuaria multorum librorum lectione aucupentur: doctissimorum aliquot virorum testimonijs ostendam, Non prodesse, imo perniciosam esse, promiscuum & variam Lectionem, per omnes autores sine delectu grassantem: Quae nec ad Σύνεσιν seu rerum cognitionem & iudicium confirmandum prodest, dum sine discrimine omnes & inter se dissimiles ac varias sententias de rebus congerit: nec ad Δυκάμιω


45 RS., 20a. “Quo praecepto, non ab omnium aliorum Autorum lectione, omnino deterentur studiosi, sed certum veluti domicilium & sedem perpetuae ac certae Lectionis dirigere iubentur, in qua familiariter & assiduam habitent: & ad quan redeant, cum ad aliorum Autorum, Poetarum, & Historiarum lectionem expatiati sunt.Nam ut
warning that hurrying through a text is a bit like swallowing without first carefully chewing. Finally, there is Xenophen who points out that someone who attempts many things simultaneously will in the end accomplish nothing.

Chytraeus’ third recommendation discusses his strategy for approaching and reading a text systematically with a list of steps and questions that the students ought to work through. Essentially this is instruction for filling a commonplace book that the student will compile using Cicero’s De Officiis as an example of how this sort of analysis proceeds. The first step is an analytical overview of the text for the purpose of determining the book’s subject, the proposition of the book, the principle members and arguments that the topics of the book generate. Students today might recognize this as pre-reading. He writes that De Officiis belongs to the category of ethics. The book’s goal is the discharge of virtues, its purpose is didactic, and its topics offer a basic checklist that ought to be committed to memory in order. Chytraeus lists them for the readers benefit. These are: 1. What is duty? 2. What are the parts of duty, namely prudence, justice, fortitude, temperance? 3. What are the definitions and divisions of each virtue? 4. What are the causes, effects, cognates and opposites of each? The second step is to pluck out the illustrious and notable examples from the text like flowers from a meadow. These might be rules of judgments, or norms for counsel and action, and they ought to be committed to memory. Finally, all of the elements of the text that are recommended study material for exercises in

Martialis inquit, Quisquis vsique habitat, maxime nusquam habitat.”

46 RS., 19b. Idem Quintilianus praecipit, lib. 10. Vt cibos mansos ac prope liquefactos demittimus, quo facilius digerantur: Ita LECTIO, non cruda, sed multa iteratione mollita, & velut confecta, memoriae imitationique tradatur...

47 RS., 20a. “Et Xenophon grauissime inquit libro 8. Παιδείας, Fieri non posse, ut simul multa quipiam faciat, eademq, omnia bene faciat.”

48 While there are many study aids on reading, a classic that offers the same advice as Chytraeus via Cicero is Mortimer Adler, How to Read a Book (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1967).
writing and rhetoric ought to be taken note of. These may be examples of narratives, amplifications, phrases, and vocabulary.\footnote{RS., 20a–b. “Initio igitur de quolibet scripto cogitandum est, ad quam classem Artium, seu ad quam partem Philosophiae perineat: Qua de re lectorem docere scriptor velit, quis sit status seu Propositio libri, quam titulus plerunque indicat, Quae sint principalia Membra & argumenta accommodatae ad locos eius generis Causarum, ad quod scripta pertinent. Vt in lectione Officiorum Ciceronis, primum cogito libellum illum esse partem Philosophiae Moralis seu Ethices: Statum esse doctrinam de Officijs omnium virtutum, Et pertinere ad genus Didascalicon. Itaque iuxta seriem locorum generis Didactici principalia membra excerpo & memoria infigo. 1. Quid sit Officium. 2. Qua sint partes officij, videlicet, Prudentia, Iusticia, Fortitudo, Temperantia. 3. Quae sint singularum virtutum definitiones & divisiiones. 4. Quae causae, qui effectus, quae cognata, qua vitia singuilis opposita seu pugnantia. Intra horum locorum metas tota explicatio doctrinae de Officijs in primo versatur. Secundo, Loci illustriores, & lectae alique ac insignes sententia, tanquam flores decerpi, & velut Regulae iudiciij, & normae consiliorum & actionum vitae, ediscii, & memoriae infigi debent. Tertio. Vniuersa orationis series ac Phrasis, illustria & lecta verba, insignes figureae, exampla narrationum, aptae amplificationes, & compositio concinna, adhibito obseruationis & imitationis studio, consideranda est. Qua de re in explicatione praeceptorum Rhetorices & Stili exercitiis plura monetur.”}

Such collecting requires organization. Chytraeus’ fourth recommendation discusses how to catalogue these elements in handmade commonplace books, a hallmark of his approach to organization and analysis. Memorable sentences, illustrious examples, similitudes, vocabulary, phrases and figures are all organized under the appropriate topical headings specific to each subject. This record keeping expedites the process of memorizing such textual selections as well as providing a ready reference for supplying both arguments, and elements for the student’s own writing. Chytraeus recommends his own book on rhetoric, \textit{Praecepta Rhetorica Inventiones} as an example for arranging the commonplaces.\footnote{RS., 21a. “III. Vt loci autorum illustriores & lumina sententiarum, exemplorum, similitudinum, verborum, phrasium & figurarum insignium, facilius memoriae insigi queant: & ad usum quocunque tempore pronta & parata sint: valde utile est, Locos communes praecipuarum artium, certo ordie distributos habere, ad quos omnia, qua audiunt aut in autorum sciptis legunt, studiosi memoriae digna annotent: & velut in classes certas distribuant. Ita & index in praecipios autores, & PENU instruetur, exquo deprecere studiosi, cum de ea re aliqua dicendum aut scribendum erit, ingentem copiam optimarum rerum sententiarum, similitudinum, Historiarum poterunt. De hac ratione instituendi Locos communes Philosophicos, utilem admonitionem in praeceptis Rhetorica inuentionis recitau, quae ad hunc locum reuocari potest.”}

The fifth and sixth admonitions encourage students to read through difficult books. Five suggests that rather than casting aside such books, notations ought to be made in the margins or
on blank pages, and the student ought to continue forward since often the later sections elucidate earlier ones.\textsuperscript{51} Six encourages students not to put down challenging books too early. Rather, students should put in diligent effort to read through to the end.\textsuperscript{52} Patience can pay off with a breakthrough in understanding.

**Memoria**

Carefully constructed notebooks and individualized, personal collections of topics and quotations are important in part because the process of collecting and organizing notes is an integral step in the process of memorization. Categories organized on a page are in turn reflected in the mind. Chytraeus calls the memory the treasury and custodian of all erudition and all things gained through learning. Although the powers of recollection may come naturally to some, nevertheless the memory requires its own exercise and bears fruit for all, including those who seem to memorize easily.\textsuperscript{53} Chytraeus suggests that if the memory is neglected, then learning becomes as inane and pointless as “writing under water,” or “trying to catch the wind with a fishing net.”\textsuperscript{54}

Chytraeus reminds his readers of the variety of tasks necessary for learning that good

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{51} RS., 21b. “V. Cum in lectione autorum, difficilior aliquis aut obscurior locus occurrit, non propter a subsistant legentes, aut plane librum abictant: sed notato ad marginem aut in charta loco obscuriore, progrediatur. Nam plerumq; posterior lectio priorem docet.”

\textsuperscript{52} RS., 21b–22a. “VI. Inter praecepta de ratione utiliter legendi bonos authores, hoc quoque considerari prodest, ut studiosi, quemcunque librum legere incipient, non prius ex manibus deponant, quam diligenter eum ad finem usque perlegerint … Hac fastidiosa legendi ratio, quantumuis magna assiduitas praestetur, tamen ad veram & solidam eruditionem comparandam plane inutilis est.”

\textsuperscript{53} RS., 23a. “Etsi enim natura, ut incaeteris rebus, ita hac quoque in parte, valet plurimum: & iuvari memoriam diaeta, & bona valetudine, & loco silenti, & tempore matutino, & modo certo ediscendi, & notis illustribus &c. constat: tamen praeципue excoli, augeri & firmari memoria potest labore & diligentia, & usu assiduo ediscendi & repetendi, ac redendi ea, quae ipsi, velut depositum, commendata sunt.”

\textsuperscript{54} RS., 22b. “Thesaurus & custos totius eruditionis, & omnium rerum discendo perceptarum velut ταμίειον est MEMORIA, quam si negligent discentes, & ocio ac desidia topere aut delitijs eneruri sinent: non minus inanis & supervacuus discendi labor erit, quam si in aquam interea scriberent, aut reti ventos venarentur.”
\end{footnotesize}
memory facilitates. Organizing and planning before undertaking a project, or following an oration or lecture all involve paying careful attention to the relationship of the various parts of the whole.\textsuperscript{55} Chytraeus is much more interested in strategies for building memory based on the principles and parts of rhetoric than other mnemonic devices such as memory palaces.\textsuperscript{56} In this sense, memory work reinforces and makes use of the principles of dialectic and rhetoric thus serving the same ends that Philip Melanchthon and Peter Ramus emphasized in their approaches.\textsuperscript{57}

Chytraeus’ approach mandates that time should be set aside each day for developing the memory by studying images in poetry, the topics of orations, and other useful writing. Students begin exercising their memories early in their academic career by learning the catechism, the fundamentals of the speaking arts, and useful and necessary things. Such an approach does double duty: it deals with subject matter while also honing mental skills. At this time they also ought to memorize poetry and other things that they read because of the ease memorization can take place during youth.\textsuperscript{58} Today when one observes how quickly children pick up a second

\textsuperscript{55} RS., 23b. “Quare in longioribus scriptis aut orationibus ediscendis, dispositionem & methodum totius disputationis initio studiosi considerent: Quot sint praecipuae orationis partes, quot singularum partium membra, quot periodis comprehensa, quo ordine singula membra & argumenta inter se contexta & collocata sint.”

\textsuperscript{56} RS., 23b–24a. . Haec diuisio & compositio, ut Fabius nominat, seu ordinis & dispositionis animaduersio, coniunctae cum mediocri, & assiduo labore & exercitacione ediscendi, multo plus memorium iuuabit, quam Mnemonica rhetorum praecepta, de Locis & imaginibus rerum ac verborum singendis, quae & laborem ediscendi gement, & in uniuersum memoriam perturbant magis quam adiuuant. Quae tamen, si cui cognoscere libet, ex fine libri tertij ad Herennium, & libri 2. De Oratore, & iudicium de illis Quintiliani, ex libro 11. capite 2. petere licebit.”

\textsuperscript{57} For Philip Melanchthon and Peter Ramus and their approach to memory see Stephen Clucas, “Memory in the Renaissance and Early Modern Period,” in Memory: A History ed. Dmitri Nikulin (New York: Oxford University Press, 2015), 131–76. On the complex use of the mind in learning, see also Francis Yates, The Art of Memory (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1966). Yates includes a foldout chart with dozens of organizing categories—so complicated that it boggles the modern mind now retold to an age of books and online resources where a person can always “look it up” rather than be left to rely on what is in memory.

\textsuperscript{58} RS., 24a. “Singulis itaq; diebus, vel certe singulis hebdomadis certae horae, perculariiter memoriae excolendaes, & sinsignibus poetarum & oratorum locis, vel alis utilibus scriptis ediscendis tribuantur. Ac pueros statim a prima aetate assefieri prodest, ut initia catecheseos, & artium dicendi praeceptae, maxime utilia, & regulas necessarias: Eaq; Poetarum & aliorum autorum scripta, quae in Scholis explicari audient, accurate memoriae
language, it is easy to agree with such practical advice.

As the elements of rhetoric form the core of his approach to the material of memorization, Chytraeus is keen to note that students should not only study the illustrations and examples found in the texts, but also ought to pay careful attention to patterns and constructions, as well as to the definitions and divisions of the topics highlighted in the texts on method and summary. For example when reading theology, students ought to memorize the definitions and parts of Christian doctrine. The same holds true for other disciplines, from the definitions of virtue and the rules for counsel and action when reading about ethics to parts of the heavens, stars, motions of the heavens, orbits, positions and occasion, eclipses, years, months, days, and positions of longitude and latitude, when reading astronomy. 59

Chytraeus concludes this section by recommending an exercise to develop the memory based on advice given by Pythagoris: before falling asleep, the student should recount the day’s events in order. This should include whatever activities he participated in, recounting these by hour, as well as what he heard, and what he read. This practice helps to fix all of these things in the mind.

Stilus

Chytraeus turns again to Quintilian’s Institutes of Oration, drawing heavily, while condensing and organizing the material. By way of introduction, he echoes Quintilian’s teaching

that reading and writing are activities that cultivate virtue and serve as a means for the student to develop their faculty of judgment through selecting and imitating examples of good writing appropriately in their own work. Like Quintilian, as well as other humanists of his day, Chytraeus emphasized that good character was necessary for a good orator. Absent character one has the mere words of the sophists. He believed that training in character occurs naturally as students select and study suitable examples of literature. Echoing Horatio, Chytraeus recommends that students concentrate on the best literary examples of advice, illustrations, and judgments that present both wisdom and eloquence. Studying writing gives students practice in critical thinking and judgment that translates into real world prudence.

Next, Chytraeus condenses advice given in Quintilian’s *Institutes of Oration* 10:3, 4, 5 and Pliny’s *Natural History* 7:9 into two sets of eight rules. The first set of rules deal with practical and methodological considerations necessary for making good progress in writing. Chytraeus

---

60 *RS.*, 25a. “Praecipua & utilissima, & maxime tum ad dicendi, tum ad iudicandi facultatem parandam, necessaria studiorum pars est, diligens & assidua STILI EXERCITATIO, qua sola fere conficiendum sibi & assequendum esse studiosi sciunt, quicquid in studijs laudabile se adepturos sperant.”

61 *RS.*, 25b. “Nam scribendi cura & exercitatio per sese ingenia studiosorum acuit & vegetiora ac magis perspicacia, & in omnia, quae ad iudicandum & dicendum proponuntur, intenta reddit, quae alioquin null labore ingens osci excitata plane hebescerent & torperent.”

*RS.*, 26a. “Nescio igitur, ut Praeceptorem Philippum alicubie dicere memini, an ullius generis artifex melius de rebus humanis mereri existimandus sit quam Stili Formator.”


63 *RS.*, 26a. “Postea in omnibus causis sapientius & rectius iudicare de rebus & de sciptis aliens possunt, qui ipsi stilum diligenter exercuerunt: Et in negotiis facilius invenire ad causam pertinentia, & commodius ea disponere, & intra certas metas totam explicationem continere: Et decori, pro ratione personarum, temporum, locorum rationem prudentius & aptius habere possunt.”
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begins with two rules are about time management. First, a student should not be able to go a day without writing, or rest easy with poor quality work, but ought to strive toward constructing a manageable amount of quality writing each day.\textsuperscript{65} Crucial to this goal is the careful selection and study of examples of good writing.\textsuperscript{66} Second, the student ought to have regular assigned times for practice so as not to rush through or skip their lesson. Chytraeus cites Quintilian on this point, noting that good writing cannot be achieved if speed is the goal. In fact, speed actually develops when the focus is kept on good writing.

Points three and six digress from the discussion of method to weigh in on the mental state and personal health of the student. In three, Chytraeus considers individual character and talent. He warns against the anxiety that can develop when a student strives to exceed their abilities as a writer, or becomes disillusioned to the point of abandoning their studies when overwhelmed by the work of a superior writer. Rather, they must remember they are students and be satisfied with their progress and their abilities at that stage, knowing that they may learn and improve, although even average writers are of great ornament and use to the church and state.\textsuperscript{67} Chytraeus more realistic approach is a marked difference from Quintilian who uses the point about differences as

\textsuperscript{65}RS., 27a. “Saepe ac multum & fere assiduam scribendum esse ... Ita adolescentes nullum diem elabi sinant, quo non aliquid temporis in scribendi exercitationem conferant, & vel tres aut quattuor solummodo lineas scribant quotidie, vel certe singulis hebdomadis duos dies fere totos in stilo versando consumant.”

\textsuperscript{66}RS., 27a–b. “Deinde non praecipitetur stilus, nec tam celeriter & expeditem, quam bene & eleganter scribendi cura adhibeatur ... Quare iustum tempus stilo singulari & diligentia formando, ad imitationem eorum, qui purissimem & elegantissimem locuti sunt. Adolescentes tribuant. Et vulgare hoc ad impurum, & agreste etiam, ac mendosum orationis genus, vacans omni cura munditiei & proprietatis ac elegantiae, quod plerique usu tantum & consuetudine obiter assecuti sumus, imitatione recte loquentium, & adhibito etiam longiore commentandi spacio, corrigamus & emendamus. Nam ut Quintilianis verbius utar, Cito scribendo non sit, ut bene scribatur: Bene scribendo sit, ut cito. Itaque sit primo, vel tardus, dummodo diligens stilus.

\textsuperscript{67}RS., 27b. “Nec tamen sit nimia diligentia & praeter modum anxia sollicitudo: sed suae natura & ingenij vires singulis considerent, nec melius dicere aut scribere velint, quam possunt. Nec, si lentius succedat scriptio, aut parum respondeat proposito exemplo eorum, quae elegantissime & propriissime locuti sunt, desperatione quadam, ut nonnulli statim abijciant stilum & infelicitatem sui ingenij deplorent: sed contenti sint eo, quod assequi possunt, & cogitent, in re magna, Esse aliquid prodire tenus, si non datur ultra, Et mediocres etiam dicendi ac scribendi artifices, magno Ecclesia Dei & Reipublicae, usui ac ornamento esse.”
a platform to emphasize that focusing on one’s immediate limitations stands in the way of forward progress and that practice and repetition is the only way forward. For Chytraeus, it is simply not realistic to assert that all who try will eventually succeed in the same way. On a related note, Chytraeus offers advice about the effect of one’s health on study. Chytraeus cautions in point six that progress becomes impossible when students allow themselves to fall into poor health, such as from overindulgent and irresponsible behavior [ebriosi]. Such students who must sacrifice time toward recovering from frivolities will not be able to put their whole effort into their studies. Such an admonition applies to all learning, notes Chytraeus, driving home the point with a line from Seneca that if the body is infirmed on account of yesterday’s crimes, the mind will be also, thus shackling the divine gift.68 Unfortunately, Chytraeus does not discuss bad health of another sort, resulting from burning the candle at both ends while studying.

Points four, five, seven and eight focus on his discussion of points of method. Four describes the place and purpose for *copia* in the students practice and writing.69 This served as a tool for broadening what is said about a particular subject.70 Five describes how the various arts provide topics that give the initial shape to the arguments specific to the art itself, and these topics then are the very seats of *copia*. For instance, theology deals with sacred matters while ethics addresses virtue and civic duty.71 Point seven argues for the importance of sufficient space

---


69 *Copia* refers to the broad variety of vocabulary and expressions students master to include in their own writing.

70 RS., 27a. “Plurimum autem ad scribendi facultatem & orationis copiam, prodest solidae & perfecta causae seu rei, de qua dicendum est aut scribendum, cognitio. Nam ex rerum cognitione efflorescat, & redundet oportet oratio, ut apud Ciceronem dicitur.”

71 RS., 27a. “Est autem rerum doctrina ex ijs artibus petenda ad quas argumenta stilo explicanda, pertinent: ut ex Theologia, concionum & explicationum sacrarum materia sumenda est: Ex Ethicis & Iuris prudentia, cognitio virtutum & officiorum ciuilium, & dijdicatio controversiarum forensium.”
left as margins on the page, allowing for comments, corrections and more to be made to their texts. Well-developed memory may be important to learning as seen earlier, but so are well-appointed margins. Finally, point eight essentially summarizes Quintilian’s advice on the process of amending writing. The student is to correct errors and then improve his argument if necessary.

Beginning immediately with a second list of eight points, Chytraeus details the ways a student may gain a more thorough understanding of the source material by discussing how to study the classical texts themselves. Point one states that students must understand a source text in its original language well enough to construct accurate translations. This can be either Greek into Latin or vice-versa, although Chytraeus reasonably admits that translating from the vernacular into Latin is the way to go at first to make things more accessible to beginners. Exercises in translation allow students to develop a fluency with the source text that will serve them in their own writing. Over time as study continues, students will translate increasingly difficult selections. For study he recommends select histories such as the *The Continence of Scipio* by Livy, various readings from Herodotus, including the oration of Artabanus against Xerxes proposed war, or the story of Solon and Croesus, or of Cambyses.

---


73 *RS.*, 28a. “Iudicatur autem ab eruditis, hoc Emendandi genus simplicissimum & optimum esse, Vt initio, insignibus tantum erratis verborum & figurarum sermonis statim mutatis: Atque etiam apud proyectores, ijs, quae ad inuentionem & collocationem, & verborum ac figurarum & compositionis elegantiam pertinent, comiter ostensis ...”


75 *RS.*, 29b–30a. “Proponi itaque pueris initio possunt vertenda elegantes & festiue narrationes, ut de rebus gestis Arati Sicyonii in 2. officiorum, de annulo Gygis, & de Cannio emente hortos hortos Syracusanos ex tertia
translations allows the student to better understand the passage and its contents, vocabulary, phrases used, ornamentation, and the meanings of unique constructions and illustration that are employed in the narrative of the classical texts. But it also allows a level of exposure to the ideas contained within the text that simply would not be possible had the student only glossed the translation of another.76

This particular point is reflective of the later Renaissance. When the movement began in the fourteenth century, the early supporters were interested in the “different” language they encountered: classical Latin with different constructions, vocabulary, and style from their own late medieval variety. But with the linguistic discoveries came also a rebirth of ideas that had lain dormant—elements of Aristotle’s logic or the revisited world view of Platonism and Neo-Platonism. Early proponents of the New Learning simply “did it.” But over time, humanists would step back and examine what they had done. New theory or a final presentation on method followed what they already had practiced. By the time of Chytraeus it was well accepted that an educator would lay out the theoretical “how to,” and students would follow the path. But it is important to remember that the prescribed method did not come out of the blue or spring full grown from the head of Zeus. It was the product of trial and error, of discussion and of growth over time. No one really sits down cold and lays out method in the abstract. It rather is the

officiorum. de Simonide apud Scopam coenante, ex 2. Oratore. de duobus Arcadibus, & Eudemo Cyprio, ex I. de diuinatione. de fratribus Philenis apud Salustium, de continentia Scipionis apud Liium Dec. 3. & lib. 6 ... Qui vero aetate & doctrina proieinctionres sunt, ex gracis autoribus illustres & amoenos locos, latinis verbis exprimere & reddere studeant, ut qui Herodotum hactenus praelegi audierunt, Orationes de tribus formis politiarum ex libro teria: Orationem Artabani dissuadetis Xerxi bellum, & alias, ex libro 7. Colloquium Solonis & Croesi, Historiam nati, expostiti & seruati Cyri infantis. Historiam de Cambise detrahente iudici δωρωφάγω cutem, & similes, latine interpretentur.76

76 RS., 29b. “Nec vero superstitione in transferrendis Graecis, verbum ex verbo sibi exprimendum putent: sed genus tantummodo, vинque verborum omnium seruent: & sententiam per singulas clausulas animo comprehensam, ita explicare phrasi latina proprie & diserte studeant perinde ac si non ab alio inuenta, verum a se ipsis exccogitata setentia, verbis latinis exponenda esset ... quos sedulo & attentem iter se coniugere & conferre, plurimum ad utriusque lingua facultatem & copiam profuturum est.”
product of life experience then organized and codified. Chytraeus drew on such experience widely and the *Regulae* as a whole shows his ambition in exploring and organizing approaches to the various subjects of the curriculum.

The third point considers the use of paraphrasing. Like translating, it is presented as another way for students to enhance their understanding of the material while practicing their own presentations. Chytraeus describes the paraphrase as a construction that allows for a shortened presentation of a passage or, in the case of confusing passages, one that has been condensed and more clearly, or appropriately presented in ones own words.77 Point four addresses revision. Specifically, Chytraeus discusses casting the same ideas through different descriptions or constructions rather than inserting new ones. Chytraeus mentions Philip Melanchthon’s theological texts as an example of this process, noting that Melanchthon had redacted the material and order or structure of his theological texts quite often during his lifetime.78 Point five teaches students how to quote classical authors. Simply put, when students wish to include a saying from antiquity, they ought to select examples that exemplify wisdom and excellence in describing such things as morals, rewards of virtue, and punishments for crime, and they ought to include the name of author.79 So quotations should be appropriate, not chosen simply to demonstrate one’s own learning. Point six states that the basis of eloquence is drawn

77 RS., 30b. “Quae vero beruius interdum ac obscurius, & confusius ab autore dicta sunt, ea paraphrastes ordine disposita copiosius & magis perspicue explicat, similibus etiam & exemplis & rationibus & circumstantiis, & alis amplificandi figuris, apte & parce adhibitis, ut Plinij praelectionem in Historiam mundi, erudita paraphrasi Philippus illustravit.”

78 RS., 31a. “Quarto, Non aliena tantum transferre, sed etiam nostra scripta retexere, & plurimis nodis variare Fabius iubet, ut sictu eadem cera aliae atque formae duci solent: ita eadem sententia subinde commutatis verbis ac figuris efferatur... Saepe etiam nostra aetate, easdem materias & totius doctrinae Theologicae corpus retractauis praeceptor Philippus.”

79 RS., 131b. “Quinto, γνώμας seu sententias tractare iubet, quae sunt breuia dicta, continentia sapientem & eximiam aliquam commonefactionem de moribus, de praemiis virtutum, de viciorum poenis & alijs in vitae euentibus.”
from the relationship between propositions and commonplaces, with the arguments derived from the commonplaces of the particular subject in question. The subject of order segues into Chytraeus’ seventh point: the use of declamations in the school. Writing composed as preparation for the declamation must be organized dialectically according to the principles of rhetoric. The subject of the oration, whether it be an art, topic of ethics, or useful thing in life, ought to be understood and explained through dialectic, says Chytraeus. Hegel would later remark that what a person has not written he has not thought. The point is essentially here behind Chytraeus’ call to write and work through the dialectical argument to prepare for whatever may follow. Finally, he states that the reading and practice of composing poetry is helpful, as long as the students concern themselves with worthy subjects. This is because especially in poetry, the writer must take special care to employ vocabulary, meter and illustration in a pleasing way, while not losing sight of the subject at hand. For this reason Chytraeus also recommends avoiding the confusion and barbarity of the lesser poets. In short, learn from the best.

Following his presentation of Quintilian and Pliny, Chytraeus recommends a few books on style. Joachim Camerarius’ *Elementa Rhetoricae*, Cicero’s *Epistles, De Officia*, the first and fifth

---

80 RS., 31b–32a. “Sexto, De Thesibus & locis communibus stilo tractandis praeipit: ex quibus, velut ex fonte, summa fere laus eloquentia emanat. Ornatissimae sunt enim orationes ea, qua ad Thesin referuntur, & quae, ut apud Ciceronem Crassus loquitur, a priuata & singulari controversia, se ad universi generis vim explicandam conferunt & conviurtet. Nam in omnibus causis, & argumenta ac nerui, & sententia ac verba, & omnis orationis copia, ex locis communibus praeципue nascentur.”


82 RS., 32a. “Nam qui Poeticen attigerunt, & versus ipsi componunt, maiorem curam & diligentiam adhibent in verborum delectu, in figuris, in compositione numerosa: rectius intelligitifiguras, & totam rationem loquendi in aliorum disertorum scriptis; eaque intellecta recte imitari facilius possunt. Econtra vero fastidium & neglectionem poetices, comitatur ignatio magnae partis Grammaticae, & in scribenda etiam soluta oratione, incuria & desidia, & tandem omnium literarum humaniorum inscitia & barbaries extrema.”
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books of the *Tusculanam, De Natura Deorum, De Diuinatione, De Legibus, De Oratore* and selected orations are recommended as excellent source material for study and imitation in writing letters, studying approaches to disputations, models of orations and should be a part of daily study.\(^3\) This list is merely a foretaste of what will be recommended later in Part III.

Chytraeus ends this section with a rationale for imitation, saying that there are few rules to keep in mind. First, the student must concern himself with only the best examples and make it a priority to memorize them. Then he must pay attention to the structure and method that the author employs in order that he understands correctly how the author has put the text together. Finally, he reminds the student that Quintilian teaches that imitation is not a slavish copying of an author but rather a thorough understanding and implementation of elements of the author’s style that culminate in a new creation. For Chytraeus imitation is a chance for the students to study the technical aspects of the writing and for use as models for structuring their own compositions.\(^4\)

---

\(^3\) *RS.*, 33a–b. “Extant autem tum de paulo ante indicatis, tum de alis etiam stili exercendii materiis, eruditissimus Ioachimi Camerarii libellus, cui titulus est, Capita exercitiorum studij puerietis, ad comparandam utriusque lingue facultatem, collecta ... Postremo adhortor Studiosos, ut praecipue elaborent in Epistolis, & Orationibus, & methodicis explanationibus recte componentu. Nam hisce generibus stili, in praesente Reipub. & Ecclesiae statu, res praecipuae & grauissima potissimum tractantur. Cum autem Imitatio iuncat assiduae & pene quotidianaec exercitationi, inprimis artifices efficiat: proponent sibi, & diurna nocturnaque man versabut stuiosi, certa quaedam & utilissima Ciceronis scriptae, ut Epistolae, Officia, primam & quintam Tusculanam, de Natura Deorum, de Diuinatione, de Legibus, de oratore & orationes aliquot selectas.”

Some humanists were careful about the texts (safe classics) they recommended and carefully avoided ones that could undermine character. *De Natura Deorum* was one of the revived classic sources for skepticism and could even threaten faith in a reader who seriously agreed with Cicero’s skeptical outlook that one could not be sure about anything dealing with the gods (or God). By Chytraeus’ time the ideas were out and about—no point in avoiding them now.

\(^4\) *RS.*, 34b. “Hae ratio dissoluendi, & ad ordines certos reducendi verborum genera & sententiarum formas mirificam utilitatem affert, tum ut Autur, quem nobis ad imitandum proposuimus, & verborum singularum significationes & pondera melius intelligantur: Tum vero, ut nostra oratio aliquam vestustae Latinorum consuetudinis similitudinem referat & redoleat.”
Chytraeus reminds the reader again in the beginning of this section, that the dual finis of studies is cognitio rerum et facultas bene dicendi, warning about those who are knowledgeable but unable to speak well in public because of neglected practice. There are various reasons why an orator may communicate poorly and Chytraeus states that those who neglect this exercise in their youth are limiting their public function later on. This speaks to his goal of creating the scholar who can communicate well. This entails more than simply writing since orations are frequently given. If a student becomes mute, or falters mid-sentence, such distraction chips away at the opportunity to communicate an idea to the audience.¹⁵ Stage fright!

Achieving the goal of clear speaking uninhibited by nerves, lack of knowledge, or other impediments comes as a result of practicing the elements of dialectic and rhetoric. Chytraeus wants students to practice reciting the notable topics, the significant ideas and examples, found either in the orations of others or their own. Next, they should participate in practice examinations and disputations, and look for other chances to speak in front of others in order to practice their delivery—working on their intonation and bodily gestures, while fortifying their voices and strengthening their spirits for the task public speaking. As an example of practice, Chytraeus suggests students recount historical narratives or fables in Latin with their schoolmates, and in the vernacular with others.¹⁶ Through such work they are also reinforcing

¹⁵ RS., 35a. “Nam qui haec linguae exercitia in iuueniti aetate neglexerunt, hi postea ad functiones publicas adhibitit, cum in coetu hominum frequentiore habenda est oratio, vel plane obmutescunt, vel deformi trepidatione perturbati subinde haerent ac titubant, vel inepte gesticulantur, vel alioquin rustice, obscure, indistincte, praecipitanter verba effutiunt.”

¹⁶ RS., 35a–b. “Hisce vitiis ut tempestiue obstent & medeantur studiosi, primum ipsi priuatum, vel in aliqvo mediocris coetu, insigne autorum locos, vel alia quae edidicerunt, vel oratiunculas a se compositas, expressa & distincta, ac clara voce, recitant. Deinde ament examina & disputationes, & alios congressus & colloquia eruditorum, in qibus praeter religiás utilitates grauisíssimas, pronunciatio etiam, seu vox & gestus dicentis formatur, & animus praesens ac firmior redditur, & ipsa dicendi facultas & extemporalis facundia augetur & confirmatur. Quam ad rem plurimum haec quoque exercitatio adiumenti adfert, si studiosi historias vel fabellas, vel alia quae
other skills, and practicing applying what they have learned in other areas. Chytraeus believes that even those students who are blessed as naturally talented speakers can benefit from this, and daily exercises can only serve to confirm and strengthen their abilities. In all practice Chytraeus recommends that students strive for clear, deliberate pronunciation, with control over not only their voices, but their entire bodies as well. Words and ideas matter, but presentation can distract from or reinforce the message.

**Examina et Disputationes**

The closing section of *De Mediis* addresses the place and value of examinations and disputation in the course of education. Both are presented as opportunities to practice communicating knowledge in a stressful situation. And, as we have seen in the presentation of the previous sections, they provide yet another opportunity to reinforce the elements of dialectic and rhetoric.

Chytraeus echoes remarks made in the final pages of the previous section about using examinations, or catechesis, as opportunities for the student to practice thinking and communicating under the pressure of their peers, instructor, or examining committee for developing a more accurate memory that can generate prompt and firm replies in the heat of the moment. The questions posed by the exam are meant to underscore the important elements of

---

87 *RS*, 35b. “Etsi autem vox bona, suauis, firma, ornata & apta, inprimis naturae beneficium est: tamen exercitatione, temperantia, cura & diligentia, emendar quaedam vitia, & bona augeri, confirmari & retineri possunt.”


89 *RS*, 36a. “Plurimum etiam utilitatis & adiumenti ad veram & solidam eruditionem comparandam, EXAMINA seu CATECHESES adferunt, in quibus discentes, ea, quae vel in lectionibus publicis audierunt, vel
the subject by calling on the student to recall and explain them under pressure. Such experience also keeps the student appropriately directed or focused with regard to the material that must be learned. Both student and instructor are able to monitor progress and are alerted to the areas in which the student may be falling behind.90

Examinations are also character building, helping to squelch attitudes such as arrogance—something Chytraeus calls a pernicious plague on the schools. It was Seneca, notes Chytraeus, who wrote that many would be able to achieve wisdom and erudition, if only they were not convinced that they already had arrived.91 But the opposite of the know-it-all is not good either: the student who fears that he knows nothing. Chytraeus warns that those students who wish to avoid being discovered as ignorant by an examination, that is, who will not risk failure and grow from the experience, will live in the perpetual darkness of ignorance.92

Disputation as Chytraeus understood it had little in common with its earlier reputation of noisy squabbles over absurd topics (And modern political wrangling is not even on the horizon). Chytraeus introduces the section on disputation with a definition in which he clarifies the practice as “peaceful collations of illustrations and explanations of statements and arguments.”93

90 RS., 36a. “Hoc consilio gradus & velut classes studiorum in scholis instituti sunt, ut EXAMINIBVS diligentia & cura, exacte & solide cognoscendi ea, quae ad discendum proponi solent, exuscitetur: ne adolescentes, oscitanter & solute in studijs oberrantes, extremis tantum labijs variae degustent, certo ordine in artibus vitae necessarijs & utilibus, recte & integre percipiendis, contineantur.”

91 RS., 36a–36b. “Formant igitur hae Catecheses & limant iudicium ac uunt vim & celeritatem ingenij: memoriam promptiorum ac firmiorum reddunt: linguam expoliunt, & facultatem loquendi & facundiam extemporalem alunt: Formant pronunciationem in moderanda voce, vultu, & vitandis gestibus ineptis ... Eximunt animis arrogantiam & philautiam, & vanam doctrinae & sapientiae eximiae persuasionem, quae perniciosissima studiorum pestis est, ut vere dixit Seneca: Multos ad veram sapientiam & eruditionem peruenire potuisse, nisi se iam peruenisse putassent...”

92 RS., 37b–38a. “Quo iusciitiam suam retegi verentes, in perpetuis ignorantiae tenebris malunt multo maiore cum dedecore, & sua ac alliorum pernicie versari, quam errores & inscitiam animis infixa corrigere, & veram ac solidam eruditionem comparare.”

93 RS., 38a. “DISPUTATIONES etiam seu placidae sententiarum & argumentorum collationes illustrandae &
Disputation has many purposes in the schools, says Chytraeus, starting with the first use for inquiring and confirming truth and then separating what is true or not, cutting away that which is false and unusable while retaining what is true and useful. In the process students learn how to evaluate the arguments of others and form judgment on important matters. This helps them improve their own arguments, just like, as Chytraeus notes, iron sharpens iron, or flint works against flint to create a spark. He also reminds the reader that disputation is an exercise in the use and principles of dialectic. Finally, Chytraeus reiterates that disputation is not a platform for quarreling over odious matters. Rather, it holds a high purpose for discussing and illustrating the truth with loving and peaceful propositions.

**Conclusion**

Chytraeus wraps up Part II by exhorting his students to follow carefully these eight rules of study, saying that by so doing such they will reap the most benefit from their labors, especially at their young age. This section of the *Regulae* showcases his humanist background both by the

---

94 RS., 38a–b. “Primum enim in singulis artibus, ad inquisitionem & confirmationem veritatis, cuius cura Scholis praecipue commendata est, plurimum haec συξήτησις seu collation prodest, cum multi, & inter hos aliqui eruditi, suas cogitationes & argumenta conferunt, & ad amussim seu normas & χριτήρια certitudinis dextre accommodant & expendunt, atque ita veras, rectas & certas sententias, a falsis & incertis segregant & secernunt. Id enim proprie significat disputare, velut relectis & amputatis inutilibus & falsis, veras sententias retinere, & puras ac illustres redere: ut cum vites putantur, inutilia sarmenta recidi, & palmites faecudi putari solent & mundari.”


96 RS., 38a. “Moribus etiam prodest, assuefieri ad confusionem animi discutiendam, ad frendandam iracundiam, ad verecundiam & modestiam in regendis gestibus, ad comitatem & affabilitatem, & caeterae officia humanitatis in omni vita, Propter has tantas utilitates colloquia disputationum a studiosis amanda, & omnibus officis fouenda sunt, qui non rixarum vel alendorum odiorum esse disputationes, sed amantes & placidas sententiarum collationes, discendi & illustrandae veritatis causa institutas, statuant.”

97 RS., 38b.
organization of method he presents as well as his knowledge and use of classical and contemporary sources for supporting and illustrating that method. The principles of dialectic and rhetoric are reinforced throughout his eight parts of study especially with regard to his heavy use of the commonplace book as a strategy for reading, analysis, genesis and the development of a student's character. His approach helps formulate a way of thinking in the student that applies to all of the arts from the trivium to the higher faculties. This is excellent practice for helping the students begin to understand the connections between one discipline and another, and especially how such an approach serves theology. Admittedly, Chytraeus can go slowly and often repeats himself. But this shows his care and attention to detail. Furthermore he has provided a thorough source that a teacher can depend on for crafting a curriculum (which a teacher or student could always trim when using the book) rather than left gaps that could affect a student's education. He has already written much, but he is hardly done. Part III of the Regulae will address each of the subjects in much more detail, explaining their use as well as the methods and corpus of literature necessary for learning them.
INTRODUCTION TO PART III

De Ratione Instituendi Studia in Singulis Artibus, & de singularum artium scriptoribus praecipuis

A brief introduction to Part III of the *Regulae* would be helpful, both to preview the content and to address Chytraeus’ own comments on the section. With much to accomplish, *De Ratione Instituendi* is the largest of Chytraeus’ three sections of his *Regulae Studiorum* proper. It owes its size to a collection of encyclopedic treatises laid out on each of the subjects contained in the four categories outlined in Part I of theology, ethics, natural philosophy and history. These categories provide organization to Part III which would otherwise consist of numerous sections on all of the subjects, gradually added to the *Regulae* during the four decades it was in print. Some of these sections Chytraeus also published as individual treatises, while others may have been delivered first as lectures or orations.

The purpose of the chapters that follow are to examine the sections of Part III through the methodological and theological lens that Chytraeus established in Part I and II. To briefly review—the first two sections set an approach to the question of the relationship between Chytraeus’ theology and pedagogy by laying out the relationship between education and its goals in Part I, and by presenting general methodological tools in Part II. Part III, as will be shown, reveals Chytraeus’ attitudes about the purpose of each subject as well as a methodological approach to studying each.

It is useful to know the central questions guiding the analysis of Part III going in: How does Chytraeus understand each art as a gift from God? How does the status as a gift relate to his understanding of its function? And how then should each subject be approached? Chytraeus’ overall approach is influenced by how he understands and defines the intended purpose of the art—how God intends the art to benefit mankind. These are the very questions that Chytraeus
raises and answers as he presents each subject. Not only does he want his students to be thinking theologically about the material, but such questions provide an overall focus and guide for dealing with the the contemporary and classical subject matter they are learning. Being clear on the purpose is essential to mastery.

Part I had discussed a method for learning each subject individually and Chytraeus is more or less consistent in presenting each chapter according to a set pattern. Almost every section opens with a description of the purpose of the subject in both the church and civil arena, and relates it to other arts in the curriculum. Chytraeus follows with a survey of the texts that teach the subjects method and summarize its parts. Finally, Chytraeus lists off a number of the important examples of literature in the field and often provides brief outlines or short summaries to the more well-known works. Although Chytraeus’ approach risks tedium (as the look at Part II has aptly shown), because of the repetition from section to section, at least Chytraeus’ readers must admit he is clear and thorough. Furthermore such repetition means that each section can then function as a kind of “self-contained” syllabus for study further reflecting the “work-in-progress” nature of the Regulae.

Chytraeus’ Introduction to De Ratione Instituendi

Chytraeus begins De Ratione Instituendi by reviewing the central points of the previous two parts. He reminds the reader that God has given the arts to mankind as gifts for the well-being of the church and community. The arts themselves are interconnected and meant to be comprehended as a complete and connected body of doctrine yet learned in a certain order as explained in the first two sections.98 He notes that the order of the subjects in his list is

98 RS., 40a. “Et monstratae sunt diuinitus generi humano artes, ecclesiae ac communi inprimis vitae necessariae: & sapienti consilio artificum, quos Deus excitauit, distinctae, & certo ordine ac concinna serie
pedagogical, reflecting the foundation that the rudiments, in particular the language arts, provide. So first learn to think, to communicate, and then focus on subjects to communicate about:

i. De Ratione vtiliter discendi Grammaticem Latinam

ii. De Dialectica

iii. De Rhetorica

iv. De studio Linguarum Graecaet Ebraeae

v. De Ratione legende Historias

vi. De Poetis

vii. De intitiis Mathematum, Arithmetica, Geometria, Astronomia, Geometria, Astronomia, Geographia, Musica recte discendis

viii. De Philosophia Naturali, seu Physica, et inde extracta Arte Medica

ix. De studio doctrinae Ethicae, ac Politicae seu Iurisprudentiae

x. De theologia, seu studio doctrinae et pietatis Christianae, cuius semina, teneris etiam discentium mentibus, una cum primis literis, et lacte nutricis, instillanda sunt, et omnibus caeterarum Artium studiis, praelucere vera agnitione Dei, et Domini nostri Jesu Christi, fontis sapientiae omnis ac doctrinae salutaris, et misceri studiis ardens petitio auxillii et gubernationis diuinae, ac ad hunc sine omnes discendi labors referri debent, ut Dei gloriam illustret, et Ecclesiae Dei distributae, & inter se connexae sunt: ut integrum velut corpus doctrinarum & artium omnium una animo comprehendi, & ordine Homines doceri de ipsis rebus, quarum cognitio inprimis expetenda & vitae necessaria est, & studiorum nostrorum inita, progressiones & metae prospici possint.”

99 RS., 40b. “Sed tamen quia rerum notae sunt verba: & ad loquendum pueri quam ad recte iudicandum promptiorem naturam habent: primum forandae pueritiae rudimentum, &initia studiorum sunt dicendi artes, & Grammatica inprimis, quae vim ac proprietatem & structuram sermonis, quo ad res intelligendas & explicandas opus est, considerat & docet.”
ac Reipublicae totiusq; vitae utilitibus commodiusq; seruiant.\textsuperscript{100}

The contents listed in his introduction signal that Chytraeus is proposing a fairly exhaustive treatment of the arts, breaking down the four categories into their respective subjects. As noted, the actual contents of Part III reflect a work in progress. One of the final editions of the \textit{Regulae}, printed in 1595—the edition examined for this study—contains several omissions, as well as chapters that appear out of place. The section on poetry appears at the end of the work where the chapter on theology is supposed to appear instead of chapter six as the outline directs. The chapter on theology was omitted with a note from the editor about the wide circulation and availability of Chytraeus’ separately printed orations on the subject. Finally, Hebrew is missing from the chapter on the study of Greek and Hebrew. Perhaps Chytraeus’ intentional organization did not suit the concerns of the editor, or it could be that the appropriate texts were not on hand at the time the type was set. In any case, the absence of Hebrew did not scuttle the work’s publication.

An almost continual work in progress that Chytraeus continued to add on to (but not otherwise alter), the \textit{Regulae} underwent a dozen printings between 1562 and 1596. While the first and second parts remained virtually unchanged from the early to the later editions, the third part changed considerably as Chytraeus added new sections throughout the years. The earliest 1562 edition did nothing but acknowledge that there was to be a third section, containing only a title page for Part III. The following editions began to slowly expand but contained only a fraction of what the later editions held. For instance, the 1564 edition, one of the earliest commonly available, contained only the sections on grammar, dialectic, and history. Even the final versions printed in 1595 and 1596 by the printer Henningus Grotius in Leipzig turned out to

\textsuperscript{100} RS., 41a. Index page featured at the beginning of part three of \textit{Regulae Studiorum}.
be incomplete, as Chytraeus had decided by then to expand Part III to include the subjects of medicine, Hebrew (originally included in the index to Part III), and music, as well as a Part IV of the *Regulae* (originally included in his plan detailed in Part I to direct on the hours of study). These were printed as a kind of supplement in 1595 by the Jena printer, Johannes Steinmann under the title of *Ad regulas studiorum Davidis Chytraei*.101

Even though a work in progress or development during its decades in print, the *Regulae* at least did not double back and contradict or refute what came before. Instead, Chytraeus added and expanded, striving to incorporate all subjects and disciplines. Someone set on having the text (if not education itself) set once and for all might be frustrated by what seems to be something of a moving target. But those who acknowledged that life’s circumstance and experiences are not etched in stone can appreciate Chytraeus for bringing out his work in stages so at least what was done could be used with subsequent material following on the foundation laid at the start (and, of course, as long as the newer versions and additions were still wanted by teachers and students, publishers would not mind the periodic changes either). But now with the 1595 edition, and with all the changes at an end and with the benefit of hindsight, it is time to look at the specifics of Part III more closely.

101 The full title is *Ad regulas studiorum Davidis Chytraei : appendix continens [paraleipomena], quae cum priori editione coniuncta, [eynumlpopodeia] integram absoluunt, catalogum versa pagina monstrabit* (Jena, Steinmann, 1595). It is interesting that while his mentor Melanchthon would rewrite and rethink his works as editions were released, Chytraeus simply adds to what he has already written, expanding but not changing the existing content. Perhaps he was overly confident in his earlier work.
CHAPTER SIX

CATEGORY FOUR: LANGUAGE ARTS

Introduction

The fourth category of arts deals specifically with the language arts and history. Leading off Part III of the *Regulae* are sections on grammar, dialectic, rhetoric, Greek, history, and poetry. This chapter will explore those, highlighting in each section the central features of Chytraeus’ approach, description, and use of each subject. As will be shown, the dual goal of knowledge and communication feature centrally, helping to shape the exercises and direct the content of the subjects in hand. Chytraeus selects literature that both expands the students knowledge of that subject material and is eloquently written, with literary examples that the students can study and then imitate in their own work. The ultimate purpose of education—true knowledge and worship of God—is also an important part of Chytraeus’ approach. Reminders of how the arts all contribute toward helping the student better understand Holy Scripture are never far off from Chytraeus’ discussions of each subject.

*De Studio Grammatices Recte Instituendo*

*De Studio Grammatices* introduces Part III, and is a lengthy section due to its encyclopedic nature. It sets the pattern for how Chytraeus will treat each subject. Lists of grammar textbooks and authors stretch on for pages, and sheer number of examples that Chytraeus includes in any
one section is surpassed only when he turns later in the *Regulae* to poetry.\(^1\) Chytraeus lays the section out in three parts. After presenting his arguments for the importance and purpose of the study of grammar, he offers advice on what subjects to read in order to practice both grammar and vocabulary and presents definitions and explanations of the various parts of speech. He concludes with a description of classical sources that exemplify fine writing. This section is extremely important as grammar (the fundamentals of communication) is necessary for taking up all the other arts in the curriculum. It appeared in the early editions of *De Ratione Discendi* beginning in 1563 and in all subsequent printings.

**Analysis**

Chytraeus calls grammar is the foundation and nurse of all the other arts, marked by a singular importance: namely, without it accurate communication would not exist, and no learning of any other art would be possible. For those who neglect the study of grammar early on, the fruits and labors of all the other arts are sure to perish as consequence.\(^2\) It is of particular importance for the church because God acted through language and chose no other way than by the writing of the prophets and apostles to make Himself known. The study of grammar allows readers to understand properly the technical aspects of the language of Scripture, the power and significance of the words, phrases, figures, constructions, tropes, and motifs. Such knowledge aids the proper understanding of the words of the divine writing in order that one who hears in

---

\(^1\) This is because Chytraeus strives to include examples of poets that wrote about each subject in the curriculum to illustrate the wide range of subjects that poetry encompasses.

\(^2\) *RS.*, 41b–42a. “Fundamentum & nutricula omnium caeterarum artium est GRAMMATICA, quae rationem recte intelligendi ac explicandi vim & naturam sermonis (in aliorum disertorum oratione ac scriptis) & recte loquendi ac scribendi, seu componenti orationem prope & perspicue animi sensa exponentem, profitetur. Ut autem domus aedificationem frustra suscipiet, qui Fundamenta prius non posuerit solida & firma, quibus illa innitio tuto possit: ita omnis studiorum labor & fructus, in reliquis artibus, & disciplinis superioribus, perit iis, qui haec Grammatices fundamenta neglexerunt.
turn can offer the living voice of Scripture in teaching, propagating, and defending God’s Word.\(^3\) By way of contrast, Chytraeus reminds his readers that those who have neglected to undertake a careful study of grammar risk misunderstanding the divine Word. He maintains that this was the problem in previous ages of the church, when language studies were neglected in the schools, obscuring not only the true Christian religion but clouding many other arts as well. Understood against this background, Chytraeus argues that it is by God’s glorious action in recent history that grammar, along with the study of languages useful in the church (theology) and civil realm (philosophy) have been restored.\(^4\) Here he echoes his mentor Melanchthon, who once pointed out that when encountering obscure passages in Scripture, knowledge of the original language is necessary, because such passages actually resist translation, and doom those ignorant of the original meaning to endless controversy.\(^5\)

Turning next to a discussion of effective communication, Chytraeus emphasizes that appropriate stylistic choices in writing and speaking are determined by the message and the context in which it is to be delivered. In this he follows the advice of the grammarians and humanists of his day, warning against mere slavish imitation of the ancient authors to the neglect

\(^3\) RS., 42b. “Praecipue autem in Ecclesia, diligenti & accurata Grammatices cognitione opus est. Cum enim Deus non aliter a nobis agnosci & coli velit, quam sicut se in verbo a se tradito in Prophetarum & Apostolorum scriptis patefecit: necesse est disci Grammaticam, ut librum, in quo Deus suam doctrinam scribi voluit, legere possimus, & vim ac significacionem verborum, phrasium, ac Figurarum sermonis, in constructione, in Tropis ac Schematis, quibus referta sunt Biblia, recte intelligere & explicare: ut genere sermonis diuin inrecte intellecto, ex eis fontibus veram de Deo doctrinam hauriamus. Deinde ut viua voce & scriptis, verae religionis doctrina propris & perspicue doceri & propagari ac defendi possit, inprimis magna facultate & copia Grammatici, hoc est, recti ac emendati & proprie sermonis opus est.”

\(^4\) RS., 43. “Sicut superioribus seculis videmus neglectis recte docendi ac linguarum studiis, verum Christi religionem, & multas artes simul obscuratas, & fere extinctas fuisse. Quae nostra aetate, reflorescentibus litteris aclinguis, simul instauratae sunt. Itaque propter gloriam Dei, & Ecclesiae ac Republicae salutem, ac ut in caeteris studiis aliquo cum fructu versari & progredi discentes possint, diligenter & exquisite GRAMMATICA, in iis linguis, quae in Ecclesiae & Philosophia maximo usu sunt, cognoscenda est.”

It is not enough to assume that technical issues in writing and communication could theoretically be discharged by careful study of the best authors followed only by imitation. This treats language as a relic, as a fossil. The point rather is to learn how the classical authors wrote and then not only to imitate when it seems proper, but also go beyond and innovate in their style, in their vein, realizing that what they did was contemporary for them, even as writing now must also honor style and yet be contemporary. Chytraeus also maintains that principles of grammar are necessary for learning effective communication in the vernacular. Without these skills there could be no hope of composing or even following an oration effectively with present-day listeners. Such emphasis on learning grammar in its proper order helps to assure that both knowledge and effective communication orient learning as whole.

Following this opening argument on the practical value of grammar, Chytraeus lists five topics as the elements of writing [sermonis grammatici]: the words, constructions, phrases, figures, and compositions that are themselves exercised through reading analysis, and writing practice. In this case he recommends natural philosophy as the category for students to draw from as they practice these elements. Guided by the rules of grammar, students are to analyze readings of the ancients with an eye toward imitating and then elegantly incorporating what they have observed in the daily practice of their own writing. Such a recommendation supplements

---

6 For the various ways imitation was studied and practiced during the Renaissance see Peter Mack, “Learning to Write Like Cicero,” in Schooling in Renaissance Italy: Literacy and Learning 1300–1600 (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1989), 222–29.

7 RS., 43b. “Etsi vero facultas recte intelligendi Autorum scripta, & emendate, proprie, ac perspicue loquendi, non tantum praecptis Grammaticae, sed usu & imitatione eloquentium scriptorum potissime comparatur: tamen postquam Latina lingua nobis vernacula esse desii, praecpta & Rugulas disci omnino necesse est: sine quibus nemo se certam loquendi rationem, & facultatem intelligendi sermonem, in disertorum scriptus (qui praecipuus Grammaticae finis est) consequi posse speret.”

8 RS., 44a. “Est igitur FINIS GRAMMATICAЕ LATINAЕ, recte intelligere sermonem Latinum & emendate & perspicue Latine loqui ...”

9 RS., 45a. “NORMAE vero iudicii de hisce partibus Sermonis Grammatici, & INSTRUMENTA, quibus
readings from moral philosophy, and is intended to help students expand their vocabularies as they learn words associated with the natural life of plants and animals both on land and sea. Clearly natural philosophy was important to his overall view of a solid liberal arts education, but this also alerts the reader to the inter-disciplinary nature of Chytraeus’ approach.

The remainder of the section considers various classical authors according to the writing styles they were known for as well as listing both classical and contemporary works on grammar by various authors. It shows the orderly and comprehensive organization typical of Part III, and Chytraeus’ approach here looks like more of what he has already included previously in Part II to the point of overflow. He covers letters, syllables, intonation, significance of words, phrases, figures, orthography, rhythm, etymology, and syntax. He then lists examples from grammatical works of antiquity that include Aelius Donatus, Priscianus, Quintilian among many others. And more well-known contemporary works are not ignored including the likes of Melanchthon, Perotto, Aldus, Mycillus, Vives, and Willichius. All in all, Chytraeus is thorough to a fault.

De Studio Dialectices Recte Suscipiendu

Chytraeus’ treatise on dialectic remained almost completely unchanged from its initial publication until its final form as it appeared in Regulae Studiorum. Another early addition to

prudenter & dextre adhibitis, parari a nobis mediocris facultas & copia SERMONIS LATINI potest, praeipue tria sunt. 1. Praecepta seu Regulae artis Grammaticae. 2. LECTIO diligens & observatio ac imitatio veterum autorum, qui recte & eleganter latine locuti sunt, Qui tamen sine regulis & praeceptis artium dicendi intelligi non possunt. 3. EXERCITATIO STILI quotidiana in oratone soluta & carminibus, recte ac eleganter ad imitatione veterum scribendis.”

10 RS., 46a. “Vtilissimum vero erit, in prima statim aetate, pueris, Rerum vocabula ediscenda proponere, ex libellis qui Arborum, herbarum, legumin, olerum, fructum, quadrupedum, insectorum, volucrum, piscium, appellaciones ex Plinio, Dioscoride & aliiis authoribus collectas, item propria opisicum & singularum artium vocabula continent.”

11 The early versions did not follow the Greek excerpts with their Latin translations while the later ones did. Additionally there are two Greek selections with translations from Plato, the Phaedrus and Philebus that did not appear in the earliest versions.
the *Regulae*, it first appeared in Rostock published under the title *De studio Dialectices recte instituendo libellus ad Christopherum Gerdenerum*, Rostochij, Myliander, 1563. Just a year later in 1564 it was included in *De Ratione* as one of the earliest entries in Part III and continued to be included in all later printings. It also found its way into Jodocus Willich’s *Erotematum Dialectices libri III* in 1568. The dedicatory epistle for the treatise, addressed to Christopher Gerdner of Lübeck, offers encouragement about the study of dialectic advising him that dialectic is a guide for human life. Like humanists who came before such as Melanchthon, dialectic is understood here as a teaching and learning tool, not to be misunderstood with Scholastic logic. It helps break down the subject into its components so that students can understand the order and relationships of the parts and how they relate to the goal of learning that subject. Chytraeus compares its utility to the instruments used by the architect, without which, they would not be able to properly construct a house. In a similar way, liberal arts studies would be go badly and be frustrated without the early and sound introduction of dialectic into the course of learning. Finally the study of dialectic emphasizes texts of method and summary. Such texts are both examples of dialectic at work in the way they summarize and present a subject, and they help the student navigate the classical sources in a particular subject area more efficiently. Such structure

---

12 Kaufmann, *Universität und lutherische Konfessionalisierung*, 628.
14 *RS.*, 58b. “Si memineritis, eam, non finem studiorum nostrorum, sed instrumentum tantum modo, & commune organon esse, ad summas illas artes, quae rerum doctrinam continent, & vitam humanam gubernant, & tuentur, recte percipiendas & propagandas, necessarium.”
16 *RS.*, 58b. “Ut autem ineptus Architectonica discipulus fuerit, qui in normis, asciis, dolabris, planulis, runcinio, cochlis, & reliquis Architectonicae instrumentis comparandis vel poliendis totam aetatem consumat, domum nunquam aedificet: ita inutiliter & frustra in studiis versabuntur.”
and organization in turn helps the student further toward becoming a good orator.\footnote{RS., 59a. “... & tradi in Scholis integre, & disci praecepta Dialecticae & Rhetoricae ad recte de rebus omnibus iudicandum & dicendum maxime necessaria & utilia, percommode possunt. Quibus perceptis, statim suscienda est Exercitatio & progrediendum ad cognoscendas Methodos & summas artium, quae sapientiae & eloquentiae fontes continent, & ad duos hosce studiorum nostrorum fines, videlicet, ad recte de rebus omnibus sentiendum, & facultatem bene loquendi ac scribendi, plurimum adierunt adiumenti.”}

*On the Study of Dialectic* is a lengthy treatise and another typical example of Chytraeus’ encyclopedic approach to a subject. Following a laudatory introduction about the uses and benefits of dialectic in which its tie to theology is especially noted, Chytraeus launches into a technical discussion of dialectic’s two parts: invention and judgment. This is followed by a description of how the component parts of dialectic are arranged and used, as well as exercises that incorporate its principles. He concludes with a listing of the literature on the subject, including a lengthy synopsis of Aristotle’s *Organon*. Finally, he illustrates the dialectic nature of conversations between Socrates and his disputants by including two short excerpts from Plato’s *Phaedrus* and *Philebo* at the end of the treatise.

**Analysis**

Chytraeus begins by connecting dialectic to the “natural light” given at creation. He understands dialectic as nothing less than the light of human reason at work [*hoc naturale lumen rationis humnae est Dialectica*]. Human reason, he states, functions as the mind’s eye, comprehending things that eyes cannot see such as logical orders, distinctions, consequences, and rationale.\footnote{RS., 60a. “Diininitus insitum est mentibus humanis lumen, uo ut oculis res propositas aspicimus, & colorum discrimina diiudicamus, ita Deum & res alias etiam non subjectas oculis aliquomodo agnosimus, & unum ac multa discernimus, & ordinem rerum, distinctionem, consequentiam, & rationcinationum metas intelligentes, via & ratione certa de re proposita disserimus & disputamus. Hoc naturale lumen rationis humanae est Dialectica, ostendens viam & rationem recte & integre cognoscendi, & ordine ac perspicue explicandi, & iudicandi, omniae, quae in disputationem hominum venire possunt.”} As a natural light, reasoning would not need cultivation *per se*, except, as he points out, in many people it has been obscured, sometimes languishes, and is often actively
aberrant. But he believes this “divine gift” can be salvaged when it is augmented by another
divine gift from above, namely, the art of dialectic. Dialectic is partly the spontaneous light of
natural reason, and partly a constructed art resting on personal observation learned from seeing
and reading about good examples of natural reason at work.¹⁹

For Chytraeus dialectic is as “necessary for learning and teaching as air and bread are for
the body.” This is true for both the civil realm and the church, and Chytraeus comments
specifically on how dialectic contributes to sound theology. He views it as a pedagogical tool
that helps students learn theology well which in turn helps them understand the errors that
contribute to false doctrine. As a result they are better able to defend orthodox Christian teaching
against heresy.²⁰ Chytraeus believes this relationship between dialectic and theology to be not
only practical, but actually required by Scripture itself. He cites 1 Timothy 3, and Titus 1 that
discuss the qualities of a bishop as one who both retains true doctrine and is able to refute errors
and show why they are wrong using the norm of Scripture.²¹ In 2 Timothy 1, Chytraeus
understands Paul commanding Timothy to maintain a “pattern of sound words” as being akin to
doing theology using a certain method and reflecting orthodox summary of the faith. Then a little

¹⁹ RS., 60a. “Cum autem hoc naturae lumen in plerisq; hominibus sit obscurius & languidius, & saepe aberret:
imenso Dei beneficio, praecepta artis Dialecticae, perpetuae & certa, accedunt, ab Heroicis artificibus, partim ex
illa naturali luce rationis humanae, partim ex longa observatione & exemplis bene disserentium extracta.”

²⁰ RS., 61a. “Ac etiamsi omnes caeterae artes & professiones, munus suum sine Dialectica posset obire: ad
quas tamen recte discendas & docendas non minus necessarium organum est Dialectica, quam hoc aere aut cibo ad
vitam corporis sustinendam opus est: tamen Ecclesia Dei nullo modo dialecticae adiumentis carere potest. Ut enim
doctrina coelestis recte, distinete, iusto ordine & perspicue doceri & explicari, & erroribus ac corruptelis dextre &
clare refutatis, defendi & retineri possit: assiduis definitionibus, distinctionibus, argumentis, & Enlchis opus est.”

²¹ RS., 61b. “Itaque Deus ipse, cum doceri & disci veram de se doctrinam, & veritatis corruptelas euidenter
confutari iubes: simul etiam Dialecticae studium, quae sola omne recte docendi, confirmandi & refellendi rationem
monstrat, severissime nobis praecipt et commendat Matthaei 28. 1. Timoth 3. Tit. 1. Oportet Episcopum, id est,
idoneum ad docendum esse: & constanter retinentem veram doctrinam, ut possit & exhortari per doctrinam sanam &
contradicentes ἐλέγχειν, dextre & erudite refutare, & erroris conuincere, euidenter monstratis locis & causis
imposturarum, & deducto contradicente ad normas seu κριτήρια certitudinis, ubi diuina voce conuincet sentiat.”
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later in the text (2 Timothy 2:15), Chytraeus interprets the task to distinguish properly between Law and Gospel as what Paul meant by rightly handling the Word of Truth.22

Chytraeus then turns to detailed descriptions of the component parts of dialectic, and proposes four exercises for students to help them learn and practice. They are cumulative, with each building upon, and reinforcing previously learned skills. At the same time, a topical analysis of the subject matter according to a set of commonplace lists is a central feature to his approach. This comprehensive program seeks to build dialectical thinking by immersing students in its use—in learning, writing, disputation, teaching—by analyzing and then explaining the use of disputation by others.23

The first exercise makes use of the components of invention as a means of analysis. To use the parts, a student obviously must first be able to identify them. So students start by memorizing the ten elements that combine in invention (the list includes name, definition, divisions, causes, effects, subjects, adjuncts, synonyms, opposites, and testimony). Students then are to practice analyzing their readings by identifying the topics [loci], or commonplaces, relevant to the subject area. For instance, they can explore their daily theological readings through theological commonplaces such as God, God’s law, sin, or good works. Or they could read Cicero according to topics that are reflected in his philosophy such as god, virtue, or personal action and duty. For

---


the commonplaces of physics, Chytraeus simply points a widely available outside source, referring his readers to the list compiled by the famous University of Wittenberg physicist Johannes Velcurio in his numerous publications on the subject. For the subject of personal virtue Chytraeus recommends own *Regulae Vitae*, a book that organizes the commonplaces of virtue according to the Decalogue.

Second, the students ought to practice applying the elements of dialectic to arguments in order to test for fallacies. They begin this on a very fundamental, basic level by looking at the subject and then the predicate of a proposition and investigating it according to the order of the topics of invention. Chytraeus follows Melanchthon’s use of the topics, laid out in his well-known *Erotemata dialectices* (1547). Chytraeus illustrates how to use the topics for investigative analysis, with a short excerpt that examines the Anabaptist question of whether or not a Christian can serve as a magistrate that presents arguments for and against what constitute a Christian’s civic responsibilities.

24 Chytraeus directs his students to the authors that best present not only the subject matter, but the method for study. Johannes Bernhardi (Velcurio as he was also known) represents the kind of methodological approach that Chytraeus finds helpful. Velcurio was a friend and colleague of Melanchthon and applied Melanchthon’s insights on method to his own approach to physics. Chytraeus is likely referring here to Bernhardi’s *Epitome Physicae Libri Quattuor*. See Pekka Kärkkäinen, “Johannes Bernhardi on Method,” *Lutherjahrbuch* 81 (2014): 193-223.


26 See Peter Mack’s discussion of Melanchthon’s use of the topics for invention in “Melanchthon,” in *Renaissance Argument*, 320–333.

27 RS., 69a. “SECUNDO Cum quaestion aliquae seu Thema coniunctum, discendi aut disputandi causa proponitur: operam dent studiosi, ut ex locis Dialecticis medium inueniant, seu probationem, seu Argumentum, quod
Chytraeus’ third exercise expands on the use of dialectic for investigation providing instruction on how to dialectically analyze texts and proceeds in three steps. The first step is to extract the thesis or main proposition from the text. Next, students are to consider from what topic and subject the argument and its supporting points have been drawn. Finally, these parts are arranged syllogistically by the students so that they may clearly see whether or not the argument holds together. After this analysis is complete Chytraeus recommends that students pay careful attention to the words, figures, and ornamentation that are found in the argument according the principles of rhetoric and grammar. Orations of Cicero, Epistles of Paul, or works of other authors that are explained in school on a daily basis are all suitable sources for filling this role of teaching by example and analysis of the example.28

The final exercise puts dialectic directly to use both for constructing arguments and evaluating arguments in the disputation or those that come up in daily readings. Building on the principles laid out in the first three exercises that make use of both topics and the syllogism, Chytraeus states that such practice yields both personal and professional results as it sharpens cum partibus quaestionis legitime dispositum, ostendat, an propositio vera aut falsa sit, vel an praedicatu & subiectum recte aut perperam inter se coniungantur ... Cuuislibet Quaestiosis aut propositionis duas sunt partes seu dictiones simplices, videlicet, Subiectum & praedicatum. Harum utramque adolescens ducat ordine per locos inventionis seu quaestionis Methodi: & inuestiget aut conquirit, primum Subiecti, deinde Praedicati ... Deinde eandem definitionem, partes, causas, &c. iungat subiecto quaestionis, & habebit Minorem. Inde Conclusio sua sponte sequetur. EXEMPLUM Anabaptistae quaestionem mouent, An Magistratum gerere Christiano concessum sit.”
character, confirms judgment, builds quickness and ease when negotiating sources, and fosters wisdom in analyzing arguments. Parsing disputation arguments is also meant to aid the faculty of extemporaneous speaking.29

The remainder of this section lists helpful authors in the field, with a summary of Aristotle’s *Organon* and excerpts from Plato’s *Phaedros* and *Philebos* included at the very end. Chytraeus considers the best approach to dialectic to be Melanchthon’s *Erotemata Dialectices*—helpful for teaching students good judgement in the midst of difficult political and theological controversies of their time.30 When it comes to sorting through and applying dialectics to reading analysis, Chytraeus names Peter Ramus as another excellent source, trailing only Melanchthon. He notes that Ramus clearly laid out the mechanics of dialectic in examples drawn from various writings and disputations while also acknowledging Ramus’ departure from the long-standing approach to logic (parting company with traditional approaches to Aristotle).31

Chytraeus acknowledges Rudolf Agricola as the scholar who restored dialectic, reviving it from the gloom and mind-numbing labyrinth of the previous age and setting it in its proper context with the precepts of rhetoric.32 Johann Sturm, Lorenzo Valla, and Joachim Willicus—all big

---

29 *RS.*, 73a. “QUARTO, Ad usum tranferri praecepta Dialectica a studiosis possunt in quotidianis Disputationibus, & aliorum etiam argumentis diiudicandis, ex quibus locis ducta sint ... Haec disputationum, praesertim de reus bonis & illustribus, exercitia, & ingenium mirifice acuunt, & confirmant iudicium, & celeritatem quandam ac facilitatem in negociorum fontibus perspiciendis, & argumentis sagaciter inuestigandis & arte disponendis adferunt. Et dicendi etiam facultatem ac extemporalem facundiam alunt.”

30 *RS.*, 72a–b. “Usitatissima vero in harum regionum Scholis, & haud dubie discentium studiis utilissima sunt praeceptoris Philippi Erotemata ... de multis horum temporum controversiis difficilibus, judicia adolescentum erudiunt & informant.”


32 *RS.*, 72b. “Primus autem superiori secolo arte Dialecticam, ex tenebris & labrynhthis prioris aetatis, in
names of the era—are also invoked to acknowledge their work toward a balanced liberal arts education.\textsuperscript{33}

\textbf{De Praeceptis Rhetoricae}

\textit{De Praeceptis Rhetoricae} is a somewhat abridged approach to Chytraeus’ earlier and widely available treatise on the subject, \textit{Praecepta rhetoricae inventionis, illustrata multis et utilibus exemplis, ex sacra scriptura, et Cicerone sumptis}. This textbook, printed numerous times, ran to over 200 pages of definitions and textual examples of the parts of rhetoric and concluded with an extensive list of commonplaces for ethics and moral philosophy.\textsuperscript{34} \textit{De Praeceptis Rhetoricae} is not only an abridgement, but in one way is an update of Chytraeus’ earlier book, as Ann Moss has stated, by enhancing the role of the commonplace book in learning and practicing rhetoric.\textsuperscript{35} As discussed in Part II, the commonplace book has featured centrally in Chytraeus’ approach to organizing and learning material, showing the kind of connection between dialectic and rhetoric in his approach. In his revamped material, Chytraeus discusses six areas where rhetoric is used, the reasons why rhetoric is taught, the standard texts of summary and method, advice on reading the classic authors for style, rhetorical topics, and imitation. His customary surveys of the classic texts conclude the section.

\textbf{Analysis}

As noted earlier in the entry on rhetoric in Part II of the \textit{Regulae}, rhetoric is important for

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{33} RS., 74a.
\textsuperscript{34} Kaufmann, \textit{Universität und lutherische Konfessionalisierung}, 624, lists that \textit{Praecepta Rhetoricae} was printed in 1556, 1558, 1562, 1567, 1571, 1574, 1576, 1582, and 1593.
\textsuperscript{35} Ann Moss, \textit{Printed Commonplace-Books}, 163.
\end{flushleft}
both communication and for the cultivation of virtue in the student. As such it encompasses much more than just eloquent speaking. Chytraeus’ introduction on the necessity of the rhetoric for use in the church, state, city counsels, courts, and schools says as much stating that by rhetoric, he means clear, perspicuous, and appropriate communication—the eloquence—setting forth in plain speaking or writing the things that need to be said that move others to piety and virtue.\textsuperscript{36}

Chytraeus breaks his discussion of the purposes of rhetoric into six parts. He begins by discussing how rhetoric draws on broad learning across all subjects thereby laying a groundwork and rationale. At the risk of belaboring the obvious, Chytraeus stresses that it is a mastery of knowledge drawn from categories appropriate to the subject, whether, for instance, this is theology, philosophy, or history, and not merely a knowledge of the mechanics or principles of rhetoric. This is another way of saying that the orator must be familiar enough with all subjects to speak on them. Speaking well is not simply a matter of putting words together, but arriving at a solid end depends on a knowledge that enables the orator to get them. Chytraeus reminds the reader that the rich variety of words an orator may employ are tied to the whole of learning, and that rhetorical breadth and splendor of the orator’s words are to arise naturally from the subject itself.\textsuperscript{37}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{36} R.S., 83a. “\textit{Magnum & excellens hominis decus, & in omni vita, cuius pars maxima oratione regitur, in Ecclesia, Republica, aulis, foro, iudiciis, senatu, scholis, scribendis epistolis, & omnibus vita partibus & officiis, utilissimum & maxime necessarium est ( non dico eloquentia, sed) mediocris etiam recte, ordine, perspicue & apte, res bonas, & vitae hominum salutares, viva voce vel scripta explicandi, & de Deo conditore ac servatore nostro Iesu Christo, de natura rerum, de Iure ac Iustitia, de Gubernatione consiliorum & actionum vitae, de faciendi ac fugiendi, & omni officio Discendi; & alios ad pietatem & virtutis studium permonendi facultas.”
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{37} RS., 83a–b. “\textit{Primum in Rebus bonis, grauis, veris, & vitae hominum salutaribus, quarum cognition non in Rhetoricos traditur, sed partim in Theologia, partim in Philosophia & historiis explicatur, unde materia discendi depremenda ac prudentur eligenda est ... Nec solum acuenda nobis, & procudenda lingua est, sed ex tota Philosophia ornerandum compleendumque pectus maximarum rerum & plurimarum suavitate, copia & varietate. Rerum enim copia verborum copiam gignit, & , si est honestas in rebus ipsis, de quibus dicitur, existit ex rei natura quidam splendor in verbis.”
\end{flushright}
Parts two and three are addressed together. Part two underscores the connection between rhetoric and dialectic in handling the component parts of the oration, where the material in its entirety is prudently collected and ordered. The third point continues the discussion on proper order by recommending that the writer be mindful to select words be appropriate to the subject and used according their proper sense. Furthermore the oration must be structured in an elegant and symmetrical fashion in order that what is said might properly and clearly explain things to the listener. Part four deals with the character of the oration and how illustrations, words, expressions, and diction are employed by the orator in order to determine not just the tone but even the meaning that the oration conveys. Will it convince, exhort, or rebuke the audience? Chytraeus points to the sermons of the prophets and apostles as examples of the relationship between the tone and intention in an orations. The need to review the grammar, vocabulary, and ornamentation for amplifying the oration characteristic to a particular orator is handled in part five. Finally, part six urges that all material ought to be composed in a clear and coherent manner and put together like links in a chain.

More than just providing instruction on constructing an oration, the six precepts combine to

---

38 RS., 83b. “Deinde, in Dispositione, seu ordine conuenienit, tum tota Orationis serie, tum singularum membrorum & argumentorum partibus, prudenter distribuendis & collocandis.”

39 RS., 83b–84a. “Postea, in elocutione seu sermone Grammatico, proprie & perspicue res propositas explicante. Quo verbis singulis, usitatis, propriis & aptis, & iuxta leges Grammaticae, & consuetudinem ac exempla veterum, qui recte ac eleganter locuti sunt, inter se iuonis, apte cohaerente, maxima pars seu corpus orationis constare, & certis interuallis, quaedam verborum & sententiarum insignia interspergi ac eminere debent.”

40 RS., 84a. “Quae FIGURAE nominantur, quia formam nouam & speciosiorem, simplici ac vulgatae elocutioni induun, vel mutata significatione propria verbi aut Orationis, ut Tropi; vel ordine ac situ verborum in continua oratione concinnius formato, ut Schemata λεξεως vel affectus animi varios exprimentes, vitam ac motum Orationi addunt, ut Schmemata Dianoias: Quibus orationis luminibus ac ornamentis, Prophetarum etiam & Apostolorum sermo ubique conspersus ac plenus est.”

41 RS., 84b. “In Augenda verbis ac rebus, & Amplificanda Oratione, quod proprium & difficillimum Oratoris opus existimatur.”

42 RS., 86a. “Postremo, in compositione & structura sententiarum & verborum, apte & concinne inter se velut annulorum in Catena cohaerentium.”
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provide an orientation for the student when it comes to both listening and imitating as a rationale
for study. Once they know the patterns for constructing an effective oration, students then can
better evaluate examples. Chytraeus has no shortage of suggestions on what to study. Familiarity
with examples from antiquity and thoughtful attention paid to the elements of these examples are
a central feature of Chytraeus’ approach.\footnote{RS., 87a. “Altera cura sit, ut Rerum, de quibus dicendum est, cognitionem & doctrinam mediocrum, ex iis
artibus, quibus illae explicantur nobis compararemus. Et illustria purae, perspicuae, & ornatae orationis exempla in
probatis authoribus, diligenter & attente lecta, qua ratione elaborata sint, consideremus, & in nostra oratone
componendae imitari ac effingere conemur ...”}
Imitation is not simply aping a style, as Chytraeus
discussed in his section on learning grammar, but it goes beyond to involve cultivating the skills
necessary to make sound judgment and to press beyond the great teachers in ones own work. In
his discussion of Cicero, for instance, he suggests that students might study the orations to learn
not only things such as the rules and constructions of Cicero’s good oratory, along with the
substance of the judgments and precepts, but Chytraeus also wants students to forge ahead with
these excellent examples to study Latin oratory for use in their own composition exercises.\footnote{RS., 87b–88a. “Perceptis vero & cognitis Rhetorica elementis, ad Ciceronis de Oratore librorum
auscultationem vel lectionem recta studiosi accedant. Qui libri, non modo artis dicendi praecpta usitata, verum
etiam judicium de praecptis, & tota ratione sapienter, ornate & apte dicendi, exponunt, sicut ipse Cicero, se quid de
ratione dicendi habuerit iudicii, in eos libros contulisse, testatur: sed etiam Exemplum ac Idea sunt bonae, purae,
perspicuæ, illustris & ornata Orationis latinae, quod in propria oratione componenda sibi ad imitandum, & pro virili
exprimendum rectissime singuli proponant.”}
Chytraeus reiterates this point again in paragraphs that follow, stating that Cicero’s work should
be lectured on not only because of its form and structure reflecting the precepts of a subject, but
also because of the breadth of the content, the subject matter. So students learn not only how to
construct an oration, but at the same time their exposure to classics teaches them how to use the
topics of history for teaching, testing, counseling, and persuading as laid out by a master of the
art.\footnote{RS., 88a–b. “Non communia modo artis praecpta, sed naturam inprimis oratoriam & totius philosophia,
omniaque rerum, de quibus dicendum est ... Esse aliquam artic propriam formandae orationis, proponit, & post}
characters of famous orators) provide examples to the careful observer of how to handle the
duties of the statesman with grace and elegance. This exposure also reinforces how important it
is to write with a particular audience in mind, using the language and kinds of illustrations that
will be persuasive in that instance. Such skill in the orator benefits both the court and the
church.

Chytraeus concludes his section on rhetoric with a listing of classic texts for continued
study that further reinforces his point about writing to a specific audience. By observing a
number of various authors from different time periods and regions students can note the
differences between the works, as well as the elements that they hold in common as great works
of oratory. Chytraeus includes, among others, master Roman rhetoricians Cicero and Quintilian
Pliny the Younger, Symmachus, and Seneca while Plato, Aristotle, Euripides, Phalaridos, Brutus,
and the orations and letters of Isocrates, Demosthenes, and Atticus are noted as excellent
examples of Greek writing. From his own time Chytraeus cites such contemporary examples as
Phillip Melanchthon, Jacopo Sadoleto, Erasmus of Rotterdam, and Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini,
showing how they drew upon the classics in their own work. These lists are supplemented with
brief descriptions of the author’s style and content as well as comparisons of one to another. By
this point if students have paid attention, they will have made a thorough start. This section has

ecursum de HISToria INVENtionis locos ad docendum, probandum, & conciliandis ac permouendis auditorum
animis seruientes, tradit.”

46 RS., 88b. “In BRUTO, seu de claris Oratoribus Chronologiam Oratorum, qui Athenis & Romae, dicendi
laude celebres fuerunt, Cicero context, quae & propter antiquitatis Romanae historiam, de multorum praestantium
virorum, qui in Republica Romana floruerunt, ingenii, natura, studii, & orationibus ac scriptis, acuta &
sapientissima IVDICIA & censuras: & ipsius Ciceronis studiorum vitae cursum: omnium de studiis recte ac
eleganter dicendi prudenter judicare cupientium, lectione dignissima est.”

47 Imitation and eloquence means capturing the spirit of the classical author’s writing. This can means
persuading the audience using the language and illustrations that are meaningful to them. See Gray, “Renaissance
Humanism,” 497–514.

48 The review of the literature is extensive, running from RS., 88a–98b.
reiterated much from the previous sections on grammar and dialectic, but such repetition begins to establish an overall method to students as Chytraeus reinforces how the arts of the trivium function together, showcasing certain authors who will appear again and again throughout the *Regulae*. It is now up to them to stay the course and forge ahead.

**De Lingua Graeca**

In the contents listed in Part III’s introduction, *De Lingua Graeca* is featured alongside Hebrew as an introduction and guide to the study of Greek. But while Chytraeus’ approach to Greek made it into the printing of the *Regulae*, Hebrew was left out of every edition and was finally treated in the *Regulae*’s appendix, published in 1595. *On the Greek Language* functions as brief introduction to the subject, beginning with a history of the rebirth of the study of Greek in the western world and featuring timeline of the events in the marginalia. This puts his own efforts within a tradition (at least since the Renaissance), and makes the case for what follows in this section. Following a standard (and by now familiar) pattern, Chytraeus highlights texts that ought to be studied and gives advice on the rules and methods that will benefit the students’ progress. This is followed by a list of genres and authors presented in the order that the student ought to read them and some observations on the texts themselves. Chytraeus presents a straightforward and common sense approach to language study: lay a groundwork and then build up by working through increasingly difficult texts.

**Analysis**

Chytraeus calls the Greek language as the door and key [*ianua & clavis*] for learning all philosophy, history, mathematics, law, traditions, and especially the true doctrine concerning Christ from the sources themselves—the Renaissance *ad fontes*. No other language contains such a treasury of wisdom and eloquence across the entire spectrum of the arts. This is particularly
true when it comes to Christian doctrine. Not only the text of Scripture itself, but the sermons and the writings about the theology done in the early church were true in Greek. In particular, the core of Christ’s suffering, crucifixion, and resurrection are explained in Greek. Yes, there also are Hebrew and Latin texts, but their value come especially in their tie to the New Testament, written in Greek. Chytraeus also notes that Christian truth has also been obscured by many serious and important controversies over the ages and he points out that arguments refuting heresy and misunderstanding, or the errors that occur in bad theology as a result of misunderstanding the text, or bad translations of the text, are remedied by a careful study of its original language. In this he follows Luther, Melanchthon and scores of other humanists, who also taught knowledge of the original languages as key for solving misunderstandings.

For Chytraeus the history of the renaissance of Greek in the western world is nothing less than an example of God’s providential care. While the rediscovery of numerous classical authors and works and the learning they inspired is fine and good, his discussion is oriented toward the role Greek played in the rediscovery of the Gospel and the success of the Reformation. He describes that after being all but extinct in the West for centuries, Greek was reintroduced by Manuel Chrysoloras and others who fled from the Eastern Mediterranean in advance of the fifteenth-century Turkish invasion. Chytraeus observes that by the turn of sixteenth-century,

---
Erasmus of Rotterdam and others such as Phillip Melanchthon saw the fruit of their indefatigable labors with Greek established in the north, a required tool for Christian humanists.\textsuperscript{50} The Gospel rediscovery came about by factors associated with this recovery, and, “by the immense goodness of God,” the superstition and darkness of the papacy were lifted in Germany.\textsuperscript{51} Is there any doubt about Chytraeus’ Lutheran credentials?\textsuperscript{52}

Greek literature is also well-known for its moral anecdotes, and as he has shown elsewhere in the \textit{Regulae}, Chytraeus is sensitive to ways students’ analysis of the moral content of the material functions in their own moral development. Greek grammar lessons from catechisms and historical adages are opportunities to learn about and cultivate virtue. Students not only work to expand their vocabulary when practicing Greek, but the examples from theology and divine history offer the student exposure to divine commands, along with a sample of God’s governance throughout history.\textsuperscript{53} Classical Greek sources such as Aesop’s \textit{Fables} fill a similar role.\textsuperscript{54} In

\textsuperscript{50} \textit{RS.}, 99a–b. “Singulari igitur Dei beneficio, studia sapientiae \& eloquentiae graecae, multis seculis antea barbarum gentium vastationibus in Italia \& Gallia extinctae, superioribus primum per Emanuelem Chrysolora, \& alios exules Graecos, Turcarum tyrannie fugientes ... 1480. Cuius Spartiatae auditores, Johannes Capnio, \& Erasmus Roterodamus Germani, late in superiori Germania \& Belgico ea sparserunt, donec patrum memoria primum in his Saxonics gentibus, per Richardum Crotum Britanum, \& Moselianum Lipsiae, \& postea Philippi Melanchthonis indefesso labore, industria \& felicitate, in uniuersam Saxonicam, \& regna, niuali vicina polo, propagata sunt.”

\textsuperscript{51} \textit{RS.}, 99b. “Sic immensa bonitate Deus, cum lucem verae Euangelii doctrinae, depulsis superstitionibus \& tenebris Pontificis in Germania iterum accendere \& illustrare decreuisset: studia etiam linguae Graecae, ad fontes doctrinae Ecclesiasticae repurgandos inprimis necessaria, rursum instauruit.”

\textsuperscript{52} Actually, Chytraeus could have made an even stronger case for the role of Greek in the Reformation had he also mentioned Luther’s curriculum revisions at Wittenberg. Following a 1517 visitation by Elector Frederick’s reorganization, they ordered Luther’s plan to have classical Latin, Greek, and Hebrew included in the regular arts curriculum. Louvain, for instance, had the languages as a kind of add-in continuing education program, but Wittenberg was the first university to adopt them wholesale. See Maria Grossmann, \textit{Humanism in Wittenberg}.

\textsuperscript{53} \textit{RS.}, 100a–b. “Quem in schola simpliciter \& perspicue sic explicari singulis annis optarim, ut non accumulentur Regulae, sed illustrentur, adiunctis exemplis Catecheseos Christianae, \& versuum, Gnomas insignes \& rotunde pronunciantas continent, vel aliarum sententiarum, Apophthegma tum Historiolarum recitatione, quorum vocabula singula inflectere casibus, vel modis ac temporibus variare, iuxtas formas in libell praescritas, pueri iubeantur. Talibus exemplis, quae non modo praeceptorum usum monstrant, verum etiam utiles admonitiones de Deo, de gubernatione vitae \& regendi moribus complectuntur ...”

\textsuperscript{54} \textit{RS.}, 100b. “Selecta Graecorum epistolae, \& Aesopi fabellae, ex quibus praeter verborum copiam, \& rerum multarum, ac praecipue animantium appellationes, magnam sapientiae gubernatricis consiliorum, \& actionum
citing Aesop, Chytraeus follows a time-honored approach to building wisdom and judgement.\textsuperscript{55}

Beyond the basics, Chytraeus recommends ordered reading from a selection of authors arranged according to their content. The first group includes well-known orations from Isocrates, Demosthenes, and others. Then come historical accounts from Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon, and others. This is followed by a category of poets including, among others, Homer, Hesiod, Pindar, and Euripides. Poets such as Homer, Hesiod and Pindar form the next group. Then, Chytraeus groups Philosophy, mathematics and medicine with the likes of Plato, Aristotle, Euclide, Ptolemy, Galen and more. The last category is theology and lists the Greek New Testament as well as church fathers.\textsuperscript{56} Such ordered reading, and the authors featured, is now familiar in his approach, and provides yet another way for Chytraeus to drive home the essentials of grammar, rhetoric and dialectic, as well as reiterate a core catalogue of classical authors.

In the conclusion of \textit{De Lingua Graeca} Chytraeus again reminds his students to make the most of every opportunity when it comes to learning, a now familiar aspect of his approach. Greek practice can also be an occasion to study an author’s content and style that they might employ in their own orations.\textsuperscript{57} At the same time, Chytraeus advises students to be cognizant of

\textsuperscript{55} Worthwhile reading for all for shaping character, many students during this time had the opportunity to read and know Aesop. For those who knew no Greek, such as those attending simple village schools, Luther had once translated Aesop into German. See, Carl P. E. Springer, \textit{Luther’s Aesop} (Kirksville, MO: Truman State University Press, 2011).


\textsuperscript{57} \textit{RS.}, 102b. “Ut autem duo sunt omnium nostrorum studiorum Fines proximi ... ita in Graecis autoribus legendis, primum considerent studiosi, quam ex singulis, utilitatem & fructum, vel ad Rerum cognitionem & erudendum judicium, vel ad facultatem recte intelligendi & componenti orationem perspicuam & dissertam, referre
what subject they are reading and from what category of the liberal arts it comes, so that they do
more than just read but also build their knowledge the commonplaces of the subject. In short,
practicing purposefully. Just like Chytraeus’ approaches to grammar, rhetoric, and dialectic,
Greek is much more than simply learning the language. The language allows access to the
knowledge contained in the text and even rudamental grammatical study is at the same time a
serious exposure to the content. Every encounter is part of a broader effort to acquire knowledge.

De Historiarum Lectione Recte Institvenda

_De Historiarum_ originally appeared as a preface to Chytraeus’ 1562 commentary on
Herodotus and Thucydides, and next in _De Ratione Discendi_ in 1563, and then appeared in all
subsequent printings. Intended in his commentary as a guide on the basics for reading and
interpreting history, Chytraeus modified it for its inclusion in Part III of the _Regulae_ to function
as a more thorough reference for how to study and use history. He adds lists of summary and
method texts, a discussion of the ages of the world featuring a detailed chronological table, and a
presentation of his own methodological approach to history with a summary of important
historical texts. Chytraeus himself was quite familiar and interested in history and lectured on it
often. His work as a historian received the attention of the previously mentioned Peter Paulson
and Detloff Klatt, two scholars early in the twentieth century who considered it to be a defining

---

58 _RS_., 102b–103a. “Semper itaque initio cogitent, Ad quam classem Artium scripta illa pertineant, & quos
Artium illarum locos praecipe explicandos susceperint, ut Isocratis pleraque orationes, Aristotelis & Platonis libri
de moribus ... Cum hoc modo ad certarum artium locos, velut ad metas, lectio autorum reuocatur, facilius
σωματοποιηθῆναι tota discendi ac legendi ratio: & intelligi potest, quam philosophiae seu iudicii & sapientiae
humanae partem singuli autores illustrent.”

59 David Chytraeus, _Chronologia Historiae Herodoti, et Thukydidis_, Rostochii, S. Mylander, 1562.

60 Peter Paulson, _David Chytäus als historiker_; Detloff Klatt, _David Chytraeus als Geschichtsschreiber_.
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characteristic of his scholarly efforts (even above theology). More recently Irene Backus has shown how Chytraeus’ work represents a systemization of Melanchthon’s historical method. In particular, Chytraeus shares with Melanchthon the notion of harmony between pagan and sacred accounts of history because although such history revolves around two different emphases, civil and ecclesiastical, it all demonstrates God’s order and providential care. His belief in the unity of history is also shared with Luther as illustrated by his Preface to Galeatus Capella’s History.

Analysis

Chytraeus understands history in a didactic way—the story of God’s interaction over the ages with his whole creation, showing especially his relationship with humanity. In this sense both profane and sacred accounts can serve as sources as both provide a record of divine providence as Luther and Melanchthon also taught. Luther understood God working through various actors in the world and through the Word in the sacred texts. Redemptive history tracks alongside world history. The Word of God in particular was how Luther identified the church throughout history rather than as a succession of institutions or men. Melanchthon, as Peter Fraenkel has noted, “sets what we call universal and secular history into the same framework of an universal chronology, the “Prophecy of Elijah,” [duo millia inane, duo millia lex, duo millia Messiae].” These same historical divisions are observed in this section by Chytraeus.

Chytraeus begins his treatment with a discussion of the sources. He states that Holy

---

63 Martin Luther, “Preface to Galeatus Capella’s History (1538),” LW, 34:276.
64 See John Headley, Luther’s View ofChurch History (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963).
Scripture contains the oldest historical accounts from the creation of the universe in Genesis, the origin and fall of man, the promise of Christ and the beginning of the church, the giving of the law and constitution of his people Israel and the subsequent destruction of Judea, to the prophetic promises culminating in Christ’s incarnation and earthly kingdoms that follow and succeed one another. Learning about how God has interacted with mankind is his chief reason for learning history. Chytraeus writes that secular history also illustrates divine providence and the actions of virtue and vice reflected by the Decalogue, which is the standard and pattern for judging people and their actions in these other accounts. In the case of Herodotus, it even corroborates the Biblical narrative by describing the same historical events. Chytraeus’ viewpoint about the theological parallels between the biblical and secular record and are really a faith statement on Chytraeus’ part—a faith testimony from a late Reformation Lutheran. The broader field of historians today may well take issue, especially with his belief of the superiority of the Scriptural

66 RS., 103b–104a. “CUM tota Doctrina de Deo & redemptore nostro Iesu Christo, & uniuersae religionis nostra ac fidei Christian fonts ordine historico in libris Moysis Prophetarum & Evangeliorum traditi sint: nec ulla extet in genere humano Historia, Bibliis antiquior, continuum & certam Annorum seriem & rerum maximarum memoriam mundi & ecclesiae initia, propagationem, & defensionem mirandam, originem, lapsum & reparationem humani generis tempora editae & instauratae promissionis de Christo; promulgatae legis, constituae & deletae Politiae Iudaicae, adventus Christi in carnem, & reditus ad extremum iudicium: seriem Quatuor Monarchiarum & praecipuorum in mondo regnorum, quae Christi regum & ecclesiam partim fouerunt, partim persecuta sunt, indeque usque a prima creatione consuerat perspicuum est, inprimis ecclesiae Dei & verae de Deo doctrinae & religioni Christiae illustrandae, se expositionis rerum quae in hoc mundi theatro, a Deo & hominibus illius incolis, memoria maxime digna in ecclesia & imperiis ab iniio mundi ad nostram usque aetatem gesta sunt, necessariam & salutarem esse.”

67 RS., 103b. “Quare a prima statim aetate pueros ad lectionem Historiae Christi & ecclesiae a Prophetis & Apostolis scripae adseuferi utile est, ut seriem diuinarum patefactionum, Doctrinum Legis, & Euangelii, & exampla providentiae & iudicii in poenis diluuii, Sodomae, Hierosolymae, & Gratiae ac misericordiae Dei in receptione lapsorum & liberatione iustorum miranda teneris statim mentibus tota reliquo vite tempore firmius in memoria haesura infignant.”

68 “RS., 104b. “Herodoti etiam ac gentium historias, in quibus multae narrationes cum Biblicis congruentes extant, cum sacra Historia conferri ad certitudinem & autoritatem Propheticae Historia confirmandum prodest. Deinde & Gentium Historiae testimonia sunt prouidentiae & iudicii diuini punientis scelera, nec minus quam sacrae, exampla sunt praeceptorum Decalogi: & ad locos communes virtutum & viciorum, praemiorum & paenarum ad Decalogi leges congruentium, accommodandae.”
accounts, but his position is certainly understandable for his time and context.\textsuperscript{69}

Chytraeus believes that all history can serve as a guide for moral action and echoes Cicero, who called history the \textit{magister} of life that taught about the characters of people and their actions, about tyrants, evil men, unjust counsel, and the consequences of the actions taken.\textsuperscript{70} Both secular and sacred accounts provide examples of the causes and effects of behaviors among individuals and nations. More specifically, history offers examples of following or transgressing divine law—the entire narrative (context and characters) can function as teaching aid for learning precepts of virtue and vice.\textsuperscript{71} But here clarification is in order. It is not difficult to point out examples in history of good or bad behavior or even motivation (when those involved speak of the same). But what is one to say when a tyrant seems to flourish or someone who is apparently noble and upright is plagued by misfortune. Does God not punish evil and support good? Chytraeus (like Luther and Melanchthon) certainly believes that. Saying so is a confession of faith and confidence in God being God.\textsuperscript{72} What cannot be said—and Chytraeus here is mindful of this quagmire—is when God will chose to act and how he will show himself. For instance, what

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item RS., 104b. “Sed sacra Historia non modo Legis Dei, verum etiam Euangeli doctrine & exempla recitat: nec regnorum mundi constitutionem, mutationes & excidia tantum, & res ab hominibus gestas, sed Christi regnum spirituale & aeternum & aeterni Dei patefactiones & opera praecipue describit, & annis 3300 fere ethicas historias antiquitae praecedit.”
\item RS., 105a–b. “Et Cicero Magistram vitae historiam nominat, in qua & series rerum gestarum, temporibus & locis accurate distincta, & causae negociorum, & praecipueae in bello & pace consiliorum deliberationes, ac euentus, & personarum ingenio & virtute praestantium descriptiones, & exempla virtutum ac viciorum, & Tyrannorum & malorum hominum poenae, inuistiis consiliis & sceleribus attractae, & alia quae hic enumerare nimes longum esset, considerandae sunt.”
\item RS., 104b–105a. “Cum autem duae res praecipue omnia hominum sanorum consilia & actiones in Republica & vitae priuata gubernent, Praecepta Legis Dei, & exempla consiliorum & euentuum ac poenarum in historis exposita, quae fere conspectiora sunt & multo efficatius quam nuda praeccepta rudorum animos mouent: perspicuum est, Historiam, velut sapientiam gubernatricem vitae & consiliorum in Republica & vitandis causis horribilium mutationum & calamitatum in imperiis & poenarum in vita priuata legendam esse ...”
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
about the Evangelical’s fate in the Schmalkaldic War, or Rome’s successes at some points in turning the tide with Counter-Reformation? Were Evangelical setbacks due to false doctrine? Chytraeus would hardly think that. No, at most one can say that God is still active. That is something every theologian in Chytraeus’ day would say, no matter which theological camp.\textsuperscript{73} When and how are another matter, perhaps reasonably evident in the long run. It is precisely because a person needs the broad and long perspective that they study of history is so important for Chytraeus. And, as Chytraeus has written elsewhere, calamity and persecution highlight the eschatological tension of the church in the world.\textsuperscript{74}

Chytraeus also reminds that history can be an important source for teaching the precepts of grammar and rhetoric—reinforcing the principles of these earlier lessons—and histories can provide examples of excellent writing. In addition to teaching about the events of the past, histories ought to be read because of the eloquent manner such truths are communicated. Livy is one such source of eloquence, seriousness, splendor and copia. Caesar is another that is unrivaled in the Latin language for orderliness, vocabulary and clarity.\textsuperscript{75} Such texts serve to reinforce grammar, logic, and rhetoric as students read according to the historical commonplacesthat Chytraeus recommends.

\textsuperscript{73} However, as Irena Backus has shown, Chytraeus interprets God’s action by drawing parallels between Biblical narrative and church history. For instance he explained the events of the Reformation as a parallel to in Constantine’s time and saw Luther as modern-day Constantine in the context his exegesis of John’ Apocalypse. See, Irena Backus “The Lutheran Counterpoint: David Chytraeus and Nicholas Selnecker,” in Reformation Readings, 113–29. See also her discussion of Chytraeus in “Protestant and Catholic Histories of the Early Church,” in Historical Method and Confessional Identity, 338–43.

\textsuperscript{74} Backus describes Chytraeus’ commentary on the Apocalypse as, “a summary of this history of the church which is reaching its end in Chytraeus’ own time.” Irena Backus, Reformation Readings, 125.

\textsuperscript{75} RS., 105b. “Sed in Academiis proponuntur & leguntur Historici, non modo rerum & prudentiae alendae causa, verum etiam propter orationis formam, ac inter latinos Historicos, LIVIVS lacteo eloquentiae fonte manans, eximia orationis grauitate, splendore, copia & maiestate omnibus antecellit. C. CAESAris commentarii elegantis, puri, proprii, perspicuitate iudicantur.” Other authors listed in his illustration are Sallust, Thucydides, Herodotus, and Xenophon.
The majority of the treatise on history is devoted primarily to providing helpful material for the student reference. Chytraeus discusses the importance of familiarizing oneself with quality summaries and methods of the different writings, recommending especially Melanchthon’s *Chronicon Carionis*. Along with this, Chytraeus recommends that students study the maps of the places described in the accounts. His recommendation for learning historical events and geography at the same time help ground each in the memory, advice that he will repeat later in the *Regulae* in the section *De Geographia*. Also included are various chronologies and charts. To aid the students in learning the time periods of the world, Chytraeus provides a chart divided into 2,000 year blocks, running from the beginning of the world, until the current era, with corresponding discussions of the regimes in power and the historians who have written about them as well as a short table of dates and events in world history.

Following the lists and tables, Chytraeus discusses which commonplace topics students ought to keep in mind when reading sacred and secular historical accounts. As he had discussed in Part II and previous sections, Chytraeus’ reading strategy is one that continuously evaluates and excerpts from texts and collects excerpts organized by a set of commonplaces [*loci*]. Commonplaces serve as an anchor for the students to analyze a text, as well as a way for them to organize excerpts to use in their own writing. For reading sacred history Chytraeus lists example commonplaces such as true God, Jesus Christ as Lord and as Savior, the creation of all things, the beginning of the church, the fall of the first man, the spread of sin to all mankind, and the

---

76 RS., 107a. “Itaque nullus sit studiosorum, qui tabulam Palestinae ad lectionem historiae sacrae inprimis utilem ... Potest autem tota Mundi historia & omnium temporum series facilius mente comprehendi & memoriae infixa circumferri, & in conspectu assidue haberi, cum iuxta hoc Eliae dictum, in tres partes, seu membra praeципua, eam distribuimus.”

77 RS., 109a. “Quae Res in lectione Historiae sacrae & prophaneae inprimis obseruari debeat, supra in utilitatum commemoratione aliqua ex parte monuimus.”
promise of grace and the remission of sin on account of Christ, miracles, marks of the church in Word and Sacrament, examples of wrath and grace, and virtues (both political and spiritual) that pertain particularly to the Gospel (faith, prayer, patience, confession, and more.) For reading secular history Chytraeus’ list of commonplaces include the lines of monarchs and kingdoms, testimony about God, apparent examples of divine providence and judgment, institutions of kingdoms and founding principles, and punishment for greed and wickedness. In addition, when examining the individuals in the narrative, students should be mindful not only of issues of power and wealth—the external outcomes—but students should also pay attention to the nature, character, will, morals, and reasons for action, and they should take away prudent counsel for both private and public life. Examples of virtue, good men, and all that can be imitated in ones own life ought also to be noted.

The final section of Chytraeus discussion presents twelve authors worth studying. He ranges from Moses to Paul Jovius, giving brief descriptions of their work, organized in the chronological order of their respective sacred and secular lives in encyclopedic fashion. Moses, whose narrative begins at creation, is followed by Joshua and Judges, then Kings and Chronicles, before the classical historians Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon, Diodorus of Sicily, Livy,

---

78 RS., 109a, “In sacra Historia Doctrina de vero Deo, & de Filio ipsius domino & redemptore nostro Iesu Christo, de Creatione omnium rerum, & initiis Ecclesiae, de lapsum primorum hominum, & peccato inde in omnes homines propagato, de Promissione Gratiae & remissionis peccatorum, propter Christum donandae: miranda collectio & gubernatio Ecclesiae per verbum & Sacramenta, Item, exempli iae & gratiae Dei, & omnium virtutum, non modo politicarum, sed multo magis spiritualium, & Euangelii propriarum, ut fidei, inuocationis, patientiae, Confessionis &c.”

Appianus of Alexandria, Cassius Dio appear on the scene. He finishes out with the Renaissance historian Johann Cuspinianus known for his work on Roman emperors, Antonius Sabellicus and Johann Nauclerus known their universal histories, and finally Paul Jovius, for contemporary histories of famous men and battles. Chytraeus’ descriptions note the most important characters or episodes of the various narratives, along with stylistic features specific to each author—grammar and rhetoric never far away in his approach. He demonstrates care in teaching students how to read not only for information, but also for style—how good history is constructed and written—while keeping to his plan for topical reading (men, kingdoms, actions, divine intervention, etc.) of history.

Chytraeus sees his collection of authors as presenting a divine and unified account of the basic relationship of God and man. In that sense, they can be read together as evidence of divine providence from the beginning of time to the current era. For instance, Herodotus offers an account of the events that follow and then corroborate and expand upon human history first seen in the Old Testament. In a sense, Herodotus was understood as the secular successor to Moses. Some histories overlap. Herodotus and Thucydides offer accounts that do just that, with the former more concerned with the deeds of the monarchs, while the latter focuses on the citizens. Neither of those is sacred text (containing the Gospel), but such a reading them still helps to understand what people are like, and that aids in distinguishing the true church and accentuates its thread through history, as people are shown to sometimes rely (sadly) on themselves and other

81 RS., 111a. “Miranda autem & ingenti bonitate Dei factum est, ut fere in eo ipso momento, ubi Prophetica historia desinit, HERODotus Halicarnassaeus (qui circa annum mundi 3540 initio belli Peloponesiaci in Graecia floruit) suam historiam ordiatur ...”
82 RS., 111b. “Ut autem Herodotus Monarchiarum & Regnorum, ita Thucydides ciuitatum praecepte res gestas explicavit.”
times against the background of divine law, human failure, and God’s redemption and restoration.

**De Poetis**

*De Poetis* is the final section of Chytraeus’ fourth category of arts, and although, the *Regulae’s* table of contents lists it as appearing in section six, it actually is in the last chapter in the *Regulae*. As he has done elsewhere in Part III, the majority of *De Poetis* is a encyclopedic list of authors with brief descriptions of their work. Chytraeus maintains his usual pattern with a discussion of the history, uses, and abuses of poetry, all held together by Chytraeus pursuit of the ways poetry helps fulfill the goal of acquiring knowledge [*cognitio rerum*]. He aimed, as usual, to be thorough in his lists and categories, resulting in the *De Poetis* dominating Part III in terms of length. But in same way it is one of the most comprehensive sections of Part III, touching on every subject in the curriculum yet again for the reader. Chytraeus divides the topics one may encounter in poetry into the same familiar four categories of theology, ethics and politics, physics, and history that he had explained in Part I as an organizational structure for all the arts. He also subdivides theology and ethics according to Christian and pagan authorship. Nathan Chytraeus, David’s younger brother, held the chair of poetry at Rostock contributes the final part of this material considering some of the technical aspects of the study of poetry. Despite its size and comprehensive nature, *De Poetis* was not published separately from the *Regulae Studiorum*.

**Analysis**

Chytraeus considers poetry to be a unique gift of God—an ornament and decoration for literature and more broadly for all human life. The two goals of education, knowledge and communication, provide a basic underpinning for the section, as he views poetry primarily as a literary device, a powerful tool for learning and communicating useful knowledge on a wide
range of subjects. Chytraeus, that there are poems and songs commemorating both people and their deeds. They present information that is pleasant for the reader and hearer, but the real point is to prompt to action. Chytraeus believes that God designed the human mind to be receptive to verse and harmony and in order to learn freely and easily. This is why such things as parables, historical examples, and well constructed stories are effective for conveying information. They captivate and delight our minds “by nature.” In other words, poetry appeals to the affective side of the human heart and mind. But such an influential medium also can be misused. In connecting poetry to learning and emphasizes its use in teaching and learning broadly over all the subjects in the curriculum, Chytraeus is representative of the typical humanist approach to the subject in the schools.

Also common among humanists were strict guidelines about the kind of poetry that was read. Hans Baron explains this as a natural consequence of humanists moving from theological poetry to secular ethical poetry, and emphasizing its importance for teaching moral philosophy. Here as well Chytraeus follows the standard approach, offering strict guidelines in his introduction and repeating the advice throughout. Appearing almost impossibly stern, Chytraeus

83 RS., 182b. “Eximium & singulare Dei donum, & literarum ac toius vitae humanae ornamentum & decus est Poesis, quae sapientiam vitae gubernatricem, de Deo ac prouidentia, & piettate Deo debita, de honesta gubernatione morum ac consiliorum, & actionum vitae privatae, ac Reipublicae, de praemiis recte factorum & poenis scelerum, de motibus syderum & natura rerum ...

84 RS., 182b. “...denique historias regnorum & laudes praestantium virorum, numeris carminibus concinnis eponit, & picturis ac imaginibus venustis illustrat, ut mainori cum suauitate & delectatione, doctrina utilis, in animos legentium influat, & studiosos ad cognitionem & amorem sui ardentiorum inuitet & inflammet.”

85 RS., 183a. “Ita enim a Deo conditi sunt hominum animi, ut numeros & harmonias auide arripiant, & doctrinam numeris & carminibus comprehensam multo ibentius & facilius ediscant, & firmius quam souta oratione traditam retineant & propagant. Et similitudines, ac exempla historiarum & faularum, quibus sapientiam vitae gubernatricem plerique Poetae velut pingere solent, & expolire, natura animos hominum capiunt & deletant.”

86 See Paul Grendler, “Poetry in the Classroom,” in Schooling in Renaissance Italy: Literacy and Learning, 1300-1600. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1991), 235–50.

writes that he frowns upon the use of poetry and song solely for the sake of pure entertainment. Rather, he contends that poetry should be limited to the higher purpose of teaching what is helpful and necessary for human existence, instead of being bandied about the dance hall.\textsuperscript{88} Like other gifts of God’s wide-ranging blessings such as natural talent, eloquence, money, or wine, poetry can be abused, dishonoring God by being misused in obscene ways.\textsuperscript{89} Chytraeus concludes his introduction saying his chapter’s aim is to guide students to a proper and profitable use, lest they imbibe Epicurean profanity instead of sipping piety and wisdom.\textsuperscript{90}

Chytraeus’ approach to the study of poetry provides yet another example of his overall method of using critical and systematic reading to foster virtue and discernment in his students. Knowledge of things [(Cognitio rerum)] is also wisdom [(sapientia)]. Communication [(facultas recte scribendi ac dicendi)], is also called eloquence [(eloquentia)], again implying that proper education results in careful and systematic judgments made by the speaker or writer. Chytraeus writes that literature is collected and studied ultimately in order that a person first might rightly know and judge the things of God as well as other matters and then be able to explain them and speak about them properly.\textsuperscript{91} Applying these principles to the study of poetry, in particular, Chytraeus says we first try understand the work of a good author, then think about its use, next

\textsuperscript{88} RS., 183b. “Non igitur voluptatis tantum & delectationis causa, ociosas & nugaces fabulas, quales in Gynceis Aularum ... sed amplissimum thesaurum doctrinae & sapientiae gubernatricis totius vitae humanae...”

\textsuperscript{89} RS., 184a. “Vt autem caeteris Dei donis, Ingenio, Eloquentia, viribus, pecunia, vino, & aliis, ad contumeliam Dei, & hominum perniciem multi abutuntur: Ita Poesis quoque, ad impias & blasphemas opiniones de Deis ...”

\textsuperscript{90} RS., 184b. “Quare fideliter & prudenter adolescentes in lectione Poetarum recte & utiliter instituenda moneri prodest, ne imprudentes, Epicuream profanitatem, & iudicium de moribus corruptum, & turpitudinem ac nequitiam, pro vera pietate & sapientia imbibant.”

\textsuperscript{91} RS., 185a. “Duo sunt fines & velut metae studiorum praeicipiae, ad quas omnis discendi & legendi ratio reuocanda est, videlicet cognitio rerum, seu sapientia; & facultas recte scribendi ac dicendi, seu eloquentia. Ideo enim colimus literarum studia, ut de Deo & aliis rebus diuinis ac humanis recte sentire ac iudicare, & ea, quae sentiums, commode eloqui & explicare possimus.”
form a judgment about its contents, and finally imagine how its contents might supply one's own writing and speaking.\textsuperscript{92}

As Chytraeus has noted elsewhere in the \textit{Regulae}, the first step in this learning process is locating the genre of writing in one of four categories: theology, physics, ethics and politics, and history.\textsuperscript{93} Chytraeus begins by offering examples from Sibyl, Orpheus, Callimachus, and Homer to illustrate the kinds of theological elements that one might discover in pagan theological poetry. By and large these are types or shadows of what might be found in Christian poetry. They seem to have an element of truth and point to something greater, yet they lack a satisfactory (a divine) end. Sibyl contains scattered references to the one god (though divine, is not expressly the Christ), fleeing idols and other sins, the resurrection of the dead, and the last judgment.\textsuperscript{94} Orpheus’ work is said to contain references to a doctrine of a true god, creation ex nihilo, and the stars.\textsuperscript{95} Homer, Virgil, Ovid and others are noted for considering the work of the gods, of providence, and for teaching that human action does not rest on fate, but is divinely governed and judged, so that just and moderate men are loved and rewarded, while impious men meet terrible punishments.\textsuperscript{96} Chytraeus ends his treatment of the elements of theology found in pagan

\textsuperscript{92}RS., 185a. “Quare in Poetarum etiam, & cuiuscunque autors boni lectione suscipienda, primo cogitandum est, quam inde utilitatem, tum ad rerum cognitionem seu formandum iudicium, tum ad verborum seu orationis propriae perspicueae ac splendidae, sicuti opus sit, facultatem assequendam, obtinere possimus.”

\textsuperscript{93}RS., 186a. “Omnes igitur Poetae praestantes, quorum lectio homini studioso & prudenti exentendae & utilis est, ad unam ex istis quatuor classibus artium, vel ad Theologiam, vel ad doctrinam Ethicam, vel Physicam, vel Historiam reuocandi sunt.”

\textsuperscript{94}RS., 186b. “... de uno vero Deo, de Christo, de fugiendis Idolis & alis accecatis, de resurrectione mortuorum, de extreme iudicio, breuisbus sententiis & versibus comprehensam, & Cabyllae nomine sparsam ...”

\textsuperscript{95}RS., 187b. “... doctrina de Deo, de Creatione rerum ex nihilo, de Stellis ...” Chytraeus also mentions the work of Philippus Morneus who has collected these references.

\textsuperscript{96}RS., 189a. “Sunt & Poemata Homeri, Virgilii, Ovidii, & aliorum, referta mentione Deorum, & sententiis de prouidentia diuina: quae docent, non casu aut fortuito ferri res humanas, sed gubernari diuinitas, & vere esse Deum conditorem, inspectorem, & iudicem rerum humanarum, qui homines iustos & modestos amet & praemiis ornet; impios vero & pollutos sceleribus horribiliter puniat.”
poetry with a warning about the moral dangers that are contained in the writing—foolish people may try to utilize the bad along with the good.  

By finding such themes alluded to in these poets, Chytraeus is not suggesting some secret divine inspiration or equating them with prophets, apostles, and evangelists. He simply is mirroring the sentiment of his era that sought to be as generous as possible with pagans, believing they at least had a kind of natural knowledge that apprehended the shadows of true theological knowledge. Chytraeus is no Erasmus saying, “St. Socrates, pray for us.” But this was still a time when the Corpus Hermeticum of Hermes Tresmagistus was thought to be a bridge between Moses and Plato (rather than the medieval fraud it turned out to be). So Chytraeus would use the pagans as illustrations for natural knowledge, but as such, they were at best the penultimate word.

Chytraeus turns next to a discussion of Christian poetry by beginning with three distinctions between pagan and Christian theological poetry that students ought to keep in mind. First, Christianity holds to the true knowledge of the divine essence because of revelation. This revelation was entirely inaccessible to the pagans who had only the illumination of natural light such as what God had revealed about himself in the world around. Therefore they err on the number of gods, and on angels and demons, and demigods. Second, the matter of God’s

---


98 RS., 189b–90a. “Primum, quod ad veram agnitionem Essentia diuinæ attinet. Etsi enim Ethnici ex naturali luce, & demonstrationibus conuicti, cognuntur fateri, unum esse Deum, mentem æternam, conditricem & conseruattricem omnium rerum, punitem sclera: tamen contra hanc ipsam naturalem notitiam, poëtæ, monstrosam multitudinem commentitiorum Numinum, & fere innumerabiles Deos finxerunt, seu nomina tantum allegorice comultantes, quae variatatem beneficiorum & rerum a Deo conditarum, a quibus plurimaæ Deorum appellationes ortæ sunt, denotarent: seu re ipsa putantes, multa esse æterna Numina. Imo communi appellatione
ultimate will is hidden to them. Although many divine precepts, such as morality, and avoiding wickedness and just punishment for evildoers are all splendidly described by pagan poets who knew of God by the reflection of his order or law visible in creation, nevertheless they remain ignorant of the saving will of God revealed by the Gospel with the remission of sin and reconciliation to and by God with eternal life on account of the suffering, death, and resurrection of Christ. Here is where human reason championed by the pagans fails in matters of salvation. Logic says God would give law only if people could somehow keep it (or God would have made a mistake in the giving). Logic’s “therefore” keeps salvation in the reach of human effort. The Gospel cannot be known by logic—no natural knowledge—because law cannot be kept, and the only therefore” then is condemnation. But on the contrary, God loves and gives salvation in Christ. Pagans apart from the divine literature cannot know that. They have things to say on morality and its topics, but only through the Gospel can morality be fully understood.

The third observation Chytraeus reaches is that the doctrine of the Law has lost its integrity as presented in pagan literature. The pagans have the second table concerning morals, but not the first table. Chytraeus says that even if they could be taught to love God above all things, they would not be worshiping the true God because he is not known outside of His Word, which they do not have. What they offer is therefore horrid blasphemy, and idolatry, performed to preserve the cult of a multitude of deities.

---

99 RS., 190a–b. “Secundo, quod ad voluntatem Dei attinet. Etsi enim multa praecepta Legis diuinae, de externis moribus honeste regendi, & fugiendis sceleribus & scelerum poenis, splendide & copiose, grauissimis sententiis & exemplis Poetae illustrant: tamen voluntatem Dei in Euangelio reuelatam, & doctrinam Ecclesiae propriam, de remissione peccatorum & reconciliacione cum Deo, & vita aeterna propter Filium Dei D. N. I. C. pro nobis passum & resuscitatum credentibus gratis donanda, prorsus ignorant & omittunt.”

100 RS., 190b–91a. “Tertio, nec Legis doctrinam integram & incorruptam retinent, etiam quod ad externos mores attinet. Etsi enim de primae tabulae cultibus in genere docent, Deum pie & religiose ab hominibus colendum...
Turning finally to a presentation of Christian poetry, Chytraeus begins listing topics such as being the doctrine of our redemption in Christ, the descriptions of Christ’s work, parts or the whole corpus of Christian teaching, accounts modeling lives of martyrs or other Christians, or other sacred songs. As he has done before, Chytraeus has given commonplace topics to organize what students will take from poetry. Chytraeus cites Martin Luther as an example of a model writer, who composed hymns to lay out of the Christian faith, to teach parts of the Catechism, and to accent sacred festivals of the year, all of which he set to popular German tunes. Another older example is Apollinaris who centuries earlier offered a version of the Old Testament in the style of Homeric poetry. Brief descriptions such as this carry through the Chytraeus’ presentation on theological poetry as he lists numerous Christian poets, descriptions and occasional excerpts of their work.

Theology is not the only one of those four major areas of view where poetry has a place. Chytraeus turns next to ethical poetry. Teaching about virtuous duty, honorable counsel, and moral action in public and private life, upholding virtue while detesting wrong, are all contained

---

101 RS., 192a. “Ad hanc primam classem Theologorum referimus omnes Poetas Christianos ... purae Christi religionae amplectentes, venam ingenii a Deo sibi tributae, ad Dei conditoris & redemptoris nostri Iesu Christi doctrina beneficia, & res gestas versibus descriptas & celebrandas retulerunt, & vel corpus integrum aut partes doctrinae Christi antiquae vel historiae Christi aliorumque sectorum ac Martyrum, vel humnos & laudes divinas, vel alias materias sacras carmine illustraverunt.”

102 RS., 192a. “Ut nostra aetate Luthererus, summam religionis Christianae, seu partes Catechismi omnes, & historias Fostorum praecepae, aliasque preces & confessiones pias, Germanicis rythmis concinnis & venustissimis complexus est.”

103 RS., 192b. “... Apollinarius, Laodiceae Syriæ Episcopus, totum vetus testamentum Heroicos versibus reddidit, & plurimis alis variis generis carminibus sacras materias tractans, verum & salutarem usum Poetics, in Asiae & Graeciae scholas, summa cun ingenii admiratione & laude inuexit.”
in this genre and are illustrated with both fables and historical examples. Chytraeus reiterates his point about poetry being more than just “bare word,” but rather it communicates by means of the most splendid descriptions and examples. In order that students make the most of their reading within this genre, Chytraeus further divides philosophical poetry into the subcategories of gnomology, tragedy, comedy, satire, odes, and history.

Gnomic poems are sayings that exhort virtue, a category that Chytraeus divides into three more categories or topics. In the first category are theological topics, such as God, providence, piety and divine punishment of evil. Next comes a category of common or basic morality. This is specific public morality such as would be expected in the governance of the state or in laws. A final category deals with topics addressing the household and the governance of the family—the oikos or economy. What unites them according to Chytraeus however is that these varied bits of wisdom are all congruent with the Decalogue. This is, in fact, what students ought to keep in mind when they read this kind of poetry. They ought to evaluate the proverb by considering finally which commandments it refers to.

---

104 RS., 201b. “Altera classis, eaque omnium amplissima est, POETARUM, qui doctrina ETHICAM & POLITICAM, de omnium virtutum officis & gubernatione honestae consiliorum & actionum, in omni vita priuata & publica, complexi sunt, eaque, tum praeeceptis virtutum & detestationibus vitiorum, tum exemplis insignibus historicis vel fabulosis illustrarunt.”

105 RS., 201b. “Non enim nudis tantum veris aut exilibus disputationibus, sicut Philosophi, virtutis doctrinam, plerique Poetae tradunt ...”

106 RS., 202a. “Ut igitur Poetae, qui virtutum doctrinam praeeptis & exemplis illustrarunt, facilius & rectius a nobis enumerari, & maiori cum utilitate & fructu a studiosis legi possint: ad certa genera & metas eos reuocabimus: qui vel nudas Gnomas, vel Tragoedias, Comoedias, Satyras, Odas, aut historias scripsentur.”

107 RS., 202b. “Ita quatuor praecepta Gnomarum seu sententiarum genera in poetis aut philosophis legimus, lumen diuinum, & sapientiam Dei inexhaustam, & vitae nostrae normas esse sciamus, & prudenter consideremus, ad quae praeecepta Decalogi, & ad quas virtutes singulae referri debeant.”
Chytraeus defines tragedy, his third basic category, as a genre of writing that offers examples of the misery that results when people rebel against Divine law. Things do not turn out as hoped. He understands tragic writing not as a bare description of the consequences of actions, but especially as illustrations by showing examples of the atrocious punishments and calamities that befall those who commit sin.\textsuperscript{109} This kind of writing, says Chytraeus, teaches how God examines and judges human lives with his most certain and immutable rule as evil is met with terrible temporal punishment. Chytraeus describes how such vivid descriptions enter the eyes and ears of a person and take effect on his mind.\textsuperscript{110} The purpose of such descriptions are to restrain lust and evil and to cultivate attitudes of piety, righteousness, modesty, chastity, and an ardent desire for all other virtue. Of all the genres, says Chytraeus, it is the sheer power of the tragedies themselves that conquers the audience.\textsuperscript{111} So it is no accident that tragic dramas of the “safe classics” from pagan antiquity were used in Chytraeus’ day in the schools.

Comedy, on the other hand, is a polar opposite of tragedy—meant to console, rather than terrify. Comedy is not so much a laughing matter as it was meant to build up and encourage. Instead of portraying the lives of great kings or princes, it portrays common, everyday life such as marketplace negotiations or conversations in the home. It is meant to encourage virtue and shun vice, to provide consolation in the face of human frustrations, and urge prudent decisions in

\textsuperscript{109} \textit{RS.}, 204b. “TRagoediae vero, eadem virtutum & vitae regendae praecepta, seu doctrinam Legis Dei de colenda Iustitia & fugiendis sceleribus, non nudam ac exilibus verbis traditam, sed summoru, Regum ac principum casibus horendis, & atrocium poenarum & calamitatum exemplis illustratam...”

\textsuperscript{110} \textit{RS.}, 204b. “Quae ostendunt, vere esse Deum, inspectorem & iudicem vitae humanae, certissimo & immutabili ordine atrocia scelera atrocibus poenis, in hoc ipso breuissimo mortalis vitae spacio punientem, ac inprimitis detestari eum, & horribilibus poenis opprimere tyrannos, incestos, contemptores Dei ... in oculos & aures incurrentibus moueantur vehementius & percellantur animi hominum...”

\textsuperscript{111} \textit{RS.}, 205a. “Ad frenandas cupiditates & scelera, quibus poenae atroces accersuntur, & ad colendam pietatem, & caeterarum virtutum officia ardentius colenda inflammentur. Itaque omne genus scripti, gruuitate Tragoedia vincit.”
all walks of life.\textsuperscript{112} Chytraeus defines the purpose of satirical poetry in a similar way. It is meant to attack wicked living and to encourage doing the good with an upbeat spirit.\textsuperscript{113}

Chytraeus considers historical poetry to be a class of its own, even though there is a great deal of overlap between its topics and those just seen in the area of ethics. The purpose of historical poetry is to carry forward a record of both exemplary deeds and people in order to encourage and instruct the reader or listener in virtue.\textsuperscript{114} Chytraeus describes Virgil’s work as the epitome of what one might expect in this genre. Chytraeus observes that Virgil simultaneously presents a good prince, the standards of virtues, the activities of war and peace, the attitudes of piety before God and elders, and all sorts of examples of justice, strength before enemies, great spirit and stalwartness in danger, vigilance in counsel, seizing the moment, diligence and tolerance in labor, trust in divine guidance, and many other enlightening, positive traits.\textsuperscript{115} The one difference between material here and what Chytraeus had in his section on ethics is that ethics dealt more, for example, with morality \textit{per se}, while history puts those things in real life contexts. By including both, Chytraeus obviously is showing that he finds value in each. The

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{112} \textit{RS.}, 208a–b. “Vt autem Tragoediarum artifices, imigines vitae magnorum regum & principum: Ita Comoediarum Scriptores, vitae quotidiana speculum, seu effigiem vitae communis hominum priuatum, & exempla consiliorum, actionum & negociorum ciuilem ac oeconomorum depingere studuerunt, ut in alienis personis, exempla virtutum imitanda, & vitiorum refugienda, & imaginem plerorumque communis vitae negociorum, & crebras consiliorum humanorum frustrationes, & variatatem casuum intuentes: amorem & studium virtutis, & prudentiam gubernatricem consiliorum & actionum vitae, in nobis alamus & confirmemus ...”

\textsuperscript{113} \textit{RS.}, 213a. “SATYRAE etiam Heroico Carmine Hominum vitiae & mores sceleratos libere & acerbe carpentes, hoc propositum habent, ut taxando vitia, bonos efficiant meliores, & malos ab improbitate deterreant.”

\textsuperscript{114} \textit{RS.}, 214b. “HISTORICI etiam Poetae, quibus peculiarem classem initio tribuimus, et si rerum gestarum narrationes ex professo describunt, tamen simul, virtutum doctrinam, plurimis & splendidissimis exemplis, & regulis consiliorum & actionum vitae honestissimis stipatam intexunt.”

\end{flushleft}
final class of poetry that Chytraeus discusses considers physics, or the study of the natural world (heavens, stars, heavenly bodies, plants and animals, etc.).

It describes the divine theater with works ranging from all-encompassing descriptions of the heavens to the smallest, most fundamental elements.

A final section of the treatise was filled with annotations from David Chytraeus’ younger brother, Nathan Chytraeus. It seems a bit tacked together, tying up the last ends with comments on the technical topics of composition such as pronunciation, vocabulary, meter, and other aspects. The actual text at this point even shows two different type-settings to differentiate the authors. But in this case David would enlist the university’s in-house expert, Nathan, who held the chair in Poetry at Rostock, and at one time was the rector of the Rostock’s grammar school.

Much of the advice is augmented by proverbs on the subject selected from the classics or by selections for illustration. This list—reinforcing by example—follows the now familiar approach of David, directing students to appropriate examples from the classical sources.

**Conclusion**

Chytraeus’ fourth category of the arts make up the beginning sections of Part III of *Regulae Studiorum* and clearly illustrate the two *fines*, or purposes, of education at work. The *Regulae’s* twin goals, namely knowledge and communication, are woven into the definitions and approaches to the study each subject, providing a coherent systematic feel to the whole, and emphasizing the relationship between listener and speaker as integral to learning and

---

116 *RS.*, 217b. “Quarta classis Poetarum est, qui doctrinam de Natura rerum, de Coelo, Stellis, Meteoris, Plantis, animantibus, carmine explicarunt.”

117 By the time the last editions of the *Regulae* had been printed, Nathan Chytraeus had been expelled from Rostock for Crypto-Calvinism. However, his contribution to the end of the section on Poetry was retained. Oxford Encyclopedia of the Reformation Vol. I, ed. Hans Hillarbrand (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 351–53.
communicating. Such an approach provides an simple division to the subjects in the section. The two parts of grammar are reading and writing. Dialectic is defined as a tool for learning and teaching. Rhetoric benefits both the speaker and hearer. Greek is described as a fountain of knowledge that helps in clearly understanding and explicating subject matter. Historical knowledge offers a guide and model for action. And finally, poetry functions in the same way as rhetoric—using literary devices to connect reader or hearer with the material in such a way that enhances the exchange between poet and audience. Although simple and straightforward, the relationship that Chytraeus understands between knowledge and communication requires a certain methodological approach. Both dialectic and the commonplace book [loci] are employed at every opportunity throughout his presentation for the purpose of analysis, communication, and even for basic memory work.

The ultimate goal of education—true knowledge and worship of God—benefits from these subjects because they contribute to reading and understanding Scripture. But theology in turn helps the students navigate the subject matter contained in the curriculum. As shown in this chapter, Chytraeus, like the other humanists of his time, draws heavily from ancient pagan sources. Such texts are understood to provide an important source of information about life in the natural world, examples of divine providence playing out in law, rewards and punishments, and natural pious inclinations. But as Charles Trinkaus has argued, the Reformation, and Lutheran theology, “drastically altered the conception of man and his place in the universe ...”118 Earlier humanists interpreted such a selection of readings in a vastly different way. But for Chytraeus, such classical texts are understood to play a valuable but ancillary role, for the natural way they

serve as witness to both the divine gift of reason, and the rules and structure for life in the world. Yet for ultimate wisdom they fall short and pale in contrast to the all important message of reconciliation through Jesus Christ. This focus will be explored more in subsequent chapters.
CHAPTER SEVEN

NATURAL AND MORAL PHILOSOPHY

Introduction

This chapter will lay out Chytraeus’ second and third categories of the liberal arts described in the *Ratio Discendi*, covering natural and moral philosophy. Although separate categories in Chytraeus’ scheme, they share common themes and approaches, and can be considered in this study together in a single chapter. Chytraeus’ treatment of this pair comprises roughly a fifth of the total length of the *Regulae* with individual sections on mathematics, arithmetic, geography, astronomy, and physics grouped under natural philosophy, while ethics and jurisprudence fall under moral philosophy. These, like nearly all the individual sections that make up Part III of the *Regulae* contain extended lists, outlines, or summaries of the important texts specific to the art discussed in the section, contributing heavily to the overall length—more examples of Chytraeus’ thorough cataloguing.

As observed already in previous chapters, an important aspect of Chytraeus’ approach is to trace how the arts relate and build upon one another, and show why order in the curriculum is important. The first example taken up in this chapter are his descriptions of mathematics and arithmetic, which function in similar ways to grammar, holding an early position in the progression of the curriculum, and laying foundation for other arts, especially philosophy. Another feature, also seen throughout the *Regulae*, is his perspective on how the arts function as windows of both divine providence and character, drawing attention to how they serve as gifts.
necessary for daily life. But while he certainly follows Melanchthon in recognizing providence in nature, this is not his central focus here. Rather, he continually reminds his readers on the roles these subjects play in reading Scripture, which abounds with natural and moral philosophy topics.

**De Initiis Mathematum Geometria, Arithmetica, &c.**

In introducing this category, Chytraeus’ explains how mathematics plays foundational role for other subjects, both for various mechanical arts and for philosophy. This first section deals with geometry while a more thorough discussion of arithmetic follows after, appearing under its own heading as a self-contained treatise. The majority of the section is devoted to an outline and description of the thirteen volumes of Euclides *Elements* and several other contemporary and classic texts, making it helpful reference for students and teachers.

**Analysis**

Echoing Melanchthon’s approach at Wittenberg, Chytraeus underscores the mathematical foundation of the other arts.¹ Beyond simply ciphering and working with numbers, mathematics was formerly put at the very beginning of the curriculum alongside the study of one’s own vernacular language before taking up other languages like Greek and Latin, or Aristotle’s logic.² Why? Just as language and grammar teach that ideas can be contained or conveyed with words and these communicated, so mathematics teaches the youth about ratios and proportions—a kind

---

¹ In his *Preface to Arithmetic* (1536) Melanchthon recognizes that although mathematics is useful in and of itself, “we also need to value those elements of numbers and measures that provide access to other parts of philosophy…” in Kusukawa, *Philip Melanchthon*, 92.
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of language that conveys meaning—even as it also instills the concepts of certainty and accuracy. This, Chytraeus says, is essential for engaging profitably the work of Pythagoras, Plato, and Aristotle. But mathematics is also a vital art with regard to education generally—the road to erudition. How so? More than just a “grammar” of ratios, numbers, and sums, it has the effect of awakening the mind to a wider range of ideas and connections. It enlivens not only people of natural intelligence but even the slothful. With a solid foundation, students are able to understand matters of physics, politics, and the whole of the literary corpus of philosophy—all topics whose meaning and worth depend on structure, the sort learned in mathematics. This, states Chytraeus, is why Plato inscribed above his academy the “entrance requirement” that no one who was unfamiliar with geometry would be admitted. Such basics were considered crucial for higher learning. Plato was not doing remedial education.

Just as when the rules of grammar are not understood then communication fails, so if the rules of mathematics are not learned and understood, then what follows when trying to learn science, physics, nor the rest of arts that a knowledge of philosophy will amount to nothing. Chytraeus also lists optics, surveying, music, architecture, and the mechanical arts for good measure, reminding the reader that these are entirely dependent on geometry and arithmetic. Even Aristotle’s Organon, a book that deals with epistemology which Chytraeus discusses

---

3 RS., 116a. “Primum igitur Mathemata seu Numerorum & magnitudinum seu Mensurarum disciplina, omnium certissima & accuratissimae iuuentuti tradebantur, & liberalis ac ingenuae institutionis fundamentum Pythagorae, Platon, Aristotele, & recta ad eruditionem via erant.”


5 RS., 116a. “Itaque Plato, inscriptis Academptae suae vestibulo verbis ... neminem nisi Geometriae (qua numeros & formas simul complectitur) peritum, vel certe capacem auditorem ac idoneum, in scholas suas admitterat ...”
elsewhere, rests upon geometric terms and principles.⁶ If that were not convincing enough, he
reminds the reader that the highest university faculties of theology, law, and medicine
completely dependent upon the concepts and terminology of geometry. For instance, in
Aristotle’s Ethics analogies and equalities are described in geometric principles. Little has
changed today: grab virtually any modern book on ethics and see how the substance is often
communicated using symbols and formulae, making one wonder if a geometry text was grabbed
by mistake.⁷ Scripture, as Chytraeus notes, is also full of geometrical concepts and thus requires
geometry to be properly understood. Parts of Roman Law require it, especially since it is ground
in moral philosophy. Finally it is also necessary to understand Galen’s work on medicine for
understanding the marvelous proportions and ratios found in the human body.⁸

Geometry also testifies to a higher order and structure. Here Chytraeus highlights the
divine handiwork visible first in the geometric wonders of the universe. Referring throughout the
Regulae to the heavens and the earth as a the theater of divine majesty upon which providence is
manifest, geometry helps make this point in particular. Very little captivated the ancient world,
or Chytraeus,’ more than the heavens. The stars and the ratios and proportions of their paths
through the sky, or the idea of lines of longitude and latitude governing immense space all

⁶ RS., 116a. “Ut enim in Grammatica, elementis literarum non cognitis, nemo legere aut scribere quicquam
discet: ita elementis Arithmeticae & Geometriae ignoratuis, nemo in Mathesi, Physicis & reliqua Philosophy
progredi & proficere poterit, nec caeteras artes & docta Philosophorum scripta intelliget. Nam ut de Optica,
Geodoesica, Musica, Architectura, & Mechanicis artibus, quae tota ex Geometria & Arithmetica emanant &
pendent, nihil hoc loco dicam; Aristotelis Dialectica in Organo, Geometricis appellationibus, figurarum,
terminorum, & abcdariis exemplis apud Geometros usitatis, & aliis inde citatis elementorum propositionibus,
praecipue in Analytics poster abundat.”

⁷ See Lorenzo Magnani, Philosophy and Geometry: Theoretical and Historical Issues (Dordrecht: Klewer

⁸ RS., 118a. “Theologia etiam nostra & sacris literis recte intelligendis Mathematicas artes necessarias esse,
de singulis deinceps in specie monebo. & Leges Romanas aliquot, numerorum & mensurarum scientia illustrari,
Buteonis, Mathematici erudita lucubrationes ostendunt, In arte Medica vero, Galenus passim Arithmeticae &
Geometriæ cognitionem medico necessariam esse inculcat.”
suggested geometric perfection and show God’s ongoing governing of all of nature. And so, borrowing a line from Plato, Chytraeus remarks that “God geometrizes everything.”

For instance, that same macrocosm/microcosm craftsmanship is seen in the dimensions, distribution, and shape, of members, substances, purposes and symmetry of all that makes up particularly and specifically the human body—precision in the individual, micro scale that is beyond imagination.

The final sections of *De Initiis Mathematum* detail the texts appropriate to the field. Chytraeus begins, as is his pattern, with the methods and summaries saying that the best are those by Peter Ramus, followed then by Philipp Melanchthon. (Yes, Chytraeus was student and close friend of Melanchthon, but he calls them as he sees them.) More specialized texts are found in the summaries and commentaries of Euclid by Joannes Scheubelius, Paul Eberus, and Johannus Aurifaber. Finally, Chytraeus outlines what were some of the well known mathematics texts of his time; Euclid’s *Elements*, Pappus of Alexandria’s *Collection*, and Vitruvius’s *Geometry*. His brief summaries of these works are bare bones, but addressing the multi-volume works of these authors is no small task. The results look a bit like syllabi, listing the subjects and topics found in each book of the title (all thirteen books of the *Elements*, for instance), thus providing a quick reference for students.

---

9 *RS.*, 119a. “Magnifice igitur, & vere Plato, τὸν θεὸν μᾶλζα πάντων γεωμετρεῖν, Deum, totius pulcherrimi huius mundi theatri architectum, immensitatis aeternae spacia definire statuentem, Geometria inprimis usum esse, dixit, qua longitudinum, latitudinum & profundorum spacia terminavit, & coelestes globos, ad motum conversionis pernicissimum ac mirandum, rotundos tornavit: orbes orbibus aptissima serie contiguos inclusit.”


12 *RS.*, 122a–29b.
De Arithmetica

*De Arithmetica* is a short section that more closely considers both arithmetic in the curriculum and the important texts in the field.\(^{13}\) It is a second look, deeper than what was found in the previous section, which simply introduced it within mathematics in a general sense. At the same time it appears that it could be a stand-alone treatise, and therefore despite the fact that it immediately follows after his longer introductory treatment of mathematics and geometry it contains repeated material. However, the pages of the section were not published separately outside of the *Regulae Studiorum*. Chytraeus’ discusses the uses of arithmetic in the curriculum, and more widely in church, and state, while also reviewing the topics of arithmetic as they appear in the Boethius’ classic *Arithmeticaen*.

Analysis

Arithmetic today would surely not start where Chytraeus does. Students probably dive straight in with working on numbers—doing mathematics. On rare occasions someone might ask the sort of question Ludwig Wittgenstein posed: not how to do mathematics but rather, “what is mathematics?”\(^{14}\) The question drove Wittgenstein out of numbers and into philosophy, asking bigger questions about what we know and how to communicate. His questions would not be asked in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Yet Chytraeus proposed some deep connections of his own, linking numbers to theology.

It is the theological significance of arithmetic that introduces the section as Chytraeus suggests that numbers, orders, and proportions are the most illustrious testimony about the

\(^{13}\) For the history of arithmetic, especially concerning the mathematicians who rediscovered and expanded on the ancients during the Renaissance, see Andre Weil, *Number Theory: An Approach through History from Hammurapi to Legendre* (Boston, Birckhauser, 1982).

“image” of God that has been placed into man’s mind. God ordered the universe in such a way that it reflects his character, and God then bestowed on man the gift to recognize and make use of these observations. Chytraeus calls this awareness a well-spring of beauty that is the fountain of all wisdom, learning, and of good things in life.\(^{15}\) As a part of creation and gift to all men, numbers, ratios, and proportions have wide practical application to guide and support all other arts. Just as he connected mathematics to philosophy in the previous section, here Chytraeus reminds again that numbers tie to the created order and allow for things to be rightly distinguished, for order and consequence in the syllogism, and all reasoning.\(^{16}\) He notes Plato’s reference to arithmetic as the doorway to all other arts and cautions that in its absence, all that would remain would be infinite confusion and fog in all the arts, accounts, contracts, and judgments and no one would be skilled in anything.\(^{17}\) Within theology, order is a testimony to God. Disorder points to other deep theological problems.

Because of its significance for all other arts, arithmetic is a requirement in the schools, and is offered to beginners alongside the Catechism.\(^{18}\) It is no accident that it leads off the quadrivium. Arithmetic is a worthwhile subject in its own right but also tied to the other arts that followed. In addition to the role it plays in all other arts that extend throughout private and public

\(^{15}\) RS., 130a. “Nullum illustrius de Deo testimonium in mente hominis ad imaginem Dei condita superest, quam Numerorum, ordinis & proportionum noticia. Quam vere πηγὴν καλῶν, fontem omnis sapientiae, & doctrinae, & plurimrum in vitae bonorum, nominare possumus.”

\(^{16}\) RS., 130a. “Initium enim & norma omnis humanae considerationis & artium est Numeratio, quae res discernit, & unum ac multa recte distinguat, & ordenem rerum ac consequentiam in Syllogismo & omni ratiocinatione intelligit.”

\(^{17}\) RS., 130a. “Vere igitur ianuam esse caeterarum artium Arithmeticam Plato dixit, & in Epinomide, sublata Arithmeticae & numeratione ex mente hominis, infinitam confusionem & caliginem in artibus historiis, contractibus, iudiciis, & tota hominum vita, nec ulla in re unquam nos prudentes fore, scripsit.”

\(^{18}\) RS., 130b. “Quam legem, in Academiis etiam & scholis omnibus praecipue vigere & flore optandum est, ut omnes studiosi, una cum primis dicendi artibus, & Catechesi Christiana, in prima statim aetate, Arithmeticend sedulo discant.”
life externally, Chytraeus reiterates the commonly held belief that learning and practicing
mathematics actually increases a students ability to learn anything. He asserts that the minds of
students who are not naturally gifted, but ordinary, or even naturally slow, may be excited and
sharpened by learning arithmetic so that their minds might be more easily taught and their
memories made more sound.19

While sharp minds are always desirable, Chytraeus maintains that they are especially
useful for reading Scripture. A sharp mind trained in fundamentals of arithmetic better follows
doctrine and the flow of sacred history in Scripture, which abounds with descriptions of patterns
and orders that arithmetic teaches. Such concepts help illuminate descriptions like the promise of
descendants to Abraham, Israel’s deliverance from Egypt, the giving of the Law at Sinai, the
coming of Christ and prophesy of the world to come, allowing such accounts to be more
accurately understood and communicated by the reader.20 Along with much loftier subjects, a
keen mind is also helpful in mundane things that fill church and public calendars and helps
accomplish many other practical functions in daily life.21

Following Chytraeus’ familiar pattern, the remainder of the treatise contains helpful

19 RS., 130b. “Non enim in Oeconomia solum & politia, seu rei familiaris & Reipublicae administratione, & omnibus caeteris artibus ac vitae generibus, nullum puerrilis disciplinae tyrocinium plus adiumenti & maiores utilisates adfert, quam Arithmetica: inter quas maxima est, quod tardiore etiam ingenio praeditum, & natura hebetiorem, exuscit & acuit, & docilem ac memoria & acumine valentem efficit ...”


21 RS., 131b. “Calendaria certa annua, quibus Ecclesia in numeratione dierum festorum, & Respublica in iudiciis & omnibus fere negotis, & singuli homines in communi vita, non minus quam hoc aere & igne possunt carere: sine Arithmeticae & Astronomiae scientia componi nequeunt. Quanta vero in omni vita caligo, & in omnibus negociis confusio futura esset, si calendaria nulla extarent.”
references for students. Among his recommendations for beginner arithmetic textbooks are Cuthbert Tunstall’s *De Arte Supputandi Libri Quattuor* (which Chytraeus claims to have used himself as a student at Tübingen) and the well-known *Arithmeticae practicae methodus facilis* of Gemme Frisius. Chytraeus concludes with a sketch of the parts of Arithmetic discussing multiplication, division, proportions, numerical progressions, and finally with a summary of Boethius’ two volume *Arithmeticen.*

**De Geographia**

Moving on from mathematics, *De Geographia* expands upon the point that Chytraeus made in *De Legenda Historiae* about the necessity of geography for understanding history. In fact Chytraeus’ primary motivation for learning geography is history, both sacred and secular. History features centrally in providing direction for the students, and historical accounts depend greatly on appreciating the significance of geographical locations. A shorter treatise, *De Geographia* did not see individual publication outside of the *Regulae Studiorum.*

**Analysis**

As shown thus far, Chytraeus’ approach to the individual subjects in the category of natural sciences sees them united by his reminder of their purpose for illuminating Scripture. That is also the most important function of geography. This part of the liberal arts is necessary for the church because of its connection to divine revelation, as well as to secondary Christian and pagan historical accounts. Geography illuminates the regions and places on the earth where God has revealed Himself and done great things. In fact, Chytraeus sees geography as even more

---

22 *RS.*, 131b.
23 *RS.*, 133a–34a.
important for the Christian than for those who study geography for other purposes.\textsuperscript{24} It is worth noting that he writes during a period of western history when geographical knowledge of the world had never had a higher value or of more interest to Europe, given the exploration going on and the colonies being established, not to mention the missionary efforts. True, German lands did not join in the race for place pursued by Spain, England, France, and Portugal.\textsuperscript{25} But while Chytraeus could hardly ignore those efforts, he values geography here above all not for the role in exploring, trade, or politics, but for Christian faith. God is known through his revelation in history, and because time and space cannot be properly understood without each other, the geography’s tie to divine revelation is significant. Chytraeus reminds the reader that because Christ became man, one can literally follow his footprints from where he was conceived in Nazareth and then born in Bethlehem through all the places he visited. He taught and performed miracles in concrete locations such as raising Lazarus in Bethlehem, or the widows son at Nain, or Jairus daughter in Capernaum. He was crucified and then resurrected and ascended at real places. And the Apostles preached the Gospel in identifiable locations. Geography illuminates the history of the life of Christ and the expression of the church as spread out on the map.\textsuperscript{26}

\textsuperscript{24} RS., 135b. “Prorsus necessaria Ecclesiae Dei, & omnium diuinum patefactionum, ac totius HISTORIAE Patrum, Propheterum, Christi, Apostolorum & omnium Regnorum & gentium apud Ethnicos, LVHEN est GEOGRAPHIA, quae regiones orbis terrae, & praecastuarum gentium urbium, & locorum, in quibus se DEVS patefecisse, & res magnae in Ecclesia & imperis gestae esse scribuntur, stitus & interualla demonstrat nobis in Ecclesia haec consideratio locorum magis necessaria est, quam aliis hominibus, qui nec quaerunt, unde Religiones acceperint, nec alias patefactiones DEI, certis locis factas desiderant.

\textsuperscript{25} “Acquisitiveness and religious zeal,” are singled out as the two universal aims behind Europe’s exploration of the world beyond its borders by J. H. Parry, The Age of Reconnaissance: Discovery, Exploration and Settlement 1450 to 1650 (University of California Press: Berkley, 1981), 19.

\textsuperscript{26} RS., 135b–36a. “Vult Deus se agnosci, sicut misso filio in regioe Palaestinae se patefecit, & hanc patefactionem vult mentes nostras alligatas esse & ubicunque terrarum sumus, tamen quasi illis ipsis locis vestigia imprimere, ubi Filius Dei pro nobis in aluo Mariae in oppido Nazareth conceptus, in Bethlehem natus, Ierosolymae & passim in Iudaea concionatus est; & doctrinam, resuscitacione Lazari in Bethania, filii viduae in Nain, filiae Iairi in Capernaum, & alius miraculis confirmavit; & tandem Ierosolymae pro nobis crucifixus & resuscitatus in Coelum ascendit, & Apostolos ad praedicationem Euangelii in totum terrarum orbem ablegaut. Huc toti historiae Vitae Christi, mirandam lucem, Geographicae Locorum notationes & picturae, Mappis expressae, adferunt.”
Christianity is not some nebulous tale set in some imaginary land far, far away. It rests on real life that unfolded in real places—geographically.

Chytraeus’ description of the significance of geography extends to all church history. The Acts of the Apostles, Chytraeus points out, describes the areas where the church grew as a result of the preaching of the Gospel with Paul and others traveling widely to different places and cultures. The books of Kings, Chronicles, or the Old Testament prophets reflect their geographic locations among the Babylonians, Assyrians, Moabites, Ammonites, Syrians, Edomites, Tyrians, and more, with a range of nations and regions involved in carrying out the Old Testament warnings of punishment and doom God directed toward a wayward Israel.\(^27\)

With the importance of geography for the Christian thus established, Chytraeus next turns to the specifics of the study for the student. Central to his approach is the connection between geography and reading, whether this means heading one way with learning the geography pertinent to whatever daily readings the student is engaged in, or going the other direction by recalling a certain reading or historical account that a geography lesson might bring to mind. Of first importance is Scripture. No one, says Chytraeus, is a true student who does not have a map of Palestine and Greece. These ought to be consulted with their daily readings, putting reading in its context, in its local setting.\(^28\) For learning the elements of geography Chytraeus recommends the Transylvanian humanist Johannes Honter’s manual, cutting edge for its time, as well as

---


\(^{28}\) *RS.*, 136b. “Itaque, nemo sit studiosorum, qui Palaestinae & Graeciae tabulas non habeat, & crebra inspectione familiariter sibi notas reddat, mentisque penitus inscribat, Quarum illa, quotidiana Bibliorum lectioni, & historiae Christi & Apostolorum ab Evangelistis expositae utilissime serviet: haec Graecis Poetis & Historicis lucem singulararem adferet.”
Pliny’s *Natural History*. After learning the technical aspects of geography such as regions, longitude, latitude and parallels they turn their attention to maps. Keeping their daily readings in mind, they need to compare the new boundaries and place names with the old on the maps of Africa, Asia, and Europe giving them a visual picture of the known world. For this Gerard Mercator’s *Europa* is recommended, cutting edge for its time. Finally, when studying maps and their features, Chytraeus recommends that students recount the history that such features bring to mind, further reinforcing the connection between geography and history.

**De Astronomia**

*On Astronomy* is a more in depth look at a subject whose importance was already noted in his chapters on mathematics. It is also a central feature of Chytraeus’ orientation toward natural philosophy as a whole, since, as he remarks here and in numerous places, the heavens are unique both in demonstrating broadly God’s providential care for mankind theologically, by illustrating the orderly character of creation, and practically, because of astronomy’s application in daily life. After surveying the uses of astronomy in the church and secular life, Chytraeus follows the pattern set in earlier subjects as he briefly reviews the literature, including a summary of the

---

29 A friend of Melanchthon, Johannes Honter was a Lutheran reformer in Transylvania, as well as an educator himself, and set the contents of his *Rudimentia Cosmographia* to verse as an aid for learning the contents. See Gernot Nüssbacher, *Johannes Honterus Sein Leben und Werk im Bild* (Kritarion Verlag: Bucharest, 1978).


31 *RS.*, 137b. “Quod si recentes etiam praecipuarum regionum & Locorum in tota Europa & littorali Africa & Asia appellaciones cognoscere, & cum veteribus confere ...”

32 *RS.*, 137b–38a. “Sed Regionum, Urbium, Fluuiorum, Montium singulorum nomina & positus in Tabulis ostendet, ac sicubii praestantis alicuius viri patria, vel alio memorabili eventu celebratus locus occurret, historiam breviter recitabit, ut illecebris illis, ad crebriorem aspectionem Tabularum auditores inuinentur, & altius ac firmius, tum aliarum regionum, tum vero inprimis Palaestinae & Graeciae Idaeam, quae totius sacrae & Graecae historiae lumen sunt: mentibus infixam, ubique secum in lectione historiarum postea circumferant.”
thirteen books of Ptolemy’s famous *Almagestum*. *De Astronomia* was not published separately outside of the *Regulae*, but it was not the only treatise on astronomy that Chytraeus published. In his youth, Chytraeus had studied astronomy at Tübingen with Philipp Imser for a time during the Schmalkaldic War in 1547 when Wittenburg had temporarily shut its doors. There he had the opportunity to study with a luminary of the field, but he was able to learn about the array of scientific instruments collected there that had been invented by another famous Tübingen astronomer, Johannes Stöfler.33 Such firsthand knowledge lies behind his thorough treatment of not only the literature, but also the science itself in this treatise. The famous astronomer Tycho Brahe met Chytraeus 1566, enrolling at Rostock after the plague came to Wittenberg.34 In his work on the comet of 1577 he mentions Chytraeus among others who had written on the event, although he understood Chytraeus to be a theologian, rather than professional astronomer. While this may be true, Chytraeus’ enthusiasm for astronomy shines through both in this treatise, as well in his book on the 1572 and 1577 astronomical events, titled *A New Star*, published in 1577.35

---

33 *RS.*, 144a. “Ego quidem, toto vitae tempore, Philippi Imseri Tubingensis Mathematici, grata mente recordor, qui tempore belli Germanici, nobis Tubingam reuersis, Theorias Planetarum publice tradens, non modo instrumentis seu machinis aptissimis, Ioannis Stofleri industria primum apparatis, omnem singulorum orbium & planetarum motus varietatem oculis subjiciet: verum etiam cum praeceptis Tabulas resolutas & Blanchini copulans, uniussuiique Planetae Theoria finita, rationem supputandi motus Planetae illius, ad quodcunque tempus propositum, & Ephemerides componnere, docebat, & Ecclipsium calculus adiungebat.”

Interestingly Chytraeus does not mention Rheticus, Rheinhold, or Peucer, other important astronomers of his day.


35 The full title of this work is *De stella inusitata et nova, quae mense Novembri, anno 1572 conspici coepit. Et de cometu sidere, quod hoc mense Novembri anno 1577 videmus. Commonefactiones in Schola praeposita, Rostochii* (J. Lucius, 1577). To be fair, Chytraeus is far less interested in the heavens themselves and far more interested in their function for illustrating divine providence. His discussion of the new star of 1572 appeared in an early work, his commentary on Deuteronomy. In *A New Star* especially, Chytraeus takes every opportunity to connect the meaning of the astronomical event with the current events of his day. For a more detailed discussion on these astronomical events in light of their sixteenth-century interpretations, see C. Doris Hellman, *The Comet of 1577: Its Place in the History of Astronomy* (New York: Ams Press, 1971).
Analysis

As we have already seen from his remarks in previous sections, Chytraeus understood the heavens to be an epitome of mathematical and geometric precision—an illustrious example of divine craftsmanship. This perspective was cultivated by Melanchthon, who also expressed such beliefs. For Melanchthon, the reflection of divine handiwork in the heavens is of utmost importance, as its movements testify both to the craftsman himself, as well as to his ongoing work in the universe. The study of astronomy related directly to the study of astrology, which taught that the positions of the heavens can be interpreted to correspond with historical events and therefore allow for predictions to be made. But such predictions for Melanchthon were not magical, but were more like the observation of the meteorologist, who takes note of the conditions of the heavens in order to forecast the weather. But Melanchthon understood the heavens to be much more consistent in their movements (and thus predictability) than the weather. And astrology is not meant to deceive minds, but to attest to the regularity of the order that God created. Chytraeus echoes Melanchthon in this section through his admiration for the precise motions and harmonies of heavenly bodies and naming astronomy as the summit and

36 Melanchthon’s understanding and justification for astrology is well-put in his *Oration on Astronomy and Geography*. Here he states that “the science of the heavenly movements is in itself an art of foretelling, and an outstanding and most certain divination ruling all of life. For these laws of the motions are evidence that the world has not originated by chance, but that it was created by an eternal mind and that this creator cares about human nature. Since the laws of the motions demonstrate this clearly, it cannot be denied that this science is divination of the greatest thing. For this notion about God and providence assuredly rouses minds to virtue … For, if we learn from it that God is the ruler of all things, we understand that one needs to obey Him, we recognize that order was installed by Him, both in our minds and in political society, and that punishments are set for those who confound this order. Moreover, the order of the heavenly laws also gives us many admonitions regarding God and morals, testifying that the changes of things are made for the benefit of humankind.” Sachiko Kusukawa, *Philip Melanchthon: Orations on Philosophy and Education*, 118. For Melanchthon’s view of astrology and the features and similarities also shared by Chytraeus, see Claudia Brosseder, *Im Bann der Sterne: Caspar Peucer, Philipp Melanchthon und andere Wittenberger Astrologen* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag GmbH, 2004), 275. Here Brosseder contends that Chytraeus actually went beyond Melanchthon in emphasizing on the heaven’s role in announcing God’s grace and wrath.
apex of all philosophy. He also was very interested in astrology, a subject that permeates his other writing on astronomy, as well as several of his histories and biblical commentaries. But astrology is not directly discussed here.

The closest he gets to an endorsement of astrology in this section is his definition of the use of astronomy. Chytraeus argues that is of service to any end that requires the accuracy and precision that may be gained from studying the positions and the patterns of the heavens (astrologic predictions fall within this general definition). But Chytraeus simply says that the best example of what he means is the settling of the calendar year for both the church and daily life. As he has pointed out in his discussions of the other natural sciences in the Regulae, Chytraeus also notes that a solid grasp of astronomy is necessary also for understanding astronomical references that appear in other texts. Of the texts that a student might read Scripture is by far the most important. The chronological and calendrical events it contains, such as the account of Noah, or the Passover, are important for Christian theology. But then there are classical texts that students will encounter as students that refer to the night sky—Hesiod, Homer, Virgil, Polybius, or Pliny—that also require a knowledge of astronomy to understand the references to the stars, figures, motions, time, places, occasions, and influences of the heavens in order to understand the stories.

---

37 RS., 139a. “Fastigium & apex totius Philosophiae, & generosis ac coelo natis ingeniis dignissima & iucundissima est pulcherimi huius & amplissimi coelestis theatri, astrorum umbinis distincti & ornati: & motuum Solis ac Lunae, dierum, mensium, & annorum spacia definientium: & aliorum Planetarum in summa varietate ratos & constantes motus & certissimam cum Sole harmoniam seruantium ... & stellarum coelo fixarum ...”

38 RS., 139b. “Rerum nascentium viribus accommodati, & caeterarum luminis coelestis in hac inferiori natura effectionum aspectio & consideratio accurata: Quae ASTRONOMIA usitate appelatur, & non solum Ecclesiae & toti communi vitae, in certa Anni descriptione & temporum discriminis ac serie rata, & Calendariis annis, quibus carere vita hominum non potest, conseruandis, utiliter seruit: verum etiam multis sacrae scripturae partibus recte intelligendiis, & perspicue ac dextre explicandis, & verae religionis doctrinae in Ecclesia propagationi, prorsus necessaria est.”

39 RS., 139b–40a. “... Nohae historia certum anni solaris spacium, videlicet duodecim menses Synodicos, & undecim Epactas definit, & initium anni certum a coniunctione Solis & Lunae proxima aequinoctio Verno, in lege
The majority of the astronomy treatise is devoted to material suitable for reference by students. Chytraeus displays his own knowledge of the subject as he lists a selection of major stars and constellations, and explains the relationship between lunar cycles and the calendar year, as well as the movements of the planets and their orbits. He also recommends texts on method and summary—for beginning study—such as Melanchthon’s *Initia Physica*, the *Arati Phaenomena*, Johannes Honterus’ *Cosmographia*, and a summary of Ptolemy’s Almagestem, titled the *Epitome in Almagestum Ptolemei* by Johannes Regiomontanus and Georg von Peurbach. Chytraeus singles out this book as being particularly helpful to Copernicus in his calculations. Rounding off this section is a summary of the thirteen books of Ptolemy’s famous *Almagestum*. Anyone wanting to go beyond mere stargazing could certainly use Chytraeus as a launching pad.

**De Studio Doctrinae Physicae Recte Inchoando**

Physics comes next on the curriculum docket. Chytraeus’ introduction to the study of physics appeared separately in 1589, and was included as well in the final version of *Regulae Studiorum*. A lengthy section with a wide scope, it lists the literature in use for teaching about the heavens, and earth and its flora and fauna, drawn from both ancient and contemporary sources. As he has done thus far in the *Regulae*, Chytraeus focuses first on the necessity of


40 RS., 141a–45a.
41 RS., 140a.
42 RS., 144a–49b.
43 Kaufmann, *Universität und lutherische Konfessionalisierung*, 637.
knowledge of the physical universe in order to understand Scripture. But physics also
demonstrates God’s character as creator and caretaker as seen also in the natural world that
surrounds. The section showcases how his commonplace method, incorporating Aristotle for
investigating the various subcategories of physics that follows on from astronomy to the study of
the elements, plants, animals, and the earth itself.

Analysis

Chytraeus’ two-part opening statement about the importance of physics is characteristic of
his overall approach to the subjects within the category of natural philosophy—the emphasis on
the ancillary role that natural philosophy plays with regard to understanding literature and to
Scripture in particular. Chytraeus echoes the Psalms as the heavens and the earth make known
the handiwork of God in the way they are created and ordered, maintaining that God desires
people to look upon creation and consider what it reveals about God both in terms of its
craftsmanship and continual care that God bestows upon both mankind and the wider creation.
Here again Chytraeus echoes his mentor Melanchthon, who also emphasized these points in his
well-known oration On Natural Philosophy. But Melanchthon’s oration the emphasis is focused
by and large on the use of natural philosophy for daily life—from the medicine, to agriculture,
and even shipbuilding. His only direct reference to Scripture is a comment about how Noah,
Abraham, and the prophets and apostles used natural philosophy in their professions, joining
their daily work to their faith for spreading of the Gospel.

44 Philip Melanchthon, “On Natural Philosophy (1542),” in Kusukawa, Philip Melanchthon: Orations on
Philosophy and Education, 133–38. The summary and method for natural philosophy from Melanchthon is best
expounded in his famous physics textbook, Initia Doctrinae Physicae first published in 1549. There as well he
differs from Chytraeus in his description of the chief end of the study. Melanchthon emphasizes God as he can be
known through his creation (which assumes a thorough study of God in the Scripture) while Chytraeus emphasizes
the study of creation to better understand God as he is revealed in Scripture.
Chytraeus’ discussion is broad enough to include all these points as well. The intricate working of the natural world in and of itself functions as a theatre of divine majesty and as a good gift of God, although this is secondary to the study’s role in providing useful and necessary information for understanding Scripture. But in this he differs from Melanchthon’s treatment. For while Chytraeus understands and states the value of the study of the natural world, the full purpose is to point beyond the natural evidence of the creator, toward an even greater gift from God coming in the Scriptures. However, such focus doesn’t diminish the majesty of creation. It rather amplifies its dignity and usefulness. Chytraeus reminds the reader that the topics within Physics [Physicae loci] abound in Scripture, from references to the heavenly bodies, to the various plants and trees, and to all of the animals. Carefully studying the natural world allows the reader to understand the references given in Scripture. While the finis of physics itself is doxological, to investigate the craftsmanship of God that both makes known his wonder and goodness in the created universe as well as testifies to the benefits that such an orderly creation provides, ultimately this is to be understood through what is revealed in Scripture.

Pedagogically, Chytraeus divides the investigation of the universe into the two traditional

\[\text{RS., 142a. “Totum hoc pulcherrimum naturae rerum Theatrum, coeli, stellae, elementa, meteora, metalla, plantae, animantia, & inprimis Animae & corpus humanum, (quod Physicae euoluit ac explicat) ideo a deo conditum, & mirandae arte & sapientia distributum & ornatum est, ut testimonium de Deo opifice illustre esset, quod vult ab hominis aspeci & considerari, ut ipsum conditorem, sapientem & beneficum, & generi hominum amicum, agnoscanum & grati celebremus. Etsi autem per se hominis cognitione dignissima & iucundissima est, & plurimas toti vita utilitates Physica adfert, & exordium est Artis Medicae: tamen inprimis Ecclesiae Dei, ad conciones Christi, Prophetarum & Apostolorum recte intelligendas & erudite explicandas, omnino necessaria est, sicut in ipso Bibliorum vestibulo, Lucis, coeli, Terra & plantarum, Luminum & stellarum, piscium & autum, terrestrium animantium & hominis (qui uniuersae & amplissimae doctrinae Physicae loci praecipui sunt) creatio distribuiter, & passim in tota scriptura, insignes similibus, a Sole, Luna, Meteoris, Sale, gemmis, margaritis, palma, cedro, olea, vite, Balsamo, Ficu, sycomoro, frugibus, columbis, serpentibus, coris, passeribus, pardis, viperis, strubionibus Herodis & allis animatus eorumque partibus, sumuntur, quas fine plantarum & animantium naturae scientia dexter intelligi & enarrare non posse perspicuem est, sicut oratione peculiari, de doctrinae Physicae Dignitate & utilitatum aplitudine, nuper edita prolixe & accurate demonstrauimus.”}

\[\text{RS., 142b–43a. “FINIS PHYSICAIE est cognitis naturae rerum in mundo conditarum, ut Dei opificis sapientiam & bonitatem mirandam ostendant, & hominum utilitati commodisque serviant.”} \]
categories of heaven and earth. Heaven include the lights, planets, and stars—a logical follow on after the section on astronomy and takes up the motions and effects of these bodies.\(^{47}\) The second category concerns the earth and related elements under the sky. (Although Chytraeus does not refer to Ecclesiastes, these are the things that are “under the sun”). This second part is subdivided into six categories considering the elements of fire, air, water, and earth and their respective mixtures along with falling objects, minerals, flora, fauna. The final category focuses on the study of humans, creatures that are unique, having both body and soul, and thus are God’s most perfect and noble creation. Chytraeus echoes Melanchthon saying that by examining humans one can best observe God’s skill as creator.\(^{48}\)

Chytraeus employs traditional Aristotelian categories—causes, parts, qualities, lives, energy, corruption and mutation—to investigate natural philosophy.\(^{49}\) This approach helps show the interaction and connectedness of nature’s complexity, of all which, as Chytraeus reminds his readers, testifies to God and his majesty. Nature is no accident but forms a grand whole that has its source and end in the Divine. Aristotle, among others, would recognize it, and Scripture declares it.

\(^{47}\) RS., 143a. “Sunt autem praecipuae Res a Deo conditae, seu partes Mundi, quarum consideratio Homini inprimis expetenda est, & quarum naturas, vires, ac motus Philosophia naturalis inquirit & explicat: Primum in aetherea mundi regione Coelum, Lumina, & caeterae stellae vagae & fixae: Quorum coelestium & perpetuo manentium mundi corporum motus & effectiones, Astronomia proprie considerat.”


\(^{49}\) RS., 143b. “Hæ coeli, elementorum, plantarum, animantium, & inprimis Animae & corporis humani consideratio, inquirens & explicans singulorum causas, partes, qualitates, vires, modum generationis, corruptionis, & aliarum mutationum.”
Aristotle’s ABCs of physics as Chytraeus actually refers to them—origins, material, form and privation, vocabulary and distinctions between natural and artificial forms, causes and accidents, motions, boundaries, place, times, and other qualities universal to bodies make up some of the categories that feed in to the commonplace system that has been drilled throughout the Regulae—reinforcing Chytraeus’ conception of the divine organization or order within nature being studied.50 Students first are to practice learning the physics categories in Latin that organize parts of the human body, trees, herbs, legumes, vegetables, liquids, quadrupeds, birds, fish, insects, metals, and gems, and learn what classes they are organized into. This work in nomenclature helps the students with own memory and organization.51 It also prepares them to read classical material that will use those same categories and vocabulary.

All of the contemporary method books that Chytraeus recommends—the Compendium Physicae of Jakob Schegk, the Compendium Scientiae Naturalis ex Aristotele of Ermolao Barbaro, the commentary on book four of Aristotle’s Physics by Johannes Velcurio, the Naturalis Philosophiae Epitome of Francis Titelmann and Hieronymus Wildenbergus, and finally Philipp Melanchthon’s De Initia Physica—are essentially commentaries on Aristotle, further illustrating the important place that this authority held in Chytraeus’ overall approach.52

50 RS., 144b. “Usitate autem in scholis, exordia tantum, & primum velut Alphabetum doctrina Physicae tradi solet, de principiis rerum naturalium, materia, forma & privatione: de vocabulo Naturae ...”

51 RS., 144a–b. “Utilissima vero, ad uniuersae physicae, seu rerum, naturae cognitionem praeparatio erit, si prima statim aetate pueris, Etymologiam, seu verborum latinae lingua singulorum proprias ac genuinas significationes discentibus, non modo vulgaria & omnis obua voabula, sed inprimis partium humani corporis, Arborum, Herbarum, Leguminum, Olerum, Liquorum, Quadrupedum, Volucrum, Piscium, Insectorum, Metalorum, Gemmarum, & aliarium rerum a Deo conditarium nomina & appellationes, in suas classes distributa, ad discendum proponantur. Ita enim praecipue res in tota natura, velut in breui tabella oculis subjectae & evoluetae, teneris statim mentibus infingentur. Nec maiore cum difficulitate exquisita haec, & non passim trita rerum vocabula, quam vulgares in scholis nomenclature, disci possunt.”

52 RS., 146b. “Ac caeteris omnibus, propter methodum, & explicationis ordinem & subtilitatem mirandam, Aristoteles merito antefertur: qui uniuersam Physicen, seu totius rerum naturae scientiam complexurus, primum exigua quaedam initia, ad omnium mundi corporum cognitionem pariter necessaria ...”
This is not a matter of Chytraeus feeling obligated to follow after his own teachers, especially Melanchthon. Rather, Aristotle simply works.

The majority of De Studio Doctrinae Physicae, like many of the sections of Part III, features both lists and summaries of both classic and contemporary texts. Here, Chytraeus shows off the many ancient authors in use in the schools on various topics as well as the contributions and investigations of his own time, showing the Renaissance interest in writing on natural philosophy. Since Aristotle forms the basis of his program, and Chytraeus begins his survey with an overview of the eight volumes of Aristotle’s Physics. Aristotle’s method, as we have seen, provides a workable tool for moving through the breadth of his survey. From Aristotle he lists four books of Meteorology, the three books of De Animae, and finally the nine books of Historia Animalium. Next, he summarizes all thirty-seven books of Pliny’s Naturalis Historia with marginal indexing to aid the reader in quickly locating the volume needed to address the particular subject. That Chytraeus feels the need to organize Pliny calls to mind the problem Wittenberg had in the late 1510s and 1520s. Luther was determined to shut Aristotle out of theology. “Aristotle is to theology as darkness is to light,” ran thesis 50 in Luther’s Disputation against Scholastic Theology. The problem was logic that suggested God’s giving law meant people could sometimes keep it and gain reward. With Aristotle’s banishment from theology he was also viewed askance in other areas, and alternative authorities and texts were tried in his place there as well. Pliny was one used in the art of natural philosophy (physics). The problem was that Pliny read more like a travelogue, and as such while it was interesting, it lacked the

---

53 RS., 147b
54 RS., 147b–51b.
55 RS., 151b–53a.
56 Aristotle’s Logica, Rhetorica and Poetica were retained during efforts to purge Aristotle’s philosophy from Wittenberg in the 1520s. See, Sachiko Kusukawa, The Transformation of Natural Philosophy, 44 ff.
organization or rigor offered by Aristotle. In time, the use of Aristotle returned. Chytraeus, a later generation, obviously feels comfortable with him. And at the same time as seen here, he finds value in Pliny, although his work could use a nudge with a bit of organization to better serve the student, even if this only meant notes in the margin. After Pliny, Chytraeus briefly summarizes the nine volumes of *De Plantarum Historia Novem*, by Theophrastus, the successor of Aristotle at the Lyceum.

Through the five volumes of *De Materia Medica* by Dioscorides, Chytraeus offers consideration for the medicinal uses of a wide variety of vegetation. The subject of agriculture expands this view through an outline of Iunius Moderatus Columella’s twelve volume *De Re Rustica*, as well as a description of Palladius Aemilianus’s famous *Opus Agricolaes*, showcase the ancient world’s knowledge of farming. Chytraeus’ list of works on botany and aquatic life are works of his contemporaries, demonstrating the Renaissance interest in the subject, including Joannis Ruellius, *De Natura Stirpium*, the *Historia Stirpium* of Leonard Fuchs, the *Dioscoridem* of Petrus Andrea Mathiolius, the *Annotationes* of Valarius Cordius, the *Eucharius* of Ottonis Brunfelius, the *Enchiridion Historae Plantarum* of Conrad Gesner, and finally the *Aquatilium naturam* of Petrus Gyllius. Other more recent names include Georgius Agricola, who wrote the famous *De re metallica*, published in 1556, twelve volumes devoted entirely to the subject of mining, with the processes and tools involved. Conrad Gessner is noted for his incredible encyclopedia on zoology, stretching to thousands of pages over several volumes and including

---

57 For Aristotle’s removal and reintegration into the curriculum at Wittenburg see also Sachiko Kusukawa *The Transformation of Natural Philosophy*.

58 RS., 162a–63b.

59 RS., 153a–55a. Today’s student can read Agricola in English, compliments of a one-time geology student from Stanford University by the name of Herbert Hoover, perhaps better known for being president of the United States.
full color illustrations. Finally, because natural philosophy was a subject commonly taken up by ancient poets, Chytraeus rehearses a list that would have been familiar to students who had already read the *Regulae*’s section on poetry, which contains its own list addressing natural philosophy. Here he includes selected works from Orpheus, Parmenides, Anaximander of Miletus, Empedocles of Agrigentum, and a summary of the six volumes of *De Rerum Natura* by the Epicurean Lucretius. This is followed by Oppianus of Anazarbaeus, who wrote about animals of all sorts, including their habitats and behaviors. Two poems of Nicander of Colophon would have been of particular interest during the Renaissance, when stories of political assassinations by poison aroused common curiosity. Nicander’s *Theriaca* concerns venomous snakes and *Alexipharmaca* is about various poisons and antidotes.

Chytraeus concludes this section with a critique of natural philosophy in the schools. It is a bit of a digression from the topic, critiquing the scholastic approach to the subject of the last few centuries. Chytraeus observes that careful attention paid to the visible world is more useful for learning about physics than are unregulated disputations based on Aristotle’s *Physics* from an earlier age. Much more can be gained from the observations of hunters, fisherman, farmers, gardeners and pharmacists who look at real life than what passed for physics taught in the schools but clouded by argument. Chytraeus may like syllogisms and logic, but not when they bypass common sense observation for speculation instead, no matter how theoretically logical they may seem. At the same time, this is not to say that he is advocating an approach to physics that emphasizes observation in nature above or in place of literary study. Instead his argument is

---


61 RS., 155b–59b.
precisely that literary study fell by the wayside in the schools. And literary studies are a kind of observation as well. They have been neglected not because the instructors were lazy or ill-equipped for the task of teaching physics, but rather the problem was methodological. The schoolmen were plunging into the eight volumes of Physics without a goal [sine fine]. While there were earlier Christian philosophers who interpreted Aristotle before the scholastics, overall there had been more interest in Plato. Chytraeus says that this all died out because of the languishing Greek, followed by Latin, a new kind of philosophy, one that favored the fruit of the theatrical disputations. This new approach was better accommodated by Aristotle, than Plato, because the former offered a clear method for investigation while Plato did not. As a result, scholars left behind not only Plato, but also what Chytraeus calls the best and most useful contributions of Aristotle apart from his works on logic, writings such as his Rhetoric, Physics, and Historia Animaliarum. The Scholastics prized Aristotle’s work on logic, physics, and metaphysics, but then they buried them under wordy commentaries, with nearly none of those useful for studying the things in nature. Earlier Greek interpretations were neglected because they were not able to be understood as well as because of the rarity and high value of the manuscripts. Inclusion of such texts into the curriculum now is representative of a new kind of

---


63 RS., 165a–66a. “Multo minus a veterum Graecorum interpretum lectione dehortor, qui amplius 500 post Aristotelem annis hominum studia, ad summi illius & acutissimi Philosophi, qui nominari antea magis quam legi solebat, libros cognoscendos primi excitarunt. Hactenus enim Platonis philosophia sola praecipue apud cordatos in
De Ethica Seu Philosophia Morali

Ethics and moral philosophy make up the third category of the liberal arts. While natural philosophy and moral philosophy have different objectives, they relate in Chytraeus’ presentation because they are understood to showcase divine providence as observed in the laws of nature and by the moral awareness seen as people recognize and react (or fail to react) to natural law. Chytraeus provides a detailed orientation toward moral philosophy in detail, first distinguishing the Law and the Gospel and then arguing that the source of moral philosophy is the natural awareness of law that Christian and pagan alike, all men share. A closer look at the role of moral philosophy in jurisprudence also falls into this topic but is unfolded in its own section. Chytraeus includes the usual summary of important texts on the matter, with Aristotle and Cicero featured centrally. On Ethics was not published separately outside of the Regulae, but is new for the large book.

Analysis

Following the Wittenburg tradition established by Melanchthon, discussions of ethics or
morality begin with a distinction between Law and Gospel. This distinction was the foundation for reintegrating Aristotle back into the curriculum, limiting the use of reason to its rightful sphere and resulting in a fuller appreciation of both Gospel and Law. Melanchthon understood the value of Aristotle for teaching natural philosophy and ethics and nothing made this more clear than the tumultuous 1520s. Against the rioting of the peasants Melanchthon and Luther both had argued that civil authority, which even the pagans recognized, must be obeyed.64 Aristotle was a suitable tool for teaching about civil authority and the limits of its powers when appropriately used (Melanchthon’s dialectic textbooks helped here) and by the early 1530s his Ethics was back in Wittenberg’s curriculum, with the Christian life growing from faith, not seeking merit.

Following the standard set by the reformers at Wittenberg, Chytraeus begins the section by defining the Gospel. Not natural but revealed knowledge, the Gospel distinguishes the church from the rest of the world by virtue of what the Gospel does and how it makes the church—believers—different and beyond the understanding of both angels and men. Chytraeus refers here to 1 Peter 1:12 which speaks to the higher view with those “born anew” [baptized] to a “living hope” having a view of God into which even angels long to look. As new creature in Christ with eyes of faith that realize what they were (and still are with the Old Man) and what Christ has made them, believers see things differently and have perspective beyond other people and even beyond angels.65 On the other hand, the Law of the Decalogue, the precepts of Divine Law, is

64 See Luther’s “Admonition to Peace: A Reply to the Twelve Articles of the Peasants in Swabia (1525),” LW, 46: 25, 27.
65 RS., 166a. “DVAE sunt partes uniuersae Doctrinae Christiae praecipuae, Lex Dei, seu praecepta Decalogi; & Euangelion, seu promissio Gratiae Dei, remissionis peccatorum ac vitae aeternae gratis propter Filium Dei mediatorem donandae. Propria autem Ecclesiae Dei doctrina, quae ab omnibus alius gentibus eam discernit, est Euangelion de Christo, non natura notum, sed supra & extra conspectum rationis Angelicae & humane a filio Dei reuelatum.”
understood as congruent with natural reason, those rays of natural light placed into man’s mind at creation of distinguishing right and wrong preventing total chaos. It functions as both a witness concerning God, and also as a guide, so that man’s sense of wisdom and virtue would be congruent with that of his creator’s and so that this would govern his actions.66

Chytraeus follows medieval tradition in contending that because natural light, the ability to recognize natural law, was instilled into man at creation, all worthy human laws and precepts of all laudably virtuous action thus are actually explications of divine law.67 Jurisprudence itself is rivulet of divine law that Chytraeus sees in such works as Cicero’s De Officis, in Phocylides, Theognides, Hesiod, Seneca, or other philosophers and books on the subject. Describing how this functions practically in society, Chytraeus writes that the church provides a most useful service when in teaches the Decalogue, and instruction in good works and virtue is necessary for good governance of public and private life, something to be learned by young nobles in the schools. But such teaching must not only be learned, it must be practiced, and definitions of virtue are to function as norms for action in life and to foster moderation and temperance of morals. Furthermore Chytraeus follows in Melanchthon’s footsteps in the connection of the art of rhetoric to the study and practice of law, noting the importance of clarity and elegance in the deliberation.68 And, lest the readers forget the reality of human frailty, Chytraeus adds that the


68 RS., 166b–67a. “Ex hisce radiis sapientiae seu legis diuinae, mentibus humanis diuinitus insitae, & natura
study and practice of ethics is a reminder that no one can maintain such moderation and
temperance in times of great calamity without faith also—true belief in Christ is therefore
necessary for such study.\textsuperscript{69}

With the source of moral philosophy being the Decalogue, Chytraeus recommends learning
this as a foundation for the definition of virtue, with the Small Catechism or other such booklets
used to guide a right understanding. He also recommends the parts of the writings of Salomon
[Solomon], Ben Sira [Syrach], the Pauline Epistles, and other authors, philosophers, orators, or
poets, that reinforce the categories and commonplaces of ethics.\textsuperscript{70} And many pagan texts that
offer exemplary teachings on ethics. The \textit{Nicomachean Ethics} of Aristotle is highly
recommended because of its superb treatment of justice as the queen of virtue. Aristotle’s \textit{Ethics}
were an enemy of grace, said Luther, but useful, wrote Chytraeus, when looking for a moral
model. As for introductory textbooks Chytraeus recommends Melanchthon’s \textit{Ethics}.\textsuperscript{71} This text

\textit{notae: Leges honestae omnes, & praecepta de omnium virtutum actionibus laudabilibus, in officiiis Ciceronis, in
Phocylide, Theogide, Hesiodo, Seneca, & caeteris Philosophorum & Iurisprudentium libris deriuata sunt: & tota
Moralis Philosophia seu Ethica, velut riulius ac explication Legis Dei, naturae insitae, extracta est. Cuius elementa,
Ecclesiae Dei in enarratione Decalogi, & tota bonorum operum seu virtutum doctrina utiliter seruientia, & originem
ac fontes totius Iuris prudentiae continetia; ad Reipublicae ac vitae priuatae gubernationem, & formandum
Iudicium de maximis rebus inprimis necessaria: nobili iuuentuti, ad Ecclesiae vel Reipublicae gubernacula paulo
post accessuam proponi in Academiis, ac disci, necesse est. ac saepe docentes & discentes cogitare & moneri, hanc
Iustitiae & caeterarum virtutum doctrinam, non in scientia & cognitione tantum, sed usu & praxi totius vitae
potissimum consistere: & Virtutum definitionibus, tanquam Normis, omnia vitae nostrae consilia & actiones honeste
regendas esse: & accedere in eruditis debere \textit{ἐθικὸν} illud, videlicet moderationem & suavitem in moribus, suae
ornamentum & suaeem speciem virtutis, quam Germanice sansse und sittig nominamus: & cunctationem, qua se
cohibere possint, donec re deliberata, cum quadam suavitate & elegantia, quod rectissimum est, respondeant &
agant.”

For how Melanchthon connected the studies of rhetoric and ethics in Wittenberg, see Nicole Kuropka

\textsuperscript{69} \textit{RS.}, 167a. “Et quia moderatos & lenes animi motus, sine fide habere in magnis calamitatis nemo potest:
ideo, ut vera \textit{ἡθο} niant, veram agnitionem Christi accedere nescesse est.”

\textsuperscript{70} \textit{RS.}, 167a–b. “Cum autem fons doctrina Ethica ac Politica sit Decalogus: magno doctrinae Ethicae pars sunt
Virtutum definitiones in Decalogi praecepta distributae: ideoque has ex libello Catechesos, vel aliunde, ubi
concinne & erudite traduntur, ediscendas esse: & ad eas, tanquam ad locos communes & classes certas, referri
omnes de moribus sententias, in Salomone, Syracide, Epistolis Pauli, & caeteris autoribus, Philosophis, Oratoribus,
& Poetis, oportere sciamus.

\textsuperscript{71} \textit{RS.}, 167b. “Extant autem multorum artificum libelli Ethici, in quibus, ex notitiis Legum & virtutum naturae
not only presents the commonplaces of virtue more elegantly and eruditely than most other books in Chytraeus’ view, but by a careful collation of examples of both philosophy and Gospel, it illuminates both.\textsuperscript{72} In addition Chytraeus recommends his own ethics textbook, \textit{Regulae Vitae}, which he wrote as a supplement to Melanchthon’s.\textsuperscript{73}

The summaries of classic texts, customary for Part III, are typical of what one would choose for this field. First in the survey are the volumes of Aristotle, his \textit{Magna Moralia}, \textit{Eudemus}, and \textit{Nicomachian Ethics}. Chytraeus refers to these as the clearest presentations when it comes to the philosophy of virtue.\textsuperscript{74} A thorough summary of the ten books of the \textit{Nicomachian Ethics} follows, with short descriptions of the \textit{Magna Moralia} and \textit{Eudemus} appended at the end. However, more widely influential text than Aristotle’s \textit{Ethics}, was Cicero’s \textit{De Officiis}, which Chytraeus also highlights. This was a popular text during the Renaissance for describing how one ought to model public life. This is followed by brief overview of the five volumes of Cicero’s equally well-known \textit{De Finibus Malorum et Bonorum} along with his \textit{Tusculanis Quaestionibus} and \textit{Consolationem Philosophicam}.\textsuperscript{75} Next, Chytraeus takes note of Plutarch’s \textit{Moralia} as the best text outside of Scripture for this genre, praising the work, and acknowledging Plutarch’s contribution in physics, medicine, mathematics, music, and history as well.\textsuperscript{76} He

\textsuperscript{72} RS., 167b–68a. “Sed ad verae de Deo doctrina illustrationem, & Iurisprudentiae; Respublicas & iudicia gubernantis, initia & fontes cognoscendos, omnium utilissima sunt, Philippi Ethica, in quibus, non modo communem de virtutibus doctrinam Philosophicam, eruditius & elegantius quam caeteri tradit, reuocatam ad fontes Legis natura, seu Legis diuinæ, mentibus humanis a Deo insitae: verum etiam assidua collatione Philsophiae & Euangelii, maiorem utrique generi doctrinae lucem adfert ...”

\textsuperscript{73} RS., 169a.

\textsuperscript{74} RS., 169a. “Sed tota de Philosophicis virtutibus doctrina, ex Aristotele rectissime sumitur. Cuius nomine, viginti libri de Moribus extant

\textsuperscript{75} RS., 169b–71a.

\textsuperscript{76} RS., 171b. “Omnium vero dulcissima, & summae admirandaque doctrinae ac venustatis, & grauisimarum
recommends Seneca’s *Letters* because they contain not only important and erudite disputations on ethics, but they also offer treatments of virtue and exhortations on fleeing vice that Chytraeus says do not merely teach the concepts, but in their delivery really seem to instill them. Last of all, Chytraeus considers poetry—classically understood to include a variety of subject matter, including works of tragedy and comedy. He finds it both sad and incredible that piety, prayer and obedience to God are not virtues addressed in the works of those who otherwise the wisest of men, namely Aristotle and Cicero. However this important angle may be found, however, in works of such poets as Pythagoras, Phocylides, and Homer, along with tragedies concerned with fear and punishment for lack of piety and contempt for God.

From Aristotle to Homer, the range of the suggested authors illustrate how Chytraeus, like Melanchthon, is interested in exposing students not only to works of moral philosophy, but to literature that would contribute to their continued development as orators. At the same time, the list demonstrates how Chytraeus is teaching his students about the range and depth of the human understanding of divine law, partly represented by the finest sources from antiquity. The Lutheran theological education that students are receiving at the same time in the curriculum provides a lens through which these readings are interpreted, and helps to reinforce the Law and

---

praecessionum & sententiarum varietate, iucundissimis illecebris Gnomarum, exemplorum, historiarum, similitudinum, copiose expolita & stipata sunt, Plutarchi Moralia, quo nullus in hoc genere, post sacras literas, liber utilior & dulcior inter homines extat ... Vere enim Bibliotheca omnigenae sapientiae & doctrinae est, non Ethica tantum & Politica: ac Oeconomica seu γαμικὰ, sed Physica etiam, Medica, Mathematica, Musica, Logica & omnis generis φιλέλογα & Historias ac exempla, & ritus reconditissimae antiquitatis, complectens.”

77 *RS.*, 172a. “Senecae etiam Epistolae, multas non modo graues ac eruditas disputationes Ethicas, verum etiam ac efficaces ad virtutem colendam, & vitia toto pectore fugienda cohortationes, continent, nec docere tantum virtutem, sed inferero animis & inculcare videntur.”

78 *RS.*, 172a–72b. “Ac profecto mirandum & dolendum est, sapientissimos homines, Aristotelem & Cicerone, dum ex professio de omnium virtutum officiis differunt, nulla omnino primae huius & omnium summae virtutis, Pietatis erga Deum, & Inuocationis Dei, ac obedientiae Deo debitae mentionem facere quam tamen Poetae, hac in parte multo Philosophis illis religiosiores, accurate praecipiunt & inculcant, ut Pythagoras & Phoelides Ethica sua ordiuntur ... & in Tragoedis passim de Timore & Inuocatione Dei & de poenis impietatis ac contemptus Dei, sententia, exemplis calamitatum & poenarum, in historiis magnorum regum & principum illustratae proponuntur ...”
Gospel distinction that Chytraeus says is the foundation for the study of ethics and moral philosophy.

**De Studio Iuris**

*De Studio Iuris*, while put in its own section, follows seamlessly in the *Regulae* without so much as a break in the pages. It considers more thoroughly and particularly the subject of moral philosophy as applied to the study and practice of law and follows the lines of the argument that Chytraeus put forward in a separately published oration, *De Iurisprudentiae Romanae origine et studio iuris recte inchoando* (1585), that deals with the universal character of Roman law. Since Roman law was considered by Chytraeus to be universally recognizable because it has been built upon what he considers to be innate principles of right and wrong, he centers his discussion on how an individual reacts to the law in practice and study. For Chytraeus the practice of law is more than just theoretical knowledge, but begins with the mental outlook of the individual student. Not only is the discernment between right and wrong (natural law), something that the student must understand before they move toward deeper study, but the legal practice itself requires the moral commitment setting aside individual desires. For Chytraeus such dedication to service is necessary for the greater good of the community.

**Analysis**

Chytraeus’ treatment of jurisprudence is based upon the principle that moral philosophy is derived from the awareness of natural law placed in man at creation. This in turn is the source of all human law and jurisprudence. This was already argued in the previous section as well as in

---

79 Kaufmann, *Universität und lutherische Konfessionalisierung*, 636. *De Iurisprudentiae Romanae origine et studio iuris recte inchoando, Oratio* (Crato, Wittenberg, 1585). This oration was also included in Chytraeus’ collected orations of 1614.
his (separately published) oration on the origins of Roman law, but Chytraeus, perhaps thorough to a fault, revisits the topic in more detail. He explains that the *Iuris civilis doctrina* is rightly taught and learned when it is based in the principles of ethics. Moral philosophy explicates natural law and is the “foundation and firmament” of jurisprudence, or civil law, that draws its reasons and causes from nature and circumstance which in turn reflect the Creator of this all.\(^{80}\)

Not simply theory, but part of the practical approach to legal study. Since the foundation for law is a discernment between right and wrong, aside from the technical aspects of law, Chytraeus strongly emphasizes the cultivation of an individual’s character. Legal teachings are not shadows of laws, but are rather sincere and solid doctrines that are bound in the mind, and require natural talent as well as a desire for discipline to be learned and implemented.\(^{81}\) Chytraeus does not say so flatly, but his approach reflects the idea of laws growing out of a sense of equity that would reflect common sense exercise of the law more than abstractly constructed theory. In this he echoes Luther, who maintained in *On Secular Authority* that a good and just prince rules from a “free mind ... such a free decision, however, is given by love and by the law of nature, of which the reason is full.”\(^{82}\)

---


\(^{81}\) Ibid, 173a–b. “Qui igitur non inanem δοξοσοφίαν seu umbram iuris, sed sinceram & solidam legum doctrinam, animo complecti, & verus iuris consultus, seu ut Graeci dicunt πολιτικός, efficie cupiet ...si modo ingenium doctrinae capax, & ad iusticiae ac veritatis amorem domestica disciplinae assuefactum ...”

Chytraeus then corrects what he sees as a common misunderstanding about the origins of the law stating that a natural knowledge of the law, discerning between good and bad, is the cause of certainty and goodness in all law. Therefore the origin and source of the legal system and all law should not understood as rooted in historic legal sources. Chytraeus lists Solon’s axioms, the Lycurgian Orators, the Twelve Tables, the stone tablets of Moses, and “rancorous [legal] commentaries” as examples. Rather, what is good in those reflects the larger, deeper divine standards. But as a theologian, Chytraeus understands that as the world is fallen, so also will laws and legal systems fail. Chytraeus would follow Melanchthon in asserting that law is not worthless simply because it does not prevent every crime. Rather, it shows God’s mercy and care for creation. Legal study ultimately points to God and his wisdom and justice, who has first imprinted the law in the mind in order to discern what is good and right, so that all matters public and private might be examined and defended with truth and justice.

---

83 RS., 176a. “Quicunque, igitur in hoc nostro coetu, ab his primarum artium rudimentis, quae necessaria superiorum doctrinarum administrula sunt, non plane imparati, legum doctrinam inchoare decreuimus: hanc nobis communicationem initio proponamus. Cum Fons Iuris & omnium legum honestarium origo prima, sint, non Solonis ἀξονες, non Lycurgi ῥητορας, non XII. Tabulae, imo ne saxeae iliae Mosis tabulae: Sed Deus ipse seu sapientia mentis diviaeaeterna & immota, discernens iusta & iniusta; patefacta in Decalogo seu Lege Dei, naturae insita, quam Philosophia Moralis euouit & explicat: sciamus Iuris nostri exordia, non a Praetoris Edicto, nec a XII. Tabulis (ut Cicero inquit) multo minus ex rancidis interpretum commentariis: sed penitus ex intima mente divina & Philosophia Morali (quae explicatio est legis naturae, ex mente in nostras mentes deriuatae, ut vitae norma sit) haurienda esse.”

84 This is the main point of Melanchthon’s Oration on the Merit of Laws (1543). Writing during a time of instability and uncertainty, when order was being challenged from all sides, Melanchthon defends against the challenge that peace is futile and law is of no use. While many do violence to the law, he argues that nevertheless is God’s gift and provides order even during times of war (as many historical examples show), and has throughout the ages prevented mankind from complete annihilation. Furthermore, the stability, however tenuous at times, has aided the church throughout the ages allowing it to do its work of teaching and preaching. Kusukawa, Philip Melanchthon: Orations on Philosophy and Education, 175-181.

85 RS., 173b–74a. “Quare & Deum fontem iustitiae & legum nostrarum ... & Finem studii iuris nostri, in Christianis Schoils & Rebus publicis, constituamus, non quaeastum, vel ambitionem, sed Deum ipsum, seu sapientiam & iusticiam congruentem cum mente divina, discernentem bonum & aequum, hoc est, congruens cum regula iusticiae, ab iniquo & prauo: ut in religionibus, in consiliis regendae Reipublicae, in judiciis foensibus, in contractibus, & aliis quibuscunque rerum pruatarum vel publicarum litibus, quae iusta, vera, recta sint, intelligamus, & probemus ac defendamus.”
This perspective also shapes the advice he offers to students concerning their ongoing work. First, Chytraeus says no student should pursue an empty study of law, going through the motions, but instead he should fill his mind with sincere and solid doctrine and with true legal knowledge.\textsuperscript{86} He ought to have a love of the politics and the polis.\textsuperscript{87} This love of justice and virtue is what he ought to be immersed in from his early years, making love of service fundamental to his training.\textsuperscript{88} Next, he must learn (basic languages) Latin and Greek in order to read the best texts on law with a native understanding, grasping the significance of the words and phrases, in order to apply the concepts correctly.\textsuperscript{89} Dialectic (again) is necessary not just for learning legal texts such as the \textit{Institutes}, but even more to use in the actual practice of law, sorting through the endless variety of cases and controversies in the classical case studies.\textsuperscript{90} Finally, historical knowledge sheds light on the application of law (a recognized problem with the reception of Roman Law), and its circumstances, as it kindles and confirms a love of virtue.\textsuperscript{91}

\textsuperscript{86} \textit{RS.}, 173a. “Quam naturae legem cum explicet ac euoluat Philosophia moralis, praeceipuum fundamentum & firmamentum est Iurisprudentiae seu legum ciuiliun, quorum rationes & causae, quae sunt Anima legum, ex iure naturae & circumstantiis sumuntur. Qui igitur non inanem δοξοσοφίαν seu umbram iuris, sed sinceram & solidam legum doctrinam, animo complecti, & verus iurisconsultus, seu ut Graeci dicunt πολιτικὸς, effici cupid ...”

\textsuperscript{87} \textit{RS.}, 173a. “Optandum certe est, omnes, qui futuri sint Iuris consulti, sic ntaura institutos & comparatos esse, qualem Plato suum πολιτικὸν καὶ φύλακα πόλεως describit ...”

\textsuperscript{88} \textit{RS.}, 175a. “Educatio. Deinde ad iusticiae & virtutis amorem ac cultum a teneris annis imbutos & assuefactos esse ...”

\textsuperscript{89} \textit{RS.}, 175a. “Studia Lingua. Grammatices certe in lingua Latina & Graeca cognitione mediocri, instructos esse oportet, qui aliquo cum suo & Reipublicae fructu in iuris Romani studio versari volent. Ac nominum Grammaticam, quae vim & naturam seu significationem verborum, prhrasis, & figurarum sermonis Latini ac Graeci propriam & natium intelligit, & in docendo aut scribendo de rebus propositis, propria & perspicua oration, animi sensa explicare potest.”

\textsuperscript{90} \textit{RS.}, 172b–73a. “Methodus vero Dialectica, cum commune organon sit recte discendi & docendi quarumcunque, artium materias: profecto etiam Iuris studioso, discendi arte arni boni & aequi, artificiosa quidem metodo in Institutionibus summatim comprehensam, sed latissime in vario & immenso causarum & quaestionum pelago, & infinita litium & controversiarum forensium varietate se extendentem, necessaria est.”

\textsuperscript{91} \textit{RS.}, 173a. “Historiarum vero seu antiquitatis Ecclesiae & veterum imperiorum ac exemplorum cgnitio & legibus multum lucis adfert, & saepe in Republica consilium monstrat, & priuatim in animis amorem virtutis accendit & confirmat.”
The emphasis on divine light carries through the survey of the literature, as Chytraeus sees the *Iuris Tyrones* and Cicero eruditely revealing, through distinctions on what is or is not just, a reflection of the divinely inspired, universal character of law.\(^2\) The same may be said for the writing of Plato and Aristotle. He suggests that students may read them if they wish, but they must consider that such theories are useful because they are based on natural law, summarized in the Decalogue and explicated by moral philosophy.\(^3\) Furthermore, law students ought to spend more time focusing on the normative legal texts, on the law itself and the statutes *per se*, and less time on the commentaries—a problem, Chytraeus says, common also with theology students, who spend too much time reading outside of Holy Scripture.\(^4\) The *Iuris Civilis*, Emperor Justinian’s famous codex of Roman Law, is recommended as the normative text of method and summary for the field. It covers a vast expanse of examples of laws and disputationes, and Chytraeus urges students to read and reread until all of its parts are completely committed to memory.\(^5\) He provides a general summary of all four books, and a more detailed description of the *Pandectes*, breaking it down into specific legal topics that will aid students practice in

\(^2\) RS., 174b. “Quare singulari cura & attentione, iuris Tyrones, & Ciceronis libros de Legibus, qui originem iuris uniuersi ex naturae mentis humanae ad imaginem Dei conditae & distinctione iustorum & iniustorum illustratae, eruditissime detexit ...”

\(^3\) RS., 175a. “Platonis etiam Leges & Aristotelis politica adiungant, qui volent. Nec existiment se, cum a Ciceronis vel Aristotelis lectione ad Iurisconsistorum doctrinam accedunt, in nouum plane orbem venire, sed fere eandem doctrinam de legibus utrobique tradi, & fontes plane eosdem esse sciant, videlicet legem naturae insitam, cuibus summa in Decalogo comprehensa, & in Philosophia morali explicata est ...”

\(^4\) RS., 177b. “Ut autem Theologiae studiosos plerosque videmus, locos communes tantum & Catechismum discere: ac commentarioris & acerui dictaorum colligendis mucho plus temporis quam textui sacrarum literarum, quae sunt unicus & solus, verae de Deo doctrinae fons limpidissimus, tribuere: ita dolendum est plerosque Iuris civilis studio deditos ex enterpretum lacunis potius quam ex Textuum fontibus iuris latices libare.”

\(^5\) RS., 175b. “Ita Iuris civilis studium ingressurus, sciat, Quatuor Institutionum libros, artificioso ordine initia & summam doctrinae iuris explicantibus diligenter & accurate sibi cognoscentos, & tantisper legendos ac relegendos esse, donec tota illa series & epitome locorum doctrinae iuris, ad quos ampliss: & immensus pelagus legum & disputationum forensium, tanquam ad suas metas apte & dextre referri potest, penitus intellectu & memoriae fuerit comprehensa.”
dialectical reading, as they take note of the definitions, divisions, efficient causes, matter, form, goals, effects, and cognates and opposites for the topics.96

Chytraeus’ final word of advice reiterates his earlier points. Law begins with the internal distinctions between right and wrong, and its application, as Luther stated, is given in love. It is more than simply engaging in litigation and matters of the courts. (Today one might say that it is more than billable hours). It is the teaching and interpreting of the law, laying down and reforming judgments, and providing the best legal counsel possible in teaching, and by extension in supporting faith, wisdom, justice, strength and industry. The students themselves must prepare for these tasks, beginning with prayer to God, and then working to gain a solid basis in both human and divine teaching and cultivating a love of truth, justice and virtue.97

Conclusion

Several threads found running through Chytraeus’ sections on natural philosophy demonstrate his overall approach and show a consistency in his pedagogy and in his theological orientation. His patterns for presenting subjects are by now familiar. Rhetoric and dialectic are reinforced, serving as a backbone to the classical and contemporary sources he advises the reader take up. Likewise, his care in highlighting the order and relationships of subjects for learning is by now expected. Mastery of one precludes the next, while the whole content of the category

96 RS., 180a–b. “Cum hoc modo semel aut bis perlectus fuerit Pandectarum Textus, altera deinde cura sit, ut in singulis Titulis seu locis communibus iuris, leges quae fine magni methodi cura, ut apparat, congesta sunt: in locis methodi Dialecticae, definitiones, divisiones, Causas efficientes, Materiam, Formam, fines, effectus seu Actiones inde orientes & singularum cognata & pugnantia, studiosi digerant.”

97 RS., 181a–b. “Sed non tantum in litibus & causis forensibus agendis, verum multo magis in docendo & interpretando iure, in constituendis vel reformandis iudiciis, in regendis consiliis maximarum deliberationum in tota Repub. Iuris consulti eximii doctrina, fides, sapientia, iusticia, fortitudo & industria lucebit & conspicuetur. Itaque ad haec maximarum rerum consilia gubernanda, studiosi, se, vera Dei inuocatione, & diligentia in Iuris duini ac humani doctrina recte & solide discenda, & amore veritatis ac iusticiae caeterarum virtutum ornamentis, praeparent.”
reflects the whole of the creation it investigates. Also central is the importance that he attaches to a thorough knowledge of the natural philosophy as an aid for understanding Scripture, which itself is the source of wisdom that flows through all natural philosophy and through all learning. Absent is any discussion of learning an art for its own sake. This is consistent with his ultimate goal of education, that students truly know and worship God. Such knowledge, as Chytraeus continually reminds, is revealed by the books of the prophets and the apostles. All learning finds its ultimate end in recognizing and bringing glory to God.

Mathematical concepts and terms are necessary for understanding references to the heavens, the chronology, and the many numerical references found throughout Scripture. The vast array of natural phenomena investigated by natural philosophy provide a context for understanding Scripture’s descriptions of creation. Geography and history are inseparable tools for understanding the places and events of the biblical narratives.

In no small way does such an emphasis on reading and accurately understanding Scripture impact another point of focus in his approach to philosophy: the way it bears witness to God’s character and nature. Chytraeus begins with a distinction between Law and Gospel and between revelation and natural knowledge. Philosophy is understood under the auspices of this distinction, falling under the category of Law, and serving the proclamation of the Gospel. The universe is described as a theater for the divine majesty, while the liberal arts themselves reflect in different ways God’s divine character, both in terms of the order and symmetry that they display as well as the role they play in God’s continual care for creation. A subject that illustrates both of these features well is mathematics. Mathematics is described as both necessary for almost all other arts but also necessary for the calendar, logic, and reasoned thinking, making it essential for acquiring knowledge in any subject—a particularly important gift from God. But it
also investigates the precision of the ratios and proportions that make up the natural world, revealing an aspect of the divine character of such perfect craftsmanship. Another case is moral philosophy. The natural light placed into man’s mind at creation is the basis for all ethics. In turn it is the basis for all jurisprudence, reflecting an orderliness and sense of purpose observed also in nature, but is a necessary connection to the divine word, above all to maintain the peace commanded by God in hearts and minds but crucial also for the life of the church to carry out its task of preaching and teaching, and for the world in which this all happens. On so many levels and in so many ways, Chytraeus draws connections that add up to a grand whole—God’s divine geometry—seamless and perfect in God’s eyes. Though people can only look at things in part from different angles, still Chytraeus does his best in the Regulae to tie things together and give more than a glimpse of that grand whole.
CHAPTER EIGHT

THEOLOGY

De Theologiae Studio Recte Inchoando

Although a section devoted to the study of theology appears in the index of Part III of very early versions of De Ratione Discendi, it was never actually included in the printings of the Regulae. By the 1580s when De Ratione Discendi began to be published under its final title, Regulae Studiorum, two of Chytraeus’ orations on the study of theology had already been in wide circulation for several decades, with a third appearing in 1581. These orations are: De Studio Theologiae Recte Inchoando, De Studio Theologiae et cum omnibus Caeterarum Artium studiis coniungendo, and De Studio Theologiae et Pietatis Verae Exercitiis, potius quam rixis Disputationum colendo. The Regulae simply features a note from the editor listing the titles of these three theology orations, and stating that they are easily found and should be supplied by the reader.\footnote{RS., 186a. “Tres Davidis Chytraei Orationes, publice editae, in multorum manibus versantur. Quas hoc loco, qui volent, interponant.”} Given how much else Chytraeus revisits and repeats with the Regulae, this is rather odd, but it does show that his theology material was well traveled and for many was likely already in hand. This chapter will take a look at each of these famous orations. The overarching hallmark of the orations, consistent with the Regulae as a whole, is Chytraeus’ ability to present an orderly, methodical approach to a subject, making careful use of the best ideas and sources available—the classic, reliable approach—rather than venture forth with novel content or provisional
material. Throughout the orations, the influences of Luther, Melanchthon, and the Wittenburg method as a whole are clear, and Chytraeus acknowledges his indebtedness numerous times.

Oratio De Studio Theologiae Recte Inchoando

Oratio De Studio Theologiae Recte Inchoando was written in 1558 (if the date provided in the dedicatory epistle is taken into account), and was printed initially in 1560 with numerous reprints to follow. Running to seventy pages (more with the dedication) it is not an oration, despite its name, but a book containing a program of study. Predating even the early versions of the Regulae by several years it is in many ways a presentation of the whole Regulae Studiorum in miniature. It also shows that from 1558 when this treatise was written, to 1563 when the earliest edition of the Regulae was printed, Chytraeus was working on expanding his descriptions of the subjects that first appeared here. These years correspond with the revamping of the theological study statutes for the University of Rostock, accepted in 1564, of which Chytraeus was chief architect. As such it shows that the Regulae Studiorum as a whole shows remarkable continuity over its forty years in print, and although Chytraeus was continually adding to it, he never deviated from the methodological course laid out in this earlier treatise. De Studio Theologiae shows not only Chytraeus’ program for the study of theology, but also explains how all the subjects and study exercises in the curriculum relate to, and ultimately serve, the study of theology. By this, Chytraeus fulfills Luther’s mandate in his Letter to the German Councilmen in behalf of Christian Schools (1524) to educate the youth in order that they can serve their

---

2 Thomas Kaufmann, Universitä t und lutherische Konfessionalisierung, 625–26. Printings are listed for 1560, 1561, 1562, 1566, and 1570 as an individual oration, and bound with other orations and reprinted in 1572, 1578, 1580, and 1582. It also appears in the 1614 collection of Chytraeus’ orations.

neighbor, and prepare for more advanced theological study for calling as pastors and teachers. This, as we have seen, is also Chytraeus’ concern in the *Regulae*—the liberal arts gain their ultimate meaning and purpose in service to theological study—true knowledge and worship of God. This he would elaborate throughout the *Regulae*, especially in Part I. Next, he discusses basic habits such as how to read, the topics of the theology, languages, dialectic, and disputation, and provides a customary overview of some of the important and authors and texts (Expanded on in *Regulae* Part II). Finally, he explains how learning other subjects benefits theology (Expanded on in *Regulae* Part III), and the last part of the discussion showcases Luther’s practical understanding of theology as prayer, meditation, and trial.

Analysis

The methodological approach with theology sets the course for the method and purpose of the *Regulae Studiorum*. Chytraeus directs attention to method in his dedicatory epistle, noting that for the profitable study of any part of the liberal arts to be taken up more easily, the student needs to follow a certain order or approach. On the other hand, Chytraeus does not want to reduce the study of theology to a cold intellectual exercise. Rather he wishes also to cultivate and

---

4 Martin Luther, “Address to the Councilmen of All Cities in Germany that They Establish and Maintain Christian Schools,” *LW*, 45: 339–78.


6 Dedicatoria epistola, 6. “Fiunt autem omnia studia faciliora, certo ordine & velut via discendi monstrata ... Itaque singuli suo loco hortatores esse ad rectissima studia Iunioribus debent, eisque viam monstrare, quam in discendo sequantur, ut aliquo cum suo et Reipublicae ac Ecclesiae fructu in doctrinarum studiis versentur.”
encourage proper attitudes of piety in the student with regard to the study of theology just as with all the arts, saying that learning is neither felicitous nor salutary for the church without God’s guidance.⁷ This guidance was for knowledge but also for virtue. Such interest in how life is to be lived was a mark of the Renaissance from its earliest times.⁸ Now centuries into the New Learning and well into the evangelical Reformation that made use of that learning, Chytraeus was continuing the interest in a moral, virtuous life.

Prayer

Chytraeus’ argument for prayer reflects the way he understands how people learn in general, as well as how learning occurs given the difference between natural and divine knowledge. Learning has no higher purpose for Chytraeus than to know rightly and invoke the true God. To this end, there is nothing more certain for Chytraeus than that if God is not teaching, nothing will be learned. In particular, if the Holy Spirit is not leading and unfolding the Sacred Scriptures, they will remain impenetrable.⁹ The idea that the natural light man has been given is useless without divine aid is common knowledge even among the pagans, claims Chytraeus, noting that Plato also recommended that prayer proceed all study.¹⁰ This act of piety,

---

⁷ Orationes, 1. “CUM nulla hominum studia & consilia sint felicia & Ecclesiae salutaria, nisi DEO ea gubernante: & inprimis DEO recte disci nihil possit, nisi DEO docente.”


⁹ Orationes, 652. “Sit igitur haec prima cura & ultimus finis ac scopus studiorum, & totius vitae humanae, ut Deum recte agnoscamus & inuocemus, sicut se in doctrina a se tradita inuocari & coli praecepit. Cumque certissimum sit, Deum nisi Deo docente non posse cognosci, & sacras literas nullius hominis studio aut ingenio posse penetrari.”

¹⁰ Orationes, 652. “Etiam Ethnici saniores naturali luce viderunt, nulla hominum consilia, studia & labores felices esse, nec suis, aut aliorum commodis, utilitatique servire, nisi a Deo iuventur ... Et aliquoties Plato orsurus disputationes de materiis doctrinarum intricatis ac difficilioribus & orat ipse, & hortatur alios, ut facta prius precatione, postea mentes ad investigationem veritatis intendant.”
and Chytraeus’ reference to Plato in particular, serves to illustrate his understanding of natural law, namely, that a recognition of that law is perfectly clear to the pagan and they understand a certain benefit to obedience. But on the one hand that approach also shows the limit that a full grasp of Sacred Scripture ultimately is closed to the unfaithful, those not enlightened by the Holy Spirit, and therefore we are to pray for guidance in our study that we grasp more in faith and than did the noble pagans.\textsuperscript{11} Furthermore, despite all the academic Latin, Chytraeus insists that even with all he has detailed to this point, theology is not speculation but practical, being of immediate consequence for every individual. The orientation to God directed through pious prayer is worth much more than the labors of learning attempted on their own, says Chytraeus.\textsuperscript{12} Therefore all study is to begin with prayer daily before study.\textsuperscript{13}

\textbf{Scripture}

Scripture is God’s testimony setting forth what he wishes to make known about Himself as recorded in the books of the prophets and apostles.\textsuperscript{14} Man is called to examine the Word with diligence and accuracy. At first glance that seems simple enough, particularly for a modern reader. But consider that not so long before Chytraeus’ time ordinary people (non-clerics) would

\textsuperscript{11} \textit{Orationes}, 653. “Hae precationum formae ideo nobis a Spiritu sancto præscriptae sunt, ut eas adsidue nostris studis misceamus, præsertim cum & seuerissime mandet Deus, ut nos ab ipso doceri, & regi oremus, & prolixæ auxilium suum perentibus polliceatur.”

\textsuperscript{12} \textit{Orationes}, 654. “Et cum Theologia non in speculatione tantum, sed praxi praecipue sita sit: ad usum transfert sententias scripturae legendo præceptas: & ad ueram, & salutarem doctrinae coelestis cognitionem parandam, longe plus affert utilitatis, quam multi labores discendi.”

\textsuperscript{13} The prayer that Chytraeus suggests is one that he attributes to Luther based on Psalm 119. “Doce me Domine viam tuam, da mihi intellectum, ut discam mandata tua, Fac cum seruo tuo secundum misericordiam tuam, \& iustificationes tuas doce me. Seruus tuus sum ego, da mihi intellectum, ut discam testimonia tua, Vias tuas Domine demonstra mihi, Dirige me in ueritate tua. Liga testimonium, obsigna legem tuam in discipul tuo, Sanctifica me in ueritate tua, Sermo tuus est ueritas.”

\textsuperscript{14} \textit{Orationes}, 654. “Cum enim Deus doctrinam de sua Essentia \& voluntate, scribi \& libris certis comprehendi voluerit, nec aliter a nobis agnosci \& coli velit, quam sicut se in suo verbo, seu libro Prophetarum \& Apostolorum patefecit perspicuum est, assiduam, \& attentam huius libri lectionem, omnibus hominibus necessariam esse.”
not have been encouraged to take up and read. As Chytraeus notes, diligence and accuracy on the part of the reader alone are insufficient, because the teaching of the Gospel concerning Christ is beyond man’s natural ability to understand. It is enough to remember that the creature does not simply or automatically know the mind of God the Creator. Then add to that the fact that post-Genesis 3 the human mind is of itself plagued by sin. Can its judgment be trusted? So Chytraeus emphasizes that it is God who kindles true understanding, new and eternal light, and righteousness and life in the reader’s mind.\textsuperscript{15} This should be taken not as some sleight but as a gracious action of God.

Broadly speaking in terms of a program of study, Chytraeus encourages a topical approach to daily reading that takes note of the historical events surrounding the text, the precepts of the articles of faith that confirm an understanding of Christian doctrine, prayer, and topics of virtue.\textsuperscript{16} Robert Kolb observed that Chytraeus recommends Melanchthon’s two-year schedule for reading Scripture—reading two chapters a day.\textsuperscript{17} Although students ought to read from the Latin, Chytraeus advises that Luther’s German translation may shed light on the difficult passages. Another textual aid Chytraeus highly recommends is Franciscus Vatablus’ grammatical aid to Scripture, the \textit{Annotationes}.\textsuperscript{18}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{15} \textit{Orationes}, 654. “Cum enim doctrina Euangelii de Christo non ex noticiis natura notis, sed ex patefactionibus duinis, quae in libris Prophetarum & Apostolorum continentur. Discenda sit: diligens, & accurata, & attenta horum librorum cognitione ab omnibus psis flagitatur. Et per hanc lectionem & cogitationem doctrinae, in scriptis traditae, efficax est deus & veram agnitionem sui, nouam & aeternam lucem, iusticiam & vitam in mentibu accendit..
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{16} \textit{Orationes}, 655. “Quotidie igitur uere pietatis studiosi mane cum surrexerunt, & uesperi priusquam cubitum ibunt, unum caput in Bibliis legant, eaque ordine eouluant: Et in ea lectione, non modo seriem historiarum, sed etiam praecipua de articulis fidei Christianae testimonia considerent, quorum cogitatione, Fidem, invocacionem, & omnes uirtutes, accendant, alant, & confriment.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{17} Robert Kolb, “Pastoral Education the Wittenberg Way,” in Ballor, \textit{Church and School}, 72–79, 75.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{18} \textit{Orationes}, 655. “... nec ullam diem abire patiemur, quo non duo capita in Bibliis legamus, tum intra biennium semel tota Biblia, quae circiter 1360, continent capita, ordine perlegemus ... veterem & plurimis in locis usitatem translationem latinam retineant. Cumque loca erunt obscurius reddita, ut in Psalmis & Propetis occurrent
\end{flushright}
As part of a systematic approach to daily Scripture reading students are required to fill out commonplace books, just as they would with the assigned readings for other subjects. In Part II of the *Regulae*, Chytraeus presented the commonplace book as an important tool for categorizing, remembering, and analysis. Investigating any subject and organizing ones findings. Students drilled by Chytraeus in this manner were accustomed to analyzing selections in terms of historical context, and language, practice that carried across disciplines. Chytraeus recommends three areas of focus for daily Scripture readings. First, the student pay attention to the chronology of the narrative of sacred history. This especially helps with the student’s memory of the passage. Second, he recommends that the passages that have been identified as supporting articles of Christian doctrine [*testimonia*] be analyzed under the appropriate doctrinal commonplace. The question is simple: why are the so-called key passages key passages? The description of the passage as a “sign” or “witness” for Christian doctrine already provides a particular orientation for the student. Third, Chytraeus calls for diligently considering and judging the emphasis and weight of each word containing a summary of the Gospel and offers two examples to illustrate what this means. The first example explains Paul’s reference to Abraham’s belief in the word of promise made to him, strange though it was, and this faith was counted to him as righteousness. Such passages as this illustrate the concept and action of saving trust. The second example was sermon by Luther on Isaiah 9 that Chytraeus recalled having

---


20 Orationes, 656. “Deinde ut sententias insignes, seu testimonia de singulis fidei Christianae articulis, & refutationibus errorum considerent, easque ad suos locos communes, qui doctrinae summam continent, aper referant.”
heard during Christmas of 1545. What stood out in the sermon was the weight of the words “for us” in his statement, “blessed is the theologian who understands and believes with certainty that this child is born for us.” In both examples the reader sees Luther’s point that what saves is not looking elsewhere at what God may have given or said to others, but rather one is saved by holding fast to whatever particular word God gives “to me” that is spoken “for me.”

Textbooks

Textbooks present an author’s summary of a subject as well as the methods for learning it—crucial tools for Chytraeus and always the first texts that he recommends students learn. Such texts present the topics of the subject in an orderly fashion that shows how they relate to one another and provide and authoritative guide, or norm, for understanding the parts of the art as whole. Chytraeus notes that Polybius had recommended such a strategy in reading history, and Paul had proposed a “certain order and form” for reading Scripture (2 Tim. 1) to which all parts of Scripture properly refer. This connects the articles of faith and acts as a norm in all controversy and for every dispute. The apostles and early church synods had used the approach and the Symbols themselves function as summaries. Furthermore, students for ages had referred to Origin’s Elementis Christianae doctrinae, John of Damascus’ books on the orthodox faith and Lombard’s Sentences. While these are praiseworthy historical examples all, Chytraeus reminds

---


22 Orationes, 656. “Proximum est, ut summam, & uelut corpus integrum ueræ de Deo doctrinae coagmentatum ex praecipuis membris, seu locis, certo ordine distribuitis, & perspicua oratione explicatis, animo insignant. Ut enim Polybius in lectione historiarum iubet σωματοποιεῖν & in omnibus alis artibus, initio summa rei, in compendium & methodum contracta traditur; ita maxime in Theologia methodus σωματοειδῆς seu (ut Paulina
his readers that they will also mix true teachings with corrupt, noting in particular the damage done to the doctrine of the remission of sins, or justification by faith.\textsuperscript{23} Much preferred are the texts that emphasize Lutheran theology, and made up part of the core of the theological curriculum at Wittenberg, known by the time Chytraeus was a student there as the Melanchthonian \textit{Corpus Doctrinae}.\textsuperscript{24} Melanchthon’s \textit{Loci Communes} and \textit{Examen Ordinarium}, are two such texts used at Wittenberg as norms and standards for doctrine.\textsuperscript{25} Chytraeus describes the collection’s function as nurturing piety while excising curious and useless questions.\textsuperscript{26} To that end he encourages daily reading of both the Bible and the \textit{Loci} or the \textit{Ordinarium}. He recommends students read and reread the recommended texts and not be tempted to go off on tangents and spread themselves

\begin{quote}
voce utar) \textit{ποιτόποσις}, hoc est certa forma & summa verae doctrinae, iunioribus proponenda est, ad quam omnes sacrae scripturae partes dextre referant, & quae mentes eorum, ueris, & proprie ac perspicue expositis sententiis, de omnibus fidei articulis instruat, & in omnibus controuersiis, ac disputationibus, iudicii norma sit. Hoc consilio, Apostoli & Synodus Necena & sequentes, symbola condiderunt. Et omnibus etatibus a avidissime a studiosis expetitae & exceptae sunt tales methodi doctrinae Christianae, inter quas olim celebres fuerunt Origenis libri, quibus titulum fecit de principiis, seu Elementis Christianae. Postea in graecis Ecclesiis Damasceni libri, de Orthodoxa fide, praecipue in manibus discipulorum fuerunt, & proximis annis 400. Petri Longobardi Episcopi Parisiensis sententiae, ex patribus certa metodo coagmentatae, studia Theologie in plerisque totius Europae Academiis rexerunt.”
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{23} \textit{Orationes}, 657. “Etsi autem horum industria, & consilium laude dignum est, & aliquot doctrinae articulos, pie & erudite ab his explicatos esse constat, tamen multas etiam uerae doctrinae corruptelas miscuerunt, & praecipuum religiosis nostrae locum: De remissione peccatorum, seu iusticia fidei, fere omnino omiserunt, aut foedissime contaminarunt.”

\textsuperscript{24} Irene Dingel writes that “alongside the primary authority of the Bible, there emerged such evaluative instruments—binding summaries of the faith—that might be designated “secondary authorities. They took on a consultative function which could help define the proper orientation for resolving divisive doctrinal disputes.” Irene Dingel, “Melanchthon and the Establishment of Confessional Norms,” in Dingel, \textit{Philip Melanchthon}, 161–80, 162–63.

\textsuperscript{25} This sounds much like \textit{norma normans} (norming norm, a primary function) of Scripture and the \textit{norma normata} (normed norm, a derived form your authority of the Lutheran Confessional writings). These texts were accepted by the Lutherans as a whole, and familiar to the graduates of Lutheran institutions like Wittenberg or Rostock.

\textsuperscript{26} \textit{Orationes}, 657–58. “Nostra vero aetate, in qua Deus immensa bonitate lucem verae doctrinae restituit, etsi multorum extant methodi, Catecheses, loci, Institutiones, compendia & similes libri, ex quibus summa verae doctrinae mediocrerit disci potest, tamen instar enitent loci Theologici & Examen a Philippo scriptum, in quo summa totius doctrinae Christianae, in quindecim locos praecipuus distributa, quos ad pietatem alendam maxime conduere, & in vita ac exercitiis piorum usum habere iudicavit, praecisis omnibus curiosis & inutilibus quaestionibus, omnium eruditissime, elegantissimeque exposita est.”
thinly by reading other material.27

Dialectic

Chytraeus succinctly defines dialectic in this chapter as he had done elsewhere in the *Regulae*, as showing a certain “via or rationale” that is necessary for correctly learning and teaching all subjects. It is particularly necessary for dealing with the theology. Without the art of dialectic “massive errors, confounded dogma and the ruination of religion is a necessary consequence.” Dialectic as a learning device is mentioned in Scripture, writes Chytraeus, who understands Paul to be speaking of the benefits of dialectic in his letters to Timothy and Titus as he discusses suitable teachers correctly dividing the word and handling contradictions.28 Chytraeus recommends theology students read Melanchthon’s textbook on dialectic, a text he feels has brought the art out the darkness and into the light.29

Public Speaking and Disputation

As with his discussion of this topic in Part II of the *Regulae*, Chytraeus’ comments extend his look at dialectic and serve to emphasize the role that dialectic plays in properly constructing

---

27 *Orationes*, 658. “Quare adolescentes hortor, ut quotidiem absoluta lectione textus Bibliorum, aliquid temporis, vel examini, vel locis ordine perlegendis tribuant, esque tantisper legant, & relegant, donec & omnes eorum sententias de singulis doctrinae articulis, ut digitos ac ungues suos norint & sermonis proprietatem, ac perspicuitatem, ipsum quoe oratio aliquo ex parte referat ac redoleat. Nec interea se plurium librorum Theologicorum lectione onerent.”


29 *Orationes*, 660. “Sunt autem, immenso Dei benficio, praecepta Dialectica, ex densissimis tenebris & caullillationum spinis, hac nostra aetate in claram lucem & in aciem educat, a communi praeceptore nostro, qui cum & utilissima praecepta, sapienti iudicio selegerit, & optimis exemplis illustratit, hortor adolescentes, qui Theologiae studium ingressuri sunt, ut unicum illum libellum tantisper legant & relegant.”
an oration. For Chytraeus, a successful presentation is defined as the listener both understanding and being persuaded by the oration, something that is in large part dependent on the preparation by the speaker, who has a responsibility for presenting material in an orderly fashion. Disputations are described here, as they were in Part II, as functioning both to strengthen the abilities of the speaker and to illustrate truth. Disputations are not the same as confrontations. Rather, he defines them here and elsewhere as peaceful and loving discussions about articles of doctrine that not only sharpen character and demonstrate the use of dialectic but also illustrate truth and confirm faith. Chytraeus emphasizes that theological discussion should center on what is known and revealed by Scripture, and not veer off the rails into speculation. Therefore, the subject of the disputation must always be the articles of faith. The experience of encountering arguments in the heat of honest, civil debate is meant to equip the students to be better prepared to defend the truth. Students are encouraged to study disputes found in literature and to seek out the best examples, noting especially how ideas are expressed in order to imitate those in their own compositions.


32 Orationes, 661. “Sed praecipuæ causæ accedant, sedula lectio & imitatio optimorum autorum, in quibus purae, facìlis, & perspicuae dictionis forma, seu Ideaæ est expressa: & cognitio artium dicendi, in quibus formandæ orationis ratio mediocrì fide & diligentia solet studiosis a praecceptibus monstrari.”
Chytraeus follows Luther and Melanchthon in placing the necessity for theological language study in the context of the pressing need to be precise when investigating and explicating theological doctrine. Knowledge of language aids in the fight against interpretative errors and promotes the truth about God. Simply put, such familiarity with the native voice allows for a better understanding of the information conveyed by the figures and phrasing of the language. Chytraeus reminds the reader that linguistic study is especially necessary because many contemporary disputes are indeed linguistic disputes, revolving, at least in part, over terms and phrases in a particular passage. Shedding light on the controversies over what is meant by grace, charity, righteousness, fulfilling the law, or what is meant by the Gospel.

Chytraeus’ approach to the Biblical languages in this program show heavy emphasis upon a mastery of classical Greek. Its broad utility in bringing students into contact with texts of philosophy, poetry, and history at the sources makes it useful for learning many subjects, many of which are beneficial for understanding certain references in Scripture. Given that Greek can be so widely useful, it should be learned alongside Latin. The second reason is the broad mastery of the linguistic elements of Greek that such wide reading and study provides. Vital for success are grammar studies, for which Chytraeus recommends Nicolas Clendardus’ grammar, as well as learning writing styles. This is accomplished by focusing on a single author from the Gospels, or Hesiod, Homer, Plutarch. Such basic school texts help to develop a better feel for the language.

---

Next, more detailed study of the significance of the words, textual ornamentation, and the structure of orations can come from studying Xenophon, Sophocles, Euripides, Herodotus, Plutarch, and others. Wide reading can only help in understanding the language. But so much reading outside of Scripture is not to take away from the study of the Bible itself, notes Chytraeus, who also recommends a set time for daily work in both the Old and New Testament so these are not lost in all the other reading. Today there are any number of computer-driven tools for working in Greek, tools that Chytraeus would never have imagined. Yet while these tools may change the way one looks at drill and memorization, Chytraeus’ basic points still hold: study of the original language of the Scriptures, along with other texts helps give one an invaluable feel for what is going on and what an author is trying to say.

**Commentaries**

Chytraeus’ entry on commentaries and church fathers resembles the typical entries of Part III of the *Regulae*, listing a selection of recommended authors with brief descriptions of their writing. Included are commentaries or theological treatises from Luther, Jerome, Nicolaus of Lyra, Augustine, Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Cyprian, Lactantius, Hillary, Athanasius, Basil, and Gregory of Nazianzus. Lombard’s *Sentences* are

---

Orationes, 663–64. “Quare hortor iuniores, ut Graecae in primis linguae cognitionem mediocrem, non modo ad genus sermonis diuini sed ad omnium fere doctrinarum fontes, & omnia sapientum Philosophorum, Poetarum, historicorum scripta, recte intelligenda necessariam, studio Latinae linguae adiungant. Cumque in hac schola usitate praecepta Grammaticae Clenardi soleant proponi ... moneo adolescentes, qui eius linguae studia suscipiunt, ut initio, ex unico illo libello, regulas omnes, & flexionum formulas accurate ediscant: easque in uno aliquo autore, ut Euangeliis, Hesiodo, Homero, vel Plutarchi libellis, qui usitate in schola praeleguntur, exiliter & accurate ad calculos revocent. Deinde natuam verborum significationem & copiam, & totius orationis, ac praecipue συγκατηγορημάτων vim & constructionem, ex Xenophontis, Sophoclis, Euripidis, Herodoti, Plutarchi, & aliorum autorum lectione & probatis magnorum artificum versionibus, addiscant: Et praecipue earum phrasium, & verborum, quibus Apostoli saepe usi sunt, testimonia & exempla, obseruent ... Et pro excellenti, qua praeditus est ipse, Linguae Ebraeae peritiam, Mosis & Prophetarum Ebraice loquentium interpretationem, sibi sumsit.
outlined, and a sampling of subjects covered by Gratian’s *Decretals* are also given.\(^{35}\)

Commentaries and patristic theology texts both illustrate and communicate the historical continuity of the church, and remind the students of their place in the community of the faithful. This is their heritage. Students are not to strive to be self-taught autodidacts. Rather, Chytraeus urges that they “diligently listen to the “theodidacts” of history, by reading their writing, paying attention to their judgment regarding religious controversy, as the power of their voices live through the text and then enlightens minds, teaches doctrine, and confirms faith.\(^{36}\) Note that Chytraeus is not suggesting that students live in the past, but following Melanchthon, who had emphasized the value of patristic reading, the *testimonia patrum*, to the study of theology.\(^{37}\)

Chytraeus’ mandate on critical selection of texts applies especially to patristic texts and commentaries. Students should pick readings that offer the best examples of method while also explaining of the topics related to the Gospel, such as true piety, faith, prayer, and hope for eternal life students should pay careful attention to the use of language as they look not only at what was said but how it was explained.\(^{38}\) A prolific writer of biblical commentaries himself,

---

\(^{35}\) Patristic readings were put back into the curriculum at Wittenburg by Melanchthon fairly early in his career, as Peter Lombard was replaced with readings from Scripture and “the fathers.” See Peter Fraenkel, *Testimonia Patrum*, 15–23.

\(^{36}\) *Orationes*, 664. “Initio studiosos moneo, ut omni cura φιλαθλίαν & fiduciam proprii ingenii & facundiae fugiant, nec ἀυτοδιδακτοί videri velint ... Sed diligenter audiant praeceptores Theodidactos, legant eorum scripta, sciscientur eruditorum iudicia de grauissimis religionis controversiis, & uiuas potissimum audire ac reddere voces, eorumque sententiiis mentes suas erudire & doctrinam augere & fidem confirmare studeant.”

\(^{37}\) For Melanchthon’s use of the church fathers at Wittenberg see Timothy J. Wengert, “Philip Melanchthon and Wittenberg’s Reform of the Theological Curriculum,” in Ballor, *Church and School*, 17–34, 23.

\(^{38}\) *Orationes*, 665. “Nam & summam seu scopum totius scripti, & orationis contextum, membroum seriem, natuam sermonis sententiam, uim ac proprietatem uerborum, figuras, lectionem diuersam, Locos communes, & natuae sententiae corruptelas indicare, ad officium boni interpretis pertiner. Deligendae sunt igitur illae potissimum enarrationes, quae ad filum methodi directae sunt, & in quibus tota explicatio ad locos Euangeli proprios, & omnibus ad ueram pietatem, fidem, inoculationem & spem aeternae salutis, cognitu necessarios refertur, et una, uera ac natuua sententia sermonis diuini, proprie & perspecue, ex fontibus linguarum, & ex collatione textuum, & praeceptis artium dicendi, illustratur.”
Chytraeus, perhaps out of modesty, does not list any of his own works here. Instead, he directs
the reader such examples as Melanchthon’s work on Romans, Timothy, Colossians, and John’s
Gospel, as well as the work of Luther. Chytraeus state that these offer interpretations of
Scripture according to the “summary of faith” \([\text{summa fides}]\), marked by diligence, and dexterity,
when dealing with both the original and German texts, examining the weight and emphasis of the
words, while limiting topical headings especially to the key concepts such as faith, fear,
penitence, prayer, suffering, good works, among others. Chytraeus advises that students read
the patristic corpus through the key topics and summary of doctrine they have already learned
from the text of Scripture itself. Echoing the commonplace method they are already familiar
with, such an approach provides a norm for judging the doctrinal points that they encounter in
the patristic texts. He notes that this is especially important for separating the tenuous, and often
absurd or false teaching on the articles about sin or the righteousness of faith from the often
correct patristic critiques of the heretics on points of doctrine such as the Trinity, the two natures
of Christ, creation, the cause of evil, baptism, the duties of virtue, marriage, and the resurrection
of the body. Such and approach is reflective of what is found in his own commentaries, which

---

39 For an examination of the breadth of Melanchthon’s biblical commentary contributions see Timothy
Wengert, “The Biblical Commentaries of Philip Melanchthon,” in Dingel, Philip Melanchthon, 43–76. For
Melanchthon’s method and content, especially his use of dialectic and rhetoric in analysis and presentation of the
biblical text see Timothy Wengert, Annotationes in Johannis in Relation to its Predecessors and Contemporaries
(Geneva: Droz, 1987).

40 Orationes, 665. “Tales sunt Philippi in Epistolam ad Romanos, Timothem, Colossenses, Evangelion
Iohannis, Danielis, & Doctoris Lutheri narrationes, qui in libris sacrae scripture interpretanis summa fide, diligentia,
& dexterity, primum natuam & germanam sententiam textus, propriis verbis & perspicue exponit, & Emphases ac
pondera verborum diligenter expendit. Deinde certos & paucos locos, fidei, timoris, poenitentiae, invocationis,
crucis, bonorum operum &c. excerptit, quos erudite & copiose & ardenti spiritu penetrante in animos & permouente
pectora Lectorum, euoluit.

41 Orationes, 667. “Vtilis erit autem, & reliquorum Patrum lectio, iis qui summam doctrinae Christianae ex
scriptis Propheticis & Apostolicis recte didicerunt, et ad hanc judicii normam scripta Patrum erudite examinabunt.
Etsi enim doctrinam de peccato, & iusticia fidei, tenuient tractant, et saepe absurdas & falsas sententias effundunt,
quas admoniti, fortasses corexissent: saepe etiam ipsi inter se dissentiant, et interdum sibi ipsis non constant: tamen
aliquot articulos videlicet de Trinitate, de duabus in Christo naturis, de creatione, de causa Mali, de Baptismo, de
take their pattern, as well as their selections of commonplaces, from Melanchthon. As
Melanchthon had also taught, Chytraeus was interested in the dogmatic teachings that could be
learned from the historical examples and consensus that such teachings shared with Scripture.\textsuperscript{42}

\textbf{Church History}

Chytraeus follows Luther and Melanchthon who were always interested in the historical
witness of the church in light of contemporary controversies.\textsuperscript{43} In addition to all the rich history
found in the reading of the fathers, Chytraeus adds a section devoted to the contributions of
notable church councils, listed under the heading of church history. The same advice given for
reading the patristics with a critical eye applies also to reading histories. Councils ought to be
heard reverently because of the witness and teaching they pass down from the Apostles. But even
ancient witnesses must always be measured against the Lydian stone of Holy Scripture.\textsuperscript{44}
Proximity to Christ and the Apostles does not itself guarantee pure biblical teaching. The
councils and decrees of Nicaea, Constantinople, Ephesus, Chalcedon, Constantinople V and VI,
and Nicaea II, are also included in Chytraeus’ list as being worthy of study because they are
expositions of Scripture. He also recommends Eusabius’ \textit{Histories}, Theodoret’s chronicles, and
Epiphansius’ histories as more strictly historical (dealing with accounts of events) and helpful for

\begin{quote}
plerisque Virtutum officiis, de Coniugio, de Resurrectione carnis & c. recte, erudite & copiose illustrarunt, &
aduersus haereses, sua aetate grassantes, defenderunt.”
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{42} Fraenkel, \textit{Testamonia Patrum}, 41. See also H. Ashley Hall, \textit{Philip Melanchthon and the Cappadocians: A}
Reception of Greek Patristic Sources in the Sixteenth Century (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 2014).

\textsuperscript{43} \textit{Orationes}, 668. “Et multa continent historica testimonia, de usu coenae Domini, quae proximis seculis
horribiliter prophanata est, de baptismo Infantum, de ordinatione, gradibus ac potestate ministrorum &
Episcoporum, de traditionibus humanis, de coniugio sacerdotum, de poenitentia &c.”

\textsuperscript{44} \textit{Orationes}, 673. “Etsi enim Ecclesia, ut doctri & testis doctrinae ab Apostolis traditae, reuerenter audienda
est: tamen regula ureritatis doctrinae, perpetua & immota semper manet, Verbum Dei, ad quod, uelut ad Lydium
lapidem, omnia Synodorum decreta sunt examinanda.” That stone was through legends as a touchstone to
authenticate gold and silver. In other words, Scripture is the norm to judge the acts and decrees of the councils.
expanding on the history of the councils already named.

**Philosophy**

The penultimate section of Chytraeus’ treatise discusses the purpose and limitation of natural knowledge with regard for the study of theology. He follows Melanchthon in pointing out that the study of the natural world is important in its own right. Both moral and natural philosophy bear witness to the orderliness of creation as well as God’s continual work of ordering and sustaining all things. Moral philosophy for Chytraeus begins with the knowledge of right and wrong that man was given at creation which he terms the rivulet of divine law. It was one of Renaissance humanism’s core interest areas, according to Paul Oskar Kristeller. The study of history, also a core subject, looked at past behavior. Together, the study of moral philosophy and history was understood to help students tackle ethical questions in their own time with such topics of law, authority, and ethical action. They are not meant as a way to discern the teaching of the Gospel, the driving force or motivation behind the good in daily life—the reconciliation between God and man on account of Christ. Rather, they are divine gifts useful for daily life. Physics and mathematics are viewed in the same way—useful for illuminating many parts of Scripture and are necessary for correctly and clearly explaining them. But like the moral philosophy, they must be confined to their proper sphere. Such theological topics as original sin, freedom of the will, or the powers of the soul, mind or will, inclinations, governance

45 See Paul Oskar Kristeller, *Renaissance Thought and its Sources.*

46 *Orationes*, 673–74, “Cum enim Philosophia moralis pars sit seu riuelus legis diuinae, cuiius noticia mentibus humanis insita est, facile appareat, Locos de lege, & de bonis operibus & de magistratibus, plurimum eruditis illis hominum sapientum & eloquentium disputationibus Ethicis & Politicis illustrari, Sed tamen accuratis limitibus discernatur haec doctrina ab Euangelio, quod est arcana sapientia de reconciliacione hominum, & uita aeterna propter filium Dei pro nobis passum & resuscitatum donanda. Haec sapientia Platoni, Senecae, Ciceroni & omnibus Philosophis ignot fuit, & nullo modo in Philosophicas opiniones transformanda est.”
of the heart, are beyond their reach.  

The subject of the study of physics as a venue for observing God’s providence in the natural world is given ample space repeatedly reminding the readers that Scripture attests to God’s continual nurture and ordering of the natural world and all of its flora and fauna. It was so since Eden. But as has been shown elsewhere in the Regulae, Chytraeus puts a high value on natural philosophy’s role in providing knowledge that enables the reader understand Scriptural descriptions of nature. Here Chytraeus raises a practical concern: the confusion that a reader who limited knowledge of the natural world would experience reading Scripture. What would happen when they came across the example of the care of young ravens, such as in Psalm 147 without knowing what a raven was? What would those ignorant of the nature of vines or different kinds of trees do about Jesus’ comparisons of his people grafted onto him as if on a vine from John 15 or the palm trees of Psalm 92?  

Arithmetic and astronomy are noted in light of their role in understanding Scripture. For instance, the calendar year combines the insights of both arithmetic and astronomy to demonstrate that the world had a beginning—a first day on the calendar—and the church also

---

47 Orationes, 676. “Physice vero doctrinae & Mathematum initia multis sacrae scripturae locis lucem afferre, & ad multos doctrinae locos, maiori dexteritate & perspicuitate explicandos, necessaria esse, manifestum est. Quomodo enim doctrinam de imagine Dei, de peccato originis, de libero arbitrio, recte & erudite quisquam explicabit, qui potentias Animae, qui mentem & uoluntatem, noticias theoreticas & practicas, appetitiones naturales sensuum & voluntarias: inclinationes per se bonas, per se malas & per accidens contaminatas: gubernationem cordis ... & locomatiueae ... non erudite discernit.”


Orationes, 676–77. “Alibi passerum meminit Christus & Iohannis 15. Confert se Viti, nos palmitibus, Item Psal: 92. Iustum confert palmae perpetuo virenti ... Has collationes fine doctrina Physica, seu consideratione naturae illarum arborum recte intelligi & accommodari non posse manifestum est.”
had its beginning, along with the ordering of the divine revelations, the rise and fall of kingdoms, and the timing of Christ coming into the flesh—all important events and people in the history of church, that happened in God’s created an ordered time. Christ’s miracles and even the timing of his death were not fables, but actually occurred in history.\textsuperscript{49} The motions of the sun and the moon, constituting the days, months, and years Chytraeus says are important illustrations of God’s providence and appear in Scripture from its first page.\textsuperscript{50}

Finally, a knowledge of geography helps the student better understand divine providence, especially reinforcing the reality of the incarnation, which was not some once upon a time story but rather was tied to a concrete place (and time). Geography helps appreciate where God has acted in history where God once and still acts—for example, where Christ was baptized, or how far Jerusalem is from Rostock. Chytraeus advises keeping such ideas and facts in mind during those daily readings of Scripture he had advised earlier. And for other reading, the fact that God continues to act and direct is part of the background makes that shapes and forms the reader.\textsuperscript{51}

The Cross

The tenth and final part of Chytraeus’ oration, devoted to a discussion of the Christian

\textsuperscript{49} \textit{Orationes,} 677. “Arithmeticae autem & Astronomiae cognitio in Ecclesia ad doctrinae de Anno & Calendarii conservationem necessaria est. Non enim initia mundi, non exordia & propagatio Ecclesiae, series diuinarum patefactionum, ordo Imperioru, tempora aduentus Christi in carnem, & ad iudicium, tempora, quibus praecipui doctores Ecclesiae vixerunt, & maximae res in Ecclesia gestae sunt: non ratio celebrandi Paschatis Iudaici, non magnitudo miraculi quo sol pariente Christo obscuratus est, cogitari & intelligi sine numeratione annorum & initiis doctrinae Astronomicae possunt.”

\textsuperscript{50} \textit{Orationes,} 677. “Ideo Deus ipse in prima statim sacre scripture pagina iubet nos spacia motum Solis & Lunae, qui dierum, mensium & annorum metas constituant, & omnium maxime illustria DEI & prouidentiae diuiniae signa sunt, obseruari.”

\textsuperscript{51} \textit{Orationes,} 677. “Et in genere omnium historiarum in sacris literis lume est Geographia, quae situs & interualla locorum, in quibus dieuinae patefactiones editae & aliae res gestae esse scribuntur, indicat & certa ratione metitur. Imo in quotidiana inuocatione cogitantes de uero Deo, & de testimoniis & locis diuinarum patefactionum, mente & fide ad illam ipsam Iordanis ripam Hierosolymae vicinam, ubi tota diuinitas se in baptismo Christi ostendi, nos sisti oportet, & circiter 500. milliaria conficere, quae inter Rostochium & Hierosolymam intersunt.”
experience and suffering is the capstone of theological training. Chytraeus had asserted numerous times that theology is not knowledge and understanding alone. Now he states that absolutely none of the previous points of study matter to those who would become theologians until and unless they come under the cross. It is through the cross and suffering that the theologian finally understands true faith in Christ, the divine promise, true repentance, prayer, faith, hope and love. The cross tests these all and confirms in the heart. The medieval oratio, meditatio, lectio was not devoid of testing. But the personal and existential dimension was intensified in Luther’s own monastic theology: oratio, meditatio, tentatio. Chytraeus clearly follows Luther’s lead.

The series of statements about faith, suffering, and peace that he presents are an intersection between praxis, the term used in the Regulae’s index, and crux, the term printed in the margins to indicate the beginning of section ten. No one can fully understand having a heart and will moved in piety, repentance, faith, consolation, patience, prayer, and desire for God, until their sorrow, anguish, and misery have given way to consolation, faith, and joy in God. Put another way, Chytraeus says that putting away empty theological doctrine and extraordinary holiness in order to prepare our minds and hearts for the cross is no less necessary than are air and bread are for sustaining the life of the body. Theology is more than careful formulation. That

---

52 Orationes, 677–78. “Sed nec totius orbis terrae, nec astrorum & motuum coelestium cognitio, non linguae, non Patres, non sacrarum literarum lectio & tractatio assidua, denique non excellens eruditio & eloquentia bonum Theologum faciunt, nisi CRUX accedat, per quam Deus lucem verae agnitionis sui, verae fidei in Christo acquiescentis, verae intelligentiae diuinarum promissionum, veram poenitentiam, invocationem, spem, humiliatem & omnes virtutes, initi per verbum, in cordibus accensas, probet, expoliat, confirmet & persiciat.”

53 Orationes, 678. Cum enim Theologia non in sola cognitione & scientia, sed in verae pietatis usu & praxi praecipue posita sit: non satis est mente preclara eruditione instructam, & linguae plectrum ulubile esse, nisi in voluntate & corde ueri motus pietatis, poenitentiae, fidei, consolationis, patientiae, invocationis, dilectionis Dei & proximi existant. Nec uero quid et quales sint hi motus, intelligi potest, nisi in seriis dolibus, angustiis & tentationibus, sensum aliquem & pauorum & consolationis, & fiducie ac laeticiae in Deo acquiescentis, percipiamus.”
is quite a commitment from an academic such as Chytraeus, and one who certainly cared greatly for carefully crafted theology, as his involvement with the Formula of Concord shows. Indeed, the entire doctrine of the Gospel is consolation, and no one can experience the power of the Gospel who is not in sorrow and distress.\textsuperscript{54} In whom God wishes to dwell, says Chytraeus summarizing Isaiah 57, God exercises suffering and distress \textit{[cruce & aerumnis exercet]} and desires to vivify a contrite heart and spirit of humility.\textsuperscript{55} He warns against the self-imposed suffering of hermits and monks. Rather, the readers’ study and confession should be reflected through their vocation in church, school, state and home.\textsuperscript{56} For theology differs from philosophy in that faith precedes experience. Christians do not seek experience upon which to prove, build or cultivate faith. Rather, the power and efficacy of the Word of promise creates faith and is perceived through faith.\textsuperscript{57} In prayer, therefore, it is first necessary when calling upon God to trust in God’s promises on account of His Son and it is only afterword that the conscience experiences peace and joy.\textsuperscript{58} Chytraeus points to Luther’s Galatians commentary where Luther states that

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{54} \textit{Orationes}, 679. “Deposita igitur inani doctrinae Theologice & sanctitatis eximie persuasione, animos nostros ad crucem praeparemus non minus necessarium is, qui boni Theologi sunt futuri, quam hoc aere & cibo ad uitam corporis sustentandam opus est. Cum enim tota Euangeli doctrina sit consolatio mentium, quae sensu irae Dei & grauium dolorum ac miseriarium, afflictae sunt & consternatae: quomodo uel intelliget recte Euangelion, uel in aliis docendis aut consolandis efficax erit: qui ipse non est in doloribus & aerumnis uim & efficaciam Euangeli expertus? Qui non est tentatus, qualia scit?”
  \item \textsuperscript{55} \textit{Orationes}, 679. “ita in quocunque homine Deus habitare uult & efficax esse, eum cruce & aerumnis exercet. Habitat enim Deus cum contrito & humili spiritu, ut uiuificet spiritum humilium & cor contritorum, Esaiiae 57.”
  \item \textsuperscript{56} \textit{Orationes}, 679–80. “Nec uero opus est acceersere crucem, ut Eremitae & Monachi ueteres, relictis uitae Oeconomicae & politicae laboribus, molestias non necessarias sibi ipsis attraxerunt. Tantum in studio & confessione uerae de Deo doctrinae 7 diuinitus mandatis officius nostrae uocationis in Ecclesia, Schola, Republica, aut Oeconomia obeundis, fidelitatem praestemus.”
  \item \textsuperscript{58} \textit{Orationes}, 680. “In inuocatione petente auxilium in aerumnis, primum credet oportet inuocantem se exaudiri & a Deo diligi & iuvari propter filium iuxta promotiones. Postea primum leuationem doloris & pacem ac laeticiam conscientiae experietur. Haec fidei exercit, piis nota sint.”
\end{itemize}
unless one has experienced the power and sorrow of tyrants and heretics, heartfelt panic and the arrows of Satan, then the words of St. Paul will be completely meaningless to him.⁵⁹ Chytraeus concludes by reminding his readers of the three powerful instruments that Luther taught make a theologian—prayer, meditation, and trial [orationem, meditationem, & tentationem].⁶⁰ He had talked of those earlier, as noted, but now he uses them expressly as an exhortation to his readers to live life under the cross.

**De studio Theologiae cum omnibus caeterarum Artium studiis coniungendo:**

This was the second of Chytraeus’ famous orations on the study of theology that was enlisted for this section. Otto Schütz says it was delivered on May 5, 1564 for the promotion of eight theology candidates.⁶¹ It was printed twice, first in 1564 in a book of orations promoting theological degrees, and a second time, bound with Chytraeus *Oratio de Studio Theologiae Recte Inchoando* in 1572.⁶² Appearing around the same time as Rostock’s new theological statutes, it too is an example of Chytraeus’ direction for the school and university there. Although it was the briefest of the three selections on theology, Chytraeus has plenty to offer as he lays out an argument that encouraging daily theological study that combines both Scripture as well as other

---


Luther saw life's experiences as a two-way street. So he understood Paul's clashes with the Judaizers fixed on the law because of his own rounds with Rome and its emphasis on works that must be in salvation's equation. And at the same time, Luther saw his problems with Rome more clearly because of the light shed by Paul's first century problems with the legalists in Galatia. See, “The Mature Paradigm,” in Mark U. Edwards, *Luther and the False Brethren* (Standford: Stanford University Press, 1975), 112–26.

⁶⁰ *Orationes*, 681. “Admonitus autem hoc Reuerendi viri, Doctoris Lutheri consilio & exemplo, qui in praefatione primi Tomi operum suorum Germanici scribit, sibi ad eam doctrine Theologicae, quam ipse adeptus esset, cognitionem, haec tria potissimum instrumenta, orationem, Meditationem & Tentationem profuisse.”

⁶¹ Schütz, *De Vita.*, 692.

⁶² Kaufmann, *Universität und lutherische Konfessionalisierung*, 628.
summaries of the faith. After arguing that it is necessary for all Christians to engage in
theological study regardless of their stations in life, he then relates theological study to other
subjects in the curriculum, explaining the meaning and significance of Christianity with respect
to the broader course of learning.

Analysis

Although this oration was delivered on the occasion of the bestowal of theological degrees
at Rostock, Chytraeus is addressing all the students in the university, regardless of their various
courses of study. 63 Throughout the Regulae he argued that all students should take a personal
interest in theology regardless of their intended professional course of education because a
person’s ultimate purpose is to know and worship God as he has revealed himself in His Word.
In the previous section, his earlier treatise, Chytraeus says theology is not just scientific
knowledge, but rather involves engaging life. Now the push is a little different: theology is not
just for theologians. So he condemns those who would argue that only theology students ought
give in daily study. That theology-only-for-theologians is a pestilence to Christianity. 64 On the
contrary, Chytraeus asserts, the most important of all study one can undertake is the daily
reading, listening, and meditating on Christ’s teaching. That study is both served by and gives

63 Orationes, 685. “Cum itaque mihi nunc hoc in loco, more publico, dicendi partes datae sint: decreui in
praesentia, non quidem de doctrinae Theologicae dignitate & praesentia orationem habere ... sed de parte aliqua
rationis studiorum recte instituendae, admonitionem utilem, & ad omnes in studiis literarum versantes pretinentem,
recitare.”

64 Orationes, 685–86. “Monebo enim & hortabor adolescentes, ut studium Theologiae seu religionis &
pietatis Christianae, in quocunque doctrinarum & vitae genere versentur, semper cum caeteris studiis coniugant &
velut nocentissimam studiorum & pietatis Christiane pestem, voces eorum fugiant, qui ad solos sacerdotes, seu ex
professo Theologos futuros, lectionem sacrarum literarum relegant. Cum enim non soli sacerdotes, sed omnes
omnium ordinum homines, ideo praecipue conditi & redempti sint, ut Deum recte agnoscant & celebrent, sicut se in
verbo, seu doctrina a se tradita patefecit: certe nulli erunt, qui homines, praeertim Christiani, & non Epicuraeae
beluae, palam a caelesti & diuina origine sua degenerantes, perhiberi volent; qui non in assequendo & obtinendo
fine, ad quem & initio eos Deus creavit, & deinceps per filium redemit, aliquam studiorum & vitae suae partem esse
impendendam, iudicabunt.”
meaning to all other subjects.  

Because natural and moral philosophy permeate much of the liberal arts curriculum, Chytraeus never seems to tire of both praising them while firmly expressing their limitations. This oration begins with an eloquent example of such a distinction. Chytraeus describes the universe in all its splendor, as a divine theater acted out by the most beautiful things of nature, revealing the wisdom, goodness and omnipotence of God. Above the earth, the sun, stars, and moon display certainty and constancy. Below, and across the earth the enormous variety of plants and animals of kinds show the wonders of the perpetuation of species and propagation of living creatures as God has ordered them. Human beings themselves are microcosms of the wonder and order of creation. In man God has implanted the awareness of Himself and virtue, which are the seeds of law and the arts. With the whole universe testifying it becomes a school that teaches of God by the reflections in his creation. The evidence is so strong, Chytraeus says, that man is compelled to admit that God, the eternal mind, is the architect and conservator of the universe, and that we are his subjects and conform to his will. Yet the cosmos, with all of its


\[\text{Orationes, 699. “Verum hoc affirmor, primam & summam omnium in studiis literarum versantium curam hanc esse debere, ut quotidie aliquid temporis lectioni, auscultationi & meditationi doctrine Christi tribuant & efficiant, ut verbum Christi in eis opulente habitet, & sapienter intelligatur, cognitis fontibus linguarum & adhibitis artibus necessariis, & dextre inter se collatis omnibus membris.”} \]
beauty and orderliness, still only reflects the light of natural knowledge. Far brighter is the light of divine revelation. And with this revelation, Chytraeus calls the Gospel, or the promise of mercy and reconciliation with God on account of Christ, the greatest and most precious treasure.⁶⁷

Among the subjects that are taught in school, subjects Chytraeus laid out in detail earlier in the *Regulae* and subjects that are given by God, Chytraeus argues that none surpasses theology in importance. Theology is the most necessary subject for life because beyond all the other liberal arts it teaches about salvation through Christ and the true knowledge and worship of God.⁶⁸ Everything else in the arts exists in the first place to serve theology. Ethics and politics, for example, are divinely instituted in order to serve as both a model of peace and order as well as the vehicles of peace-keeping in the land so that the doctrine of Christ and God may be propagated.⁶⁹ This is what Luther argued for, wanting princes to promote the Reformation when bishops failed to do so. In his *Address to the Christian Nobility 1520*, and again in the idea of the

---

⁶⁷ *Orationes*, 684. “... tamen multo maior & eruditior ac sublimior schola mirandae sapientiae & bonitatis ac misericordiae Dei erga nos inenarrabilis est, Patefactio doctrinae, a Deo inde usque ab initio, post conditum genus humanum, supra & extra humanae rationis conspectum, clara voce & illustribus testimonii traditae, de vera agnition essentialis & voluntatis diuinae, non modo in notitiis Legis, naturae insitis, quae obedientiam erga Deum, iuxta praescriptum & normam legum flagitant, & sceleratis poenas denunciant, reuelatae, verum multo magis, in Euangelio seu promissione gratuite misericordiae, & reconciliationis cum Deo, & vite ac glorie aeternae propter Christum donandae. Haec doctrina, ex sinu aeterni patris per Filium prolata, & Prophetarum ac Apostolorum libris comprehensa, praecipua & propria Ecclesiae Dei sapientia & summus ac preciosissimus in toto genere humano thesaurus est.”

⁶⁸ *Orationes*, 687. “Verum hoc affirmo, inter omnes doctrinas & artes, quae Dei concessu & munere hominibus tributae sunt, nullam praestantiorum, & omnibus cognitum magis necessariam esse ea doctrina, quae fini, ad quem conditus est homo, immediate seruit: & ad quam velut ad ultimum & summum finem, caeterae artes & vitae genera omnia referuntur, quaque & certum praesidium est vitae praesentis & aditus est ad aeternam salutem. Atqui sola haec doctrina, quam Filius Dei, Dominus noster Iesus Christus, ex patris aeterni finu prolatam, Ecclesiae tradidit, haec, inquam, sola finem hominis verum, videlicet verum Deum & veram Dei agnitionem & celebrationem, & cultus ipsi placentes, monstrat, & huic ultimo fini assequendo vel tuendo, omnia reliqua vitae genera, & artes omnes, praecipue seruiunt.”

⁶⁹ *Orationes*, 687. “Ideo regna & politiae diuinitus institutae sunt & conservantur, ut sint tranquilla hostpitia & templa regni Christi, in quibus vera de Deo & Domino nostro Iesu Christo doctrina late propagari, & erudiri ac institui iuuentus ad Christi agnitionem & pios mores, possit.”
Notbischof or Emergency Bishop, Luther is not calling on princes to preach. They were no more in the preaching office than were David and Solomon, for instance, numbered among the priestly Levites. But they made possible and promoted the preaching of the Gospel by those whose task it properly was. And they protected those who, as believers, spoke of the hope that was in them. This does not make a theocracy but rather makes possible or give space and possibility for others to teach and believe the Gospel. The law, courts, and various elements of a rightly organize society all function properly by allowing for the truth about God to be taught and models of virtue to be shown. But beyond the obvious connection with authority and society to further the work of revelation, the elements of the liberal arts also play a supporting role. The medicinal arts testify to evidence of the divine, both in the bodies and also in the spirits of living creatures, and also in the infinite variety of plants and animals, all created and cared for by God. But this also serves God’s work of preservation, upholding the health of the Christian, that the believer might have a long life in true knowledge of God and be able to share that knowledge widely. Rhetoric is profitable with the speaking arts by serving through language and oration, not indulging in fables or lies, warns Chytraeus, but in speaking about, praying to, and praising the true God.

---

70 Orationes, 687. “Ideo in ciuitatibus homines consociati, & vinculis legum, iudiciorum, contractuum, coniugiorum deuncti sunt, ut inter se alii allis veram dei notitiam communicare, & suae confessionis de Deo ac virtutum exempla ostendere queant. Ad hunc finem ars politica, consilia gubernationis Reipublicae ad normam Legum, quae iustitiae & tranquillitatis publicae custodes sunt, dirigit, & controversias ciuium iure & leibibus dirimit, ut in politia honesta & tranquilla veri Dei notitia late propagetur, & Ecclesiae Christi pie regantur & floreant.”

71 Orationes, 687–88. “Ars Medica non tantum testimonia & vestigia Dei plurima, in natura corporis & animae humanae & caeteris animantibus, ac infinita varietate herbarum & virium, quas singulis Deus attribuit, impressa, considerat ... verum etiam valetudinem & vitam hominum tuetur & prorogat, propter hunc finem, ut in longiore vita, veram Dei notitiam, & aliarum rerum bonarum doctrinam, usu confirmare & augere, & latius spargere ac propagare possimus.”

72 Orationes, 688. “Rhetorica dicendi artem profitetur. Ideo autem hominibus linguae & orationis beneficium, ac dicendi facultas prae caeteris animantibus, a Deo tributa est, non ut maledictis certemus, vel fabellas amatorias recitemus, aut de contractibus opum cumulandarum caussa colloquamur, sed ut de Deo & virtutum Deo placentium officiis, & allis rebus bonis vera perspicue dicere, & synceram de Deo doctrinam, aliis alios docere & vera inuocatione, predicatione & laudibus piis Deum celebrare possimus.”
Dialectic promotes clarity and order, and benefits learning and teaching Theology.\textsuperscript{73} This is a contribution Chytraeus has noted repeatedly throughout his writing when discussing method. Astronomy and physics (apart from theology itself), contain the greatest testimony of divine wisdom and goodness.\textsuperscript{74} Theology gives all these along with the other arts a direction and purpose that they would not otherwise have, leading and directing just as a head does to a body.\textsuperscript{75}

Chytraeus warns against those who would seek theological knowledge apart from revelation. They engage in a great danger, acting in foolishness and arrogance that is very difficult to eradicate once it has taken hold in a young mind.\textsuperscript{76} Instead, all who would call themselves Christian ought to engage in daily reading of Scripture along with meditation.\textsuperscript{77} He reiterates his earlier point that theological study is not meant for priests and ministers alone. Rather, Chytraeus contends that the command for all people diligently to hear, read, learn, meditate, be filled with faith, and spread God’s Word concerning His Son, is God's sternest mandate.\textsuperscript{78} Chytraeus regularly reminds his students of this, writing that God does not wish to be

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{73} \textit{Orationes}, 688. “Dialectica methodum discendi & docendi in Theologia & omnibus caeteris artibus informat.”
\item \textsuperscript{74} \textit{Orationes}, 688. “Astronomia & Physica post Christiana Theologia, omnium maxime illustria sapientiae & bonitatis diuinæ testimonia continet, sicut usitatissimæ & omnibus notae sententiae testantur.”
\item \textsuperscript{75} \textit{Orationes}, 689. “Sic omnes artes & omnia vitae genera ministræ & operas referre debent, ut Theologiae seruiant. Omnis enim sapientia & virtus humana, expers Theologiae & pietatis veræ, similis est trunco corporis humani, caput non habenti. Itaque ut vere Lactantius ait, omnis doctrina & virtus Philosophorum sine capite est: quia Deum nesciunt, qui est virtutis & doctrinae caput.”
\item \textsuperscript{76} \textit{Orationes}, 689–90. “Multo maius periculum est illis, qui vana sapientiae & eruditionis persuasione & arrogantia, ambitioneque stulta & religionis veræ contemptu ... Haec Epicurea prophanitas, præsertim eximæ sapientiae & eruditionis specie succata, ubi semel teneros animos infecit, difficillime iterum in tota reliqua aetate elui potest.”
\item \textsuperscript{77} \textit{Orationes}, 690. “Ommes igitur, qui hominis præsertim Christiani appelationem tueri cupiunt, & inprīmis omnes bonarum literarum studiosi, singulis diebus, tota vitae suæ tempore primitias suorum studiorum Deo consecrænt, & quotidie aliquid temporis, perlegendæ ordine libris divinitus traditis, & piae meditationi, vel auscultatione doctrinæ coelestis tribuant.”
\item \textsuperscript{78} \textit{Orationes}, 690. “Non enim ad solos sacerdotes & ministros ecclesiae publicos, verum ad totum genus humanum pertinent seuerissima mandata Dei, quæ iubent doctrinam filiæ Dei diligenter & attente audire, legere, discere, meditari, crebro repetere, fide amplecti, & sedulo propagare.”
\end{itemize}
known, and really cannot be known, outside of His Word. For Christians who do not intend to become professional theologians, Chytraeus nevertheless echoes Paul’s command to give careful attention to the sacred text since the Word of Christ lives in them, and therefore it ought to be read daily.79

Such daily, pleasant, conversation through reading Scripture must become a lifelong habit. To that end Chytraeus cautions against thinking that the articles of faith can be learned quickly or even completely. Following Luther, he states that it is a lifelong endeavor. Even so, the student’s daily reading is not without value but rather ought to be purposeful, studying the articles of faith in an orderly manner in their proper context. This is why Chytraeus has spent so much time establishing a foundation for a method and structure for study. Repetition must be practiced even if the students feel they have learned a particular article of faith thoroughly. Luther once commented that a person would have come a long way if they had learned in a day to make a single Psalm verse live in their heart.80 Quality is more important than quantity achieved in haste. Chytraeus echoes the same, strongly warning that any students who thinks they have exhausted an article are dreaming and have not considered the magnitude of the difficulty of the task, not to mention their own ignorance, and the effort required for any worthwhile method of study.81 Such

79 Orationes, 691–92. “Nec aliter vult a nobis agnosci, invocari & coli Deus, quam sicut se in hoc verbo, per Christum tradito agnosci & coli praecepit... Quod igitur alibi Paulus iubet attendere lectioni, hoc est attente & assidue libros coelestes legere, idem hoc in loco praecepit, cum ait, Verbum Christi habitet in vobis, h.e. non sit ignotus aut rarus ospes doctrina Christi in vobis, sed sit familiaris conuictor: ac ut in domo tua familiarissime tibi noti sunt, coniunx, liberi, & alii, quos praecipue amas, & cum quibus quotidie & suauissime colloqueris, & omnes curas & cogitationes tuas communicare soles: ita familiariter & integre tibi perspecti & cogniti sunt libri, doctrinam Christi continentis.”

80 He wrote this in a letter to George Spalatin in the context of describing his own struggles to understand particular passages. Such continual effort was pursued, in spite of the fact, as Karl Holl notes, that Luther regularly quoted very long passages out loud to himself. Karl Holl, “Martin Luther on Luther,” in Interpreters of Luther: Essays in Honor of Wilhelm Pauck ed. Jaroslav Pelikan (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1968), 9–34,12.

81 Orationes, 692. “Primum ut summam totius doctrinae de Deo in corpus redactae, ordine & integre ex illis discas & testimonia articulorum fidei, & veram ac natiuam sententiam, in locis praecipuis teneas & memineris. Neque enim subito res tanta penitus comprehendi possunt, ac si quis existimat satis esse semem & iterum legisse,
care in reading and study is particularly important, Chytraeus emphasizes, because it is by hearing, reading, and understanding the Word that God teaches, consoles, leads, regenerates, and saves the Christian. Wherever the doctrine of Christ dwells, writes Chytraeus, and wherever it is understood in faith and piety, there the true God dwells in the heart.\footnote{Orationes, 693. \textit{Quod per hoc verbum Christi a nobis auditum seu lectum & cogitatum, \& non aliter Deus docet, consolatur, trahi, regenerat \& saluat homines \ldots Nam ubicunque doctrina Christi habitat, hoc est, ubi pie cogitatur \& fide accipitur, ibi vere Deus ipse in corde habitat, \& cor regit \& sanctificat, hoc est, sua luce, sapientia, iustitia \& vita perfundit \& ornat.}}

Chytraeus ends his oration with a reminder of the consolation of Scripture, driving home the message that theological study is important for all Christians. He reminds his readers again that Scripture is unique among all writings in that it alone reveals both man’s true condition as well as the good news of the reconciliation between God and man that alone offers true consolation. Scripture was written for the church and the comfort of the Gospel pertains directly to it.\footnote{Orationes, 694. \textit{Non sunt sacrae scripturae dicta, alienae tantum historiae narrationes nihil ad nos pertinentes, ut sermones personarum in veteribus tragoediis: sed te \& me \& nos omnes alloquitur Deus, cum inquit: Agite paenitentiam \& credite Euangelio.}} Chytraeus says that people discover their place in the narrative of Scripture by learning who God, the Son, and the Holy Spirit are, and about who they are through the record of creation, the fall, the remission of sin and the reconciliation between God and man on account of Christ, the resurrection of the body and eternal life. The believer’s response is to put trust in God in the midst of suffering and sorrow, to yearn for God’s will instead of acting with indignation and anger, and instead to call upon God with a firm trust that God himself is both propitiation and aid.\footnote{Orationes, 695. \textit{Docent enim de rebus summis \& maximis, de quibus nulli alii libri, vel Philosophorum, vel Poetarum, vel oratorum, vel quorumque sapientum quidquidam certi aut solidi docere possunt, videlicet de vera Dei agnitione \& invocatione veri Dei \& invocatione veri Dei, qui est aeternus Pater Filius \& Spiritus sanctus, de vel audiuisse libros sacros, \& postquam semel perlegit, penitus se exhauste totam eorum sapientiam somniat, vehemens fallitur, nec doctrinae coelestis magnitudinem \& difficultatem, nec nostram imbecillitatem, nec ullam discendi rationem considerat.}} We are to remember the example of Christ, who is our brother and co-heir, who

\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{vel audiuisse libros sacros, \& postquam semel perlegit, penitus se exhauste totam eorum sapientiam somniat, vehemens fallitur, nec doctrinae coelestis magnitudinem \& difficultatem, nec nostram imbecillitatem, nec ullam discendi rationem considerat.}\footnote{Orationes, 693. \textit{Quod per hoc verbum Christi a nobis auditum seu lectum \& cogitatum, \& non aliter Deus docet, consolatur, trahi, regenerat \& saluat homines \ldots Nam ubicunque doctrina Christi habitat, hoc est, ubi pie cogitatur \& fide accipitur, ibi vere Deus ipse in corde habitat, \& cor regit \& sanctificat, hoc est, sua luce, sapientia, iustitia \& vita perfundit \& ornat.}}
\item \textit{Non sunt sacrae scripturae dicta, alienae tantum historiae narrationes nihil ad nos pertinentes, ut sermones personarum in veteribus tragoediis: sed te \& me \& nos omnes alloquitur Deus, cum inquit: Agite paenitentiam \& credite Euangelio.}\footnote{Orationes, 694. \textit{Non sunt sacrae scripturae dicta, alienae tantum historiae narrationes nihil ad nos pertinentes, ut sermones personarum in veteribus tragoediis: sed te \& me \& nos omnes alloquitur Deus, cum inquit: Agite paenitentiam \& credite Euangelio.}}
\item \textit{Docent enim de rebus summis \& maximis, de quibus nulli alii libri, vel Philosophorum, vel Poetarum, vel oratorum, vel quorumque sapientum quidquidam certi aut solidi docere possunt, videlicet de vera Dei agnitione \& invocatione veri Dei \& invocatione veri Dei, qui est aeternus Pater Filius \& Spiritus sanctus, de
\end{itemize}
suffered in our place, taking upon himself God’s wrath.\(^5\) This all may sound rather academic at first, but it actually is intensely personal, and that makes all the time and effort spent by Chytraeus in the writing and by the student in the reading, learning, and applying, well worth it.

**De Studio Theologiae et Pietatis Verae Exercitiis, potius quam rixis Disputationum colendo**

*De Studio Theologiae et Pietatis Verae Exercitiis, potius quam rixis Disputationum colendo*, the last of Chytraeus’ theological orations, is unique among the three collected for the *Regulae* because it alone contains discussions on a number of theological doctrine—a personal confession of faith on these points. Otto Krabbe mistakenly understood it to be Chytraeus’ *Antrittsrede* delivered before the members of the Academy of Rostock on April 21, 1551.\(^6\) However, numerous comments within the text suggest a later date. Thomas Kaufmann has proposed that Krabbe may have meant that it was a reworking of that oration from 1566.\(^7\) But as Kaufmann observes there are statements within the oration itself, as well as a letter referring to it, that place the composition in its published form at the end of the 1570s. For

---

exordio mundi & creatione omnium rerum, Angelorum & hominum, de causa calamitatum, peccati & mortis humanae, de remissione peccatorum & reconciliacione hominum cum Deo, propter filium Dei Dominum nostrum Iesum Christum, pro nobis crucifixum & resuscitatum, de vera consolatione opponenda morti & omnibus aerumnis, de abdicatione pecci & mortis, de restitutione corporum, de perpetuis impiorum poenis, de piorum vita & gloria aeterna. De his tantis rebus & ad omni nostrum aeternam salutem pertinentibus, erudit nos scriptura, qua ea de causa, inde usque a pueris diligenter discere, alibi Paulus iubet. Altera utilitas est, Patientia, quae in doloibus, iniuriis, obrectationibus, contumeliis & aliis aerumnis quibuscunque moderate & placide ferendis reueneret se voluntati Dei subiicit, nec indignatione fremitu adversus Deum, vel eos, a quibus laesa est. Dolorem auget, sed fide statuit, Deum sibi propitium esse, & petit ac expectat auxilium Dei & liberationem.”

\(^5\) *Orationes*, 696. Iterea exemplum Christi Redemptoris nostri, cuius fratres & coheredes summus, sequamur, qui cum iniurii & contumeliis aficeretur, non regessit contumelias, sed tradidit vindictam Deo, qui iuste iudicat.”

\(^6\) Krabbe, 42. “Es war ihm der Vortrag der Catechesis im Pädagogium zugewiesen, und begann Chyträus diese seine Lehrtätigkeit schon am 21. April 1551, mit seiner *De Studio Theologiae et Pietatis Verae Exercitiis, potius quam rixis Disputationum colendo*, in welcher bereits seine theologische Grundrichtung nach den verschiedensten Seiten sich ausspricht.” In a footnote, Krabbe indicates that this is the very same oration that appears in Chytraeus’ collected orations.

\(^7\) Kaufmann, *Universität und lutherische Konfessionalisierung*, 260, note 39.
example it contains a remark by Chytraeus about attitudes on display among the theologians since the Colloquy of Worms (1557). Even the theological topics that Chytraeus discusses in the treatise suggest a later date. Not mentioned by Kaufmann but also noteworthy are Chytraeus’ specific references to Melanchthon’s *Responsiones ad articulos Bavaricae inquisitionis* as the basis for his position on justification and the Gospel, another text not in existence in 1551. The *Responsiones* made up the final document in the *Corpus Doctrinae Philippicum* and were intended by Melanchthon as a “doctrinal last will and testament.”

Chytraeus does not refer to them specifically by name, but those are certainly what Chytraeus means when he refers to “those sentences set forth two years before [Melanchthon’s] death,” and says those “publically declared a few days before his death” in 1560.

This is the last of Chytraeus’ three famous orations on theology to find its way into print, appearing first in 1581 and then in a posthumous collection of orations in 1614. It was printed again much later in 1704 bound with theological treatises of other writers. In his biography of Chytraeus, Otto Schütz refers to this treatise as being both popular and widely available. Schütz does not provide a specific date for the first printings of Chytraeus’ text, but he does find a


89 *Orationes*, 488. “Consulto enim in hoc articulo verba preceptoris Philippi retineo quibus sententiam suam biennio ante mortem ipse explicaui ... in ipsius Philippi, paucis ante mortem diebus publice edita declaratione ...”

90 *Orationes*, 472–93.

91 DAVIDIS CHYTRAEI ORATIO DE STUDIO THEOLOGIAE, EXERCITIIS VERAE PIETATIS ET VITUTIS POTIUS QUAM CONTENTIONIBUS ET RIXIS DISPUTATIONUM COLENDO: Juxta exemplar Witenberg. Excusum Anno M D LXXI. OBSERVATIONES additit Constatinus Schütz Pastor ad aed. primar. apud Dantiscanos: Cum Dissertatione de ORTHODOXIA JUDAE ISCHARIOTH. LIPSIAE, Apud JOH. HEINICII VIDUAM. A. MDCCI.

92 Schütz, *De Vita*, 549. “Ea autem est celebratissima Chytraei Oratio, de Studio Theologiae, exercitiis verae pietatis & virtutis potius quam contentionibus & rixis disputationum colendo: quae inter reliquas ejus Orationes palmam facile tenet ...”
reference to it in a letter written in 1577. In this letter, penned to certain Jacob Monavius, Chytraeus states that the oration, “on the study of Christian theology and controversies of our church” was delivered before the magistrates at the Academy at Heidelberg in 1576. Such an address falls within the context of reform efforts within the Palatinate, as Ludwig VI sought to implement changes both in the University of Heidelberg and the Pfalz, bringing them back in a Lutheran direction.

While the circumstances behind the oration and its subsequent use cannot be nailed down definitely, it nevertheless shows Chytraeus’ concern for theology properly presented and taught. So if Chytraeus’ oration actually was based on his Antrittsrede (later revised and published), he got additional mileage out of the older work with his Heidelberg presentation, perhaps considering there to be worthwhile continuity with his earlier thought. Rather than do something completely new because his thinking had substantially changed (which it did not), it was perhaps enough to revisit the older text. Chytraeus’ Antrittsrede was delivered to an institution that he would shortly bring into reform in 1551. The occasion for his oration in the late 1570s was the attempted restructuring of the University of Heidelberg. Having been called to implement Lutheran reforms, Chytraeus understood that the foundations of that restructuring should be like the 1551 effort with an emphasis on doctrinal unity based on Scripture and the Confessions.

Chytraeus explains in the letter to Monavius that he was presenting consolation rather than contention, with the “true fear of God and faith in Christ” offering comfort. Such teaching has

---


94 Krabbe, David Chyträus, 312–25.
been lifted up and rescued by “our teachers” (Luther and Melanchthon) from the “labyrinth of opinions” and then clearly presented. Disputations and contests among fellow confessors, are to be done to help define and teach. Those, along with pious reading, prayer, exercises in virtue, and salutary consolations are better than quibbling and inexplicable disputation.95

The kind of learning in the schools that Chytraeus fervently hopes for is intended to edify the Christian, kindling “true fear and love of God,” following the precepts of St. Paul. This is the approach that Chytraeus understands Melanchthon to have put forward with his Loci Theologici.96 Support for Melanchthon is clear in the oration, and Chytraeus states that it is his intention to show a consensus between Luther and Melanchthon in the wake of the controversy that arose after Luther’s death.97

Chytraeus’ argument for oration is spelled out in the title, De Studio Theologiae et Pietatis Verae Exercitiis, potius quam rixis Disputationum colendo. The study of theology is better served in true and pious exercise than quarreling. This advice, as he will show, concerns both the subject matter of theology as well as the methodology. Scripture as the subject directs the method. But theology is not merely knowledge, whether of the principles of doctrine or of the

---

95 Epistolae., 893. “Consolationes vero, in Agendorum libello, tibi, non rixis disputationum, sed vero timore Dei ac fide in Christum & vita ac moribus sanctis ... inprimis placere, laetor; atque utinam, evoluta iam per praeceptores nostros, ex labyrinthis opinionem, & mediocriter instituta, maxime ad veram Dei agnitionem & pietatem alendam verae doctrinae forma: modus aliquis sit disputationum et certaminum de doctrina, inter eiusdem confessionis socios, et ad piam lectionem et precationem et honesta exercitia obedientiae, dilectionis, beneficiantiae et caeterarum virtutum, ac consolationum salutarium potius, quam ad cauillationes causarum, et inexplicabilium disputationum, discentes adsuefiant.”

96 Epistolae., 894. “Maxime enim opto, vt in Ecclesia et scholis, iuxta Pauli praeceptum doctrina, ad pietatis verae edificationem, seu verum timorem Dei et dilectionem proximi in animis accendendum vitis, quam singulari iudicio, praeceptorem Philippum, in locis Theologicis, complexum esse video: praecisis omnibus aliis quaestionibus, et rixis non necessariis, horridioribus et inexplicatis, et ad pietatem infrugiferis disputationibus, quarum plerasque illos ipso, qui eas vehementissime agitabant, non minus quam me, non penitus intelligere animaduertebam, abstinui. Easque in coelestis Ecclesiae scholam perfecte explicandas reieci.”

97 Epistolae., 894. “Fateor me et collegas meos, cum de illis interrogamur, ex congruente ad normam verbi diuini confessione Ecclesiarum nostrarum communii, et consensu Lutheri et Philippi; qui exhibitae confessionis Augustanae tempore illibatus et sincerus haud dubie fuit, respondere solitos esse.”
practice, of Christianity. It is also the true fear and love of God—a sure belief on account of the work of Christ and the hope for eternal life, as well as then acting in Christian love toward one’s neighbor and all that this entails. But this too comes from a study of Scripture and such piety highlights the connection between faith and wisdom keeping both inquiry and discussion from going off the rails, so to speak.

The early Reformation’s interest in both education and life in the created world—First Article and Left-Hand—carried over through the century. Its use of humanism with its interest in the *vita activa* and exploring could be a two edged sword. It opened up new ideas and interests, but some of these would threaten theology as it was traditionally held. Some of humanists pressed beyond orthodoxy. Michael Servetus and Fausto Sozzini are common examples of sixteenth-century humanists who were familiar with language and hermeneutics to the (unfortunate) point of arguing that the “Trinity” was not a New Testament concept. A little—too late—learning could be a dangerous thing. So a second-generation educator rightly was concerned about the approach students could and would take to learning, lest they go off on some tangent to their detriment.

Chytraeus’ own positions on a number of theological doctrines addressed in this oration he presents as affirmations of the Augsburg Confession, addressing the trinity, original sin, the person of Christ, justification, the Lord’s Supper, the freedom of the will, Law and Gospel, and predestination, (although this last topic is directly not addressed in the Augsburg Confession).98 They are significant in the context of the theological issues at hand in Heidelberg during the 1560s and 1570s, especially of the Lord’s Supper and the person of Christ. The Heidelberg

98 *Orationes*, 483. “Ac ut seriem articulorum in communi Ecclesiarum nostrarum confessione Augustana praescriptam sequar.”
Catechism in particular demanded response for its explanation of Christ’s presence in the Lord’s Supper, a position that put subscribers in danger of falling outside the legal protections afforded by the 1555 Peace of Augsburg. Part of Chytraeus’ role at Heidelberg was to turn it in a more Lutheran direction again. Through his oration Chytraeus demonstrates both the content of proper theological exercises (established doctrine) and makes a case for a pious and loving manner of theological discussion.

Analysis

Decades of inter-Lutheran wrangling following the death of Luther had left Chytraeus concerned about the state of the church. But Calvinist theology taking root in Lutheran territories and among Lutheran pastors and teachers was a problem as well. Chytraeus expresses his responsibility in guiding the formation of both students and theologians and begins the oration with a few basic points, not the least of which is the orientation of the theologian himself. A pious theologian will explicate his subject matter properly and with humility and the fruit of the pious and godly theologian will be an exposition of Scripture ought to yield concord rather than discord. Pious theology unites, rather than separates. The opposite is seen in the impious or ungodly theologian, whose work creates strife and discord. The character and personal piety of the theologian is connected to his broader methodological approach. Although it would be just as easy to highlight more recent attempts to rationalize how Christ was present in the Lord’s Supper, Chytraeus points to earlier scholastic theology, as one example of the relationship between piety and methodology gone horribly wrong—a misuse of reason and its gifts.

Christian piety remains in center focus throughout the oration, especially when Chytraeus discusses points of doctrine. Theology is more than knowing the points of Christian teaching alone, but rather it is the understanding that flows from true fear and love of God, and faith in
Christ, and obedience to God. Today one might say theology is not just orthodoxy but also orthopraxy. Chytraeus states that pious notions of the heart are kindled and guided by true teaching and by the Christian living out a life of faith comes true wisdom. 99 He says that such piety flows from the justification of the Christian, revealed in Scripture through the Law and Gospel. 100 The sacred writings themselves are the basis for such pious wisdom. 101 Any other approach to theology is senseless and therefore impious. 102 Chytraeus’ contrast is sharp and clear—-theology is articulated by and grounded in what is in and from God.

As Chytraeus has shown throughout the Regulae, and in his other orations on theology, learning any subject requires certain tools and techniques. Here he highlights one particular aid, the (by now familiar) summary, a necessary tool when it comes to learning, but in this case also a confession and epitome of faith. As an epitome of faith it functions as examples of pious theology. The catechism is an excellent summary for the student to begin with because it contains the Decalogue, the Symbols, the institutions of the Sacraments, prayers, and creeds—all filling the role of summaries and epitomes of Scripture. 103 In brief, a Catechism is a short-hand way to see and learn the faith. Chytraeus especially recommends the writings of Luther and
Melanchthon, with the *Loci Theologici* and *Augustana* noted in particular as useful models and examples of method for studying theology.\(^{104}\) And while many other texts from other authors both ancient and contemporary might also have things to offer, they ought to be read with caution. At this point Chytraeus repeats his warning about allowing the study of theology to devolve into the curious disputations of the scholastics who have tried to resolve the Patristic errors.\(^{105}\) Better reading comes from the fathers of the church themselves. Chytraeus calls them without a doubt the wisest and best of the church, following after Christ and then Moses. Moses in particular is hailed as “the teacher and head of the entire chorus of the prophets, the fountain, or ocean rather, of all theology,” and source for all the sermons of the Prophets, Christ, and Apostles.\(^{106}\) Clearly, Chytraeus sees “Moses” not in a narrow Law-Decalogue sense but as Torah or wider foundational teaching.

Pious theology expounded in summaries and epitomes of faith are to provide the subject material for the disputation, as students practice discussing and defending points of doctrine. It is important to remember that there is disputation and there is disputation. That is, not all are the same. There are hair-splitting sophist-like arguments, the scholastic sort that Chytraeus as well as others rejected without issue. But he has no problem encouraging the use of dialectic to sort

\(^{104}\) *Orationes*, 476. “Nostra etiam aetate excitatis divinitus piis & salutaribus Evangelii doctoribus & instauratoribus D. Martino Luthero & Philippo Melanchthone, quorum viva voce & sanctissimis scriptis Deus me ad verbi sui cognitionem deduxit ... singulari consilio & religione, in confessione Augustana breviter recitati, & in locis Theologicis Philippi uberius declarati sunt ... Iaque nunc eo studiosius facio & faciam Deo juvante, quia non solum veram doctrinam esse sentio: verum etiam hanc formam & methodum, seu corpus doctrinae in Lutheri & Philippi scriptis constitutum retineri utilissimum judico.”

\(^{105}\) *Orationes*, 476–77. “Cur non de praeceptorum quoque scriptis candide judicare potius, quam ambigua in deteriorem partem torquere velimus, ac profecto evoluta jam ex labyrinthis opinionum & controversiarum cum Pontificiis & aliis sectis, & mediocriter constitutae verae & necessariae Doctrinae forma: modus aliquis esse disputationum & certaminum inter eisdem confessionis socios debeat.”

\(^{106}\) *Orationes*, 477. “Sapientissimi & summi Ecclesiae Doctores haud dubie fuerunt Filiius Dei, & post hunc Moses, praeceptor & Dux totius chori prophetici, & fons seu Oceanus, ut eum Theodoretus appelat, universae Theologiae, ex quo fluvii omnes & maria omnia concionum Propheticarum, Christi & Apostolorum emanarunt.”
through other disputations aimed at clarifying theology resting on biblical foundations. The approach echoes his mentor Melanchthon who once argued for a responsible return of Aristotle to the university curriculum as a necessary tool for theology, a tool that would not be allowed to get out of hand as it had in the days of the Scholastics. As seen throughout the *Regulae* Chytraeus encourages disputation as a necessary tool for sharpening the mind and judgment, for moral formation, and giving the student practice in extemporaneous thinking and speaking. Such reasons speak to both his presuppositions about theological truth as well as the purpose of the exercise, imploring the disputants to behave modestly and in a friendly manner, in order to facilitate a peaceful discussion and not devolve into shouting matches. Because of his confidence and commitment to the Christian Lutheran message, Chytraeus expects that the disputant arguing on the side of truth must win, not the loudest or most linguistically gifted but the one with the right position. The defeated party acts graciously by thanking God for the display of truth that took place. A cynic might wonder if this would work, but Chytraeus believes that the one vanquished in dispute will nevertheless be thankful, convinced by the message that had just won the day.

Commenting on the current state of affairs in the church, Chytraeus praises those who take up dispute in the public forum for Christian doctrine saying that it is better to take up a praiseworthy battle than to remain in peace yet separated from God. On the other hand he says

---

107 *Orations*, 479–80. “Ita non reprehendo disputationes, seu collationes sententiarum et argumentorum, quas de rebus bonis et vitae utilibus, vel viri docti, veritati et sibi mutuo amici inter sese: vel adolescentes studiosi cum Praeceptoribus aut aequalibus suis in scholis amanter et placide inquirendae et illustrandae veritatis causa instituunt: sed plurimum acuendis ingenii et formandis judiciis, et alendae extemporali facundiae, imo etiam humanitati morum, et comitati in alloquendis, et respondingo in omni vita prodesse judico ... et amicae, candidae, quietae, modestae, et omnis malevolentiae, odii et contumeliarum expertes sint, et tranquillis animis et placido amicoque velut familiari colloquio, non rixis ac contentionibus virulenter disceptantes veritatem vestigent vel illustren, et se mutuo auditores de rebus utilibus doceant, et postquam ostensam veritatem gratias agant, eamque ad usum in aliis docendis et juvandis in communi vita transferant.”

that the sorrowful and depressing examples of disputes currently going on in the church produce not only doubt concerning true doctrine, but also extinguish all zeal for piety, gentleness and love. Having seen examples of the contests among the disputants that have served only to destroy both parties from with, he calls them the Cadmean victories of the church. That is, one gains the victory but brings ruin on oneself—to win the battle but lose the war. Clearly Chytraeus understands the danger of a tool out of control. The question is whether he can avoid that happening he cannot really know. He can only warn and hope that those who will use who heed his words can hold the line.

Chytraeus’ Confession of Doctrine

It is in the context of his lament over the current state of affairs in the church that Chytraeus addresses several points of doctrine, the final section of the oration. His stance over the points of doctrine in the oration reflect his state of mind at the time as he surveys the landscape of the Lutheran church both as a theologian, and educator, responsible for the next generation of Lutheran theologians. He remarks that for the past twenty years since the Colloquy of Worms (1557), wounds have been torn open by disputants within the church. He claims he himself has “desired truth and peace” and has offered his own judgments with modesty and

Melius est enim laudabile bellum quam pax a Deo separans.”

109 Orationes, 481. “Hanc tristem et lugubrem Ecclesiarum nostrarum speciem intestinae dissensiones et disputationes, seu praelia docentium de articulis fidei nostrae Cadmea, nobis pepererunt, quae non solum de doctrinae veritate et certitudine dubitationes in multorum infirmorum et profanorum mentibus perniciosas excitant et permiscent: verum etiam omne studium Christianae pietatis, mansuetudinis et charitatis extinxerunt.”

110 Students of Melanchthon on both sides of the theological issues dividing the Lutheran church made use of his educational approach, remaining Melanchthonian even in the midst of struggles concerning Melanchthon and his theological legacy. See Robert Kolb, “Philipp’s Foes, but Followers Nonetheless: Late Humanism among the Gnesio-Lutherans,” in The Harvest of Humanism in Central Europe: Essays in Honor of Lewis W. Spitz ed by Manfred P. Fleischer, (St. Louis: Concordia, 1992), 159–78.
without acerbity, leaving the uncertain questions for the “Academy of eternal life.” The points of doctrine that Chytraeus then presents call to mind some of the points of disagreement, especially in the Palatinate with its trend toward Calvinism, while pointing to the Augsburg Confession, a document that he as well as others had pressed for as a basis for unity across the empire.

The Trinity

Turning from comments on theology in general to specific topics or doctrines, Chytraeus opens with a discussion of the Trinity. It is a reasonable, obvious, and appropriate place to start because it is understood as fundamental for true Christian piety and doctrine and attested to by all the Symbols of the Church. But even more it is crucial to understand this correctly because it has received the wrong kind of attention. Though he does not use the terms “hidden” and “revealed God” per se, Chytraeus explains that the revealed God [verbo per Christum tradito] ought be approached in piety and adoration and then embraced, and he laments that the hidden God has instead so often been the subject of idle speculation and careful investigation. As such, academic approaches to the doctrine showcase precisely the wrong kind of attitude, not the piety

---

111 Orationes, 482. “Hoc animo et voluntate in praesentibus Ecclesiarum dissidiis totoj viginti annos, quibus post colloquium Wromatieni illa recrudescentia maxime viguerunt, constitutus sui. Veritatem et pacem dilexi. Interrogatus quae vera esse judicavi, modesta et sine ulla acerbitate professum. Incerta et expresso verbo Dei non definita in aeternae vitae Academi ...”

112 Orationes, “Ac ut seriem articulorum in communi Ecclesiarum nostrarum confessione Augustana praescriptam sequeur.” For the function of the Lutheran confessional documents in establishing both doctrinal and political unity, especially after the Peace of Augsburg (1555), see Charles Arand et al., The Lutheran Confessions: History and Theology of the Book of Concord (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2012), 259.

that should be found in the schools. Chytraeus contends that the doctrine should underlie our thinking about the true fear of God, His judgment and wrath against sin, and our faith in His goodness and mercy on account of Christ are basic and ought to underscore his recreative work, emphasizing the character of our new lives in Christ, with minds illuminated to conform to God as the archetype of wisdom, goodness, righteousness, truth and holiness. In this, especially with respect to a pious regard for Scripture as the basis for doctrine, Chytraeus suggests that our approach to the doctrine of the Trinity ought to be the model by which other questions are undertaken. The opposite is the approach of the scholastics who, Chytraeus says, have occupied themselves with the hidden questions of the Divine essence and the intractability of the three persons. Chytraeus says these questions have no place in the schools as they are nothing more than fruitless quests and vain speculations that profane the mind rather than nourish piety.

**Original Sin**

Chytraeus’ description of original sin is directed entirely at the controversy that arose when the Gnesio-Lutherans, particularly Matthias Flacius, argued that for fallen man sin has become

---

114 *Orations*, 483–84. “De unitate essentiae & tribus personis Diuinitatis ὁμοουσίως simpliciter in testimonis verbi divini & inde extractis Symbolis, Apostolico, Niceno & Athanasii acquiscendum esse: & unum solum verum Deum, sapietem, bonum, veracem, iustum, omnipotentem, misericordem, fontem omnium bonorum, aeterum Patrem, Filium & Spiritum sanctum, non otiosis speculationibus tantum & argutiis ac disputationibus, audaci curiositate essentiam ipsius, quae adorandae potius, quam serupulosius disquirenda est, excutientibus: sed in operum ipsius admirandorum contemplacione, & verbo per Christam tradito, ita cognoscendum esse sentio: ut verus timor justi judicii & irae Dei adversus nostra peccata; & vera fides seu fiducia misericordiae & bonitatis divinae propter Filium Mediaterum promissae & quotidianis ac infinitis erga nos beneficiis cumulate effusae; ardens invocatio ad verum Deum Ecclesiae patefactum in nomine Christi directa, & praestentis & aeterne vitae bona ab ipso petens ac expectans, & ipsi soli cum laude & gratiarum actione accepta referens; denique totius vitae obedientia, & conformitas cum Dei archetypsi sapientia, bonitate, justitia, veritate, & sanctitate, in nostris animis accendatur, & in & omnis negotiis & periculos exercetur & confirmetur. Haec vera & practica Dei notitia, ad verae pietatis adsectus & motus sanctos ac Deo conformes, in animis accendendos utilis & fructuosa, praecipue a nobis expetatur & colatur.”

115 *Orations*, 484. “... nam inanes illae argutiae & questiones de Dei essentia & tribus personis inextricabiles sine modo in scholis agitatae: prophanitatem mentium potius, quam veram pietatem alunt, & tamen non explicant arcana naturam Dei.”
part of human nature. This is the position Flacius defended after being trapped in a debate by Victor Strigel into stating that sin is not accidental, but substantial to human nature. The original statement was a problem, but it was made worse when in later debates he stood by this error. Some Gnesio-Lutherans saw his definition as helpful because it emphasized God’s work in conversion and did not allow leave any possibility for synergistic interpretations. By this point there had been plenty of other voices elsewhere in the Reformation in general, arguing other views more generous to human ability. However, even with good intentions, the Flacian position taken up by later theologians presented theological problems that Chytraeus addresses here. Chytraeus rejects the use of Aristotelian terminology here and instead defines original sin as the depraved, perverse, and corrupt condition of our nature that merits the wrath of God and ought to be truly deplored, lest it rules our lives and bears the fruit of contention and scandal. Because this is a theological problem, Chytraeus argues against the use of reason in solving the problem, pointing out that the substance of sin itself is not able to be understood (because of sins affect on reason). The very subject, therefore, lends to odious debate and Chytraeus contends that trying to argue that original sin is substance rather than what follows from a depraved nature, thus denying a difference between sin and a corrupt nature is “manifest insanity.” Chytraeus illustrates the absurdity of the argument by pointing out that such a position makes God, the creator of man’s nature, the creator of sin. Neither does such a position make proper sense of the sacraments:

Christ’s blood was shed to redeem our nature, not sin, and baptism is meant to renew our nature, not sin, which it washes away. The Holy Spirit sanctifies our nature, in order that we may serve God in righteousness and holiness, but the Spirit does not sanctify sin. Finally, since human nature has been given into sin but is not sin, it can be redeemed when God’s kingdom comes.  

Chytraeus may admire Aristotle when it comes to learning and using dialectic, but it is no blind admiration, and, given the discussion here, it clearly has its limits.

Christ

Chytraeus’ discussion looks at a short sampling of errors common to Christology dealing with the two natures in the one person Jesus Christ. Christology was another matter significant for the Palatinate at the time, especially in the context of the Lord’s Supper. While he clarifies definitions and addresses some of the chief errors, his intention is to direct the reader away from arguments that arise from such questions and instead to focus on Christ’s promise of forgiveness and salvation, reflecting the “for you” emphasis of Luther. Chytraeus begins by affirming the distinction between the two natures of Christ in one person. The divine and human nature remain distinct but united in one person of Christ. The human nature is not equal with the divine, nor is

---

117 *Orationes*, 484–85. “Peccatum originis, quo natura nostra extreme deprauata, peruersa & corrupta, & rea irae Dei ac aeternae damnationis facta est, gemitibus veris & ardentibus deplorare potius & emendare deberemus, ne regnaret in mortali corpore nostro, & pestiferos odiorum, contentionum & tristium scadalorum fructus pareret; quam de substantia peccati, quod a natura corrupta ne cogitatione quidem distinguo possit, disputaret & virulentissimis odio ac scandalis peccata peccatis cumulare ... Manifesta autem insania est contendere peccatum Originis substantiam, sue naturam subsistentem, non Accidens naturae vitium ac deprauationem esse: & discrimen Peccati ac nature corruptae negare. Cum Deus etiam post lapsum conditor sit naturae, non peccati. Deus odit, abiicit & delet peccatum, non naturam a se creatam, cuius ad se conversae propter filium miseretur, eamque vita & salute aeterna donat. Filius Dei & Mariae virginis precioso sanguine nostram naturam, non peccatum redemit. Nostra natura in Baptismo regeneratur & renouatur, non peccatum quod expurgatur. Spiritus Sanctus nostram naturam sanctificat, non peccatum, ut Deo in vera justitia & sanctitate serviamus. Nostra natura abolito peccato, erit, & resurget, non peccatum. Denique nostra natura mundata ab omni peccato, non peccatum, ingredietur regnum Dei & salvabitur.”

118 For an introduction to Luther’s emphasis with regard to the person and work of Christ see Robert Rosin, “Reformation Christology: Some Luther Starting Points,” *Concordia Theological Quarterly* 71:2 (Apr. 2007): 147–67.
it absorbed or deleted. He rejects that one nature has been subsumed into another as the Eutychians of old believed. Instead, he asserts that the personal union is none other than the miraculous and ineffable union of the two natures in the hypostasis or person of the Son of God, whereby the logos of God assumed a human nature in the womb of the Virgin Mary. This constitutes one person in Christ. Chytraeus continues by saying that on account of the closeness of the union, those actions appropriate to either nature can be ascribed to whole person of Christ \([communicatio Idiomatum]\). A true union means full active participation of both natures, doing things appropriate to the human or divine in the one whole person.

Chytraeus says that even though the scholastics attribute the names and corresponding duties of mediator, priest, redeemer, and king to the human nature, nevertheless our redemption is accomplished because of the union of the two natures. Without that, those roles would be hollow and ineffective. He contends that precisely how the powers and attributes of the natures are shared in the person is mystery that we will not understand in this lifetime, but it will be clear

\(119\) It was common for the reformers to refer to those theologians they disagreed with by the ancient heretic their teaching resembled (however close that actually was). Avoiding names and exaggerating error allowed the offending party to “save face” and amend their error if they wished. But here such a reference also must be understood in light of Chytraeus’ view of heresy and church history. He followed Melanchthon in teaching that the same heresies would be repeated by different individuals or groups in different times, and one ought to expect that there would be modern-day “Eutychians,” or “Nestorians,” or “Arians.”

\(120\) \textit{Orationes}, 485. “DE PERSONA CHRISTI & mirando duarum naturarum foedere semper ita senssi & sentio, perpetuum discrimen diuinae & aeternae naturae conditricis, & humanae naturae creatae, sed per unionem personalem, & exaltationem ad dextram Dei, super omnes angelos & homines euectae, nec tamen cum diuina natura exaequate, multo minus a diuina absorptae & deleatae, seruandum esse. Nec sciens & volens, Eutychianis, vel aliurum sectarum delirii, verae Ecclesiae iudicio damnatis, patrocinari unquam velim. Unioem personalem nunquam definivi aliter, quam mirandum & ineffabilem copulationem durarum naturarum in Filii Dei hypostasi factam, ita ut secunda Persona divinitatis, λόγος θεοῦ & natura humana in utero Mariae Virginis assumpta unam tantum personam seu unum individuum Christum constituant, propter quam unionem & communione durarum naturarum arcissimam, proprietates etiam omnes & actiones, quae alteri tantum naturae originaliter congruent, toti personae Christi in concreto vere & re ipsa communicentur, neque enim alia quam realis communicatio Idiomatum, quae quidem vera sit, in persona Christi esse potest.”

\(121\) \textit{Orationes}, 486. “Mediatoris vero, Sacerdotis, Redemptoris, & Regis appellationes & officia, etsi humanae tantum naturae Scholastici quidam tribuunt: tamen cum Redemptionis nostrae causa copulatio durarum naturarum facta sit.”
and thoroughly understood in the eternal academy. Meanwhile, the Scriptures testify that not only finite adornments and created gifts, but also the resurrection, freedom from sin and death, omnipotence, and the power to judge the living and the dead have all been given to the person of Christ. Chytraeus explains that while these powers are truly in the person of Christ, they are not understood as changing or replacing the essence of his nature like wine or oil may be poured from one vessel into another or imparting power to his human nature. Rather, Chytraeus argues the divine majesty communicates its attributes within the person of Christ. His divine nature is able to act freely in his person, just as fire can communicate its properties of heat and light to iron.\textsuperscript{122} The key for Chytraeus is that Christ is present according to both natures where he promises [\textit{ubicunque se verbo suo praesentem fore promisit}]. The 1563 Heidelberg Catechism, the position he is refuting here, had stated that “since divinity is incomprehensible and everywhere present, it must follow that the divinity is indeed beyond the bounds of the humanity which it has assumed.”\textsuperscript{123} Chytraeus says that Christ, our Lord and Redeemer, Emanuel has promised to be fully present not only according to his divine nature but also according to his human nature wherever His Word is preached, and so we ought not to doubt this or take away his glory and power.\textsuperscript{124} But he leaves it at this, condemning those who would understand ubiquity to

\textsuperscript{122} {\textit{Orationes}}, 486. “Majestatem & gloriam Humanae Christi naturae in unitatem personae a Filio Dei assumptae, & ad dextram Dei Patris omnipotentis supra omne nomen, quod nominari potest, exaltatae, in aeterna Academia penitus perspiciemus. Interea quae expressis sacrae Scripturae testimoniiis Coloss. 2. Ephes. 1.4. Joh. 5.6. 3,13. 17. Matth. 11, 28. homini Christo tribuantur, non tantum dona creata, & ornamenta finita, verum etiam vitam vivificantem seu liberantem a peccato & morte, omniscientiam seu omnes thesauros sapientiae & scientiae, omnipotentiam, potestatem judicandi vivos & mortuos & c. non verbaliter tantum & titulotenus, sed vere ac realiter ipsa data & communicata esse, ita ut vera ea IN SE, tametsi non EX SE habeat, fīrmissime credamus, non quod assumptae naturae essentiales proprietates factae sint, vel quod secundum se aut subjective humanitas seorsim a λόγо ἡ Ἰλλα possideat, (ut si vinum aut oleum e uno vase in aliud transfusum sit), sed ex unita personaliter divinitate τοῦ λόγου quae ex se sola vivificatrix omnipotens & omniscia est, verum in assumpta Humanitate tota lucet, & in ea ac per eam libere efficac est, ut ferrum ignorant calorem & vim lucendi & urendi, vere & re ipsa communicatam in se, sed non ex se possidet, nam hac similitudine totam antiquitatem orthodoxam unanimiter usam esse scimus.

\textsuperscript{123} See Lyle D. Bierma, \textit{An Introduction to Heidelberg Catechism} (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 2005).

\textsuperscript{124} {\textit{Orationes}}, 487. “Quod autem de Vbiquitate quaecitur; Dominum & redemptorem nostrum Iesum
mean that the body of Christ is diffused everywhere apart from His Word of promise.\textsuperscript{125} Such a misunderstanding had occurred on the Palatinate in the 1560s, when Martin Brenz and Jacob Andrea were accused at the Maulbronn Colloquy of being ubiquitistic for their arguments about Christ’s omnipresence.\textsuperscript{126}

Chytraeus concludes this discussion with another warning against curious or speculative disputations. That kind of attention on Christ misses the mark and is really an attempt to tout the skills of the debater rather than attempts to lay out theology for one’s spiritual welfare. Chytraeus states that it is better rather to focus our attention on the immense goodness of God, who gave his Son to redeem his servants. Better than curiosity is the recognition of the gifts of God’s Son with a grateful heart, of his suffering on our behalf and to glorify God with pious praise and a life of total obedience.\textsuperscript{127}

\textbf{Justification}

The two topics that follow on Christology are the Gospel and Justification—who Christ is leads to what he does. Chytraeus identifies what he has about these two as coming from one of Melanchthon’s last documents, composed in the twilight of his life, the \textit{Responsiones ad Christum, Emanuelem, non modo diuinitate sua, verum etiam secundum humanam naturam vere praeuentem adesse, ubicunque se verbo suo praeuentem fore promisit, non dubitemus, nec debitam Christo Veritatis & omnipotentiae gloriam auferamus.”}

\textsuperscript{125} \textit{Orationes}, 487. “Ubiquitatem vero illam prodigiosam, qua corpus Christi eodem modo, quo divinitas immensa & infinta, ratione suae essentiae aut propritatis essentialiter communicatae ubique diffusum, & divinitati prosus exaequatum esse fingitur, toto pectore damnemus & execremur.”

\textsuperscript{126} See Charles Arand et al. \textit{The Lutheran Confessions}, 240.

\textsuperscript{127} Ibid. 487. “Verum curiosioribus disputationsibus in futurae vitae scholam rejectis, multo rectius & melius est, immensam erga nos bonitatem & misericordiam Dei, qui Filium dedit, ut servos redimeret, & prae desiderio & amore hominis, non solum sua, verum etim se ipsum impendit, reverenter & attente considerare: & beneficia Filii Dei Emanuelis & Redemptoris nostris grato corde agnoscere, & fide amplecti & in doloribus ac aerumnis omnibus cogitatione hujus mirandi & arctissimi foederis, quod cum natura nostra Filius Dei fecit, se erigere & consolari, & tanto beneficio & honore laetari & exultare, & Deum piis laudibus & totius vitae obedientia celebrare.”
Like Melanchthon, Chytraeus is concerned with a definition that takes into account both Divine and human responsibility in justification. Neither makes God the author of sin, nor does this allow a person to initiate or participate in one’s justification by virtue of one’s own powers or merit. Also like Melanchthon and Luther, Chytraeus understands conversion in two senses. It refers to justification on the one hand, but the term is also applied to regeneration, the continuous regeneration of the believer. In the discussion of justification Chytraeus is clear, stating that good works are excluded from the efficient, and formal causes of our justification before God. Does this mean good works are unnecessary? By no means, says Chytraeus, pointing out that such language is retained against antinomianism (those who saw no need for law at all in the life of a still sinful believer) and that “new obedience” refers to the whole restored “reason” of man that is obedient to God. In that case, “necessary” means “logically or inevitably follows.” In this case, new obedience is to be discussed in conjunction with regeneration following conversion. It is not a cause of conversion, and in that case, works are not necessary, that is, not required as some contributing factor or ingredient to conversion and so to salvation. Finally, against the Osiandrian controversy, Chytraeus speaks of the Holy Spirit renewing the image of God in the Christian in the context of new obedience, not conversion. This is what the Lutherans confessed in explaining the Third Article of the

---


130 Orationes, 487–88. “A IVSTIFICATIONI nostrae coram Deo causa efficiente, materiali & formali, nostra bona opera penitus exclusenda esse: & tamen, particularus exclusiius, in conversione, nec dolorem de peccato, nec petitionem veniae, nec bonum propositum, & caeteras virtutes sine interuallo temporis sequentes prohiberi aut excipi, haud dubie verum est. Etsi enim non utamur his verbis, Bona opera sunt necessaria ad Salutem, quia hac additione AD SALVTEM intelligitur Meritum; tamen hanc propositionem adfirmo veram esse, & contra Antinomos constanter retinendam esse; Nouae obedientiae Inchoationem necessariam esse, quia hic ordo diuinus & immutabilis est, ut creatura rationalis Deo obiediat. Et loquor de Obedientia sequente Conuersionem seu regenerationem, Vbi &
Apostle’s Creed, namely, that one cannot come to faith in Christ by one’s own reason or strength (doing works), but the Spirit converts and preserves in faith. It’s not a new theological position that Chytraeus has, but then the continuing problem is not new either, and the answer, says Chytraeus, remains the same.

**The Gospel**

Chytraeus’ comments here show that he was aware of the controversy that surrounded Melanchthon’s narrow and broad definitions of the Gospel. Broadly defined or bound together under the name of the Gospel [*Evangelium*] are teachings of penance and eternal promise. This usage of the word appears both in the Symbols and was a definition that had been employed by the Apostles in certain parts of Scripture. But although the law has been subsumed under the general and broader heading of Gospel, or Good News, in the sense that it includes the message of repentance and forgiveness of sins together—a narrower sense—it is to be distinguished from the Gospel. Chytraeus states that according this narrow sense, the Gospel is exclusively the promise of grace and remission of sin according to the gifts of Christ. Next, he distinguishes Law and Gospel, the two categories that mark all Scripture. He illustrates this with a series of comparisons between the functions and powers of both, showing that the purpose of the Law is to show sin and the Gospel displays grace. The Law shows death and the Gospel is the remedy. The Law is the servant of death and the Gospel life and peace, so the power of the Law is death, while the power of the Gospel is life.131

---

131 *Orationes*, 488. “De Evangelii definitione etiam, in ipsius Philippi, paucis ante mortem dibus, publice edita declaratione adquiesco. Complector in definitione, Evangelii nomine, dontrinam poentitentiae & aeternae propter causae & effectus consensum, necessaria est inchoatio obedientiae iuxta dictum: Qui spiritu Dei ducentur, hi sunt filii Dei, id est, tales morus ascendit Spiritus sanctus, qualis est ipse, & datur ut renouetur in nobis Imago Dei. Consulto enim in hoc articulo verba preceptoris Philippi retineo quibus sententiam suam biennio ante mortem ipse explicant.”
Lord’s Supper

Chytraeus’ discussion of the Lord’s Supper condemns both the Roman Catholic and sectarian positions. At the heart of his argument is his insistence that the Lutheran position is founded on the words of Scripture alone, a case again of not speculating in logic but explicating or restating texts. Chytraeus’ discussion here echoes his contribution to the drafting of Article VII (Lord’s Supper) of the Formula of Concord. His summary of the sacrament’s proper use and benefits is unambiguous: the Lord’s Supper is the body and blood of Christ given unto death for the forgiveness of sin that applies to the faithful, offering the promise of grace and remission of sin, and the confirmation and strengthening of faith. Like branches grafted to the vine, Chytraeus states that Christ protects, vivifies and makes fruitful. This plain restatement of biblical material is more useful for teaching than the various curious and profane questions that have taken up time in disputation elsewhere. Chytraeus does not speak about the presence of Christ in the sacrament in ambiguous terms. Such an approach has caused numerous problems. He refers simply to the words of Christ. The bread and the wine are the “His true and substantial


133 Orationes, 488–89. “COENAM DOMINI instituit Christus, ut hoc ritu ονάμνησιν άντον, Recordationem sui erga nos Amoris immensi, & beneficiorum, quae assumptione nostrae naturae, & corpore suo pro nobis in mortem dato, & sanguine suo in remissionem peccatorum nostrorum pro nobis effuso, Ecclesiae promervit, memoriam fidelem in nobis excitet, alat & augeat, & promotionem Gratiae seu Remissionis peccatorum singulis credentibus applicet; & fidem confirmet; & nos sibi tanquam membra in unum cum ipso corpus coalescentia copulet, ac, ut palmites viti verae insertos, seruet, viuiscet ac foecundet ...”

body given for us in death and the true and natural blood poured for the forgiveness of our sins.”

He goes on to urge that we heed the words spoken by the Lord with firm and unfailing faith just as is confessed in the Augsburg Confession and Apology, the Wittenberg Concord, the Schmalkald Articles, and “frequent synods.” He then lists a number of Roman Catholic practices that the Lutherans rejected such as transubstantiation, the spectacle of the Corpus Christi celebration, other forms of adoration outside the use instituted by Scripture, and idolatry and parricide. He also specifically rejects what he calls the opposite view of the Calvinists [alterum scopulum], that Christ is not physically present at all, but rather that the body and blood of Christ are as far from bread and wine as heaven is from earth, and that the communicant is partaking in the meal in faith. Chytraeus reiterates that the reason and foundation of Christ’s presence in the sacrament is established by his Word alone, not by the faith or unbelief of the participant. “For you for the forgiveness of sins,” meant much to Luther, and it does as well for Chytraeus.

135 Orationes, 489. “DIXIT DOMINUS & Servator noster Iesus Christus, Sapiens, verax & omnipotens: Hoc quod in coena ipsius in his terris ore sumentes Panem & Calicem benedictum manducamus & bibimus, esse verum & substantiale corpus suum pro nobis in mortem datum, & verum ac naturalem sanguinem suum pro nostris peccatis effusum.”

136 It ought to be noted however that language employed by Melanchthon in articulating the Lord’s Supper in the Wittenberg Concord was acceptable to Martin Bucer and the southern delegates. One important example was the abandonment of Luther’s phrase “godless” for Melanchthon’s “unworthy” with regard to those who partake in the Supper leaving the question open as to how the supper is received without faith. See Arand et al. The Lutheran Confessions, 112, 151–52, 169–70, 231–32. Chytraeus clearly emphasizes in his explanation that the true body and blood are received not on the basis of the faith of the participant but on the basis of God’s Word.

137 Orationes, 489–90. “Huic Domino dicenti, firma & indubitata fide pareamus, & in confessionibus de hoc articulo editis a patribus & praeceptoribus nostris, in Augustana confessione & Apologia, & Concordiae Formula anno 1536. Witebergae constitura, & Smalcaldicis articulis sequenti anno in frequenti Theologorum Synodo subscriptis, adquiescamus, & pontificia transubstantiatione, inclusione, circumgestatione, adoratione extra usum institutum: & alis abusibus, Idolis & patricidiis constanter reactis & damnatis: alterum etiam scopulum prudenter vitemus, ne tanto incredulo, quanto altissimi coeli a terris distant, substantiam corporis & sanguinis Christi a pane & calice coenae Domini in his terris abesse contendamus, nec in Fide aut dignitate sumentis, sed sola Christi ordinatione & vero institutionis, seu DIXIT DOMINUS, causam & fundamentum praesentiae corporis & sanguinis Christi in Eucharistia collocemus...”
Freedom of the Will

Chytraeus also had contributed to the drafting of Article II of the Formula of Concord on the Freedom of the Will making this an especially familiar topic. Here he presents the Lutheran position, and clarifies the terminology (Melanchthon’s in particular) on justification.

Melanchthon’s description of the role of the human will in conversion had led to fierce disputes. Chytraeus explains that what was meant was that the human will is not the efficient cause of in conversion causing (effecting) a coming to faith, but rather the will is the subject that is converted [subiectum convertendum esse]. Chytraeus’ intention, like Melanchthon’s, was to both preserve the integrity of the human and to explain how God alone is responsible for conversion. The human mind and will are captive until converted and regenerated by God. It has no power on its own, even in part, to admit the truth [assentiendi] of the Gospel. While the will rejects, there is no conversion. At the same time a will cannot be coerced to admit the Gospel. Rather, the will is changed when word of Gospel is heard and understood. This is not something the will is capable of doing on its own but is the work of the Holy Spirit. Chytraeus acknowledges the controversy present in the language that appears in the Loci, and is aware that some find it reprehensible, but believes Melanchthon’s explanation to be useful because it is useful for

---


139 Orationes, 490. “De libero arbitrio, constat accuratius considerata verbi divini testimonia, omnem bene agendi vim, in ipsis quae sunt Spiritus Dei, adimere menti & voluntati nonden a Deo conversae & regenerari ceptae, & voluntatem hominis, non causam efficientem primae conversioinis, sed subiectum convertendum esse. Nec ullam vim & efficaciam assentiendi Euangelio, & bene coram Deo agendi, totalia vel partialem, ac ne nutum quidem, tribuendum esse voluntati ψυχής, priusquam a Deo ipso ad Deum conversa sanari ceperit.”

140 Orationes, 490. “Certum est autem, in conversione, voluntatem adventiri Euangelio, & non repugnare oportere, & donec omnia repugnans voluntas, nullam fieri conversionem: & cum assentitio voluntas, non inuita & coacta sed velentem assentiri. Sed haec ipsa sacultas applicandi se ad gratiam, seu adventitio Euangelio, non ex viribus voluntatis ψυχής, sed ab efficacia Spiritus sancti per verbum auditum & cogitationem mentes trahendis existit.
discussing the new life of the repentant sinner. Certainly Melanchthon’s discussion of Word, Spirit and will in later editions of his Loci Communes raised questions for some, but Chytraeus points out that Luther and Melanchthon were in agreement on it. Melanchthon’s language is seen as a look at how life works or how it appears when we look at it and Chytraeus echoes it. While again avoiding Aristotelian terminology, Chytraeus does state that in the life of the faithful there are three causes underlying any good work, the Holy Spirit, the Word, and the converted will, operating all together [tres causas concurrentes recte & pie conjungi]. After liberated from its servitude to sin and the devil the will is not idle, but now serves God, simultaneously working and being drawn by the Holy Spirit.141

Predestination

Chytraeus approaches the doctrine of predestination as consolation, while refusing to use it as a platform for exploring the arcane questions of theology the “why some but not others” quagmire. He instead centers the discussion squarely on the Gospel “which reveals eternal predestination, or the will of God concerning salvation ... not on account of our works or merit, but the good grace and mercy of God, that on account of Christ the elect were decided before the creation of the world, all who were called by the ministry of the Gospel and sacraments to believe in Christ were preserved by this faith from death.”142

141 Orationes, 490–91. “Et in hanc sententiam, formas loquendi in locis Theologicis, quas reprehendunt aliqui, ab aliis etiam Lutheri & Philippi concordiam in hoc articulo retineti cupientibus explicari video. Quod vero ad poenitentiam, toto tempore vitae fidelium assidue durantem, & quotidiana fidei & novae obiedientiae exercitia, in renatis ex aqua & spiritu attinet: non dubium est, tres causas concurrentes in omnium virtutum & bonorum operum effectione, Spiritum Sanctum, verbum & voluntatem conversam recte & pie conjungi. Ideo enim convertitur voluntas, & a servitute peccati & diaboli liberatur, non ut ignavum & iners otium agat, sed ut Deo in iustitia & sanctitate serviat, & Spiritu Dei sancto acta, simul agat & agens adjuvetur.”

142 Orationes, 491. “DE PRAEDESTINATIONE nostri ad vitam aeternam, non ex rationis nostrae imaginationibus, nec ex lege, sed ex solo Euangelio Christi, quod aeternae praedestinationis seu voluntatis Dei de saluandis, patefactio est, statuamus, non propter opera aut merita nostra, sed gratuita dei bonitate & misericordia, propter Christum electos esse ad vitam aeternam ante mundi constitutionem, omnes, qui per ministerium Euangeli
Chytraeus describes the boundaries of the group of elect as those who have been brought to faith first in baptism and then by hearing and learning the Gospel and being filled with faith. In the end, no one is among the company of the elect who has not heard the call. In true faith the elect hold the course of piety and as such should not doubt their predestination. It is the will of God concerning predestination and eternal salvation that all see the Son and believe in Him not perish but have eternal life.\textsuperscript{143}

The signs of election are certain. Here also Chytraeus’ language is inclusive and comforting, pointing outside of internal feelings of assurance or fear to promises of Christ in three ways. First, Chytraeus reminds that God desires all and sent His Son so that they might believe in Him and have eternal life (John 3:16). Second, the sacraments of Baptism and the Lord’s Supper also apply the promise of grace and eternal salvation. Those who receive them while believing the promises should know that God delivers those promises. Finally, Chytraeus points out passages in Scripture that show that the faith of the believer is also a sign of election. He discusses two ways this faith is evident. First is through self-examination as Paul writes in 2 Cor. 13:5 “examine yourselves to see whether you are in faith.” Second, faith and so being God’s own (elect) is manifest through ardent prayer as Paul writes in Rom 10:13, “all who call on the name of the Lord will be saved.” This faith is a sign and seal of election that God both confirms and preserves in order that we persevere as he has promised in Phil 1:6, 1 Cor 10:13, John 10, Luke 22 and John 17. Chytraeus concludes the list with the words of Paul in Romans 8:38–39

\textsuperscript{143} Orationes, 491. “Nusquam enim nisi in coetu vocatorum, electi imaginandi sunt. Et qui coetui vocatorum per baptismum inserti, doctrinam Euangelii audiant, discunt, fide amplectuntur, & verae fidei ac pietatis cursum constater tenent, hi se ad vitam aeternam praedestinatos esse, nihil dubitent.
that nothing can separate us from the love of God in Christ.\textsuperscript{144}

Chytraeus has no patience for the curiosities that may arise in discussions of this subject. Because Predestination is meant to be a doctrine of comfort for the believer, care must be taken lest it becomes the subject of debate or a springboard for inquiry. Chytraeus rejects Stoic-like disputations about the fatalistic necessity of some being saved and others damned because such fatalism leads people to a kind of Epicurean profanity on the one hand and desperation on the other.\textsuperscript{145} Rather Christians are to trust what God has revealed in His Word that commands to repent, believe the Gospel, and keep faith and good conscience and in that faith persevere, affirming the gift of eternal life.\textsuperscript{146} The approach is simple, although the temptations to range widely are great. Here, as has been seen so often before, the counsel Chytraeus offers is the same: avoid becoming lost in what is not said or known, and keep eyes, minds, and hearts fixed


\textsuperscript{145} Chytraeus and “necessitas” has been treated by Robert Kolb in “Divine Determination and Human Responsibility: David Chytraeus (1531–1600),” in Day, et al., \textit{Lord Jesus Christ}, 221–38. Kolb shows Chytraeus care in tempering definitions of divine necessity so as not to invite doubt and dread concerning the question of salvation.

\textsuperscript{146} \textit{Orationes}, 491–92. “Ita doctrinam de praedestinatione, ad exercitia fidei & invocationis & consolationem salutarem transferamus, praecedentes penitus, exemplo Pauli, quaestiones curiosas, cur deus tantam multitudinem ethicorum, sapientia & virtute praestantium, tot seculis ad salutem aeternam non vocarit? Cur permetter hominem labi? Cur non omnes qui credere incipient, in vera fide conservet: 7c. reiect etiam Stoici disputationibus, de aeternis Parcarum tabulis, & fatali necessitate salvandorum aut damnandorum, quae vel Epicuream prohantatem vel desperationem mentes aducunt Sed patetacionem volutatis Dei in verbo traditam intueamur, quod poenitentiam agere & credere Evangelio, & retinere fidem ac bonam conscientiam jubet, & in fide usque ad finem perseverantibus, coronam vitae & salutis aeternae certo donatum iri adfirmavit.”
finally on what is given to know and believe. It is what the *Regulae* was compiled to accomplish.

**Conclusion**

To conclude this chapter on Chytraeus’ pedagogical work directly concerned with the subject of theology, it is worth briefly noting some of the more outstanding features of what makes up his approach. First, it ought to be restated that Chytraeus is not so much an innovator as he is an organizer, compiler, and interpreter of Luther and Melanchthon, condensing and harmonizing elements from both reformers. Commenting specifically on *De Studio Theologiae*, the first treatise addressed in this chapter, Robert Preus has noted that it “intends to offer the best that Luther, Melanchthon, and others have said on the subject of theology. As such a summary it is significant in the development of Lutheran prolegomena to theology and dogmatics.”147

Evidence of this is clear not only from the many places where Chytraeus expresses his indebtedness, but especially from the content and tone of this work. From Melanchthon come the organizational principles regarding the study of theology as whole. He also influences the way the distinction between Law and Gospel informs the incorporation of the liberal arts, especially natural philosophy, as ancillaries of theology. From Luther comes the emphasis on the individual Christian’s experience through prayer, meditation, and suffering as the paradigm of all theological study. Combining this “what” and “for you” makes for a powerful, meaningful message. Chytraeus himself emphasizes a pious, practical theology that promotes peace and clarity based on sound method and drawn from Scripture and the confessions. This forms a core for his other theological orations as well. As a pillar of the University of Rostock, Chytraeus

---

emphasizes the practical, lived-out theology. This is the point of the second oration, that theology is not just for theologians, but for all Christians. In fact, he presents the entire endeavour of education as directed specifically for this purpose—to truly know and give glory to God. Learning provides an opportunity to recognize and make use of gifts God gives both to sustain daily life, and recognize his handiwork in creation. Through such purpose comes a way of doing theology that is different from his scholastic predecessors. In the final oration, Chytraeus makes the case for learning and teaching theology in a way that avoids conflict, arguing that when the goal is kept in sight, theology is naturally done in piety and is focused on explicating Scripture and not inane questions, promoting harmony rather than discord, a stance that Chytraeus has been well-known for.
CONCLUSION

I.

We have followed the trails of the *Regulae* down a road that Chytraeus seems to travel not with giant strides in seven-league boots but rather inch by inch. To play off a classical image, Achilles may be swift of foot, but in Zeno's mathematical game, Achilles always trails the tortoise that takes its time and plods on step-by-step. At times our reader needs patience with Chytraeus. But in truth, that approach was not uncommon in that day. Martin Chemnitz could be thorough to a fault as could Chytraeus’ and Chemnitz’ teacher Melanchthon. But consider the context. Medieval methods were still competing for attention. Then a teacher may have Chytraeus’ book and not much more since books were only within the last century becoming more common. The huge libraries and overabundance of today's e-libraries online would have been beyond imagination. So perhaps given that, Chytraeus’ approach is more understandable—a thorough guide to each subject in the curriculum. In a sense, Chytraeus’ (overly thorough) sweep through the curriculum is like the old-fashioned course syllabi from a few generations ago—an inch and a half thick with absolutely everything that the course contained.

The purpose of this dissertation has been to present Chytraeus’ *Regulae Studiorum*, to look at the content and structure and raise the question of what it could reveal about the nature of the relationship between his humanist pedagogy and theology. This conclusion will revisit the

---

1 Further research on Melanchthon’s rhetorical method in particular would be beneficial to understanding how it was appropriated by students such as Chytraeus and Chemnitz.
central features that have characterized his approach in the examination of the *Regulae* provided by the preceding chapters. The starting point for such a review must be what Chytraeus made explicit in Part I, and drove home again virtually every section thereafter: the ultimate purpose of a liberal arts education is the true knowledge and worship of God. This is not limited or dependent upon a particular vocation, be it priestly or secular, but rather is required by all Christians. The source of this faith is not some direct divine revelation, or priestly intervention, but rather it ultimately is the work of the Holy Spirit through the preaching and teaching of the Gospel. The testimony of that has been recorded in the writings of the prophets and apostles which points in faith to establish true belief and trust in the work of Christ concerning the redemption and salvation of those who hear and believe. Chytraeus’ connection between pedagogy and theology is framed by his Lutheran faith and it fuels the entire enterprise.

With such an important purpose given to education, learning has to be shaped and directed in a certain way. Theology criticized by Chytraeus had been dominated by syllogisms and by logic (informed by Aristotle) that essentially created theology. In contrast, Chytraeus championed the liberal arts of Renaissance humanism. He did not abandon logic, but thought dialectic would be tempered and couched by a wide range of the arts. This was the curriculum focus of his schools, with teachers carefully guiding students on how to master those liberal arts and then use them, especially to serve theological study. God works through means—means of grace to save and means of pedagogues and curriculum to serve learning and daily life. Chytraeus believed and taught that learning any and all of the arts would benefit learning Scripture, whether it is by an art that contributes to daily life in order that time may be set aside for theology, or an art that contributes to better understanding the text. All of Chytraeus’ efforts find their ultimate meaning in the mandate to learn and share the Gospel.
Teaching and preaching require skill in both understanding and correctly interpreting Scripture, as well as then in speaking and communicating that follow. Such is the function of his two ends or purposes of education, *cognitio rerum et facultas bene dicendi*, that is, knowing things and then speaking well about them. Throughout the *Regulae*, these twin goals are found directing the course of study and are fundamental to his overall method. The liberal arts components of the curriculum serve the purpose of fulfilling these objectives in order that the Gospel might be taught and understood—grammar and languages, for example, in the “knowing” and grammar again and rhetoric in the “communicating.” And using the liberal arts is not confined just to narrow theological, biblical interests. Other parts of the liberal arts also can be plugged into that two-pronged approach. Those things necessary for daily life are understood to be included under this objective as well, serving to create and maintain an environment suitable for the church to fulfill its duty.

Chytraeus emphasizes that nothing in the liberal arts is really unimportant. The relationships between the four categories of arts that he introduced in Part I of the *Regulae* serve his project as a whole. The inferior arts, especially those found in the fourth category, not only provide a foundation for the course of education as whole by providing the rudimentary learning necessary for more advanced subjects, but they are understood to be interwoven in such as way as to become an integral part of the superior arts. Grammar, rhetoric, and dialectic—the trivium—are anything but trivial, functioning as the means of learning and analysis for all subjects. Part II offered direction on how to study, showing how the role of these three liberal arts at work as students read, listened, composed, and debated. The elements of the commonplace text, Chytraeus’ recommended tool for both analysis, memorization, and genesis of one's own ideas and material, were explained. Nearly every section of Part III illustrated this
in action. The texts of method and summary provided a framework and direction for tackling
commonplaces as a whole, for which reason Chytraeus repeatedly warned to pick only one such
text and reread it until it is memorized, lest the student be thrown off course by trying to navigate
between varied or competing approaches. These norms supplied the commonplaces, orders, and
goals for each subject, acting as touchstones to refer to when reading through the corpus of
literature, the texts of history or poetry offered up by both classic and contemporary sources.

Chytraeus emphasized throughout the *Regulae* the vital relationships existing between and
within the liberal arts. Studying one subject simultaneously means engaging in several others at
the same time, and a conscious awareness of this fact is a crucial part of learning as a whole.
Readings in history may encompass and present a wide variety of other subjects simultaneously,
providing information about ethics and moral philosophy, for example, while also discussing the
natural world. Historical accounts of famous battles, litigations, or other important occasions call
to mind their geographical contexts, and vice-versa. The accounts show what happened, what
was decided, and so the moral lessons learned are nuanced, something that should not be lost on
students. While studying for any subject, the student is expected to use the commonplace method
to analyze the subject, argument, context, and elements of style of the ancient author in order to
build up a repository of material for their own compositions, as well as exercise judgment and
practice virtue. While these examples relate again to the role the trivium played, Chytraeus is
also keen to point out the role of the quadrivium. Arithmetic, geometry, and astronomy (music
comes in his later *Appendix ad Regulae*) awaken the mind to the ratios and proportions between
things as well as teaching logic and sequence, the very fabric of rational thinking. Such
illumination is crucial for the recognition of the syllogism, and orders of arguments that are the
basis for teaching and learning every subject. This is why time and time again Chytraeus warns
II.

Theological presuppositions affect Chytraeus’ pedagogy, and pedagogy is supposed to further theology. So how does his humanist pedagogy impact theology, or, more specifically impact the theology encountered in the *Regulae*? First and foremost, his approach to learning theology at a basic level is the same as for learning any other subject. This holds true for his views on authoritative texts, the use of texts of method and summary, and authorities. But at the same time Chytraeus is obviously aware that theology is not mathematics. Theology, by virtue of working with texts that are divine revelation, claims to show something about God that otherwise would not be known. Even natural law is deepened and expanded in Scripture. Something like mathematics is a natural subject, not elevated by revelation. So as subject matter varies, so also Chytraeus sees (on a deeper level) the rules for study—method—contained in the subject itself rather than impartial and imposed, which was part of the problem with earlier theology with Aristotle’s logic as overlay. The question is, then, does the method of doing theology affect the outcome? This is a more difficult question to answer from the *Regulae* alone. Chytraeus requires that the theologian possess a very wide knowledge base. In short, the theologian must become a generalist, learning every subject, much like how Chytraeus describes the classic orator.

While today with information overload that would have been unimaginable in Chytraeus’ day, even though the Renaissance opened up wider areas of interest and the printing press churned out more titles than the world had ever seen, Chytraeus still comes not long after a time when a scholar could know a great percentage of available knowledge. Today universities have departments never imagined, and then those are also subdivided many times. In Chytraeus’ day there was a preparatory, generalist arts faculty with law, medicine, and theology to follow. Even
if one did not know everything about everything, a student learned how to learn, and a student learned method and so could manage a plunge into some new area. In short, Chytraeus’ call to study widely may be rigorous, but it was not completely impossible.

Chytraeus’ Oratio De Studio Theologiae Recte Inchoando shows the basics of theological study and virtually the entire contents of the Regulae Studiorum find their way into his ten rules. He includes prayer, reading from the sources (Scripture), summaries, dialectics, rhetoric, language study, commentaries, history, philosophy (natural and moral), and finally affliction. His recommendations for the task of learning theology, as noted, are remarkably similar in this oration to those given for learning the other arts in Regulae Part III. Studying any subject in the curriculum reinforces the overarching, general skills and patterns for learning that apply equally to theology. The same commonplace reading, analysis, and genesis strategies are to be employed. These are given direction by the careful study of texts of method and summary, which in addition to providing the overview of theology and delineating its scope, also function as norms for the students’ own reading and writing. Chytraeus does not present significant surface-level differences between studying theology and studying history, or geometry, or natural philosophy. This is another way that liberal arts study helps theological study—by reinforcing patterns and habits. Furthermore, Scripture reading follows the same common rules of grammar and rhetoric and may be approached from that standpoint with confidence. And, like other liberal arts subjects, theology also has its own internal methodological rules (that apply strictly to itself) which limit and direct learning and inquiry.

While the limits of the scope of the dissertation prevent a more detailed look at the large corpus of theological publications, especially at the numerous commentaries that Chytraeus composed during his lifetime, studies done by others show that his writing exemplifies the
approaches and patterns recommended in the *Regulae*. This dissertation corroborates the findings of those studies and shows the connections between approaches to the liberal arts and approaches to the specific study of theology.

But there are two major differences between studying theology and studying any other subject that are clearly considered in the *Regulae*, forming a thread through his education program as a whole. First, what has been revealed about God in Scripture by the writing of the prophets and apostles is beyond human understanding and not revealed in nature. This is an often repeated point for Chytraeus. Second, theology is not simply knowledge, but is practical, something that is lived out, a reality that Chytraeus underscores in his theological orations especially in discussing suffering, temptations, and the cross. Following Luther, Chytraeus maintains that suffering is a central part of the Christian experience. Without it the Gospel cannot be realized at its fullest. But such an emphasis also provides a distinction that sets theology apart from the rest of learning and the liberal arts and points to the uniqueness of Christianity. Neither suffering nor the Gospel that comforts amidst suffering are comprehensible to reason. Focusing on and defining what is beyond natural light serves to orient reason toward its proper object and beyond itself. Still, natural theology and philosophy have an important role in the grand scheme of education as a whole—Christian education included—and Chytraeus continually stresses that one’s studies improve character, cultivate virtue, and improve judgment. The end result allows man to serve his neighbor through the various liberal arts given to mankind by God for the support of body and life.

III.

This dissertation has looked at one angle of the *Regulae Studiorum* through the relationship of its pedagogical and theological elements. As always happens (or should happen) with
academic studies, leaning into one area sparks questions and opens avenues into others. The study here paves the way for further research into other questions, not the least of which may be the precise relation of Chytraeus’ approach to that of Melanchthon. As was suggested in the introduction and reiterated along the way, Chytraeus’ strength here has not been to propose a novel or original approach to education but rather to organize and systematize the work of those who have come before him. Much of his insight concerning the purpose of each of the liberal arts and their relationship to the other arts in the curriculum echoes Melanchthon, and while its is beyond the scope of the present work to do a side by side comparison of Chytraeus and the Praeceptor Germaniae, a number of examples shown in this dissertation reveal their similar perspectives. Stressing order in the subjects, the importance that the lesser arts hold for supporting learning in general and the significance of relationships that one liberal art holds for another are all shared, but many other humanists also championed these viewpoints. What is clear in the Regulae is that Chytraeus does not slavishly promote his former teacher simply because of who Melanchthon was, but rather because of his pedagogical concern to recommend the best approaches to learning. Melanchthon’s approach may be recognized for its value, and Chytraeus takes cues from his teacher, but he recommends numerous other authors and scholars as well, even those that are not Lutheran (like Peter Ramus) because of their methods and approaches to the various subjects of the liberal arts curriculum. Chytraeus’ presentation of sources and method must be understood as being tempered by his educational training.

He also seeks to instill restraint in his students by emphasizing clarity of thought and sure method. He understood the controversies that plagued the Lutherans during the latter half of the sixteenth-century as resulting not only from sinful human nature but also poor method to begin with. Chytraeus was not an unknown quantity and when it came time to seek concord, he could
work with others who also certainly have their ideas and likes and dislikes to put together the Formula of Concord. The third theological oration shows Chytraeus continually directing his reader’s attention toward Scripture and the Confessions for guidance on both the theological issues as well as the solutions of the day. Scripture is the ultimate authority. Chytraeus did not necessarily act the way he did because of timid character, as some of his biographers have suggested, but rather was practicing what he taught his own students. Throughout the Regulae, as has been shown, Chytraeus is seen to encourage the cultivation of character and discipline meant to promote a sensitivity to not only the context of the debate, but especially to the issues, assiduously referring back to authoritative texts of method and summary as well as to the recognized canons of each respective subject. When it comes to theology, a certain modesty is called for—a winsome appeal to texts (and questions) that matter. In this way his pedagogy complements and reinforces his theology, and his theological convictions provide the impetus for such sure and careful method in the first place. After all, Chytraeus taught that learning found its beginning and true purpose in the glory of God. It could well be (at least the question might be raised) that Chytraeus has compiled and systematized many of Melanchthon’s insights into a coherent approach contained in a single book. To answer that we need a side-by-side comparison—but that is a different study for another time. The significance here is that Chytraeus understands a coherent use of method to be the basis of an overall approach to the arts that can be counted on to provide sure direction for education. This does not make him an epigone, but rather an example of a maturing pedagogical and theological tradition that began with the confluence of Reformation theology and Renaissance humanism early in the century, radiating outward from Wittenburg and gradually effecting a radical and indeed a continual change within the intellectual landscape of western world.
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