

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

Master of Sacred Theology Thesis

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

6-1-1959

An Analysis of the Theology of the Merger Documents Between Lutherans and Reformed in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries

Walter Harms

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/stm>



Part of the [Religious Thought, Theology and Philosophy of Religion Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Harms, Walter, "An Analysis of the Theology of the Merger Documents Between Lutherans and Reformed in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries" (1959). *Master of Sacred Theology Thesis*. 119.
<https://scholar.csl.edu/stm/119>

This Thesis 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 Master of Sacred Theology Thesis by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

SHORT TITLE

AN ANALYSIS OF THE THEOLOGY OF THE MERGER
DOCUMENTS
THEOLOGY OF MERGER DOCUMENTS
IN THE SIXTEENTH AND SEVENTEENTH CENTURIES

A Thesis Presented to the Faculty
of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis
Department of Systematic Theology
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Master of Divinity Theology

Walter William Frederick Harnes

June 1959

Approved by:

[Signature]
[Signature]

AN ANALYSIS OF THE THEOLOGY OF THE MERGER
DOCUMENTS BETWEEN LUTHERANS AND REFORMED
IN THE SIXTEENTH AND SEVENTEENTH CENTURIES

A Thesis Presented to the Faculty
of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis
Department of Systematic Theology
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Master of Sacred Theology

by

Walter William Frederick Harms

June 1959

1501
Approved by:

W. W. Harms

Advisor

Carl S. Meyer

Reader

BV
4070
C69
M3
1959
no.4
C.2

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. BRIEF HISTORICAL INTRODUCTIONS	5
The Marburg Articles	6
The Wittenberg Concord	7
The Consensus of Basle	10
The Leipsic Colloquy	11
The Brief Report of the Cassel Colloquy	13
III. THE LORD'S SUPPER	14
The Marburg Articles	15
The Wittenberg Concord	15
The Consensus of Basle	19
The Leipsic Colloquy	24
The Brief Report of the Cassel Colloquy	26
Summary	27
IV. THE DOCTRINE OF BAPTISM	30
The Marburg Articles	30
The Wittenberg Concord	31
The Leipsic Colloquy	33
The Brief Report of the Cassel Colloquy	35
Summary	36
V. THE DOCTRINE OF CHRISTOLOGY	37
The Marburg Articles	37
The Consensus of Basle	38
The Leipsic Colloquy	38
The Brief Report of the Cassel Colloquy	43
Summary	45
VI. THE DOCTRINE OF EUCHEARISTY	47
The Leipsic Colloquy	47
The Brief Report of the Cassel Colloquy	49
Summary	51
VII. THE DOCTRINES OF JUSTIFICATION, FAITH, AND SANCTIFICATION	54
The Marburg Articles	54
The Consensus of Basle	56

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. BRIEF HISTORICAL INTRODUCTIONS	5
The <u>Marburg Articles</u>	5
The <u>Wittenberg Concord</u>	7
The <u>Consensus of Sendomir</u>	10
The <u>Leipzig Colloquy</u>	11
The <u>Brief Report of the Cassel Colloquy</u>	13
III. THE LORD'S SUPPER	15
The <u>Marburg Articles</u>	15
The <u>Wittenberg Concord</u>	16
The <u>Consensus of Sendomir</u>	18
The <u>Leipzig Colloquy</u>	24
The <u>Brief Report of the Cassel Colloquy</u>	26
Summary	28
IV. THE DOCTRINE OF BAPTISM	30
The <u>Marburg Articles</u>	30
The <u>Wittenberg Concord</u>	31
The <u>Leipzig Colloquy</u>	32
The <u>Brief Report of the Cassel Colloquy</u>	33
Summary	35
V. THE DOCTRINE OF CHRISTOLOGY	37
The <u>Marburg Articles</u>	37
The <u>Consensus of Sendomir</u>	38
The <u>Leipzig Colloquy</u>	38
The <u>Brief Report of the Cassel Colloquy</u>	42
Summary	45
VI. THE DOCTRINE OF ELECTION	47
The <u>Leipzig Colloquy</u>	47
The <u>Brief Report of the Cassel Colloquy</u>	49
Summary	52
VII. THE DOCTRINES OF JUSTIFICATION, FAITH, AND SANCTIFICATION	54
The <u>Marburg Articles</u>	54
The <u>Consensus of Sendomir</u>	56

The <u>Leipzig Colloquy</u>	56
Summary	57
VIII. ECUMENICAL THEOLOGY	58
The <u>Marburg Articles</u>	58
The <u>Wittenberg Concord</u>	59
The <u>Consensus of Sendomir</u>	60
The <u>Leipzig Colloquy</u>	61
The <u>Brief Report of the Cassel Colloquy</u>	62
Summary	63
IX. MISCELLANEOUS DOCTRINES	64
Tradition	64
Government and Laws	65
The Trinity.	65
Confession and Absolution	66
The Cause of Sin	68
X. CONCLUSION	70
BIBLIOGRAPHY	72

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This thesis will analyze the theology of the merger documents between Lutherans and Reformed in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The analysis will consist in looking at the theology of these documents to discover what theology they contain, how the theology of one agrees with the theology of the others, and the purpose for which the documents themselves propose this theology is to be used.

This analysis was suggested to the author by his advisor, Dr. Lewis W. Spitz. Furthermore, it was undertaken after the author had read the Arnoldshein Theses, which are theses between Lutherans and Reformed on the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, currently under discussion. The author was interested in seeing historically the character of the theology of previous documents of this type and how they spoke on the various points of theology under discussion during the early centuries of the Reformation. The author felt that this would distinctly present the differences which had historically separated the two parties on the various points of theology.

Because of the interests at hand, the thesis is limited to an analysis rather than an evaluation of the theological correctness of the parties. The analysis consists in breaking down the parts and then clearly distinguishing the terms and theological points which were of importance. Naturally, an evaluation of the differences in theology among the various documents resulted.

The term, theology, does not mean theology in the speculative sense

nor theology proper, the doctrine of God; but the term, theology, means the various doctrines which are found in Holy Scripture, as they appear in these documents.

The term, merger documents, is a limiting factor. It limits this thesis to those documents proper which were undertaken for the purpose of bringing about harmony and/or eventual merger of the two parties. The documents are further limited to those which contain the signed results between the two parties. Various other documents were presented for this purpose, but they were the results either of one party's efforts or the efforts of an individual. They are not included in this thesis. Likewise, many meetings were undertaken for the purpose of bringing about merger. Some of these resulted in no document or in a mere statement of what was discussed without any type of presentation as to what was agreed upon. These discussions are not included in this thesis. This limits the documents to the Marburg Articles, the Wittenberg Concord, the Consensus of Sendomir, the Leipzig Colloquy, and the Brief Report of the Cassel Colloquy.

At the same time this does not mean that the documents studied present complete agreement between the parties. They are simply documents which were signed by both parties and reflect the honest agreement and the disagreements which still remained.

The terms, Lutherans and Reformed, mean that documents between these two parties alone are used. Certain documents and discussions are available among Roman Catholics, Lutherans, and Reformed, but they are not considered in this thesis.

By limiting the thesis to the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries,

enough time has elapsed for several documents to appear and for a complete discussion of the differences to be reflected in the documents. As the number of documents which appeared is limited to five during this period, it reflects that the time element used was sufficient.

The thesis is organized according to the various doctrines which appear in the documents, after a very brief historical introduction to the various documents. The arrangement of the doctrines is arbitrary, but starts with the doctrines which were most discussed and leads to those which were least discussed. Therefore, the doctrine of the Lord's Supper is the first to be discussed, while a miscellaneous chapter, containing the doctrines which are of minor importance in the documents, is the final one.

In this study the author is deeply grateful for the book by J. L. Neve, The Lutherans in the Movements for Church Union,¹ for its guidance to the documents which are discussed in this thesis.

The sources used are those of the original documents as they have been republished in the original language. For the Marburg Articles the author used, "Artikel, deren saemmtliche zu Marburg anwesende Theologen sich verglichen haben, den 3. Oct. Anno 1529," in Dr. Martin Luthers Saemmtliche Schriften;² for the Wittenberg Concord, "Formula

¹J. L. Neve, The Lutherans in the Movements for Church Union (Philadelphia: The Lutheran Publication House, 1921).

²"Artikel, deren saemmtliche zu Marburg anwesende Theologen sich verglichen haben, den 3. Oct. Anno 1529," Dr. Martin Luthers Saemmtliche Schriften, edited by John George Walch (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1901), XVII, 1929-43. Hereafter, it is called simply, "Artikel."

Concordiae," in Corpus Reformatorum;³ for the Consensus of Sendomir, "Consensus Mutuus," in Collectio Confessionum in Ecclesiis Reformatis Publicatarum;⁴ for the Leipzig Colloquy, "Das Leipziger Gespraech," in Die Bekenntnisschriften der evangelisch-reformirten Kirche;⁵ for the Brief Report of the Cassel Colloquy, "Kurtzer Bericht von dem Colloquio," in Historia Syncretistica.⁶

³"Formula Concordiae," Corpus Reformatorum, edited by Carolus Gottlieb Bretschneider (Halis Saxorum: C. A. Schwetschke et Filium, 1836), III, cols. 75-8.

⁴"Consensus Mutuus," Collectio Confessionum in Ecclesiis Reformatis Publicatarum, edited by H. A. Niemeyer (Leipzig: Julius Klinkhardt, 1840), pp. 553-65.

⁵"Das Leipziger Gespraech," Die Bekenntnisschriften der evangelisch-reformirten Kirche, Ernst Gottfried Adolf Boeckel (Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus, 1847), pp. 441-59.

⁶"Kurtzer Bericht von dem Colloquio," Historia Syncretistica, Abraham Calovius (1685), pp. 634-47.

CHAPTER II

BRIEF HISTORICAL INTRODUCTIONS

The Marburg Articles

The Marburg Colloquy was held on October 2-4, 1529.¹ The need at that time was for political union to stave off threats by the Emperor and Roman Catholic princes. In order to have political union, religious harmony between the Protestant princes was necessary. Unity was hindered because of their differences over the Lord's Supper. The movement for unity had been started by the Reformed theologians but had been thwarted by the strong Lutheran convictions on this matter.²

In February of 1528 the politicians were moving for a union. Duke Ulrich of Wirtemberg invited Oecolampadius and Butzer to the court of Philip of Hesse at Marburg for the purpose of winning Philip's support for the south Germans. Furthermore, Philip was moved by the actions of the Diet of Speyer in 1529 to bring Luther and Oecolampadius together.³

The temporary agreement reached at Speyer in 1529 had united Saxony, Hesse, Nuremberg, Strasburg, and Ulm. Philip saw that these preliminary negotiations would lead to a permanent union only if there

¹T. Kolde, "Conference of Marburg," in The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, edited by Samuel Macauley Jackson (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1950), VII, 167.

²Ibid.

³Ibid., p. 168.

was a real agreement on the Lord's Supper. To accomplish his purpose, Philip invited Zwingli to a religious conference on the same day that further political conferences were to be held. Zwingli said that he was willing to attend as he also was interested in political alliance.⁴

The Wittenberg theologians were not pleased with this conference. Melanchthon knew that this was a political move and was evidently offended by the affair. Luther even persuaded his elector not to give his consent, because Luther did not think the theological situation could be improved, even if political affairs were improved.⁵

Finally, in June of 1529, the Wittenberg theologians received a formal invitation to the conference from Philip of Hesse. It was only after the urging of the elector, that Luther and Melanchthon finally gave their consent on July 8, but unwillingly and with no hope of good results. Philip and Zwingli had won, and both were full of hope for a great political alliance of all the Protestant states. Neither the Wittenberg theologians nor the elector himself considered the meeting to be of political importance.⁶ They thought the conference would be strictly theological. While they knew that meetings would be held for political purposes at the same time, they did not know the political intentions of Philip of Hesse.

The document which came out of this discussion is called the

⁴Ibid.

⁵Ibid.

⁶Ibid.

Marburg Articles. They were signed on October 3, 1529.⁷ The signers of the document were Martin Luther, Philip Melanchthon, Justus Jonas, Andrew Osiander, John Brentius, Stephan Agricola, John Oecolampadius, Ulric Zwingli, Martin Bucer, and Caspar Hedio.⁸

The document contains fourteen articles which deal with God, the deity of Christ, the incarnation, the fall into sin, the way of salvation, opposition to work righteousness, faith as righteousness, the Holy Spirit as the source of faith, Baptism, good works, confession, civil government, human traditions, and the Lord's Supper.⁹

The Wittenberg Concord

No agreement had come out of Marburg which was considered sufficient as a basis for union. Until the Diet at Augsburg, it had been Zwingli's hope to win Philip of Hesse to his side and isolate Wittenberg. When Philip put his name on the Augsburg Confession, that hope was gone.¹⁰

The Lutherans, in the meantime, were also careful not to come too close to Zwingli because his political ambitions made him obnoxious to the Emperor. This endangered the happiness of the Saxon elector. Also Zwingli's doctrine of the Lord's Supper was particularly odious to the

⁷"Artikel," Dr. Martin Luthers Saemmtliche Schriften, edited by John George Walch (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1901), XVII, 1939.

⁸Ibid., col. 1943.

⁹Ibid., cols. 1939-43.

¹⁰J. L. Neve, The Lutherans in the Movements for Church Union (Philadelphia: The Lutheran Publication House, 1921), p. 6.

Romanists. Hence at Augsburg, Melanchthon had not even met with Bucer, Zwingli's man, for fear of hurting the Lutherans' and his elector's cause. In fact, the cities of Upper Germany were not even permitted to subscribe to the Augsburg Confession. ¹¹

The cities of Upper Germany, after the end of the Diet of Augsburg, knew that they would be the first to be overrun if the Emperor attacked. They knew they would have to join the Smalcald Federation and did so in April of 1532. However, they did not renounce their own confession in signing the Augsburg Confession. At the same time it did not mean that the Lutherans were acknowledging the religious position of the Upper Germans as being correct. To bring about this union of confession, was the task to which Martin Bucer set himself with indefatigable zeal. ¹²

Bucer tried several things to bring about a meeting of the minds on the points of difference. He had the Tetrapolitana, that neither Lutheran nor Zwinglian document presented to the Emperor at Augsburg. ¹³ He hoped in this way through this document to show the way to union between the two groups. By compromising both sides he hoped to come to agreement. He convinced himself that the supposed consubstantial expressions in Luther's Grosses Bekenntnis vom Abendmahl were not intended to convey what they really said and that Zwingli would be willing to admit to a positive gift in the Lord's Supper besides the mere symbolical one. ¹⁴

¹¹Ibid., p. 6f.

¹²Ibid., p. 7.

¹³Ibid., p. 7f.

¹⁴Ibid., p. 8.

In order to produce this desired effect he employed the term, sacramental union. This was a term which he had used already in 1528 in his writing, Vergleichung Dr. Luthers und seine Gegenteils vom Abendmahl Christi. By the use of this term he hoped to make both sides happy and convince them that they agreed.¹⁵ With this plan in mind, he met with the Lutherans in Wittenberg in May of 1536.

The document which came out of this discussion is called in its full Latin name,

*Concordia inter Doctores Wittenbergenses et Doctores civitatum Imperii in Germanici superiori. De Praesentia corporis et sanguinis Christi in Coena Dominica. Scripta iussu et rogatu utriusque partis a Philipp Melant. Anno Christi 1536.*¹⁶

It is dated on May 29, 1536.¹⁷

It is signed by Dr. Wolfgang Capito, minister of the church at Strasburg; M. Martin Bucer, minister of the church at Strasburg; Lic. Martin Feeth, minister of the Word of the church at Ulm; M. Boniface Lycosthenes (Wolfhardt), minister of the Word of the church at Augsburg; Wolfgang Musculus, minister of the Word of the church at Augsburg; M. Gervasius Scholasticus, pastor of the church at Memmingen; M. John Bernhardt, minister of the church at Frankfurt; Martin Germani, minister of the church at Fuerfeldt; M. Matthew Aulbert, pastor of the church of Reutlingen; John Sebradinus, deacon of Reutlingen; Martin Luther,

¹⁵Ibid., p. 8f.

¹⁶"Formula Concordiae," Corpus Reformatorum, edited by Carolus Gottlieb Bretschneider (Halis Saxorum: C. A. Schwetschke et Filium, 1836), III, 75.

¹⁷Ibid., col. 78.

Wittenberg doctor; Dr. Justus Jonas; Dr. Caspar Cruciger; Dr. John Bugenhagen, Pomeranus; Philip Melanchthon; Justus Menius of Eisenach; Frederich Myconius of Gotha; Dr. Urban Regius, superintendent of the churches of the duchy of Luneburg; George Spalatin, pastor of the church at Altenburg; Dionysius Melander, minister of the church at Cassel; and many others. ¹⁸

The document is the agreement and disagreement which was reached on the Lord's Supper, Baptism, and confession and absolution. ¹⁹

The Consensus of Sandomir

The Consensus is the result of a conference among Polish Calvinists, Polish Lutherans, and the Bohemian Brethren, held at Sandomir on April 9-14, 1570. ²⁰

Neve says the conference was held because,

A union of all Protestants in Old Poland was urged as a political necessity over against the Roman influence by the Protestant faction of the Polish nobility which was almost exclusively Reformed. The Reformed representatives were in the majority, in fact they regarded the convention as a Reformed synod and, therefore, simply presented the second Helvetic Confession to be adopted as the Polish National Confession. The Bohemian Brethren were willing to agree provided their own Confession was not rejected. The Lutherans suggested that a new Confession be drafted. This was finally done, and so the Consensu Sandomiriensis came into existence. ²¹

It may be assumed that political considerations were the cause for this

¹⁸Ibid., cols. 76f.

¹⁹Ibid., cols. 75-78.

²⁰Jaroslav Pelikan, Jr., "The Consensus of Sandomiers, A Chapter from the Polish Reformation," Concordia Theological Monthly, XVIII (November, 1947), 825.

²¹Neve, op. cit., p. 53.

conference rather than internal religious need for union.

The official name for the Consensus is in Latin,

CONSENSUS IN FIDE ET RELIGIONE CHRISTIANA INTER ECCLESIAS Evangelicas Maioris et Minoris Poloniae, Magnique Ducatus Lithuaniae et caeterarum eius regni provinciarum, primo SENDOMIRIAE Anno MDLXX in Synodo generali sancitus, et deinceps in aliis, ac demum in Wlodislaviensi generali Synodo Anno MDLXXIII confirmatus, et Serenissimis Poloniae Regibus AUGUST. HENRICO ac STEPHANO oblatus, nunc autem ex decreto Synodo in publicum typis editus. Anno Christi MDLXXXVI.²²

The large group of signers of this confession may be found at the close of the document. The document discusses many points in summary, and the Lord's Supper in great detail.²³

The Leipzig Colloquy

The horrors of the Thirty-Years' War and the fierce polemics made thoughts of union come into the minds of the princes. When a common danger is added, it made union even more desirable. In this case it was the edict of Ferdinand II, a pupil of the Jesuits, in 1629 that all Protestantism was to be destroyed. However, Gustavus Adolphus landed on German soil and prevented the edict's fulfillment. Also at this time the classical union sentence was heard by those in trouble, "In necessary things unity, in doubtful things liberty, in all things charity."²⁴

²²"Consensus Mutuus," Collectio Confessionum in Ecclesiis Reformatis Publicatarum, edited by H. A. Niemeyer (Leipzig: Julius Klinkhardt, 1849), p. 551.

²³Ibid., pp. 553-65.

²⁴Philip Schaff, The Creeds of Christendom (New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1899), I, 558.

It was,

Under the operation of this feeling and the threatening pressure of the Romanists, the Elector Christian William of Brandenburg, accompanied by his chaplain, John Bergius, and the Landgrave William of Hesse, with the theological Professor Crocius, and Chaplain Theophilus Neuberger, met at Leipzig with the Elector George of Saxony and the Lutheran divines Mattias Hoe of Hoeneegg, Polycarp Leyser and Henry Hoepfner, to confer in a private way about a friendly understanding between the two confessions, hoping to set a good example to other divines of Germany. ²⁵

Both ideas must be remembered as being the cause of this meeting, the religious and the political. The princes had already agreed on a political union by which they hoped to avoid joining Gustavus Adolphus. At the same time, they wanted religious harmony for the furtherance of their plan. ²⁶

This conference was held on March 3-23, 1631. ²⁷ Each session lasted for three hours. The result of this colloquy was the document which is called in its full name,

COLLOQUIUM LIPSIENSE, Das ist, Die Unterredung deren zu Leipzig in Jahr 1631. anwesenden Chur-Saechsischen, Chur-Brandenburgischen und Fuerstlichen Hessischen Theologen, Von denen zwischen den Evangelischen streitigen Religious Puncten. ²⁸

The document is signed not by the princes who arranged the conference, but only by the theologians who were already mentioned. ²⁹ It is a document which discusses the various points of difference

²⁵ Ibid.

²⁶ Neve, op. cit., p. 57f.

²⁷ Schaff, loc. cit.

²⁸ "Consensus," op. cit., p. 653.

²⁹ Ibid., p. 668.

between the two parties on the basis of the Augsburg Confession. As such, it contains comments on all disputed points and mere statements of agreement on points not discussed at length.³⁰

The Brief Report of the Cassel Colloquy

This conference was held on July 1-9, 1661. It was arranged by the Reformed Landgrave of Hesse, William II, for the purpose of bringing the two universities in his realm together into one faith. The two universities were Marburg, which was Reformed, and Rinteln, which was Lutheran.³¹

The name of the document which came out of this colloquy is called by its German name,

Kurtzer Bericht von dem Colloquio, So auff Anordnung, Des Durchleuchtigsten Hochgebohrnen Fuersten und Herren Herrn Wilhelmi Land-Graffen zu Hessen, Fuerst zu Herszfeld, Graffen zu Catzenelenbogen, Dietz, Ziegenhain Nidda, und Schaumberg. Unser Graedisten Fuersten und Herren Zwischen Etlichen Theologen Von Marburg und Rinteln. Die auff Seiner Fuerstl. Durchleuchtigkeit Befehl zusammen beruffen worden zu Cassel an i July und etlichen andern nachfolgenden Tagen gehalten. Nebenst dem Schluszu derselben Theologen.³²

The signers of the document include both princes and theologians. The princes were Johann Caspar from Dornberg, Johannes Henricus from Dauber, and Casper Fridericus from Dalwigk. The Reformed theologians are Sebastianus Cuttius and Johannes Heinius, while

³⁰Ibid., pp. 653-68.

³¹Neve, op. cit., p. 64.

³²"Kurtzer Bericht," in Historia Syncretistica, Abraham Calvius (1685), p. 634.

the Lutheran theologians were Petrus Musaeus and Johannes Heinrichus.³³

The document concerns itself with the Lord's Supper, predestination, the person of Christ, and Baptism.³⁴

³³Ibid., p. 647.

³⁴Ibid., pp. 634-47.

The Marburg Articles

The nineteenth article reads,

Es ist vorsechtig gelaubt wir und halten alle von dem Abendmahl
 zweere haben Herrn Jesu Christi, dasz man beide Gestalt nach
 der Duretzung brauchen soll: dasz auch die Messe nicht ein Werk
 ist, durch einer dem andern, tott und lebendig, Gnade erlangt:
 dasz auch das Sacrament der Altare sei ein Sacrament des wahren
 Leibes und Blutes Jesu Christi, und die geistliche Messeung
 dreyzehnen Leibes und Blutes einem leylichen Christen vorsechtig
 thun. Dergleichen den Brauch des Sacraments, wie
 das Wort von Gott, dem Allmochtigen, gegeben und geordnet sei,
 dasz die schwachen Gewissen zum Glauben und Liebe zu bewegen,
 durch das Heiligen Geist. Und wir wohl aber wir uns (ob der wahre
 Leib und Blut Christi leylich im Brod und Wein sei) diese Zeit
 nicht verglichen haben, es soll doch ein Theil gegen dem andern
 christliche Liebe, so ferne jedes Gewissen hinnenfahr leiden kann,
 anzeigen, und beide Theil Gott den Allmochtigen Hertenly bitten,
 dasz er uns durch seinen Geist in dem rechten Verstand bestatigen
 wolle. Amen.

In this article the following points stand out most clearly. One, the
 Sacrament is to be given under both kinds by the institution of the Lord.
 Two, Christians do not obtain forgiveness of sins for another through

¹"Artikel," Dr. Martin Luthers Saemmelliche Schriften, edited by
 John George Walch (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1901),
 VII, 193f.

CHAPTER III

THE LORD'S SUPPER

The theology of the Lord's Supper is discussed in all of the documents. It forms almost the entire content of the Consensus of Sendomir. It also has the most points of disagreement. The theology of the Lord's Supper will be presented chronologically, starting with the oldest document.

The Marburg Articles

The fourteenth article reads,

Zum vierzehnten glauben wir und halten alle von dem Abendmahl unsers lieben Herrn Jesu Christi, dasz man beide Gestalt nach der Einsetzung brauchen soll; dasz auch die Messe nicht ein Werk ist, damit einer dem andern, todt und lebendig, Gnade erlange: dasz auch das Sacrament des Altars sei en Sacrament des wahren Leibes und Blutes Jesu Christi, und die geistliche Nieszung desselbigen Leibes und Blutes einem jeglichen Christen vornehmlich vonnoethen. Desgleichen den Brauch des Sacraments, wie das Wort von Gott, dem Allmaechtigen, gegeben und geordnet sei, damit die schwachen Gewissen zum Glauben und Liebe zu bewegen, durch den Heiligen Geist. Und wiewohl aber wir uns (ob der wahre Leib und Blut Christi leiblich im Brod und Wein sei) diese Zeit nicht verglichen haben, so soll doch ein Theil gegen dem andern christliche Liebe, so ferne jedes Gewissen immerhehr leiden kann, erzeugen, und beide Theil Gott den Allmaechtigen fleiszig bitten, dasz er uns durch seinen Geist in dem rechten Verstand bestatigen wolle, Amen.¹

In this article the following points stand out most clearly. One, the Sacrament is to be given under both kinds by the institution of the Lord. Two, Christians do not obtain forgiveness of sins for another through

¹"Artikel," Dr. Martin Luthers Saemmtliche Schriften, edited by John George Walch (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1901), XVII, 1942f.

the Sacrament. Three, the very body and blood of Christ is present in the Sacrament. Four, the spiritual manducation of the body and blood of the Lord is necessary to have a valid Sacrament. Five, it was ordained by God for weak consciences. Six, the Sacrament results in people being moved to faith and love, or good works.

The point of disagreement that remains is whether the body and blood of Christ are bodily present in the Lord's Supper. Christ is present in the Sacrament, both sides admit. The point under discussion is to the type of presence of Christ in the Sacrament. One side wants an oral eating of the body and blood of Christ while the other side would not admit this.

From this article the author concludes that the Lutheran and the Reformed condemn certain practices of the Roman Catholics, as the Sacrament under one kind, masses for the dead and the living, and forgiveness of sins as the result from the work of the Sacrament.

The Wittenberg Concord

In the Wittenberg Concord there are no points of disagreement in the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. Both parties, first of all, agree that,

*Confitemur iuxta verba Irenaei, constare Eucharistiam duabus rebus, terrena et coelesti. Itaque sentiunt et docent, cum pane et vino vere et substantialiter adesse, exhiberi et sumi corpus Christi et sanguinem.*²

This is the positive side of the agreement. It contains several points

²"Formula Concordiae," Corpus Reformatorum, edited by Carolus Gottlieb Bretschneider (Halis Saxorum: C. A. Schwetschke et Filium, 1836), III, 75.

which are of note. The Lutheran and the Reformed agree that in the Sacrament two types of things are present, the heavenly and the earthly. This refers to the bread and wine, the earthly, and the body and blood, the heavenly. They are here admitting that the Sacrament is not as the Romanists claim, simply the body and blood of Christ and not also bread and wine. Secondly, they say that in the bread and wine the body and blood of Christ are truly and substantially present, offered, and received. It is in the usus of the Sacrament that the body and blood of Christ is present. The "vere et substantialiter" offer little improvement over the Marburg article which states "der wahre Leib und Blut Christi leiblich im Brod und Wein sei."

Both parties substantiate the two points above when they say,

Et quanquam negant fieri transubstantiationem, nec sentiunt fieri localem inclusionem in pane, aut durabilem aliquam coniunctionem extra usum Sacramenti: tamen concedunt sacramentali unione panem esse corpus Christi, hoc est, sentiunt porrecto pane simul adesse et vere exhiberi corpus Christi. Man extra usum, eum asservatur in pixide aut ostenditur in processibus, ut fit a Papistis, sentiunt non adesse corpus Christi.³

The emphasis is on the presence of Christ in the usus of the Sacrament. Both parties, likewise, stress a new term, sacramental union. By this the Lutheran and the Reformed wish to say that Christ is really present when the bread is given to the communicants. Christ is in the bread by means of the sacramental union. Hence, while the terminology of "vere et substantialiter" is not an improvement over the Marburg article, they, by adding the term, sacramental union, would seem to do away with the disagreement which remained at the finish of the Marburg Colloquy.

³Ibid.

Both parties expand more fully on the last point when they state,

Deinde hanc institutionem Sacramenti sentiunt valere in Ecclesia, nec pendere ex dignitate ministri aut sumentis. Quare sicut Paulus ait, etiam indignos manducare, ita sentiunt porrigi vere corpus et sanguinem Domini etiam indignis et indignos sumere, ubi servantur verba et institutio Christi. Sed tales sumunt ad iudicium, ut Paulus ait, quia abutuntur Sacramento, cum sine poenitentia et sine fide eo utuntur. Ideo enim propositum est, ut testitur illis applicari beneficia Christi et fieri eos membra Christi, et abluere sanguine Christi, qui agunt poenitentiam et erigunt se fide in Christum.⁴

The validity of the Sacrament does not depend on the worthiness of the minister or the communicant. The unbeliever then receives the body and blood of Christ, but for damnation. Moreover, the Sacrament is valid when it is used according to Christ's command and institution, and that the presence of Christ is a bodily one, that all communicants actually receive the body and blood of Christ.

The benefits of the Sacrament are also given. The Sacrament helps the weak Christian become strong. This means that the weak Christian already has faith and lives in repentance.

The Consensus of Sendomir

The doctrine of the Lord's Supper forms almost the entire discussion and mutual consensus of the Consensus of Sendomir. It is almost entirely Melancthonian, because it quotes the section on the Sacraments which Melancthon had composed for the Council of Trent in 1551. It contains, therefore, the unclear and uncertain language to which Melancthon was given during his later days.

Before proceeding to the article by Melancthon the signers came

⁴Ibid., col. 76.

to this agreement.

Deinde vero quantum ad infelix illud dissidium de Coena Domini attinet, convenimus in sententia verborum Domini nostri Iesus Christi, et illa orthodoxe intellecta sunt a patribus, ac imprimis Irenaeo, qui duabus rebus, scilicet terrena et coelesti, hoc mysterium constare dixit: Neque elements signave nuda et vacua illa esse asserimus, sed simul reipsa credentibus et praestare Fide, quod significant: Denique ut expressius clariusque loquamur, convenimus, ut credamus et confiteamur, substantialem praesentiam Christi, non significare duntaxat, sed vere in coena eo vescentibus repraesentari, distribue, et exhiberi corpus et sanguinem Domini symbolis adiectis ipsi rei, minime nudis, secundum Sacramentorum naturam. Ne vero diversitas formularum loquendi contentionem aliquam pariat, placuit, praeter articulum, qui est insertus nostrae Confessioni mutuo consensu ascribere articulum Confessionis Saxonicarum ecclesiarum de coena Domini, ad Tridentinum Concilium anno 1551. missae, quem etiam pium agnoscimus, et recipimus.⁵

Both parties want, first of all, to be in the direct line of descent with the fathers and particularly, Irenaeus, who was mentioned in the Wittenberg Concord. Both Lutheran and Reformed thereby admit that the Lord's Supper does not consist simply in empty signs. In the Sacrament itself something heavenly is received. This is emphasized when it states that the elements are not bare and empty signs.

What the signs signify, however, is not so clear. It is the heavenly part of the sacrament, and it must be received by faith. The question is what do elements signify. Does the bread and wine proffer the body and blood of Christ, the flesh born of the Virgin Mary, or does the communicant receive a spiritual Christ who is in heaven and not physically present? This apparently is left to the interpretation of the individual signers.

⁵"Consensus," Collectio Confessionum in Ecclesiis Reformatis Publicatarum, edited by H. A. Niemeyer (Leipzig: Julius Klinkhardt, 1840), p. 554.

This matter is not made any clearer when both sides confess that, the substantial presence of Christ is not merely signified, but that the body and blood of the Lord are represented, distributed, and exhibited. What is meant is that Christ is present in the usus of the Sacrament. What type of presence the parties mean is even harder to distinguish when they say, He is in the usus, "yescentibus . . . symbolis adiectis ipsi rei, minime nudis, secundum Sacramentorum naturam." This passage permits any kind of interpretation as to the type of Christ present. The only point which can be clearly drawn from the statement is that Christ is present and present only in the usus of the Sacrament.

Turning to the Saxon Confession which is then included in the text of the Consensus, we read,

"Et Baptismus et Coena Domini sunt pignora et testimonia gratiae, ut antea dictum est, quae de promissione et tota redemptione nos commonefaciunt, et ostendunt beneficia Evangelii ad singulos pertinere, qui his ritibus utuntur."⁶

Melanchthon seems to emphasize at the very outset that the Sacraments are pledges and testimonies of grace. He tells us that as God has promised, we are entirely redeemed. The main emphasis of the Sacrament of the Altar is that the Christian knows by using the ceremony he is redeemed.

The full impact of this is seen when he states the purpose for which the Lord's Supper was instituted.

"Prima causa est: Filius Dei vult in publica et honesta congregatione sonare vocem evangelii. Huius congregationis vinculum vult esse hanc sumtionem, quae summa reverentia facienda est, cum

⁶ Ibid.

ibi testimonium exhibeatur mirandae societatis Domini et sumentium, de qua reverentia Paulus loquitur, inquit: Qui sumit indigne, reus erit corporis et sanguinis Domini. Secunda: Vult et concionem, et ipsum ritum prodesse ad conservationem et propagationem memoriae passionis, resurrectionis, et beneficiorum suorum. Tertia: Vult quemlibet sumentem hoc testimonio singulariter confirmare, ut statuat ad se pertinere beneficia evangelii, cum concio sit communis: et hoc testimonio, hac sumptione ostendit, se ipsius membrum esse, et se ablutum esse sanguine suo, et facere se hoc foedus: Manete in me, et ego in vobis. Item: Ego in eis, et hi in me. Quarta: vult hanc publicam sumptionem, confessionem esse qua ostendis quod doctrinae genus amplectaris, cui coetui te adiungas. Vult et gratias agi publice et privatim in hac ipsa cerimonia Deo aeterno patri, filio et spiritui sancto, cum pro ceteris beneficiis, tum nominatim pro hoc immenso beneficio redemptionis et salvationis. Vult et ipsis ecclesiae membris inter sese vinculum esse mutuae benevolentiae. Ita multis fines concurrunt. ¹⁷

From this it may be concluded that the Sacrament is little more than a ceremony to convince the individual of the following points. One, there is a bond between the receiver or congregation and Christ. Two, God actually suffered and died. This is to be remembered and propagated. Three, Christ died for the individual. Four, all who use the Sacrament agree in their faith. Five, you are to give thanks by using this ceremony, that Christ died for you. The type of presence of Christ in the Sacrament is not mentioned here by Melanchthon.

Next the document condemns many of the false and evil practices of the Roman Church. He condemns the ex opere operato concept of the Roman Sacrament. He says faith and repentance are necessary for a profitable use of the Sacrament. ⁸

Melanchthon condemns the adoration of the host, or that Christ is

⁷ Ibid., p. 555.

⁸ Ibid., p. 555f.

present outside of the usus of the Sacrament. He states,

"Docentur etiam homines, Sacramenta esse actiones divinitus institutas, et extra usum institutum res ipsas non habens rationem Sacramenti: sed in usu instituto in hac communione vere et substantialiter adesse Christum, et vere exhiberi sumentibus Corpus et Sanguinem Christi: Testari Christum, quod sit in eis, et faciat eos sibi membra, et quod abluerit eos sanguine suo: etc., sicut et Hilarius inquit: "Haec accepta et hausta efficiunt, ut et nos in Christo, et Christus in nobis sit."⁹

While he condemns the way the Sacrament is used in the Roman Church, it should be noticed that here is the clearest presentation of the type of Christ received in the Sacrament. The "vere et substantialiter" can, as was seen in the two previous documents, mean any type of presence. However, when he says that, "vere exhiberi sumentibus Corpus et Sanguinem Christi," then he perhaps comes close to saying that there is an oral manducation of the Lord. However, since this is not explicitly stated, any type of interpretation is possible again. This is confirmed by the previous quotation. That Christ is in them, that He has washed them, that they are His members can be stated as the result of the Sacrament without having a type of presence of Christ that is physical and that is orally received.

Following this is a long list of evil practices in the Roman Church. They include private masses where the elements are not distributed to the people.¹⁰ The mass as an oblation for the forgiveness of sins for the living and dead is condemned.¹¹ The idea of the mass as a sacrifice

⁹Ibid., p. 556.

¹⁰Ibid.

¹¹Ibid., p. 556f.

is condemned when it is used as a sacrifice for sins, but not when it is used as a sacrifice of praise.¹² The whole liturgy of the Romanists with all of its additions is condemned as not commanded in the New Testament.¹³ Again he condemns the mass as a sacrifice for the dead.¹⁴ The worship of the host is condemned.¹⁵ The general attitude of the Roman clergy concerning these abuses is condemned.¹⁶ After this follows a long list of many small evil practices which take place in the Roman Church in its use of the Sacrament.¹⁷ The final abuse which is condemned in the Saxon Confession as it is found in the Sendomir Consensus is the Sacrament under one kind.¹⁸

The part of the Saxon Confession which is incorporated into the Consensus of Sendomir, is more against the abuses in the Roman Church than it is a presentation of the positive side of the author. In its statement as to the type of presence of Christ in the Sacrament, it is too unclear to have a definite type of interpretation. The benefit of the Sacrament is best described as the privilege to remember with certainty that Christ died for the individual and that the ceremony binds the individuals of the congregation together.

¹² Ibid., p. 557.

¹³ Ibid.

¹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵ Ibid., p. 557f.

¹⁶ Ibid., p. 558.

¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸ Ibid., p. 559.

In general then, the whole document from Sendomir on the Lord's Supper is unclear and open to any type of interpretation. It is more of an anti-Roman document than a pro-Reformed or pro-Lutheran one on the doctrine of the Lord's Supper

The Leipzig Colloquy

As was stated in the historical introduction to the Leipzig document, it is a frank and open discussion concerning the various doctrines. This is true also of the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. There were points of agreement and also points of disagreement.

They agreed that the transubstantiation of the Romanists was wrong. They, likewise, confessed that in the Lord's Supper not only the elements of bread and wine, the power and work, or the mere signs of the body and blood of Christ were present, but that the true and essential or substantial body and blood of Christ are truly present, because of the sacramental union. This sacramental union does not consist in the mere significance or in the promise, but in the usus or distribution of the earthly elements and the true body and blood of Jesus Christ.¹⁹

Further, they confessed in agreement that in the spiritual eating and drinking, not only the power, use or work, but also the essence and substance of the body and blood of Christ himself is present. This was the body which appeared on earth. Further, this is eaten and drunk in a spiritual way through true faith. This spiritual enjoyment in the holy

¹⁹"Das -Leipziger Gespraech," Die Bekenntnisschriften der evangelisch-reformirten Kirche, edited by Ernst Gottfried Adolf Boeckel (Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus, 1847), p. 541f.

use of the Sacrament is noteworthy.²⁰

The dispute arose when the Reformed could not agree that both the unworthy as well as the worthy received the body and blood of Christ orally. They said it was received only by faith and not with the mouth. On this point there was no agreement.²¹

The Lutherans added that in the Sacrament the body and blood by means of the blessed elements were received and eaten and drunk by all communicants with the mouth. However, the blessing or enjoyment of the Sacrament could be received only by those who had faith, which was a heavenly and supernatural way. Likewise, there was no gnawing, chewing, or tearing of the body of Christ when it was received by the mouth.²²

The dispute then was over the type of presence of Christ in the Sacrament. Both sides said that He was present. The type of presence arose when the question of who receives Him was asked. If all received Him, then the body must be a physical body received with the mouth. If the unworthy did not receive Him, then only a spiritual body and blood was received and that by faith alone. The Lutherans maintained that the body and blood were received by all but that it was received, was present, in a supernatural, heavenly way. Faith, the Lutherans said, made the reception of the body and blood of Christ beneficial. While unbelief made the reception a matter of damnation. The Reformed

²⁰Ibid., p. 452.

²¹Ibid.

²²Ibid.

maintained that it was faith that made the reception of the body and blood possible. Without faith, the body and blood of Christ were not received.

The Brief Report of the Cassel Colloquy

On the Lord's Supper the Reformed and Lutherans did not reach an agreement at Cassel. There were only certain points on which the theologians agreed.

First of all, they agreed that the spiritual essence of the body and blood of Christ is noteworthy for salvation and that it was not wholesome when it was not in the usus of the Sacrament.²³

The theologians agreed that the reception of the body and blood of Christ requires an act of true faith. Likewise, they agreed that by the reception of the body and blood of Christ, the communicants are united with the entire work of Christ.²⁴

Another point of agreement is that the breaking of the bread is a useful and blessed use which should be retained in the church, in unity and common consent.²⁵

The Reformed declared that the bread was really only bread and could not be esteemed by them as anything else than pure bread. At the same time the Reformed stated that the breaking of the bread did not belong to the essence of the Sacrament, but only to the integral whole and

²³"Kurtzer Bericht," Historia Syncretistica, Abraham Calovius (1685), p. 637.

²⁴Ibid.

²⁵Ibid.

completeness of the Sacrament because of Christ's command and example. This, the Lutherans, could not accept.²⁶

On the question whether the body of Christ in the use of the Sacrament together with the blessed bread was placed in the mouth of every communicant, be he worthy or unworthy, the Reformed answered, no, while the Lutherans answered, yes,²⁷

They finally agreed, however, that both sides whether they said yes or no to the questions in their churches had the Sacrament and that it was administered and used without distortion or breaking up of the substance or essence.²⁸

The question at Cassel was the type of presence of Christ in the Sacrament. They did agree that Christ was present and that He was received by faith. The telling point in this document as well as in the one from Leipzig was whether the unworthy received the body and blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper. The Reformed consistent with their view said, no, while the Lutherans also consistent said, yes.

The matter of the breaking of the bread is a new matter which is not present in the other documents. That this should be questioned perhaps tells something about the differences which had arisen between the two parties as time went on.

That they should agree on the matter of the validity of the Sacrament in both churches is something new also. It shows that the matters could

²⁶Ibid., p. 637f.

²⁷Ibid., p. 638.

²⁸Ibid.

not have been taken too seriously in which they disagreed.

Summary

As the documents are surveyed together on the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, certain points stand out most clearly.

1. All documents are anti-Roman. They all condemn certain practices of the Roman Church. Chief of these is that the body and blood of Christ is present outside of the actual usus of the Sacrament. They condemn the worship of the host and all private masses where the Sacrament is not distributed and received by the congregation. The Sacrament under one kind is also condemned by both parties.
2. They all agree that Christ is present in the usus of the Sacrament. They are agreed that Christ is received by the believing communicants.
3. One of the points which is always open for discussion, except in the Wittenberg Concord, is the type of presence of Christ in the Sacrament. The Reformed are willing to say that Christ is present really and substantially. However, the Lutherans are always insistent on the point that the body and blood of Christ are present bodily and are received by the mouth of all communicants. This happens because of the sacramental union. This means that Christ is not simply received by faith but also orally. This the Reformed were never willing to admit.
4. This leads to the next point which is the question of who receives Christ. Naturally, if the Savior is only received by faith, then only the worthy communicants can receive Him. If He is received orally, then all communicants receive Him, be they worthy or unworthy. This is one of the distinguishing points between Lutherans and Reformed. The Reformed took the former position, while the Lutherans took the latter.
5. The benefits of the Lord's Supper are also discussed. The Reformed tend more to the remembrance of the death of Christ with the benefits it has for the communicants, while the Lutherans tend to stress the idea that the work of Christ is given to the communicants with its benefits. In all of the documents this point is never thoroughly discussed, probably because too much controversy was already apparent over the type of presence of Christ and who receives Him.
6. Other points are discussed, which are peculiar to the individual document. They show that as time passed certain differences arose which were not present at the start of the two parties.

The discussions vary because of time, locality, and membership in the discussions. For instance, the meeting at Sendomir was controlled by the Reformed, while the early discussion at Wittenberg was largely a matter of Lutherans making their ideas felt.

In general the author would say that the doctrine of the Lord's Supper does not present a consistent doctrine in the merger document. The variations range from highly Lutheran doctrine at Wittenberg to almost totally Reformed at Sendomir. When differences were found, they were almost always about the same points of doctrine.

CHAPTER IV

THE DOCTRINE OF BAPTISM

The doctrine of Holy Baptism is discussed as a major point in four of the five documents. It is only incidentally referred to in the Consensus of Sandomir. The doctrine did not provoke as much discussion as the Lord's Supper, but it was one point which needed clarification before merger could take place. The doctrine will be presented chronologically starting with the oldest document.

The Marburg Articles

The ninth article states,

Zum neunten, dasz die heilige Taufe sei ein Sacrament, das zu solchem Glauben von Gott eingesetzt, und weil Gottes Gebot: Ite, baptisate, Matth. 28, 19., und Gottes Verheissung: Qui crediderit, Marc. 16, 16., darin ist, so ist es nicht allein ein ledig Zeichen oder Losung unter den Christen, sondern ein Zeichen und Werk Gottes, darin unser Glaub gefoerdert, durch welchen wir wiedergeboren werden.¹

In this statement the following points stand out. Baptism is instituted by God. God has commanded it. It is not an empty sign or watchword but a sign and work of God. It has the promise of God attached to it. It is an aid to faith, creates faith, and gives rebirth.

The main point of the article is to reaffirm the fact that Baptism

¹"Artikel," Dr. Martin Luthers Saemmtliche Schriften, edited by John George Walch (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1901), XVII, 1941. The Weimar edition of Luther's works has included an article on infant Baptism in the Marburg Articles. It is the fourteenth article. On this problem see George John Beto, "The Marburg Colloquy of 1529: A Textual Study," Concordia Theological Monthly, XVI (February, 1945), 73-94.

does convey the grace of God; that it creates and aids faith; and that this happens because of the promise and command of God.

The Wittenberg Concord

While the Marburg article centered on the general topic of Baptism, the Wittenberg Concord's discussion of Baptism centers on infant Baptism. This document as the previous one has complete agreement between the two parties on this doctrine.

The Lutherans and Reformed agree that,

De baptismo infantium omnes sine dubio consenserunt, quod necesse sit infantes baptizari. Cum enim promissio salutis pertineat etiam ad infantes, et non pertineat ad illos, qui sunt extra Ecclesiam, necesse est eam applicari infantibus per ministerium, et adiungere eos membris Ecclesiae. Cumque de talibus infantibus, qui sent in Ecclesia, dictum sit: Non est voluntas patris, ut pereat unum ex illis; constat infantibus per baptismum contingere remissionem peccati originalis et donationem Spiritus sancti, qui in eis efficax est pro ipsorum modo. Reicimus enim errorem illorum, qui imaginantur, Infantes placere Deo, et salvos fieri sine actione aliqua Dei, cum Christus clare dicat: Nisi quis renatus fuerit ex aqua et Spiritu, non potest intrare in regnum coelorum. Etsi igitur nos non intelligimus, qualis sit illa actio Dei in infantibus: tamen certum est, in eis novos et sanctos motus effici, sicut et in Iohanne in utero novi motus fiebant. Nam etiamsi non est imaginandum, quod infantes intelligant: tamen illi motus et inclinationes ad credendum Christo et diligendum Deum sunt aliquo modo similes motibus fidei et dilectionis. Hoc dicimus, cum inquirimus, ut intelligi possit, quod infantes non fiant sancti et salvi sine actione divina in ipsis.²

They agree on infant Baptism because of the promise that infants must be in the church in order to be saved, that infants are sinful and need forgiveness. At the same time they willingly admit they do not know how this faith takes place but leave the matter to the divine action of God.

²"Formula Concordiae," Corpus Reformatorum, edited by Carolus Gottlieb Bretschneider (Halis Saxorum: C. A. Schwetschke et Filium, 1836), III, 77.

Another point which is stressed is that the infants are to be baptized by the ministers. The act of Baptism is an act of the church. While they confess this, both parties at the same time are willing that,

Quaquam igitur mos est alicubi, ut certis diebus publice administratur baptismus: tamen docendi sunt homines, si quid periculi est vitae infantium: ut eos interim baptizari curent, et quod ministri debent talibus impertiri baptismum.³

This could be interpreted to mean either emergency Baptism is permitted by laymen, or that ministers should baptize children who are in danger of losing their lives. Which ever it might be, the concern that infants be baptized is certainly expressed.

The Leipzig Colloquy

On this doctrine the Leipzig Colloquy expressed complete agreement between the Lutherans and Reformed. They agreed that,

die heilige Taufe um des goettlichen Befehls willen, als ein verordnetes Mittel zur Seligkeit noethig sei, und obwohl die Gnade Gottes durch die Taufe nicht ex opere operato, oder um des blossen Werkes willen, wie auch nicht durch die blossze aeuszerliche Abwaschung oder Besprengung, die Seligkeit wirke, so geschehe es doch kraft des Wortes der Einsetzung und Verheiszung, vermittelst der Taufe. Sie haben auch mit und neben den Kuraaechsischen dafuer gehalten dasz es recht und noethig sei, die Kinder zu taufen, und wenn man sie durch die Taufe Gott vortrage, dasz sie auch alsdann dadurch in die Gnade Gottes, Gottes Ordnung nach, an- und aufgenommen werden.⁴

The points which formed the main part of the Marburg article are also mentioned here. The command of God is the reason for administering Baptism. The grace of Baptism is noted. This grace comes through

³Ibid.

⁴"Das Leipziger Gespraech," Die Bekenntnisschriften der evangelisch-reformirten Kirche, Ernst Gottfried Adolf Boeckel (Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus, 1847), p. 451.

the institution and promise of God. With the Wittenberg Concord they agree that children come into grace through Baptism.

The new point which is emphasized clearly here is that Baptism does not take place ex opere operato. Children can believe and take part in Baptism. This was seen already in the Wittenberg Concord in its concern over how children believe.

The Leipzig Colloquy voices all of the concerns of the Marburg article and the document from Wittenberg. Apparently the frank and open discussion led both parties to this agreement.

The Brief Report of the Cassel Colloquy

The Brief Report is the document which has little agreement and much controversy. As such it sets out clearly the points which need to be emphasized for a clear distinction between Lutherans and Reformed.

The theologians from the two universities, Riteln and Marburg, could only agree,

dasz man die Kinder tauffen solle nach Christi Einsetzung, welcher Zwech ist, dasz sie CHRISTO einverleibet, und geistlich wieder-gebohren werden moege. Beiderseits hat man auch die Nothwendigkeit der Taufen erkennt, nicht zwar schlechter dings, doch dergestalt, dasz sie nicht die Beraubung, ⁵sonder Verachtung des Sacraments fuer verdamlich gehalten.

The question for discussion was the Baptism of infants. They could only agree that they should be baptized because of God's institution of the Sacrament and because they could be reborn through it. The agreement to hold as damnable the despising of the Sacrament is almost unnecessary in the light of their previous affirmation.

⁵"Kurtzer Bericht, " Historia Syncretistica, Abraham Calovius (1685), p. 643.

The questions which could not be agreed upon were whether children were holy before Baptism and whether a child who was not baptized and then died was damned because of the neglect of his parents. ⁶

In answer to these questions the Lutherans answered that the children are received into God's covenant through Baptism. However, if a child dies and was not baptized because of the carelessness of the parents, they were not ready to say that the child was lost, because there was always God's grace. However, it should serve as a warning to parents that they should have their children baptized. ⁷

The Reformed contended that children born of believing parents have a certain type of grace because of the promise given to the parents. If the child should then die without Baptism, they believed the child would be saved, because God loves all children. The type of faith the child has in this case is not a working actual faith as the parents have, but rather a primitive type. The guilt of the parents who neglect Baptism does not have any result on the eternal position of the children. ⁸

There was a final agreement on the fact that both parties in their respective churches did have a valid Baptism because they both had the essential parts of Baptism. ⁹

The Lutherans added a comment on the practice of exorcism. They said that it did not mean that the child was actually possessed by the

⁶Ibid.

⁷Ibid., p. 644.

⁸Ibid.

⁹Ibid., p. 644f.

Devil but rather that the child was a child of the Devil through original sin and that by renouncing him, they were renouncing his person and power. They considered this an important part of the baptismal rite.¹⁰

In the Cassel document the question is not so much about Baptism as it is about original sin and the state of man before grace. Both parties could agree that Baptism was necessary and beneficial. However, when it came to the reason for Baptism, the fact that man needs it because of his lost state, they could not agree.

The distinguishing mark between Lutherans and Reformed then is the question in Baptism about the state of man before Baptism, particularly in the case of infants. If Baptism is the only way that infants can be saved, then it is a Lutheran statement, while the Reformed would say that children are saved with Baptism, particularly those of Christian believing parents.

Summary

In general all of the document can agree on the following points. Baptism should be administered because of the promise, institution, and command of God. Baptism results in the rebirth of children, and, therefore, forgiveness of sins and membership in the body of Christ.

The statements about Baptism are not as anti-Roman as those on the Lord's Supper. There is only one instance of this type of polemic. The point on which there is disagreement is the Baptism of children.

On this point the differences between Lutherans and Reformed stand

¹⁰Ibid., p. 645.

out most clearly. Because of this difference the Wittenberg Concord on this doctrine can be judged as the most Lutheran document. The Leipzig document does not answer the question and leaves it open to the thoughts which are expressed by the Reformed in the Cassel document, as well as the Lutheran expression in the same document.

The point of exorcism which is made in the Cassel document probably was a point of irritation for the Reformed, and, therefore, needed clarification for them by the Lutherans. It is not one of the chief points of concern as this is the first time it makes its appearance.

Two of the articles speak about the person of Christ. They are the second and third. The second reads:

Zum andern glauben wir, dass nicht der Vater noch Heiliger Geist, sondern der Sohn Gottes des Vaters, natürlicher Gott, sei Mensch worden, durch Wirkung des Heiligen Geistes, ohne Mutter zuzuziehen, geboren von der reinen Jungfrauen Maria leiblich, vollkommen mit Leib und Seele, wie ein anderer Mensch, ohne alle Sünde.¹

The points are that it was the second person of the Trinity who became man; that this happened through the Holy Spirit without the seed of man; and that Jesus is a true man but without any sin.

In the third article the work of Jesus is related.² This article establishes the point that it was Jesus, both God and man and undivided in person, who did the things which are commonly ascribed to Him. As the undivided person, all of these things were done. It would seem, therefore, that the discussion was whether it was only the divine or only the

¹Artikel, "Dr. Martin Luthers Saemtliche Schriften, edited by John George Walke (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1901), XVII, 194.

²Ibid.

CHAPTER V

THE DOCTRINE OF CHRISTOLOGY

The doctrine of Christology is found in four documents as a point of discussion. Only the Wittenberg Concord has no discussion on this point. It was a point of discussion because it affected the doctrine of the presence of Christ in the Lord's Supper.

The Marburg Articles

Two of the articles speak about the person of Christ. They are the second and third. The second reads:

Zum andern glauben wir, dasz nicht der Vater noch Heiliger Geist, sondern der Sohn Gottes des Vaters, natuerlicher Gott, sei Mensch worden, durch Wirkung des Heiligen Geists, ohne Zuthun maennliches Samens, geboren von der reinen Jungfrauen Maria leiblich, vollkommen mit Leib und Seele, wie ein anderer Mensch, ohne alle Suende.¹

The points are that it was the second person of the Trinity who became man; that this happened through the Holy Spirit without the seed of man; and that Jesus is a true man but without any sin.

In the third article the work of Jesus is related.² This article establishes the point that it was Jesus, both God and man and undivided in person, who did the things which are commonly ascribed to Him. As the undivided person, all of these things were done. It would seem, therefore, that the discussion was whether it was only the divine or only the

¹"Artikel," Dr. Martin Luthers Saemmtliche Schriften, edited by John George Walch (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1901), XVII, 1940.

²Ibid.

human nature of Jesus that performed the various things mentioned. It is interesting to note that the descent of Christ into hell is not mentioned in this document.

The Consensus of Sendomir

In the discussion which took place before the document was written, it was found that there was complete agreement on the doctrine of Christology. There were no points on which the parties differed in Christology.³

The Leipzig Colloquy

In the Leipzig document the author finds the differences between the Lutherans and the Reformed coming out most clearly. This document is filled with details on Christology. The document first states the position of the Reformed to which they hope the Lutherans can agree.

They state that the Son of God became a true man, born of the Virgin Mary who remained a virgin in and through the birth; that Mary is not simply the bearer of man or of Christ, but truly the mother of God. This God and man is born as one undivided person. He truly suffered, was crucified, died, was buried, truly rose on the third day, ascended to heaven, sits on the right hand of God, and is Lord over all creatures. Both sides confess that all who believe on Him through the Holy Spirit are made holy, cleansed, strengthened, comforted, given

³"Consensus Mutuus," Collectio Confessionum in Ecclesiis Reformatis Publicatarum, edited by H. A. Niemeyer (Leipzig: Julius Klinkhardt, 1840), p. 553f.

life and all good things, and are protected and guarded against the Devil and all sins.⁴

Both parties agreed to the following twelve points. They are:

1. That the Son of God has a complete human nature of body and soul already in the Virgin Mary; that on account of the personal union, the Son of God is not only verbally but truly and in fact, man. Likewise, that the man is not only verbally but also really the Son of God; that the attributes of both natures are common to both;
2. That the two natures in Christ, the divine and the human, are indissolubly and indivisibly united with each other; that at no time and at no place in the state of humiliation as well as in the state of exaltation is there any division or separation of the natures; and that neither can be separated from the other even in death itself; that in death where the bond of body and soul was broken, yet the bond of the personal union remained indivisible and indissoluble; that especially the Son of God was or will never be without His flesh after His conception at any time or place;
3. That the two natures are indissoluble and indivisible but without confusion or mixing or exequation of the natures; and that the attributes are united with each other. They say that the divine nature because of the personal union is not the human nature nor did the divine become the human nature, but it remained the divine nature. The human nature also is and remains the human nature forever. The divine attributes remain the attributes of the divine nature and never become attributes of the human nature. Likewise, the human nature keeps its own attributes, and they never become attributes of the divine nature;
4. That although suffering and death is an attribute of the human nature alone, yet it was not a mere man that suffered but God's Son himself, the Lord of glory, who appropriated and was united with the sufferings of His flesh, and that the blood poured out for us was not the blood of a mere man but also the blood of the Son of God or God's blood;
5. That the sentence, the deity alone has suffered, or the humanity alone has suffered, is unscriptural;

⁴"Das Leipziger Gespraech, " Die Bekenntnisschriften der evangelisch-reformirten Kirche, Ernst Gottfried Adolf Boeckel (Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus, 1847), p. 446.

6. That in Christ, not only the mere essence, but also truly the fulness of the Godhead dwells bodily, and that the whole Christ without division of natures is omniscient, almighty, and omnipresent, not as if the omniscience, etc., were attributes of the human nature or existed in and of themselves, much less as if these attributes belong to the essence of the flesh of Christ, but they are and remain alone attributes of the divine nature and are ascribed to the whole person, God and man, because of the personal union;
7. That the whole Christ as one undivided person without separation or division from the human nature is to be invoked, trusted, and to be served, as the Council of Ephesus decided;
8. That the whole Jesus in one undivided person is present in heaven and on earth but not in a local way, rules and reigns over all from one sea to the other; that He has set all under His feet; that He has one foot on the land and one on the sea; that He is and will remain with us until the end of the world; that where two or three are gathered together in His name, He is in their midst; that He fills all things; that God the Father raised Him from the dead; and that He sits at the right hand of God in heaven over all;
9. That the descent into hell is a difficult article of faith of which little has been received by men, as also the session at the right hand, and confess that the whole Christ, God and man, went to hell, overthrew the Devil, destroyed the power of hell, and has taken all might from the Devil;
10. That the Lord Christ not only in the body of His mother, but especially during the forty days after His resurrection before the ascension, when He was truly locally, visibly, and not invisibly present, had His flesh, went to heaven where our dwelling shall be, but is also here with us and is not enclosed in heaven;
11. That the right hand of the Father is neither a certain nor created place, and the session is to be understood as no bodily or local session, but it is the majesty, power, and almightiness of God. The session means that Christ eternally rules and governs completely, according to both natures, all creatures; and especially the church of which He is the head and through which the Father rules all;
12. That the office of Jesus is, according to both natures, the holy office of mediator and redeemer; that the Son of God works in, with, and through His assumed hallowed flesh, and that the assumed humanity truly performs and powerfully cooperates with the office of the Lord in His work of giving life,

righteousness, and salvation.⁵

On these twelve points there is agreement. However, the Lutherans felt that two points had not been clearly made. The first was that Jesus not only according to the divine, but also according to the human nature is truly omniscient, etc., yet that the omniscience, etc. of the human nature cannot be ascribed as a natural attribute, but through the personal union and through the exaltation at the right hand it is present in the person of Christ and not outside of the same. The second point is that it is only the human nature of Christ which is exalted and not the divine nature.⁶

The Reformed countered that the Godhead itself received no further glory in the exaltation. Also it was not only the human nature that suffered, etc., but also the whole person of the Son of God in the flesh through the resurrection, etc., has caused the humanity to be exalted. It is the whole person who carries on His office and work now. The deity and the humanity of Christ perform all the things which were ascribed to Him.⁷

Likewise, the Reformed deny that Christ according to His human nature and essence in an invisible way is at all places and with all creatures, either in the state of humiliation or during the session. They deny also that the divine attributes are given to the human nature. They finally want to leave this matter as one of the deep secrets of Holy Writ,

⁵ Ibid., pp. 447-449.

⁶ Ibid., p. 449.

⁷ Ibid., p. 449f.

as they are described in the primitive councils and in the Augsburg Confession.⁸

A final agreement was reached that all past and present heresies are to be condemned. They are the errors of old and new Arianism, Nestorianism, Eutychianism, Monotheletism, Marcionism, and Photinianism.⁹

The disagreement seems to stem from the Lutherans' concern that the deity of Christ be protected, while the Reformed were concerned that the humanity of Christ was not injured. They could not reach agreement because they were interested in different points of the same doctrine. As the material is surveyed, it would appear that both concerns were well meant but that neither could be nor was denied by the other. The Reformed probably were right when they said that the deep secrets of God could not be fathomed and that it was best to leave matters as they were in the early symbols and the Augsburg Confession.

The Brief Report of the Cassel Colloquy

On Christology the Lutheran and the Reformed agreed that the divine and human natures of Christ were truly and personally united. They also agreed that the one nature did not change into the other, or become mixed with the other, but that both natures remained in this union together with the attributes of each.¹⁰

⁸Ibid., p. 450.

⁹Ibid., p. 450f.

¹⁰"Kurtzer Bericht," Historia Syncretistica, by Abraham Calovius (1685), 641.

They further agreed concerning the predication or communication of attributes, that the names of one nature could truly be predicated of the other concretely; that is, God is man and man is God. Also they agreed that the attributes of both natures could really and truly concretely be predicated of the whole person, and that such understanding was according to the nature to which the particular attributes were appropriate.¹¹

Disagreement arose over the point whether the divine attributes could be predicated abstractly of the human nature. The Lutheran theologians said that they could be, but that it was a moral power, not an innate physical power by which they could be attributed in the abstract, because of the personal or hypostatic union.¹² They stressed the point that because the natures or essences had become one, the consequence was that the attributes had become one. They said that all the divine attributes could be predicated of the humanity, but it was only an actum secundum type of action, which took place when the human nature worked. They wished to stress here that the power did not belong intrinsically to the human nature but that it was only through the personal union that this was possible.¹³

They made a third point by saying that,

Drittens betreffend die Wercke der Allmacht, sagten sie, deroselben Principium quod sei Christus selbst seiner Persohn nach, beide Natured waeren principium quo und zwar in genere causai efficientis

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² Ibid.

¹³ Ibid., p. 641f.

Physicae, wiewol mit dem Unterschied, dass die Goettliche Natur wuercke als die Haupt-Ursache, die Menschliche nicht Hauptursachlich; Also wenn Christus Wunder gethan, habe die Goettliche Natur gewuercket nach der ihr intrinsece innerlich zustehenden Allmacht, die Menschliche aber habe nach der Allmacht, so ihr persoehnlich vereinget, mit cooperiret, aber nicht Haeuptursachlichen. ¹⁴

They hoped to establish the point that the attributes could be attributed abstractly but that it was a type of secondary participation.

To this the Reformed theologians said it was enough that the attributes of the natures be predicated concretely of the whole person. Also they said that no divine attributes could be ascribed abstractly to the human nature. Further, they state that when almighty works were done, both natures worked but each according to its own power. ¹⁵

While the point of disagreement remained, they did agree that Christ is true God, one essence with the Father and Holy Spirit, also true man; that both natures in Christ truly and personally are united together with their attributes; that the human nature by the session is raised to the highest honor; that all heresies, past and present be condemned; that neither the Reformed by their stand wished to separate the personal union, or the Lutherans by their stand wish to mix the natures, but the questions of dispute were not so important that they overthrew the basis of faith and eternal happiness, but that the substance of the article was agreed to by both. ¹⁶

¹⁴ Ibid., p. 642.

¹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶ Ibid., p. 642f.

The final agreement places the disputed points into their correct position. It was not a basic point on which agreement had to be reached before eternal salvation was assured. It was a point which was of importance to both parties but could be overlooked apparently before agreement or merger could take place.

The Cassel document brings out the main point for discussion between Lutherans and Reformed. It was the point of how and in what manner the attributes of the divine nature could be ascribed to the human nature.

The final statement shows that agreement had been reached on the personal union and on the essence of exaltation, the raising to honor of the human nature. The attitude of the two parties would make for progress as they realized that neither was damnable.

Summary

The documents seem to offer the conclusion that the doctrine of Christology became more important as time passed. Little difference of opinion can be seen in the Marburg article, while much more discussion is given in the Leipzig Colloquy and at Cassel. Both parties can agree to the position taken by the early symbols and the Augsburg Confession on this doctrine. Further developments can not always be easily understood, and as the Leipzig document points out, by stressing one side of the point, the party might become guilty of falsifying its original position. The importance of the disagreement seems to be best stated in the Cassel document.

In general the author would say there was agreement on the doctrine of Christ, His person and work. The disputed points were the result of carrying the simple agreements to their ultimate conclusions. This was not always feasible. However, none of the conclusions were considered detrimental to the Christian faith and salvation.

CHAPTER VI

THE DOCTRINE OF ELECTION

The doctrine of election is discussed in two documents, the Leipzig Colloquy and the Brief Report of the Cassel Colloquy. The discussion in both of these is open and frank on the points which concern both parties.

The Leipzig Colloquy

The Leipzig Colloquy discusses this doctrine by simply stating the position taken by the Reformed and then the position taken by the Lutherans. When both have been given, there is no comparison or further discussion. This, no doubt, was because of the very close agreement that was reached. In fact, the terminology of both parties is much the same.

The Reformed make the following points:

1. That God from eternity in Jesus Christ from damned humanity has chosen not all, but certain men whose choice and names are known only to Him, whom He at His time, enlightens and renews through the power and working of His Word and Spirit to faith in Christ, holds them in faith until their end, and makes them eternally holy through their faith;
2. That He also finds or sees no cause of inner virtue, or condition for His choice in the elected, either in their works, their faith, or their first nod or tendency toward faith, but that all good which is in them has been foreordained and given to them by the free grace of God;
3. That also God from eternity has foreordained certain ones who persist in their sins and unbelief to eternal damnation, not by some absolute decree or bare will or choice, as if God had created the greater part of the world or a single man without looking at their sins and unbelief to eternal damnation or to eternal salvation, but the damnation comes from His righteous

judgment. The cause of judgment is man's own sin, unrepentance, and unbelief. The whole guilt and cause of damnation of the unbelievers is themselves, while the entire cause of the election and salvation of the believers is the grace of God alone in Jesus Christ:

4. That the individual can and may know his choice and salvation not a priori from the knowledge of God, but alone a posteriori from the revealed word of God and his faith and the fruits of his faith. The misuse of this doctrine by the world is damnable;
5. That if someone wants to delve into this deep secret further and wants to know the reason why some are damned and others are saved, he is referred to the words of the Apostle.¹

The Lutherans then make ten points in their doctrine. They are:

1. That God has chosen certain men but not all for salvation;
2. That the choice and names of the chosen are known to God alone;
3. That God has chosen the same from eternity whom He in this time through the power and working of His Word and Spirit brings to faith in Christ and keeps them in it until the end, and although the elected for a time may fall away, it is impossible that they will finally be lost;
4. That God has found in the elect no cause for His choice of them either in their nod or tendency toward faith, but that all the good that is in the elect comes from the free grace of God;
5. That God from eternity has foreordained others, whom He knows that they will persist in their sins and unbelief, to eternal damnation and destruction;
6. That this destruction does not come from an absolute decree or mere whim or will, as if God without looking at the unbelief of anyone damned him; that no such whim has ever been in God that He could foreordain to salvation or damnation the greater part of humanity or a single person;
7. That likewise many men are eternally lost and damned by their righteous judgment, but the cause of such damnation is the men themselves, their unbelief, and unrepentance; that the entire guilt and cause of damnation of the unbelievers is the unbelievers

¹"Das Leipziger Gespraech," Die Bekenntnisschriften der evangelisch-reformirten Kirch, Ernst Gottfried Adolf Boeckel, (Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus, 1847), p. 453f.

themselves. The cause of election and salvation of the believers is the free grace of God;

8. That each man can be certain of his election and salvation not a priori but a posteriori from the revealed Word of God and his faith in Christ. The misuse of this doctrine by the world is damnable;
9. That in this high secret of election many questions by men will be raised, who in their mortal condition do not understand it, as Paul says;
10. That the words of Holy Writ and the explanation as found in the Book of Concord are to be taught.²

After looking at what is said, only two points stand out. The one is that the Reformed say that the elect may be certain of their election by the revealed Word of God, their faith, and the fruits of faith. The Lutherans omit the fruits of faith. The second point is the tenth point of the Lutherans who refer to the Book of Concord. Neither one of these was so prominent that further discussion ensued.

It would appear, therefore, that there was agreement on the doctrine of election at the Leipzig meeting, at least in the document.

The Brief Report of the Cassel Colloquy

The Cassel document starts out with a statement of agreement.

Both the Lutherans and the Reformed agree that,

in den Menschen nach dem Fall keine Kraeffte mehr uebrig sein, etwas gutes in Geistlichen Sachen entweder anzufahen oder zuvollbringen, um dasz das gantze Werck dem Menschlichen Seligkeit, von dem Willen, Vollgefallen, und Gnade Gottes einzig und allein bestehe.³

²Ibid., p. 454f.

³"Kurtzer Bericht, "Historia Syncretistica, Abraham Calovius (1685), p. 638.

They are agreeing here on the condition of man after the fall rather than on election.

The question whether God is ready to offer to all men and each man His grace through the ordained medium, and also to call, convert, give rebirth, make righteous, call and receive as His children and glorify all and each one was first asked. The Lutherans answered, yes, when it is considered the conditional will of God, but if it is understood as the absolute will of God, then they deny it. The Reformed answered, no, under both circumstances.⁴

The question of whether the grace of perseverance conditions a man so that because of grace he could obey as well as disobey, was affirmed by the Lutherans and denied by the Reformed.⁵

The question whether the election of grace happens after the foreseeing of persistent faith, was affirmed by the Lutherans and denied by the Reformed.⁶

The question whether certain rejections happen because of the foreseeing of final unrepentance and unbelief, the Lutherans answered, yes, and the Reformed answered, no. The Reformed understood by this that sins, final unrepentance, and unbelief do not make God from eternity decide to damn in time. They do not allow that it was the sins, foreknowledge of final unrepentance, or unbelief which are the cause of the damnation of the godless and the decree to reprobation.⁷

⁴Ibid., p. 638f.

⁵Ibid., p. 639.

⁶Ibid.

⁷Ibid.

The Lutherans answered, yes, and the Reformed, no, to the question whether Christ died, has forgiveness of sins for, and earned righteousness and eternal life for the godless as well as the chosen.⁸

Whether a person who had saving faith and is in the state of grace by doing certain sins can fall from grace, was affirmed by the Lutherans who understood that for a time such a chosen one could fall away but at the end would have to return because God had chosen him. The Reformed denied this because it is impossible to fall from grace, because the grace of God would support him when he sins.⁹

The parties simply could not agree on these important points. They did finally agree, however, that man can neither do nor complete good spiritual things by himself. Good works must be ascribed to the grace of God alone. They also agree that neither party is Pelagian, and both parties damn semi-Pelagianism. The Reformed wish to leave the unanswered questions to the mystery of God's will, poor judgment, or God's unrevealed way of dealing with man. None of these questions, they both agree, will or could make a man holy. They finally agree that the disputed points should be left until God gives one or the other party the grace to understand. Until that time they should not damn each other.¹⁰

The differences are quite clear in this document. Apparently the Reformed are of a different stripe from those of the Leipzig Colloquy, and the Lutherans are different also. The dispute was more about the cause of election than election itself. Also the condition of man after

⁸Ibid.

⁹Ibid., p. 639.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 640.

election is a much discussed point. It could not be settled because the difference came from their opposite view of the will of God.

There is agreement that all of the grace which man has comes from God. This is about the only point on which they could agree. The agreement to condemn Pelagianism is, therefore, understandable. There final agreement not to damn the other party is also understandable since the Reformed, at least, did not consider faith in this doctrine as necessary for salvation. The Lutherans, since they agreed to this, probably felt that the doctrine was important and also wanted God to show them the way to go in this matter.

Summary

The doctrine of the eternal election of man varies a great deal in these documents. There is agreement only on a very elementary point, that man has nothing to do with the good or his salvation. The cause of election is not agreed upon, nor is the matter of persistence in faith.

The cause of election is also not agreed upon. In the case of the Lutherans at Cassel, God's choice takes place when He foresees that man would come to faith. This is quite different from Leipzig where man is elected and then brought to faith. The other point that man will persist in the faith if he is elected, presents difficulty, because Lutherans and Reformed could, no doubt, see men who were Christians fall away from the faith. The Reformed would say those people were never chosen, but the Lutherans would say they, if chosen, would finally come back to faith. Therefore, no agreement was reached.

In fairness it must be stated that the two documents do not speak of

election in the same way. In fact some of the questions raised at Cassel did not appear at Leipzig. It can only be said that as time passed the doctrine of election became more difficult, and the differences between Lutherans and Reformed became more pronounced.

The struggle between these three doctrines is restricted to the definite statements on these points. Justification is used in the sense that it is the work of Christ for us. The larger area of life, lived by faith, is dealt with under sanctification.

Only these documents make any direct mention of the three doctrines. In one of them, the Consensus of London, there is steady agreement without any further discussion. The doctrines will be considered in chronological order, starting with the oldest document.

The Marburg Articles

The fifth, sixth, seventh, eighth, and tenth articles speak on these doctrines. The fifth says,

Item fünfften glauben wir, dass wir von solcher Sünde, und allen andern Sünden, durch den ewigen Tod erlöset werden, so wir an rechten Christen Sohn, Jesum Christum, der uns gestorben, glauben, und durch solchem Glauben durch heilighen Werk, stand oder Leben u. so mögen werden von einigen Sünden u.

The emphasis is on faith in Jesus who died for sin, frees us from all sin, both original and actual, and also from eternal death. Good works have nothing to do with ridding ourselves of sin.

In the sixth article, the stress is on the fact that good works, service, or our strength do not give us faith. Faith is a gift of God, more

¹⁰Artikel, "Dr. Martin Luthers Saemmtliche Schriften, edited by John George Walsh (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1931), XVII, 1963.

CHAPTER VII

THE DOCTRINES OF JUSTIFICATION, FAITH, AND SANCTIFICATION

The chapter on these three doctrines is restricted to the definite discussions on these points. Justification is used in the sense that it is the work of Jesus for us. The larger area of life, lived by faith, is dealt with under sanctification.

Only three documents make any direct mention of the three doctrines. In one of these, the Consensus of Sendomir, there is simply agreement without any further discussion. The doctrines will be considered in chronological order, starting with the oldest document.

The Marburg Articles

The fifth, sixth, seventh, eighth, and tenth articles speak on these doctrines. The fifth says,

Zum fuenften glauben wir, dasz wir von solcher Suende, und allen andern Suenden, sammt dem ewigen Tod erloeset werden, so wir an solchen Gottes Sohn, Jesum Christum, fuer uns gestorben, glauben, und auszer solchem Glauben durch keinerlei Werk, stand oder Orden u. los moegen werden von einigen Suenden u.¹

The emphasis is on faith in Jesus who died for sin, frees us from all sin, both original and actual, and also from eternal death. Good works have nothing to do with ridding ourselves of sin.

In the sixth article, the stress is on the fact that good works, service, or our strength do not give us faith. Faith is a gift of God, more

¹"Artikel," Dr. Martin Luthers Saemmtliche Schriften, edited by John George Walch (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1901), XVII, 1940.

directly the gift of the Holy Spirit, who gives and creates faith in a person's heart through the Gospel or Christ's words.²

The seventh article stresses the fact that good works of all kinds are even wrong if salvation is to be gained by them. The positive side of the article stresses that faith is righteousness before God. By it God declares us to be righteous, pious, and holy. Faith gives us righteousness, life, and the gift of God's Son, and saves us from sin, death, and hell.³

The eighth article repeats what the sixth has said, that faith comes through the work of the Holy Spirit through the Word, either preached, spoken, or read. The emphasis is on the means which the Spirit uses.⁴

The tenth article speaks to sanctification. It is this faith created by the Holy Spirit, which makes us righteous and which makes us do good works such as loving the neighbor, praying to God, and suffering persecution.⁵

In summary, the following points are to be noted. Faith frees us from all sins, the power of the Devil, hell, and eternal death. Faith is believing that Jesus is the Son of God who died for our sins. Faith is a gift of God the Holy Spirit, which makes us righteous and gives us all the blessings of the Son of God. Good works of all types do not give us forgiveness, faith, or the love of God. Faith comes through the Word of

²Ibid.

³Ibid., col. 1941.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Ibid.

God, the spoken, or the read Word. Faith results in good works.

It is hard to see any point of discussion or disagreement in these articles. There is an anti-Roman bent in the stress against good works earning any type of merit. There is also the anti-Schwaermer note in that the Holy Spirit uses means to bring people to faith. However, that this was disputed cannot be seen from the document.

The Consensus of Sandomir

The document from Sandomir only states that all sides are agreed on the matter of justification. Apparently agreement was so evident that little discussion took place on this article.⁶

The document does not speak on the matter of faith or sanctification. It simply states that there is agreement on the primary articles of faith. This would include these doctrines.

The Leipzig Colloquy

The Leipzig document has this simple agreement,

Dasz Christus, der Herr und Heiland, fuer alle Menschen gestorben und mit seinem Tode fuer die Suende der ganzen Weltvoellig, vollkoemmlich und in sich kraeftiglich genug gethan habe; dasz es auch nicht nur ein Scheinwille waere, sondern dasz es sein eigenlicher, ernester Wille und Befehl, dasz alle Menschen an ihn sollten glauben, und durch den Glauben selig werden, also dasz Keiner von der Kraft und dem Nutzen der Genugthuung Christi ausgeschlossen sei, als der sich selbst durch Unglauben ausschliesze.⁷

⁶"Consensus Mutuus," Collectio Confessionum in Ecclesiis Reformatis Publicatarum, edited by H. A. Niemeyer (Leipzig: Julius Klinkhardt, 1840), p. 553f.

⁷"Das Leipziger Gespraech," Die Bekenntnisschriften der evangelisch-reformirten Kirche, Ernst Gottfried Adolf Boeckel (Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus, 1847), p. 451.

The basic points are that Christ died for all; that by His death He has done enough for the sins of the entire world; that God wants all men to believe on Jesus. This is His earnest will and command. Faith makes one holy. Unbelief alone cuts the person off from the power and use of the satisfaction of Christ.

This document stresses the points which were made in the Marburg articles. There is not attack here on good works. In fact the place of good works is not defined. This is a simple basic statement.

The point for discussion is not given here. It is perhaps because agreement was reached very early in the discussion. At least in this document no difference between Lutherans and Reformed is visible.

Summary

The doctrine of justification, faith, and sanctification is not a primary doctrine in the merger documents as it appears in only three, has very little discussion, and does not give evidence of vigorous disagreement.

The doctrine as it is found in the documents is very similar. The documents all speak the same language on this doctrine. The statements are also very simple. They do not have a full-blown doctrine of justification, faith, or sanctification in the merger documents.

CHAPTER VIII

ECUMENICAL THEOLOGY

In this chapter the spirit in which the meetings were conducted and particularly the ecumenical theology which was formed in the documents will be considered.

All of the documents contain some type of discussion or mutual agreement on this doctrine. The purpose of this is to see how far they went, what they would tolerate, and what would still be necessary in order for both parties to become one.

The Marburg Articles

At the end of the fourteenth article, on the Lord's Supper, they state,

Und wiewohl aber wir uns . . . diese Zeit nicht verglichen haben, so soll doch ein Theil gegen dem andern christliche Liebe, so ferne jedes Gewissen immermehr deiden kann, erzeigen, und beide Theil Gott dem Allmaechtigen fleiszig bitten, dasz er uns durch seinen Geist in dem rechten Verstand bestaetigen wolle, amen.¹

They are ready to admit that they are not agreed as yet. Then they state that Christian charity should be shown to the fellow members of both parties, as far as conscience permits. This undefined conditional clause could actually mean no Christian charity at all. The desire that both parties pray for the Spirit's guidance is noteworthy.

All that can be said about this ecumenical theology is that it tries to promote harmony between the parties. However, the final statement

¹"Artikel," Dr. Martin Luthers Saemmtliche Scriften, edited by John George Walch (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1901), XVII, 1942f.

is so undefined that no harmony at all might result. It is a very incomplete statement of the situation and gives little guidance to the members of the parties.

The Wittenberg Concord

The Wittenberg Concord has two statements which speak on ecumenical theology. The first is,

Cum autem pauci convenerimus, et opus sit utrinque hanc rem ad alios concionatores et superiores referee, nondum licet nobis de concordia pacisci, priusquam ad alios retulerimus.²

The second is,

Cum autem omnes profiteantur, se iuxta confessionem et Apologiam Principum Evangelium profitentium in omnibus articulis sentire et docere velle, maxime cupimus sanciri et constitui concordiam. Et spes est nobis, si reliqui utrinque ita consanerint, solidam futuram esse concordiam.³

There are no disputed points in this document. Agreement between both parties had been reached. Why could there not be complete harmony between the two parties?

First of all, it is noted that the agreement was only between a few theologians. Other preachers and superiors had to agree before a merger could take place. This set up the condition which must be fulfilled before a merger could take place after agreement of doctrine had been reached.

The second point to be noted is the strong desire for harmony.

²"Formula Concordiae," Corpus Reformatorum, edited by Carolus Gottlieb Bretschneider (Halis Saxorum: C. A. Schwetschke et Filium, 1836), III, 76.

³Ibid.

The purpose or reason for this harmony is not stated.

Note that not only was the document necessary but also the Augsburg Confession and its Apology. That is the third point which is necessary for full agreement.

The Wittenberg Concord is a primitive merger document. It was a preliminary document which would have to meet the tests of others before it could be approved. It shows a strong desire for harmony, but there is no point made regarding the treatment of the other party during the time this was being sought.

The Consensus of Sendomir

This document is one which evidences complete agreement between the two parties. It is perhaps the one with the least amount of discussion on differing points of doctrine. It was decided that,

*Huius autem sancti, mutuique consensus vinculum fore arbitrati sumus, convenimusque, ut quemadmodum illi nos, nostrasque ecclesias, et Confessionem nostras in hac Synodo publicatam, et Fratrum, orthodoxas esse testantur: Sic etiam nos illorum ecclesias eodem christiano amore prosequamur, et orthodoxas fateamur: Extremumque valedicamus, et altum silentium imponamus omnibus rixis, distractionibus, dissidiis, quibus evangelii cursus non sine maxima multorum piorum offensione, Impeditus est, et unde adversariis nostris non levis calumniandi et verae Christianae religioni nostrae contradicendi. Quinpotius occasio sit subministrata paci et tranquillitati publicae studere, charitatem mutuum exercere, et operas mutuas ad aedificationem ecclesiae pro fraterna coniunctione nostra praestare debemus.*⁴

The Lutherans and Reformed are here putting a damper on all disputes which would hinder the Gospel. Whether disputes could be avoided is

⁴"Consensus Mutuus," Collection Confessionum in Ecclesiis Reformatis Publicatarum, edited by H. A. Niemeyer (Leipzig: Julius Klinkhardt, 1840), p. 559.

another matter. The desire for peace and the time to practice charity is also noted here.

As this also is a preliminary document, they wish at some future date to meet to draw up a confession which will embody the entire doctrine of the church. They also desire that a mutual exchange of people at their various synods take place. They hope, finally, to have one body rather than the several synods and various confessions they have now.⁵

They also agree to join their right hands on the sacred and mutual consensus and to avoid all occasions for alienation of the churches. They also ask that prayers be said that God would grant that their church live in peace and be rescued from the Papacy.⁶

For the first time, mention is made of actual steps which should result from this preliminary meeting. The mutual exchange of persons, and the avoidance of all chances for disturbances are to be noted. They are the first to offer concrete proposals for further moves toward organic union. The stress on harmony and peace is also of importance.

The Leipzig Colloquy

At the Leipzig meeting no agreement was reached. Yet, several proposals are made which are important for their ecumenical theology.

First of all, the Lutheran and the Reformed deplore the divided

⁵Ibid., p. 560.

⁶Ibid.

state of Christendom. They hate this mostly because the Romanists have been making such progress.⁷ This is important because it was one of the reasons, if not the reason, for the meeting of the theologians.

On the doctrine of the Lord's Supper on which they had not agreed, the Reformed were anxious that their views would not be completely damned by the Lutherans. They wanted this so that a united front could be presented against the forces of Rome. The Lutherans, therefore, decided to think this doctrine over in the fear of the Lord and consult with more theologians.⁸

Both finally agree to consult with more theologians and to have peace while it is being done.⁹ This was also called for in the Wittenberg Concord.

The important points in the ecumenical theology at Leipzig is the stress on the united front and the idea of calling in more theologians. Peace again was to prevail. This might again be interpreted as in the Marburg Articles with their conditional clause.

The Brief Report of the Cassel Colloquy

At Cassel where there was no unity of doctrine, both parties finally agreed that they will not smear or damn the other party on the disputed points, but love each other heartily and brotherly. Further, they will consider as fellow members of the church and heirs of eternal life the

⁷"Das Leipziger Gespraech," Die Bekenntnisschriften der evangelisch-reformirten Kirche, Ernst Gottfried Adolf Boeckel (Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus, 1847), p. 443f.

⁸Ibid., p. 452f.

⁹Ibid.

members of the other church. Thus, they hope to arrive at true peace and church unity.¹⁰

The agreement seems strange in the light of the disputes that were held. However, as neither side considered the points as damning as held by the other party, this agreement is possible. Nothing is stated as to future meetings or as to the exact way in which they hope to achieve unity. Perhaps they felt this was unnecessary in the light of the fact that they considered each other as members of the church.

Summary

There is little consistency on the doctrine in the documents. They do not agree at all as to the methods or plans for future agreement. The Sandomir document is the most complete and offers the most concrete methods for organic union.

Generally, the difference of doctrine is acknowledged where it existed. No one was ready for complete organic union even where agreement of doctrine had been reached. Generally, others had to be consulted.

The desire for unity is always present and always voiced. Where the reason for this is stated, it was for a united front against the Papacy. There is at this time little consideration as to the reason and purpose for union as far as the merger documents are concerned.

¹⁰"Kurtzer Bericht," Historia Syncretistica, Abraham Calovius (1685), p. 645.

CHAPTER IX

MISCELLANEOUS DOCTRINES

A number of other doctrines are discussed in the documents which should be mentioned for the sake of completeness. In this chapter, tradition, the cause of sin, government and law, the Trinity, and absolution and confession will be considered.

Tradition

The Marburg Articles and the Consensus of Sendomir are the two documents which mention tradition. Article thirteen of the Marburg Articles states that all traditions if they are not contrary to God's Word are a matter for the people to decide. They are neither forbidden nor commanded. Under this category they condemn the celibacy of priests because it is not commanded in God's Word. The rule is a plain one which does not permit misinterpretation.¹

The Consensus of Sendomir states,

*Ritus autem et Ceremonias uniuscuiusque Ecclesiae, liberos hac concordia, et Coniunctione relinguimus. Non enim multum refert, qui ritus observentur, modo sarta tecta et incorrupta existat ipsa doctrina et fundamentum fidei ac salutis nostrae: Quemadmodum et ipsa Confessio Augustana et Saxonica de ea re docent: Et in hac Confessione nostra in praesenti Synodo Sendomiriensi publicata, id ipsum expressimus.*²

¹"Artikel," Dr. Martin Luthers Saemmtliche Schriften, edited by John George Walch (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1901), XVII, 1942.

²"Consensus Mutuus," Collectio Confessionum in Ecclesiis Reformatis Publicatarum, edited by H. A. Niemeyer (Leipzig: Julius Klinkhardt, 1840), p. 559.

They also leave the matter of rites, traditions, and ceremonies open, to be decided by the people. They are in complete accord with all the confessions which were accepted at this meeting.

In summary, the doctrine on tradition was consistent in the documents. It is probably an anti-Roman matter as both documents come from a highly anti-Roman background.

Government and Laws

The Marburg Articles are the only document which as a statement concerning government and laws. It reads,

Zum zwoelften, dasz alle Obrigkeit und weltlich Gesetz, Gericht und Ordnung, wo sie sind, ein rechter guter Stand sind, und nichts verboten, wie etlicht Pabstliche und Wiedertaeufer lehren und halten, sondern, dasz ein Christ, so dezu gerufen order geboren, wohl kann durch den Glauben Christi selig werden gleichwie Vater- und Mutterstand, Herrn- und Frauenstand.³

The reason for the article is stated in it. The Romanists opposed certain governments, and the Anabaptists, all. This was a necessary statement because of the times. No difference of opinion can be seen in the article.

The Trinity

The Marburg Articles and the Leipzig Colloquy are the two documents which discuss the doctrine of the Trinity. In both there is agreement on the doctrine. The first article from Marburg states that both parties agree that there is one, true and natural God, who is Creator of all; that God is one in essence and nature, but threefold in person;

³"Artikel," ibid.

that these three persons are Father, Son and Holy Spirit; that they agree with the Nicene Council and the whole Christian church.⁴

The Leipzig Colloquy states that both parties agree that God is one in essence and three in person; that the unity of the divine essence and the secret of the three different persons in the Godhead is grounded powerfully and incontestably in the Old and New Testaments; that God is "simpliciter," eternal, without a body, of indivisible essence, without end, with immeasurable might; that He can do all that He wants and that nothing is impossible with Him.⁵ The Leipzig Colloquy goes into greater detail as to the attributes of God. The reference to the Trinity being in the Old as well as in the New Testament is interesting. It would appear that the time between Marburg and Leipzig had caused some differences of opinion between Lutherans and Reformed. The doubts concerning the Trinity seem to have been on the part of the Reformed.

The two documents agree as to their position on the Trinity. The Leipzig document is fuller in its treatment of the Godhead. While the Marburg article mentions that the doctrine of the Trinity was established in the Nicene Council, the Leipzig document goes back to Scriptures.

Confession and Absolution

Four of the documents discuss confession and absolution. Marburg

⁴Ibid., col. 1940.

⁵"Das Leipziger Gespraech," Die Bekenntnisschriften der evangelisch-reformirten Kirche, Ernst Gottfried Adolph Boeckel (Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus, 1947), p. 446.

points out the position which is agreed to by almost all the documents.

It reads,

Zum elften, dasz die Beicht oder Rathsuchung bei seinem Pfarrherrn oder Naechsten, wohl ungezwungen und frei sein soll, aber doch fast nuetzlich den betruebten, angefochtenen, oder mit Suenden beladenen, oder in Irrthem gefallenen Gewissen, allermeist um der Absolution oder Troestung willen des Evangelii, welches die rechte Absolution ist.⁶

Confession is not mandatory but it is important. The Gospel is considered the only type of absolution which is really absolution.

The Wittenberg Concord states the desirability of preserving private absolution, because of the consolation and the discipline which is very useful to the church. It is especially good for the uncultivated. The enumeration of sins is neither approved nor required, but this conversation is preserved because of the absolution and institution.⁷ In this an importance is attached to confession and absolution which is not apparent in the Marburg article.

In the Consensus of Sendomir, confession came in only by way of Saxon Confession, a part of which is incorporated into it. In this statement by Melanchthon, it is stated that none are admitted to the Lord's Supper without confession and absolution by the pastor. He states that in this act the ruder type of person is asked and instructed concerning the whole doctrine.⁸ Here confession is a matter which must be kept in the church. It appears that it has left the state of being only desirable and has now become an obligation.

⁶"Artikel," op. cit., cols. 1941f.

⁷"Formula Concordiae," Corpus Reformatorum, edited by Carolus Gottlieb Bretschneider (Halis Saxorum: C. A. Schwetschke et Filium, 1836), III, 78.

⁸"Consensus Mutuus," op. cit., p. 556.

At Leipzig, the theologians agreed that confession, when it was not misused and considered an adiaphoran, and when it was considered as a free, Christian, and good ceremony, could be used in the church; and where it was already used, it should remain. The Papal forced and demanded confession was a complete misuse and was quite unholy and damnable.⁹

Here it is approved and not demanded. Leipzig seems to return to the position held at Marburg. It would seem that there was little disagreement about the whole matter. For the most part it was considered as a free matter with the exception of Sendomir. The purpose always remains the same. It is an aid to the uncultured or burdened consciences.

The Cause of Sin

The two documents which discuss the cause of sin are the Marburg Articles and the Leipzig Colloquy. Both of these agree on this doctrine.

The Marburg article says that original sin is received and inherited by all from Adam and is capable of damning all men. Christ is the one who has brought us life and escape from eternal punishment and has permitted us to enter God's kingdom of bliss.¹⁰

Leipzig goes into more detail by saying that since the fall of Adam, all men who are naturally born, also the children of believers, are conceived and born in sin; that this original sin is really sin in them; and

⁹"Das Leipziger Gespraech," op. cit., p. 453.

¹⁰"Artikel," op. cit., col. 1940.

that all of them are under the wrath of God and will be damned if they are not reborn through Baptism and the Holy Spirit.¹¹

The controversy over the state of children of believers appears to be the point of discussion. That this was discussed shows the difference which had arisen between Lutherans and Reformed during the time interval between Marburg and Leipzig.

However, there is agreement on this doctrine. The Leipzig document is the more complete statement of doctrine.

¹¹"Das Leipziger Gespraech," op. cit., p. 446.

CHAPTER X

CONCLUSION

After analyzing the theology of the various documents, the following conclusions are reached:

1. All the documents discuss two doctrines. The first is the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, and the second is ecumenical theology. The Lord's Supper is a primary matter in all the documents. Ecumenical theology is only incidental to the whole discussion.
2. The documents were never considered as sufficient for merger of the two parties. All documents reveal that further documents or discussion would be necessary before mergers could take place.
3. The documents do not present, as individual documents, a complete summary of the beliefs of the two parties. They speak either to the points which were causing disagreement or to matters which had been mutually agreed upon without discussion.
4. The chronology of the documents reveals that as time passed, the doctrines under discussion became more complex and more points of difference arose. Although Marburg contains many of the doctrines which were discussed, they are in embryo form when the Leipzig Colloquy is considered.
5. The theology of the various doctrines, when agreement was reached, may or may not be consistent throughout the various documents. The same is true when agreement was not reached. For instance, the doctrine of the Lord's Supper at Marburg is different from the doctrine of the Lord's Supper at Sendomir. Likewise, the ecumenical theology varies from Wittenberg to Sendomir.
6. The chief points of difference between Lutherans and Reformed in these documents are the Lord's Supper, Baptism, election, and Christology.
7. It appears that the deeper the discussion went on a certain doctrine, the more the theologians realized that the finer differences were not such, that they destroyed faith or the character of the church of the non-confessing party.
8. The final point is that not all Lutherans and not all Reformed theologians held the same doctrine on the various points discussed.

For example, there is a great difference between the Lutherans who signed the Consensus of Sandomir and those who signed the Wittenberg Concord. The variations between Lutherans at Cassel and those at Leipzig reveal a difference of doctrinal position. The same is true of the Reformed at these meetings.

It would be valuable to look at present day documents between Lutherans and Reformed to note the doctrines discussed as well as the individual doctrines. The result of the documents discussed in this thesis, while not given here, would offer some guidance to the expected results of present documents. Particularly the differences between past and present documents should be carefully studied so that the results of the present discussions would have the same or better results than the merger documents discussed in this thesis.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- "Artikel, deren saemmtliche zu Marburg anwesende Theologen sich verglichen haben, den 3. Oct. Anno 1529," Dr. Martin Luthers Saemmtliche Schriften. XVII. Edited by John George Walch. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1901. Cols. 1939-1943.
- Beto, George John. "The Marburg Colloquy of 1529: A Textual Study," Concordia Theological Monthly, XVI (February, 1945), 73-94.
- "Consensus Mutuus," Collectio Confessionum in Ecclesiis Reformatis Publicatarum. Edited by H. A. Niemeyer. Leipzig: Julius Klinkhardt, 1840. Pp. 553-565.
- "Formula Concordiae," Corpus Reformatorum. III. Edited by Carolus Gottlieb Bretschneider. Halis Saxorum: C. A. Schwetschke et Filium, 1836. Cols. 75-78.
- Jacobs, Henry Eyster. The Book of Concord. II. Philadelphia: G. W. Frederick, 1893.
- Kolde, T. "Conference of Marburg," The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge. VII. Edited by Samuel Macauley Jackson. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1950. Pp. 167-168.
- "Kurtzer Bericht von dem Colloquio," Historia Syncretistica. Abraham Calovius. 1685. Pp. 634-647.
- "Leipziger Gespraech, Das," Die Bekenntnisschriften der evangelisch-reformirten Kirche. Ernst Gottfried Adolf Boeckel. Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus, 1847. Pp. 441-459.
- Pelikan, Jaroslav, Jr. "The Consensus of Sandómierz: A Chapter from the Polish Reformation," Concordia Theological Monthly, XVIII (November, 1947), 825-837.
- Neve, J. L. The Lutherans in the Movements for Church Union. Philadelphia: The Lutheran Publication House, 1921.
- Reu, M. The Augsburg Confession. Chicago: Wartburg Publishing House, 1930.
- Schaff, Philip. The Creeds of Christendom. I. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1899.