

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

Doctor of Theology Dissertation

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

5-1-1992

The Bestowal of the Benefits of the Real Presence the Early Eucharistic Works of Martin Chemnitz as a Contribution Toward the Formula of Concord Article VII

Brynjulf Hoaas

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, ir_hoaasb@csl.edu

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



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

Recommended Citation

Hoas, Brynjulf, "The Bestowal of the Benefits of the Real Presence the Early Eucharistic Works of Martin Chemnitz as a Contribution Toward the Formula of Concord Article VII" (1992). *Doctor of Theology Dissertation*. 130.

<https://scholar.csl.edu/thd/130>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Doctor of Theology Dissertation by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

THE BESTOWAL OF THE BENEFITS OF THE REAL PRESENCE
THE EARLY EUCHARISTIC WORKS OF MARTIN CHEMNITZ
AS A CONTRIBUTION TOWARD THE FORMULA
OF CONCORD ARTICLE VII

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

by
Brynjulf Hoaas
June 1990

Approved by

A. Neigel
Advisor

Jacobson
Reader

Paul Rossin
Reader

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter

1.	INTRODUCTION.....	1
	The Task (3). The Sources (5) "Der Stand der Forschung" (8)	
	PART I HISTORICAL AND THEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND	
2.	CHEMNITZ IN CONTEXT	17
	The circumstances in Church and Theology in Northern Germany (18). Gnesio-Lutherans versus Philippists (24). The Theological Development in Lower Saxony (34). The Making of a Theologian: Chemnitz from 1548-1561 (44)	
3.	MELANCHTHON AND THE LORD'S SUPPER	67
	Melanchthon's Doctrine of the Lord's Supper 1525-1529 (68). Summary (97). Melanchthon's Relation to Luther in 1544 (100). Melanchthon's Doctrine of the Lord's Supper 1552-1560 (106).	
	PART II THE BENEFITS AND USE OF THE LORD'S SUPPER	
4.	HERMENEUTICS FOR THE LORD'S SUPPER	116
	Methodological Approaches by Lutherans: an Overview (117). Chemnitz' Methodological Approach and Principles of Interpretation in "Repositio" (1561) (127).	
5.	THE PURPOSE OF THE LORD'S SUPPER	153
6.	THE GIFT AND THE BENEFITS OF THE LORD'S SUPPER	166
	The Body and Blood as the Gift of the Lord's Supper (168). The Benefits of the Real Presence (173).	
7.	THE COMMUNICATION OF THE BENEFITS	197
	Three Kinds of Eating (197). Manducatio Physica (200). Manducatio Sacramentalis (201). Manducatio Spiritualis (220). The Benefits of Christ for the Whole Man (223).	

8. THE RECIPIENS: HOW IS THE LORD'S SUPPER RECEIVED PROPERLY ACCORDING TO ITS INSTITUTION?	244
---	-----

The Interpretation of the *Verba* a Serious Matter (246). Faith and the Substance of the Sacrament (248). Worthy Reception: A Penitent Faith versus Unbelief (250). The Lord's Supper and Repentance (263). Worthy Reception: To Discern the Body of the Lord (268). Eating to One's Judgement (278).

9. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	284
----------------------------------	-----

A SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY	294
-----------------------------	-----

CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Martin Chemnitz is often counted as the last and foremost of the Reformers of the second generation and the main theological contributor to the Formula of Concord. He also represents the most important connection between the Reformation and the period of Orthodoxy.¹ Important to recognize is also that the most formative period of Chemnitz as a theologian was the turbulent years that followed the Augsburg and Leipzig Interims of 1548.

Both according to Luther and Chemnitz the doctrine of the Lord's Supper consists of two parts, the "substantia" and "usus".² For historical and confessional Lutheranism the core

¹Bengt Hägglund points out in his History of Theology, trans. Gene J. Lund (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1968), 273, that "his writings . . . formed the strongest connecting link between the Reformation period and Lutheran Orthodoxy."

²Martin Chemnitz, Die Reine Gesunde Lehre/ von der wahren gegenwertigkeit/ des Leibs vnd Bluts Christi in seinem Abendmal . . ., trans. Johannes Zanger (Leipzig: Ernst Vögelin, 1561), 1-2. [Hereafter cited: Die Reine Gesunde Lehre]. This is the translation of Repetitio (1561); see below, 7, note 13. Chemnitz uses these terms to state the same distinction as Luther does in his Sermon von dem Sacrament des leibs und bluts Christi widder die Schwarmgeister (1526). "In diesem Sacrament sind zwei ding zu wissen und zu predigen. Zum

of the doctrine of the Lord's Supper has always been the real presence of the body and blood of the Lord Jesus Christ. After the second front of the sacramental controversy was opened in the mid 1520s and later with the appearance of John Calvin, the influence from Geneva was regarded as the main threat. The problems dealt with on the first front over against Rome receded into the background.³ This may have contributed to the lack of emphasis on some dimensions of the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper.

In the Lutheran Church there has been an increasing interest in liturgy in our century -- stimulated as it may seem by the Liturgical Movement and the "cult mystery" doctrine in the Roman Church, and the ecumenical dialogues. A kind of new appreciation of the Lord's Supper is evident. However, it may be feared that it is carried as much by a romantic, mystical sentiment which exults in the performance of rich, "catholic" liturgy, as by distinct doctrinal motives. Too easily this tends toward an attitude which more or less consciously thinks that when the sacrament is properly

ersten, was man glewben sol, dass man auf latinisch nennt 'Obiectum fidei'; das ist das werck odder ding, das man glewbt odder daran man hangen soll. Zum andern, der glawbe selbst odder der brauch, wie man des, so man glewbt, recht brauchen sol." D. Martin Luthers Werke, Kritische Gesamtausgabe. (Weimar: Hermann Bohlau, 1883-.) 19, 482,15; cf., 26,147.13. [Hereafter cited: WA].

³Theodore G. Tappert, ed., The Book of Concord. The Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1959), FC, SD, VII, 108-110, 588-589 [Hereafter cited: Book of Concord].

performed, the recipient also receive the gift -- tacitly implied -- beneficially.

Also among confessional Lutherans we can find convictions which come from a different starting point, but with almost the same result. It can be captured in the saying: "When the doctrine is right everything will be right -- by itself". Applied to the Lord's Supper: When the doctrine of Real Presence is upheld, the proper application will take care of itself. As laudable this regard for the doctrine is, the saying is inadequate. The Lutheran Reformers as well as the Bible itself have something to say about the proper use of the sacraments which we ought to give heed to. If that is forgotten we too easily come close to an *ex opere operato* attitude.

The Task

The focus of Article VII: "The Lord's Supper" in the Formula of Concord is clearly the real presence of the body and blood of the Lord.⁴ Questions related to the benefits and the proper use are not discussed at any length. The formulators state, however, that they do not deal with the whole doctrine of the Lord's Supper.⁵ To the detriment of the church

⁴Cf., Book of Concord, FC, SD, VII, 1.111, 589.

⁵Ibid., FC, SD, VII, 111. Cf., "Wollegündeter Bericht von dem fürnemsten Artickeln Christlicher Lehre, so zu unseren Zeiten streitig worden seyn . . . ," Corpus doctrinae, das ist die summa, form und fürbilde der reinen christlichen lehre, aus der heiligen göttlichen schrift der propheten und aposteln zusammengezogen . . . aus gnediger verordnung . . . Julii, hertzen zu Braunschweig und Lüneburg etc . . . (Heinrichstadt, 1576). The edition used in this work is Corpus

too little attention has been paid to the latter part of this doctrine; that is, how it may be used so that the benefits may be lived and enjoyed. On the other hand, by the Reformers -- Luther and Chemnitz included -- the purpose of the Lord's Supper is not located in the Real Presence in isolation, but in the distribution and appropriation of the benefits of the Christ's redemptive work as our substitute. This emphasis Luther expressed in the words: "For us Christian to eat and drink for the forgiveness of sin."⁶

Our thesis is that in Chemnitz' doctrine of the Lord's Supper the benefits of the Lord's Supper are inherently the benefits of the Real Presence. The beneficial use of the sacrament is, therefore, connected with the "substance," that is, both the giving of the benefits and the receiving of them -- faith and "the discerning of the body" -- are tied up with the Real Presence. This indicates that the two parts are closely connected, and their separation has negative consequences for both parts.⁷ A major purpose of our research will

doctrinae Julii (Braunschweig: Christoph-Friedrich Zilligers, 1690) 940, 948. [Hereafter cited: Wolgegründeter Bericht]. In this work which as for the content is close to the Formula of Concord, Chemnitz states this very clearly.

⁶Book of Concord, SC, 2, 6; LC, 20-22.

⁷In his Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 53-54, Chemnitz states that the Words of Institution comprises "die gantze Lahr/ nicht allein von der gegenwertigkeit des Leibs vnd Bluts Christi/ sondern auch von der frucht vnd nutzbarkeit/ derselben gegenwertigkeit"

be to examine more in detail what he confesses of this relation.

For these reasons we will make the "beneficia" and "usus" of the Lord's Supper our focus and vantage point from which our discussion will start. Questions related to the "substantia" will be treated in connection with and so far as necessary for our main issue.

Theodor Mahlmann has called attention to an strong consistency in Chemnitz' theology over the years.⁸ Our thesis is that there is a close connection between Chemnitz' earliest works and the Formula of Concord. Since Chemnitz played an important part in the composition of the Formula of Concord, it will be worthwhile to examine his earliest published works which actually treat the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. The purpose of this dissertation is to examine Martin Chemnitz' doctrine of the Lord's Supper as it is presented in his earliest works (1560-1561), focusing on the Lord's Supper and its way in the Christians life we hope to show what is the life blood in his theology.

The Sources

One who studies the successive works of Chemnitz on the same topic will have little difficulty in pointing out that Chemnitz was not afraid of making use of the same material in more or less the same form in different works. Chemnitz was

⁸See below, 11-12.

not only a key figure in the preparation of the Formula of Concord. Between 1567 and 1576 Chemnitz was instrumental in establishing corpus doctrinae for three different territories;⁹ for Ducal Prussia (1567),¹⁰ Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel (1568),¹¹ Celle-Lüneburg (1575), and an enlarged edition of Corpus doctrinae Julii for Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel (1576).¹² To a certain extent we will take these documents into account and indicate continuity and differences. However, a full scale comparison between the first stage in Chemnitz' doctrine of the Lord's Supper and his later confessional works is not included in this dissertation. The main document for our research, particularly for the part which deals with Chemnitz' doctrine of the Lord's Supper, will be Repetitio sanae doctrinae de vera praesentia corporis et sanguinis in Coena . . .

⁹Ducal Prussia (1567), Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel (1568), Celle-Lüneburg (1575), enlarged edition of Corpus doctrinae Julii for Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel (1576).

¹⁰Repetitio Corporis Doctrinae Ecclesiasticae. Oder Wiederholung der Summa und Inhalt der rechten, allgemeynen, christlichen Kirchen Lehre . . . von Fürstlicher Durchleuchtigkeit zu Preussen . . . (Königsberg: Johann Daubmann, 1567); reprinted in Walter Hubatsch, Geschichte der evangelischen Kirche Ostpreussens, Vol.3 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1968).

¹¹Was das Corpus Doctrinae, das ist: Die Form und Fürbilde der reine Lehre in den Kirchen dieses Fürstenthums hinführo seyn soll. [Im Anschluss daran:] Kurtzer, einfeltiger und nothwendiger Bericht von etlichen fürnemen Artickeln der Lehr . . . (Wolfenbüttel, 1569). Reprinted in Emil Sehling, ed. Die evangelischen Kirchenordnungen des XVI. Jahrhunderts, Vol. 6, part 1 (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1955). [Short title: Kurtzer Bericht].

¹²Wollegündeter Bericht, see above, 3, note 5.

., (1561)¹³ The same year Chemnitz also published a polemical work related to the Hardenberg controversy in Bremen, which had for many years also affected the other churches in Lower Saxony, titled Anatome propositionum Alberti Hardenbergii de Coena Domini . . . (1561).¹⁴ To come to grips with Chemnitz' theology it is not unimportant to read him in the proper context. During the last century Chemnitz has been characterized as a "friend and student" of Philipp Melanchthon, a left-Melanchthonian, a representative of the "center party", and a Gnesio-Lutheran. All these views have their advocates. The question is: Where did Chemnitz place himself in the struggles among the adherents to the Augsburg Confession which erupted in these years? In a first part we will, therefore, draw a picture of the circumstances in Church and theology in

¹³Martin Chemnitz, Repetitio sanae doctrinae de vera praesentia corporis et sanguinis in Coena . . . Additus est Tractatus com-plectens doctrinam de Communicatione idiomatum. (Leipzig: Ernst Vögelin, 1561). [Hereafter cited: Repetitio].

¹⁴Anatome propositionum Alberti Hardenbergii de Coena Domini quas exhibuit ordinibus Saxoniae inferioribus in conventu Brunsvigensi. Additae sunt etiam propositiones ministrorum Bremensis. Et Declaratio articuli decimi in Confessione Augustana de Coena Domini sumpta ex publicis confeßionibus et historiis nostrorum temporum . . . (Eisleben: Urban Graubisch, 1561). [Hereafter cited: Anatome]. The book was at the same time published in a German version titled Leuterungen der proposition oder schlussreden Alberti Hardenbergs von dem Abendmal des Herrn, welche er auff dem kreistag zu Braunschweig den stenden des Nidersechsischen kreis ubergeben hat. Sampt Erklerung des zehenden artickels der Auspurgischen Confession, wie die lere vom Abendmal des Herrn bey Lutheri zeit und leben verstanden sey worden. Auch von den propotionibus oder schlussreden der prediger von Bremen etc., trans. Johannes Zanger (Eisleben: Urban Graubisch, 1561). [Hereafter cited: Leuterungen].

the realm where Chemnitz worked and try to find out where he fits in. Almost all the controversies that plagued the Lutheran Church between the Interims (1548) and the Formula of Concord can be traced back to elements of Melanchthon's theology. A review of the main features of his doctrine of the Lord's Supper will, therefore, be included in the first part.

"Der Stand der Forschung"

Even shortly after his death Chemnitz was already recognized as "der hervorragendste Theologe unserer Zeit."¹⁵ As indicated he also represents the most important connection between the Reformation era and the period of the Lutheran Orthodoxy. In contrast to this there has not been much interest in Chemnitz research in modern scholarship.

From around 1860 and for some decades quite a few works on leading late Reformation and the pre-history of the Formula of Concord were published.¹⁶ In the last thirty years we again

¹⁵Polycarp Leyser, in his preface to Martin Chemnitz, De controversiis quibusdam que superiori tempore, circa quodam Augustanae Confessionis Articulos, motae et agitate sunt: Iudicium D. Martini Chemnitii . . ., ed. Polykarp Leyser (Wittenberg: Simon Gronenberg, 1594). [Hereafter cited: Iudicium].

¹⁶Among the most noteworthy are the works of Wilhelm Preger, Theodor Pressel, F. H. R. Frank, Hermann Hachfeld, C. G. H. Lentz, Heinrich Heppe, August Kluckholm, Robert Calinich can be mentioned. For titles related to our topic, see our "Select Bibliography."

can notice a renewed interest in this period.¹⁷ As a result of this new trend during the last fifteen years more has been published on Martin Chemnitz and his contribution as a theologian and churchman than for almost a century.

In a biographical article on Chemnitz in Theologische Realenzyklopedie Theodor Mahlmann in a short note after listing of sources characterizes the situation thus:

Eine alle, weit verstreut gedruckten und/oder ungedruckten (zahlreich in Wolfenbüttel und Göttingen vorhandenen) Schriften, Gutachten, Briefe, Protokolle und Akten erfassende Bibliographie fehlt, desgleichen eine Biographie und Darstellung der Theologie Chemnitzens auf einer derart gesicherten Grundlage.¹⁸

Since Mahlmann wrote this he himself has published the so far most extensive bibliography, including most published works and a number of "Gutachten".¹⁹ For an overall presentation of Chemnitz life and work the older biographies of Carolus Lentz,

¹⁷For a survey of Late Reformation studies see James Kittelsen, "The Confessional Age. Late Reformation in Germany," in Steven Ozment, Reformation Europe. A Guide to Research (St. Louis: Center for Reformation Research, 1982), 361-381. Among the leading authors in this field are Peter F. Barton, Ernst Koch, Theodor Mahlmann, Jörg Baur, Robert Kolb, Jobst Chr. Ebel, Rudolf Keller, Inge Mager, Bengt Hägglund, Hans Chr. von Hase, Bernhard Lohse, Wolf-Dieter Hauschild, and for Melanchthon, especially Wilhelm Neuser. For titles, see our "Select Bibliography."

¹⁸Theodor Mahlmann, "Chemnitz, Martin (1522-1586)," in Theologische Realenzyklopädie vol. 7 (Berlin-New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1977-.), 720 [Hereafter cited: "Chemnitz, Martin (TRE)"].

¹⁹Mahlmann, "Bibliographie Martin Chemnitz," in Der zweite Martin der lutherischen Kirche. Festschrift zum 400. Todestag von Martin Chemnitz, ed. W. A. Junke (Braunschweig: Ev.luth. Stadtkirchenverband und Propstei, 1986), 368-425.

Hermann Hachfeld, and Theodor Pressel are indispensable.²⁰ This is particularly true of J. Rehtmeyer's Antiquitas ecclesiasticae inclytæ urbis Brunsvigæ,²¹ which basically is biographies of the superintendents of the city of Braunschweig.

During the last fifteen years more than fifteen articles are published on the overall biography or aspects of Chemnitz' life and work.²² The key to understanding the theologian Chemnitz seems to be a firm grasp on his early period, say from about 1550 until the early 1560s. This is, however, the part of Chemnitz' biography where there are least published sources, and where least work has been done. His first thirteen years in the ministry (1554-1567) Chemnitz served as coadjutor of Joachim Mörlin, the superintendent of the city of Braunschweig. A work on Mörlin's Braunschweig period would also throw light on these early years of Chemnitz' ministry,

²⁰Hermann Hachfeld, Martin Chemnitz nach seinem Leben und Wirken, insbesondere nach seinem Verhältnisse zum Tridentinum, Unter Benützung vieler, zum Theil wenig bekannten Handschriften (Leipzig, 1867); C. G. H. Lentz, Dr. Martin Kemnitz, superintendent in Braunschweig . . . Ein Lebensbild aus den 16. Jahrhundert, aus gedrückten und handschriftlichen Nachrichten (Gotha: Friedrich Andreas Perthes, 1866). [Hereafter cited: Martin Kemnitz]; Theodore Pressel, Leben und Ausgewählte Schriften der Väter und Begründer der lutherische Kirche (Eberfeld: R. L. Friedrichs, 1862).

²¹Philipp J. Rehtmeyer, Antiquitas ecclesiasticae inclytæ urbis Brunsvigæ, oder: Der berühmter Stadt Braunschweig Kirchengeschichte, Vol. 3 (Braunschweig: Chr. Fr. Zilligers, 1710).

²²Cf., our "Select Bibliography, 297-301.

years of learning and growth as a theologian. It is therefore badly needed.

As far as the more recent Chemnitz research is concerned, the contributions of Theodor Mahlmann and Inge Mager are most helpful. As for the pre-history of the Formula of Concord Jobst Chr. Ebel has convincingly demonstrated in two detailed articles that Chemnitz must be regarded as its main author.²³ His main conclusions have been confirmed in Inge Mager's thorough Göttingen dissertation on the Formula of Concord in Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel,²⁴ and in three articles of Wolf-Dieter Hauschild's on the theological development in Lower Saxony and its importance for the concord efforts.²⁵ As reflected in chapter two the works of Ernst Koch, Robert Kolb, and Bernhard Lohse have been used extensively.²⁶

²³Jobst Chr. Ebel, "Jacob Andreae (1528-1590) als Verfasser der Konkordienformel," ZKG 89 (1978): 78-119; idem, "Die Herkunft des Konzeptes der Konkordienformel," ZKG 91 (1980): 237-281.

²⁴Inge Mager, Die Konkordienformel in Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel. Die Entstehung - Rezeption - Geltung. Habil. Diss., University of Göttingen, 1986.

²⁵Wolf-Dieter Hauschild, "Zum Kampf gegen Augsburger Interim in norddeutschen Hansastädten," ZKG 84 (1973): 60-81. [Hereafter cited: "Kampf gegen Augsburger Interim"]; idem, "Theologienpolitische Aspekte der lutherischen Konsensusbildung in Norddeutschland," in Widerspruch, Dialog und Einigung, ed. W. Lohff and L. W. Spitz (Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1977) 41-63. [Hereafter cited: "Theologienpolitische Aspekte"]; idem, "Corpus doctrinae und Bekenntnisschriften. Zur Vorgeschichte des Konkordienbuchs," in Bekenntnis und Einheit der Kirche. Studien zum Konkordienbuch, ed. Martin Brecht and Reinhard Schwarz (Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1980) 235-252.

²⁶For their works, see our "Select Bibliography."

In his biographical article on Martin Chemnitz in Gestalten der Kirchengeschichte, Theodor Mahlmann has called attention to a notable consistency in Chemnitz' theology over the years. He maintains there that Chemnitz succeeded in turning his early doctrinal conceptions into official corpus doctrinae, first for two separate territories, then for the two Welfish territories together, and finally for the major part of the German Lutherans.²⁷ Mahlmann's dictum refers particularly to Iudicium (1561).²⁸ But the article indicates that it applies equally well to his early work on the Lord's Supper and Christology, namely Repetitio sanae doctrinae de vera presentia corporis et sanguinis in coena . . ., which he had completed the previous year. In fact Chemnitz refers to this book in the very last sentence of Iudicium.²⁹ This book was most probably composed for private use and it was never published by Chemnitz himself.

There seems to be a general agreement both among older and more recent authors that Chemnitz' works on the doctrine

²⁷Theodor Mahlmann, "Martin Chemnitz," in Gestalten der Kirchengeschichte, vol.6, Die Reformation, part II, ed. Martin Greschat (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1981-1985), 318. [Hereafter cited: Martin Chemnitz (GKH)].

²⁸De controversiis quibusdam que superiori tempore, circa quodam Augustanae Confessionis Articulos, motae et agitate sunt; Iudicium D. Martini Chemnitii . . . ed. Polykarp Leyser (Wittenberg: Simon Gronenberg, 1594). [Hereafter cited: Iudicium]. This is one of Chemnitz earliest works, finished March 1561.

²⁹*Ibid.*, 164.

of the Lord's Supper had a widespread influence. Their frequent reprints prove that contention.³⁰ In spite of this no major work has been written on Chemnitz' doctrine of the Lord's Supper until Bjarne W. Teigen recently published his monograph The Lord's Supper in the Theology of Martin Chemnitz.³¹ As an introduction to Chemnitz' Eucharistic theology Teigen's work is helpful. However, in line with the general trend in Lutheran theology the whole emphasis is on the Real Presence of the true body and blood of Christ in the elements and related questions.

As a comprehensive presentation of Chemnitz' doctrine of the Lord's Supper Teigen's book must be said to be lopsided. Questions related to the Christological foundation of the Supper and consecration take up two third of the book. In both Repetitio, and its later revision Fundamenta Sanae doctrinae (1570),³² the former theme is treated only in a subsection in the chapter "Concerning the arguments of the adversaries."³³

³⁰For details, see Mahlmann, "Bibliographie Martin Chemnitz," no. 2, 372, and no. 16, 386.

³¹Bjarne W. Teigen, The Lord's Supper in the Theology of Martin Chemnitz (Brewster, MA.: Trinity Lutheran Press, 1986).

³²Martin Chemnitz, The Lord's Supper, trans. J. A. O. Preus of Fundamenta Sanae doctrinae de vera et substantiali praesentia, exhibitione et sumptione corporis et sanguinis Domini in Coena. Repetiat . . ., 1570. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1979.

³³Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 301-344; The Lord's Supper, 195-231.

The latter theme is treated in a short chapter in Repetitio.³⁴ In The Lord's Supper that chapter is left out. In Teigen, however, consecration seems to be the major issue.

On the other hand, the main issue in Repetitio and its later revision, The Lord's Supper, is the Biblical foundation for the Lord's Supper and the basic principles of interpretation of Scripture. This Teigen dealt with in nine pages. It is true that some issues may be important and also in an actual situation need a more lengthy discussion even though they are presented briefly in the sources. However, the major weakness of Teigen's book is not so much his conclusions as its disproportionate presentation which gives a wrong impression of the emphases in Chemnitz' doctrine of the Lord's Supper.

The purpose of Chemnitz' Eucharistic works is no doubt to defend the doctrine of the Real Presence. But he does not for that reason neglect the proper use of the Supper. Teigen should be commended for including a chapter which outlines the main points in this issue.

Our work is based on different sources than Teigen's and it has a more narrow scope. Teigen's main sources are The Lord's Supper and the later works of Chemnitz. Our main sources are Chemnitz' early works and to a certain extent treatises written for territorial confession books in the late

³⁴Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 260-269; Repetitio, 187-195. In a modern edition a la The Lord's Supper this would be only ca. 4 pages.

1560s and early 1570s, works which for the most part Teigen does not even mention. For this reason his book does not play a significant part in our research.

The only recent work which treats Chemnitz doctrine of the Lord's Supper on the basis Repetitio (1561), is a recent article of Frank G. Gozdek in the a volume published for the 400th anniversary of Chemnitz' death. The strength of Gozdek's article is that he, in this writers judgment, presents a balanced outline of all the main features of Repetitio.³⁵

Finally Mahlmann's major work Das neue Dogma der lutherischen Christologie, must be mentioned. The author treats the relation between the doctrine of the Lord's Supper and Christology, and particularly the development of Christology to a theological locus in its own right during the 1550s. Chemnitz' early contributions to both these doctrines stands at the end of this period. Only a minor part of Mahlmann's book treats Chemnitz, and as we have indicated, its focus is different. Nevertheless, it is very helpful because it introduces the reader to the major approaches to what may be the most difficult of the problem complexes in the late Reformation period. The specific area of this disertation therefore lies open inviting our research.

³⁵Frank Georg Gozdek, "Der Beitrag des Martin Chemnitz zur lutherischen Abendmahlslehre," in Der zweite Martin der lutherischen Kirche. Festschrift zum 400. Todestag von Martin Chemnitz, ed. by W. A. Junke, (Braunschweig: Ev.luth. Stadtkirchenverband und Propstei, 1986) 9-47.

PART I.

HISTORICAL AND THEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND

CHAPTER 2

CHEMNITZ IN CONTEXT

The period from the end of the Smalcald War (1547) to 1577/1580, when the Formula of Concord and the Book of Concord were published, filled as it was with conflicts and strife, was not only a very difficult time for the young Lutheran Church; it is no doubt also one of the most decisive in the whole history of the Lutheran Church. The first decade of this period -- roughly from 1550 to 1560 -- covers the years from 1549 when Chemnitz decided to make theology his profession until he was a recognized theologian and church leader in Lower Saxony. During the last decade (1570-1580) he made his historic contribution to the Book of Concord. Between these periods most of Chemnitz' major works were written.

The purpose of this chapter is to outline the main features of the context of Church and theology in which Chemnitz operated. The Augsburg Interim and the Leipzig Interim (1548) arouse tense internal struggles among adherents of the Augsburg Confession. The so-called Gnesio-Lutherans opposed the Philippists, the more close followers of Philipp Melanchthon. No theological leader could be neutral. The

question is: Where did Chemnitz fit in this picture? Actually the situation was more complicated than these two often-used labels indicate. A reasonably adequate appraisal of Chemnitz' main positions and "place" in the controversies in the contemporary theology will provide the proper perspective for the analysis and interpretation of the texts we will deal with below. We will, therefore, outline the main features which conditioned the theological setting for Chemnitz' work and the distinctive features which characterized the theologian Chemnitz around 1560-1561, the time when he published the works which will be the main documents in our present research.

The circumstances in Church and Theology in Northern Germany

The Smalcald War and the events which followed in its wake, the Interims included, until the Religious Peace of Augsburg 1555 were particularly fateful and of almost incalculable consequences for the empire as well as for the territories and the church in Germany. The scene for much of the following political development was set, and partly also for the course of events in the realm of the Church.¹ As for the

¹Bernhard Lohse, "Das Konkordienwerk von 1580," in Kirche und Bekenntnis, ed. Peter Meinhold (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag GMBH, 1980), 95. [Hereafter cited: Konkordienwerk]. For an extensive discussion see Martin Heckel, "Deutschland im konfessionellen Zeitalter," in Deutsche Geschichte, Bd. 2: Frühe Neuzeit, ed. Bernd Möller, Martin Heckel et al. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1985).

political realm, it may suffice here to say that the Peace of Augsburg represented a definite shift of power -- particularly in the religious realm -- from the imperial power to the territories and the city councils.² This state of affairs is of particular importance for the efforts in the prehistory of the Formula of Concord. Bernhard Lohse writes:

Der Einfluß der Territorialherren, der in der ganzen erste Hälfte des 16. Jahrhunderts angewachsen war und nun in dem Frieden von Augsburg seine verfassungsmäßige Bestätigung erhalten hatte, setzte allem Bemühen um kirchlichen und theologischen Einheit Grenzen, die nicht zu übersehen waren.³

In many territories, especially in middle and south Germany, a most difficult situation occurred when the Emperor included the Augsburg Interim (1548) into the final decree of the Diet. Thus he made it imperial law. He also was willing, if necessary, to enforce it with armed forces in order to bring the Protestants back into the Roman Catholic Church.⁴ The reactions in the Lutheran territories and cities differed

²Ibid., 95: "Diese epochemachende Bedeutung des Religionsfriedens tritt besonders darin hervor, daß das Schwergewicht der politischen Gewalt sich immer stärker auf die Territorialgewalten verlagert" (95). "Es dauerte zwar einige Zeit, bis Staatskirchentheorien entwickelt wurden; aber faktisch fiel doch schon 1555 die Schutzfunktion des Kaisers gegenüber die Kirche nun den Territorialfürsten zu. Tatsächlich zeigte sich auf breiter Front, daß Landesfürsten die früheren Rechte des Kaisers übernahmen, nämlich etwa im Ketzerrecht oder in der Einführung einer Druckzensur" (97).

³Ibid., 103.

⁴The text of the Augsburg Interim (1548) is published in Joachim Mehlhausen, Das Augsburger Interim von 1548. Deutsch und lateinisch. Texte zur Geschichte der evangelischen Theologie 3 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1970).

considerably -- from acceptance (Nürnberg, Brandenburg) over passive resistance (Württemberg) to armed resistance (Magdeburg). In Northern Germany it had little practical importance, except that in many places it resulted in a strengthened confessional attitude.⁵

Internal Struggles among the Lutherans

What made the situation so perilous for the Lutherans was that it uncovered and furthered a considerable degree of internal dissimilarity and disagreement in doctrinal issues among their theologians. One should also realize that the theological crisis was not caused so much by the Augsburg Interim as by the Leipzig Interim of the same year (1548).⁶ The reason for this is obvious. The Augsburg Interim was forced upon the churches of the Reformation and was almost unanimously rejected.⁷ The theologians who collaborated with

⁵Joachim Mehlhausen, "Die Streit um die Adiaphora," in Bekennntnis und Einheit der Kirche. Studien zum Konkordienbuch, ed. Martin Brecht and Reinhard Schwarz (Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1980), 105-128; idem, "Interim," in Theologische Realenzyklopädie 16: 230-237; B. Lohse, "Von Luther bis zum Konkordienbuch," in Dogma und Bekenntnis in der Reformation, ed. by Bernhard Lohse, Wilhelm Neuser, e.a., Vol. II, in Handbuch der Dogmen und Theologiegeschichte. Ed. Carl Andresen. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1980. 106-108.

⁶Lohse, "Konkordiewerk," 103-104.

⁷For Johann Agricola's part in the participation and attitude to the Augsburg Interim, see Mehlhausen, "Interim," 230-237; idem, "Die Streit um die Adiaphora," 108; Lohse, "Von Luther bis zum Konkordienbuch," 106-109; Wolf-Dieter Hauschild, "Zum Kampf gegen Augsburger Interim in norddeutschen Hansastädten," ZKG 84 (1973): 61, note 6. [Hereafter cited: "Kampf gegen Augsburger Interim"].

the government in preparing the Leipzig Interim for Electoral Saxony, were Philipp Melanchthon and other leading Wittenberg theologians.⁸ Lohse calls attention to this point. He writes:

Die Tatsache, daß Melanchthon und die gesamte theologische Fakultät Wittenberg das Leipziger Interim deckten, ließ dieses sogar im Vergleich mit dem Augsburger Interim als noch weniger erträglich erscheinen.⁹

Moreover, in consequence of this, through the *Interim controversy*, Melanchthon forfeited his former authority as Luther's close co-worker and was reduced to the leader of a theological party.¹⁰ Quite a few of his former students, headed by Matthias Flacius Illyricus (1520-1575), also started to suspect that the Preceptor had departed from Luther's doctrine on other important issues. Ernst Koch expresses a general agreement when he maintains: "Allerdings darf man dem Interim hierfür lediglich katalysatorische, nicht begründende Funktion zuschreiben."¹¹ It can be shown that almost all the difficult controversies which grew out of the *Interim contro-*

⁸Mehlhausen, "Die Streit um die Adiaphora," 105-128; idem, "Interim," 230-237.

⁹Lohse, "Von Luther bis zum Konkordienbuch," 108.

¹⁰Hauschild, "Kampf gegen Augsburger Interim," 1973, 62-63.

¹¹Ernst Koch, "Die kursächsische Philippismus und seine Krise in der 1560er und 1570er Jahren," in Die reformierte Konfession-alisierung in Deutschland. Das Problem der "Zweiten Reformation." Schriften des Verein für Reformationsgeschichte, nr. 195, ed. Heinz Schilling (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1986), 61. [Hereafter cited: "Kursächsische Philippismus"]. Cf. also Mehlhausen's dictum in "Die Streit um die Adiaphora," 107.

versy, directly or indirectly, had their roots in or grew out of Melanchthon's theology. This is particularly true of the more serious of them.¹²

Our discussion of the development in Northern Germany, and particularly in the Lower Saxon circle of the Empire, and Martin Chemnitz' development as a theologian until about 1561, will touch upon some of these controversies. Here we will confine ourselves to point out the main issues at stake. The issue in the *Interim Controversy* was from first the doctrine of the two realms, which turned into a struggle over "Die Gestalt der Kirche Luthers."¹³ The *Majoristic Controversy* over the place of good works in relation to salvation grew directly out of the struggle over the Leipzig Interim and it ended up in the second *Antinomistic Controversy* over the third use of the law. While the *Majoristic Controversy* was in progress,

¹²Lohse, "Von Luther bis zum Konkordienbuch," 108-138; Wilhelm H. Neuser, Luther und Melanchthon. Einheit im Gegensatz, Theologische Existenz Heute NF 91 (Munich: Chr, Kaiser, 1961); Martin Greschat, Melanchthon neben Luther. Studien zur Gestalt der Rechtfertigungslehre zwischen 1528 und 1537 (Witten: Luther Verlag, 1965); Robert Kolb, "Historical Background of the Formula of Concord," in A Contemporary Look at the Formula of Concord, ed. Robert D. Preus and Wilbert H. Rosin (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1978), 13-16. [Hereafter cited: "Historical Background"].

¹³Lohse, "Von Luther bis zum Konkordienbuch," 108-113; Ernst Koch, "Der Weg zur Konkordienformel," in Vom Dissensus zum Konsensus, Fuldaer Hefte 24, ed. Gottfried Klapper (Hamburg: Lutherische Verlagshaus, 1980), 13-14. For a broader discussion of the whole issue, see Hans Christoph von Hase: Die Gestalt der Kirche Luthers. Der casus confessionis im Kampf des Matthias Flacius gegen das Interim 1548, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1940.

there came *synergistic controversy*, which was related to that controversy,. The cause of this was Johannes Pfeffinger, Melancthon's Wittenberg colleague and friend. Of the Wittenbergers Pfeffinger may be said to be the most ardent defender of the Leipzig Interim. At issue in the *Synergistic Controversy* was the participation of the will of man in conversion. Lastly, but not least important, were the *Osiandrian Controversy* (justification and Christology) and the *Eucharist and Christology Controversy*. Ernst Koch summarizes the issues thus:

Die Jahre zwischen 1550 und 1560 sind, abgesehen von der Auseinandersetzungen um das Interim, gekennzeichnet durch die Beschäftigung mit zwei Problemerkisen: Abendmahl/Christologie und Rechtfertigung . . . Es waren auch die beiden Problemerkisen gewesen, die die Hauptthemen für Luthers Theologie gesetzt hatte, und die der Generation nach Luther vererbt geworden waren. Mag dies historisch bedingt gewesen sein oder nicht: diese beide Problemerkise waren es auch, die den Kirchen der Augsbürgischen Konfessionsverwandten ihr Gesicht gegeben haben.¹⁴

For good reasons, therefore, Lohse, with other historians, in this connection speaks of an "Identitätskrise des Luthertums".¹⁵ This judgment is appropriate also because the

¹⁴Koch, "Der Weg zur Konkordienformel," 27; cf., idem: "Kursächsische Philippismus," 63; Lohse, "Von Luther bis zum Konkordienbuch," 109: "Zugleich leitete der Streit um das Verhalten insbesondere der Wittenberger die Epoche der Auseinandersetzungen um fast alle wichtigen theologischen Fragen ein, die erst mit der FC einen gewissen Abschluß fand". See also, idem, "Konkordienwerk," 105, 109.

¹⁵Lohse, "Von Luther bis zum Konkordienbuch," 109: "Die Probleme, die sich mit der 'Interim' stellten, führten zu der bis dahin *größten Krise* im deutschen Protestantismus." Cf. also, idem, "Konkordienwerk," where he refers to W. Lohff, "Identität des Luthertums nach der Konkordienformel," in Nachrichten der Evang. Luth. Kirche in Bayern 32 (1977), 205-

adherents of the Augsburg Confession seemed unable to solve these serious internal controversies which revolved around the central doctrines of the Lutheran Reformation.¹⁶ As the controversies developed, the statement of Augsburg Confession about the "Ecclesiae magno consensu apud nos docent"¹⁷ seemed more and more questionable.

Gnesio-Lutherans versus Philippists

The theological differentiation which the Interims uncovered, and which was enlarged and hardened through the subsequent controversies, is generally indicated with the names of Melancthon and Flacius, or the Philippists and the Gnesio-Lutherans.¹⁸ Their concern was obviously to preserve the par-

207. Lohff writes: "Es is nicht übertrieben, wenn man . . . von einer Identitätskrise spricht." Cf. also Hauschild, "Theologiepolitische Aspekte der lutherischen Konsensusbildung in Norddeutschland," in Widerspruch, Dialog und Einigung, ed. W. Lohff and L. W. Spitz (Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1977), 42 [Hereafter cited: "Theologiepolitische Aspekte"]; Ernst Bizer, Reformationsgeschichte 1532-1555, vol. 3, in Die Kirche in ihre Geschichte, ed. Franz Lau and Ernst Bizer (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963), 164-166.

¹⁶Lohse, "Konkordienwerk," 105. "Die strittigen Fragen betrafen dabei gerade die zentralen Themen der reformatorischen Theologie."

¹⁷Book of Concord, CA, 1,1, p. 27.

¹⁸Mehlhausen, "Die Streit um die Adiaphora," 115. For the origin the names "Philippists" and "Gnesio-Lutheran", see Rudolf Keller, "Gnesiolutheraner," in Theologische Realenzyklopädie, vol. 5 (Berlin-New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1977-), 512-519. For more extensive discussions, cf., Koch, "Kursächsische Philippismus," 60-77; Robert Kolb, "Dynamics of Party Conflict in the Saxon Late Reformation. Gnesio-Lutherans vs Philippists," The Journal of Modern History 49 (1977), D1289-D1305. Luther D. Peterson, The Philippist Theologians and the Interim of 1548: Compromise and Controversies within

ticular heritage of Martin Luther and Philipp Melanchthon respectively. Kolb has been able to identify 131 Gnesio-Lutherans,¹⁹ and Koch indicates that there might be a comparable number of "Philippists".²⁰ The size of the clergy taken into account, this is not a very high number.

This division into Philippists and Gnesio-Lutherans, which in many respects is convenient and perhaps even obvious, is, however, by no means as uncomplicated as often assumed. The groups were not organized, and the line between these two main opponents cannot be drawn easily or very tightly. Ernst Koch rightly argue:

Denn mag das Datum Ostern 1549, das Datum des Weggangs des Flacius aus Wittenberg, so etwas symbolische Bedeutung haben, so wird man in der Folge mit der Bloßen Unterscheidung hier Philippismus - dort Gnesioluthertum nicht mehr auskommen. Was bedeutet es z. B., wenn man Männer wie Nikolaus Gallus und Tilemann Heshusius in gleicher Weise als Flacianer bezeichnet, obwohl sie später in entscheidenden Punkten gegeneinander standen? Was hilft es für eine sachgemäße Differenzierung, Christoph Pezel und Joachim Mörlin als Melanchthonianer zu bezeichnen, wenn sie doch schließlich mehr trennte als etwa Mörlin der "Melanchthonianer", und Gallus der "Flacianer"?²¹

The majority of theologians and pastors of the period were not active in either party. Some scholars have spoken

German Lutheranism (Ph.D. diss., University of Wisconsin, 1974); Peter F. Barton, Um Luthers Erbe. Studien und Texte zur Spätreformation. Tilemann Heshusius (1527-1559). Untersuchungen zur Kirchengeschichte, vol. 6 (Witten: Luther-Verlag, 1972), 9-11 .

¹⁹Kolb, "Dynamics of Party Conflict," D1291, note 3.

²⁰Koch, "Kursächsische Philippismus," 65.

²¹Koch, "Der Weg zur Konkordienformel," 13.

of a "centrist" group. It is reasonable to assume that most of them found their stand somewhere in between the extremes. There is, however, no evidence that there existed a "centrist" group or party.²² For the sake of objectivity, and to come to grips with the realities of the period, it is necessary to differentiate further. Two examples may illustrate this. In his book Um Luthers Erbe Peter F. Barton gives a vivid picture of Melanchthon's "Lieblingsschüler," Tilemann Heshusius. Until 1558/1559 he was very close to his teacher, but soon became an ardent Gnesio-Lutheran without giving up his Melanchthonian methodology and schemata in doing theology.²³

Joachim Mörlin, superintendent in Braunschweig and Chemnitz' friend, was named by his opponent among the close followers of Melanchthon "der Flacianer Abgott".²⁴ Mörlin respectfully recognized what he owed Melanchthon thus:

Wir könnten nicht einen Syllogism machen, wenn uns Philippus solches nicht gelehrt hätte. Er ist unser Præceptor und müssen ihn einen Præceptorem nennen; wenn's aber kommt ad locum de coena Domini, de libero arbitrio,

²²Kolb, "Dynamics of Party Conflict," D1290-1291; Koch, "Kursächsische Philippismus," 62-63, 67. For a somewhat different view see Franz Lau, "Chemnitz, Martin," in Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart, vol.1, 1647-1648; Johannes Kunze, "Chemnitz, Martin," in Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche, 3d ed., vol. 3: 796-804, who talk of a middle ground between the Philippists and the Gnesio-Lutherans.

²³Peter F. Barton: Um Luthers Erbe, 158-163, 225-232.

²⁴Julius Aug. Wagenmann, "Mörlin, Joachim," in Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche, 3d ed., vol. 13: 247.

de justificatione hominis, de interimisticicis actionibus,
da lobe der Teufel, Philippe, ich nicht.²⁵

Both parts of this statement are interesting. Mörlin received his doctoral degree under Luther himself, and for a while served as his "Kaplan".²⁶ However, Mörlin, as well as his fellow contemporary Wittenberg students, received his technical training in theology from Melanchthon. In this sense both Philippists and Gnesio-Lutherans were all "Melanchthonians". Kolb writes:

The similarities between the Philipists and the Gnesio-Lutherans ought not to be overlooked. Nearly all members of both groups had studied under Melanchthon and bore the imprints of his humanistic training. Some members of both groups used scholastic forms and methods in presenting their theology. Both groups shared the same understanding of the work of Christ, and they produced similar critiques of the challenge to the Wittenberg understanding of justification through faith issued by Andreas Osiander in 1550. Even though the Gnesio-Lutherans and the Philippists fought over the doctrine of the real presence in the Lord's Supper, their approaches to the doctrine initially were more similar to each other than was the Gnesio-Lutheran view to that of the south German Swabian party, with which they finally united in the Formula of Concord. For both groups among the Wittenberg graduates stressed the words of institution rather than related Christological arguments in their discussion of the real presence.²⁷

²⁵Cited from Lentz, Martin Kemnitz, 105. Lentz does not indicated his source.

²⁶Wagenmann, "Mörlin, Joachim," 238.

²⁷Kolb, "Dynamics of Party Conflict," D1292-1293. Kolb cites Johann Wigand and Matthaëus Judex: Syntagma, seu Corpus Doctrinae, 1558/1563, as a manifest example of "the influence of Melanchthon's philosophical instruction on the Gnesio-Lutherans." (Ibid., note 7, D1292) For another assessment of Syntagma, cf., Bengt Hägglund, History of Theology (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1968, where the method used in the Syntagma is characterized as "a simple Bible-theological method, whereby the authors sought to present a collation of

This applies even to Flacius.²⁸ In controversial issues, however, particularly from the time of the *Interim controversy*, many of the Wittenbergers began to look more critically at Melanchthon's theology and consciously turned to Luther for guidance in doctrinal issues.²⁹ We notice that Mörlin even included the doctrine of justification among the *loci* where he could not praise Melanchthon. This hardly means that he was critical of the strictly forensic feature of this doctrine in Melanchthon. In the Oriandrian controversy Melanchthon, Flacius and Mörlin stood side by side. What Mörlin reacted against was, rather, the views on account of which leading students of Melanchthon came under fire in the *Majoristic* and *Syncretistic controversies*.

the content of Scripture without philosophical categories." For further details on the question of the Lord's Supper, see Theodor Mahlmann, Das neue Dogma der lutherischen Christologie (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1969, 19-42, and our discussion below, 121-123, 142-144.

²⁸Lohse, "Von Luther bis zum Konkordienbuch," 112-117; Rudolf Keller, Der Schlüssel der Schrift. Die Lehre vom Wort Gottes bei Matthias Flacius Illyricus (1984), 108; Koch, "Kursächsische Philippismus," 65-71; Heinz Scheible, Die Entstehung der Magdeburger Zenturien (Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1966); Hans Emil Weber, Reformation, Orthodoxie und Rationalismus, vol. I, 1 (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1937; reprint, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1966), 298-311; Lauri Haikolai, Gesetz und Evangelium bei Matthias Flacius Illyricus (Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1952), 9-47.

²⁹Keller, "Gnesiolutheraner," 512, defines "gnesiolutheraner" thus: "Als Gnesiolutheraner bezeichnet man die Theologen, welche in den innerprotestantischen Lehrstreitigkeiten zwischen dem Interim und der Konkordienformel (1577) Luthers Erbe gegen Aufweichungen und Überfremdungen bewahren wolten."

In view of what we have seen so far, it is necessary to distinguish between Philippists and Melanchthonians. The former group following not only Melanchthon's methodology and thought-schemata, but also his position on the issues where he in his theology departed from Luther. One should also distinguish between Gnesio-Lutherans and Flacians, reserving the latter for the ardent followers of Flacius, who from the mid-1560s adopted Flacius' doctrine of original sin.³⁰ This distinction, however, is not relevant until well after the Weimar disputation between Flacius and Victorin Strigel in 1560; that is, it does not apply to the early, formative period of Chemnitz as a theologian.

To come to grips with the Philippist - Gnesio-Lutheran diversity, it is helpful to see it in a broader perspective than the strictly dogmatic. Kolb, and recently also Koch, has isolated some characteristics of the two groups beyond the traditionally described doctrinal controversies where they divide.³¹ We will summarize these characteristics.

1. "Gnesiolutheraner aller Richtungen kennzeichnet ein ausgesprochen apokalyptisches Geschichtsbewußtsein."³² This

³⁰Kolb "Dynamics of Party Conflict," D1289-D1305; Lohse, "Von Luther bis zum Konkordienbuch," 121-125.

³¹Robert Kolb, "Dynamics of Party Conflict," D1293-D1304; Ernst Koch: Philippismus, 65-73.

³²Koch, "Kursächsische Philippismus," 66. Koch refers particularly to Jürgen Moltmann, Christoph Pezel (1539-1604) und der Calvinismus in Bremen, 1959, 137.

influences their attitude toward more of the other issues involved. It accounts particularly for the severity of these theologians in doctrinal questions. "In these last days," they maintained, it was important to be faithful to God and his Word. The Philippists, on the other hand, bore the mark of Melanchthon's humanistic "Mässigung". "Ihre Ziel war . . . eine humanistische Wiedergeburt des Corpus Christianum in Kirche und Schule, in Theologie und Wissenschaft." "Die Theologie, ihre Inhalt und der Stil theologischer Arbeit werden der Hoffnung auf das kommende Zeitalter echter und umfassender Bildung untergeordnet."³³ These convictions clearly influenced for example both groups' attitude toward theological polemics.

2. The Interim Controversy uncovered a definitely different attitude towards ecclesiastical uses and affairs between the Philippists and their Gnesio-Lutheran opponents.³⁴ This cannot simply be reduced to the famous dictum of Flacius:

³³Koch, "Kursächsische Philippismus," 70-71. For Melanchthon and the concept "Mässigung" or "epieikeia", see Neuser, "Von Zwingli und Calvin zur Synode von Westminster," in Dogma und Bekenntnis in der Reformation, ed. Bernhard Lohse, Wilhelm Neuser, et al., Vol. II, Handbuch der Dogmen und Theologiegeschichte, ed. Carl Andresen (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1980), 279. "Melanchthon hat eine ausführliche Lehre von der 'Mäßigung' (modestia, moderatio, lenitas) entwickelt, die bei der aristotelischen 'epieikeia' ansetzte und auch die Barmherzigkeit Gottes in Christus als 'Mäßigung versteht. Das Evangelium selbst ist 'Mäßigung des göttlichen Gesetzes', weil es den unvollkommenen Gehorsam der Frommen Gott wohlgefällig sein läßt." See below, 109-113.

³⁴For this and the following point, see particularly von Hase Die Gestalt der Kirche Luthers.

"Nihil est adiaphoron in casu confessionis et scandali." Some of the Philippist leaders -- for example, Georg von Anhalt and Johannes Pfeffinger -- also represented a definite high church tendency.³⁵ For the group in general we may, with Kolb, speak of a conservative attitude towards late medieval ceremonies and uses, which wanted to change as little as possible.³⁶ Related to this is further --

3. A different understanding of the relation between the civil authorities and the Church - that is, the doctrine of the two realms.³⁷ Melancthon, too, wanted to uphold a clear-cut distinction between the two realms. ". . . Nos seiungemus

³⁵Lohse, "Konkordienwerk", 104; Kolb, "Dynamics of Party Conflict," D1297-D1298.

³⁶Kolb "Dynamics of Party Conflict," D1297-D1299; idem, "Martin Chemnitz, Gnesio-Lutheraner," in Der zweite Martin der lutherischen Kirch. Festschrift zum 400. Todestag von Martin Chemnitz, ed. W. A. Junke (Braunschweig: Ev.luth. Stadtkirchenverband und Propstei, 1986), 119-120.

³⁷Koch, "Der Weg zur Konkordienformel," 13-14, writes: "Was die theologische Komponente im Streit um das Interim angeht, so läßt sich der Kernpunkt vermutlich ziemlich exakt bestimmen: es handelt sich um eine jeweils unterschiedliches Verständnis der Zwei-Regimenten-Lehre" Robert Kolb "Dynamics of Party Conflict," D1297 also rightly points out that "Ecclesiastical attitudes are sometimes difficult to separate from strictly doctrinal concerns." Relative to our issue he says: "The doctrine of the church held by each group deserves careful study. Gnesio-Lutherans tended to see the church as a 'remnant' and thus approached a concept of a free church at times The Philippists more often worked with a concept of the church as an institution. In this connection the eschatological setting of the Gnesio-Lutheran doctrine of the church and its struggle against the forces of the world and the Antichrist as seen in the Magdeburg Bekennntnis, . . . must be considered" (D1297, note 20).

nostram confessionem a conciliis politicis."³⁸ This distinction had to be carried out on different levels. B. Lohse explains:

Zunächst ergab sich, daß über die Lehre Christus, über die Kirchenordnung aber die Obrigkeit bestimmt. Sodann, die christliche Freiheit soll nur auf das Gottesverhältnis beziehen, das nicht durch andere vermittelt ist, also auf die Sündenvergebung. Die äußere Dinge auch des kirchlichen Lebens sind von der Vernunft zu regeln. Von der christlichen Freiheit kann hier demnach nicht argumentiert werden. . . . ; diese Aufgabe [für Religion und Kirche zu sorgen] gehören zu der umfassenden Pflicht des Staates, Hüter des Gesetzes zu sein. Unter dem Gesetz versteht Melanchthon ausdrücklich beide Tafeln der Gebote. Deshalb soll der Staat auch für die rechte Gottesverehrung Sorge tragen.³⁹

The Gnesio-Lutherans, on the other hand, were very sensitive over against encroachments in church affairs from outside in matters they regarded as "eigentlich theologisch verstandene Bereiche der innenkirchliche Disziplin."⁴⁰ They could by no means regard the ceremonial part of the Leipzig Interim as an adiaphoron of little significance, if only the doctrine

³⁸Philipp Melanchthon, Philippi Melanthonis opera quae super-sunt omnia, in C. G. Brechtschneider and H. E. Bindseil. Corpus Reformatorum (Halle-Braunschweig: C. A. Schwetschke, 1834-), vol. 7:76, [Hereafter cited: CR], in a letter of advice to Valentin Curtius in Hamburg. The same advice he also issued to Nikolaus Medler in Braunschweig and others, cf., Ph. J. Rehtmeyer, Antiquitas ecclesiasticae inclytae urbis Brunsvigae, oder: Der berühmter Stadt Braunschweig Kirchengeschichte (Braunschweig: Chr. Fr. Zilligers, 1710) Beilagen, 41. [Hereafter cited: Antiquitas ecclesiasticae Brunsvigae]. For a pertinent discussion of the issue, cf., Hauschild, "Kampf gegen Augsburg Interim," 65-71.

³⁹Lohse, "Von Luther bis zum Konkordienbuch," 111; cf., Mehlha

⁴⁰Ernst Koch "Kursächsische Philippismus," 66.

in a narrow sense was maintained. Nor would they admit that questions related to Church order belonged to the domain of the civil government.⁴¹

4. Compared with the Gnesio-Lutherans the Philippists published remarkably little devotional literature for edification and catechesis. This surely indicates a difference in orientation. In this field the Gnesio-Lutherans demonstrated both a strong motivation and ability, and attained real achievement.⁴²

5. A very visible difference between the two groups was their attitude toward polemics in theology and church affairs. Generally the Philippists tended as far as possible to stay away from public theological discussions. Melancthon, for example, wrote very little on any of the issues which were so disputed during the 1550s. He tended to regard theological polemics as exclusively negative.⁴³ The Gnesio-Lutherans on the

⁴¹Kolb "Dynamics of Party Conflict," D1297 also rightly points out that "Ecclesiastical attitudes are sometimes difficult to separate from strictly doctrinal concerns." Relative to our issue he says: "The doctrine of the church held by each group deserves careful study. Gnesio-Lutherans tended to see the church as a 'remnant' and thus approached a concept of a free church at times . . . The Philippists more often worked with a concept of the church as an institution. In this connection the eschatological setting of the Gnesio-Lutheran doctrine of the church and its struggle against the forces of the world and the Antichrist as seen in the Magdeburg Bekennntnis, . . . must be considered." (D1297, note 20).

⁴²Koch, "Kursächsische Philippismus," 66.

⁴³This is related to his view of "Mässigung", cf., above, 30-31, and below, 78-79, 109-110, 112-113.

other hand were on another spirit. They regarded it as their responsibility as theologians and pastors publicly to confess and defend the divine truth, as they confessed it, without regard for personal consequences. Even over against fellow Gnesio-Lutherans and princes who shared their basic doctrinal convictions they did not yield.⁴⁴ The frequent exiles many of the leading Gnesio-Lutheran theologians had to suffer for their conviction witness most clearly to this.

In broad strokes these are the theological circumstances in which Chemnitz worked his way from theological student (1549) to leading theologian. He was definitely recognized as such with his first theological publications in 1561.

The Theological Development in the 1550s in Lower Saxony

Before we turn to Martin Chemnitz to see where he placed himself in this complex and developing situation, we will take a look on the situation in Northern Germany, especially in Lower Saxony and in the cities of the Hanseatic League.

⁴⁴Kolb, "Dynamics of Party Conflict," D1302-D1304. Koch, "Der Weg zur Konkordienformel," 33-34. The reaction of the theologians in Ernestine Saxony when duke Johann Friedrich initiated his new church polity with censoring of theological literature, demonstrates the Gnesio-Lutherans disregard for compromise, when they saw essential principles threatened. Peter F. Barton, "Matthias Flacius Illyricus," in Gestalten der Kirchengeschichte, vol. 6. Die Reformation, part II, ed. Martin Greschat (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1981-1985), 284-285.

We have already pointed out that the enforcement of the Augsburg Interim varied widely.⁴⁵ Where imperial Spanish troops were present, the Interim was enforced by power. This was the case in large parts of Southern and Middle Germany, particularly in Württemberg, Augsburg, Constance, Ulm, and Strassburg. In Brandenburg and Nürnberg the Interim was accepted by the authorities. In Lutheran Northern Germany the same was the case in the territory of Oldenburg. In some evangelical cities the city councils, under pressure from their Roman Catholic princes, had to accept at least modified "interims". This was the case, for example, in Göttingen.⁴⁶ A large number of evangelical preachers were exiled, some of whom became key figures in the subsequent decades in Northern Germany.

In Northern Germany, specially in the Hanseatic cities, there was a different development, partly because imperial troops to enforce the Interim were not present. More important for our issue was that this situation allowed the

⁴⁵Mehlhausen, "Die Streit um die Adiaphora," 110-111; idem, "Interim," 230-237; Lohse, "Von Luther bis zum Konkordienbuch," 106-108. Bernd Moeller, "Deutschland im Zeitalter der Reformation," in Deutsche Geschichte, vol. 2, Frühe Neuzeit, ed. Bernd Moeller et al. (Göttingen: Vanderhoeck & Ruprecht, 1985), 122-143. Ernst Bizer, Reformationsgeschichte 1532-1555. Vol. 3. Die Kirche in ihre Geschichte, ed. F. Lau and E. Bizer (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963), 132-160.

⁴⁶Erich Roht, "Ein Braunschweiger Theologe des 16. Jahrhunderts. Mörlin und seine Rechtfertigungslehre," Jahrbuch der Gesellschaft für Niedersächsische Kirchengeschichte 50 (1952), 60-61; Julius Aug. Wagenmann, "Mörlin, Joachim," 238-239.

authorities to support the theologians firm rejection of the Interim.⁴⁷ This development was strengthened by exiles from south. The case of Magdeburg is well known. The besieged city became the center of a very strong opposition against the Interim. From 1549 quite a few of the most noted Gnesio-Lutheran sought refuge there.⁴⁸ From 1558 a number of them held teaching positions at the new university at Jena. The impact of the theologians of Magdeburg was felt throughout Northern Germany.

Often overlooked is the theological development that this took place in the Hanseatic cities of Hamburg, Lüneburg, and especially Lübeck, and generally in Lower Saxony. Independent of Magdeburg and in an completely undramatic way,

⁴⁷The leading Hanseatic cities, especially Lübeck, acted with self-confidence over against the Emperor. The case of Hamburg shows that even in this area politicians and merchants were influenced by threats of economical sanctions; cf., Hauschild, "Kampf gegen Augsburg," 68-71.

⁴⁸Keller, "Gnesiolutheraner," 512, summarizes the situation thus: "Als Vater der Gnesiolutheraner muß man Nikolaus Amsdorf an-sehen, der seit 1548 in Magdeburg als 'Excul Christi' lebte. Der freie Reichstadt Magdeburg mit ihren blühenden Druckgewerbe bot seit 1549 auch Flacius Asyl. Hier wirkte ab 1549 Nikolaus Gallus als Pfarrer an St. Ulrich. 1548 kam Erasmus Alber . . . Die Pfarrer Johann Wigand und Matthäus Judex gehörten zu den wichtigsten Mitarbeitern von Flacius, der die "Seele des Widerstand gegen die Vertreter des Interims wurde."

these cities, under the leadership of Johannes Äpin,⁴⁹ took a very firm stand against the Augsburg Interim in their "Gutachten" of August 1548.⁵⁰ Hauschild has pointed out that "Sie dürfte einer der ersten größeren Druckschriften gegen das Interim sein und zu den am meisten aufgelegten zählen."⁵¹ What took place was highly significant for the future development even to the Formula of Concord three decades later. Hauschild summarizes:

Die konfessionelle Verfestigung im Sinn einer Konservierung lutherischen Lehren, die in der Position der Niederdeutschen bei der Abwehr von Interim und melanchthonischer Vermittlungstheologie deutlich wurde, ist die Ausgangsbasis für die Mitarbeit der Fürstertümer und Städte des niedersächsische Reichkreises.⁵²

⁴⁹Hans Düfel, "Äpinus, Johannes (1499-1553)", in Theologische Realenzyklopädie (Berlin-New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1977-), vol. 1: 535-544; Carl Bertheau, "Äpinus, Johannes", in Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche, 3d. ed. (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1896-1913), vol. 1: 228-231.

⁵⁰Bekennnisse und Erkleringe up dat Interim, dorch der Erbarn Stede Lübeck, Hamborch, Lüneborch etc Superintendenten, Pastoren und Predigere tho Christliker und nödiger Underrichtinge gestellet, (Hamburg: Jochen Louw, August 1548). High German edition, Magdeburg: Michael Lotther, 1549. The document soon obtained almost confessional position in Hamburg and Lübeck, formally part of their *Corpus doctrinae* from 1560.

⁵¹Bekennnisse und Erkleringe up dat Interim. The document soon obtained almost confessional position in Hamburg and Lübeck, formally part of their *Corpus doctrinae* from 1560, cf., Hauschild, "Kampf gegen Augsburger Interim," 72. The document soon obtained almost confessional position in Hamburg and Lübeck, formally part of their *Corpus doctrinae* from 1560. Hauschild gives a comprehensive review of the historical background, the content and theological profile of the document is also given (68-78).

⁵²Hauschild, "Theologiepolitische Aspekte," 42.

How this "Verfestigung" and "Konservierung lutherischen Lehren" manifested itself we, will demonstrate on a few, but important issues, which took place a decade later.

After the Religious Peace of Augsburg (1555) the Augsburg Confession attained a new political significance. Only the adherents of the Augsburg Confession were included in the peace treaty. The notorious disunity which became evident at the Worms Colloquium (1557) raised serious concerns not least among the politicians. The Roman Church began to ask which of the strident parties could rightly appeal to the Augsburg Confession. The theological disunity became a potential political threat. By the Frankfurt Recess (1558) and at the Naumburg Fürstentag (1560) the princes tried to reach a consensus.⁵³ None of them achieved anything except to sharpen the fronts.

The "Gutachten " on the Frankfurt Recess from the *Ministerium Tripolitanum* exhibits the typical features of the emerging Lower Saxon consensus. The effort to obtain agreement was acknowledged, but as a whole the Recess was rejected. Hauschild outline the main concerns of the three cities thus:

Zum Problem der Verwerfungen wurde festgestellt, es lege in der Konsequenz der Frankfurter Verurteilung von

⁵³Julius Aug. Wagenmann (C. Enders), "Frankfurter Rezess," in Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche, 3d ed., vol. 6: 169-172. Gustav Kawerau, "Naumburger Fürstentag," in Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche, 3d ed., vol. 13:661-669; H. Heppe, Die Geschichte des deutschen Protestantismus im Jahren 1555-1581, (Marburg: N. G. Elwerts'sche, 1852), vol. 1, 266-297.

Sakramentierern, Wiedertaufern und Osiandristen, daß auch andere bekanntgewordene Irrtümer wie z. B. die Lehre von der Heilsnotwendigkeit der guten Werke verurteilt werden müßten - natürlich eine Konkordie z. B. mit den Wittenbergern von vornherein torpedierte. Die erste drei Artikel⁵⁴ wurde zwar inhaltlich akzeptiert, aber aus theologiepolitischen Gründen abgelehnt: Sie böten - insbesondere in der Abendmahlslehre - so allgemeine Formulierungen, daß die konträren Positionen sich darin wiederfinden könnten. Dies könnten nur eine Schein- Einigung sein, wenn jeder den akzeptierten Wortlaut anders interpretierte. Deswegen hätten solche Formeln nur Sinn im Zusammenhang mit entsprechende Negationen und mit ausführlichen autorativen Schriften. Das Ministerium Tripolitanum warnte davor, aus rein politischen Absichten eine Einigung zu suchen.⁵⁵

As for the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, reference is made to Augsburg confession, the Apology, the Smalcald Articles, the Catechism, and other works of Luther. The last phrase is very typical, and indicates that the early confessions penned by Melanchthon should be interpreted from a definite Lutheran stand.

In 1560 both Lübeck and Hamburg established their own Corpus Doctrinae. Even the parts of their content display their profile. In addition to the earlier confessions, Augsburg Confession, Apology, and Smalcald Articles, the Corpus Doctrinae of Hamburg included the following five doctrinal works which related to the recent controversies: Bekennnisse und Erklärunge up dat Interim (1548), the letter of Hamburg

⁵⁴The text of the Frankfurt Recess is printed in CR 9: 489-507. It included the following four articles: justification, good works, the Lord's Supper, and adiaphora.

⁵⁵Hauschild, "Theologiepoltische Aspekte," 43. For the text of the "Gutachten", cf., Caspar Heinrich Starck, Lübeckische Kirchenhistorie, vol. 1, Hamburg, 1724, 193-196.

to the Wittenbergers on the adiaphora (1549), the declaration of Hamburg and Lüneburg against Osiander's doctrine of justification (1553), the declaration of Lübeck, Hamburg, Lüneburg, and Magdeburg against Majorism, and the Confession of the Lord's Supper of Hamburg against the Sacramentarians (1557).⁵⁶ The Gnesio-Lutheran character of the *Corpus doctrinae* of these cities is unmistakable.

The same year these *Corpora* proved their importance when the *Ministerium Tripolitanum* at Mölln prepared for the Lüneburg Convent, which met at Lüneburg in July, 1560. There the cities of the Lower Saxon circle of the empire responded to the resolutions of the Naumburger Abschied (1560). Hauschild thus summarizes the opposition of the theologians against the way the princes sought to overcome the internal dissention among the Augsburg Confession adherents.

Angesicht der Tatsache, daß es unter den evangelischen Ständen in dem zentralen Abendmahlsartikel keine Lehr-gemeinschaft gebe, seien die Städte nicht bereit, von ihren "uthgegangenen Confessionen"⁵⁷ abzuweichen, um den Dissensus nicht zu verschleiern. Vielmehr müßten die hierin irrenden Kirchen und Fakultäten zuvor öffentlich von ihren bisherigen Irrtümer abrücken. Die CA zum

⁵⁶The texts are printed in Nicolaus Staphorst, Die Bekenntnüß der Kirchen zu Hamburg, Hamburg, 1728; in abbreviated form in Heinrich Heppe, Entstehung und Fortbildung des Luthertums und die kirchlichen Bekenntnisschriften derselben von 1548-1576, Kassel, 1863, 34-38, 49-53. On the Corpus doctrinae of Lübeck, cf., Hauschild, "Theologie-politische Aspekte," 43-44; idem, "Corpus doctrinae und Bekenntnisschriften," 241-243.

⁵⁷This phrase obviously refers to the above mentioned Corpora doctrinae of Lübeck and Hamburg which were issued earlier the same year.

jetzigen Zeitpunkt nochmahls durch gemeinsame Unterzeichnung zu bekräftigen, habe nur Sinn, wenn dem der Zusatz hinzugefügt werde, damit würden alle in zwischen geäußerten Irrelehren verworfen. Da die CA als Norm nicht ausreiche, sollten zu ihrer Interpretation - im Sinn der Idee des *Corpus Doctrinae* - Apologie, Schmalkaldische Artikel, der Katechismus Luthers, das Bekenntnis gegen das Interim von 1548 sowie andere Bekenntnisse dieser drei Städte als normative Erklärungen hinzugefügt werden.⁵⁸

Armed with this resolution the representatives of the three cities met at the Lüneburg Convent. Led by their superintendent Valentin Curtius, the outspoken Gnesio-Lutheran theologians of Lübeck were the driving force inside the *Ministerium Tripolitanum*. Regarding the attitude of the pastors and preachers of the three cities, three issues should be emphasized:⁵⁹ (1) They should not deviate from the recently adopted, Gnesio-Lutheran, *Corpus doctrinae*. (2) All the false doctrines which had caused the public controversies of recent years had to be dealt with explicitly and publicly denounced. (3) Any confessional document for a larger area must include *negativa* as well as *affirmativa*. (4) In their situation the Augsburg Confession was not sufficient. Confessional works of Luther, together with more recent "confessions" which dealt

⁵⁸Hauschild, "Theologienpolitische Aspekte," 44-45. The text of the Mölln consultation, see Johann Georg Bertram, Das evangelische Lüneburg oder Reformations- und Kirche-Historie der alt-berühmten Stadt Lüneburg, (Braunschweig: Ludolf Schröder, 1719), 55-58.

⁵⁹The situation in Hamburg was more complex. There struggles between Gnesio-Lutherans and Philippists over the doctrine of the Lord's Supper had been going on. Cf., Hauschild, "Corpus doctrinae und Bekenntnis-schriften," 242.

with the recent controversies, must serve as the norm for the interpretation of the Augsburg Confession.

Present at the Lüneburg Convent were representatives of the "seven cities," namely, Lübeck, Bremen, Rostock, Magdeburg, Braunschweig, Hamburg, and Lüneburg.⁶⁰ The document agreed upon, the so-called Lüneburger Artikel or Lüneburger Erklerung, was prepared by Joachim Mörlin, superintendent of Braunschweig and generally recognized as a leading Gnesio-Lutheran theologian.⁶¹

The document was of particular importance in at least two respects. First, and directly related to our issue, the Lüneburger Artikel demonstrated a considerable consensus in these dominant cities. Mörlin's purpose with the Lüneburger Artikel Hauschild summarizes thus:

Was Mörlin mit den Lüneburger Artikeln - denen Theologen wie Heßhusen, Chemnitz, Westphal, und Paul von Eitzen beitraten - bezweckte, war ein eigenes Konkordienwerk für den niedersächsischen Reichkreis. Er hatte die Prediger und die Politiker der sieben bedeutendsten Städte

⁶⁰Later even the city of Wismar, which was not present at Lüneburg, subscribed to the adopted document. See Hauschild, "Theologiepolitische Aspekte," 45.

⁶¹Erklerung aus Gottes wort/ und kurtzer bericht/ der Herren Thoelogen/ Welcher sie der Erborn Sechsischen Stedte Gesandten/ auff dem Tag zu Lüneburg/ in Julio des 61. jahrs gehalten/ fürnemlich auff drey Artickel gethan haben (Magdeburg, 1562). Kolb suggests that Martin Chemnitz' Iudicium, which was finished in March 1561, may be was written as as a preparation for the Lüneburger Artikel. ("Martin Chemnitz, Gnesio-Lutheraner," 123). Chemnitz had then been Mörlin's co-adjutor for six years. Kolb cites no direct evidence, but is is an interesting suggestion, since the two documents were written at the same time by the superintendent and his co-worker and close friend.

zu einhelliger Meinungsbildung gebracht; die übrigen Städte und die Fürstentümer sollten die Druckfassung der Artikel zur Begutachtung erhalten und alle zusammen auf einem Konvent in Braunschweig das Konkordienwerk beschließen.⁶²

But Mörlin's plan failed to reach its goal. In the territories it met strong opposition. A planned meeting in Braunschweig, where the Lüneburger Artikel should be confirmed by the territories and cities in Lower Saxony, never convened. Here a split appeared between the territories and the cities. The princes would not have a "gnesiolutherische Sonderkonkordie" in their imperial circle.⁶³

Second, the theologians present at Lüneburg had all been instrumental in working out confessions on the controversial issues in their own cities. They were not able to agree upon a selection from their confession books which could be added to a consensus document. In his draft for the Lüneburger Artikel Mörlin presented a new design for a consensus document which points forward to the Book of Concord: A consensus formula which addressed the contemporary issues added to the older confessions (Augsburg Confession, Apology, Smalcald Articles). This twofold pattern he, and particularly his co-worker, Martin Chemnitz, applied to territorial Corpora Doc-

⁶²Hauschild, "Theologiepolitische Aspekte," 46. Cf. Ph. J. Rehtmeyer, Antiquitas ecclesiasticae Brunsvigae, 247.

⁶³In accordance with the Frankfurt Recess stern measures, such as cencorship, were devised against further actions of the same kind. Mörlin, Heshusius, and Chyträus protested publicly, but to no avail. Cf., Hauschild, "Theologiepolitische Aspekte," 46-47, notes 25-27.

trinae in the years to come, first at home in the city of Braunschweig (1563/1564), where the proposed plan was realized.⁶⁴ Here we break off. We do not need to go further in stating the background and the context of Martin Chemnitz' earliest published works. By this time he is a recognized leader among the Lutherans in Lower Saxony.

The Making of a Theologian:
Chemnitz from 1548-1561

Unfortunately the sources are lacking in information about these formative years in Chemnitz' life, the Königsberg and early Braunschweig years. Chemnitz own brief autobiographical outline takes us only to 1555. The best source for the Chemnitz' biography is Philipp Julius Rehtmeyer, Antiquitas ecclesiasticae Brunsvigae.⁶⁵ The purpose of the following is not to furnish a biography, but to focus upon elements in Chemnitz' biography which may throw light upon his personal development as a theologian. From Chemnitz' time in Königsberg and Wittenberg, the time until the end of 1554, we

⁶⁴Lüneburger Artikel here served as "consensus formula" in addition to the historic confessions (CA, Apology, and AS). The only difference is that here J. Bugenhagen's church order for the city of Braunschweig of 1528 was added.

⁶⁵Rehtmeyer, Antiquitas ecclesiasticae Brunsvigae, vol. III, Ch. VII-VIII, 207-536, and the "Beylagen" for Ch. VII-VIII, 1-438, cover Mörlin and Chemnitz. Important for Chemnitz' early period is also Ch. VII and its Beylagen, which treat Joachim Mörlin. Ed. Preuss, "Vita Martini Chemnitii," Appendix in idem, Examen Concilii Tridentini (Berlin: Gust. Schlawitz, 1862), 925-958, compiles in a compressed presentation much information. Unfortunately it includes but few references to his sources.

will take a look at three issues -- namely, his relation to Melanchthon, his attitude toward and methodological approach in the study of theology, and some questions related to the *Osiandrian Controversy*. As a last part we will review some important experiences from his early Braunschweig period.

The Königsberg period

During his Königsberg years (1547-1553) Chemnitz laid the foundations for his later work. Not until 1550, and well after his Magister promotion, on September 27, 1548, did Chemnitz, now twenty-eight years old, definitely turn toward theology.⁶⁶ From the very beginning one of the outstanding features of the theologian Martin Chemnitz stand forth: his thoroughness. In his autobiography Chemnitz writes:

I should have given myself wholly to theology earlier, had it not been for my dislike for superficial knowledge of any kind. Hence while I was destitute of books whence I might acquire solidly and from its foundations what is necessary for this study, I had no taste for Theology. For I could not approve of those who, satisfied with certain dictations, were not eager to understand the text from its fundamentals, or to arrive at a sound judgment of the points of controversy.⁶⁷

⁶⁶"An Autobiography of Martin Chemnitz," trans. A. G., Theological Quarterly 3 (1899): 472-487. Chemnitz had for about two years heard lectures in theology by Staphylus. He also heard lectures at the medical and juridical faculty. Even though Chemnitz interests for a while had been leaning toward theology, Staphylus way of dealing with theology did not commend itself to him. It created rather doubt than confidence. Chemnitz himself writes: "To this was added that, having heard Staphylus, who subsequently apostatized, for about two years, I had never known him of advancing anything that was sure and solid." (482).

⁶⁷Ibid., 482.

Early the same year Chemnitz accompanied Georg Sabinus, the rector of the university at Königsberg, to Wittenberg. Sabinus was Chemnitz' cousin and Melanchthon's son-in-law. The purpose of his trip to Wittenberg was to ask

M. Philipp to show me a method of properly instituting and shaping the study of Theology. Among other things he replied that the chief light and best method in theological study was to observe the difference between the Law and the Gospel.⁶⁸

When he was back home again with Sabinus he fled to a small town named Salfeld because of pestilence. While there, for lack of other books, he started to study Peter Lombard's Sentences and Luther's postils. Related to the former he says: ". . . it was thus I began to take a liking to the writings of the antiquity."⁶⁹ His later works also demonstrates this liking very well.

On his return to Königsberg in 1550 Chemnitz wanted to leave Prussia to pursue his studies - most likely in Wittenberg. However, on account of his ability in astrology Duke Albrecht would not allow him to leave because he wanted to keep him as his court astrologer.⁷⁰ As a result on April 5,

⁶⁸Ibid., 480.

⁶⁹Ibid., 481. Petrus Lombardus work was the most used and may be the best collection of material from the early church fathers.

⁷⁰About his practice of astrological prediction Chemnitz writes: "But as I saw that the foundation for such predictions were rather uncertain, I preferred to make use of Astrology only in such a way to scrape together thereby the necessary means for other studies; and in this I was fairly succesful. However, the Arabian fooleries and certain other superstitious tricks I have always fled, despised and stunned in this

1550, he was "appointed as librarian in the ducal library in the castle, which was well stocked with the best books in every line."⁷¹ For three years Chemnitz devoted himself to diligent studies at the ducal library. Looking back, Chemnitz later evaluate these years thus: "I look upon this as the greatest fortune God bestowed upon me during the time of my studies."⁷² In accordance with Melanchthon's advice Chemnitz conducted his studies in a systematic manner: First, he read through the biblical books in their order, comparing the different versions and the older and newer expositions available. What he found "remarkable and memorable" he brought into an arranged system of notes. Secondly, he studied the Fathers, especially the earlier ones. "What engaged my attention, I brought into my notes." Thirdly, Chemnitz applied his knowledge and insights to contemporary issues.⁷³

I diligently read those recent authors who pointed out the fundamentals of the purified doctrine, and chiefly those who wrote polemical treatises on the controversies of our time, the arguments of the papists, Anabaptists, Sacramentarians, and from what foundations the explanations and solutions were taken, and what solutions were the best.⁷⁴

science." (Ibid., 481).

⁷¹Ibid., p 481.

⁷²Ibid., p. 481.

⁷³In addition to the difference between Law and Gospel - the "among other things" of Melanchthon's advice most probably refers to biblical and particularly patristic studies. It was scarcely Melanchthon who recommended the study of the *Interim controversy* and related issues.

⁷⁴Ibid., 482-483.

We here discern the contours of the later Chemnitz, a theologian who is not content with the knowledge easily gathered from compendiums, but a man who wants to understand theology from its foundations and to come to grips with the disputed issues from their basic arguments. Who are the "recent authors"? Should we look back to the 1520s, or are the combatants of the Interim and Majoristic controversies also included? Most probably we should think of both.⁷⁵

The Osiandrian controversy gave Chemnitz a special occasion to work thoroughly with doctrinal issues.⁷⁶ By the first public disputation, October 24, 1550, over Osiander's doctrine, Chemnitz was one of the two opponents.⁷⁷ As for the doctrine of justification narrowly regarded, this controversy only contributed to the strengthening of the forensic view so

⁷⁵Martin Stupperich, "Martin Chemnitz und der Osianderische Streit," in Der zweite Martin der lutherischen Kirche. Festschrift zum 400. Todestag von Martin Chemnitz, ed. W. A. Junke (Braun-schweig: Ev.luth. Stadtkirchenverband und Propstei, 1986), 228, thinks primarily of the contemporary controversies, "z. B. mit den Auseinandersetzungen über das Interim, mit dem antinomistischen Streit und dem Abendmahlstreit." The second Eucharistic controversy, however, had only recently started when Chemnitz was about to leave Königsberg.

⁷⁶"An Autobiography of Martin Chemnitz," 483. "Yet that Osiandrian controversy afforded me occasion to give more careful thought to the foundations of doctrine, . . ."

⁷⁷About the debate, see Martin Stupperich, Osiander in Preussen 1549-1552, Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte 44. (Berlin-New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1973), 110-112; idem, "Zur Vorgeschichte des Rechtfertigungsartikels in der Konkordienformel," in Bekenntnis und Einheit der Kirche. Studien zum Konkordienformel, ed. M. Brecht and R. Schwarz (Stuttgart: Calver Verlag, 1980), 175-194.

typical of Melanchthon's way of presenting this doctrine. Here Melanchthon and Gnesio-Lutherans stood side by side. There is no reason to think that this controversy contributed to any alienation between Chemnitz and Melanchthon. If anything the opposite would be the case.

The controversy also involved Christology. It is not our purpose here to go into the Osiandrian debate. Martin Stupperich has clearly demonstrated, however, that issues essential to doctrine of the Lord's Supper as later presented by Chemnitz were at stake in Osiander's theology. He writes:

Kernpunkt der Argumentation Osianders ist die Aussage, daß Christus als Person der unteilbaren Trinität die essentielle Gerechtigkeit der gesamten göttlichen Dreiheit in den Menschen direct einfließen läßt.⁷⁸

In addition to the rejection of the Wittenberg doctrine of imputation in justification, Osiander's concept of God had another consequence. Stupperich summarizes the matter thus:

Jede Vermischung des Göttlichen mit dem Kreatürlichen ist ausgeschlossen, da andernfalls der Göttlichkeit Gottes Abbruch getan würde. Daher ist Osiander nicht in der Lage, die Lehre von der communicatio idiomatum, d.h. der Verbindung der Naturen in Christus festzuhalten. Osiander sieht des Verhältnis beider Naturen Christi lediglich so, wie er das Verhältnis von innerem und äusserem Wort beschrieb. Wie das äussere Wort, so ist auch die menschliche Natur Christi ein Hilfsmittel zur Vermittlung des göttlichen Wesens selbst an den Menschen. Von eigenständiger Bedeutung für die Christen ist Christus damit lediglich allein nach seiner göttlichen Natur. Die menschliche Natur fällt nach Erfüllung ihrer Aufgabe hin und vergeht.⁷⁹

⁷⁸Stupperich, "Martin Chemnitz und der Osianderische Streit," 230.

⁷⁹Ibid., 235.

In the Osiandrian controversy in general the focus was not on the fundamental Christological issue which lay at the root of the problem. Most of the contemporary theologians did not even seem to recognize it as a major problem.⁸⁰ Among those who did recognize it, as Mahlmann claims, were Joachim Mörlin, Osiander's main opponent in Königsberg, and his friend Martin Chemnitz. In his book Das neue Dogma der lutherischen Christologie Mahlmann gives some evidence that Chemnitz first work on Christology⁸¹ may have its roots so far back as his Königsberg time when he (and Mörlin) gathered material on the issue of "communio idiomatum".⁸² This indicates that Christology had not yet surfaced as an internal Lutheran problem. Not until the late 1550s did it become a sensitive issue, not only between Melanchthon and the Swabian theologians, but also between Melanchthon and the Gnesio-Lutherans, and even between Gnesio-Lutherans and the Swabians.⁸³

There is no reason to think that the Osiandrian controversy alienated Chemnitz from Melanchthon. The opposite is

⁸⁰Stupperich, Osiander in Preussen 1549-1552; idem, "Zur Vorgeschichte des Rechtfertigungsartikels in der Konkordienformel," 184-190.

⁸¹To Chemnitz' Repetitio, 1561, was added as an appendix a treatise titled Additus est Tractatus complectens doctrinam de Communicatione idiomatum; see the bibliography.

⁸²Mahlmann, Das neue Dogma der lutherischen Christologie, 206.

⁸³Generally on this question, see *ibid.*, 62-92, 125-204; *ibid.*, "Personeinheit Jesu mit Gott," in Blätter für Württembergische Kirchengeschichte 70 (1970): 176-265.

rather the case. In fact, it contributed to the strong forensic emphasis in his doctrine of justification and to the close connection to the *obedientia activa et passiva* of Christ substitutional work.

Chemnitz in Wittenberg

When Chemnitz left Königsberg in the spring of 1553, he headed for Wittenberg, where he was immediately included in the inner circle of students around the Preceptor. He became his "Tischgenosse" and an attentive hearer of his lectures "quia rectius tunc eas, quae tradebar, intellegebam."⁸⁴ Considered from the situation of say ten to fifteen years later, one may wonder how Chemnitz could attach himself so closely to Melanchthon during his Wittenberg time. However, with the exception of the *Interim controversy* Melanchthon did not take part in the public disputes over doctrinal issues. One should here take care not to read the more clear fronts from the 1560s and 1570s into the early 1550s. Even after 1554 Joachim Westphal and Nikolaus Gallus, in the second Eucharistic controversy, appealed to Melanchthon and expected support.⁸⁵ The Hardenberg controversy in Bremen demonstrates clearly both

⁸⁴Ph. J. Rehtmeyer, Antiquitas ecclesiasticae Brunsvigae, 292. Theodor Mahlmann, "Chemnitz, Martin (1522-1586)," in Theologische Realenzyklopädie (Berlin-New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1977-). 7: 715, 16-22. [Hereafter cited: "Chemnitz, Martin (TRE)"]

⁸⁵Neuser, "Von Zwingli und Calvin zur Synode von Westminster," 276-278; idem, "Melanchthons Abendmahllehre und ihre Auswirkung im unteren Dunauraum," ZKG 84 (1973): 53-54.

that Melanchthon differed from Luther in the doctrine of the Lord's Supper and that this difference was generally badly understood.⁸⁶ As late as 1565 Mörlin defended the "real" Melanchthon against the "invented" Melanchthon of "die Landlüge der Heidelberger Theologen."⁸⁷ They misused the Preceptor. The differing stand of his friend Mörlin and his teacher Melanchthon on the Interim was evident. How much this discrepancy meant for Chemnitz at that time is an open question.

Promising prospects for a good teaching position in Wittenberg lay before Chemnitz. He had the favor of Melanchthon. But less than two months after he started lecturing on Melanchthon's Loci, Chemnitz received an invitation from his Gnesio-Lutheran friend Mörlin, who now was superintendent in Braunschweig, to be his coadjutor. "All the Professors of Wittenberg dissuaded me from going," Chemnitz relates, and

M. Philipp proposed that I be engaged for the weekday-sermons in the Castle at Wittenberg, and the instruction of the candidates for ordination, until I might be further promoted.⁸⁸

After a short visit in Braunschweig, Chemnitz received the call from the city council to be Mörlin's coadjutor in Braun-

⁸⁶Neuser, "Hardenberg und Melanchthon. Der Hardenbergische Streit (1554-1560)," JGNSKG 65, (1967):142-186, especially; Mahlmann, Das neue Dogma der lutherischen Christologie, 44-61.

⁸⁷Joachim Mörlin, Wider die Landlügen, der Heidelbergischen Theologen (Eisleben: Andreas Petri, 1565). Cf. Wagenman, "Mörlin, Joachim," 243.

⁸⁸"An Autobiography of Martin Chemnitz," 485.

schweig.⁸⁹ To answer the question why he did so, the sources give but little evidence. His friendship with Mörlin no doubt played a part. He himself indicates a kind of "inner calling": "God inclined my heart toward Braunschweig".⁹⁰ This, however, does not exclude the possibility that doctrinal considerations may have also influenced Chemnitz' decision. However, the evidence is too scant to sustain such a conclusion. Melanchthon's correspondence with Chemnitz until 1557 indicate a continuing close relationship.⁹¹

Coadjutor of Mörlin in Braunschweig

Less than a half year after Chemnitz assumed his office, as a part of his duty he resumed his lecture on Melanchthon's Loci communes, now as a sort of continuing education for the city clergy. This practice no doubt contributed to Chemnitz development as a theologian.

⁸⁹Rehtmeyer, Antiquitas ecclesiasticae Brunsvigae, 293, gives the details.

⁹⁰Ibid.

⁹¹Melanchthon accepted Chemnitz invitation to his wedding August 19, 1555. Because of duties in Wittenberg, he could not make it, but sent the couple a present, cf. Friedrich Koldewey, "Neun bisher nicht gedruckte Briefe Melanths über und an Martin Kemnitz. Mit Einleitung und Anmerkungen," in ZHistTheol 42 (1872): 7, 10-13, and 19. An interesting detail in his autobiographical outline is that the only theologian Chemnitz mentions from whom the couple received a wedding gift, a silver cup, was Nikolaus Gallus, first pastor in Regensburg, reknown Gnesio-Lutheran and one of the closest friends of Flacius.

From the early Braunschweig period we will concentrate on two events of great importance which took place in 1557: First, the negotiations in Coswig and Wittenberg to reconcile Melanchthon and Flacius; then the Colloquy of Worms. In both Mörlin played an important part. Chemnitz was involved in the first and present at the latter.⁹²

Both Flacius and Melanchthon realized the harmful effect of the ongoing sharp controversies. Both of them expressed their wishes for reconciliation.⁹³ Duke Johann Albrecht of Mecklenburg was asked to be intermediary. At a meeting in Braunschweig January 14, 1557, Mörlin persuaded friends from Lübeck, Hamburg, and Lüneburg to join him in an attempt to overcome the conflict between Melanchthon and the Wittenbergers on the one hand and Flacius and his friends on the other hand.⁹⁴ Flacius had requested this of Mörlin. A plan for the negotiations was agreed upon. Articles Flacius had

⁹²Chemnitz followed Mörlin to Worms. Mörlin wanted him present as a witness of his actions, CR IX: 259. "Coadjutor noster petit, ut possit diutius mecum hic haerere, et ego statuo necesse Ecclesia, ut testem habeam mearum actionum."

⁹³For an extensive and detailed presentation on the following, Jörg Rainer Fligge, Herzog Albrecht von Preussen und der Oslanderismus, 1522-68 (Diss. phil., University of Bonn, 1972), 371-376; Wilhelm Preger, Matthias Flacius Illyricus und seine Zeit (Erlangen: Theodor Bläsing, 1861), vol. 2, 32-59. [Hereafter cited: Matthias Flacius].

⁹⁴The sources do not reveal whether Mörlin's initiative was independent of that of the Mecklenburgers or not. However, negotiators from Duke Johann Albrecht arrived at Wittenberg one month after Mörlin's group had finished. Preger, Matthias Flacius, vol. 2, 59-60. Mörlin's initiative was most probably independent action (Ibid., 32-33).

prepared were accepted as the basis for the negotiations. The articles were signed by the full delegation.⁹⁵ In keeping with Flacius' articles, the negotiations were to focus on the *Adiaphoristic* and the *Majoristic controversies*.⁹⁶ We notice that the doctrine of the Lord's Supper was not among the problem articles. The plan was accepted in Magdeburg.⁹⁷ The Magdeburg delegates stayed at Coswig, a small town near Wittenberg.⁹⁸

January 21, 1557, Mörlin presented the eight articles to Melancthon. Mörlin, who was the main mediator, had no easy task. The sources clearly demonstrate that the dealings were filled with suspicion, agitation, intense emotions, and pleading. Melancthon would not discuss the issues on the basis of a draft prepared by Flacius. In order that the negotia-

⁹⁵CR IX, 35-37. The delegation was made up of the superintendent and one pastor from each of the cities. CR IX, 35-37. This makes plain that also Chemnitz signed these articles. Cf., Kunze, "Chemnitz, Martin," in Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche, 3d ed., vol. 3: 800.

⁹⁶The heading of Flacius' articles reads: "Acta tentatae pacificationis inter eos, qui contra Interimistas Adia-phoristas et Majoristas scripserunt, et ipsos etiam adia-phoristas Vitebergenses potissimum. Anno domini 1557 mense Januario." (Preger, Matthias Flacius vol. 2, 33, note **.)

⁹⁷In Magdeburg the delegation met with Flacius and Johann Wigand. They wanted to discuss the plan in the presence of the whole ministry of the city. Mörlin, however, allowed no such dealings. Cf., Fligge, Herzog Albrecht von Preussen, 373-374; Preger, Matthias Flacius, vol. 2, 34. The delegation was also invested with a letter of authority from Flacius and Wigand.

⁹⁸Matthias Flacius, Johann Wigand, Matthäus Judex, and Johann Baungartner were commissioned by the city council of Magdeburg for the negotiation. (CR, IX, no. 6160, 29-30).

tions should not break down before they started, the mediators had to present a paper which comprised the main issues. "In der Sache blieben sie ganz auf die Seite von Flacius, wenn sie auch den Form milderten."⁹⁹ The problems were located in the third article and in the end particularly in the seventh. The text of the third article, as reworked by the mediators read:

Aus dem Artikel von der Rechtferdigung sollen alle Verfälschungen, welche mit der reinen apostolischen Lehre und der Augsburgischen Confession streiten, entfernt werden, sonderlich die Verfälschung von der Nothwendigkeit der Guten Werke zur Säligkeit.¹⁰⁰

Melanchthon could not admit that he had introduced errors into the doctrine of justification. However, if the reference to the article of justification was removed, he could accept this statment. His view was that good works are necessary, but not "zur Säligkeit."¹⁰¹

In the end, however, a possible agreement was shattered at the seventh article, which read in the version of the mediators:

⁹⁹Rudolf Keller, "In Konflikt über die Adiaphora. Martin Chemnitz auf dem Weg zum zehnten Artikel der Konkordienformel," in Der zweite Martin der lutherischen Kirche. Festschrift zum 400. Todestag von Martin Chemnitz, ed. W. A. Junke (Braunschweig: Ev. luth. Stadtkirchenverband und Propstei, 1986), 97. For the different drafts of the articles, cf. Preger, Matthias Flacius, vol. 2, 37-38 and CR, IX, 36-37, 54, 60-61, and 68-69. The last three drafts do not differ much from the articles of Flacius, CR, IX, 36-37, even in form.

¹⁰⁰Preger, Matthias Flacius, vol. 2, 37.

¹⁰¹CR, IX, 39; cf. ibid., 69. Cf. also Hans-Werner Gensichen: We condemn. How Luther and 16th Century Lutheranism Condemned False Doctrine, trans. Herbert. J. A. Bouman (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1967), 126.

Wir bitten auch freundlich den ehrwürdigen Herrn Präceptor, daß er durch eine öffentliche Schrift bezeugen wolle, daß seine Meinung von den Mitteldingen und von der Nothwendigkeit der Werke mit dem Bekenntniß unserer Kirche eine und dieselbe sey.¹⁰²

This Melanchthon could not but reject. There is no doubt that he regretted his involvement in the Interim affair. He was convinced though that he had acted responsibly in a very difficult situation.¹⁰³ A public rejection of his stand in the adiaphoristic controversy would be too much of a self humiliation. That would be as to "cut off their own trout." To Flacius, however, a clear rejection of the "adiaphoristic affair" was necessary. All the trouble in the recent controversies not only grew out of the Interim, the Interim actually contained all the subsequent deviations.¹⁰⁴ For this reason it was necessary not only to approve the true doctrine, but also publicly to condemn the false doctrine. When the articles were reworked a second time without success, Mörlin realized that their mission had failed.

Our question is this: what did this event mean for Chemnitz? As a member of the delegation of mediators he had

¹⁰²Preger, Matthias Flacius, 38.

¹⁰³CR, 7, 839-844. Lohse, "Von Luther bis zum Konkordienbuch," 112, comments: "In der Sache konnte er schließlich nicht umhin, den Gegnern halbwegs recht zu geben. Auch bedauerte er seine Mitwirkung an Leipziger "Interim". Andererseits hielt er grundsetzlich an seiner Position fest."

¹⁰⁴Jan. 21 the Magdeburg theologians wrote to Mörlin: "Totum enim istud malum non tantum oritur ex erroribus ab Interim per Adiaphora in Ecclesia Dei, sed etiam in eo comprehenditur ac consistit." (CR IX, 32)

signed the articles drafted by Flacius.¹⁰⁵ Chemnitz followed the delegation to Wittenberg to meet with Melanchthon. There he stayed, while Mörlin the other mediators went back to Coswig. The sources disclose nothing about his part in the negotiations.¹⁰⁶ Keller contends that we must abstain from every kind of psychologizing.¹⁰⁷ It is, however, a fact that Melanchthon's letters to Chemnitz ceased after this event.¹⁰⁸ Even if he had wanted to, Chemnitz could not have been neutral in these issues. His stand cost him his friendship with Melanchthon.¹⁰⁹ Keller rightly maintains: "Der Streit um die Adiaphora war auch für Chemnitz kein rein akademisches Problem, sondern berührte seine persönlichen Freundschaften."¹¹⁰ In view of what Chemnitz himself wrote in his Iudicium (1561) on this issue four years later Keller's assessment is obviously right.

¹⁰⁵See above, 55, note 132.

¹⁰⁶The same holds good for the other six mediators except Mörlin who was the main negotiator. Cf. the report CR IX, 42-67.

¹⁰⁷Keller, "Im Konflikt über die Adiaphora," 98, against F. Koldewey, "Neun bisher nicht gedruckte Briefe," 8.

¹⁰⁸Ibid.,

¹⁰⁹Mahlmann, "Chemnitz, Martin (TRE)" 715; cf., idem, "Martin Chemnitz (GKG)", 316-317.

¹¹⁰Keller, "Im Konflikt über die Adiaphora," 94-98; see Kolb's instructive article "Martin Chemnitz, Gnesio-Lutheraner," 122.

At the Regensburg Diet 1556 it was resolved that a colloquy between theologians from the Roman Church and the Lutherans should meet August 24, 1557, at Worms.¹¹¹ Duke Johann Friedrich of Ernestine Saxony sided definitely with his Gnesio-Lutheran theologians. Their mandate for the colloquy was very strict. On his instruction "seine Theologen forderte die namentliche Verwerfung und klare Richtigstellung aller Irrelehren, die unter den Anhängern CA aufgekommen waren."¹¹²

Flacius was by now professor at Jena and highly influential at the Weimar court. He was not in the Weimar delegation, but he was eager to bring about internal agreement among the Lutherans before the colloquium officially started. The Ernestine Saxon theologians were supported by Mörlin and Sarcerius of Mansfeld. Under the pressure of the Roman opponents Mörlin particularly hoped to bring about what had failed in the Wittenberg-Coswig negotiations in January the same year. Fligge gives evidence that there were signs that Melanchthon in this situation was ready to yield to the Gnesio-

¹¹¹ For a detailed discussion, see especially Fligge, Herzog Albrecht von Preussen, 378-441; Erdmann K. Sturm, Der Junge Zacharias Ursin. Sein weg vom Philippismus zum Calvinismus (1534-1562), (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1972), 87-97; Gustav Kawerau, "Wormser Religionsgespräche. II. Das Religions-gespreäch 1557," in Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche, 3d ed., vol. 21: 492-496.

¹¹²Keller, "Im Konflikt über die Adiaphora," 99; cf., Fligge, Herzog Albrecht von Preussen, 389.

Lutherans even on the adiaphora issue.¹¹³ The Osiandrian question caused no trouble in Coswig. Here Melanchthon and the Gnesio-Lutheran essentially agreed. Nevertheless, this issue became crucial. Johannes Brenz and the Württembergers were by no means willing to condemn Osiander's position. Melanchthon would not risk losing his good relationship with Brenz. Mörlin could not allow himself to bypass Osiander, and he was particularly severe in his criticism of Brenz.¹¹⁴ And so once again an attempt to reach, if not a full agreement, at least an understanding, broke down. In the words of Erasmus Sarcerius, Fligge summarizes the outcome of the negotiations between the adherents of the Augsburg Confession thus:

So dürfen wir der Analyse Erasmus Sarcerius Glauben schenken der die Vorgänge wie folgt erklärt: "Melanchthon war nach erfolgter Beratung der Unsrigen zu allen völlig bereit, seine Ansicht gegen die Sekten kundzutun die in diesen Jahren gegen die Augsburgische Confession aufgekomen waren; aber Brenz, mit Sicherheit ein Osiandrist, zog, gestützt auf seine Autorität, mit Unredlichkeit und Auftritten Melanchthon von der Vorlage wieder ab." Nimmt man die Behauptung Brenz habe unredlich handelt, fort, so kommt diese Erklärung der Wirklichkeit sehr nahe.¹¹⁵

¹¹³Fligge, Herzog Albrecht von Preussen, 393-397, 401-404, 411-414, 417.

¹¹⁴Mörlin called attention to the part the Würtemberg "Gutachten" played in the Osiandrian Controversy. It was their "Gutachten" he maintained, that made it possible for Duke Albrecht to continue his pro-Osiandrian course. (Ibid., 411-412, 418-420.

¹¹⁵Ibid., 419, where also an account of an unknown in the Anhalt archives is referred, which in the main support Sarcerius.

Melanchthon's attitude in 1557 is very difficult to understand. He must obviously have been frustrated. Calvin, and especially a Lasco, planned negotiations with Melanchthon and other moderate Lutherans, and, if possible, Bullinger. Melanchthon was favorable toward such a colloquy.¹¹⁶ At Worms, on the other hand, he finally seemed willing to yield to demands of the Gnesio-Lutherans, but this was spoiled because he wanted Brenz' support. His lectures on Colossians 3 in the weeks just before the Colloquy at Worms lead to a definite break with Brenz.¹¹⁷ Finally under pressure of the Romanists at Worms Melanchthon signed the condemnation of the heresy of Zwingli. As a result the colloquium plans and the good relation to the Swiss broke down.¹¹⁸

Again we notice that the doctrine of Lord's Supper was not one of the disputed issues. The Lutherans regularly referred to works of Melanchthon from around 1530, which were read through Lutheran glasses. The Swiss, on the other hand, cited more recent, often non-public utterances of Melanchthon.

¹¹⁶Neuser, "Von Zwingli und Calvin zur Synode von Westminster," 279-281. Erdmann K. Sturm, Der Junge Zacharias Ursin, 97-104. Cf., below, 110, 113-114.

¹¹⁷Erdmann K. Sturm, Der Junge Zacharias Ursin, 73-86; Martin Brecht and Hermann Ehmer, Südwestdeutsche Reformationsgeschichte (Stuttgart: Calwer, 1984), 368-371; Mahlmann, Das neue Dogma der lutherischen Christologie, 176-192.

¹¹⁸For the circumstances in the years before Worms, cf. the discription by Neuser, "Von Zwingli und Calvin zur Synode von Westminster," 275, quoted below, 110.

To a certain extent this explain that both parties appealed to him for support.

After the Colloquium at Worms the situation among the Lutherans was more difficult than ever before. For Melancthon this was particularly true. He became isolated in the emerging group of Philippists.¹¹⁹

Chemnitz held no official position at Worms. Because Mörlin realized the importance of the upcoming events, he wanted Chemnitz present as a witness of his own undertakings.¹²⁰ In Worms, in a situation which demanded unity, Chemnitz experienced a serious dissension among the adherents of the Augsburg Confession. Mahlmann summarizes the matters thus:

Daß Chemnitz in Begleitung Mörlins in Worms war, hat für ihn die Bedeutung gehabt, daß er die herrschende kirchenpolitische Gesamtsituation erfuhr, die bedeutenden Theologen aller Kirchenpartien persönlich kennenlernte und dabei den bald wichtig werdenden dauerhaften Kontakt zu Oberdeutschland durch Mattias Ritter (Frankfurt) und Johannes Marbach (Strassburg) gewann.¹²¹

Chemnitz' Theological Position

The earliest source from which we may learn about Chemnitz' own position in these questions which caused division in these years are his works from around 1560. The first draft of Repetitio which treats the Lord's Supper, goes back

¹¹⁹See below, 109, 112-113.

¹²⁰CR IX, 259, quoted above, 54, note 129.

¹²¹Mahlmann "Martin Chemnitz," 317.

at least to 1557.¹²² This work must also be read as a defense of Mörlin against Melanchthon's unfair attack in his Heidelberg "Gutachten."¹²³ Here in his first published work Chemnitz publicly, though indirectly censured leading fellow Lutherans.

Of particular interest is Chemnitz' Iudicium (1561). In this work Chemnitz treated the major issues which were disputed in the contemporary theology and worked out solutions for his own personal use. This is not the place for a broad discussion of this work. A comparison of Chemnitz' Iudicium¹²⁴ and the Lüneburger Artikel, which was drafted by Mörlin, shows that the theology of the two men at that time must for all practical purposes be said to be the same. In his preface to Chemnitz' Repititio Mörlin writes:

Aber was unser Lehre und eintrectige meinung dieser Kirchen sey/ zeigt der Herr magister Martinus in diesem Büchleinreichlich genug/ Dann was er allheir schreibet/ das ist unsere meinung und Lehre/ inn welcher eintrectiger meynung/ wir ob Gott wil/ wider alles Toben aller Sacramentierschwermer/ wider alles lestern/ aller verleumbder/unnd alle hohe klugheit/ so sich wider das rechte erkenntniss GOTtes erhebt/ mit einfeltigem hertzen/ durch seine gnade zuuerharren bedacht sind/ der do zuge-saget hat/ das uns von seinen henden niemandts reissen sol.¹²⁵

¹²²Mahlmann, Das Neue Dogma der lutherischen Christologie, 205-207.

¹²³Mörlin's preface to Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, A vi v.

¹²⁴The preface of Iudicium is dated April 3, 1561.

¹²⁵Joacim Mörlin's preface in Martin Chemnitz, Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, A viii r-v.

As his Iudicium shows this holds good also for the other doctrines which were disputed.¹²⁶

There are no signs which indicate that Chemnitz felt the situation in Braunschweig difficult on account of Mörlin and his close relationship with the theologians of the Hanse cities and the leading Gnesio-Lutherans of Magdeburg and Jena. He soon had the opportunity to leave Braunschweig to assume leading positions in other territories. In 1560 he received calls from both Lüneburg and Brandenburg, and in 1564 from Denmark.¹²⁷ Gerhard Müller's observation and comment nicely summarizes the whole matter we have been discussing thus:

Es spricht für Mörlin und Chemnitz, daß aus den folgenden Jahren ihrer Zusammenarbeit kein Zwist bekannt ist, der ihre Arbeit untereinander und nebeneinander belastet hätte. Sie haben sich gegenseitig offenbar gut ergänzt und immer dieselbe theologische und kirchenpolitische Richtung vertreten. Es ist vielmehr das Gegenteil davon bekannt, daß sie nämlich gemeinsam Hand angelegten bei den wichtigsten kirchlichen und theologischen Aufgaben der Zeit. Dabei war Mörlin der entscheidende Theologe der Stadt, aber Chemnitz hat sich offenbar nie so in seinem Schatten stehend gefühlt, daß er den Versuch gemacht hätte, Braunschweig zugunsten einer andere Stelle aufzugeben. Sowohl im Hinblick auf die Streitigkeiten über die Lehre vom Abendmahl wie auch bei den Konkordienbemühungen im niedersächsischen Raum wie auch bei der Erarbeitung des Braunschweiger Bekenntnisbuches haben sie offenbar ohne größere Konflikte zusammengearbeitet.¹²⁸

¹²⁶Even for the time about 1557 Kunze, "Chemnitz, Martin," 800, maintains: "Man wird annehmen dürfen, daß er dasmals bereits einen festen dogmatischen Standpunkt einnahm und daß es der Mörlins war, der nicht Philippist sondern Lutheraner war."

¹²⁷Rehtmeyer, Antiquitas ecclesiasticae Brunsvigae, 294.

¹²⁸Gerhard Müller, "Martin Chemnitz. Ein Reformator der zweiten Generation," in Luther 57 (1986): 121.

So far as doctrinal issues are concerned we can fairly conclude that around 1560 Chemnitz was a leading spokesman of the moderate Lower Saxon Gnesio-Lutherans.

This does not, however, mean that Chemnitz turned completely away from Melanchthon. As we have seen, this holds good even for Mörlin. Chemnitz never explicitly criticized Melanchthon and his continuing education of the pastors in Braunschweig from 1555 on was based on the 1543 edition of Melanchthon's Locj. An incident in 1570 illustrates well Chemnitz evaluation of Melanchthon's theology.¹²⁹ N. Selenecer had been installed as General Superintendent for Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel on July 14, 1570. A crisis was provoked when he in agreement with J. Andreae prescribed Corpus doctrinae Philippi

auff das dadurch richtigkeit in der lere und consensus unter [muß heißen: mit] den kirchen und schulen des churfürstentum zu Sachsen . . . köndte gestiftet und bestetiget werden.¹³⁰

Only with difficulty Chemnitz prevailed in a hard struggle with the two men and Duke Julius. In the negotiations Chemnitz was able to establish that

¹²⁹For the following see Inge Mager, Die Konkordienformel in Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel. Die Entstehung - Rezeption - Geltung (Habil. diss., University of Göttingen, 1986), 102-118, and Mahlmann, "Martin Chemnitz (GKG)," 323-325.

¹³⁰Quoted from Mahlmann, "Martin Chemnitz (GKG)," 324-325. Chemnitz reports the following disparaging saying of Selenecer: "Es ist nichts mit der Corpore doctrinae in der fürstlichen kirchenordnung. . . Darumb habe ich das Corpus doctrinae Philippi verschrieben" (Ibid., 325).

das Corpus doctrinae Philippi nicht norma seyn, sondern propter methodum [nur noch als Munster wissenschaftlicher Behandlung der Lehre] gelesen und nach [dem Lehrsystem] der kirchenordnung regulirt werden.¹³¹

Mager has demonstrated that now Chemnitz in this confrontation leveled direct critique against Melanchthon on the doctrines of man's will in conversion, Christology, and the Lord's Supper.¹³² His basic position, however, is essentially the same as it was in 1561 when he wrote his Iudicium. The more explicit Smalcald Articles were necessary beside Augsburg Confession and the Apology in order that they should not be misused.¹³³ This position was laid down in the Lüneburger Artikel and in the *Corpus doctrinae* of the city of Braunschweig in 1563/1564.¹³⁴ The difference is that Chemnitz attitude toward Melanchthon had become more critical. Now Selenecer regard the Philippists use of Melanchthon as misuse, Chemnitz tends to regard the development from Melanchthonian theology to Philippism as natural.¹³⁵

¹³¹Ibid.

¹³²Mager, Die Konkordienformel in Braunschweig-Wolfenbützel, 110-112.

¹³³Iudicium, 2-5.

¹³⁴For the Lüneburger Artikel, see above, 42-44, 64; Inge Mager, "Corpus doctrinae of the city of Braunschweig," in Vier Jahrhunderte lutherische Landeskirche im Braunschweig (Braunschweig: Landeskirchenamt, 1968).

¹³⁵Mager, Die Konkordienformel in Braunschweig-Wolfenbützel, 111-112.

CHAPTER 3
MELANCHTHON AND THE LORD'S SUPPER

Except for Martin Luther no single person had such an impact on the Lutheran Reformation as Philipp Melanchthon. In certain respects his influence - directly and indirectly, positively and negatively -- may even surpass Luther's. Directly his influence is exerted through Augsburg Confession and the Apology. Whatever contribution one might ascribe to Luther, both Augsburg Confession and Apology were penned by Melanchthon and in many respects bear the marks of his mind. Through his Loci Communes, and the later thoroughly rewritten and expanded editions, Melanchthon exerted an enormous influence on the following generations of Lutheran theologians.

We have already seen that the controversies into which the Lutherans were plunged in the wake of the Augsburg and Leipzig Interims can in most cases be traced to Melanchthon's theology.¹ This is particularly true in the aftermath of the Second Eucharistic Controversy, the struggles among Lutherans from about 1557 and until the early 1570s.

With respect to the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, from the late 1520s, the views of Melanchthon and Luther started

¹See above, 20-24.

diverging. This involves especially questions related to the Real Presence. As for the nature of the dissimilarity, how radical the divergence became, and how early the deviations started, there is no general agreement.² In older works Melanchthon's departing from Luther was generally dated in the 1530s.

Since Melanchthon's position was so important in the 1550s, we shall now present the main features of his doctrine of the Lord's Supper. We will focus on the late 1520s, the relation between Melanchthon and Luther in 1544, and the last decade of Melanchthon's life. A clear understanding of his position on this doctrine in the early years is helpful for a better understanding of its development in his later years.

Melanchthon's Doctrine of the Lord's Supper 1525-1529

Melanchthon came to Wittenberg in 1518 as a young man, only twenty-one years old. He came as a professor of Greek, not as a theologian. His Loci Communes of 1521 was highly praised by Luther. That does not mean, however, that Melanchthon already had reached a definite stage in his theological

²Cf., Hermann Sasse, This is my Body. Luther's contention for the Real Presence in the Sacrament of the Altar (Adelaide, S.A.: Lutheran Publishing House, 1981), 242-243, 252-260 [Hereafter cited: This is my Body]; Wilhelm H. Neuser, Die Abendmahlslehre Melanchthons in ihre geschichtlichen Entwicklung (1519-1530) (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1968), 339-398. [Hereafter cited: Abendmahlslehre]. See also Peter Fraenkel, "Ten questions concerning Melanchthon, the Fathers and the Eucharist," in Luther and Melanchthon, ed. Vilmos Vajta (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1961), 146-164.

development. The last half century of Melanchthon research has clearly demonstrated that there was an ongoing development.³ Wilhelm Neuser has documented this regarding Melanchthon's doctrine of the Lord's Supper from 1519-1530.⁴

One should have in mind, however, that Luther's doctrine of the Lord's Supper also developed through the 1520s. His doctrine found its final form in his great eucharistic works 1526-1528.⁵ A proper assessment of Melanchthon's doctrine of the Lord's Supper must, therefore, be examine it in relation to Luther, and so in relation also to Luther's development.

The Foundation of the Real Presence Letters to Confidants in 1525-1526

The first question which will concern us is how Melanchthon in letters to confidants argues for the Real Presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Supper. In a letter to Oekolampadius, January 12, 1525, which primarily deals with Carlstadt's doctrine of the Lord's Supper but also with that of Oekolampadius, Melanchthon writes:

³As representative for many we here only mention the outstanding works of Wilhelm Maurer, Der junge Melanchthon zwischen Humanismus und Reformation, 2 vols. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969).

⁴Neuser, Die Abendmahllehre, 17-313.

⁵See below, 80. Cf., Ralph W. Quere, Melanchthon's Christum Cognoscere. Christ's Efficacious Presence in the Eucharistic Theology of Melanchthon (Nieuwkoop: B. De Graaf, 1977), 47-49, 147-170; Neuser, Die Abendmahllehre, 324-339. Both draw upon F. Gräbke, Die Konstruktion der Abendmahlslehre Luthers in ihre Entwicklung dargestellt (Leipzig: A. Deichert, 1908).

Petrus fordert, wir sollen nichts in der Kirche lehren denn 'Worte Gottes' [logia Theou], und nichts glauben denn 'aus der Kraft, die Gott gewährt' [1.Petr. 4:11]. Darum kann ich [am Bibelwort] nichts ändern, ich werde denn aus eine gewissere Offenbarung gezwungen. Unterdessen will ich fest bei den Schriftworten bleiben.⁶

In this letter two notable features are apparent. First, over against "Dem 'fühlen' und ungewisse Geistbesitz der karlstadtianer"⁷ Melanchthon sides clearly with Luther who maintains Real Presence on the basis of *Verba*. In opposition to Oekolampadius himself Melanchthon says this about Real Presence: "Der tropos des Wortes 'ist' berührt mich nicht. Ich zweifele nicht, dass die Jünger im Abendmahl Christi den natürlichen Leib Christi gegessen haben."⁸ Secondly, Melanchthon's appeal to the *Verba* at the same time reveals a kind of uncertainty. He will remain firmly by the *Verba*, except "ich werde denn durch eine gewissere Offenbarung gezwungen." As Neuser points out by "Offenbarung" Melanchthon is not thinking of a new revelation from above. He simply means the "enlightening" by the Spirit in the Word.⁹ His closing words to

⁶Ernst Stähelin, Briefe und Akten zum Leben Oekolampads, Bd.I, 1927, 339; German translation quoted from Neuser, Abendmahlslehre, 316.

⁷Neuser, Abendmahlslehre, 316.

⁸Stähelin, Briefe und Akten I, 339; Neuser, Abendmahlslehre, 316.

⁹Neuser, Abendmahlslehre, 316.

Oekolampadius reads: "Lebe wohl, und bitte Christus für uns, dass er uns alle richtig belehre."¹⁰

A letter ten days later (January 22, 1525) to Joachim Camerarius, perhaps his closest friend, shows clearly that this is more than a tactful way of wishing that his friend also should recognize the truth. He writes: "I hoffe bisher beständig, dass Christus uns über diese Angelegenheit die Wahrheit offenbart."¹¹ These words do not demonstrate a firm inner certainty.

The difference from Luther's confidence in the *Verba* as "dürre, helle, gewaltige wort Gottes, die mich zwingen zu bekennen, das Christus leyb und blut ym Sacrament sey,"¹² is obvious. Further, Luther's watch word "Des sacraments ym wortt warnemen"¹³ expresses the all-decisive importance he attached to the *Verba*. We have seen that Melanchthon, too, appeals to the *Verba*. But compared with Luther, we have to say that he shows surprisingly little interest in the exegesis of the *Verba*. Neuser states: "Zur Exegese der Einsetzungsworte äus-

¹⁰Neuser, Abendmahlslehre, 317.

¹¹CR 1, 722: "Et spero adhuc constanter eum apokalypsin hämin kai peri toutoui tou pragmatos tän alätheian." Neuser, Abendmahlslehre, 316

¹²WA 18,166,8-9, and many other places in his works on the Lord's Supper in the following years.

¹³WA 11, 448,31. For a comprehensive discussion, cf. Wisløff, The Gift of Communion, 22-32.

sert sich Melanchthon im Gegensatz zu Luther selten."¹⁴ The reason for this may be that for Melanchthon they are not that "hell und klar." Therefore, he needs further reasons to uphold the doctrine of Real Presence. These he finds primarily in the ancient Fathers, who became decisive for him.¹⁵ As we shall see, Melanchthon also argues from Christ's presence in the Church and from what he effects through the Lord's Supper in the church.¹⁶

As early as January 2, 1525, Melanchthon writes this warning to Thomas Blaurer in Konstanz:

Du verwirfst [zugleich] auch die Autorität der Alten. Denn die Alten sind beständig der Meinung, dass der wahre Leib Christi wirklich dort sei - wie sie lehren. Ich habe mir zu meinen eigenen Gebrauch ihre Meinung zusammenstellt.¹⁷

He draws largely on Cyril of Alexandria and Hilary. Although he had rejected the doctrine of transubstantiation as early as 1519, the next year -- January 1526 -- Melanchthon in a letter to Matthäus Alber appeals to Cyprian, who declare that "durch die Allmacht des Wortes wird das Brot verwandelt und wird Fleisch," and to Damascenus, who claims that "die griech-

¹⁴Neuser, Abendmahlslehre, 350.

¹⁵Neuser, Abendmahlslehre, 321, pt. 4, and note 45.

¹⁶See below, 86 pt. 2, and 88-95; cf., Neuser, Abendmahlslehre, 350.

¹⁷O. Clemen, Melanchthons Briefwechsel, Supplementa Melanchtoniana, IV, 1 (Leipzig: Rudolf Haupt, 1926), 277-278; Neuser, Die Abendmahlslehre, 321-322.

ische Kirche meint, das Brot werde seiner Natur nach Leib [Christi]."¹⁸ Melanchthon's concern here is not a specific explanation of the Real Presence, but Zwingli's denial of Real Presence itself.¹⁹ The letter to Blaurer continues: "Um so mehr verwundert es mich, dass einige meinen, die Alten unterstützen die zwinglische Ansicht."²⁰ Neuser summarizes: "Das Ergebnis seiner Forschungen ist: Die Alten Kirche lehrten die Realpräsenz."²¹ As Melanchthon sees it, there is nothing in the Scripture hinders that this interpretation of the *Verba*.²²

"Place" and Context of the Doctrine of the Lord's Supper

From the very beginning Melanchthon was strongly opposed to the eucharistic controversy. Both in public and in private letters he airs his disdain. In his opinion this controversy is indeed not profitable for the church. In the Scholien to The Song of Solomon (1527/1529) he writes: "Ich sehe in den vielen Streitigkeiten der Theologen der Teil der christlichen Lehre sozusagen dahinschwindet und in Vergessenheit gerät,

¹⁸CR 23, 742; Neuser, Abendmahlslehre, 323; J. P. Migne, Patrologiae cursus completus. Series Graeca, Paris: a l'imprimerie Catholique Petet Montronce, 1844-1892, vol. 94, 1142: ". . . panis fiat corpus Christi."

¹⁹We should here recognize that Luther first in 1527 entered into a full discussion of the mode of the Real Presence.

²⁰Neuser, Die Abendmahlslehre, 323.

²¹Neuser, Die Abendmahlslehre, 322.

²²CR 23, 750.

welcher die am meisten notwendigen Loci, wie ich sie nenne, enthält."²³

The doctrinal *loci* should be edifying and profitable to the people. "Zudem gibt es Lehren, die die anderen an Bedeutung überragen; es sind . . . die vorwiegend ethisch bestimmten Lehrstücke".²⁴ What then has Melanchthon in mind with "*loci maxime necesarii*" and the "*questiones minime necessariae*"? The introduction of *Iudicium contra Anabaptistas* (1528) is illuminating. The opening paragraph reads thus:

I have often said at other times just what topics are the most necessary to know. Now Christ pointed them out when he ordered that "repentance and the remission of sins are to be declared. "And Paul . . . [1 Tim. 1:5] . . . in the prophets . . . [Hos. 6:6] . . . In this manner and in other passages Scripture often admonishes us especially to know these topics: the doctrine of repentance, and likewise of faith, patience, love, and all good works."²⁵

By "*questiones minime necessariae*," on the other hand, Melanchthon actually means topics which so far as possible should be avoided.²⁶ Only if the situation forces them should the pastors deal with them. Neuser review the passage which follows the quotation above from *The Song of Solomon* as thus:

²³Philipp Melanchthon, *Melanchthons Werke im Auswah*, ed. Robert Stupperich et al. (Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann and Verlag Gerd Mohn, 1951-1963), IV, 307,25; Neuser, *Abendmahlslehre*, 263, note 162.

²⁴Neuser, *Abendmahlslehre*, 262-263.

²⁵Philipp Melanchthon, *Selected Writings*, trans. Charles L. Hill, ed. E. E. Flack and L. J. Satre (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1962), 104; CR 1, 956; *Melanchthons Werke im Auswah*, IV, 443, 21-29.

²⁶*Ibid.*, IV, 443,29; 444,8.

Melanchthon zählt auch die *questiones minime necessariae* auf: das Eindringen der Vernunft in Gottes verborgenen Willen, die Erörterung, ob wir erwählt sind, warum da Evangelium uns, aber nicht Sokrates und Cicero offenbart ist und "ob der Leib Christi an vielen Orten zugleich sein kann."²⁷ Also auch die Frage, wie die Realpräsenz zu verstehen sei, gehört hierher.²⁸

One should, however, take care not to draw the premature conclusion that the Real Presence, or even the Lord's Supper itself, is unimportant to Melanchthon. It demonstrates, rather, his attitude toward public struggle over doctrine,²⁹ which he regarded as needless and harmful to the church. To Johann Schwebel in Zweibrücken he writes in 1529:

Gleich dir sollen sie in den Kirchen lehren, was zur Erbauung dient: Busse, Glaube, Liebe zum Nächsten, mit Auslassung aller Streitigkeiten. Einerseits versteht das Volk sie nicht, andererseits müssen wir feststellen, dass sie nicht genügend Nutzen bringen, die Sinnen zum frommen Lebenswandel anzutreiben. Welche Notwendigkeit besteht zu jenen Streitigkeiten über das Abendmahl? ³⁰

According to Melanchthon such disputed issues should be settled privately between the antagonists.³¹

²⁷Ibid., IV, 444,5-6.

²⁸Neuser, Abendmahlslehre, 263. For further evidence on this issue of "most" and "least" necessary doctrines see, *ibid*: 252-254; 259-264; 346-347.

²⁹On Melanchthon's view of "Mäßigung", see above 30-31, 34, and below 112-113.

³⁰CR 1, 1047; Neuser, Abendmahlslehre, 262; cf. letter to Camerarius, CR 1, 1083.

³¹See letter to Th. Blaurer in the fall 1526, O. Clemen, Melanchthons Briefwechsel, IV,1, 340: "Die privaten Angelegenheiten plagen meine Seele nicht so sehr wie die öffentliche Zwietracht der Männer, die das Evangelium gemeinsam verteidigen sollen. O, dass doch die Hauptpersonen dieser Geschwätzes über die ganze Sache vorher durch private Schreiben unter sich verhandelt hätten, bevor es an die

Furthermore, to evaluate the cited misgivings of Melanchthon properly, we must notice what he has in mind. The target of his criticism is not the Lord's Supper itself. Neither is it the Real Presence, even though he does not fully follow Luther. What he criticizes is the disputes over the "how" of the real presence.³²

The importance of the Lord's Supper to Melanchthon becomes apparent when it is considered in its theological and practical context. We have already seen that Melanchthon does not include the Lord's Supper among the most necessary and useful doctrines. Ubiquity and the "how" of Real Presence he considered as issues that ought to be avoided. Considered by itself, this can be deceptive. The practical context of the Supper of 1521 is this:

Die Zusammengehörigkeit von Bußsakrament und Abendmahl in der Praxis erwähnt Melanchthon in den Loci nicht. Sie ist selbstverständliche Voraussetzung. In Wittenberg wurde die vorreformatorische Ordnung weiter geübt, die die Beichte vor dem Abendmahl forderte. Auf diese Weise war der Ablauf der Bußprozesses auf das Abendmahl gesichert: Die Beichte erfolgt unter der Wirkung des Gesetzes, Absolution und Abendmahl stellen das Evangelium dar.³³

Öffentlichkeit gekommen ist. Sie hätten alles ruhig und ohne Schärfe und Streit besprechen können."

³²CR 1, 974 in a letter to Gerbel; H. Gollwitzer, Coena Domini. Die altlutherische Abendmahlslehre in ihrer Auseinandersetzung mit dem Calvinismus dargestellt an die lutherische Frühorthodoxie., (Munich: Chr. Kaiser, 1937; rep. 1988); 68, note 3; 69, note 1 and 2.

³³Neuser, Abendmahlslehre, 113.

The Visitation Articles show that the situation is still the same in 1527/1528.³⁴ In the section "De Poenitentia," which follows upon "Eucharistiae Signum," Melancton states: "Iam dixi, poenitentiam non esse distinctum Sacramentum ab aliis, sed significari tum a baptismo, tum a manducatione corporis Domini et sanguinis."³⁵ Neuser may go too far when he maintains that in Melancton "Beichte und Absolution sind Teile des Abendmahls." He is at the same time obviously right in claiming that in Melancton's theology

Abendmahl und Buße stehen in einer unlösbaren praktischen und systematischen Einheit. Bei die allgemeine Sakramentlehre wird dem Abendmahl der gleiche Zweck beigelegt wie der Buße, nämlich Glauben zu erwecken und stärken. Wie dieser Glaube beschaffen sein soll, besagt die Lehre von der Buße.³⁶

In this way Melancton places the Lord's Supper right at the center of the life of the Christians and the church: penitence. About this he can say: "Non aliud enim poenitentia est nisi iustificatio". It follows the true believer throughout life.³⁷

³⁴Ibid., 346-349.

³⁵CR 26, 20; LW 40, 293, reads: "Penance also is to be reckoned as a sacrament - all sacraments are a kind of penance." Despite the difference, both versions state the connection of the Lord's Supper with "poenitentia."

³⁶Neuser, Abendmahlslehre, 348.

³⁷The Visitation Articles, 1527, continuing the quotation above, 68, note 196: "Ita poenitentia per omnem vitam durare debet . . ." (CR 26, 20).

Christology and the Real Presence

For Luther the *Verba* spoke of the Real Presence of the body and blood of Christ. In the late 1520s, when his view was challenged, he defended it with the help of two arguments: the *sessio ad dextram dei* (ubiquity) and the *unio personalis naturarum*.

We will first consider the question of ubiquity. In his "Daß die Worte Christi . . . feststehen" (1527) Luther writes:

Die schriftt aber leret uns, das Gottes rechte hand nicht sey ein sonderliche ort, da ein leib solle odder müge sein, als auff eym gülden steul, sondern sey die almechtige gewalt Gottes, welche zu gleich nirgent sein kan und doch an allen orten sein mus.³⁸

For Luther the ubiquity of "totus Christus," human and divine, is given with his understanding of the *dextra dei*.

Melanchthon never shared this view. As the Swiss believed, he understood heaven in a spatial way: "Christus ist 'an einem bestimmten Ort'. Das ist Voraussetzung aller seiner christologischen Überlegungen."³⁹ The reason that he did not follow Luther may be found in his attitude to the Fathers.

Er ist im Gegensatz zu Luther nicht bereit, Augustins Aussagen über die *dextra Dei* den Gegnern als Beweisgrund zu überlassen. Die Kirchenväter will er unbedingt auf seine Seite haben.⁴⁰

³⁸WA 23, 133, 19.

³⁹Neuser, Abendmahlslehre, 354.

⁴⁰Ibid., 356. For Luther, see WA 23, 131, 133, 143. Cf. Fraenkel, "Ten questions concerning Melanchthon, the Fathers and the Eucharist," 146-164.

Melanchthon was, however, very much concerned that the body of Christ must not be only in heaven. In his Sententia Veterum (1530) he explains:

Niemand hat mich überzeugt, daß Augustin den Leib Christi an dieser Stelle so an eimen Ort fesselt, daß er behauptet, er könne niemahls anderswo sein, vor allem, da die Schrift niemahls versichert, Christus sie so an einem einzigen Ort, daß er anderswo nicht sein kann.⁴¹

At this point Melanchthon can be sarcastic. "Ipsi sic pingunt Christum, certo aliquo loco sedentem, sicut Homerus Iovem suum, convivantem apud Aethiopas."⁴² He would rather die than affirm that the body of Christ could be only at one place.⁴³

Luther's second argument in defence of Real Presence is the *unio personalis naturarum*. This may be summarized thus: The divine and human nature in the person of Christ are so closely joined together that the properties of God, for example, ubiquity, pertain also to his human nature.⁴⁴ In agreement with Luther's view of the personal union Melanchthon rejects Zwingli's "alloeosis" as an illegitimate separation of the natures. There is, however, here also a marked difference -- at least in accent. In an undated statement on the Lord's Supper from these years Melanchthon says:

Nun hats je keinen Grund Christum zerreisen, also, daß er nach der Gottheit bei uns sey, nach der Menschheit nicht

⁴¹CR 23, 748.

⁴²CR 1, 974; *ibid.* "Nam illa est indigna Christiana opinio."

⁴³CR 2, 25; *ibid.* vol. 1, 1077.

⁴⁴Neuser, Abendmahlslehre, 356.

bei uns sey, sonderlich dieweil er gesprochen [i.e. die Einsetzungsworte], er gebe uns Leib und Blut damit uns zu trösten, daß wir gewißlich dafür halten sollten, daß er nicht allein mit Gedanken mit uns seyn wollt, wahrhaftlich und wesentlich.⁴⁵

Luther can substitute "body and blood" for "human nature." Melancthon distinguishes between what he can conclude from the *unio personalis* and from the *Verba*. From the former he claims a general multi-presence of Christ, human and divine. The Real Presence of the body and blood of Christ in the sacrament he bases on the *Verba*. "Die exegetische Erwägung ergänzt die christologische Überlegung."⁴⁶ Helmut Gollwitzer's dictum holds good of this early stage:

Melancthon hat die Ubiquität des totus Christus immer gelehrt, er hat aber die Ubiquität des corpus Christi nicht nur nie gelehrt, sondern sie nie anerkannt; er hat sie in jenen früheren Jahren mit Schweigen übergegangen aus Rücksicht auf Luther, in seinen späteren Periode hat er sie als ein neues Dogma immer offen abgelehnt.⁴⁷

We have pointed out that Melancthon might have had his doubt whether the *Verba* established the Real Presence as firmly as necessary. One of the ways he used to undergird this doctrine was to bring in Bible passages about Christ's presence in the Church. The following five Bible passages occur often: Matt.18:20; 28:20; John 14:23; and Eph.3:17 and

⁴⁵CR 1, 760. The title and date ("Iudicium de Carolostadii sententia de S. Coena," 1525, 9. Oct.) in CR stems from Seckendorf. It is though undated. Neuser thinks that it should no be dated before 1528. Cf. Neuser, Abendmahlslehre, 357, note 262.

⁴⁶Neuser, Abendmahlslehre, 358.

⁴⁷Gollwitzer, Coena Domine, 69.

4:10.⁴⁸ In this context also Melanchthon claims the presence of the *totus Christus*, human and divine. By bringing together the promises of Christ's general presence in the church and the *unio personalis* Melanchthon frames an argument that gains importance for the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. A connection with Christ's presence in the Lord's Supper is established.

The last quotation from Melanchthon⁴⁹ emphasizes that Christ in the *Verba* promised ["gesprochen"] that "er gebe uns Leib und Blut uns zu trösten" and he contrasts "nicht allein mit Gedanken" with "wahrhaftlich und wesentlich." The decisive step follows when he brings in 1 Cor. 10:16 and interprets it in the light of the personal union and the *Verba*. The text continues:

So spricht auch Paulus, es sey das Nachtmahl eine Gemeinschaft des Leibes und Blutes Christi. So aber Christus nicht leiblich da, wäre es nur des Geistes Gemeinschaft und nicht des Leibs und Bluts.⁵⁰

From this we can establish three points: [1] Melanchthon does teach the Real Presence of Christ's body and blood in the Lord's Supper in the late 1520s - but his argumentation is not the same as Luther's; [2] the person of Christ is the starting point and center of the whole argument. Christ's body and blood "unterstreichen die reale und darum tröstliche Gegenwart

⁴⁸Neuser, Abendmahlslehre, 359.

⁴⁹See above, 81.

⁵⁰CR 1, 760.

der Person Christi";⁵¹ [3] through his emphasis on the personal union of the natures Melanchthon avoid the so-called *extra calvinisticum*. Actually Zwingli and Bucer taught this in the 1520s, that is well before Calvin was on the plane.⁵²

Consecration: How Real Presence Takes Place

This is a question which had engaged Melanchthon. It serves well to disclose some important features of his thinking. Neuser has clearly documented Melanchthon's changes during 1526.⁵³ Luther held in the main the traditional doctrine of consecration, most fully explained in Vom Abendmahl Christi. Bekenntnis (1528). The short form of this view is Augustine's word: "Accedat verbum ad elementum, et fit sacramentum." In Luther's own words in the Large Confession: "The words are the first thing; for without the Word the cup and the bread would be nothing."⁵⁴ More detailed Luther explains:

Even though I should pronounce over all bread the words: "this is my body", nothing, of course, would result therefrom; but when in the Supper we say, according to his institution and command: "This is my body", it is his body, not on account of our speaking or word uttered, but because of his command. . . . He has commanded us thus to speak and to do, and has united his command and act with our speaking.⁵⁵

⁵¹Neuser, Abendmahlslehre, 360.

⁵²Ibid., 361-363. For his later development, see below, 112-114.

⁵³Ibid., 363-367.

⁵⁴WA 26, 478,38-39. Cf. Sasse, This is my body, 134.

⁵⁵WA 26, 285; quoted from Sasse, This is my body, 135.

From 1525 until mid-1526 Melanchthon also spoke like this. In a letter to Matthäus Alber he restates the words of Cyprian: "panis iste quem Dominus discipulis porrigebat, non effigie, sed natura mutatus, omnipotentia verbi factus est caro", in this way: "omnipotentia verbi panem mutari, fierique carnem etc."⁵⁶ This should not be read as support of transubstantiation. Melanchthon had rejected that doctrine some six years earlier. It is an expression of consecration. Neuser comments:

Seitdem redet er nicht mehr von dem "Allmacht" des Wortes. Wenn er von den Einsetzungsworten spricht, sagt er "iuxta promissionem" oder in den Visitationsartikeln "iuxta verbum Christi, . . . quia Dominus ita vocavit".⁵⁷

How did Melanchthon think about consecration from 1526 on? In a letter to Balthasar Thüring, January 4, 1528, his change of view is explicitly stated:

In der Abendmahlssache nehme ich schon längere Zeit Anstoß an die Konsekration – wie man sie nennt. Auch Oekolampad drängt heftig [mit der Frage]: Wie kann es geschehen, daß Christus aus dem Himmel gerufen wird? Geschieht dies durch die Verdienste oder Gebete des Priesters oder des Volkes oder – wie gewisse Leute lehren – kraft der [Einsetzungs] worte?

The letter goes on to deny all of this. Melanchthon continues:

Schließlich bin ich zu der Meinung gekommen, daß weder den Verdiensten oder Gebeten der Priester noch des Volkes zuzuschreiben ist, daß Christus uns sein Leib und sein Blut gibt, noch der Kraft der Worte; das ist nämlich wie es klingt, magisch [gedacht]. Vielmehr bin ich dafür, die

⁵⁶Neuser, Abendmahlslehre, 363-364, quoting J. Hartmann, Matthäus Alber (Tübingen, 1863), 95, note 10.

⁵⁷Neuser, Abendmahlslehre, 364; cf. WA 1, 911; ibid., 26, 19.

Ursache der Einsetzung Christi zuzuschreiben. Wie nämlich die Sonne durch göttliche Anordnung täglich aufgeht, so ist Christi Leib durch göttliche Anordnung in der Kirche, wo immer die Kirche ist.⁵⁸

The image of the rising sun seems to be a stock illustration of the *ordinatio divina* of the Real Presence.⁵⁹ We now will review three aspects of Melanchthon's doctrine of this *ordinatio divina*.⁶⁰

In the first place, that the *Verba* recited in the rite of the Lord's Supper are consecration words is directly denied. That the Real Presence is effected "virtute verborum"; that is, by their recitation in the Eucharist, is rejected as magical. Further, with Neuser the image of the daily sunrise *propter ordinationem divinam* must be interpreted to mean that "alles menschliche Mitwirkung bei der Konsekration ausgeschlossen ist."⁶¹ As the sun rises daily, so the Real Presence is brought about by the original institution of our Lord when the Lord's Supper is celebrated according to the *Verba*.⁶²

⁵⁸CR 1, 948-949; quoted from Neuser, Abendmahlslehre, 363, 367.

⁵⁹Cf. "The Visitation Articles," LW 40, 289; WA/TR 2, 392, 36-38.

⁶⁰Neuser Abendmahlslehre, 367-369.

⁶¹Ibid., 368.

⁶²Neuser paraphrases the issue well, ibid., 368: ". . . er is der Geber, er ist die Kraft. Die Beständigkeit des Gebens, die Treue des Gebers, die Gewissheit des Gegenwart im Abendmahl wird durch das Beispiel vom täglichen Aufgang der Sonne unterstrichen. Christus hat sich durch seine "göttliche Anordnung" gebunden. Des menschlichen Mitwirken bedarf es nicht."

Secondly, the "place" of the Real Presence is not the elements, but the "church" or "the Supper in the Church".⁶³ This way of speaking occurs regularly in Melanchthon. Based on a broad amount of data from the period 1524-1529⁶⁴ Neuser summarizes the matter thus:

Seit Mitte des Jahres 1526 scheut sich Melanchthon, die Elemente, Brot und Wein, überhaupt zu nennen. Wenn er von ihnen spricht, sagt er "cum pane . . . cum calice", nicht aber "im" Brot. Aus dem Torgauer Abendmahlgespräch wird deutlich, daß er von der Realpräsenz in den Elementen nicht sprechen will. Wenn aber der Ort der Präsenz nicht die Elemente sind, sondern das "Abendmahl", dann ist das ganze Abendmahlhandlung gemeint.⁶⁵

Thirdly, to Melanchthon the *Verba* are *verba promissionis*. As such they are directed not to the elements, but to men. His definition of a sacrament is the same in 1529 as in 1521, and reads: "Est autem sacramentum signum divinitus institutum promissae gratiae Dei."⁶⁶ In this definition two functions of the *Verba* are joined: the divine institution and the divine promise. They are an indivisible unity. Neuser raises this question: "Welcher Teil der Abendmahlworte ist aber promissio und welcher institutio signi?"⁶⁷ Melanchthon

⁶³Ibid., 368; cf. Quere, Melanchthon's Christum Cognoscere, 352-381.

⁶⁴Neuser, Abendmahlslehre, 265-291, especially, 283-90.

⁶⁵Ibid., 368.

⁶⁶Loci communes, 1521, Melanchthons Werke im Auswahl, vol. II,1, 142,5; 144,27-28; 156,3-4; cf., Contra Anabaptistas, CR 1, 956.

⁶⁷Neuser, Abendmahlslehre, 370.

can refer to the *Verba* as a whole as *institutio*. But he can also restrict them to Christ's "Wiederholungsbefehl." "Der Wiederholungsbefehl ist aber auch das eigentliche Konsekrationswort; denn Christi Anordnung bewirkt, 'daß der Leib des Herrn in der Kirche ist.'"⁶⁸ The promise, on the other hand, can not be restricted to a part. At the same time the "Wiederholungsbefehl" is promise. The whole of the *Verba*, therefore, aims at man to create and strengthen faith, which is the primary purpose of the Lord's Supper. This fits well to his early "Theologie der Verheißung"⁶⁹ and also to the Augustinian view of *signum*, *verbum*, and *res* which at least partly informs his sacramental thinking.⁷⁰

The "cum pane" Formula

As we have seen, Melanchthon himself points out that there took place an important change in his view well before 1528, -- in fact, during the first part of 1526. This change concerns also the relation between his and Luther's view. To understand this, we must also take into consideration the development in Luther's view. Gräbke summarizes thus

⁶⁸Ibid., 354; cf. 370. The included citation, WA\TR 2, 392, 37-38. Again we see that the "place" of the real presence is the Church.

⁶⁹Ernst Bizer, Theologie der Verheißung. Studien zur Theologie des jungen Melanchthon (1519-1524) (Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1964). On the relation of the promise to the Lord's Supper, see Neuser, Abendmahllehre, 24-29, 41-48.

⁷⁰Quere, Melanchthon's Christum Cognoscere, 49-96.

[den] Hauptdaten dieser Entwicklung:
 1523, Leib und Blut werden zum Object des spendenden Wortes neben der Vergebung.
 1525, Leib und Blut werden zum Vehikel der Vergebung.
 1526, Leib und Blut werden neben der Vergebung als res gewertet.
 1529, Leib und Blut werden ausschließlich als res praediciert, die Vergebung aber dazu in das Verhältnis des effectus gesetzt.⁷¹

We must, however, affirm with Quere that although this increasing emphasis on the body and blood does take place, "Luther does not allow the Word to be displaced. Though his doctrine of ubiquity takes on more and more importance, it never assumes the role of the Word."⁷² We are here not concerned about details in Gräbke's epigrammic sketch, only in its main features. As the eucharistic controversy developed, questions and objections were raised which Luther had to face. We mention only ubiquity, consecration, and more than one mode of presence (*definitive, repletive* et al.). Our point here is, as stated by Neuser, that

je mehr Luther seine Lehre von der Realpräsenz ausbildet, um so weiter weicht Melanchthon von ihm ab und geht in der Abendmahllehre eigene Wege. Es ist bezeichnend, daß die Weiterentwicklung der Lehre Luthers gerade die Lehrpunkte betrifft, in denen Melanchthon seine Eigenarten entwickelt.⁷³

⁷¹Gräbke, Die Konstruktion der Abendmallehre Luthers in ihre Entwicklung dargestellt, 80; cf. Quere, Melanchthon's Christum Cognoscere, 47-49, 159-170; Neuser, Abendmahlslehre, 324-339.

⁷²Quere, Melanchthon's Christum Cognoscere, 160.

⁷³Neuser Abendmahlslehre, 325-326.

The first major visitation of the church took place in Saxony in July and August 1527. Melanchthon was the only theologian in the visitation commission. After the visitation (August 13) and based on the experiences behind him, Melanchthon wrote his Articuli Visitationis (Sept./Oct., 1527)⁷⁴ Compared with The Visitation Articles (1528), a revision of the former by Luther (and Bugenhagen), these articles show how the ways of the two men parted. The most pertinent passages in the two texts read thus:

Primum sic doceant, iuxta verbum Christi esse cum pane verum corpus Christi, cum calice verum sanguinem, quia Dominus ita vocavit.⁷⁵

First, they are to believe that the true body of Christ is in the bread and the true blood of Christ is in the wine. For thus reads the words of Christ in the Evangelists Matthew, Mark, and Luke: . . .⁷⁶

The question is how these differences are to be understood. At the Torgau Conference, September 26-27, the matters of the visitation were discussed with Luther and Bugenhagen. After the conference Luther and Melanchthon held a private meeting where the Lord's Supper was discussed. Letters Melanchthon wrote shortly afterwards throw interesting light on how he perceived the issue.

⁷⁴For a detailed discussion of the historical development, from Luther's request for the visitation to the final edition of The Visitation Articles, including Melanchthon's Latin Articuli de quibus egerunt per visitatores in regione Saxoni and Torgauer conference, see Neuser, Abendmahlslehre, 265-291.

⁷⁵Melanchthon's text: CR 26, 19. Emphasis added.

⁷⁶The revised text: LW 40, 289. Emphasis added.

To Justus Jonas he wrote "Ende September" that he "cum multa timide disputasem" with Luther about the Eucharist.⁷⁷ The most interesting letter he wrote October 23, 1527, to his friend Joachim Camerarius. The part which deals with this issue is written in Greek, a kind of secret language.⁷⁸ Melanchthon asks him to destroy it when he has read it. He writes:

Ich habe aber mit Luther viele Fragen erörtert, auch über die paradoxe Lehre der Vermischung von Brot und Leib, die von gewisse Leuten als Satzung [dogmatidzomenäs] auferlegt wird. Jener antwortete aber bestimmt bekräftigend und bestärkend das, was er kürzlich und früher gesagt hatte. Ich will auf keine Weise mehr mit dieser Kontroverse zu tun haben . . . Viele Fragen wollte ich in diesem Brief mit dir besprechen, aber teils hindert mich die Krankheit, teils sind die Fragen von der Art, daß ich sie brieflich nicht mitzuteilen wage. Jedoch bitte ich dich, diesen Brief zu zerreißen, wenn du ihn gelesen hat.⁷⁹

The letter displays disappointment and worry. Even more than before, Melanchthon now wants to stay outside the Eucharist controversy. This was never granted him.

The letters further makes plain that many questions regarding the Supper were discussed. Beside [1] "die paradoxe Lehre der Vermischung von Brot und Leib," and [2] "die Dogmatisierung" of this doctrine, Neuser is probably right when he regarding the many questions assumes that:

⁷⁷CR 1, 913. Similarly he wrote to Caspar Aquila about the same time (CR 4, 964).

⁷⁸Cf. Neuser, Abendmahlslehre, 281, note 261.

⁷⁹CR 1, 920-921; cf. Neuser, Abendmahlslehre, 280-209; see also *ibid.*, note 261. For the letter to Jonas, see CR 2, 960.

Die "vielen" besprochenen Abendmahlsfragen, von denen Melanchthon berichten, müssen dann die übrigen in den Visitationsartikeln enthaltenen Abendmahlsätze betreffen: [3] Konsekration, [4] *communio sub una*, [5] Verheißungswort, und [6] geistliche Nießung.⁸⁰

We will here take a closer look at the first and the fifth points.

To Luther it was important that the Real Presence was not only a personal presence. To him it included the presence of the very body and blood of the crucified, risen Lord. When Melanchthon refuses to use the "in" formula, the reason is no doubt that in his view it represented the "mixing" or "mingling" of the bread and the body. This criticism was not only aimed at the consubstantiation theory of Catholic theologians from Petrus Lombardus to Gabriel Biel and Pierre d'Ailly, but also at Luther.⁸¹ Lohse is most probably right when he says that

Luther an sich jede Theorie über die Art und Weise der Gegenwart von Christi Leib und Blut vermeiden und statt dessen bei den einfachen Wortlaut der Einsetzungsworte bleiben wollte.⁸²

Lohse also underlines that "Zugrunde liegt bei Luther eine *ganzheitliche Personvorstellung*, die also nicht eine Abwertung

⁸⁰Neuser Abendmahlslehre, 284; the numbers in brackets are added.

⁸¹W. Köhler, Zwingli und Luther. Ihr Streit über das Abendmahl nach seiner politischen und religiösen Beziehungen. 2 Vol. (Leipzig: Verein für Reformationgeschichte, 1924/1953), vol. 1: 801; Neuser, Abendmahlslehre, 285, 372-382.

⁸²Lohse, "Von Luther bis zum Konkordienbuch," 58.

der leiblich-materiellen Sphäre gestattet."⁸³ Nevertheless, from De captivitate Babylonica (1520) on Luther had made use of the arguments of the consubstantiationists, and in his conclusions he had come close to it. It is well known that he also made use of the deliberations of Ockham and Biel concerning different modes of presence.⁸⁴ In 1528 Luther uses the concept *praedicatio identica* to summarize his position, and he defines it thus: "praedicatio identica de diversis naturis, das ist, das zweyerley unterschiedliche natur solten ein ding sein."⁸⁵ Frequently he uses Augustine's illustration of the red-hot iron. In De captivitate Babylonica Luther even uses the word "vermischen" to describe the relation.

Warum kann der Leib Christi aber nicht innerhalb der Substanz des Brotes enthalten sein . . . ? Siehe, die beide Substanzen Eisen und Feuer werden so zu einem glühenden Eisen vermischt, daß jeder Teil Eisen und Feuer ist.⁸⁶

Later, also in 1527-1528, Luther uses the comparison, but not the word "vermischen". He could use daring expressions which easily can be interpreted as "Vermischung." His view is rather "Koexistenz,"⁸⁷ not "Vermischung" or "Verschmelzung."⁸⁸

⁸³Ibid., 58.

⁸⁴WA 26, 325,26-29; 329, 27-30, 34-36; Cf. Lohse, "Von Luther bis zum Konkordienbuch," 57.

⁸⁵WA 26, 439.1-2.

⁸⁶WA 6, 510,4-8.

⁸⁷Cf., Sasse, This is my Body, 81-83; Neuser, Abendmahlslehre, 375-377.

⁸⁸Neuser, Abendmahlslehre, 378-379.

At other places he explains the same by referring to the *unio personalis* of Christ's two natures. In the Lord's Supper there is a *unio sacramentalis*. The latter, however, is not permanent. This is the meaning of the "in pane"/"im Brot" formula in Luther. In the final version of the Visitation Articles Luther substituted this formula for the *cum pane* formula of Melanchthon. Of Melanchthon, Neuser rightly maintains: "Die Koexistenz zweier Substanzen unter der Gestalt des Brotes oder im Brot lehnt er als 'Vermischung' und 'paradoxe Lehre' ab."⁸⁹

The letter to Camerarius displays a different and much more negative mood than the letters to Jonas and Aquila. But it was written after Melanchthon had become aware that Luther in the section on the Eucharist had replaced his particular accents by the typical Lutheran formula. Now he asserts: "Ich will auf keine Weise mehr mit dieser Kontroverse zu tun haben." Luther's viewpoint may be interpreted thus: Melanchthon's view may well be tolerated, as the subsequent history seems to prove, but not in a Visitation Book. This attitude Melanchthon classifies as "Dogmatisierung". It is certainly also a question of Melanchthon's evaluation of the discussion, and especially how clearly he actually dared to

⁸⁹Neuser, Abendmahlslehre, 382.

voice his criticism of "die paradoxe Lehre der Vermischung von Brot und Leib Christi" when face to face with Luther.

Of bread and body, wine and blood in the elements Luther said "daß Brot und Leib *zugleich* da sind."⁹⁰ Also Melanchthon could use this formula. However, close examination shows that the two men used this expression in a different way. Neuser explains:

Luther versteht das "zugleich" lokal im Sinne der Konsubstantiationslehre, Melanchthon temporal. Bei diesem sind Leib und Blut Christi "zugleich im Brot und Wein, bei jenem "zugleich" in der Abendmahlfeier, das heißt, sie werden zugleich ausgeteilt. Darum prägt Melanchthon die Formel, mit dem Brot (cum pane) ist der Leib Christi gegenwärtig, und betont die Abendmahlshandlung.⁹¹

According to Melanchthon, then, the joining of the bread and wine with the body and blood takes place, not in the elements, but in the distribution and the eating and drinking in the eucharistic action. Various phrases have been used to express this view: personal presence, ecclesial presence, ritual presence, and functional view.⁹² This feature of Melanchthon's eucharistic theology, which became more prominent later, is clearly present in the late 1520s. Only by reading Melanchthon's formulas in a clear Lutheran context

⁹⁰WA 26, 328; Cf., Neuser, Abendmahlslehre, 379-380.

⁹¹Neuser, Abendmahlslehre, 379-380.

⁹²Quere, Melanchthon's Christum Cognoscere, 123-133, for the early period; for the period after 1530, especially 352-381. Cf., Peter Fraenkel, "Ten questions concerning Melanchthon, the Fathers and the Eucharist," 146-164.

can they express genuine Lutheran doctrine. This applies also to the late 1520s.

The Eating

Melanchthon does not treat this question often.⁹³ As Luther, so he also distinguishes between a double kind of eating. Luther uses the concepts *manducatio spiritualis* and *manducatio oralis*, which implies a *manducatio impiorum*. Melanchthon on his side distinguishes between *manducatio spiritualis* and *manducatio corporalis* or *ceremonialis*.⁹⁴ The question is whether Melanchthon understands "manducatio corporalis und ceremonialis als Nießung des Leibes Christi mit dem Mund auch durch die Gottlosen?"⁹⁵ In the Articuli Visitationis he writes: "Tertio, quod maxime necessarium est, manducatione corporali non iustificari homines, sed manducationem esse signum, quod nos admoneat, ut credamus [nobis remitti peccata]."⁹⁶ The German translation proves that *corporali* does not refer to Christ's body, but to the

⁹³Neuser, Abendmahlslehre, 386, points to four sources where the topic is mentioned: in Articuli visitationis (1527), in the Commentary on Colossians (1527), in Iudicium contra Anabaptistas (1528), and in Sententiae veterum (1530).

⁹⁴Neuser, Abendmahlslehre, 386-392.

⁹⁵Neuser, Abendmahlslehre, 386.

⁹⁶CR 26, 19; the 2d ed. of the book adds: "[ut credamus], nobis remitti peccata".

"outward reception" of the elements.⁹⁷ The polemical thrust is against the Roman *opus operatum* doctrine. Simply to participate in the sacrament does not justify. This was agreed upon by all in the Eucharistic controversy. The proper use of the Supper, however, is that the outward eating should direct us to the object of the faith: the promised gift of forgiveness, which is the main gift.⁹⁸ According to Melancthon, the body and blood of Christ are not in the elements. The outward eating, therefore, can not be *manducatio spiritualis*. But as we have seen, the *totus Christus* in his human and divine nature is present in the church. With the bread and wine, *cum pane formula* temporally understood, is the body and blood given by the present Christ. Neuser summarizes the issue well:

Sie [Leib und Blut] sind nicht Hauptgabe des Abendmahls, sondern Beigabe. Leib und Blut sind dem Wort dem Verheißung nach- und untergeordnet. Wie beide zusammengehören, erklärt Melancthon nicht.⁹⁹

So much can be concluded: When the external eating is not *manducatio spiritualis* and not the eating of the body and

⁹⁷CR 26, 68-69: "eusserliche niessung" ; cf., LW 40, 293. For further evidence, see CR 1, 958-959, 1100; Melancthons Werke im Auswahl, IV, 252,12-18.

⁹⁸Cf. *ibid.*, IV, 252,14-19: "Non quia caeremonias faciebant, sed quia cum facerent caeremonias, credebant promissam esse iustificationem per Christum. Sicut de eucharistia nos dicere possumus, manducatio corporis ipsa non iustificat, sed admonet nos remissionis peccatorum promissae credentibus. Cum igitur credimus, iustificamur."

⁹⁹Neuser, Abendmahlslehre, 287.

blood, then it can be neither *manducatio oralis* nor *impiorum*. Melanchthon never shared this doctrine of Luther.

When Melanchthon is compared with Zwingli and Oekolampadius, it is possible to see more clearly what he affirms. Over against the spiritualism of the Zwinglians he uses the concept *manducatio ceremonialis*. Claiming the support of Cyril, Oekolampadius claimed that "spiritualem carnis Christi manducationem absque caeremoniali vivificare."¹⁰⁰ Against this Melanchthon with reference to Rom.1:16 asserts that the Lord's Supper is a means of grace:

. . . fidem et Spiritum sanctum concipi per Evangelium, per verbum et per sacramenta . . . sed sunt tradita, ut per ea coram Deo erigantur corda nostra, et fidem concipiant. Adest Deus et impellit et movet corda per haec quae auribus atque oculis percipimus. Itaque quae de manducatione spiritualis alicubi dicuntur, non impediunt ceremonialem.¹⁰¹

Therefore, to Melanchthon spiritual and ceremonial eating belong together. Both the Word and the Sacraments, the Lord's Supper included, are means God uses to bring his salvation into the life of man.

It is difficult to state clearly how Melanchthon perceives the relation between the word of promise and the body and blood, "die Hauptgabe und die Beigabe." It is, however, evident that he affirms that the body and blood are present

¹⁰⁰Ibid., 388; cited from Chr. Pfaffius, Acta et scripta publica ecclesiae Wirtembergicae, Tübingen, 1720, 135.

¹⁰¹CR 23, 746.

in the Supper,¹⁰² even though not in the elements. With Neuser we can say: "Melanchthons manducatio spiritualis ist im Gegensatz zu Zwinglis Lehre eine manducatio realis," and with Herrlinger that "Melanchthon . . . zwar eine manducatio realis, aber nicht oralis verteidigt hat."¹⁰³ Christ gives us his body and blood to comfort us and affirm to us "daß er nicht allein mit Danken bei uns seyn wollte, sondern wahrhaftlich und wesentlich."¹⁰⁴

Contrary to the Zwinglians, as Melanchthon sees it, the Sacrament does not presuppose faith. It aims at faith. The Articuli Visitationis states: ". . . manducationem esse signum, quod nos admoneat, ut credamus . . . [sacramentum] moneat nos promissionum divinum, et excitet ad credendum."¹⁰⁵ We must here remember what we started to call attention to, namely, that the context of the Lord's Supper is "die Buße."¹⁰⁶

Summary

It is often presupposed that Melanchthon in the first years of his early development by and large adopted Luther's

¹⁰²CR 2, 25: "Ego mori malim quam hoc affirmare, quod illi affirmant: Christi corpus non posse nisi in uno loco esse". Cf. also CR 1, 1077.

¹⁰³Neuser, Abendmahlslehre, 390; the quotation from Herrlinger, *ibid*, note 422.

¹⁰⁴CR 1, 760.

¹⁰⁵CR 26, 19.

¹⁰⁶See above, 73-77.

theology and followed him reasonably closely. The result of our review of Melanchthon's eucharistic theology in the late 1520s is that in this most controversial area the two foremost Lutheran theologians parted ways in these years. This is especially plain from about 1526 -1527.

We have not searched for reasons and influences behind this parting of ways. Some are, however, indicated. Very early Melanchthon seems to have systematized his theology. We noticed that he worked with a general concept of sacrament, that as he was influenced by Luther he developed a "Theologie der Verheißung", and that at the heart of his theology was a view of penitence (Buße) which provided the whole of his theology with its purpose; that is, to arouse men to fear of God, faith, and a godly life. It may be that his established "system" contributed to the fact that Melanchthon failed to follow Luther when he clarified and expounded his eucharistic doctrine in the controversies from the middle of the 1520s.

Melanchthon as well as Luther wanted to build the doctrine of the Lord's Supper on the *Verba*. The vital issue of the Real Presence, however, he was unable to establish firmly on that basis. Therefore, he looked to the early Fathers for support for the Real Presence. Melanchthon tried to establish Real Presence on a broader basis by arguing from the general presence of Christ in the church to his particular presence in the Supper.

Some utterances of Melanchthon give the impression that the Lord's Supper is not a very important issue. This, however, is a wrong impression. Systematically and practically the Lord's Supper is closely joined to "die Buße." It will, therefore, follow the believers throughout their life.

Melanchthon did not agree with Luther in his interpretation of "dextra dei" which he regarded as an innovation not taught by the ancients. The same applies to the doctrine of ubiquity. In the doctrine of personal union, however, he was close to Luther and sharply disagreed with the Zwinglians. The person of Christ cannot and must not be divided. On account of the personal union even the human nature of Christ can be wherever he wills and promises to be. Melanchthon's view, even from 1525 on, can best be captured by the term multi-voli-presence.¹⁰⁷

With all his respect for the Fathers Melanchthon rejected the traditional view of consecration. According to him the *Verba* originally spoken by Christ are the words of consecration. The traditional view of consecration did not conform to Melanchthon's doctrine of Real Presence, which is comprehended in the *cum pane* Formula. Perhaps the most adequate explanation is to say that in this formula Melanchthon combines a personal and ritual presence. The person of Christ, human and divine, is present and gives his body and blood,

¹⁰⁷Neuser, Abendmahlslehre, 321, 355-358, 466.

essentially and substantially, in the Supper. The external eating is the means for this giving and receiving. Only where there is faith or where faith is aroused, does spiritual eating take place. The sacrament is a powerful and creative Gospel which does not presuppose faith, but aims at faith.

Melanchthon's eucharistic theology parted from Luther's position on important issues even in the late 1520s. Luther could say that his concern was the Real Presence, and not explanations. But after all, for him Real Presence meant bodily presence of Christ, human and divine, in the bread and wine of the Supper. This also became the Lutheran position, despite, if we may say, the Latin version of the Augsburg Confession. In the long run this also made Melanchthon's position more and more difficult. Throughout his life Luther tolerated Melanchthon's view and indeed regarded him highly. We may wonder why. Was it because he was an invaluable co-worker and colleague, who after all defended the Real Presence against the Zwinglians? In the new situation in the 1550s and 1560s the more faithful follower of Luther found it increasingly difficult to act in the same manner.

Melanchthon's Relation to Luther in 1544

We have seen that Melanchthon's doctrine of the Lord's Supper started to deviate from Luther's already in 1520s. These differences did not break out into open controversy during Luther's lifetime. One serious crisis did though occur

in 1544. Before we turn to the last decade of Melanchthon's life, we will take a look at this conflict.

The cause of the conflict was the article on the Lord's Supper in the church order for Cologne. This church order was composed by Bucer and Melanchthon in the summer 1543.¹⁰⁸ The article of the Lord's Supper was written by Bucer but approved by Melanchthon. In a "Gutachten" for the Saxon Elector, Amsdorf had criticized the document severely. He also communicated his misgivings to Luther.¹⁰⁹ Luther had not yet read the book. But Melanchthon had informed him: "Es enthalte den legitimen Begriff und Gebrauch des Wortes (sc. Gottes) und der Sakramente . . . wenn es sich so verhehlt, ist diese Ordnung annehmbar, bis Gott eine andere gibt."¹¹⁰ Neuser comments:

Melanchthon bestätigt Luther also ausdrücklich die Rechtgläubigkeit des Abendmahlsartikels. Bei Luther ist dagegen ein erster Zweifel wachgeworden: "Wenn es sich so verhält."¹¹¹

In the first days of August Luther received the church order together with Amsdorf's "Gutachten" from Chancellor

¹⁰⁸For the following cf. Neuser, Luther und Melanchthon. Einheit im Gegensatz, Theologische Existenz Heute NF 91 (Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1961), 25-34; idem, "Die Versuche Bullingers, Calvins und der Strassburgers, Melanchthon zum Fortgang von Wittenberg zu bewegen," in Heinrich Bullinger 1504-1575. Gesammelte Aufsätze zum 400. Todestag, vol.II, ed. U. Gäbler and E. Herkenrath (Zurich: Theologischer Verlag, 1975), 35-45. [Hereafter cited: Melanchthon zum Fortgang zu bewegen"].

¹⁰⁹CR 5, 459.

¹¹⁰WA/Br 10, 601, note 3.

¹¹¹Neuser, Luther und Melanchthon, 26.

Brück. The article on the Lord's Supper made him "uber die massen unlustig."¹¹² He wrote back to Brück:

Es treibt lang viel geschwetz von nütz, frucht und ehre des Sacraments. Aber von der substantz mümmelt es, . . . nirgent wils heraus, ob da sey Rechter leib und blut mündlich empfangen. . . . Summa, das buch is den Schwermern nicht allein leidlich, Sondern auch trostlich, viel mehr fur yhre lere, den für unser.¹¹³

August 5, 1544, Melanchthon sought out Luther after the latter's lecture. To an unsuspecting Melanchthon Luther vented his anger on Bucer and the Cologne Reformation, saying:

[Bucer] ist ein Kleppermaul, gehet mir mit seinen conciliationibus umb, aber er soll bey mir aus conciliret haben. Er soll mir mit seinen scriptis nit mehr unter meinen augen kommen. Ich will ihn pro damnato halten.¹¹⁴

Melanchthon was instructed to communicate this by letter to Bucer.¹¹⁵ Melanchthon was confused because in the Cologne Reformation Bucer and he had endeavored to bring the Wittenberg Concord into effect. Melanchthon himself was also certainly hit by Luther's attack.

What made Melanchthon so concerned was that Luther just then had started to work on a new book on the Lord's Supper. He assumed that it was aimed at Bucer and himself. His let-

¹¹²WA/Br. 10, 618

¹¹³Ibid.

¹¹⁴Hieronimus Besold, who was present at the event, in a letter to Veit Dietrich August 8, 1544. The letter is printed in O. Albrecht and P. Flemming, "Das sogenannte manuscriptum Thomasianum, V," ARG 13 (1916): 164.

¹¹⁵Ibid.

ters to friends during the following weeks increasingly reflect his fear. Neuser summarizes:

Es sei bekannt, daß Luther ein Buch verfasse. Aber er [Melanchthon] wage Luther nicht nach dem Inhalt zu fragen. Seine Sorge wächst. Ende August ist er überzeugt, daß es ein "schreckliches Buch" sein wird, in dem er und Bucer beschimpft werden. Amsdorf Censura des Kölner Buches sei schrecklich und voller Schmähungen. Dabei habe Luther geäußert, sie sei noch milde. In Wahrheit sei durch sie ein Signal zu einem neuen Abendmahlsstreit gegeben worden.¹¹⁶

When the book -- Kurz Bekenntnis D. Mart. Luthers vom heiligen Sakrament -- finally was published, Melanchthon's fear proved to be without substance. Neither Bucer, he himself, or the Cologne reformation was mentioned or covertly indicated.

First and foremost, this event discloses Melanchthon's attitude toward the issues involved. Melanchthon's concerns can be summed up in three points: [1] He feared that a new controversy on the Lord's Supper should erupt. [2] With an attack on the Cologne Reformation he feared that the Wittenberg Concord should break down. [3] He also feared that an attack from Luther should force him to leave Wittenberg. That would only serve the opponents. How serious Melanchthon estimated the situation stands forth abundantly in letters he wrote to close friends these weeks. Plans for his departure are seriously discussed.¹¹⁷

¹¹⁶Neuser, Luther und Melanchthon, 28; cf., idem, "Melanchthon zum Fortgang zu bewegen," 36-40.

¹¹⁷Neuser, "Melanchthon zum Fortgang zu bewegen," 35-45.

Melanchthon's doctrine of the Lord's Supper in the early 1540s is much the same as in the late 1520s.¹¹⁸ It is difficult to see how Luther could have been unaware of the differences between his and Melanchthon's doctrines of the Lord's Supper. The differences between the two had at least not escaped other theological observers.¹¹⁹ At a meeting initiated by the Elector, Luther and Melanchthon met to talk the matter over one of the first days in October. The main issue was Amsdorf's criticism that in the Cologne church order the *Verba*: "This is my body" and so forth, were not understood as *synecdoche*, and that the Lutheran understanding of the *Verba* were excluded. In defence Melanchthon reports that he rebutted:

Ich habe Luther gesagt, ich hätte stets die synekdoche vertreten. Wenn nämlich Brot und Wein genossen werden, sei Christus wircklich gegenwärtig und mache uns seine Gliedern. Aber extra usum hätte keine Riten Sakramentscharakter.¹²⁰

Luther was too well versed in these matters not to realize immediately the difference from his own view. His letter to Venice the year before shows that he clearly distinguished

¹¹⁸Cf. Neuser, "Melanchthons Abendmahlslehre und ihre Auswirkung im unteren Dunauraum," in ZfKG 84 (1973), 51-52. [Hereafter cited: "Melanchthons Abendmahlslehre im Dunauraum"]

¹¹⁹Neuser, "Melanchthons Abendmahlslehre im Dunauraum, 49.

¹²⁰CR 5, 498-499; quoted from Neuser, Luther und Melanchthon, 32.

between the different views.¹²¹ The differences between the two, Neuser points out, are the following:

Melanchthon bezieht die Synekdoche nicht wie Luther auf die Elemente, sondern auf die Abendmahlshandlung. Das heißt, Christus ist im Abendmahl, aber nicht in Brot und Wein gegenwärtig. Als Abendmahlgabe nennt Melanchthon gar nicht Leib und Blut Christi, sondern die Person Christi, die im Abendmahl handelt. Die mündliche Nießung . . . ist damit ebensowenig gelehrt wie die Nießung der Ungläubigen. Man wird urteilen müssen, Melanchthon hat seine von Luther wesentlich abweichende Abendmahlslehre ohne zu beschönigen vorgetragen.¹²²

If Melanchthon's report is correct, then he presented his doctrine without embellishment, a doctrine which deviated from that of Luther. Luther had listened, but he did not make plain his decision. Melanchthon hoped he had satisfied Luther, but he was not sure. Therefore, he still seriously considered the possibility of leaving Wittenberg.¹²³ One month later Chancellor Brück reports to the Elector that the good relationship is restored.¹²⁴

¹²¹WA/Br 10, 330-331, no. 3885; cf. Neuser, Luther und Melanchthon, 32.

¹²²Ibid..

¹²³Melanchthon continues the report quoted above thus: "Ich denke, er ist zufrieden gestellt. Wenn ich merke, daß dies nicht der Fall ist, werde ich an Auswanderung denken müssen, . . . ich habe viele und schwerwiegende Gründe dafür" (CR 5, 499).

¹²⁴Neuser, Luther und Melanchthon, 33. This incident shows that also Luther had his doubts and needed time to think the situation over.

Melanchthon's Doctrine of the Lord's
Supper 1552-1560

In May 1549 the "Consensus Tigurinis" was reached between Bullinger and Calvin. Two years later it was published. In a situation where intense internal struggle broke out among the Lutherans, Zurich and Geneva came to agreement in the theological issue which most seriously divided the Reformers.

The direct impetus that sparked the second controversy over the Lord's Supper was a letter of May 10, 1552, from A. Bruchsal in Antwerp to Joachim Westphal of Hamburg. There the latter was warned against the rapid spread of Calvinism.

Du wird es kaum glauben, wie hier und in England und in den benachbarten Gebieten, ja, auch in Frankreich die Sekte der Sakramentarien Vermehrung findet und wächst. Sie hat zum größten Teil Calvin als Schutzherr und Urheber.¹²⁵

Bruchsal urged that Westphal himself, J. Äpinus, or M. Flacius should take issue with Calvin and a Lasco.¹²⁶ Later the same year Westphal opened the controversy by the publishing of his Farrago confuseanarum et inter se dissidentium opiniorum.¹²⁷ Calvin swiftly gave rebuttal with his Defensio (1553).

Our purpose here is not to outline the second eucharistic controversy, but only to focus upon Melanchthon's doctrine

¹²⁵S. H. W. Sillem, Briefsammlung des hamburgischen Superintendent Joachim Westphal, (Hamburg, 1903), 127-128; Neuser, "Von Zwingli und Calvin zur Synode von Westminster," 274.

¹²⁶Ibid.

¹²⁷For a overview of the participants in the controversy, cf. Neuser, "Von Zwingli und Calvin zur Synode von Westminster," 275.

of the Lord's Supper in this period. The year 1557 proved to be decisive.

Melanchthon and the Lord's Supper from 1552-1556

The second eucharistic controversy did not deal directly with Melanchthon's theology. Neither did he himself publicly take part in the debate. The situation was very complex. Melanchthon particularly found himself between the fronts.¹²⁸ Neuser draws this picture of the groups and relations:

Die Anknüpfung an den ersten Streit [1526-1529] ist Kennzeichen der neuen Auseinandersetzung. Ein Kampf um die alten Autoritäten setzt daher ein, um Luther, Zwingli und die "Confessio Augustana". Melanchthon wird zur meistumworbene und -umkämpften Autorität. Die Gnesiolutheraner stehen vor der Verlegenheit, Melanchthons Abendmahlslehre mit der Luthers nicht in Übereinstimmung bringen zu können. Die Zwinglianer befürchten wie zu Zeiten Bucers eine Einigung, die von Zwingli wegführt. Calvin und seine Anhänger suchen die Einigung mit den Melanchthonianer, sind aber durch den "Consensus Tigurinis" gebunden. Melanchthon schließlich befürwortet die Einigung, will aber nicht gegen Luther und die Gnesio-lutheraner in der Streit gezogen werden.¹²⁹

Two features are particularly characteristic of Melanchthon's attitude in these years.¹³⁰ First, he resisted pressure to intervene in the conflict. In 1554 Nikolaus Gallus published Melanchthon's Sententiae veterum aliquot scriptorum de coena domini (1530) anew. The Preceptor was urged to break

¹²⁸See above about the negotiations at Worms, 60-62.

¹²⁹Neuser, "Von Zwingli und Calvin zur Synode von Westminster," 275. Neuser's subsequent presentation illustrates the complex situation well, *ibid.*, 275-285.

¹³⁰Neuser, "Melanchthons Abendmahlslehre im Dunauraum," 53.

his silence to state the opponents' misusing his authority to further their false doctrine.¹³¹ In two works in 1557 Westphal printed material from the early Melanchthon for the same purpose.¹³² From the other side Calvin tried repeatedly in letters between 1554 and 1557 to make Melanchthon to stand forth openly with his view.¹³³ In 1556 and 1557 he did the same publicly in his books against Westphal on the Lord's Supper.¹³⁴ No one, however, was able to make Melanchthon break his silence.

This striking reserve may be seen as related with what Melanchthon often expressed with the word "Mässigung" (*moderatio, modestia*). We hear of this already in the 1520s.¹³⁵ What this "Mässigung" means in this context is very clearly expressed by the Wittenberg student Zacharias Ursin in a letter to Melanchthon's friend, Crato von Crafftheim, in Breslau. Crato also had complained about Melanchthon's silence. Earlier also Ursin had been of that opinion, but not so any longer. The reason for his change of mind is this:

¹³¹"Von Zwingli und Calvin zur Synode von Westminster," 277. Melanchthon himself never let this work be reprinted.

¹³²Cf. especially Erdmann K. Sturm, Der Junge Zacharias Ursin. Sein weg vom Philippismus zum Calvinismus (1534-1562), Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1972, 69-72.

¹³³Neuser, "Melanchthon zum Fortgang zu bewegen," 47.

¹³⁴Neuser, "Melanchthon zum Fortgang zu bewegen," 46-48.

¹³⁵See also above, 30, 33, 75. Cf. Neuser, "Melanchthons Abendmahlslehre im Dunauraum, 53-54. ; idem, "Von Zwingli und Calvin zur Synode von Westminster," 279.

O daß doch in der Sakramentlehre niemahls solche Streitigkeiten entstanden wären und daß sie, nachdem sie aber entstanden sind, nicht durch Affekte und Gründe in die Länge gezogen und belastet werden, . . . Es gehe nicht um Disputationen, sondern den wahren und festen Trost. Melanchthon habe die im geschriebenen Wort Gottes deutlich ausgesprochene Sakramentlehre rein und unverfälscht dargestellt. Er [Melanchthon] legt allen Wert auf das was wahr, gewiß, vorrangig, notwendig und die Hauptsache ist, und doch übersieht er nicht zur Sache gehört.¹³⁶

Neuser has demonstrated how this "Mässigung" is applied in the Hardenberg controversy by Hardenberg and by his adviser, Melanchthon, both in relation to activity and to doctrine.¹³⁷ In 1554, at the beginning of the conflict, confident in Hardenberg's wisdom and "moderatio" Melanchthon advised him to do anything to keep the controversy out of Bremen.¹³⁸ Timann, Hardenberg's main opponent, was also admonished not to cause any conflict. The letter to Timann is typical of Melanchthon's "moderate" way of dealing with conflicting groups: "Alle Spezialfragen vermeidet er, um nicht selbst Partei zu werden. Ganz allgemein tadelt er, daß viele nicht zur Sache gehörende Fragen (extra causam) disputiert würden."¹³⁹ Neuser thus summarizes the main issues of Melanchthon's "moderatio" related to the doctrine of the Supper:

¹³⁶Erdmann K. Sturm, Der Junge Zacharias Ursin, 61.

¹³⁷Neuser, "Hardenberg und Melanchthon," 148-153.

¹³⁸This concerns particularly the coming back to the area of a Lasco's who was central in the beginning of the new sacramental controversy. Cf., Neuser, Hardenberg und Melanchthon, 150-153.

¹³⁹Neuser, Luther und Melanchthon, 153.

Melanchthon verweist auf das allen Gemeinsame (die tröstende Wirksamkeit Christi im Abendmahl), das Unaufgebbare (die wahre, substanzielle Präsenz, das untragbare (die Vergötzung der Elemente extra usum) und auf die Lehrnorm (für die er eine selbstverfaßte Unionsformel vorschlägt).¹⁴⁰

Melanchthon's consensus formula reads: "In usu vere et substantialiter adest Christus, et est efficax in vera consolatione."¹⁴¹ The only public work in which Melanchthon dealt with the Lord's Supper in these years is his Examen Ordinandorum written for the Mecklenburg church order 1554. The article on the Lord's Supper here is, as we might expect, very short. The decisive formula is in accord with the basic concept we have discerned in Melanchthon since 1527.

Changes in Melanchthon's Doctrine 1557-1560

Melanchthon's silence in the eucharistic controversy continued until 1559. However, decisive developments took place in 1557. The negotiations with the Gnesio-Lutherans at Coswig and Worms definitely did not bring them closer to each other. Melanchthon's "Vorgrimm" against his Lutheran critics only increased. When the Gnesio-Lutherans had left Worms October 2, 1557, the pressure to condemn the Sacramentarians

¹⁴⁰Ibid.

¹⁴¹CR 8, 337 (Nr. 5638). The connection backward even to the time before 1530 is evident when we compare the core statement of the unification formula Melanchthon presented probably on the last day at the Marburg Colloquium 1529: "Christum vere adesse cum sacramento, quandoquidem agit ibi." See W. H. Neuser, "Ein unbekanntes Unionsformel Melanchthons vom Marburger Religionsgespräch 1529," in ThZ 21 (1965), 181, 183-187, 194-197.

continued, now by the Romanists. October 21 those who were left yielded. The decisive sentence reads: "Non enim tantum Cinglii dogma improbandum est, sed simul horribilia idola pontifica damnanda sunt."¹⁴² Melanchthon's good relations with Calvin were ended. The colloquy planned by Calvin, a Lasco, and Melanchthon between moderate theologians was aborted.¹⁴³

From at least about 1554 Melanchthon had warned against the "Brotkult" (*artolatrea*) which he saw among some Lutherans.¹⁴⁴ He was upset when in May 1557 he became aware that Westphal might attack his doctrine of the Lord's Supper, particularly the formula "Nihil habet rationem sacramenti extra usum institutum."¹⁴⁵ This "rule" was accepted by Luther and served to protect against the Roman idolatrous ceremonies, such as worshiping the elements, and so forth. Melanchthon persisted in his silence. Neuser writes:

Seine Briefe und Gutachten der Jahre 1558 bis 1560 lassen aber keinen Zweifel aufkommen, gegen wen sich eine Schrift Melanchthons richten würde: gegen die Entleerung des Abendmahls durch Zwingli und gegen die Verehrung der Abendmahls-elemente durch die Gnesiolutheraner.¹⁴⁶

¹⁴²CR 9, 353; cf. *ibid.* 9, 352.

¹⁴³See above, 107-108.

¹⁴⁴Cf. Lohse: "Von Luther bis zum Konkordienbuch," 130., where a number of references are given.

¹⁴⁵Neuser, "Melanchthons Abendmahlslehre im Donauraum," 56, comments: "Gemeint ist: Der Sacramentscharacter des Abendmahls ist begrenzt auf die von Christus eingesetzte handlung des Essens und Trinkens."

¹⁴⁶*Ibid.*, 56.

A definite development beyond his earlier position is evident in Melanchthon's lectures on Paul's letter to the Colossians in June 1557.¹⁴⁷ Here he treats Col.3:1 in connection with John 1: 18 and 3: 13. Calling upon the Fathers, particularly Athanasius, he presents a eucharistic Christology which contains the Reformed Christology, the so-called *extra Calvinisticum*.¹⁴⁸ Melanchthon dictated his lectures. Letters between Swiss and Southern German theologians and letters from some of them to Melanchthon show both how soon that dictation spread and also that they immediately understood the importance of his new position.¹⁴⁹ In Worms in 1557 Brenz and Melanchthon supported each other against the Gnesio-Lutherans.

¹⁴⁷For the following, cf. Erdmann K. Sturm, Der Junge Zacharias Ursin, 73-82.

¹⁴⁸Ibid. p. 75. This "extra" was clearly taught by Zwingli and Bucer in the late 1520s, but not by Melanchthon, cf. above, 81-82; cf. Neuser, "Ein unbekannte Unionsformel Melanchthons vom Marburger Religions-gespräch 1529," in ThZ 21 (1965): 197, note 69 and 70. On the other hand in his presentation of the issue in his 1559 edition of the Institutio, Calvin clearly leaned upon Melanchthon's lecture of June 1557; cf. Neuser, "Von Zwingli und Calvin zur Synode von Westminster," 249: "Er [Calvin] folgt dem Dankengang Melanchthons in dessen Vorlesungsdiktat zu Kol. 3,1 vom Juni 1557, das ihm bekannt wurde." In 1559, the commentary on Colossians was published.

¹⁴⁹References is given in Neuser, "Melanchthons Abendmahllehre im Dunauraum, 55, note 20. In November 1556 Melanchthon approved without reservation Hardenberg's Themata sive Propotiones adversus Ubiquitatem corporis Christi (CR 8, 917).

In the Hagen case in Württemberg Brenz became aware of Melanchthon's position. The result was a complete break.¹⁵⁰

A letter to his friend Crato von Crafftheim may be regarded as the last of Melanchthon's doctrinal statements.¹⁵¹ Here he sought to demonstrate from the Fathers that the bread and wine in the Lord's Supper are "Symbole, Zeichen und Antityposi." He claims that Luther had approved the use of these concepts. Neuser rightly states: "Nie zuvor hat sich Melanchthon stärker den Begriffen der Schweizer genährt."¹⁵²

And he adds:

Es zeigt sich, daß nur der Tod Melanchthon bewahrte, aktive in den Abendmahlstreit hineingezogen zu werden. Albert Hardenberg hat er kurz vor seinem Tod angeboten, in öffentlicher Disputation gegen Heshusius, Westphal und Mörlin aufzutreten.¹⁵³

These two examples illustrates the important development that took place in Melanchthon's doctrine of the Lord's Supper in the last few years of his life. With these steps Melanchthon moved clearly beyond the position he settled on in the late 1520s and in the main retained during the 1540s.

This is the context in which Martin Chemnitz was situated when around 1560 he worked out his first book on the

¹⁵⁰Brecht and Ehmer, Südwestdeutsche Reformationsgeschichte 369-371, 427-428; Mahlmann Das neue Dogma der lutherischen Christologie, 176-191.

¹⁵¹CR 9, nr. 6714.

¹⁵²Neuser, "Melanchthons Abendmahllehre im Dunauraum," 57.

¹⁵³Ibid.; cf. idem, Hardenberg und Melanchthon, 186.

doctrine of the Lord's Supper. Although he publicly never commented upon these controversial positions of Melancthon explicitly, he could not be unaware of them. His personal relations with more of the men who were directly involved in these struggles made that impossible.

PART II

THE BENEFITS AND USE OF THE LORD'S SUPPER

CHAPTER 4

HERMENEUTICS FOR THE LORD'S SUPPER

This part forms the central part of our work. As stated in the "Introduction," its purpose is to draw a picture of Chemnitz' doctrine of the Lord's Supper. More precisely, to show what he teaches concerning the gift and the benefits of the Supper, and how they are conveyed to the communicants. Our purpose is not to investigate the roots of his doctrine in the New Testament, by the Fathers, and in earlier Lutheran tradition, to see how he arrived at it. On vital issues, however, it will be necessary to take a closer look at how he argues to support his conclusions. More precisely, it is necessary to relate his doctrine to his own basic hermeneutical principles. This kind of internal criticism must be regarded as a part of a sound historical research. A survey of these principles, therefore, will be included as a first chapter of this part. In the following chapters the main issues, such as the purpose, the gifts, and their way of bestowal will be treated. In these chapters some questions which arise out of our discussion of the main issues will be discussed.

The systematic undertaking of testing Chemnitz' doctrine of the Lord's Supper, whether it actually matches the biblical

evidence, which is indeed Chemnitz' claim, would require a detailed exegetical discussion of the biblical material and a comparison of this with Chemnitz' exegesis. This, however, lies beyond the scope of this dissertation.

The main primary source for our research will be the earliest published work of Martin Chemnitz, his Die Reine Gesunde Lehre (1561), the Latin translation of Repetitio (1561). As supplementary source we will utilize Leuterungen (1561), the translation of Anatome (1561), published at the same time as Repetitio as an assessment of Albert Hardenberg's doctrine of the Lord's Supper and defence of Hardenberg's dismissal from his office as preacher at the cathedral at Bremen.¹ The scope of this work is more narrow and, therefore, much less helpful for our purpose. Major parts of Repetitio will be utilized in the this part.

Methodological Approaches among Lutherans: An overview

As already pointed out,² the doctrine of the Lord's Supper turned out to be the most difficult and dividing issue within the Reformation movement. As time passed it

¹Rehtmeyer, Antiquitas ecclesiasticae Brunsvigae, vol. III, 238-243; "Martin Chemnitz (GKH)," 318-319; idem, "Chemnitz, Martin (TRE)," 715; Carl Bertheau, "Hardenberg, Albert Rizaeus," in Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche, 3d. ed., vol. 6: 408-414; Hanns Engelhardt, "Das Irrlehreprozeß gegen Albert Hardenberg 1560/61," Jahrbuch der Gesellschaft für Niedersächsische Kirchengeschichte 61, (1963): 32-62.

²See above, 68-69 and 99-102.

increasingly became a dividing issue also among Lutherans. Differing theological and exegetical presuppositions and principles here came to the surface, particularly in the issues that pertain to the Real Presence. But even with our approach which focuses on the *usus* and *beneficia* of the Lord's Supper, it will be necessary to take a look at these issues.

Before we turn to Chemnitz, an overview of different hermeneutical approaches as background will be helpful to recognize the particular profile of Chemnitz' way of dealing with this issue.

Three Approaches

As Theodor Mahlmann has demonstrate in his book, Das neue Dogma der lutherischen Christologie, there were in the late 1550s at least three more or less different methods among the Lutherans in dealing with the doctrine of the Real Presence over against the Sacramentarians.³

In their hermeneutics the major group of Gnesio-Lutherans clearly prove themselves to be influenced by Melanchthon. They based their doctrine of the Real Presence and their defence of it on the *Verba*. Only close connection to the *Verba* did they allow themselves to make use of Christological arguments in defense of the Real Presence. They take the step

³Theodor Mahlmann, Das neue Dogma der lutherischen Christologie (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1969), 19-40, 63-92, and 125-204.

from the *Verba* to their originator, from the promise to the promiser. Mahlmann illustrates this approach to this doctrine from the theologians behind the Weimar *Book of Confutation*, Erhard Schnepff, Simon Musäus, and Matthias Flacius, and their close friend Johann Wigand, from Paul von Eitzen, and from Joachim Westphal.⁴

Another group, among whom Melanchthon himself must be counted, is characterized by the same main hermeneutical principles. The difference appears in their speaking of Christ's presence in the Supper as the presence of the person of Christ and not of the body and blood, and a corresponding different understanding of *communicatio idiomatum*, which relate to the person of Christ and to the body and blood. Further, the com-
munion concept of 1 Cor. 10:16 plays an important role in their understanding of the *Verba*, particularly the Real Presence.⁵

Johannes Brenz of Württemberg may be mentioned as the main representative of the third group.⁶ From 1557 on, and especially in his major Eucharistic works in the early 1560s, Brenz endeavored to establish the Real Presence of the body

⁴Ibid., 19-40.

⁵Ibid., 62-92; Wilhelm Neuser, "Hardenberg und Melanchthon. Der Hardenbergische Streit (1554-1560)." Jahrbuch der Gesellschaft für Niedersächsische Kirchengeschichte 65, (1967): 157-173.

⁶Other non-Swabian theologians of this group are Johannes Bötter (Hamburg) and Johannes Timann (Bremen).

and blood of Christ on a basis that was not dependent on exegetical discussions of the *Verba*, which could always be contested. His aim was not to work out "die christologische Möglichkeit" of Real Presence, but to evidence its necessity from the personal union.⁷

Chemnitz' "Repetitio" (1561)

Nowhere does Chemnitz discuss the fundamental hermeneutical questions to such an extent as in Repetitio (1560) and in the later edition of the same work, Fundamenta sanae doctrinae (1570).⁸ Since Repetitio is our main source, we will give an overview of the purpose and plan of the book.

The main purpose of the book is to establish the Real Presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Supper as

⁷Mahlmann, Das neue Dogma der lutherischen Christologie, 165: "bisher ist die Diskussion dabei stehengeblieben, neben die der 'Einsetzung' immanenten Kriterien der Realpräsenz lediglich ihre christologische Möglichkeit zu setzen. Brenz will darüber grundsetzlich hinausgehen, indem er nicht in die christologische Voraussetzungen der Einsetzungsworte in der Personeneinheit zurückfragt, sondern umgekehrt von der Entwicklung des inneren Sinnes der Personeneinheit aus die Realpräsenz vorfindet. Hier haben wir den Grund zu sehen, warum Brenz die universale Weltgegenwart Jesu entschlossen als notwendig aus der Personeneinheit, dem Grunddatum der Christologie, folgen läßt. Denn damit allein ist es möglich, die Realpräsenz rein christologisch zu behaupten. . . . Zu dieser Feststellung bedarf es wegen ihrer Notwendigkeit nicht der Zuhilfenahme der Einsetzungsworte. Es bedarf auch nicht der Argumentation aus der *sessio ad dextram*."

⁸The Lord's Supper differs both from the Latin and German version of Repetitio (1561). The material is partly rearranged and partly enlarged. Some sections are shortened or even removed, e.g. the whole chapter on the history of the sacrament "Schwermereyen" (383-456).

firmly as possible from the Word of God. Chemnitz' thesis can be formulated thus: The doctrine of the Lord's Supper must be based exclusively on the *Verba*.⁹ If these principle texts themselves do not demand otherwise, we must retain the simple, natural, and literal meaning of the words and avoid all kinds of figurative interpretations. Even closely related passages such as 1 Cor.11:27-29 and 10:16 (the former is very important in Chemnitz' argument) are secondary to the *Verba*. Chemnitz' main opponents also claimed to build their doctrine on the Word of God. To achieve his purpose Chemnitz, therefore, considered it necessary to refute their hermeneutical presuppositions. As we will see, the hermeneutical issues proved to be decisive. Chemnitz' thesis, that the *Verba* must remain the only source of the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, obliged him to lengthy hermeneutical discussions. His hermeneutical arguments turn around two focal points: (1) Which texts can rightly be considered the basis of the doctrine of the Lord's Supper? (2) How are these texts properly interpreted? These two questions we will focus on in the following.

The Latin and German editions contain basically the same material. There are, however, three differences between the editions. First, two chapters have been relocated in the German edition. Secondly, all the chapters of the Latin edition

⁹Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 90. No one can deny, Chemnitz claims, that "der rechte grunt der lehr vom Abendmal/ gesucht/ genomen/ geleret sol werden/ nirgendts anders aus/ denn aus den worten der einsetzung."

which deals with the interpretation of the *Verba*, have in the German edition been combined as one large chapter. As for the content the subsections of the German edition follow the order of the Latin edition. Thirdly, some not extensive parts of the Latin text have been omitted from the German edition. The latter also contains some minor additions.¹⁰

With the relocation of Repetitio chapter five: "Quis sit praedicatio . . . : Hoc est . . . Et de synechdoche," to chapter eight in the German edition the book can be divided in the following six sections:

I. Introduction: (1) Main purpose; (2) statements of the Real Presence in public confession of the evangelical churches; (3) does the controversy affect the wholesomeness of the faith?¹¹

II. Discussion of some questions related to the main issue: (4) ubiquity; (5) the mode of the Real Presence; (6) three kinds of eating; (7) the benefits of the Real Presence.¹²
- The purpose of this initial discussion seems to be that Chemnitz wants to clear away the unnecessary disputes over

¹⁰The reason for both omissions and additions seems to be the consideration of the needs of the German reader. Some of the most scholarly advanced discussions are omitted. Occasionally this is explicitly stated. See e.g. Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 84.

¹¹Repetitio, 1-20; Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 1-13.

¹²Repetitio, 13-19, and 33-57; Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 21-67.

ubiquity,¹³ to remove, according to Chemnitz, obvious misconceptions related to the mode of presence and the different kinds of eating,¹⁴ and to refute the opinion that the Lutherans were interested only in the Real Presence, not in the gifts of the Supper.¹⁵

III. Discussion of hermeneutical issues: (8) the nature of the statement: "This is my body/blood"; (9) the *sedes doctrinae*; (10) the *status controversiae* defined; (11) a. principles of interpretation related to *sedes doctrinae*;¹⁶ b. application of the principles to the *Verba* and 1 Cor.10:16 and 11:27-29;¹⁷ c) the witnesses of the ancient writers.¹⁸ -- As we will see later, and as the heading of chapter 11 of Die Reine Gesunde Lehre clearly shows, even the discussion of the

¹³Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 21. "Dieweil wir in Gottes wort/ dauon nichts ausstrucklichs haben/ sihet vnd versteht ein jeder einfeltiger Christ [sic.!] wol/ was vnd wie/ mit dieser frage zuhandeln sey/ nach der lehr Pauli/ von vnnötigen vnd vntlichen fragen 1.Tim. 4[:1-7] vnd 6[:3-5]. 2.Tim. 2[:23]. Tit. 3[:9]."

¹⁴Ibid., 32-33; especially the Zwinglian charge that the Lutherans' doctrine was Capernaitic.

¹⁵Ibid., 51-53.

¹⁶Except Repetitio, 19-32 and 65-72, and Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 67-84 and 95-104, which treat two questions pertaining particularly to this Sacrament, ch. 8 and 10, this whole section deals with general hermeneutical questions, Repetitio, 19-32, 57-111 and Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 67-155.

¹⁷Repetitio, 111-157; Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 155-219.

¹⁸Repetitio, 158-172; Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 219-239.

four versions is a discussion of how to read the text properly, that is, a hermeneutical discussion.¹⁹

IV. Four question related to the Real Presence discussed; (12) the proper formulas and phrases to express the Real Presence; (13) consecration and the *Verba*; (14) about unworthy eating; (15) how to honor the sacrament rightly.²⁰

-- There is hardly any internal connection between these issues. Chemnitz wanted to settle these issues, it appears, before he started to deal with the arguments of the opponents.

V. The main argument of the opponents refuted: (16) In general; (17-24) spelled out in detail. Arguments (17) from Christ's human nature; (18) from his ascension; (19) from his departure from this world; (20) from spiritual eating; (21) from John 6; (22) from the words: do it in my remembrance; (23) from the signs of the Old Testament; and (24) from words of the early fathers.²¹

VI. (25) Review of the history of the opponents of Real Presence and the arguments by which they were refuted.²²

¹⁹The heading of Chapter 11, reads: "Welches die Fürnemsten Argument sind/ dadurch erwiesen wirdt/ das man mit nichte von der eigenschafft dieser wort/ das ist mein Leib/ der für euch gegeben wirdt/ etc. abweichen sol" (Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 104).

²⁰Repetitio, 172-213; Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 239-294.

²¹Repetitio, 214- 292; Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 294-382.

²²Repetitio, 292-347; Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 375-456. To the original Latin edition is added the independent treatise "Tractatus complectens doctrinam de Communicatione idiomatum" It is important to notice both that it is added and that it is not included in the book on the doctrine

In a summary, the main part of the book (67-219) deals with "die . . . Heuptfrage . . . darauff der gantze Handel . . . stehet vnd beruhet."²³ The answer Chemnitz gives when he concludes the chapter on "De statu" with these words:

So stehet nun der gantze Handel darauff . . . ob man die wort verstehen sol/ wie sie lauten/ oder ob man denselbigen/ ein andern verstandt/ denn sie lauten/ geben solle/ das ist der *Status*, darauff *Argumenta in probatione et refutatione*, müssen gerichtet werden.²⁴

Experience had convinced Chemnitz that this is an important and most useful approach.²⁵

For our purpose the most important parts of Repetitio will be the chapters on the benefits, fruit, and comfort of the Lord's Supper (50-67), the three kinds of eating (32-50), unworthy eating (269-282), how to honor the Lord's Supper (282-293), and the refutation for the opponents arguments from spiritual eating and from John 6 (344-358), together with parts of his discussion of the *Verba*. It should also be noted that the chapter on the benefits of the Real Presence precedes the discussion of the hermeneutical principles which are deci-

of the "true Real Presence" as a kind of Christological foundation. As we shall see, Chemnitz does not base his doctrine of the Lord's Supper on any other basis than the "sedes doctrinae" of this particular doctrine.

²³Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 97.

²⁴Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 103-104.

²⁵The last quotation from Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, continues: "Vnd die treibe ich so fleissig/ denn ich weiss vnd hab erfahren/ wie gross Liecht es diesem gantzen Handel gibt/ wie sich ein ein-feltiger darinn selber berichten vnd verwaren kan/ wenn er den grundt wol setzt vnd versteht" (104).

sive for his position. The reason for this is that the benefits themselves, narrowly regarded, were not much contested.

The polemical thrust of the treatise is primarily against the Sacramentarians or Zwinglians and the Crypto-Calvinists among the adherents of Augsburg Confession. The former are attacked directly throughout the book, and especially in chapters 16-24 where he takes up and refutes their main arguments.²⁶ But Chemnitz also has both Melanchthon and Brenz in mind.²⁷ This, however, can be recognized only through a careful examination of the arguments. How much Chemnitz really knew of the changes in Melanchthon's view in the late 1550s is an open question. It is, however, certain that he never criticized any of them directly. The doctrine of the Roman Church is no main target in this work. Occasionally, for example, their doctrine of transubstantiation and the *ex opere operato*, are attacked.

²⁶Repetitio, 214-291; Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 293-382.

²⁷Joachim Mörlin states in his preface to Die Reine Gesunde Lehre: ". . . vnd hörestu Christlicher Leser hie gar nicht/[1] von einigem reumlichen einschliessen des Leibs CHristi/ [2] du hörest auch von keinem verwandeln des Brots vnd Weins/ [3] viel weniger von dem/ das wirs dafür solten halten oder leren/ als were der Leib CHristi allenthalben in allen Creaturen/ daruon doch die Kirche dieser löblichen Stadt vergangen jahrs/ bösslich vnd jemmerlichen ist ausgegeben worden" (A vi v). The last sentence refers to Melanchthon's attack on Mörlin and Heshusius in his "Gutachten" (1559) to Friedrich III of Electoral Pfalz when Heshusius was expelled and the territory started its move toward a Reformed confession.

Chemnitz' Methodological Approach and Principles
of Interpretation in "Repetitio" (1561)

There can be no doubt that Martin Chemnitz, first and above all, wanted to be a theologian of the Word of God. In his doctrine of the Lord's Supper, particularly in his discussions of hermeneutical questions, we will see that this over and over again will come to the fore. In controversial issues Chemnitz repeatedly calls the church back to its true foundation. In doing theology he is particularly insistent that it must be done on the proper basis; that is, on the basis of the Holy Scriptures. In his early work Iudicium, finished in March 1561, that is, one year after the Repetitio (1560), he lays down the following rule:

Retinenda ergo est regula, ordiendum esse a verbo Dei, quia per illud organon Spiritus sanctus est efficax, & aliquando ordimur a sana doctrina, juxta verum intellectum & usum & legis & evangelii.²⁸

Here both the formal and the material principles of the Reformers concerning the interpretation of Scripture are explicitly stated. This twofold scriptural principle defends Chemnitz against the charge of a wooden biblicism. Both principles are equally important to Chemnitz. This should be kept in mind in when we review his hermeneutics since he only infrequently refers explicitly to Law and Gospel.²⁹

²⁸Iudicium, 51.

²⁹Even apart from the main theme of the book, it should be realized that in Repetitio Chemnitz also offers a contribution to the doctrine of Scripture as norm and source of doctrine, inspiration, etc., and to hermeneutics.

The Biblical Foundation of the Doctrine of the Lord's Supper: The *Sedes Doctrinae*

The doctrine of the Lord's Supper must be thoroughly founded on the Scriptures as its basis and expounded from the Scriptures as its source. This is Chemnitz most basic persuasion. A general feature of Chemnitz' theology is his practical Christian and pastoral concern. This surfaces repeatedly throughout his hermeneutical discussions. It is necessary, Chemnitz declares, that

man derselbigen Lehr/ und des Glaubens vom Abendmal . . . beständigen vñnd gewissen grundt/ aus Gottes wort anzeige/ dadurch die gewissen/ die warheit also berichtet vñnd vberweist werden/ das sie wider allerley disputationes/ gedanken vñnd einfelle/ inn waren einfeltigen verstandt/ sicher/ fest vñnd beständig beruhen mögen.³⁰

For this reason Chemnitz explicitly warned against entering into "frembde vñnötige" "vñnd vñndlichen fragen" disputations concerning Christ's ubiquity.³¹ The same applies to the Sacramentarians use of Christological and rational arguments in combination. His advice is to extract oneself from these kinds of arguments and remain by the simple statement of the biblical texts.

³⁰Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 85; cf., 124, 134. See also, *ibid.*, 101-102, where Chemnitz' calls for simplicity in doctrinal issues.

³¹*Ibid.*, 21-23. In the Bremen sacramental controversy both Timann and Hardenberg made the "ubiquity" a key issue in their attack on each other. Cf., Neuser, "Hardenberg und Melanchthon," 1965, (1967), 157-173; Mahlmann, Das neue Dogma der lutherischen Christologie, 44-54.

To Chemnitz it is particularly important that the handling of such a controversial issue as the doctrine of the Lord's Supper be dealt with in a most careful way. He writes:

Das sage ich darumb/ das man mith fleiss acht darauf gebe/ wenn in diesem Handel der grundt recht gelegt wirdt/ an welchem ort der Schrifft/ man suchen sol/ vnd finden mag den rechten waren verstandt vom Abendmal des Herren/ so hat man mehr denn die helfft gewonnen.³²

No doctrine can be allowed to be based on human reason. It must be founded on "der grundt der Propheten vnnnd Apostel" (Eph. 2:20).³³ Luther maintained as a principle that *signum* or *sacramentum* had to be considered "in Verbo," that is, not anywhere or in Scripture in general, but in the *Verba institutionis*.³⁴ Chemnitz, however, advances this to a general principle and maintains that all articles of faith must have particular Scripture passages as their proper foundation, their *sedes doctrinae*. Chemnitz seems to take this principle as a matter of course, even though it scarcely can be said to be a widely-used principle at that time.³⁵ He states:

³²Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, p. 88.

³³Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, p. 85.

³⁴WA 11,448. 31; cf., Carl Fr. Wisløff, The Gift of Communion. Luther's Controversy with Rom on Eucharistic Sacrifice, trans. Joseph M. Shaw (Mineapolis: Augsburg Publishibg House, 1964), 22-31. The hermeneutical principles of Luther which form the background of this discussion, are summarized by Albrecht Peters, Realpräsenz. Luthers Zeugnis von Christi Gegenwart im Abendmahl (Berlin: Lutherische Verlagshaus, 1960), 173.

³⁵The same matter of course is expressed in the Confutatio two years earlier in 1559: "Zum andern ist gelerten und unge-lerten bekannt die gemeine Regel, welche offft in allen künsten, fünemlich aber in auslegung heiliger Schrifft widerholet wird,

Wie nun alle Artickel des Glaubens/ an etlichen gewissen örtern in der Schrifft/ ihren rechten grundt haben/ aus welchen man den waren vnd eigentlichen verstandt derselben Artickel nemen mus. Also mus man auch in diesem handel/ für allen dingen darauff acht geben/ in welchen zeugnissen der Schrifft/ die Lehr vom Abendmal des HErren/ ihren rechten waren grundt habe/ da man forschen/ suchen vnd lernen sol/ warhafftigen bericht von diesem Artickel.³⁶

Where these *sedes* are to be found is so evident that not even the opponents can deny it.³⁷ The *Verba* and nothing else can constitute the *sedes doctrinae* of Lord's Supper.³⁸ At the very beginning of Die Reine Gesunde Lehre Chemnitz claims that the whole doctrine of the Lord's Supper, both "was wir von dem wesen/ und was wir von der frucht seines Abendmal wissen und glauben sollen," has Christ given in the *Verba*.³⁹

das man nicht urteilen sol aus gestimleten oder kurtzen reden, die auserhalb der haubtsachen fallen, sondern aus den örten, da die hendel vollkommenlich disputiert werden, und die meister fürsetzlichkeit damit umbgeben, das sie ihre meinung gründlich und deutlich an tag geben." (Quoted from Mahlmann, Das neue Dogma der lutherische Christologie, 21, note 13).

³⁶Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 85-86. Mahlmann, Das neue Dogma der lutherischen Christologie, 21, indicates that this rule [quoted in the previous note] was applied by the Saxons in their "Gutachten" against Osiander. In their Confutatio (1559) the Thüringian theologians' made use of it, may be for the first time in the doctrine of the Lord's Supper.

³⁷See quotation below, 131.

³⁸Only in the chapter on *Sedes doctrinae* within few pages Chemnitz repeats this a number of times, Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 88, 90, 93(2) and often elsewhere in the book.

³⁹Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 2; cf. also *ibid.*, 53-54: "Nun ist dis der einfeltigste und aller gewisseste weg in dieser Lehr/ das wir uns halten an die wort der einsetzung/ denn dieselbigen begreifen die gantze Lahr/ nicht allein von der gegenwertigkeit des Leibs und Bluts Christi/ sondern auch von der frucht und nutzbarkeit/ derselben gegenwertigkeit/ so wirdt es auch leichter/ beide zubehalten und zu verstehen/

In his discussion of the *sedes doctrinae* Chemnitz insists that the *Verba* are not only a source; they must be the only source. He concludes:

Ist derhalben so gewiss und klar/ das auch von den widersachern/ niemand dasselbige leugnen darff/ Nemlich das der rechte grunt der Lehr vom Abendmal/ gesucht/ genommen/ gelernet sol werden/ nirgendts anders aus/ denn aus den worten der einsetzung.⁴⁰

As Chemnitz sees it, one of the major faults of the Sacramentarians is that they do not take this into account. They allow themselves to draw arguments from very different sources, and let even rational arguments influence or even determine the interpretation of the *Verba*.⁴¹

Chemnitz is, moreover, insistent that this principle must be strictly applied. Whenever doubt and contention arise, the Words of Institution must serve as the norm one should call upon to settle the matter. He writes:

wenn man den Handel aus den worten der einsetzung fürleget".

⁴⁰Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 90. In Anatome Chemnitz criticizes that "der wort der einsetzung/ darinnen doch diese lere/ als in ihrem rechten fundament gegründet ist/ gedencket er [Hardenberg] gar nicht." (E iii v). Shortly after he concludes: "Und also begründet Albertus seine meinung . . . nicht . . . auff die Sprüche/ stet/ ort vnd zeugnis/ da die lere vom Abendmal des HERRneigentlich vnd allein gegründet ist" (E iii r); cf., *ibid.*, Ciii v.

⁴¹Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 86-88. Cf., Anatome, D iii, E iii r-E viii, where the argument that Christ is chained in heaven, based on Christ's ascension and true humane nature, is rejected. Chemnitz' firmly repudiates the "calumnien" that the preachers of Bremen were teaching "ubiquity" of Christ in every stone and wood, when they were teaching the Real Presence. (B vii-C iii). This criticism also hits fellow Lutherans, particularly J. Brenz.

. . . wenn etwa zweiffel/ jrrung/ fragen oder disputationes von diesem Sacrament fürfallen/ es sey aus der vernunfft/ oder sonst aus anderen sprüchen der Schrifft/ sollen wir zu der einsetzung/ als zu der Heuptquellen/ eilen vnd lauffen/ daselbs bericht und bescheidt suchen und holen.⁴²

It should here be added that for Chemnitz, 1 Cor. 11:27.²⁹ especially, but also 10:16-17, is very close to the *Verba*. The former passage plays a key position in his argumentation.

The major problem which Chemnitz wrestles with, however, is how the *sedes* are to be read. The passage on the *Verba* as the only source for the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, just quoted, continues as follows:

Darüber aber scheidet es sich/ wie vnd auff was weise/ der rechte verstandt in den worten sol gesucht werden/ denn die Zwinglianer/ treten vnd weichen von dem eigentlichen gewissen natürlichen verstandt der wort im Abendmal. Vnd wenn sie denn könnten auffbringen/ eine meinung/ die etwa sonst anderen sprüchen der Schrifft gemess möcht sein/ so machten sie einen solchen schein/ ob jhr ding eitel Gottes wort were/. . .⁴³

From his comprehensive view of Scripture and doctrine Chemnitz can not allow for such a procedure. His own position on this issue he shortly summarizes thus:

In etlichen sprüchen aber der Schrifft/ werden die Lehr oder Artickel des Glaubens/ gleich in jhren rechten/ eigen orth gegründet. In solchen Sprüchen mus man ja trawn bey der einfeltigen/ waren/ natürlichen eigenschafft der wort bleiben/ sol man anders des rechten waren verstandts gewiss sein.⁴⁴

⁴²Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 88.

⁴³Ibid., 90-91.

⁴⁴Ibid., 92-93.

This is the thesis Chemnitz is going to develop and defend from the Scriptures.

The last part of the quotation directs us to the second area Chemnitz focuses upon in his discussion of hermeneutics. The first step he takes is to focus sharply on the contested issue. Then he discusses the main principles of interpretation which he thinks must be applied. We will now take a look at his main arguments in both steps.

The *Status Controversiae*

Both in Die Reine Gesunde Lehre and in Anatome Chemnitz is upset and frustrated by the way the more recent opponent of the Lutherans acted in the sacramental controversy. They adopted the Lutheran formulas but understood them differently, often without making the difference explicit.

Derhalben nemen sie die wort/ welche an ihnen selber recht/ vnd in vnseren Kirchen gebruchlich sein/ Vnd vnter den vnuerdechtigen worten/ führen sie die verfelschung der reinen lere ein . . . Vnd mit dem schein verführen sie viel guter einfeltigen Leute⁴⁵

However, people who know their catechism would not buy their opinions.

The carefully defined *status controversiae* stands forth almost as a hallmark of Chemnitz' controversial works. Here he applies this procedure to both the doctrinal issue itself

⁴⁵Anatome, C v v. This tactic Chemnitz throughout Anatome brands as sheer dishonesty. The Zurich theologians at the time of the Wittenberg Concord (1536) Chemnitz credits with more honesty (C vii v-C viii r).

and the hermeneutical issue. At least two reasons can be found for this. First, Zwingli, Calvin, and their followers are accused of deliberately making the discussion complex and confusing in order to move the common believer where they want.⁴⁶ In the name of the church and for the sake of the man in the pew Chemnitz protests this and calls for simplicity.

Wenn nun solche einfeltige/ klare/gewisse beständige gründe gelegt/ und in guter fleissiger acht gehalten werden/ so kan sich ein einfeltiger/ aus vielen verwirten dingen/ inn diesem Handel selber entrichten.⁴⁷

Chemnitz invests much energy in order to clarify the issue and to settle the principles simply because he wants to preserve the simplicity of faith on a firm foundation. The importance of the definition of the *status* in Chemnitz is evidenced by the frequency with which it surfaces in his discussion.

The second reason for this procedure also has to do with simplicity. Attempts to settle controversial issues must focus on the main issue, Chemnitz maintains. He explains:

. . . man mus ja für allen dingen der heuptsachen eins sein . . . Wenn wir vber heuptsachen eins sein . . . wöllen wir vns leichtlich vertragen/ vber den modis loquendi, auff was art vnd weise/ vnd mit was worten man von diesen Artickel reden soll.⁴⁸

⁴⁶Mockingly Chemnitz urges his reader "er woll mit vleiss darauff acht geben/ Es ist jtzt gebräuchlich/ das man die Leut vberteube/ vnd vom rechten Statu des zweyspalts abführe/ durch vieles geschrey vnd disputiren de *ubiquitate* . . ." (Anatome, B viii v-C i r, C iii r). Ubiquity is (mis-)used to discredit the Lutheran view of the Real Presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Supper (C i r-Cii r; C v v).

⁴⁷Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 102.

⁴⁸Anatome, Liiii v-Lv r.

The very first Chemnitz does in Die Reine Gesunde Lehre is to insist, over against the Sacramentarians, that the gifts and the beneficial use of the sacrament should not be brought into the discussion of its essence.⁴⁹ If this is not done, the whole issue is muddled. Not to observe this distinction is a particular fault of the sacramentarians.⁵⁰ Even before he defines the *status*, Chemnitz is, as we have seen, anxious to remove unnecessary and alien issues from the discussion.⁵¹

In Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, chapter ten on "*De statu*," Chemnitz offers a two-fold definition of the main issue, a doctrinal and a hermeneutical. Both center on the words: "This is my body/blood". After he has listed ten issues which do not belong to the main issue, he offers the following carefully stated definition:

. . . sondern das is die Heuptfrage/ darauff der gantze handel/ zwischen vns vnd den Zwinglianern/ stehet vnd beruhet/Es ist ohn alle widerrede gewiss vnd klar im Abendmal des Herren/ ist etwas fürhanden/ dasselbige reichet vnd gibt vns CHristus der Son Gottes/ durch die handt des Dieners/ vnd befiehet das wirs sollen entpfangen vnd nemen. Vnd da er spricht/ Esset/ trincket/ zeigt vnd beschreibt er die weise/ wie wirs nemen vnd entpfangen sollen/ Nemlich das wirs mit dem Munde entpfangen sollen.⁵²

After thus narrowing the issue, Chemnitz states the decisive question: "Nun ist die frage/ was dasselbige sey/ das im

⁴⁹Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 1-3.

⁵⁰Ibid., 2, 14-15.

⁵¹Ibid., 95; cf., Kurtzer Bericht, 131. On "alien issues," cf., Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 21-23, 33, 97.

⁵²Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 97-98.

Abendmal gegenwertig ist/ das uns gereicht wirdt/ das wir auch mit dem Munde entpfangen."⁵³ Our senses obviously see nothing but bread and wine. Further, both the evangelists and Paul speak of bread and wine also after consecration. Therefore, the *status controversiae* finally is presented in this form:

Stehet nun die frage darauff/ obs allein Brot vnd Wein sey/ das im Abendmal vorhanden gereicht/ vnd mit dem Munde entpfangen wirdt. Vnd hie gilts nicht meinens/ dünkens oder erachtens/ sondern es mus gewisser bestendiger grundt da sein/ dieweil so viel daran gelegen ist.⁵⁴

By narrowing the issue to one point, Chemnitz clearly has simplified the issue. He does not claim that this is the only controversial issue between the Lutherans and the Reformed. He seems, though, to mean that if this crucial issue is agreed upon, not only with regard to words and formulas, but also to the real meaning of the words: "This is my body/blood," then agreement will easily follow on other issues.

To Chemnitz this is a very practical and at the same time a most serious question. It impinges directly upon the spiritual welfare of the users. For the sake of the communicants the question must not rest on personal opinions. Rather "es mus gewisser bestendiger grundt da sein." For those who do not discern the body (1 Cor.11:29), participate in the Supper to their own judgement.⁵⁵

⁵³Ibid., 98.

⁵⁴Ibid.

⁵⁵Ibid., 98-99.

Chemnitz knew that the sacramental controversy from the beginning had been loaded with hermeneutical questions. The meaning of the very sentences of the *Verba* which his dogmatically oriented *status* focuses on, was the very center of the controversy. If the disagreement should be settled through exegesis, then first the hermeneutical issue must be settled.

In the same careful way as he defined the dogmatical *status* Chemnitz also defines the *status controversiae* from a hermeneutical point of view. The *Verba* are given by the Son of God himself, he argues,

. . . wenn sie sollen verstanden werden/ nach ihrer gebrauchlichen/ natürlichen/ eigentlichen vnd einfeltigen bedeutung/ wie sie lauten/ so ist der handel so gantz klar/ das auch die Widersacher/ nicht leugnen können noch dürffen/ das die wort den verstandt vnd die meinung geben/ Nemlich/ das im Abendmal zugegen sey/ mit dem Brot zu essen gereicht/ vund mit dem munde empfangen werde der Leib Christi/ der für vns gegeben ist/ vnd das mit dem Wein zugegen sey/ vnd dargereicht werde zu trincken das Blut/ durch welches vergissen/ das newe Testament bestetiget vnd bekreffiget ist.⁵⁶

The "wenn" of this statement contains the problem to which Chemnitz devotes a major part of his work. The *status* of the hermeneutical issue Chemnitz expresses by the same phrases he stated the dogmatical issue, and as a case of either/or.

So stehet nun der gantze handel darauff. . . ob man die wort verstehen sol/ wie sie lauten/ oder ob man denselbigen/ einen andern verstandt/ denn sie lauten/ das ist der *Status*, darauff alle Argumenta *in probatione et refutatione*, müssen gerichtet werden.⁵⁷

⁵⁶Ibid., 99-100.

⁵⁷Ibid., 103-104.

From the fact that Chemnitz offers the hermeneutical *status* after the dogmatical *status*, one may assume that the dogmatical issue finds its solution in or through the hermeneutical. The last part of our last quotation confirms this assumption. All arguments pro and contra should concentrate on this issue. This is certainly also the reason why Chemnitz is so serious about the hermeneutical questions.

Basic Rules of Interpretation in Articles of Faith

Just as all articles of faith are based on their *sedes doctrinae*, so there are also a number of general "rules" which need to be observed in the interpretation of these passages. In the beginning of his discussion Chemnitz refers to the fact that the many works of "our men, especially Dr. Luther's of blessed memory" had fully dealt with these issues.⁵⁸ Just as Luther, and particularly Melanchthon before him, Chemnitz had little regard for innovations. He claims no originality. His purpose is only to summarize "die fürnemsten gründe/ daraus die Argumanta genommen werden/ in etliche gewisse Hauptstücke/ . . ."⁵⁹ However, in marked difference from most of the other chapters Chemnitz here does not quote Luther. The main outline of his arguments clearly follows Melanchthon's hermeneutics which he quotes at length.

⁵⁸Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 104-105.

⁵⁹Ibid., 105.

But also the Swiss theologians made use of Melanchthon's hermeneutics.⁶⁰ One of his hermeneutical rules which was related to our issue Melanchthon formulated in these words:

Frequentissime in foro, et in ecclesiis, questiones sunt, scripti et voluntatis, quae oriuntur ex scripti obscuritate, aut ambiguitate. Graeci vocant hunc statum *rhetou kai dianoias* . . . Tunc autem voluntas quaeritur, quando *rheton* est, aut obscurum, aut absurdum.⁶¹

Melanchthon's point is that there are texts where we by adhering to the literal meaning obscure the meaning rather than explain it.⁶² According to the Swiss this is the case in the Words of Institution. In order to retain the text, they follow Melanchthon's next step: "Nos addimus interpretationem, ut sententiam retineamus . . ." ⁶³ The authors of the Confutatio succinctly captured the view of the Swiss thus: "In doctrina coelesti, ubi *to rheton* parit absurditates, confugiendum ad *dianoian*."⁶⁴ This "rule" the Sacramentarians applied to the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. According to Melanchthon, however, there are definite limitations on this "rule," and the Swiss do not observe them. Shortly stated: Only if

⁶⁰For the following cf., Mahlmann, Das neue Dogma der lutherischen Christologie, 19-24.

⁶¹Philipp Melanchthon, Elementa rhetorices (1542), CR 13, 442; cf., Mahlmann, Das neue Dogma der lutherischen Christologie, 19.

⁶²Ibid.

⁶³Melanchthon, Elementa rhetorices (1542); CR 13, 442. Mahlmann, Das neue Dogma der lutherischen Christologie, 20.

⁶⁴Confutatio (1559), bl. 27b; quoted from Mahlmann, Das neue Dogma der lutherischen Christologie, 19.

faith comes into conflict with itself, and not on account of a contradiction from natural reason, is there a legitimate reason to depart from the literal sense of the words.⁶⁵ This is the background on which Chemnitz' discussion of rule of interpretation must be understood.

Chemnitz' view of Scripture and its interpretation is fundamental for his way of handling this whole issue. Not only the doctrine but also the hermeneutical principles, or the "rules" for the interpretation, must be firmly based in Scripture itself. In 2 Peter 1:20-21 Chemnitz finds a basic biblical rule of interpretation laid down. He regularly refers to it as *Regula Petri*. Chemnitz starts his examination of the "rules" of interpretation by stating the issue negatively. God has by no means granted us the license of "privata interpretatio" of those passages of Scripture in which

. . . die Heuptstücke/ was Gott von seinem wesen vnd willen geoffenbaret hat/ gegründet sein/ ein jeder seins gefallens müge umbgehen/ dieselbige zu deuten/ keren vnd wenden/ wie es einem jeden gutdüncket. Denn Petrus saget in der 2. am 1. Capit. Das die auslegung der Schrifft/ nicht solle aus eingem Menschlichen willen herfür gebracht werden.⁶⁶

⁶⁵Melanchthon, Elementa rhetorices (1542); CR 13, 442. Cf., Mahlmann, Das neue Dogma der lutherischen Christologie, 20. Even if not so succinctly stated, the same "rule" is expressed also in Chemnitz' lengthy quotation from Melanchthon's Sententiae Veterum (1530) in Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 127-129.

⁶⁶Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 107.

This is not only the counterpart of the argument that the Holy Spirit has reserved the interpretation for Himself.⁶⁷ Chemnitz is very concerned about man's natural inclination to depart from the true meaning of Scripture.⁶⁸ Beyond what Scripture says to the issue, Chemnitz draws arguments from the doctrine of our original or inborn sinful nature.

Denn dieweil die verderbte Menschliche natur/ von art dazu geneiget ist/ das sie lust hat/ Gottes wort/ mit klugen weisen worten/ auff ihr gutdüncken zu drehen keren und wenden/ kan man ihr zu der leichtfertigkeit bald helffen/ wenn man fürgibt/ das mans wol könne und möge ohn verletzung des glaubens/ und nachtheil der seligkeit/ sonst oder so disputieren/ handeln und deuten.

Derhalben ist für alle dingen von nöten/ das man im diesem Handel/ von des HERren Abendmal/ erst und letzt aus warhafftigen beständigen grunde der schrift/ solche leichtfertige gedancken ausschlahe⁶⁹

Chemnitz is here dealing with general rules of interpretation. He cannot, therefore, be accused of breaking the very rules he has set down, by bringing in passages outside the *sedes doctrinae*. At least according to his view, and also that of

⁶⁷Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 148; cf., the next two quotations, 142-143. This is a basic conviction which Chemnitz repeats over and over again throuhout his discussion of the hermeneutic principles and the *Verba*. Cf. *Ibid.*, 107 (ch. heading), 146-147, 149, 154, 164, 171, 176-177, 186-187, et al. At the end of his discussion of the *Verba* Chemnitz writes: "[Ich] dancke von gantzem Hertzen/ dem Son Gottes . . . für solche schöne liebliche erlkerung/ die er vnd durch den heiligen Geist/ nicht auff eine/ sondern auff vnterschiedliche zeit/ in den *repetitionen* vnd widerholungen der einsetzung/ so gantz einfeltig/ gründtlich vnd gewiss gegeben hat." (*Ibid.*, 199)

⁶⁸*Ibid.*, 143.

⁶⁹*Ibid.*, 18; cf. his quotations from Chrysostom and Augustine, *ibid.*, 142-143.

the Lutheran Reformers before him, the doctrine of original sin was highly relevant for the question of the interpretation of Scripture.

When he has finished his first and most important part of the analysis of the general "rules", Chemnitz positively states his position thus:

Die bisher erzelte Argument/ sind gute starke gewisse/ beständige gründe/ genommen aus der form/ regel vnd weise/ welche der heilige Geist selbst fürgeschrieben hat zu halten/ in auslegung der Schrifft vnd Sprüche/ darinn die Lehr/ von Gottes wesen vnd seinem willen gegründet ist.⁷⁰

This belief Chemnitz repeats in different words throughout his discussion of the hermeneutical questions. In short he maintains: a) the interpretation of the main articles of faith is not entrusted to man's personal judgment; b) the Holy Spirit has in Scripture laid down the "rules" for the proper interpretation, and even more; and c) the Spirit has reserved the right of interpretation for himself.⁷¹

In the chapter on the *status controversiae* we saw that in Chemnitz' eyes the decisive issue was whether the *sedes*

⁷⁰Ibid., 137. The heading of the first subdivision of Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, chapter 11, which reads thus: "Argumenta aus gewisser stetwerender Regel/ form/ art vnd weise/ so in verklerung vnd auslegung der Sprüche/ darinne die lehre von Gottes wesen vnd seinem willen/ gegründet wirdt/ durch den heiligen Geist selber/ zu halten gewaiset vnd fürgeschrieben ist" (107). Cf., above, 142, note 394.

⁷¹Ibid., 148: ". . . wie in andern heuptstücken/ also auch in dieser Lehr/ der heilige Geist ihme selbs/ die ware ausslegung vnd deutung vorbehalten."

doctrinae had to be understood literally.⁷² Now we will review the arguments he advances for this view.

The first question Chemnitz deals with is the place of reason in relation to the articles of faith. In this context he does not discuss the use of reason as a formal means for clear and logical handling of the matter under scrutiny. Rather, the issue is how to deal properly with the simple and literal meaning of the text of the *sedes doctrinae*.

We have already called attention to what Chemnitz spoke of as the natural inclination to depart from the natural meaning of the words of Scripture, particularly when they sound unusual or "hart lauten".⁷³ Now he writes:

Es ist nicht newe/ auch in diesem Handel nicht erst auffkommen/ das die vernunft mit jhrem fürwitz/ in den Sprüchen/ darinn die lehr von Gottes wesen vnd seinem willen/ gegründet ist/ grübelt/ vnd wenn sie etwa mith einem schein/ fürgeben kan/ als sey jhres bedünckens/ vnmöglich/ vngeschickt/ ungeräumt ding darinn/ so dringt sie baldt darauff/ das man wol möge abweichen/ von den klaren deutlichen worten der Schrifft/ vnd wird als denn für sonderliche grosse weissheit gehalten/ wenn jemandt den klaren worten/ mith einer klugen/ gleissenden deutung/ einen frembden verstandt/ geben . . . kan⁷⁴

Also in the believers the human reason has the inclination to evade "[die] klaren deutlichen worten" of

⁷²See above, on the *status controversiae*, 134-139.

⁷³Ibid., 143, citing Augustine, who maintains that "Es sey sehr gemein/ when die Schrifft etwas saget/ des die zuhörer nicht gewonet/ sondern jhnen frembdt ist/ das sie baldt gedencken/ es sey ein *Tropus* oder figürliche rede" (Augustine, *De doctrina Christianae*, 3.10).

⁷⁴Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 108-109.

passages on God's essence and will in order to find place for its own private interpretations. In the account of God's promise to Abraham and Abraham's repeated attempts to interpret it in a way which seemed compatible with the circumstances (Genesis 12-18), Chemnitz sees a classical example of reason's "spiel mit deuteln" and the Spirit's unmistakable warning.⁷⁵

Vnd also hat Gott/ in dem Exempel Abrahe/ welcher ist ein Vater der Gleubigen/ zu steter ewiger erinnerung/ aller nachkümplingen/ wöllen fürmalen/ wie Menschlicher fürwitz/ sich an Gottes ordnung vnd verheissung / mit mancherlei deutung versucht/ vnd weiset vns zugleich/ den rechten weg/ welchen man in gleichen fellen/ folgen sol.⁷⁶

This "right way" is the first rules which the Holy Spirit prescribes for us "in solchen schweren Hendelen"

Nemlich/ das wir in den Sprüchen/ darinn die Artickel des Glaubens gegründet sein/ nicht leichtfertig/ ohn helle/ klare/ vrsach vnd grundt/ annemen sollen/ solche auslegung/ sie scheinen/ wie guth sie wollen/ die da abweichen von den klaren worten/ wie die nach bekanter gewisser eigenschafft der Schrifft lauten.⁷⁷

We see here that Chemnitz does not exclude that figurative language may be found in the *sedes doctrinae*. Rather, he maintains that Christ himself even in the articles of faith "oftt hat fürgelegt/ mit verblümbden verborgenen figürlichen

⁷⁵Ibid., 109.

⁷⁶Ibid., 114.

⁷⁷Ibid., 109.

worten."⁷⁸ His point is that in the *sedes doctrinae* the *sensus literalis* should not be abandoned without very good reasons. What seems plausible or possible for natural reason cannot serve as a criterion in questions concerning God's essence, will, his promises and power. Even in Abraham, the father of the believers, Chemnitz points out, "So gar hart war das hertze eingenommen/ mit den gedancken/ es were nicht möglich" that it took God four repetitions to overcome these thoughts in him.⁷⁹

Chemnitz finds further support for the conclusion drawn from the example of Abraham in Christ's answer to the Sadducees on resurrection (Matthew 22) and to the Pharisees on marriage and divorce (Matthew 19), and in the case of Hymenaeus and Phyletus in 2 Timothy 2.⁸⁰ The following statement suitably concludes Chemnitz discussion on this issue:

So ist nun nach der Lehr des Sons Gottes/ dis die *analogia*, vnd rechten art der waren ausslegung die dem Glauben ehlich ist/ wenn in einem Spruch der Schrifft/ etwas von Gottes willen vnd verordnung gegründet ist/ sollen wir dauon nicht weichen/ darumb/ wens vns ungereimt düncket/ oder nicht begreifen/ wie es könne geschehen vnd zugehen.⁸¹

⁷⁸Ibid., 133. Chemnitz discusses these examples: Regeneration (John 3), living water (John 4), spiritual eating and drinking (John 6), and leaven (Matthew 16).

⁷⁹Ibid., 112.

⁸⁰Ibid., 115-121.

⁸¹Ibid., 117.

Chemnitz' use of Matthew 22 is of particular interest here, because he combines it with an argument of another category. The Pharisees did not question "die wort/ damit Gott anfänglich den Ehestandt hat eingesetzt." However, on the basis of later legislation about divorce they did advocate a more "reasonable" interpretation, which "nicht so hart/ sondern etwas glinder sey/ denn die wort der stiftung des Ehestandes/ an jhnen selbst/ eigentlich vnd stracks lauten."⁸² "Christ aber/ gibt stracks die antwort" in that

er zeucht vnd weiset/ die gantze disputation zurück/ auff die erste stiftung/ einsetzung vnd verordnung des Ehestandes/ vnd wil das man darinn suchen/ daher nemen sol/ den rechten verstandt vnd meinung/ nach welcher / auch andere Spruch sollen aussgelegt werden/ Das wil er in keinem wege zulassen/ das man der einsetzung des Ehestandes/ von jhrem eigentlichen verstandt/ auff frembde meinung ziehen sollen/ von wegen etlicher ander Sprüche/ die sich lassen ansehen/ als ob sie der ersten einsetzung zu wider/ entgegen vnd streittig sein.⁸³

This statement clearly shows that Chemnitz refuses to accept not only rational arguments in the articles of faith. In agreement with his conclusion that the *sedes doctrinae* should remain decisive, Chemnitz also refuses to allow arguments outside the *sedes* to determine their meaning. God's words in the institution of the marriage have priority over any relevant passage which may be added.⁸⁴

⁸²Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 119.

⁸³Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 120-121.

⁸⁴See below for Chemnitz' definition of a sacrament, 160-162.

Even if arguments from natural reason are dismissed, one could argue that also the *Verba*, as many other passages, must be interpreted figuratively. In his response Chemnitz first grants that Scripture no doubt contains many tropes and figure which need to be understood accordingly. That is, however, he claims, only part of the issue:

Es ist aber auch das gewiss/ das man nicht alle Sprüche der Schrifft/ von den worten auff eine andere meinung/ vnd fremde deutung ziehen muss/ den es sind viele Sprüche/ sonderlich darinn Gott von seinem wesen vnd willen offenbarung gethan/ mit klaren/ deutlichen/ verstentlichen worten/ in der Schrifft gesetzt.⁸⁵

The Scripture and the articles of faith must be guarded against arbitrary interpretation according to individual preference. If latitude as to the interpretation of such passages were granted, "so würde man leichtlich alle Artickel des Glaubens können vmbstossen, vnd würde endlich in der gantzen Schrifft/ nichts gewiss bleiben."⁸⁶ For the sake of the assurance and peace of the conscience which is most necessary in such questions, we must have "ein gewisse/ beständige Regel" according to which it can be easily determined that

in welchen Sprüchen vnd orten der Schrifft/ man durch *Tropos* vnd *Figuras*, von den worten abweichen möge/ vnd welche Sprüch man eigentlich nach den Buchstaben/ wie sie lauten/ ausslegen vnd verstehen müssen.⁸⁷

⁸⁵Ibid., 123.

⁸⁶Ibid.

⁸⁷Ibid., 123-124.

How can this be done? In his answer Chemnitz draws heavily on Melanchthon, but also on Augustine. In his Sententiae Veterum (1530), which Chemnitz quotes, Melanchthon emphasizes that there are many genres of material in Scripture.

So ist aber doch ein grosser unterschied/ wenn in der Schrifft Historien beschrieben/ oder wenn geschichte erzehlet werden/ vnd wenn Göttliche verordnung vnd stiftung beschrieben werden/ darin die Lehr von Gottes wesen/ vnd seinem willen geoffenbaret ist.⁸⁸

In the former it is easy by our reason to figure out from the circumstances whether a figurative interpretation is proper or not.⁸⁹ In the latter case, however, Melanchthon allows neither for rational arguments nor figurative interpretations. The only case where Melanchthon allows for figurative interpretation in such passages is when a literal interpretation brings faith in conflict with itself.⁹⁰ In such cases, or where the meaning is obscure for historical or grammatical reasons, Chemnitz insists that

aus denselbigen dunckelen schweren Sprüchen/ können wir/ sollen auch nicht/ sonderliche newe Artickel des Glaubens nemen/ sondern müssen sie auff solche meinung ausslegen/ welche in anderen klaren deutlichen Sprüchen gegründet ist.⁹¹

⁸⁸CR 23, 748-750; quoted from Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 127.

⁸⁹Chemnitz himself writes: "Hieher gehört auch das Argument/ das die Tropi diese eigenschafft an sich haben/ das ein jeder/ so allein ein wenig immlesen geübt/ baldt mercken kan/ das vnter den worten etwas anders verborgen ist/ denn wie sie lauten" (Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 140).

⁹⁰CR 23, 749; Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 127-128.

⁹¹Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 130.

Chemnitz here brings into play the three basic rules which Luther also advocated, namely, the clarity of the Scripture, the analogy of faith or the integrity of Scripture, and Scripture as its own interpreter. These rules apply particularly to the *sedes doctrinae* which rules provide the standard according to which difficult passages must be interpreted.

The clarity of Scripture is an axiomatic presupposition which must be accepted. How can the Scripture enlighten "unsere finstere Hertzen" if it itself is obscure and doubtful in the passages on which the articles of faith are based? Only more confusion would be produced.⁹² Only persons who lack experience "vom Geistlichen kampff des gewissen" can treat this question so lightly.⁹³ Chemnitz' leaves no doubt about his position:

Aber mith den sprüchen/ darinn die Artickel der Christlichen Lehre/ gegründet sind/ hats viel ein andere gestalt/ Denn die sprüche darinn GOtt gründlich etwas gelehret/ geboten/ verordnet/ oder verheissen hat/ von seinem wesen vnd willen/ die sein nicht dunckel/ oder zweifelhaftig/ sondern klar/ mith eigentlichen deutlichen vnd bekanten worten/ in der heiligen Schrift dargethan.⁹⁴

⁹²Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 131.

⁹³Melanchthon, CR 23, 749; quoted from Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 125-126.

⁹⁴Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 131.

To Chemnitz the *Verba* obviously belong to this category of Scripture passages.⁹⁵

This seemingly uncompromising position needs, however, some qualification. As already pointed out Christ himself often presented the articles of faith "mit verblümbden verborgenen figürlichen worten."⁹⁶ Chemnitz cites John 3 (regeneration), John 4 (water), John 6 (spiritual eating), and Matt. 16 (leaven) as examples.⁹⁷ There is, however, no real contradiction here. Chemnitz explains the matter thus: The Son of God did take particular care "das er jha nicht in den nöthigen Artickeln/ etwas ohn gewisse deutliche erklerung/ so dunckel vnd zweifelhaftig stehen liesse/ dadurch die gewissen verwirret werden".⁹⁸ Whenever the words should be understood in a figurative sense, this was explicitly explained:

So zeigt er [Christus] erstlich an/ das sie die wort nicht verstehen sollen/ wie sie lauten/ darnach gibt er jhnen die verklerung/ nicht mit ungewissem/ zweifelhaftigen/ sondern mit klaren/ deutlichen worten/ was er meine vnd verstanden wölle haben.⁹⁹

⁹⁵Ibid., 132. " Nun gehören aber on allen zweiffel vnd widerrede/ die worten des Abendmals/ nicht vnter die schwere/ dunckele sprüche/ inn welchen vngleiche deutung vnd ausslegung gestattet wirdt/ so fern die mith anderen hellen klaren sprüchen vbereins kompt/ sondern sie gehören vnter die sprüche/ darinn Gott mith klaren/ gewissen/ deutlichen worten/ verordnung von seinem willen/ gethan hat."

⁹⁶Ibid., 133.

⁹⁷See above, 146, note 404.

⁹⁸Ibid., 133.

⁹⁹Ibid., 134-135.

In the final analysis this does not change his very definitive position which is stated above. As Chemnitz understands the Scriptures, they allow for no uncertainty so far as their abiding message is concerned.

The main conclusion of his discussion so far Chemnitz summarizes thus:

Also stehet nun der grundt fest vnd gewiss/ das die sprüche der Schrifft/ darinn Gott sein wesen vnnd willen geoffenbaret hat/ entweder mit klaren deutlichen worten gesetzt sind. Oder wenn jha inn solchen sprüchen/ etwa verblümte figürliche wort stehen/ dieselbige sind als baldt in der Schrifft/ durch andere gewisse/ deutliche/ verstentliche wort erkleret.¹⁰⁰

Related to the doctrine of the Lord's Supper and the *Verba*, this mean that if there was anything that had to be interpreted as figuratively, then Christ would have stated this in unequivocal terms. Paticularly in a *new* institution like the Lord's Supper¹⁰¹ the audacity of going beyond the literal sense of the *Verba* would be equal to tempting or challenging God. The confusion of the Sacramentarians Chemnitz regarded as God's just punishment.¹⁰²

As an immediate introduction to his discussion of the *Verba* Chemnitz calls attention to the fact that they are related four times. This is not accidental. In this Chemnitz sees a particular application of the *regula Petri*. They are

¹⁰⁰Ibid., 135.

¹⁰¹Ibid., 159-163, especially, 161.

¹⁰²Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 141.

not mere parallels. But through the repetitions the true meaning is confirmed and possible ambiguities are removed.¹⁰³ Comparison of the accounts, therefore, "ist der einige ware vnd gewisse weg/ den rechten/ vngezweiffetlen verstandt/ in solchen Sprüchen zu finden."¹⁰⁴ Chemnitz maintains that when the Scripture repeats

so hat ohn zweiffel/ der heilige Geist dieselbe Lehr/ nicht wöllen eines jeden eigener deutung unterwerffen [2 Pet.1]/ sondern wie in andern heuptstücken/ also hat auch inn dieser Lehr/ der heilige Geist jhme selbs/ die ware auslegung vnd deutung vorbehalten.¹⁰⁵

Over and over again Chemnitz repeats that the four accounts which follow each other are indeed nothing but "die gewisse vnd ware auslegung des heiligen Geistes selbst" of the *Verba*.¹⁰⁶ Because they are not plagued with humane uncertainty and failure, they are the firm and immovable foundation of the doctrine of the Lord's Supper.

¹⁰³Ibid., 178-179; cf., 175.

¹⁰⁴Ibid., 142.

¹⁰⁵Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 148.

¹⁰⁶Ibid., 149-150.

CHAPTER 5

THE PURPOSE OF THE LORD'S SUPPER

In his discussions of the sacraments Martin Chemnitz always distinguishes between the two parts which constitute their essence or *substantia*; namely the outward, visible sign and the word and the promise of grace which are join to the former. Furthermore, Chemnitz distinguishes between the substance of the sacrament, on the one hand, and its use and effects, on the other hand. In relation to the *Verba*, particularly the distribution words, the promise, and the command of repetition, Chemnitz discusses the proper and beneficial use of the Lord's Supper and its improper and detrimental use.¹ In Die Reine Gesunde Lehre this distinction is the very starting point of his discussion of the whole issue.

Wir müssen notwendig in diesem handel bey der *distinction* bleiben/ welche guten grundt hat/ Nemlich/ das es ein andere frage sey/ was des HERren Abendmal sey/ nach seiner

¹In the treatises written by Chemnitz, which were included in the *corpus doctrinae* of the territories, this is stated most explicitly in the articles on the sacraments in general; cf. Kurtzer Bericht, 118 and especially Wolgegründeter Bericht, 930. In Examen II, 38-39, where the definition is most detailed, this distinction is directly stated.

substantz und wesen? Und ein andere frage/ was die krafft/
wirckung/ nutz und fruckt des Abendmal sey?²

When the issue is what the Lord's Supper is; that is, what its substance or essence is, then questions about the benefits, and so forth, are other issues which have to remain outside or removed from the discussion.³ As we will see, the case is different with the purpose, gifts, and fruits of the sacrament. These cannot be understood apart from the substance. The purpose of the Lord's Supper is related especially to the words of promise in the Words of Institution, which point to the gifts.

In all the treatises Chemnitz later wrote for territorial *corpora doctrinae* as well in Examen II and Enchiridion, Chemnitz includes a chapter which deals with the sacraments in general. There he offers definitions which spell out what the sacraments are. These definitions contain summary statements concerning the purpose of the sacraments. However, in his major treatises on the Lord's Supper, Die Reine Gesunde Lehre (1561), and its later revision Fundamenta sanae (1570),

²Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 1; cf., Wolgegründeter Bericht, 948, where Chemnitz concludes his discussion with a statement which reminds us of the one cited above. Actually in both cases he cites Augustine for this distinction. The Lord's Supper, 38: "These two points, dealt with separately in the words of institution, must not be confused . . . we make a proper distinction between the substance of the Lord's Supper and its power and purpose."

³Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 96-98.

Chemnitz does not have any section in which he treats the sacraments in general.⁴

In accordance with his principle that the *sedes doctrinae* are the supreme source and norm for any article of faith, Chemnitz actually refuses to treat the doctrine of the Lord's Supper from or on the basis of a comparison with other sacraments or from a superior, preconceived concept of sacrament *in genere*; that is, based on "systematische Vorentscheidungen."⁵ As usual Chemnitz is judicious. "Das ein vergleichung sey/ zwischen den Sacramenten/ beide Altes vnd Neues Testamentes/ fechten wir nicht."⁶ The *sedes*, however, holds the definitive position.

Dann dieser Regel soll/ vnd muss steth vnd fest gehalten werden/ das man von den Sacramenten vrteilen soll/ auss eines jeden eigener sonderlicher einsetzung/ also/ das man auch aus der einsetzung nemen/ vnd nach der selbigen messigen muss/ wie weit vnd fern sich die vergleichung strecke.⁷

Only when the distinctive features of each of the sacraments are considered properly and are clearly brought out from their

⁴In both books the issue is discussed in a subchapter when the arguments of the opponent are refuted; Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 366-374; The Lord's Supper, 256-262.

⁵Frank-Georg Gozdek, "Der Beitrag des Martin Chemnitz zur Lutherischen Abendmahlslehre," in Der zweite Martin der lutherischen Kirche. Festschrift zum 400. Todestag von Martin Chemnitz, ed. W. A. Junke (Braunschweig: Ev.luth. Stadtkirchenverband und Propstei, 1986.), 14; cf., Helmut Gollwitzer, Coena Domini (Munich: Chr. Keiser, 1937; rep. 1988), 3-4.

⁶Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 367-368.

⁷Ibid., 368.

own *sedes*, can a concept of sacrament *in genere* be established.⁸ This applies also to the purpose of the Lord's Supper.

Chemnitz does not offer a detailed definition of the Lord's Supper in Die Reine Gesunde Lehre. Neither does he treat the purpose of the Supper separately.⁹ This does not mean, however, that it is not clearly stated. Below we will focus on the gifts and the proper use of the Lord's Supper primarily on the basis of chapters on the benefits and the three kinds of eating in Die Reine Gesunde Lehre. There we find that statements which pertain to the purpose and intended use often appear in the discussion. Not surprisingly, this indicates that there is a direct correlation between the benefits received through a proper use and the purpose for which this sacrament once was instituted. Our analysis of the chapter on the benefits, fruits, and comfort of the Lord's Supper will, therefore, serve as corroboration and further illustration. So far as Die Reine Gesunde Lehre is concerned, here we will confine ourselves to some comment on the following comprehensive statement:

Denn so wir warhafftig gleuben/ das JHesus CHristus der Son GÖttes/ in solcher handlung zugegen sey/ auff ein sonderliche gnedige weiss/ seiner gegenwertigkeit/ also das daselbst/ warhafftig vnd wesentlich/ seinen Leib/ vnd sein Blut/ reichet vnd gibet/ zu essen vnd zu trincken/

⁸See also The Lord's Supper, 257, 260, 261, where Chemnitz works this out most clearly.

⁹The same applies to the The Lord's Supper.

damit vnd dadurch er sich mit vns also wil vereinigen/ das er einem jeden/ der es mith Glauben empfehet/ zu eigen gebe und *applicire*, die geschenck vnd gaben des newen Testaments/ so er mit dargebung seines Leibes / vnd vergiessung seines Blutes/ erworben hat.¹⁰

Christ's purpose with the Supper is expressed in two points in the latter part of the passage. Through the distribution of his body and blood to eat and drink Christ, first of all, wants to apply and bestow upon the believers all that which He accomplished through his sacrificial death, that it may be their own. Further, implied in this, but often as above stated separately Christ, in the second place, wants to unite himself with everyone who receive the sacrament in the intended way; that is, by eating and drinking in faith. In addition to these two points one should also observe, as the third point, the verbs Chemnitz uses to express the purpose of the Supper: to awaken, uphold, strengthen, and make the faith grow; to apply, confirm, and seal the promise, forgiveness, benefits, and merits of Christ to the believers.¹¹ Finally, Chemnitz emphasizes in a fourth point that the Lord's Supper is instituted to impart the gift of salvation not only to man's "spirit", but also to his body.¹²

¹⁰Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 284.

¹¹Cf., below, 264-268, on the Lord's Supper and repentance.

¹²Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 44, 47-49, 62-64. Cf., below, 163-165, 185-192, and 223-242, where this question is discussed more in detail.

In summary, in Die Reine Gesunde Lehre the purpose of the Lord's Supper is to give and apply the entire gift of God's grace, Christ and all the benefits acquired through his death on the cross, to the whole man, and to confirm and seal the promise in the faith of the communicants.

In Wolgegründeter Bericht (1575) there is no explicit statement of the purpose in the chapter "Vom Abendmahl des HErrn". However, in the following statement on "the precious comfort" we have in the Supper is the purpose of the Lord's Supper also clearly expressed.

Weil wir in unser Schwachheit mit unserem sündigen Fleisch also beschweret und beladen sind/ daß wir uns nicht vermögen über alle Himmel zu erheben/ daß Christus derwegen zu uns kommt/ und sich mit uns vereiniget/ und also uns zu sich erhebe/und demnach unseren Glauben mit dem herzlichen theuren Pfande seines Leibes und Bluts bestätige/ daß er uns warhaftig und gewiß schencke/ zueigne und verziegle alles dasjenige/ daß er mit Aufopfferung seines Leibes/ und mit Vergießung seines Bluts erworben hat/ und daß er gewiß in uns wolle wohnen/ und uns zu seinen Gliedermassen machen/ und alles in uns wircken/ was zu unser Seligkeit nöhtig ist/ weil er sich mit seinem theuren Leib und Blut mit uns aufs nechste vereiniget/ und spricht: Nimm/ iß und trinck/ das ist mein Leib/ das ist mein Blut.¹³

A very characteristic feature of Chemnitz' doctrine of the Lord's Supper, even as it is presented in his Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, stands forth here. The need of man, Christ incarnation,¹⁴ his work of salvation, and the act and purpose of this sacrament are joined together to a whole. In the

¹³Wolgegründeter Bericht, 945-946. Underlining added.

¹⁴In the quotation the Incarnation is expressed in the phrase "sich mit uns vereiniget." Cf., Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 183-185.

Verba the words "body" and "blood" are determined by the phrases "given for you" and "poured out for many." According to Chemnitz, this refers directly to Christ's sacrificial death.¹⁵ The Lord's Supper is, therefore, first and foremost a means to convey the merits and benefits of Christ's atonement.¹⁶

In all the works of Martin Chemnitz on the Lord's Supper the emphasis is without doubt on the true and substantial presence of the true body and blood of Christ, which was conceived of the Virgin Mary and offered up for us in the death on the cross, in the Supper or in, with, and under the elements.¹⁷ However, in these external elements of bread and wine as through means the communicants receive with their mouth the true body and blood; that is, the body and blood of our Redeemer, which were offered up for us in his substitutionary death on the cross. This is strongly emphasized by Chemnitz.

¹⁵Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 166-168, 180, 185-186.

¹⁶Wolgegrüedeter Bericht, 941. "Christus selbst in diesem seinen Abendmahl trägt und für/ reichet und gibet uns seinen Leib und Blut mit allem seinem Verdienst und Wolthaten." "Der Glaube dis feste Vertrauen fasset/ das ihm Christus durch und mit slocher Darreichung und Empfahungzueigne/ übergebe und versiegele seine Gnade und Wolthaten/ so er mit aufopfferung seines leibes und Vergiessung seines Blutserworben und verdienet hat." (Ibid., 947). The words "Gnade", "Verdienst," and "Wolthaten" refers to what (1) Christ aquired through his sacrificial death on the cross; (2) and this he has done for us.

¹⁷Ibid., 940.

Kurtzer Bericht states in the opening paragraph of the article on the Lord's Supper that this is the express purpose of this sacrament:

Zum gedechtnus des einigen versönopfers, so einmal am kreutz verrichtet, hat Christus eingesetzt . . . sein heiliges abendmal, in welchem seiner gedacht und sein todt verkündiget soll werden, bis er wieder wird kommen, zu richten die lebendigen und todten. Und dasselbige hat er eingesetzt in der nacht, do er verrathen ward, gleichwie sein testament, darin er seine güter und himlische schetze, so er durch aufopferung seines leibes und durch vergiessung seines bluts erworben, seinen jungen bescheidet, also das er dieselbige allen gleubigen reichen, zueignen, vergewissen und versigeln will, darmit das er uns in seinem abendmal zu essen gibt mit dem eusserlichem brodt denselbigen seinen leib der für uns gegeben ist, und mit dem eusserlichem wein zu trinken eben dasselbige blutt, das für uns zur vergebung der sünden am kreutz vergossen ist. ¹⁸

From this we can conclude that with all the emphasis on the Real Presence of Christ's true body and blood in the Supper the purpose of the Lord's Supper is not this Real Presence as isolated in itself. Its purpose must be sought in the use for which it was instituted; namely, that "er seine güter . . . durch . . . seines bluts erworben, seinen jungen bescheidet . . . zur vergebung der sünden." In short:

The Sacraments were instituted by Christ for this purpose and use that through them as outward means and visible testimonies He wants to apply, give, confirm, and seal individually to those who use them in true faith . . . ¹⁹

all his grace, the merits and benefits of his vicarious atoning death on the cross.

¹⁸Kurtzer Bericht, 128.

¹⁹Enchiridion, 109, q. 215.

In the chapter "Von den Sacramenten ingemein" in Wolgegründeter Bericht Chemnitz states the purpose explicitly in his definition of a sacrament. Directly joined to the promise of grace in the second part of the definition of the substance of a sacrament we read:

Zum andern/ die gnädige Verheissung des Evangelii/ von Gottes gnade/ und Vergebung der Sünden um des HERRN Christi willen/ so durch Gottes Stimme dem Sacrament anghenget/ daß dadurch einen jeden insonderheit für sich/ so er mit wahren Glauben daselbige Sacrament gebrauchet/ dieselbe Gnade fürgetragen/ gereicht/ zugeeignet/ und verzigtelt werde.²⁰

The Formula of Concord contains only two passages which speak expressly of the purpose of the Supper. After the *status* and a long section on the earlier confessions and quotations from Luther we read that

Jesus Christ, selected his words with great deliberation and care . . . instituting this most venerable sacrament, . . . which was to be an abiding memorial of his bitter passion and death and of all his blessings, a seal of the new covenant, a comfort of all sorrowing hearts, and a true bond and union of Christians with Christ their head and with one another.²¹

²⁰Wolgegründeter Bericht, 930. The definition of a sacrament in the Enchiridion, written eight years after Die Reine Gesunde Lehre and six years before Wolgegründeter Bericht, may serve as a suitable summary of Chemnitz' view of the purpose of the Lord's Supper throughout the period: ". . . the Sacraments were instituted by Christ for this purpose and use, that through them as outward means and visible testimonies He wants to set forth, apply, give, confirm, and seal individually to those who use them in true faith, the promise of grace which is at other times proclaimed and offered in the Gospel to all in general."

²¹Book of Concord, FC, SD, 44, 577.

The other passage underlines that the Lord's Supper was ordained primarily for "timid and perturbed Christians, weak in faith" who "consider themselves unworthy of this noble treasure and the benefits of Christ" and "perceive their weakness in faith", but heartily want to serve God in faith and obedience. "This most venerable sacrament was instituted and ordained primarily for communicants like this."²² This is an accent which corresponds very well to a recurring theme in Die Reine Gesunde Lehre.²³

The same concern is negatively expressed when Chemnitz definitely confirms that *extra usum* there is no sacrament at all.²⁴ The purpose is to be found in the use for which it was instituted. As we have seen, everything that pertains to the Lord's Supper, its use included, must be based directly on the *Verba*. No part which the the *Verba* includes, can therefore legitimately be omitted. The whole is a unit.²⁵ In conformity with this, the method of the papalists, which opens the way for logical deductions and consequences from the Real Presence, such as transubstantiation, is rejected together with

²²Ibid., FC, SD, 69-70, 582.

²³Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, e. g. 55-56; 282-283, 288-289.

²⁴Ibid., 282-283; Wolgegründeter Bericht, 941: "Dagegen haben und halten wir die Regel/ welche recht und nützlich ist/ dass nemlich Brodt und Wein nicht ein Sacrament machen noch seyn ausser und ohne den Brauch der Niessung/ welchen Christus selbst eingesetzt und befohlen hat."

²⁵Enchiridion, 121, q. 251.

such abuses as processions, and so forth, which have arisen from this.²⁶ The use of the Lord's Supper must be restricted to that for which it was instituted. This use is succinctly formulated by Luther in the Small Catechism: ". . . given to us Christians to eat and to drink."²⁷

Related to the question of the purpose of the Lord's Supper is the question whether, when compared with the other means of grace and especially the proclamation of the Word, there is a particular *proprium* to this Sacrament. This issue also will be clarified through the subsequent discussion of the benefits and the different kinds of eating. A short survey of the main points may be in place already here.

As far as the substance of the Lord's Supper is concerned, the answer is quite obvious. The *proprium* is the Real Presence of the true body and blood of Christ in, with, and under the external means of bread and wine. As for the use, the *proprium* is the eating and drinking. The question which

²⁶Wolgegründeter Bericht, 941. Chemnitz says this about *sub una*: "Wir urtheilen von diesem grossen Geheimnisse nicht darnach/ was man hierin fölgern/ oder eins aus dem andern schliessen möge/ sondern wie Christus selbst davon lehret und berichtet/ in seiner Stifftung und Einsetzung." This applies to the carrying around of the consecrated the host: "also auch/ da im Pabstthum das gesegnete Brodt vom Altar hinweg getragen/ beygelegt/ ins Sacramenthäuslein eingesperret/ in der Monstrantz umgetragen und gewiesen wird". Then he cites the rule that outside the use there is no sacrament. Cf., Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 282, where Chemnitz sharply denounces this traffic with the "bread" outside communion and names it "Abgötterey und Gotteslesterung."

²⁷Book of Concord, SC, 2, 351; Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 13.

concern us here is whether Chemnitz claims a *proprium* for the Supper relative to its gifts and the purpose.

First, according to Chemnitz, there is no special sacramental grace. "Das neue Testament" comprises the whole gift or all the gifts of salvation, "vergebung der Sünden/ Gottes gnade/ die Kindtschafft/ Seligkeit/ vnd das ewige Leben."²⁸ These gifts are bestowed to those who use the Sacrament in a true faith. However, "Diese Gaben werden in der Predigt des Euvangelij/ allen in gemein fürgetragen vnd angeboten."²⁹ Secondly, Chemnitz asserted that grace is bestowed in a "sonderliche weise" in the Lord's Supper.³⁰ There are three features that make the Lord's Supper stand out especially over against the Word. First, the Supper applies God's grace not to "allen in gemein" but to each individual separately.³¹ Secondly, in our weakness and infirmities it is difficult for us to cling to the naked word.³² Christ, therefore, ordained his body and blood in the external means of bread and wine as "das aller krefftigste *antidotum* vnd Seelen trost . . . wider

²⁸Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 58.

²⁹Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 58.

³⁰Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 47, 354.

³¹Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 58: "In diesen Abendmal aber/ spricht der Son Gottes/ zu einem jeden in sonderheit . . . bezeuget derhalben Christus/ Er schencke/ applicire vnd eigene dir zu/ für dein person in sonderheit/ alle seine woltathen/ so er durch vergiessung seines Bluts erworben hat." This *proprium* also applies to Baptism.

³²Wolgegründeter Bericht, 932-933.

alle anfechtungen," etc.³³ Thirdly, since the grace of God also relates to our body, Christ has ordained his life-giving body (and blood) as the appropriate means to communicate eternal life also to our bodies.³⁴ All these point we will come across below. The last point, however, needs to be considered with special care since here alone a particular "work" is assign to the Lord's Supper.

³³Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 57; Cf., *ibid.*, 55-57, and 60-61.

³⁴Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 62; cf., *ibid.*, 44, 48-49, 64. In The Lord's Supper the question is dealt with in the chapter: "Arguments from the testimonies of the ancient church" (163-171). We will come back to this question when we treat the benefits more in detail. The problem which arises here is whether it is possible on the basis of the Scripture to claim that the Word only communi-cates with "den hertzen/ Geist oder Seelen" through faith, while our body "auff keine andere weise/ zu der unverweslichkeit vnd dem leben gebracht werden" than through Christ's body in the Supper. (Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 64) One may also ask whether God's grace, when it is received, can be divided and limited to a part of man.

CHAPTER 6

THE GIFT AND THE BENEFITS OF THE LORD'S SUPPER

We have seen that Christ instituted the Lord's Supper in order to convey to us all the benefits which he won for us through his death, summed up in the forgiveness of sin. There is a duality in the way Chemnitz deals with this issue. On the one hand he can say that "concerning this aspect of the doctrine there is no particular controversy at this time" in our churches.¹ The constantly recurring formula when Chemnitz deals with this issue, is the "nutz frucht vnd trost." Often "nutz" or "nutzbarkeit" are use alone. On the other hand, as Luther once complained about the the article of the Lord's Supper in Melanchthon's and Bucer's church order for Cologne, "es treibt viel lang geschwetz von nütz, frucht und ehre des Sacraments,"² so does Chemnitz now over the Zwinglians, who "schreien viel dauon/ was für nutz/ frucht vnd trost/ das

¹The Lord's Supper, 185. In Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 96-97, Chemnitz emphasizes that the issue is not whether spiritual eating in faith is necessary, nor what the benefits and comfort are. It must, however, be said that in Chemnitz both these issues are directly related to the most disputed question, namely, the Real Presence of the true body and blood of Christ in the external elements of the Supper.

²WA/Br 10, 618; cf., above. 103.

Hertz von dem Geistlichen essen habe/ vnd das ohn rechten/
waren glauben/ solch nicht geschehen könne."³

In this and the following chapter we will examine how Chemnitz speaks about these issues. His reason for going into the benefits is twofold. First, he wants to refute the Sacramentarians who criticize the Lutherans for showing little interest in the benefits and fruits of the Supper. Secondly, there is a very practical reason to focus on the benefits: Chemnitz wants to incite appreciation and a frequent use of the Lord's Supper among the people. This cannot be accomplished by force, but only by helping them to see their own need and the salutary benefits of the Supper.

Und dis ist gantz nütz unnd hoch von nöten / das man diese Lehre/ mit fleis wol betrachte/ und alle zeit für augen habe/ denn so wird der gantze handel richtiger und besser verstanden/ und wenn wir die gedancken dahin richten/ so werden wir den rechten verstandt und glauben vom Abendmal desto lieber haben/ und mit grösserem ernst darüber halten.⁴

It ought to be emphasized that this second point is no isolated issue in Chemnitz presentation of the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. We have already called attention to the pastoral and practical note that is a hallmark of Chemnitz' theology. His theology is a theology for the faith and life of the church and its people. In harmony with his concern for

³Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 96; cf., 51.

⁴Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 53; cf., Kurtzer Bericht, 129; Enchiridion, 128, q. 273; Examen II, 232, pt. 1.

the needs of the people in Chemnitz this feature comes to the fore over and over again throughout his discussions.

The Body and Blood as the Gift of the Lord's Supper

In our review of Melanchthon's early doctrine of the Lord's Supper we saw that he diverged from Luther on the question of what was the *res sacramenti*. Luther increasingly emphasized the body and blood of Christ as the main gift, the *res*. To Melanchthon the word of promise was the "Hauptgabe", while the body and the blood were "Beigabe."⁵ We will now examine what is Chemnitz' position on this issue.

Above we have seen how carefully Chemnitz defined the *status controversiae*. The following part of the definition of the *status* relates directly to our present issue:

Es ist ohn alle widerrede gewiss vnd klar im Abendmal des Herren/ ist etwas fürhanden/ dasselbige reicht vnd gibt vns CHristus der Son Gottes/ durch die handt des Dieners/ vnd befiehet das wirs sollen entpfangen vnd nemen. Vnd da er spricht/ Esset/ trincket/ zeigt vnd beschreibt er die weise/ wie wirs nemen vnd entpfangen sollen/ Nemlich das wirs mit dem Munde entpfangen sollen.⁶

The question is whether that which is given and received is only bread and wine or is something more. Chemnitz answer is unequivocal. That which is "reicht vnd aussgetheilet" is the same body which once "für euch gegeben" in death on the cross.⁷

⁵See above, 96-97.

⁶Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 97-98.

⁷Ibid., 99.

Our first observation is that Chemnitz not infrequently substitutes "geben" for "reichen" and " austheilen".⁸ Even though the point cannot be pressed, his choice of verb seems to indicate that the body and blood of Christ, dispensed through the hand of the servant and received with the mouth, may be named "gift." In Die Reine Gesunde Lehre Chemnitz does not use the noun "gift" very often, and he scarcely uses it with explicit reference to Christ's body and blood. We will review some passages which clarify how Chemnitz thinks about the "gift" of the true body and blood of Christ and the benefits.

In the first part of the chapter on the benefits Chemnitz maintains that the *Verba* comprise "die gantze Lahr/ nicht allein von der gegenwertigkeit des leibs vnnnd bluts Christi/ sondern auch von der frucht vnd nutzbarkeit/ derselbigen gegenwertigkeit."⁹ The last sentence expresses both a distinction and a connection. The benefits are not identified with body and blood. But neither can the benefits of the Supper be retained without the presence of Christ's true body and the blood. Before we analyzes Chemnitz' presentation of the benefits of the Lord's Supper, we will attempt to clarify how he perceives the relation between Christ body and blood in the Supper and the benefits. A passage in his discussion

⁸Ibid., 42, 47, 57, 284.

⁹Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 54; cf., 50-51. The Latin version uses a plain genitive (Repetitio, 46).

of the three kinds of eating illustrates this well. Commenting on spiritual eating in the Supper Chemnitz writes:

Im Abendmal aber/ geschich das geistliche essen/ auff diese sonderliche weise . . . das da der Mundt nicht empfindet noch vernimpt/ das er etwas anders mehr/ denn Brodt vnd Wein empfangen/ so ergreiff doch das Hertz durch den Glauben/ aus GOTTES Wort/ den trost/ das Christus durch solche aussteilung seines Leibs vnd Bluts/ allen denen/ so es im Sacrament/ mith Glauben empfangen/ givet/ schencket/ vnd zueignet/ alle seine verdienst vnd wolthaten/ denn der Glaube lernet . . . auss . . . der einsetzung . . . diese höchste wolthat des Son GOTTEs/ das er sich nicht allein mith seinem Geist/ sonder auch noch darüber/ mith warhafftiger Ausstheilung . . . seines thewrbaren Leibs vnd Blutes/ auffs genaweste vnd feste zu vns thut/ vnd in vns sein wil . . . vnd also/ das aller gewisseste pfandt unser seligkeit haben/ das auch unsere arme nichtige Körperlin/ in die Gemeinschaft der hohen Himlischen güter angenommen werden.¹⁰

The following very typical features of this text ought to be noticed: First, Christ himself is the acting agent in the Supper. Sometimes phrases as "durch die Hand des Dieners" are added. But always Christ is perceived as the host and doer of the act.¹¹ Secondly, the distribution of Christ's body and blood is the means, or instrument, through which Christ gives and appropriates the merits and benefits to those who receive this Sacrament in faith. Thirdly, the true body and blood of Christ are acknowledged as a most sure pledge and surety of the gifts of salvation. The technical terms are "Pfandt" and

¹⁰Ibid., 47-48.

¹¹See quotation above, 169; cf., *ibid.*, 57, 58, 59, 284, 286-287; Wolgegründete Bericht, 941; Enchiridion, 109, q. 215 and 216; 126, q. 265; 129, q. 274, pt. II; Kurtzer Bericht, 130.

"Sigill", often used together.¹² While examining the "New Testament" Chemnitz by means of a rhetorical question asserts:

Vund was künthe doch für ein gewisser/ oder threwer Sigill vnd Pfandt sein/ das Christus mith allem seinem verdienst/ dir warhafftig vun gewiss/ applicieret vnd dein eigen sey/ denn das ereben dasselbige Blut/ damit das neue Testament versiegelt vndd bekrefftigt ist/ warhafftig vnd wesentlich gegenwertig die vnd mir zu empfaen darreicht.¹³

To be noted is that it is not the external elements of bread and wine, which are "Pfandt und Sigill", but the body and blood.¹⁴ Fourthly, Chemnitz uses the terms "gift(s)," "benefits," and "merits" of Christ to describe that which is acquired through his death on the cross. However, the body and blood received in the Supper are the very same body and blood through which Christ on the cross achieved these "gifts." For this reason is the presence of Christ's true body and blood "Sigill vnd Pfandt" that Christ with all his merits "dir

¹²Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, e.g. 59, 61.

¹³Ibid., 59.

¹⁴Ibid., 61: "Die hohe pfandt vnd sigel/ des gegenwertigen Leibs vnd Bluts Christi/ setzen wir gegen alle anfechtungen vnd zweiffel." Chemnitz occasionally uses the word "Zeichen", but almost exclusively in connection with negations. It is not mere signs, or signs of the absent body, but the sign of the true blood and blood which is present in the elements. Because the Holy Spirit in the Gospel of Luke to the distribution words: "This is my body," added: "which is given for you," Chemnitz asserts: "So ist jha trawn nicht ein zeichen / des abwesenden Leibs/ für vns gegeben/ Auch nicht die krafft oder wirckung des abwesenden Leibs/ sondern . . . der Leib des Fleisches Christi/ das ist/ die substanz vnd dasselbe wesen/ so vom heiligen Geist entpfangen/ vnd aus der Jungfrawen Maria geboren ist" (Ibid., 185). This "erklerung vnd ausslegung [ist] so hell vnd klar/ das es nicht deutlicher gegeben kündt werden" (Ibid.). Cf., Anatome, E iii v-E iii r.

warhafftig vnd gewiss/ appliciret vnd eigen sey."¹⁵ Finally, even though Christ is the one who applies and bestows the gifts, Chemnitz usually employs the terms "gifts," "benefits," and "merits" of Christ when they given to and received by the believer.

Chemnitz' main concern throughout the chapter on the benefits appears clearly in his conclusion. "Vnd hieraus ist nun offenbar/ welchen schatz vns die rauben/ welche die ware gegenwertigkeit/ des leibes vnd bluts Christi aus dem Abendmal verwerffen."¹⁶ The body and blood of Christ are the treasure which comprises and brings the benefits of the New Testament. To bring out the tight connection between Christ, his body and blood in the Supper, and the salutary gifts Chemnitz quotes the "schöne güldene Ketten" of Luther:

Die wort Christi fassen das Brot vnd den Kelch zum Sacrament/ Brot vnd Becker/ fassen den Leib und Blut Christi/ leib vnd blut Christi/ fassen das neue Testament/ das neue Testament fasset vergebung der Sünden/ vergebung der Sünden fassen das ewige leben vnd seligkeit.¹⁷

The benefits of the Lord's supper, therefore, are the benefits of and from the true body and blood in the Supper. The giving of his body and blood for our salvation and the distribution of them in the Supper are the "unmessliche

¹⁵Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 59.

¹⁶Ibid., 67; cf., 206, quoted below, 274.

¹⁷Ibid., 188.

wolthaten des Son Gottes."¹⁸ Therefore in Anatome Chemnitz can name the true body and blood "das heuptgut selbst" in the Lord's Supper.¹⁹

There should be little doubt that Chemnitz in this issue strives to retain and uphold the same doctrine as Luther. On the other hand, whether Chemnitz realized it or not, his position differs sharply from that of Melanchthon, which he, as we have seen, interpreted as positively as possible.²⁰

The Benefits of the Real presence

Scripture does not, however, speak about the benefits and fruits of the Lord's Supper only in general. There they are spelled out in detail. In keeping with his principles Chemnitz starts his discussion by bringing it back to proper starting point:

Nun ist die der einfeltigest und aller gewisseste weg in dieser Lehr/ das wir uns halten an die wort der einsetzung/ denn dieselbigen begreifen die gantze Lahr/ nicht allein von der gegenwertigkeit des Leibs und Bluts Christi/ sondern auch von der frucht und nutzbarkeit/ derselbigen gegenwertigkeit.²¹

The last words of this quotation express both the close connection and the necessary distinction between the Real Presence of the body and blood and the benefits. The latter

¹⁸Ibid., 286.

¹⁹Anatome, J vii v.

²⁰See above, 64-66.

²¹Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 53.

are drawn from the former.²² Therefore, as already pointed out, the benefits depend on the true Real Presence, but they cannot be identified with Christ's body and blood. Therefore, the benefits must be distinguished from, but not separated from, the Real Presence of the body and the blood of Christ.

This same point can also be demonstrated from what Chemnitz teaches about the *manducatio impiorum*, which will be discussed below.²³ It is important in Chemnitz' whole argument that also the ungodly receive the "Hauptgabe." But in that case the gift is received with a detrimental effect precisely because the immense treasure of Christ's true body and blood is received unworthily. This also indicates the importance of faith, if not for the substance of the Sacrament, so for its beneficial use. The Word of God shows clearly, Chemnitz maintains

was wir für nutz/ frucht vnd trost dauon haben/ denn so der schuldig wirdt/ an dem Leib vnd Blut des Herren/ vnd jhme das Gericht jsset/ der da vnwürdig jsset/ darumb/ das er nicht vnterscheidet den Leib des HERren. So folget jha welcher vnterscheidet vnd würdig jsset/ der jsset jhm alles heil vnd alles seligkeit/ nicht *ex opere operato* vmb des wercks willen/ das er zum Sacrament gehet/ sondern weil ers im Glauben empfehet.²⁴

From this we can conclude that, according to Chemnitz, the benefits of the Lord's Supper received in faith are the

²²Ibid., 52: ". . . was für nutz . . . wir daraus haben/ das im Abendmal der Leib vnd Blut Christi/ gegenwertig gereicht vnd empfangen werde."

²³See below, 250-268.

²⁴Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 52.

benefits of the Real Presence of Christ's body and blood. Both parts of this doctrine, the substance of the Lord's Supper and its use, must be based on the *Verba*.

We will now examine more closely how Chemnitz "unterschiedlich und stückweis" spells out the benefits of the Lord's Supper. The most suitable text for an analysis of what Chemnitz teaches about the "nutz/ frucht und herlichen trost" of the Real Presence in Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, we find in chapter VII, which treats this issue. There he singles out five more or less distinctive benefits.²⁵

The First Benefit: The Lord's Supper Strengthens the Faith

This benefit is very broad and general.²⁶ The specific reference in the *Verba* is: "This do in remembrance of me." Chemnitz explains this as follows:

Wenn der Glaube verloren wirdt/ so nennet es die Schrifft ein vergessung/ in der 2.Pet. am 1 Capit.[:9]. So ist nun ein recht gedechtnis/ ein beschreibung eines lebendigen wachsenden Glaubens.²⁷

²⁵Ibid., 50-67. We will also draw on The Lord's Supper, 186-194; Enchiridion, 128-129, q. 274, offers a surveyable summary, but it needs to be supplemented if we want to grasp Chemnitz full meaning. Examen II, 233-236, pt. 2-4, will also be taken into account.

²⁶Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, p. 54: "So ist nun der Erste nutz in gemein zu reden/ das dadurch vnser Glaube gestercket wirdt." Cf., Enchiridion, 129, pt.III; The Lord's Supper, 192-193, pt.7

²⁷Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 54. A reference to 2 Tim. 2:8 is then added.

The general use of the word *anamnesis*, which is used in the *Verba*, includes the idea of being brought back from forgetfulness to memory. Chemnitz writes:

Das wörtlin (anamnesis) . . . Heist so viel/ wenn man etwas/ das durch vnachtsamkeit/ oder vergessenheit/ aus dem Hertzen kommen ist/ widerumb erinnert/ zu gemüth führet/ vnnd im Gedechtnis vernewert.²⁸

Such remembrance is most necessary since it is the experience of all believers that we too easily slip back into false security and the like. This connects the doctrine of the proper use of the Supper with conversion or repentance.²⁹

Chemnitz expounds:

Denn er wissen vnnd erfahren alle Heiligen vnnd Gleubigen/ in diesem ellenden Sündlichen fleisch/ mit was mancherley grossen schwachheit/der Glaube angefochten wirdt/ wie leichtlich das hertzliche vertrauen/ in anfechtungen geschwechet werde/ wie baldt vnd offft/ der Glaube durch die dörnne der sicherheit/ vertruckt vnd fast ersticket werde/ das er sich nicht erweist mit ernster betrachtung/ mith anruffung/ dancksagung/ etc.³⁰

To speak in accordance with the testimony of Scripture, Chemnitz continues, we have to conclude that

es mangelt vns allenthalben daran/ das wir den HERren CHristum/ vnd seinen Todt/ nicht also im gedechtnis haben/ wie die art eines starcken thetigen Glauben erfordert. Das ist nach der art der Schrifft zu reden/ es mangelt vns allenthalben darqn/ das wir den HERren CHristum/ vnd seinen Todt/ nicht also im gedechtnis haben/ wie die art eines starcken thetigen Glaubens erfordert.³¹

²⁸Ibid., 55; cf., The Lord's Supper, 192-193; Enchiridion, 129, q. 274, pt. III.

²⁹For a more full discussion see below, 250-268.

³⁰Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 55-56.

³¹Ibid., 56.

Christ our true Samaritan, however, has provided "mancherley Artznerey" in order to heal our weakness and corruption. The Holy Spirit is at work in the ministry of the Word. The same applies also to our meditation on the Word.³² But, Chemnitz adds:

Über das alles hat Christus wider solche vergessenheit vnd böse gedechtnis/ die aller krefftigiste Artznerey/ verordnet im Abendmal . . . Denn/ dieweil des Glaubens art ist/ das er Christum ergreiffet/ jha viel mehr und fester ergriffen wird von Christo/ wie Paulus saget Phil.3[:12] Was kündte doch für ein krefftiger Artznerey sin/ die rechte gedechtnis Christi/ vnd seines Todes zu erwecken/ zu mehren vnd zu erhalten/ denn wenn Christus selber durch sein eigen Leib vnd Blut im Abendmal/ die Gleubigen ergreiffet vnd in sich zeucht . . . Solte denn nicht unser schwacher Glaube daran/ das aller krefftigiste *antidotum* und Seelen trust haben/ wider alle anfechtungen/ wider die sicherheit/ unnd allerley anreizung der vergessung? ³³

The question why the Lord's Supper is such a powerful means of grace, Chemnitz answers thus: "sein Fleisch ist ein lebendigmachendes Fleisch/ dieweil die ewige Gottheit/ in persönlicher einigkeit darinn wonet."³⁴ And this presious gift we receive in the Lord's Supper.³⁵

Even though it is not discussed in a particular section, Chemnitz often states, and always presupposes, that God, or specifically Christ himself, as in the quotation above, is the

³²Ibid., 56; Chemnitz refers here to John 14:26 and the whole of Psalm 119.

³³Ibid., 56-57.

³⁴Ibid., 57.

³⁵Ibid., 57. We note that this argument is not drawn from the *sedes doctrinae*. At this point the same occurs regularly.

active agent who bestows his gifts to the communicants through the hand of the human servant in the Lord's Supper.³⁶ In the Lord's Supper we therefore have "das aller krefftigste *antidotum* vnd Seelen trost haben/ wider alle anfechtung/ wider die sicherheit/ vnd allerley anreizung der vergessung," Chemnitz concludes.³⁷

The Second Benefit: The New Testament

This gift is, as Chemnitz sees it, the most fundamental one. The scriptural basis here is the following sentence from the *Verba*: "This cup is the New Testament in my blood." In Die Reine Gesunde Lehre Chemnitz summarizes the main points of this issue in these words: "Nun begreiffet das neue Testament/ vergebung der Sünden/ GÖttes gnade/ die Kinderschafft/ Seligkeit/ und das ewige Leben/ Jer.31[:31-34] Hebr.8[:10-12]." ³⁸ The exegetical foundation for this benefit Chemnitz establishes in his discussion of the *Verba*, when he in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke deals with the words concerning the blood.³⁹

Just as in his discussion of the first benefit, the strengthening of faith, Chemnitz also here confirms that

³⁶See above, 170.

³⁷Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 57.

³⁸Ibid., 58; cf., 187-188. In Enchiridion, 128-129, q. 274, pt.1 the first part of this point is very well stated.

³⁹Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 166-169, 187-188.

"diesen Gaben werden in der Predigt des Euangelij/ allen in gemein fürgetragen und angeboten."⁴⁰ This evidences that Chemnitz does not, as already pointed out, speak of a special "sacramental grace." All means of grace offer and give the one and same grace.⁴¹

At this stage of his discussion Chemnitz introduces two "uses" or functions, of the Lord's Supper which we now will consider.⁴² The first is related to the question why the Lord's Supper is such a powerful means of grace. To Chemnitz faith is not a simple thing which is easily lived in the midst of our infirmities and "Anfechtungen." In his discussion of the gifts of communion it is a recurrent theme that living faith is very often a struggling faith. The *proprium* of the sacraments, *in casu* the Lord's Supper, is that the one and same grace which is proclaimed in general in the Gospel is set forth, applied, given, confirmed, and sealed individually to

⁴⁰Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 58; cf., 47 and 169.

⁴¹Examen II, 65: "However, the grace which is in the word of promise is not different from that which is conveyed in the sacraments; neither is the promise in the word of the Gospel different from that in the sacrament. The grace is the same;... Therefore faith does not seek some other grace in the sacrament than in the Word . . ." Cf. Wolgegründeter Bericht, 932-933. For a more extended discussion, see Brynjulf Hoas, The Doctrine of Conversion in the Theology of Martin Chemnitz: What Conversion is and how it is Worked (Ft. Wayne: STM Thesis, Concordia Theological Seminary, 1985), 141-149, where the purpose of baptism is discussed. The pattern of Chemnitz argumentation is very much the same.

⁴²These questions are dealt with in separate sections in Enchiridion, 129, pt. II and IV and The Lord's Supper, 189-190, pt. 4 and 191-192, pt. 6.

each recipient in the external elements in an external act based on God's explicit command.⁴³ This Chemnitz brings to bear for the support of the troubled conscience. In Die Reine Gesunde Lehre the personal application is strongly emphasized:

In diesem Abendmal aber/ spricht der Son Gottes/ zu einem jeden in sonderheit (Nim hin/ trincke/ dieser Kelch ist das neue Testament im meinem Blut) bezeuget derhalben Christus/ Er schencke/ applicire unnd eigene dir zu/ für dein person in sonderheit/ alle sein wolthaten/ so er durch vergiessung seines Bluts erworben hat/ das du derer einer solt sein/ die solches sich zu trösten/ und zu frewen sollen haben.⁴⁴

The pastoral concern is here obvious. Chemnitz wants to help his people to grasp Christ and his benefits as firmly as possible. Then he adds the following about the external character of the sacramental act:

Und was künfte doch für ein gewisser/ oder thewrer Sigill und Pfandt sein/ das Christus mit allem seinem verdienst/ dir warhaftig und gewiss/ applicieret und dein eigen sey/ denn das er eben dasselbige Blut/ damit das neue Testament versigelt unnd bekreffiget ist/warhaftig unnd wesentlich gegenwertig dir und mir zu empfaen darreicht.⁴⁵

⁴³This is clearly stated in Chemnitz' definition of the sacraments in general, cf., Examen II, 38-39; Wolgegründete Bericht, 930-933; Enchiridion, 109, q. 215. See above, 156-165.

⁴⁴Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 58-59; cf., Kurtzer Bericht, 129-130.

⁴⁵Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 59; cf., The Lord's Supper, 187: "In the Supper He Himself is present in the external celebration and shows by visible signs where He wills to be present with His body and blood, and there we may safely seek Him and surely find Him, for there He Himself through the ministry distributes His body and blood to the communicants."

In both the last two quotations we note the strong emphasis on Christ's atoning work and its bestowal. In his discussion of this point in The Lord's Supper Chemnitz emphasizes this: "Among Christians no one doubts that by this giving of Christ's body and shedding of his blood the wrath of the Father has been satisfied and eternal redemption gained."⁴⁶ Participation in the benefits of Christ is what is needed to "stand before the judgement of God."⁴⁷ The benefits of Christ are bestowed and sealed in the Lord's Supper by the very blood through which the New Testament was sealed and confirmed. Chemnitz, therefore, fights vigorously to uphold the doctrine of the Real Presence of the true body and blood of Christ in the Supper. For that reason we should "dest öffter in warer demuth suchen vnd gebrauchen" the Lord's Supper.⁴⁸

Second, this aspect of confirming the troubled conscience the assurance of grace Chemnitz relates to the question of falling out of the covenant of grace. This covenant was established by the shedding of Christ's blood on the cross. We were received into it by the Spirit through baptism. In Die Reine Gesunde Lehre Chemnitz expresses himself as he regards the Supper as a kind of "penitential sacrament".

Wir brechen leider mehr denn zum offtermal/ vnd
ubertreten das Testament oder den Bundt des guten

⁴⁶The Lord's Supper, 189.

⁴⁷Ibid., 189.

⁴⁸Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 58.

gewissens/ so Gott mit vns in vnser heiligen Tauffe/
gemacht vnd auffgericht hat . . . Aber der Son GÖttes/
weil er als ein trewer Mittler/ suchet was verloren ist/
ruffet in diesem Abendmal/ keret wider/ ihr/ so den bundt
ubertreten habt.⁴⁹

The phrases "ubertretten . . . den Bundt," "verloren," and "keret wider," and so forth, clearly show that he has the fallen in mind. Taken at face value, this text says that the fallen one is taken back into the covenant through the sacrament of the Lord's Supper.⁵⁰ This Chemnitz states explicitly in the following context.

Weil vns nun der gesegnete Kelch im Abendmal/ in oder mit dem Blut Christi/ reicht vnd vbergibet das newe Testamnet/ so werden wir jha hiedurch vnnd hiermit/ wenn wir das Blut Christi im Abendmal/ mith warem Glauben empfangen/ widerumb in dieselbe Bündtnus des newen Testaments auffgenomen/ so wir gebrochen haben/ oder in dem vertrauen desselbigen Testamentes oder Bundes/ bekrefftigt vnd erhalten.⁵¹

There is an unevenness here. The beneficial use of the sacrament always presupposes a truly penitent faith by the recipient. But then he is no longer a fallen, who needs to be taken into the covenant of grace again. Furthermore, in the quotation above Chemnitz distinguishes between those who are fallen and those who need a sure confirmation that they are received in the covenant of grace. The emphasis in the

⁴⁹Ibid., 59-60. Underlining added.

⁵⁰In the Latin edition of Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, this is stated only very generally. The following is based on the German translation, which many places includes interesting elaborations which are primarily aimed not at the theological educated readers, but at interested lay people.

⁵¹Ibid., 60. Emphasis added.

context is on the reassurance of God's grace in Christ "gegen alle anfechtung und zweiffel".⁵²

Taken by itself, this text at least lacks clarity. However, to understand Chemnitz correctly, we must consider this issue in the proper context. In Chemnitz' theology the use of the Lord's Supper is based in his doctrine of conversion or repentance.⁵³ In the life of the church and the individual Christian the Supper was firmly tied to private confession and absolution. No one was allowed to go to the Sacrament unless he previously had confessed and had been absolved by the pastor.⁵⁴ This must be taken into account when Chemnitz speaks of the Lord's Supper as a means of reacceptance into the covenant of grace. As by Melanchthon⁵⁵ the Lord's Supper and confession and absolution are seen as an unit.

In The Lord's Supper, a thoroughly revised edition of Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, this viewpoint is no longer present. Now the text unequivocally speaks of "a fuller assurance that we are truly, surely, and constantly received and restored into his covenant" when we "through faith and in true

⁵²Ibid., 61.

⁵³See below, 250-268.

⁵⁴Kutzer Bericht, 120. Cf. our discussion of this issue below, 251-269, where also the ruling of the Church Order of which the Kurtzer Bericht was a part, is quoted, 268.

⁵⁵See above, 76-77.

repentance return to that covenant and are received into."⁵⁶
 In Kurtzer Bericht the same is stated very plainly that Christ through Baptism has received us "in den Gnadenbund des neuen Testaments."

Aber denselben Bund halten wir leider so steif und fest nicht, wie wir solten, treten oft darauß und brechen deselben, das wir nun gewiss mögen sein, das Christus, so wir in wahrer buss durch den glauben uns zu ihm kehren, uns widerumb in denselben bund des neuen testaments einnehme, und das wir ein gewisses pfand und siegel mögen haben, das wir in dem bunde allzeit mügen gefunden sein, bleiben und erhalten werden.⁵⁷

As by the first benefit so also when he deals with the New Testament, Chemnitz stresses the worth of the Supper especially for the troubled hearts. He writes:

Wie künnten aber erschrockene hertzen/ einen gewissern trost haben/ damit sie jha nicht zweifferten/ das auch sie/ für vnnd bey GOtt/ in diesem newen Bundt oder Testament/ warhafftig eingeschlossen vnd begriffen werden/ sein vnd bleiben. Denn das Christus saget/ das jene das jhr im Kelche nemet vnd trincket/ ist eben dasselbige mein Blut/ damit ich das neue Testament auffgerichtet/ bestetiget vnd bekreffiget hab.⁵⁸

In short, Chemnitz main concern is that the Lord's Supper is a most certain pledge, sign, and guarantee for the frightened consciousness that God will keep and preserve them in his covenant of grace.

⁵⁶The Lord's Supper, 192. Also Enchiridion shortly convey the same idea (129, pt. IV).

⁵⁷Kurtzer Bericht, 129.

⁵⁸Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 60-61.

The Third Benefit: The Union with Christ

This benefit of the most intimate, life-giving union with Christ concerns particularly the bodily life of the communicants.⁵⁹ The basis which Chemnitz cites for this issue is the words: "This is my body, which is given for you." What Chemnitz presents here goes beyond Luther's words of the Lord's Supper as "a food of the soul, which nourishes and strengthens the new man."⁶⁰ This subject will be discussed more in detail later. Here we will confine ourselves to a simple account of the main point in his presentation of this topic.

Chemnitz begins by focusing on the miserable condition of the Christian in this life. Also Paul, he points out,

klaget vber die ellendt/ welches alle Gottseligen/ in diesem leben fülen/ vnd teglich erfahren/ das in vnserm Fleisch nichts gut wohne/ sonder das gesetz der sünden/ das da widerstreitet dem gesetz im vnserm gemüte/ nimt vnd führet vns gefangen/ das wir das gute/ das wir wöllen nicht thun noch vollbringen. Rom.7[:18-23] Gal. 5[:17].⁶¹

Because of this state of affairs, because our body [Fleisch] and blood avails for nothing, Christ comes to us with the

⁵⁹The most detailed discussion of this issue is found in The Lord's Supper, 187-189 and 191, pt. 1, 2, 3, and 5. The whole discussion is there deeply rooted in Christology. Chemnitz refers to his book The Two Natures in Christ, trans. J. A. O. Preus (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1971), 188.

⁶⁰The Book of Concord, LC, V, 23, 449.

⁶¹Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 61-62.

invitation: "Nemet vnd esset/ das ist mein Leib."⁶² Here we notice that the only element Chemnitz makes use of from the quoted "text" is the word "body." In the "text" the reference was to the body "given for you," that is, given unto death for us. Here, however, his emphasis has shifted to Incarnation. Citing Cyril of Alexandria, he writes: "Weil das Fleisch des Erlöser vnnd Heyland/ mit dem wort Gottes ([Logos] welches is von natur das Leben) ist vereiniget/ ist es auch lebendig machent worden."⁶³ This is said of the "Erlöser vnnd Heyland," who offered up his body and blood for us. The emphasis, however, is on the divine Life, which belongs to Christ's assumed nature on account of the personal union. The quotation continues as follows: "Wenn wir nun dasselbige essen/ so haben wir das Leben inn vns/ dieweil wir mith dem Fleisch im Abendmal/ vereiniget werden/ welches das Leben worden ist."⁶⁴ However, read in the larger context to which

⁶²Ibid., 62.

⁶³Ibid.

⁶⁴Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 62. In The Lord's Supper Chemnitz explicates this further: In his assumed nature Christ, the second Adam "in that nature condemned sin, destroyed death, and restored that nature to life. Thus, first of all, in his own person He sanctified, restored, and blessed human nature. And now, in order that we might be made certain that these blessings apply also to us and our wretched nature, and have been truly communicated to us, Christ in His Supper again offers us that very nature which he has assumed from us and in Himself first restored . . . this way He, as it were, grafts our miserable and corrupt nature into the holy and life-giving mass of His human nature, as Cyrill says, so that our depravity and misery are cured and renewed through the remedy of this most intimate union" (188-189).

it belongs, Chemnitz' point seems to be that Christ's vicarious death for the sins of the world is saving only because it was not the death of a mere human being.⁶⁵

Chemnitz can in his discussion of this issue make use of very concrete and realistic language.

Wenn wir aber im Abendmal warhafftiglich mit rechten glauben empfangen den Leib Christi/ so werden wir seine glieder von seinem Fleisch/ vnd von seinen Gebeinen/ wie die Schrift saget/ Ephes. 5[:29-32]. Denn wir werden gleich wie der Pffropffreiser/ in seinem Leib vnd Blut eingeleibet vnd eingepflantzet/ das wir/ wie die Reben von der Weinstock [Joh.15]/ von ihm vnd aus ihm/ das Leben nemen vnd haben.⁶⁶

The *Verba*, which Chemnitz claims to be the only source of the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, does not expressly speak of union with Christ. This is, however, an important issue in Chemnitz. His basis seems to be that which take place in the Supper. By the communicants eating of Christ's body and blood he unites himself with them through his body and blood. Thus they have the Life in them.⁶⁷ When he enlarges upon the issue, so far as he make use of biblical material, his reference is Eph. 5:30; in more general terms he also refers to John 15. None of these passages, however, can be claimed as obvious references to the Lord's Supper.

⁶⁵Cf., *ibid.*, 304-306. See also our discussion below, 233-237.

⁶⁶Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 62-63. With "Pffroffreiser" Chemnitz probably alludes to Rom.6:5.

⁶⁷*Ibid.*, 43-44, 47-48, 62; cf., below, 211-220.

The Fourth Benefit: *Pharmakon Athanasias*

This benefit is closely connected with the previous, the intimate, life-giving union with Christ. The German version here expands on the not so elaborate Latin version, the Repetitio. Chemnitz does not connect this benefit with any part of the *Verba*. With reference to the ancient fathers, it is presented as a deduction from the third benefit. He writes: "Die Patres/ als Ireneus vnd andere/ nemen aus diesem grunde/ schöne vnnnd herrliche Argumanta vnnnd erweisung der zuküfftigen vnsterblichkeit/ vnnnd verklerung vnser armen Körper."⁶⁸ Key words here are "unsterblichkeit,"

"unverwesligkeit," and "verklerung" of our miserable body.

Chemnitz explains:

Denn wiewol dieselbe [Cörper] vber alle mass ellend sind/ dem Tode vnnnd vnzelichen trübsal vnderworffen/ dieweil aber nicht allein die seele/ sondern auch vnserer Körper/ mit dem Leib vnnnd Blut Christi/ gespeiset werden (wie er [Ireneus] redet) so folget/ das dieselben nicht können in ewiger verwesung bleiben/ werden auch nicht allzeit solchem ellend/ wie hier in diesem leben sein vnd bleiben/ sondern sie werden endlich genomen in die gemeinschaft des lebens/ der herrligkeit und der unuerwesslichkeit. Denn der Leib Christi/ damit vnserer Körper gespeiset werden/ ist im Tode nicht blieben/ sondern erhöht und erkleret worden/ vnd lebet in der krafft GÖttes/ 2.Corinth.13[:4]⁶⁹

Chemnitz reaches this conclusion concerning the hope of eternal life for the body by bringing together his conclusion

⁶⁸Ibid., 63.

⁶⁹Ibid., 63-64; underlining is added.

on the third benefit with Scripture's testimony of Christ's resurrection.⁷⁰

But Chemnitz takes a further and more questionable step. Since Chemnitz explicitly is speaking of the body, there must be a connection between the participation in Christ body and blood in the Supper and the eternal life bestowed upon our body. By quoting Cyril approvingly, Chemnitz maintains that

Es künthe diese verwesentliche natur vnsers Leibs auf keine andere weise/ zu der vnuerwesslichkeit vnd dem leben gebracht werden/allein das der Leib/ des natürlichen lebens/ ihr zugethan/ zugefüget und vereiniget würde/ etc."⁷¹

What Chemnitz says can scarcely be reduced to a vivid and figurative way of expressing the hope of immortality and future glorification also for the whole man.⁷² His concern is

⁷⁰Taking into account the principles of interpretation Chemnitz so emphatically has laid down, one may wonder why Chemnitz argues as he does. The closest Scripture passage seems to be Rom. 8:9-11. No Scripture passage relates the Christians' hope of resurrection and glorification to the Christ's body and blood received in the Supper. The Scripture very clearly teaches the resurrection of the body without resorting to inferences from a not too convincing basis.

⁷¹Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 64. He also quotes Bernard approvingly, who says: "The body of Christ is to the sick a medicine, . . . heals weariness, preserves health," and Chrysostom who can even say that when Christ is in us "he will . . . drive out all sickness . . .", Examen II, 234.

⁷²Hermann Sasse in This is my Body. Luther's contention for the Real Presence in the Sacrament of the Altar (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1959; rev. ed. Adelaide: Lutheran Publishing House, 1981), 315, claims that "our fathers [Luther to Calov] never intended to give an explanation of the bodily effects of the Sacrament." We may, however, wonder what the meaning is when Chemnitz quotes Ambrose, who says: "This food which you are receiving supplies the substance of eternal life" (Examen II, 235). From the last part of the seventeenth century until it was revived by the German Neo-Lutherans of the last century this notion was

clearly the bestowal of salvation to the whole man, not only the soul, but also the body.

On this background it must be fair to conclude that Chemnitz sees a particular work of the Lord's Supper, a *proprium*, in communicating the gift of salvation also to the body of the believers. The Lord's Supper does not impart a particular grace, but it is a particular means ordained for the particular needs of the body, which cannot be reached by the Word.⁷³

In view of Chemnitz' basic principles for doing theology, the decisive question is how he substantiates what he says. Die Reine Gesunde Lehre and Examen II are the only sources where Chemnitz explicitly endorses the more blatant notion of the Lord's Supper as "a medicine of immortality, an antidote, that we may not die."⁷⁴ He refers to Eph. 5:30 and 2 Cor. 13:4, and probably alludes to Rom. 6:9 and Acts 2: 27, 31. But these Bible verses can scarcely carry the burden. It is notable that none of these Scripture passages deal with

virtually absent from Lutheran theology. Sasse refers particularly to August Vilmar, Kirche und Welt, vol.I, 1872.

⁷³Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 48-49. If Chemnitz had applied this line of reasoning to Baptism, one may wonder what conclusion he would have reached. When he discusses the Word and Baptism as means of grace, he never raises the question whether man's body on the one hand, and soul, spirit, and heart on the other hand, need different means to convey grace to them.

⁷⁴Ignatius, quoted in Examen II, 234.

the Lord's Supper. Examen II cites a long list of fathers, starting with Ignatius of Antioch.⁷⁵

Particularly on this issue, but partly also on the previous benefit, it must be said that Chemnitz does not follow the hermeneutical principles he so emphatically has laid down. What he offers is not what we could expect. It is what he himself says, "Folgerungen", or theological reflections based on the statement that "auch unsere Körper/ mit dem Blut Christi/ gespeiset werden."⁷⁶ This procedure he elsewhere criticizes.⁷⁷ This can not claim to be based on exegesis of the *Verba*, at least not what today is regarded as exegesis. The Real Presence of the body and blood of Christ in the elements as such can hardly be regarded as proof of the *theologoumenon* of *pharmakon athanasias*.⁷⁸

⁷⁵Ibid., 234-235. Ignatius, Ireneus, Ambrose, Basil, Hilary, Cyril, Cyprian, Augustine, Chrysostom, and Bernard are cited. One should also compare what he refers from Paschasius (ca. 880), whom he refers much more fully than any other of the ancient authors. Cf., Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 416-417.

⁷⁶Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 63.

⁷⁷When Chemnitz discusses the Zwinglians argument from the human nature of Christ, he writes: "Wir *Argumentiren* aber in diesem Handel/ nicht ausser oder ohn Gottes wort/ allein aus der *Consequentia* vnd folge/ *A possibili ad inesse*/ von dem das Christo möglich kündte sein/ vnd derhalben sein müsse/ ausser vnd ohn GOTTES wort/ wie gesagt ist" (Ibid., 306-307; cf. 337, 373). See also Amatome, E viii r; Wolgegründeter Bericht, 941.

⁷⁸A full discussion of this question should include an analysis and comparison of Chemnitz anthropology as he deals with it in the doctrines of creation and the fall, on the one hand, and then here in the doctrine of the Lord's Supper.

In the works Chemnitz wrote for the *corpus doctrinae* of more territories and in the Formula of Concord, only slight remains of this idea are discernable.⁷⁹ What may be regarded as Chemnitz more considered view we find in his later works, for example, in Wolgegründeter Bericht. It can be summarized as follows: To save us in our weakness and sinfulness, Christ came to us and united himself with us, and thus by assuming our nature in order to exalt us to himself. Through the precious surety of his body and blood he confirms to our faith that he truly gives us, makes our own, and seals to us the whole gift of salvation, which he has won for us through his death on the cross. He will live in us, make us his members, and work everything that is necessary for our salvation, because He has united himself most intimately with us through his body and blood, which He has given us to eat and drink.⁸⁰

⁷⁹The more refined version we also find in Formula of Concord, SD, VIII, 76: "His flesh is truly a life-giving food and his blood truly a quickening beverage" (Book of Concord, 606). Luther is more explicit in the Large Catechism, V, 70: "But those who feel their weakness, who are anxious to be rid of it and desire help, should regard and use the sacrament as a precious antidote against the poison in their system. For here in the sacrament you receive from Christ's lips the forgiveness of sins, which contains and conveys God's grace and Spirit with all his gifts, protection, defence, and power against the death and the devil and all evils" (Book of Concord, 454). Notable in the last quotation is the key position of forgiveness of sins from which the other good things flow. The forgiveness, however, is received "from Christ's lips". Chemnitz does not, however, make any references to Luther's works from 1527-1528, where this view is clearly expressed (e.g. WA 23.181,11-15).

⁸⁰Wolgegründeter Bericht, 945-946.

Luther articulated this succinctly in the Small Catechism in these words: "Where there is forgiveness of sins, there are also life and salvation."⁸¹

The Fifth Benefit: The Communion of the Believers

Chemnitz does not enlarge much on this benefit. His main biblical reference is 1 Cor.10:16-17. According to Chemnitz there is an analogy, yes, even more, a very close connection between the *Communion* of the Lord's Supper and the *Communion* of the believers.⁸²

Diese *Communion* [zwischen Christus und die Gläubigen] sey ein bandt der liebe vnnnd Brüderlichen vereinigung/ denn wie ein Brot ist/ also sein wir viel ein Leib. Gleich aber wie das Abendmal hat zwey stück/ ein Irdisch und ein Himlisch. Also ist diese *Communion*, auff zweierley weiss/ ein bandt der Lieb vnd einigkeit.⁸³

To explain the earthly aspect, Chemnitz uses a simile which he had found in Augustine. As bread and wine are produced from many grains and grapes,⁸⁴ so is "die vereinigung vnd gemeinschaft der glieder seines Leibes/ welcher da ist/ die heilige Christliche gemeine." There many are made one.⁸⁵ In

⁸¹The Book of Concord, SC, IV, 6, 352.

⁸²In Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 65, in the context which we now are dealing with, Chemnitz uses the word *Communion* consciously of both the Supper and the Church.

⁸³Ibid.

⁸⁴"Aus vielen in eins" is the phrase Chemnitz uses (ibid.).

⁸⁵Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 65. When Chemnitz deals with unworthy eating Chemnitz interprets 1 Cor.10: 16-17 differently, see below, 258, especially note 42.

the Lord's Supper, however, this union and fellowship is not simply signified.

Sondern dieweil CHristus warhafftig und wesentlich/ mit seinem Leib vnd Blut im Abendmal gegenwertig ist/ gereicht vnd empfangen wirdt/ wircket er auch krefftiglich/ das wie er das Heupt in vns ist/ das auch wir/ einer des andern glieder sein/ Ephe.4 [:4.11-16]. vnd 1.Corin.12[:12] wir sind alle zu einer Geist/ getrencket.⁸⁶

This twofold unity of the true Christian Church is then the basis of "ernste vnd scharffe vermanungen zur Liebe."⁸⁷

As we have finished our examination of Chemnitz' discourse of the five benefits in his Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, we will raise the question: Should we according to Chemnitz speak of the gift or the gifts of the Lord's Supper? We are here not concerned about "die Hauptgabe," the substance of the Sacrament, but about the relation between the gifts which are mentioned above. First, we need to emphasize that to Chemnitz that which is given in the Sacrament is what Christ earned for us through the offering up of His body and the shedding of His blood. In Examen II, he declares:

We say that among these benefits the chief and highest place is held by the forgiveness of sins, reconciliation with God, reception into grace, and acceptance to salvation and eternal life . . . these are, as it were, the bases for all the other benefits of Christ which are to be conferred on us.⁸⁸

⁸⁶Ibid., 65-66.

⁸⁷Ibid., 66

⁸⁸Examen II, 236.

The relation between the gifts or benefits is here conceived of in such a way that the gifts are based on and derived from the main gift, which is the gift of justification. This conforms with what Chemnitz maintains when he treats the article of Justification. It is

der fürnemste der ganzen Christliche Lehre/ welche zu klarem richtigem Verstande der ganzen heiligen Schrifft dienet/ und in der ganze Bibel allein die Thür aufthut ohne welchen Artickel auch kein arm Gewissen einigen rechten beständigen trost haben/ oder den Reichthum der Gnaden Christi erkennen mag⁸⁹

The article of justification, therefore, must always be the "*Finis et Scopus* seyn dahin und darauf alle Lehre und Predigten fürnemlich sollen gerichtet werden."⁹⁰

The main gift, as stated in the quotation above from Examen II,⁹¹ corresponds directly to the "New Testament," the second of the benefits, which Chemnitz spelled out in Die Reine Gesunde Lehre. This gift, when it is received in faith, brings us into the covenant of grace.⁹² This is what Chemnitz refers to when he summarizes the whole issue, for example, in the phrases "die verdienste Christi" or "die geschenck vnd gaben des newen Testament," which are applied in faith.⁹³

⁸⁹Kurtzer Bericht, 39-40. Cf., Hoas, The Doctrine of Conversion in the Theology of Martin Chemnitz, 16-18.

⁹⁰Kurtzer Bericht, 40.

⁹¹See above, 194-195.

⁹²Kurtzer Bericht, 129.

⁹³Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 272, 284 et a..

In conclusion, we must focus upon an issue which we have already noticed several times. The benefits of the Supper are the benefits of the true and substantial Real Presence of the body and blood of Christ.⁹⁴ To Chemnitz this is fundamental when we speak of the benefits of the Lord's Supper. Each of the five sections in Die Reine Gesunde Lehre which deal with the benefits conclude in the same way. They all underline strongly that the benefits, fruit, and comfort depend on the Real Presence of the true body and blood of Christ.⁹⁵ At the end of the chapter on the benefits Chemnitz states this positively and negatively:

Dis halt ich/ sey nun aus gutem klarem grunde/ genugsam erweist/ was für nutz/ frucht und herrlichen trost/ arme gewissen/ aus der wolgegründeten Lehre haben/ das im Abendmal der Leib und Blut Christi/ warhafftig und wesentlich/ mith Brot und Wein/ gegenwertig gereicht und empfangen werde . . .

Vnd hieraus ist nun offenbar/ welchem schatz uns die rauben/ welche die ware gegenwertigkeit/ des Leibs und Bluts Christi aus dem Abendmal verwerfen.⁹⁶

It is in this perspective that we must see Chemnitz' ardent efforts to uphold the doctrine of the true and substantial Real Presence of the body and blood of Christ in, with, and under the external elements of the sacrament. For him this was no mere theoretical issue of minor significance, as it seemed to be for his opponents.

⁹⁴Ibid., 53-54.

⁹⁵Ibid., 57-58, 61, 63, 64.

⁹⁶Ibid., 66-67; cf., The Lord's Supper, 193.

CHAPTER 7

THE COMMUNICATION OF THE BENEFITS

In the two previous chapters our focus has been on the main gift of the Supper, namely, the Real Presence of Christ's true body and blood, and the gifts, benefits, fruits, effects, and comfort that accrue from the this "Schatz" and "Heuptgut" when it is used according to its institution. The particular feature of this means of grace is that the gifts are conveyed through eating. Our objective in the subsequent discussion is to examine how Chemnitz perceives this particular eating, its implications and meaning, and how it is received properly, that is, according to its institution. The textual basis for the discussion will be the chapters in Die Reine Gesunde Lehre on the three kinds of eating and the refutation of the opponents who acknowledged only a spiritual eating. Afterwards we will treat some questions related to faith. We start with an analysis of Chemnitz' discussion of the three kinds of eating.

Three Kinds of Eating

Regarding the benefits of the Lord's Supper Chemnitz could say that there was not much disagreement in the church. He even begins his discussion of the *status controversiae* by

declaring that the spiritual eating in the Supper is not the controversial issue. He writes:

Denn wir lehren klar vnd bescheidenlich/ das das Geistliche essen/ durch den Glauben/ im Abendmal in alle wege von nöthen sey/ denen/ die es seliglichen entpfangen wöllen.¹

Nevertheless, so far as reception of the gifts of the Lord's Supper is concerned, the question of the eating brings us into the center of the controversy. For here the doctrine of the Real Presence of the true body and the blood of Christ inevitably becomes a part of the problem.

As already indicated, Chemnitz distinguishes among three different kinds of eating, each of which take place in the Lord's Supper, when it is properly used. The heading of the chapter on this issue in Die Reine Gesunde Lehre presents the problem in the form of a thesis:

Das wir im Abendmal/ wenn daselbige nach der einsetzung Christi gehalten wirdt/ das Brot natürlicher weise essen/ vnd den Leib Christi/ nicht allein Geistlich durch den Glauben/ sondern auch mündtlich (wie Luther redet) oder wie es die alten nennen/ Sacramentaliter empfangen vnd essen/ vnd was dasselbige sey.²

The three kinds of eating which are here mentioned are: (1) *manducatio physica*; (2) *manducatio sacramentalis*; and (3) *manducatio spiritualis*. Chemnitz now goes on to discuss each separately and in this order. As far as our theme is concerned -- namely, the beneficial use of the sacrament --

¹Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 96.

²Ibid., 32.

Chemnitz' discussion of these three kinds of eating pictures and clarifies important point of the issue. The way he deals with the sacramental and spiritual eating needs to be subjected to close scrutiny.

As we could expect, in Chemnitz' dealing with this issue, the hermeneutical principles come more into play than when he treated the benefits. This applies particularly to the controversial issue of sacramental eating. Without going into details, we need to point out that Chemnitz is convinced that an appropriate methodology, particularly a clear stating of the issue, is most helpful. He writes:

Ist derhalben kein zweiffel/ es werde diesem gantzen handel viel lichtet bringen/ wenn man auss einfeltigem rechten waren grundt/ den unterscheidt wol mercket/ vnd mith fleiss erkleret/ wie das Brot/ vnnd wie das Leib Christi/ im Abendmal gessen werde/ So viel wir auss Gottes wort/ von diesem geheimnis wissen sollen vnnd verstehen können.³

This implies that the foundation for the theological endeavour also here must be the *Verba* as the *sedes doctrinae*, which must be understood in their simple, literal meaning. The *sedes* set the limits of what we "wissen sollen vnnd verstehen können."⁴ This implies, on the other hand, that alien issues should not be brought into the discussion.⁵ Nor can natural reason

³Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 33.

⁴Ibid., 33.

⁵Ibid.: "Wollen derhalben nicht viel frembde disputationes hieher ziehen/ sondern den grundt aus den einfeltigen worten der einsetzung nemen."

determine what we should believe in this question.⁶ Therefore, almost by every new argument Chemnitz refers to the *Verba*. Since these principles are very important to Chemnitz, we will keep them in mind to see how they are applied in his handling of the arguments.

Manducatio Physica

In Wolgegründeter Bericht and other treatises for territorial confession books Chemnitz speaks of two kinds of eating. *Manducatio physica*, or natural eating, is only mentioned in passing in connection with sacramental eating.⁷ In Die Reine Gesunde Lehre he, in fact, maintains that the issue is obvious and needs no lengthy discussion.⁸ This does not mean, however, that the issue is unimportant. His theological argument Chemnitz draws from Paul who says: "For as often as you eat this bread . . ." (1 Cor.11:26) This sentence from the *Verba* makes it plain that bread is handed out also after consecration. Physical or natural eating mean that visible and sensible food is chewed and digested for the nourishment of the body.⁹ "Das nun auf solche natürliche weise/das irdiche

⁶Ibid.: "Denn die vernunftt verstehet vnd weis von keinem andern mündtlichen essen/ denn wie die Kuh das Grass frisset."

⁷Wolgegründeter Bericht, 946, 947.

⁸Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 36. When he discusses the arguments of the opponents, Chemnitz also in this work speaks of two kind of eating (ibid., 346).

⁹Ibid., 36. Here the process is spelled out in detail.

wesen des Brots/im Abendmal gegessen werde/ lehret nicht allein die erfahrung/ sondern es bezeugen auch die alten Scribenten."¹⁰ This is the argument Chemnitz uses against the doctrine of transubstantiation. There the substance of the bread and wine is removed from the sacrament.

The outward act of eating and drinking of bread and wine is according to the institution part of the *proprium* of the Lord's Supper. But a mere outward eating, robbed of theological meaning, is, according to Chemnitz, almost the same as abolishing the Sacrament. This is the line of arguing he makes use of in his refutation of the Sacramentarians' arguments from spiritual eating, which will be discussed below.

Manducatio sacramentalis

The subject matter which is epitomized in this technical term Chemnitz regarded as of particular importance. In an addition to the original Latin text in the German version, aimed at the general Christian reader, Chemnitz will not accept that it should be regarded as "ein vnnötige hochtrabende disputation" of the kind Paul warned against.¹¹ On the contrary, Chemnitz claims, "das fürnemste in dem handel/ wider die Sacraments schwermer/ stehet fast auff dem punctt/ denn sonst

¹⁰Ibid., 36-37. Chemnitz quotes Origen and Augustine (Ibid., 37). However, they should be regarded as exemplar quotations from Chemnitz' collections of material from "den alten scribenten" "der alte, reine Kirche."

¹¹Ibid., 45; cf., 59 and 101-102 on the *Regula Pauli*.

können sie mith schmeidigen zweyzüngigen worten/ den Schalck meisterlich bergen."¹²

The initial explanation of what Chemnitz means by the term *manducatio sacramentalis* reads as follows:

Weil Christus sagt zu gleich zu Petro vnd Juda/ Nemet hin vnd esset/ das ist mein Leib/ so ist da ein essen des Leib Christi/ welchs gemein ist/ beide dem Wirdigen/ vnd vn-wirdigen/ die alten nennens Sacramentalem manducationem, Lutherus heists leiblich vnnnd mündtlich essen/ dieweil CHRistus mith klaren worten spricht/ was jhr im Abendmal mith dem munde nemet vnd empfaht/ das ist mein Leib.¹³

Here we see that the issue, what the communicants receive, corresponds directly to the main point of controversy as defined in the *status controversiae*.

The background of the controversy over *manducatio sacramentalis* is, according to Chemnitz, this: The Sacramentarians objected to Luther's term "oral eating," and had long been falsely accusing the Lutherans of a Capernaitic doctrine of the Lord's Supper.¹⁴ The attention Chemnitz pays to this offensive accusation shows that he realized that there was a problem here. He admits that if the terms "mündlich" or "leiblich essen" are not properly explained, they can too easily be misunderstood by "einfeltige hertzen," since natural reason is close at hand to all and everyone. And so they can

¹²Ibid.

¹³Ibid., 35.

¹⁴Ibid., 32, 37.

be lead astray by the Sacramentarians' misrepresentation of Luther's view of oral eating.¹⁵

On this background Chemnitz formulates the question he is going to discuss as follows:

Die frage [ist]/ Ob auch der Leib Christi im Abendmal/
auff solche natürliche weise [wie im physica
manducatione]/ gegessen werde/ dieweil die einsetzung
spricht/ Nemet esset/ das ist mein Leib.¹⁶

If the eating of the Christ's body and blood in the Supper is the same as the *physica manducatio* of the bread and wine, then the Capernaitic view of the Supper is unavoidable. According to Chemnitz, however, this is a rationalistic interpretation, "weil die vernunft von keinem andern mündtlichen essen weiss" than the natural eating.¹⁷ This opinion Christ himself sternly rejected. Augustine and Luther also frequently did the same.¹⁸ Chemnitz' argument against the Capernaitic-rationalistic view indicates where he finds his answer.¹⁹ As he sees it, the natural eating might not be the only kind of oral eating.

The fault Chemnitz criticized in the gross Capernaitic rationalism he also diagnoses in the Sacramentarians' position. They do not consider seriously more than one kind of oral eating. When the Capernaitic idea is rejected, "so

¹⁵Ibid., 32-33.

¹⁶Ibid., 37.

¹⁷Ibid.

¹⁸Ibid., 37-38.

¹⁹Ibid., 25-31.

fahren die Zwinglianer zu/ fechten vnd streiten/ das im Abendmal der Leib Christi allein Geistlich gegessen werde."²⁰ In the chapter on the three kinds of eating, however, Chemnitz does not consider the arguments of his opponents against the sacramental eating of the true body and blood of Christ or, what is the same, against the Real Presence as believed and confessed by the Lutherans. Later, however, when "der rechte verstandt vom Abendmal der HERRen/ erweiset/ vnd zimlich erkleret ist . . . ," that is, when he has completed the outlining of his own arguments for the true presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Supper, then Chemnitz takes up for analysis and refutation the arguments which the opponents trust most.²¹ Among these are the argument from spiritual eating and from the Gospel of John chapter 6.²²

The most important arguments are those from Christ's true human nature and from his ascension. These arguments, however, Chemnitz does not even mention either in the chapter on the three kind of eating or in his refutation of the opponents' argument from spiritual eating. As for the latter, the reason seems to be that they are the first arguments he deals with in his refutation. When he comes to the arguments from

²⁰Ibid., 38. For Chemnitz definition of "spiritual eating," see below, 221-222.

²¹There Chemnitz underlines that he is only considering the arguments which the more recent Zwinglian theologians regarded as the most important. Ibid., 300-301.

²²Ibid., 344-351; The Lord's Supper, 231-241.

spiritual eating, he does not repeat that which he had already refuted, but he confines himself to the discussion of the sacramental and spiritual eating and the relation between the two.

Our theme does not require that we enter into a detailed analysis of Chemnitz discussion of the personal union and the ascension. However, since these issues were very important in the controversies of the period, we will cite the conclusions of Chemnitz' arguments against his opponents on these two important issues, before we continue our analysis of the two kinds of eating in the Supper.

As already indicated Chemnitz aims his main criticism at the opponents' doctrine of the personal union of Christ's two natures and the ascension. As for the personal union Chemnitz formulates the issue thus:

Die frage [ist]/ Ob CHristus nach seiner Menschlichen natur/ also den Brüdern aller ding gleich sey/ das wenn die schrift von seinem Fleisch/ etwas redet vnd aussaget/ welches wir in vnseres Leibes eigenschafft nicht haben/ noch finden/ das wir solchs verwerffen/ oder anders deuten sollen/ eben vmb der vrsach willen/ dieweil CHRistus nach seiner Menschlichen natur/ den Brüdern aller ding gleich sein sol.²³

As this quotation shows, the issue is what can be attributed to Christ according to his human nature. The basic Scripture reference is Hebrew 2 and 4, particularly the implications of Heb. 2:17. To speak of Christ's body and blood is to speak of the assumed human nature of the Son of God. Scripture does

²³Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 305.

attribute to Christ's human nature "eigenschafft vnd Vermögen" that would be "ein grewliche Gotteslesterung" to ascribe to "eines andern menschen Fleisch vnd Blut." Among the many examples of this Chemnitz cites this which relates well to our theme: "Trawn die Schrifft zeuget/ das Blut CHristi reinige vns von allen vnsern Sünden. 1.Johann. 1[:7]." ²⁴ This can indeed not be attributed to our flesh and blood without blasphemy. Then Chemnitz states: "Nun müssen wir aber von Christi Fleische/ nach zeugnis der Schrifft/ solches bey verlust vnser seligkeit glauben." When the issue is clearly stated and the full testimony of Scripture presented, Chemnitz asserts that

da kan ein jeder Christ/ den rechten grundt leichtlich sehen/ Nemlich/ das es beides war sey/ vnd bleiben müsse. Erstlich/ das Christus nach dem er an sich genommen hat/ alle eigenschafften vnserer natur/ gleich sey worden den Brüdern/ aller ding aussgenommen die Sünde. Zum andern/ das die Menschliche natur in Christo/ vmb der persönlichen vereinigung willen/ mith der Gottheit/ einen grösseren vorzug habe/ in vielen stücken/ welche wir in vnserem Fleisch vnd Blut/ nicht haben noch finden/ sonder die da vnserer natur eigenschafft vnd vermögen/ vber alle mass weith vbertreffen.²⁵

This "far more" which Scripture attributes to Christ's true human nature can be accounted for only from the personal union of the human nature with the divine. For Chemnitz the main issue of this discussion is to refute the argument that Christ cannot be present in the Supper down here in his human nature,

²⁴Ibid., Chemnitz also cites Eph. 1:7, Rom. 5:9, Is. 53:5, John 6:51, Acts 2:24,31.

²⁵Ibid., 306; emphasis added. Cf., ibid., 308, 311, 312.

if this nature retains its attributes. Here 1 John 1:7 and others serves as an argument which Chemnitz thinks that his opponents must and will accept. The doctrine of forgiveness of our sins on account of Christ's blood -- that is, the doctrine of justification -- cannot be upheld, if the "far more" which is attributed to Christ's human nature is denied. When this is accepted in the doctrine of the atonement, it must also be accepted in the doctrine of the Lord's Supper.

From this Chemnitz concludes that the limitation of our human nature must not be used to decide what in fact Christ can or cannot do. This does not mean that Chemnitz allows for deductions from Christology to the doctrine of the Lord's Supper.²⁶ But it does mean that we "das von ihm glauben/ was ihm die Schrift gibt vnd zuschreibet."²⁷ In typical manner Chemnitz' firm belief in the authority and integrity of Scripture here comes into play.

As for the ascension the issue is not about changing of place, becoming invisible, and so forth. For Chemnitz a review of a number of Bible passages and a comparison between the ascensions of Christ and Elijah, makes the issue plain.

²⁶Ibid., 306-307.

²⁷Ibid., 31; cf., 307: "Wir aber nemen für vns/ das klare ausgetruckte wort Gottes/ vnd fangen dauon an/ vnd wenn wir daselbst lesen/ das etwas geredet / oder aussgesaget wirdt/ von dem menschlichen natur in Christo/ dasselbe verleugnen wir nicht/ verkerens auch nicht durch frembde deutung/ darumb/ wenn wir solche eigenschafft nicht in vnserem Leibe nicht finden."

So begreiffet nun der Artickel der Himelfart Christi/ nach gewisser klarer ausslegung der heiligen Geistes selbs/ die aller herrlichste erhöhung Christi/nach seiner Menschheit/ vber alle Creaturen/vnd ist ein beschreibung/ wie Christus in seiner herrligkeit eingegangen/nun herrlich vnd mechtig Regieret. Also derselbige Christus/ der sich geussert/ vnd in schwachheit gekreuziget ist/ nuhmalens lebet in der krafft GÖttes. 2. Corinth. 13[:4].²⁸

Here everything that apply to the exalted Lord Chemnitz expressly ascribes to Christ, not only as person, but "nach seiner Menschheit."

On the one hand, Chemnitz will not base the doctrine of the Lord's Supper on these articles of faith. On the other hand, because he is firmly convinced of the integrity and doctrinal unity of Scripture, there can be no conflict between these doctrines and the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. Therefore, he also takes the opponents' attack on this point very seriously.

Denn sie [die Zwinglianer] schreien/ wo vnser meinung vnd Glaube solte recht sein/ so müste die Schrifft an vielen orten wider sich/ vnd miteinander vneins sein/ Dieweil aber das nicht sein kan/ mus man auff solche gegenwürffe/ gründliche antwort wissen.²⁹

On the basis of what we have outlined, Chemnitz is convinced that neither the doctrine of the personal union nor the doctrine of ascension represent any obstacle to the doctrine of the Real Presence of the true body and blood of Christ in the Supper. They indeed confirm it.³⁰

²⁸Ibid., 321; emphasis added.

²⁹Ibid., 294; cf., Anatome, J iii v.

³⁰Ibid., 315, 327.

Furthermore, because Chemnitz believes in the unity and integrity of the doctrine of Scripture, he maintains that "wir sondern aber vnd scheiden nicht von einander/ Gottes allmechtigkeit vnd seinen willen/ sondern lassen beydes bey einander bleiben/ was er wil deas vermag er."³¹ What we otherwise teach about Christ must also come to bear here. This has direct application to the doctrine of the Real Presence.³² What Christ has promised, He is surely able to accomplish. One should not let oneself be led astray by the "fürwitz der vernunft," Chemnitz constantly warns, when he deals with the hermeneutical questions.³³

Turning back to the question of sacramental or oral eating, we now ask how does Chemnitz meet the Zwinglians' "fechten vnd streiten/ das im Abendmal der Leib Christi allein Geistlich gegessen werde"?³⁴ In his refutation of their arguments from the Gospel of John, chapter six, Chemnitz emphasizes the difference between the spiritual eating of Christ's body and blood in the Sacrament and outside it without external elements.³⁵ In agreement with his view of the *verba* as the *sedes doctrinae* Chemnitz rejects that the mode

³¹Ibid., 314.

³²Ibid., 314-315.

³³Ibid., 314; cf., 28, 108-109, 122; cf., above 138-152.

³⁴Ibid., 39.

³⁵Ibid., 353-358. Cf., 46-47.

of eating in the Lord's Supper should be understood on the basis of John 6.

Dann Christus hat in seiner einsetzung ein neue vnd sonderliche weise/ seinen Leib zu essen/ die zuor in der Kirche nicht war/ gestiftet/ Derhalben sol vnd mus dasselbe essen nicht auss dem sechten Capittel Johannis/ sondern aus den worten der einsetzung genommen vnd gelernet werden.³⁶

The *Verba* must, therefore, remain the basis the the proper understanding of the Lord's Supper.

In his refutation of the opponents' argument from spiritual eating, Chemnitz reproduces their argument like this: The Lord's Supper is indeed instituted to apply everything Christ has won for us through his death on the cross for our salvation. However, all that can be ours through the spiritual eating whether Christ's body and blood is truly present or not.

Derhalben wenn gleich die gegenwertigkeit der substantz vnd des wesens/ Christi Leibs vnd Blutes/ aus dem Abendmal

³⁶Ibid., 354. Chemnitz consistently rejects that John 6 applies to the Lord's Supper. However, just as a comparison of sacraments of the Old and the New Testament may be appropriate when the particular *sedes* are respected, so a comparison of the John 6 and the *Verba* may be done as far as the text corresponds, that is, as far as the spiritual eating is concerned. Five arguments are detailed to support this view. (1) John 6 was spoken one year before the Supper was instituted. (2) In John 6 Christ spoke of no external means. (3) Eating and drinking must "ohn alles einrede Johan. 6 figürlich genommen." In the Supper "wie offenbar ist/ werden gemelte wort proprie . . . gesetzt," because there the disciples are asked to eat with their mouth. (4) In John 6 Christ's benefits are always applied in faith for eternal life. In the Supper many receive it "zum gericht der ewigen verdammis. (5) the eating of John 6 takes place "auff allzeit/ vnd an allen orten vnd steten", the Supper only "so oft jhr es thut." (Ibid., 355-358)

aussgeschlossen ist/ haben wir nicht desto minder ein herrliches Abendmal/ jha viel herrlicher denn mith dem Hertzen/ gemüth/ vnd glauben entpfangen/ sind jha herrlicher mittel/ denn mith dem munde nemen.³⁷

Chemnitz' response over against this position is two-fold. The first is negative. With direct reference to the cited argument, he undertakes to expose its absurdity. Shortly stated, Chemnitz answer is this: If the opponents' argument that the presence of Christ's true body and blood in the Supper makes no difference, then there was no use for this sacrament. Mockingly he states: "Jha also möchten wir den gantze *action* vnd verhandlung diese Abendmal/ als vnnötig hinweg werffen."³⁸

Chemnitz supports his sharp criticism of his opponents with this argument: We can eat Christ's body spiritually and drink his blood spiritually also without the sacrament [John 6]. His point is that if the particular feature of this sacrament is removed, then it is nothing but the Word in another form. It cannot be said that this argument is especially strong. Its weakness becomes evident when a comparison is made with absolution. Chemnitz regards absolution as a particular application of the Word to a single person. That its function is not different from the Word does not in itself render it useless. Actually, Chemnitz regards absolution

³⁷Ibid., 344-345; cf., *ibid.*, 348-349, where the same argument is presented in the form of a response to the words of Christ himself, the host of the Supper.

³⁸Ibid., 345.

highly.³⁹ It may be that Chemnitz has let himself be influenced too much by the negative tendency of the thesis of his opponents which he wants to refute.

Secondly, Chemnitz positive response is based on 1 Cor. 11:27-29 together with the *Verba*.⁴⁰ He presents his argument and draws his conclusion without enlarging on any of them. His argument reads thus:

Paulus aber sagt rundt heraus/ das auch die Vnwirdigen/
welche jha nicht Geistlich essen/ dieweil sie jhnen das
Gericht essen/ dennoch schuldig werden an dem Leib des
HERren/ wenn sie das Brot vnwirdig essen/ welchem . . .
der Son Gottes den namen gibt/ das ist mein Leib.⁴¹

The same *manducatio oralis* is plainly stated "rundt vnd klar" in the *Verba*. The point is: If 1 Corinthians 11 only should be understood of spiritual eating -- that is, that only the believer receives the body and blood spiritually -- then no one can be guilty of Christ's body and blood. The worthy communicant receives it in faith for salvation and not for judgment. The unworthy does not receive and eat the body and blood at all, and therefore likewise he does not eat Christ's body and blood with their mouth for judgment. This, however,

³⁹Kurtzer Bericht, 120-121.

⁴⁰This applies to both texts, Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 39, 346-347. In the latter discussion Chemnitz starts his discussion from the *Verba*, in the former from 1 Cor. 11:27.29.

⁴¹*Ibid.*, 39. This is his stock argument which appears everywhere Chemnitz treats the question of the Real Presence of Christ's true body and blood in the Supper.

is directly "wider die hellen offenbaren worten Pauli."⁴² By this simple reference to the clear *Verba Chemnitz* recalls the hermeneutical principles which were discussed above.⁴³

On this basis Chemnitz concludes that in the Lord's Supper something more than a [physical and] spiritual eating must take place. His conclusion reads:

Derhalben wenn unser Glaube/ den worten der einsetzung/ sol gleichförmig vnd gemess sein/ so müssen wir im Abendmal/ nicht allein von Geistlichen essen/ reden/ sondern vber das *de sacramentali manducatione*, das mith dem munde im Sacrament/ Sacraments weise/ der Leib Christi empfangen vnd gegessen werde/ nicht allein von wirdigen/ sonder auch von vnwürdigen.⁴⁴

Here three of the four criteria of Luther are included, namely, *manducatio oralis*, *manducatio indignorum* or *impiorum*, and the natural meaning of the words. The only test question which is lacking is that about the local inclosure of the human nature of Christ at a certain place in heaven.⁴⁵ That is: the "Hauptgabe" of the Supper, the true body and blood of Christ, is received and eaten by the communicants by their mouth. So much about the "that" of sacramental eating.

⁴²Ibid., 347.

⁴³See above, 138-152.

⁴⁴Ibid., 39.

⁴⁵Cf., *Anatome*, D ii v-D iii v; *Wolgeründeter Bericht*, 942-943, where all four probe stones are listed. In *Anatome* Chemnitz applies them to Hardenberg' doctrine extensively.

We have already indicated that Chemnitz has some hesitation to delve too much into this issue.⁴⁶ This applies particularly to the "how" of sacramental eating. When he first introduces this theme he quotes Luther, who maintains that

Wie aber das [leiblich vnd mündtlich essen] zugehe/ oder wie er im Brot sey/ wissen wir nicht/ sollens auch nicht wissen/ GÖttes wort sollen wir gleuben/ vnd jhm nicht weise noch mass setzen.⁴⁷

Also Chemnitz has a similar conviction. The "how" of sacramental eating cannot be explained or described in the same way as by the natural, physical eating. He cites two reasons for this. The first of them is the inborn darkness of our mind.⁴⁸ The other reason is "dieweil *Sacramentalis vnio*, wie der Leib Christi/ mit dem Brot im Abendmal vereiniget vnd gegenwertig sey/ ein geheimnis ist/ welches wir in diesem leben/ nicht begreifen können."⁴⁹ But Chemnitz also thinks that something more can and ought to be said. He will, therefore, offer that which "durch den Spiegel des Göttlichen wortes/ vns hieyon

⁴⁶See above, 182. "So viel wir auss Gottes wort/ von diesem geheimnis wissen sollen vnd verstehen können" (Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 33).

⁴⁷Ibid., 35.

⁴⁸Ibid., 40. This reason is only stated and not enlarged upon in this context. It is, however a stock argument in Chemnitz' discussions of hermeneutics and the subject matter of the articles of faith.

⁴⁹Ibid., 40.

zuwissen/ gegeben ist."⁵⁰ It should be noted that Chemnitz regards it as a work "durch Gottes gnade" that the churches of the Augsburg Confession teach and confess the true presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Supper.⁵¹ However, when Chemnitz continues his discussion he confesses his dependency on other authors. Chemnitz does not claim originality, not even that what he offers is based on his own study of the Scripture. What we can know about this mystery, Chemnitz relates, "habe ich aus deren schrifften/ welche diese frage grüntlich vnd fleissig gehandelt/ in ein kurtze summa zusammen gezogen."⁵² Chemnitz does not name his source here. His discussion shows that he leans on the same representatives of the "pure" ancient church and the leading Lutheran Reformers whom he ordinarily calls upon as witnesses of the truth.⁵³

Chemnitz' "kurtze summa" consists of two points, one negative and one positive or affirmative. In both Chemnitz argues from the same basis, namely, from the sacramental union, or the Real Presence, which he states as a fact on the

⁵⁰Ibid., 40.

⁵¹Ibid., 32.

⁵²Ibid., 40.

⁵³From his explicit quotations and references we can see that he draws on Luther, Ireneus, Origen, Chrysostom, Cyprian, Augustine, Hilary, and Paschasius. In the previous chapter on *De modo presentiae* of the true body and blood in the Supper he also quotes Cyril from the ancient church and Bugenhagen and Brenz from the first generation of Reformers.

basis of the *Verba*. What he here discusses is the "how" of sacramental eating. The former, negative point reads thus:

Nemlich/ wenn der Leib CHRisti mündtlich im Sacrament empfangen vnd gegesen wirdt/ geschichts nicht sichtlicher entpfindtlicher weise/ denn wie droben gesagt/ die gegenwertigkeit der Leib CHRisti/ im Abendmal ist nicht jrrdischer natürlicher oder begreiflicher weise/ auch wirdt inn demselbigen essen/ der leib CHRisti nicht zu rissen vnd zu bissen . . . lest sich auch nicht verwandeln in Fleisch vnd Blut/ wie andere speise.⁵⁴

Scriptural support for this position Chemnitz finds in Rom. 6[:9] and Acts 2[:27,31]. These Scripture passages do not deal with the Supper. But they do express a fundamental biblical doctrine. If Christ's body and blood had been eaten and digested in a natural, sensible way, then this doctrine had been denied since Christ repeatedly would have been put to death in the Supper. But the sacramental union is not physical; therefore, the sacramental eating is not physical or natural either.⁵⁵

The affirmative point is the direct continuation, or counterpart, of this statement. Now the presupposed basis for the sacramental eating, the sacramental union, is taken into the argument and is related to both the negative and the positive point. Chemnitz writes as follows:

Wie nun Vnio nicht ist *physica*, das ist/ wie der Leib CHRisti/ gegenwertig ist mith dem Brot im Abendmal/ nicht natürlicher weise/ also isset auch der Mundt denselbigen nicht auff solche natürlicher weise/ wie das Brot/ dauon droben gesagt/ vnd gleichwol empfeheth vnd isset der Mundt

⁵⁴Ibid., 40-41.

⁵⁵Ibid., 42-43. See quotation below this page.

warhafftiglich den Leib Christi/ denn so lauten die wort
 rundt vnd klar . . . Dasselbige mündtliche essen aber des
 Leibs Christi/ geschicht nicht natürlicher/ sondern
 vbernatürlicher vnd himlicher weise/ denn *qualis est
 Vnio, siue praesentia corporis Christi cum pane, talis est
 etiam ratio manducationis Sacramentalis.*⁵⁶

The Real Presence of the true body and blood of Christ in the Supper is simply stated on the basis of the *Verba* as a fact. Again the basis on which Chemnitz can argue in this manner is to be sought in his hermeneutical principles, in the quotation above expressed in the sentence: "Denn also lauten die wort rundt vnd klar." In these two statements Chemnitz gives the reason why he can maintain the eating of the true body and blood in the Sacrament at the same time as he rejects the Capernaitic notion. With the phrase "wie droben gesagt" Chemnitz refers to the two previous chapters "Wie oder auff was weise/ der ware Leib vnd Blut Christi im Abendmal gegenwertig sey" and "De modo praedicationis."⁵⁷ The essence of the former chapter can be gathered in two quotation from Luther and one from Brenz. In the first quotation Luther rejects the idea of a descent and ascent in relation to the Supper.

Bleiben fest bey dem Artickel des Glaubens/ Aufgefahren
 gen Himel/ sitzen zur rechten Gottes/ zukünfftig/ etc. vnd
 lassens Göttlicher Allmechtigkeit befohlen sein/ wie sein
 Leib vnd Blut im Abendmal vns gegeben werde . . . Wir

⁵⁶Ibid., 42-43.

⁵⁷In the German edition the chapter "De modo praedicationis" is moved to follow after the chapter on the benefits. But with "wie droben gesagt" Chemnitz obviously refers as much to that chapter as to the former.

dencken da keiner auffart noch niderfart/ die da solt geschehen/ sondern bleiben schlecht vnd einfeltiglich/ bey seinen worten/ das ist mein Leib/ das ist mein Blut/ etc.⁵⁸

The second quotation reads thus:

Wir leren/ das der Leib Jesu Christi/ sey im Sacrament nicht *localiter* (wie stroh im stack) sondern *definitive*, das ist/ Er ist gewisslich da/ nicht wie stroh im stack/ aber doch leiblich vnd warhafftig.⁵⁹

Using the phrase "mathematical presence" Brenz then expands upon Luther's term "definitive presence." Brenz writes:

Wann wir sagen/ das der Leib vnd das Blut Christi gegenwertig sey . . . mit Brot vnd Wein/ in des Herren Abendmal/ sol man solchs nicht verstehen/ von der Mathematischen gegenwertigkeit . . . Dann die Mathematische gedancken/ wie klein/ wie gross/ wie reumlich/ gehören zu den sachen dieser zeitlichen lebens/ vnd nicht zu den Geistlichen vnd Himlichen sachen.⁶⁰

In the chapter on "De modo praedictionis" Chemnitz summarizes his discussion by asserting that his conclusion is the same as Luther's *synecdochen*. His summary reads thus:

Also ist auch im Abendmal des Herren/ das wörtlein (Brot) hat eben die bedeutung/ was man sonst Brot heist/ (der Leib Christi) heist vnd ist das Fleisch/ welches vom heiligen Geist empfangen/ von Marien geboren/ am Creutz für vns gegeben ist. Die *Copula*, oder das wörtlein (ist) bezeichet ein solche vereinigung des *subiecti* vnd *praedicati*, das mit den Elementen/ so gesehen worden/ als mit Brot vnd Wein/ warhafftig vnd wesentlich/ doch unsichtlich/ der Leib vnd Blut Christi/ gegenwertig sey/ vnd zu essen vnd trincken dargereicht/ aus getheilet/ vnd genossen werde. Diese art zu reden heist Lutherus *synecdochen*.⁶¹

⁵⁸Ibid., 28-29. Ref. 6. Teil of Jena ed. Bl. 543.

⁵⁹Ibid., 30; see above, 88-93.

⁶⁰Ibid., 29.

⁶¹Ibid., 82.

These statements do not "explain" much. Actually they are not meant as an explanation of the unexplainable, nor do they claim to explain the "how" of the mystery of the sacramental union.⁶² In these statements their authors only want to confess what the *Verba* say: In the Supper both the elements, the bread and wine, and the substance of the true body and blood of Christ are present, distributed, and eaten without any hiatus.⁶³ They also firmly believe that God in his almighty power is able to do what He has promised even though the promised presence differs from that of ordinary experience. This is what Chemnitz wants us to understand when he maintains that the sacramental eating of Christ's body and blood "geschicht nicht sichtlicher entpfindlicher weise" and not "jrrdicher natürlicher oder begreifflicher weise."

So far we have seen that "die Hauptgabe" of the Supper, the true body and blood of Christ, is given and received, and eaten together with the bread and wine. In his summary of the discussion of the sacramental eating Chemnitz relate this to the gifts and benefits. From the relation between the sacramental union and the sacramental eating, namely, that the

⁶²Chemnitz concludes his discussion thus: "Wie aber vnd auff was Weise/ solches alles geschehe vnd zugehe/ weis der alleine/ der dis geheimnis eingesetzt / vnd verordnet hat/ wir aber könnens vnd sollens in diesem leben/ weder mith gedanken noch mit worten/ aussdencken oder aussreden" (ibid., 44).

⁶³The simultaneous eating is expressed in Chemnitz' statements by the words "inn demselbigen essen." See our discussion below, 223-227.

latter is based in the former in such a way that we can say:

"as is the former so is the latter," Chemnitz maintains:

Folget nun der verstandt vnd die meinung klerlich/ das die jenigen/ so die Sacrament nemen vnnnd essen/ den Leib vnnnd das Blut CHristi/ welche warhafftig vnnnd wesentlich gegenwertig/ vnnnd mit Brot vnd Wein/ dem Munde gereicht werden/ empfahren/ also/ durch solch nemen vnnnd essen/ der Leib des HERren/ nicht allein nach seiner krafft vnnnd wirckung/ sondern auch nach seinem wesen/ vereinigt werden/ nicht allein mit den hertzen/ Geist oder Seelen/ durch den Glauben/ sondern auch mith dem Leibe/ Fleisch vnd Blute/ derer so die Sacrament geniessen/ vnd dasselbige nicht also/ das es sey ein vergengliche speise des bauchs/ sondern ein Himlische essen/ den gleubigen zum ewigen leben/ den vnwürdigen aber/ zum gericht.⁶⁴

This summary relates directly to what was indicated in the discussion of the *proprium* of the Lord's Supper and was clearly stated in the presentation of the gifts and benefits of the Real Presence. There is, according to Chemnitz, a particular relation between "die Hauptgabe" as well as the gifts and benefits and the bodily life of the communicants. The gift of salvation applies to the whole man, not only to man's spirit or soul, but also to his bodily life. This issue, however, Chemnitz deals with more in detail when he discusses the spiritual eating, to which we now will turn.

Manducatio Spiritualis

The third kind of eating which is to take place in the Lord's Supper if the reception of the Sacrament is to be for the benefit of the communicant and not for judgment, is the

⁶⁴Ibid., 43-44.

spiritual eating. Chemnitz defines this kind of eating as follows:

Nun heisset die Schrifft Geistlich essen die *applicacionem*, da jhm ein jeder durch den Glauben/ zur Seligkeit vnd ewigem leben/ CHristum Gott vnd Menschen/ mit allen seinen wolthaten/ die er mith auffopfferung seines Leibs/ vnnnd vergiessung seines Bluts/ erworben hat/ zueignet vnd annimpt. Denn wer all sein vertrauen auff den Todt/ vnd die Aufferstehung CHristi setzet/ von dem sagt die Schrifft/ das er Geistlich gespeiset vnd getrencket werde/ mith dem leib vnnnd Blut CHristi/ zum ewigen leben/ Johannis am vierdten vnd sechsten.⁶⁵

As we already have pointed out the need of spiritual eating also in the Lord's Supper was not a controversial issue.⁶⁶ Chemnitz also emphasizes that "die Geistliche essen/ geschicht auch ausser dem brauch des Abendmal/ allein durch den Glauben auff das wort/ Johan.6."⁶⁷ As the Lutheran Reformers before him, Chemnitz knows of no beneficial use of the means of grace without faith. This applies also to the Lord's Supper. We expressly teach according to the words of Christ, Chemnitz emphasizes, that the sacramental eating is of no use without faith. Yes, and this is the particular Lutheran emphasis over against all the kinds of Sacrament-arians, sacramental eating without faith is in fact detrimental.⁶⁸ In Chemnitz' doctrine of the Lord's Supper this is a very important question. Faith, its character and function are impor-

⁶⁵Ibid., 46-47; cf., 36, 38, 347.

⁶⁶See above, 166 and 197-198.

⁶⁷Ibid., 47.

⁶⁸Ibid., 347-348.

tant issues in this connection. These will be mentioned all along the way as we treat spiritual eating. But we will not focus specifically upon them, since they will be discussed separately below when we treat the questions of worthy and unworthy eating.⁶⁹

In this context Chemnitz focuses on the particular kind of spiritual eating⁷⁰ which takes place in the Supper. The emphasis is on the relation between sacramental and spiritual eating. What Chemnitz here expounds is a direct parallel to the second, third and fourth benefit which were treated in the previous chapter, particularly the third and the fourth.

The second of the benefits discussed above, which Christ gives in the Lord's Supper, is the "New Testament." This benefit comprises "alle seine wolthaten/ so er vergiessung seines Bluts erworben hat."⁷¹ When he starts his discussion of spiritual eating Chemnitz connects directly with this issue:

Im Abendmal aber/ geschich das geistlich essen/ auff diese sonderliche weise . . . das da der Mundt nicht empfindet noch vernimpt/ das er etwas anders mehr/ denn Brodt vnd Wein empfangen/ so ergreifet doch das Hertz durch den Glauben/ aus Gottes wort/ den trost/ das Christus durch solche ausstheilung seines Leibs vnd Bluts/ allen denen/ so es im Sacrament/ mith Glauben entpfangen/ gibe/ schencket/ vnd zueignet/ alle seine verdienst vnd wolthaten.⁷²

⁶⁹See below, 249-277.

⁷⁰Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 47: "Im Abendmal aber/geschich das geistliche essen/ auff diese sonderliche weise"

⁷¹Ibid., 58.

⁷²Ibid., 47.

The last sentence in this statement: "Christus . . . gibet . . . alle seine verdienst vnd wolthaten," is a shorter repetition of the first part of the definition of spiritual eating which was quoted above.⁷³ His emphasis in this context, however, is, as we will see, not on this subject, but on the union between Christ and those who believe in him. As pointed out in the discussion of the third and fourth benefit of the Supper, the merits and benefits of Christ's death and his union with the believers are connected in Chemnitz understanding, even though it some times may not seem to be so.

The Benefits of Christ for the Whole man

In Chemnitz' discussion of the spiritual eating there are two trains of thought which go through the whole discussion of the "sonderliche weise" of the spiritual eating in the Supper. These we will analyze more in detail, particularly the second.

First, as we have seen, there are two (or even three) kinds of eating which take place when the Lord's Supper is received properly.⁷⁴ But it is important to realize that in the Supper both kinds of eating are united or joined together in one action.⁷⁵ The key words in the quotation at the end of the previous section is "durch solche ausstheilung." They

⁷³See above, 221.

⁷⁴See above, 197-199.

⁷⁵See above, 217-220, and below, 224-228.

refer to that which the mouth receives. The mouth does receive bread and wine which it can feel and sense. But it receives more. Through this very same distribution it also receives Christ's body and blood. All who in faith receive this very same distribution of Christ's body and the blood ["solche ausstheilung"] in the Sacrament, to all of them Christ gives all his merits and benefits.⁷⁶ In his conclusion on spiritual eating Chemnitz relates the sacramental and the spiritual eating to each other as the "was" and the "wie" of the same action.

Das mündtliche essen gehöret zu dem/ was das sey/ das mit Brot vnd Wein im Abendmal zu essen vnd trincken gereicht wirdt/ Das Geistliche essen aber lehret/ wie man solchs mith rechtem Glauben zum ewigen leben empfangen möge/ das nicht das mündtliche essen zum Gericht geschehe.⁷⁷

Secondly, and this is the main issue here, Chemnitz is concerned to make clear that the gifts of the Lord's Supper apply to the whole man. Related to this theme are a number of issues which ought to be considered. A fitting starting point is the twofold anthropology which Chemnitz works with in this context.

⁷⁶The "es" in "alle denen/ so es im Sacrament . . . empfangen" refers to "solche ausstheilung" which in turn captures the "etwas anders mehr/ denn Brot vnd Wein" of the previous sentence. This "mehr" which is given in and with the distribution of the elements are the body and blood of Christ.

⁷⁷Ibid., 50; underlining added.

In the summary of his discussion of the sacramental eating Chemnitz says that those who receive and eat the true body and blood of Christ in the Supper, receive it

also/ das durch solch nemen vnd essen/ der Leib des HERren/ nicht allein nach seiner krafft vnd wirckung/ sondern auch nach seinem wesen/ vereinigt werden/ nicht allein mit den hertzen/ Geist oder Seelen/ durch den Glauben/ sondern auch mith dem Leibe/ Fleisch vnd Blute/ derer so die Sacrament geniessen.⁷⁸

Here Chemnitz distinguishes very clearly between heart, spirit and soul on the one hand, and the body, flesh and blood, on the other hand. The subsequent analysis will demonstrate even more clearly the importance of this distinction.

In a passage in the section on spiritual eating Chemnitz expands on this issue in a way that displays how he thinks about the role the two parts of man play in the reception of the Sacrament. We are not Capernaïtes, he retorts to the argument of his opponents,

denn wir beides behalten/ Leiblich vnd Geistlich essen/ der Mundt jssset den Leib Christi/ denn er kan die wort nicht fassen/ noch essen/ vnd weiss nicht was er jssset/ schmeckt jhm gleich/als esse er etwas anders/denn Christus Leib/ Aber das hertz fasset die wort im glauben/ vnd jssset eben dasselbige Geistlich/ das der Mundt Leiblich jssset/ denn das Hertz sihet wol/ was der vnerstendige Mundt jssset/ Woher sihet es aber? Nicht vom Brodt/ noch vom essen des Mundes/ sondern vom wort das da stehet/ Esset/ das ist mein Leib/ vnd ist doch einerlei Leib CHristi/ denn beide Mundt vnd Hertz jssset/ ein jegliches auff seine masse vnd weise.⁷⁹

⁷⁸Ibid., 44; cf., 346-347, 351.

⁷⁹Ibid., 48-49.

Here the following should be noted: (1) It is emphasized, as already pointed out, that both the mouth and the heart eat the same body.⁸⁰ Here, however, the point is that each of them receives the same gift "auff seine masse vnd weise." (2) The mouth receives Christ's body and blood without any perception of what it is eating or what that which it eats may mean. Actually the mouth, or the body, does not grasp the words of the Lord.⁸¹ (3) The heart, on the other hand, receives and eats the same gift in a different way. In faith the heart fixes its "eyes" not on the elements, nor on the act of eating, but on the *Verba*.⁸² From the *Verba* it sees and realizes both what itself and the body eat and what the received gift means for each of them. The expressions that Chemnitz uses are these: "das hertz fasset die wort," "das Hertz sihet vom wort das da steht," and "die Seele sihet vnd verstehet."⁸³ This corresponds with Chemnitz' view of the *sedes doctrinae*

⁸⁰This is stated two times in the quotation, and it is repeated in the subsequent context. ". . . vnnnd also beide/ von einerlei speise gesettiget vnd selig werden" (ibid., 49); cf., above, 218-199 and 225.

⁸¹The mouth or "der vnerstendige Leib nicht weiss das er solche speise jssset/ dadurch er sol ewig leben/ denn er fülests nicht/ sondern stirbt dahin vnd verfaulet/ als hette er sonst andere speise gegessen/ wie ein vnuernünfftig Thier" (ibid., 49). As we see Chemnitz is here not speaking of the effects of the original sin, but of the the nature of the body. See above, 226, note 635.

⁸²See the following from 226, note 636: "Das Hertz sihet . . . vom wort das da stehet/ Esset/ das ist mein Leib."

⁸³Ibid., 48-49.

and expresses the same as Luther's watchword: "des Sacraments ym wortt warnemen."⁸⁴

The eating of the mouth and of the heart are united in one act. But in eating the same body, each in its own "masse vnd weise," they are not only receiving the gift each for its own part; they are also serving each other. Continuing the quotation above, Chemnitz writes:

Das Hertz kan nicht leiblich essen/ so kan der Mundt nicht Geistlich essen/ so machts nun GOTT gleich/ das der Mundt für das Hertze Leiblich/ vnnd das Hertz für den Mundt Geistlich esse/ vnnd also beide/ von einerlei speiss gesetztiget vnd selig werden.⁸⁵

The service which the mouth renders the heart, Chemnitz does not comment upon. It is, however, not difficult to discover: The particular spiritual eating of Christ's true body and blood in the Supper, in, with, and under the external elements, and applied to the individual in person, cannot take place except in conjunction with natural and oral sacramental eating. On the other hand, if the heart does not apprehend the *Verba* in faith, the sacramental eating will not do the body any good. On the contrary, as Chemnitz often emphasizes, it will be detrimental, an eating to judgment.

Further, with this twofold view of man in mind, how does Chemnitz think of Christ's application of himself and all his merits to the sinner? This we will now consider more closely.

⁸⁴WA 11, 448.31; cf., above, 129.

⁸⁵Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 49.

There seems to be a parallel between the twofold view of man and the way Chemnitz speaks of Christ and the bestowal of his benefits. From the *Verba*, he maintains, faith learns

diese höchstte wolthat des Sons GOTTES/ das er sich nicht allein mith seinem Geist/ sonder auch noch darüber/ mith warhafftiger Ausstheilung vnd Vberreichung/ seines thewrbaren Leibs vnd Blutes/ auff genaweste vnd feste zu vns thut/ vnd in vns sein will/ das wir das Leben haben in vns wonend/ vnd eins mit jhm sein/ Bein von seinen Beinen/ Fleisch von seinem Fleische/ dieweil das heilige Fleisch/ das für der Welt Leben gegeben ist/ darinn das Leben wonet/ mit vns vereiniget/ in/ mit/ vnd bey vns ist.⁸⁶

The question is whether the distinction which Chemnitz makes between Christ's "Geist," on the one hand, and his "Leib vnd Blut" on the other hand, (1) relates to the person of Christ in a manner parallel to the twofold view of man which he works with, or (2) should be read as a reference to the two kinds of eating of the Sacrament: the sacramental and the spiritual. In view of the twofold view of man stated not long before the former could seem obvious. A neat parallelism seems then to emerge: Christ Spirit [spiritual being] communicates with our spirit [soul, heart]; Christ's body and blood communicates with our body, flesh and blood. There are, however, good reasons not to read the text in this way. Both mouth and faith eat "einerley Leib Christi,"⁸⁷ which "vereinigt werden/ nicht allein mit den hertzen/ Geist oder Seelen/ durch den Glauben/ sondern auch mith dem Leibe/ Fleisch vnd Blute" of

⁸⁶Ibid., 47-48.

⁸⁷Ibid., 49.

the communicants.⁸⁸ The closest parallel to the quoted passage we find at the end of Chemnitz' refutation of the opponents' argument from spiritual eating. There he states "das er [Christus] nicht allein durch seinen Geist in vns wohnen will/ sondern auch durch seinen Leib vnd Blut sich zu vns tuth vndd vereiniget."⁸⁹ A few lines before he expresses the same in a slightly different way:

Derhalben weil CHristus sich mith vns nicht allein Geistlich verfügen/ sondern auch durch das wesen seines Fleisches . . . in diesem hochwirdigen Sacrament/ sich mit vns vereinigen wil⁹⁰

"Geistlich" here most probably means "through the Holy Spirit" with the eating of the Sacrament in faith in mind. This indicates that "seinem Geist" in the text we are discussing refers to spiritual eating through the Holy Spirit and not to Christ's spiritual nature. This fits very well with the context immediately preceding which reads:

. . . so ergreiffet doch das Hertz durch den Glauben/ aus Gottes wort/ den trost/ das Christus durch solche auss- theilung seines Leibs vnd Bluts/ allen denen/ so es im Sacrament/ mith Glauben entpfangen/ gibet/ schencket/ vnd zueignet/ alle seine verdienste vndd wolthathen/ denn der Glaube lernet vndd betracketet auss den worten der einsetz- ung⁹¹

In the context of the Word as a means of grace "geistlich" would no doubt be understood as the work of the Holy Spirit

⁸⁸Ibid., 44.

⁸⁹Ibid., 351; emphasis added.

⁹⁰Ibid.; emphasis added.

⁹¹Ibid., 47.

in and with the words in application of the merits and grace of Christ to man the sinner.⁹² The same applies to Baptism.⁹³

Admittedly, there are few explicit references to the Holy Spirit in Chemnitz' discussion of the Supper. But the adjective "geistlich" appears frequently. It can not mean invisible, insensible or the like, since that applies also to the unworthy eating.⁹⁴ It must either mean inwardly, through faith with the heart, or it must refer to the Holy Spirit. Since "geistlich" very often is used together with heart or/ and faith, the former meaning would make a tautology. On the other hand, eating through the Holy Spirit must be an eating in faith with the heart. When Chemnitz speaks of spiritual eating, all three elements are included together: through the Spirit, in faith of the heart. The Holy Spirit works on the communicant through the "word-part" of the Supper. This Chemnitz says explicitly by quoting Luther.

Derhalben wenn auch gleich im Abendmal des HERren/ nicht anders oder mehre gereicht würde/ denn Brot vnd Wein . . . so ist dennoch da/ die verheissung vnd das wort Gottes/ vnd der heilige Geist ist krefftig/ durch das wort im

⁹²In his discussion of the first benefit of the Supper, the strengthening of faith, in his comments on the words: "do this in remembrance of Me," Chemnitz writes: "Denn von dem ampt des worts spricht er Johan. 14. Der heilige Geist wirdt euch erinnern alles des/ das ich euch gesagt habe." (Ibid., 56). This is a commonplace in Chemnitz doctrine of conversion.

⁹³Kurtzer Bericcht, 126; cf., Brynjulf Hoaas, The Doctrine of Conversion in the Theology of Martin Chemnitz: What Conversion is and how it is Worked (Ft. Wayne: STM Thesis, Concordia Theological Seminary, 1985), 142-145.

⁹⁴Die Reine Gesinde Lehre, 40.

Abendmal . . . Wie viel mehr aber ists billicher/ das es [mith ehrerbietung hinzu zu gehen] geschehe/ weil wir gleuben/ das allda der ware Leib/ vnd das ware Blut/ mit dem wort gegenwertig sey.⁹⁵

This is not a spiritualizing of the Lord's Supper, since this pertains not to the substance and sacramental eating of the Supper, but to its beneficial use. "Denn wir beides behalten," Chemnitz asserts, "Leiblich vnd Geistlich essen." And he adds: "Aber das hertz fasset die wort im glauben/ vnd jsset eben dasselbige Geistlich/ das der Mundt Leiblich jsset."⁹⁶ The gifts are made the communicants' saving own when the receiving hand of faith lays hold of the *Verba*.⁹⁷ This is a genuine spiritual act; that is, it can only take place, as Luther said, when "der heilige Geist ist krefftig/ durch das wort im Abendmal."

To express the relation between Christ and the bodily life of the believing communicants, Chemnitz regularly uses the verb "sich vereinigen mith." This union he depicts very concretely: Bone of Christ's bones, flesh of his flesh.⁹⁸ However, we have seen that the sacramental union and the sac-

⁹⁵Ibid., 292. On Luther, cf., Peters, Realpräsenz, 46-67.

⁹⁶Ibid., 48; cf., *ibid.*, 50.

⁹⁷Cf., *ibid.*, 351. For the image of the means of grace as God's hand and faith as the hand that receives God's gift, cf., Wolgegründeret Bericht, 931.

⁹⁸This expression, quoted above, 188, which alludes to Eph.5:30, appears often in Chemnitz' works on the Lord's Supper; cf., The Lord's Supper, 169; Wolgegründeter Bericht, 946: ". . . er gewiss in uns wolle wohnen, und uns zu seinen gliedmassen machen," and in Formula of Concord, SD, VII, 78.

ramental, or oral, eating is not physical or natural in the sense of *physica manducatio*. The same is the case here. The union of Christ through his body and blood with our body is not physical. The body and blood of Christ do not go into the communicants' digestive system the way the external elements do. They "lest sich auch nicht verwandeln in Fleisch vnd Blut, wie andere speise," and in such a way provide eternal life for the body.⁹⁹ Nor does it prevent the death of the body. On the contrary,

der vnuerstendige Leib nicht weiss/ das er [der Leib] solche speise jset/ dadurch er sol ewig leben/ denn er fülets nicht/ sondern stirbt dahin vnd verfaulet/ als hette er sonst andere speise gegessen.¹⁰⁰

Nevertheless, Christ, human and divine, unites himself with our bodily life in such a way that "auch vnser arme Körperlin/ in die Gemeinschaft der hohen Himlischen Güter angenommen werden."¹⁰¹ This implies that the more gross conception of the *pharmakon athanasias* is not intended.

In the two sections on the union with Christ and the *pharmakon athanasias* and the chapter where Chemnitz refutes the Zwinglians' arguments from spiritual eating there are two striking features. First, Chemnitz focuses almost exclusively on the participation of our body in this union. The

⁹⁹Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 41; cf., 42-43. See above, 216-217.

¹⁰⁰Ibid., 49.

¹⁰¹Ibid., 48.

heart, spirit, and soul are either not mentioned, or are touched on only in passing. The reason for this is that the spiritual eating of the body and blood of Christ is presupposed. It is indeed often dealt with in other contexts. Chemnitz repeatedly uses a "nicht allein . . . , sondern auch" construction to indicate this. Almost at the beginning of his discussion of the *pharmakon athanasias* Chemnitz writes: "Dieweil aber nicht allein die seele/ sondern auch vnsere Körper/mit dem Leib vnd Blut Christi/ gespeiset werden . . . so folget/ das" ¹⁰² The former is simply stated, while the latter is enlarged upon.

Secondly, and even more striking, is that in these contexts which deal with Christ's union with our bodily life, Chemnitz scarcely mentions Christ's work of redemption. In the chapter on the three kinds of eating, Christ's redemption comes to the fore only when Chemnitz spells out the meaning of spiritual eating. A typical example of this is the following from one of his definitions of spiritual eating:

Nun heisset die Schrifft Geistlich essen die *applicati-
tionem*, da jhm ein jeder durch den Glauben/ zur seligkeit
vnd ewigem leben/ Christum Gott vnd Menschen/ mit allen
seinen wolthaten/ die er mith auffopfferung seines Leibs/
vndd vergiessung seines Bluts/ erworben hat/ zueignet vnd
annimpt. ¹⁰³

This corresponds directly to the benefit of the "New Testament" in the chapter of the "nutz/ frucht vnd trost" of the

¹⁰²Ibid., 63; cf., 44, 47, 351.

¹⁰³Ibid., 46.

Supper. This benefit comprehends Christ and all his merits and benefits, "vergebung der Sünden/ GÖttes gnade/ die Kindtschafft/ Seligkeit/ vnd das ewige leben."¹⁰⁴

When Chemnitz, on the other hand, treats the third and the fourth benefits, the communication of the gift of salvation to the body and the *pharmakon athanasias*, Christ's death on the cross, forgiveness of sins or the like is not mentioned explicitly. In the general perspective of Chemnitz' theology Christ's redemptive work, on the one hand, and "die Himlischen Güter" and eternal life belong intrinsically together. His argument, therefore, needs to be considered carefully. The background of his argument is Rom. 7[:18-23] and Gal.5[:17]. Chemnitz explains:

Derhalben spricht nun CHRistus/ dieweil ewre Fleisch vnnnd Blut nichts taug/ denn es is ein Leib der Sünden. So (nemet vnd esset/ das ist mein Leib) denn wie Cyrillus spricht/ weil das Fleisch des Erlösers vnnnd Heylands/ mit dem wort Gottes (welches ist von natur das Leben) ist vereiniget/ ist es auch lebendig machent worden. Wenn wir nun dasselbige essen/ so haben wir das Leben inn vns/ die- weil wir mit dem Fleisch im Abendmal/ vereiniget werden/ welches das Leben worden ist.¹⁰⁵

The reasoning here is very clear. The life-giving and saving power of Christ's body and blood received in the Supper is here clearly related to the Incarnation, or the union of the flesh of our Redeemer with the Logos, which is by nature Life

¹⁰⁴Ibid., 58-59

¹⁰⁵Ibid., 62. The underlining is added to make plain how the reasoning runs.

itself.¹⁰⁶ When Chemnitz discusses the body and blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper as *pharmakon athanasias*, the means for the "zukünfftigen vnsterblichkeit vnnd verklerung unserer armen Cörper," he argues in the same way.¹⁰⁷ The only reference to Christ's historical work of salvation in these texts are the names "Erlöser vnnd Heyland." In Cyril these names most probably do not refer to Christ's atoning death as our substitute, at least this is not emphasized. In Chemnitz, however, this is the meaning they generally carry. What Chemnitz wants to say, therefore, may imply this: the flesh of our Redeemer and Savior, who died vicariously for our sins, is saving because it is united with the divine *logos*. This, however, is not said expressly.

It would be onesided and unfair to present Chemnitz' view on this issue only from the texts mentioned above. They are very short, and they are in fact preceded by the chapter on the three kinds of eating which are more elaborate. There Chemnitz' train of thought runs thus: He starts with the definition of spiritual eating which is nothing but an applica-

¹⁰⁶Cf., *ibid.*, 275: " Es stossen sich aber viel daran/ dieweil das Fleisch CHristi/ vmb der persönlichen vereinigung willen mit der Gottheit/ das Leben worden ist/ wie Cyrillus redet" Chemnitz also refers to the personal union when he emphasizes the Lord's Supper as the most powerful antidote for the awakening and strengthening the remembrance of Christ. (*ibid.*, 57: ". . . sein Fleisch ist ein Lebendigmachendes Fleisch/ dieweil die ewige Gottheit/ in persönlicher einigkeit darinn wonet"

¹⁰⁷*Ibid.*, 63-64.

tion in faith of Christ, "Gott vnd Mensch/ mit allen seinen wolthaten/ die er mit auffopfferung seines Leibs/ vnnd ver-giessung seines Bluts/ erworben hat."¹⁰⁸ In the Supper this spiritual eating is in a "sonderliche weise,"¹⁰⁹ a joint eating by mouth and heart of the very same body and blood of Christ. The believing heart apprehends "aus Gottes wort/ den trost/ das Christus . . . givet/ schencket/ vnd zueignet/ alle seine verdienst vnd wolthaten."¹¹⁰ With joyful heart faith con-siders "diese höchstte wolthat des Sons GOTTES," who in the Supper not only through spiritual eating, but also through the sacramental eating of his true body and blood will unite himself with us

das wir das Leben haben in vns wonend . . . dieweil das heilige Fleisch/ das für der Welt Leben gegeben ist/ dar-inn das Leben wonet/ mit vns vereiniget/ in/ mit/ vnd bey vns ist.¹¹¹

We see, then, that Chemnitz' argument starts with a very clear reference to Christ's atoning death; in the phrase "Christus . . . zueignet/ alle seine verdienst vnd wolthaten" he repeats it before he emphasizes the bestowal of the benefits to the body, and he underlines the same at the end by asserting that "das heilige Fleisch" in which "das Leben wonet," is the flesh

¹⁰⁸Ibid., 46; quoted in full, 222.

¹⁰⁹Ibid., 47; see above, 224.

¹¹⁰Ibid.

¹¹¹Ibid., 47-48; quoted more full above, 229.

which "für der Welt Leben gegeben ist." This is said, it should be emphasized, about Christ, who is "Gott vnd Mensch."

We can, therefore, conclude that also to the body it is Christ, human and divine, with all the merits and benefits, procured through his atoning death, that gives salvation. Because he is not only human, but human and divine in an insoluble personal union, his vicarious death has saving power.¹¹²

From what we have seen it is obvious that Chemnitz makes use of arguments from Christology. He discusses them not only to correct their misuse by the Sacramentarians, as he sometimes indicates.¹¹³ They play an important part in his own argument. And he does not feel that he is in conflict with his own principle that one must not argue from "frembde grunde," but always cling to the *Verba*. In his discussion of the personal union Chemnitz asserts:

Wir *argumentieren* aber in diesem Handel/ nicht ausser oder ohn Gottes wort/ allein aus der *Consequentia* vnd folge/ *A possibili ad inesse*, von dem das Christo möglich kündte sein/ vnd derhalben sein müste¹¹⁴

There are those who do so. As the quotation indicates, Chemnitz repudiates this procedure. No names are mentioned,

¹¹²Ibid., 305, 307-308.

¹¹³Wolgegründeter Bericht, 944; Wiederholte Christliche Gemeine Confeßion und Erklerung. . . . (Wolfenbüttel: Conrad Horn, 1572), C i r-v. In both sources the issue we now will comment upon is very nicely summarized.

¹¹⁴Ibid., 307.

but it is clear that Brenz is within the range of this censure. Positively he states:

Wir aber nemen für vns/das klare ausgetruckte wort Gottes/ vnd fangen dauon an/ vnd wenn wir daselbst lesen/ das etwas geredet/ oder aussgesaget wirdt/ von der menschlichen natur in Christo/ dasselbe verleugnen wir nicht/ verkerens auch nicht durch frembde deutung/ darumb/ wenn wir solche eigenschafft nicht in vnserem Leibe nicht finden.¹¹⁵

There are statements which strictly speaking pertain to Christology and which must be taken into account in the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. Chemnitz is convinced of the doctrinal unity and integrity of Scripture. There can, therefore, be no conflict between Christology and the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. We must take into account "wer der sey/ der es wircket," Chemnitz maintains.¹¹⁶ He, therefore, refuses to separate "Gottes allmechtigkeit vnd seinen willen."¹¹⁷ God's will here announces his gracious promise. God's omnipotence is the "Möglichkeitsbedingung"¹¹⁸ for "die Hauptgabe" and the gifts and benefits it brings.

We are here not going to investigate the roots for the particular way Chemnitz treats this issue. If we should

¹¹⁵Ibid.

¹¹⁶Ibid., 313, quoting Hugo of St. Victor.

¹¹⁷Ibid., 314; see above, 186-187.

¹¹⁸Theodor Mahlmann, Das neue Dogma des lutherischen Christologie (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1969), 216-218, maintains that to Chemnitz the personal union as "den Grund der Möglichkeit" to bring Christology and the testimony of the Scripture together. He does not, however, allow for deductions from Christology. The testimony of Scripture sets the limits of what can be said.

search for the roots for the strong emphasis on the union of the body and blood of Christ with our body, and their life-giving power, and particularly *pharmakon athanasias*, the clue no doubt must be searched for in his use of the ancient fathers. In Chemnitz the union with Christ, done by his body and blood in the Sacrament, is not an unimportant part of the benefits of the Lord's Supper. Nevertheless, he does not prove it from the New Testament. The only sources which he cites are the fathers, especially Irenaeus and Cyril of Alexandria.¹¹⁹ Both these fathers often gave expression to the so-called "physical" or "mystical," or what may be better called the "incarnation-redemption" theory. In Cyril it is the dominating viewpoint. The gift of salvation is regularly, if not exclusively, interpreted as immortality and incorruptibility.¹²⁰ None of these fathers taught these doctrines to

¹¹⁹In Examen, II, 234-235, Chemnitz also quotes Ignatius, Cyprian, Chrysostom, and Bernard of Clairvaux. In the same context he also quotes Augustine and Basil the Great. The quotations from them, however, do not support the issue we are now discussing. He does not refer to Luther for support on this issue.

¹²⁰J. N. D. Kelly, Early Christian Doctrines, (New York and San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1978), 396-399; and particularly Ezra Gebremedhin, Life-Giving Blessing. An Inquiry into the Eucharistic Doctrine of Cyril of Alexandria (Uppsala, 1977). Gebremedhin demonstrates very clearly that to Cyril man's problem after the fall is "the tyranny of death and corruptibility over man and the defeat of these enemies through the body and blood of Christ is an overriding theme of Cyril's eucharistic theology. Thus the far most dominant feature of Cyril's eucharistic theology is his teaching that the Eucharist bestows the gift of incorruptibility" (ibid., 100).

the exclusion of other aspects. In Cyril's Eucharistic theology, however, the suffering and vicarious death and atonement of Christ play at best a marginal part. For the most part it is absent. The "incarnation-redemption" viewpoint is the only one that appears.¹²¹

What Chemnitz cites from these fathers is closely connected with his strong emphasis on Christ's vicarious death and atonement. Further, it is almost exclusively in sections where he deals with Christ's union with the believers' bodily life that Chemnitz draws heavily on these fathers. In such contexts these viewpoints occur together.

It should also be recognized that John 6 is important in Cyril doctrine of the Lord's Supper,¹²² a chapter which Chemnitz emphatically rejected as *sedes doctrinae* of the doctrine of the Lord's Supper; that is, Chemnitz integrates viewpoints in his doctrine of the Lord's Supper which were based on a text which he in other contexts rejects as a source for this doctrine. We may, therefore, conclude that what he says of bodily benefits is not in the usual way of Chemnitz theology. This element stands clearly apart in Chemnitz

¹²¹Gebremedhin, Life-Giving Blessing, states: "It is through the Incarnation -- and more specifically through the hypostatic union of the two natures -- that man is vivified and restored. This is the fundamental basis of Cyril's soteriology and eucharistic theology" (ibid., 22).

¹²²Ibid., 50; cf., Albrecht Peters, Realpräsenz. Luthers Zeugnis von Christi Gegenwart im Abendmahl (Berlin: Lutherische Verlagshaus, 1960), 33.

theology. The way he treats the viewpoints we now have focused on is best explained as the impact of the fathers on an aspect of Chemnitz theology. It is atypical of his general procedure, and to a certain extent they are at variance with his own hermeneutical principle. Later these viewpoints almost faded away, particularly in his confessional works.¹²³

Before we leave this issue one more aporia ought to be mentioned. We have seen that Chemnitz in his doctrine of the Lord's Supper advance a twofold anthropology. It climaxes in the Cyril's assertion, which Chemnitz quotes approvingly, that

es künfte dieser verwesentlichen natur vnsers Leibs/ auff keine andere weise/ zu der vnuerwesslichkeit vnd des leben gebracht werden/ allein das der Leib/ des natürlichen lebens/jhr zugethan/zugefüget vnd vereiniget würde/ etc.¹²⁴

The aporia becomes transparent when this issue is related to the chief Reformation doctrine; that is, the doctrine of justification by faith and the related doctrine of man as a sinner. In this context it may suffice to call attention to the so-called *totus homo* aspect which is so important in both these doctrines.¹²⁵ Man is, first and foremost, what he is *coram deo* both as saint and sinner. In this perspective man

¹²³See above, 191-192.

¹²⁴Ibid., 64; here Chemnitz is citing Cyril.

¹²⁵Bengt Hägglund, De Homine. Mäniskouppfattningen i äldre luthersk tradition (Lund: C W K Gleerup, 1959). The question is dealt with repeatedly throughout the book both with reference to Luther and the later theologians of the Lutheran Orthodoxy. For detailed references, see the subject index [sakregister] on "totus homobetraktelse" (ibid., 416).

is always regarded as whole person. Justifying grace applies to man as person. It is not given out in parts or to parts of man. Either the whole man is fully under God's grace, or he is not under grace at all. In his De homine Bengt Hägglund has pointed out some differences between Luther and the later theologians of Lutheran Orthodoxy on this issue. These differences are particularly related to the changes in their way of treating anthropology under the influence of Melanchthon and Neo-Aristotelianism.¹²⁶ It became difficult for the Lutheran theologians to apply the *totus homo* aspect consistently. The importance of this development can be seen as early as in the *Flacian Controversy*.¹²⁷

As far as Chemnitz is concerned, he strove to keep philosophical categories out of theology, and he has retained the main concerns of Luther.¹²⁸ The critical questions concern especially the way the twofold anthropology is applied in the bestowal of the gifts for grace and the piecemeal distribution of grace. It is difficult to see how Chemnitz' doctrine of sin and grace, or justification in a broader sense, can go together with the view that life eternal can be bestowed on man's bodily life only through the Lord's Supper.¹²⁹ The con-

¹²⁶On this issue see *ibid.*, 146-163, especially 156-159.

¹²⁷*Ibid.*, 243-252, especially 249.

¹²⁸Hoaas, The Doctrine of Conversion in the Theology of Martin Chemnitz, 33-34, 53-56, 155-168.

¹²⁹See above, 241.

clusion can scarcely be avoided that there is a discrepancy here, if not a contradiction.

The most questionable issue is the claim that the gift of salvation can be conferred to man's bodily life only by the Lord's Supper. It is difficult to see that this position can be defended from the testimony of Scripture, particularly on the basis of Chemnitz' own hermeneutical principles. As we have seen, Chemnitz relies on the testimony of "der alte pure Kirche."¹³⁰ Nowhere is any criticism or doubt voiced. We will here confine ourselves to ask the following critical, but highly relevant question: What about children and other believers to whom Chemnitz denies admission to the Lord's Supper? Justifying grace has been given to them in Baptism. But are they excluded from the gifts of salvation that apply particularly to the body? The answer is given in the *totus homo* aspect to which we just have called attention to and which Chemnitz elsewhere vigorously supports. Everyone who has received justifying grace has received it fully for his whole person, for the inner man: soul, spirit, and heart, and for the external man: body, flesh, and blood, and whatever distinctions one may make. Such distinctions are both allowable and necessary, but they must be distinctions without separation. The rejection of such separatism together with Chemnitz own hermeneutical principles may then serve as the clue for what we here can learn from Chemnitz.

¹³⁰See above, 185-191.

CHAPTER 8

THE RECIPIENS: HOW IS THE LORD'S SUPPER RECEIVED PROPERLY ACCORDING TO ITS INSTITUTION?

The previous chapters have demonstrated how Chemnitz dealt with the benefits of the Sacrament. They are all that Christ won for us through his vicarious death and his victorious resurrection; in sum: the Gospel. In the sacrament God bestows these benefits on man through sacramental and spiritual eating of the body and blood of Christ. In his preaching and teaching Chemnitz had proclaimed these Gospel gifts to his people. His concern was to arouse their appreciation and love of the Lord's Supper.

In this chapter our focus will be upon the recipient of the gifts. Not all, indeed many, who receive the body and blood of Christ in the Supper do not obtain its salutary fruits but, rather, receive the Sacrament to their own judgment.¹ The question is: How is the Lord's Supper used properly according to its institution? What makes the difference? The short answer to this question: faith. Our discussion of

¹Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 53, 272. That Chemnitz so often warns against the *ex opere operato* indicate that many rely upon the simple participation of the sacrament, 52, 96, 281 et al.. See also Enchiridion, 126, q. 267; Kurtzer Bericht, 130; Wolgegründeter Bericht, 931, 941.

spiritual eating has demonstrated sufficiently that faith is indispensable for a salutary reception of the Lord's Supper. Chemnitz' discussion of this issue throws interesting light on the whole issue of how the Lord's Supper ought to be used in the Church.

The biblical basis for Chemnitz' discussion, primarily, is Paul's serious warning in 1 Cor. 11:27-29, but also the *Verba* themselves, since the warning is directly related to the Pauline version of the *Verba*. "Worthy" and "unworthy" eating are the general terms Chemnitz uses. The purpose of this chapter is to uncover more clearly what is meant by "worthy" and "unworthy" reception of the Supper.

There are four chapters in Die Reine Gesunde Lehre which are of particular interest. First, there is a chapter "Von denen so unwirdig essen."² This chapter together with his section on 1 Cor.11:27-29,³ which is appended to his treatment of the *Verba*, will serve as the basis of our discussion. After having explained the purpose of his book and quoted the confessional statements on the Lord's Supper,⁴

²Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 269-282.

³Ibid., 199-206.

⁴According to Chemnitz Paul handed over to Timothy "die form vnd fürbild der gesunde wort" that he "nicht allein die meinung vnd verstandt/ lauter vnnnd rein erhalten/ sondern das er sich auch befleissen sol/ das er vndem fürbild der heilsamen wort/ wie von einem jeden Artickel zu reden/ nicht abweiche." "Hab derhalben baldt vorn an/ etliche formulas/ von der Lehr des Abendmals/ wie dieselbigen in öffentlichen *Confessionibus*, der Euangelischen Kirchen/ verfasst sind/ zum fürbildt wollen setzen" (Ibid., 4-5) Among the items he

Chemnitz discusses first whether Christians may hold different opinions of the statements from the *Verba*: "This is my body" and "this is my blood," without harming their faith.⁵ There is also a chapter on "Wie man dis Sacrament ehren soll."⁶ There Chemnitz spells out some characteristics of a "rechte," "ware," and "lebendige Glaube." Both these chapters contain material which illuminates the issue we are now addressing. Most of the issues involved pertain to the questions of "faith -- unbelief" and "to discern the body."

The Interpretation of the *Verba* a serious matter

On the basis of our previous discussion it is easy to understand that for Chemnitz the Lord's Supper is, first and foremost, a most holy and gracious institution which cannot be treated lightly. Whether his opponents like it or not, according to Chemnitz it is definitely to treat the Supper very lightly, when they maintained that original meaning of the distribution words is not important.

includes there are some which later were not regarded as confessions. The following are quoted: The Augsburg Confession, the Apology, the Wittenberg Concord, the Smalcaid Articles, the formula presented at the Colloquy at Regensburg (1541).

⁵Ibid., 14-21. The heading of the chapter reads: "Ob man wol könne vnnd müge/ ohne verletzung des Glaubens/ vnnd ohne nachtheil des seligkeit/ auff mancherley vngleiche meinung von den worten des Abentmals (das ist mein Leib/ etc. das ist mein Blut/ etc.) disputiren/ einer sonst/ der ander so glauben vnd halten" (ibid., 14).

⁶Ibid., 282-293.

Whether the plant God let grow up to shade Jonah from the sun (in Hebrew "kikajon"), in Greek should be translated "Coloquint", "Hederam", or "Iffloff", is of no consequence. In such cases turmoil and charges of heresy are out of place.⁷ The Real Presence of the Christ's true body and blood in the Supper is, however, not a comparable issue. On account of the inclination of "die verderbte Menschliche natur" a detrimental "leichtfertigkeit" is easily fostered "in fürwitzigen hertzen," when the *Verba* are treated in a similar manner.⁸ One should not think, Chemnitz warns, that the *Verba* are something to play around with. He concludes thus:

Derhalben ist für allen dingen von nöten/ das man inn diesem handel/ von des HERren Abendmal/ erst vnd letzt aus warhafftigen beständigen grunde der schrift/ solche leichtfertige gedanken ausschlagen als möchten wir/ mit den worten vnsers gefallen spielen/ vnd weren gleichwol nicht mehr denn vngefahrliche fragen vnd disputationes/ darinn ohne nachtheil des Glaubens vnd der Seligkeit/ vnser vernunft spitzigkeit sich üben möge.⁹

It should be noticed that the seriousness of the matters involved in the Supper is the very first issue Chemnitz raises. His purpose in bringing it in at this early stage can only be that he wants to make it plain that our way of dealing with the *Verba* indeed is of consequence for our use of the Lord's Supper and therefore concerns our faith and eternal salvation.

⁷Ibid., 16-17.

⁸Ibid., 17.

⁹Ibid., 18.

Faith and the Substance of the Sacrament

To avoid misconceptions, Chemnitz begins his presentation by focusing on the fundamental relation between the substance and fruits of the Supper. We have seen that in his very first paragraph in Die Reine Gesunde Lehre Chemnitz makes this distinction. He also distinguishes very clearly between the merely external use and the use which receives the benefits and fruits of the Lord's Supper.¹⁰ His concern is to ward off any misconception as to what constitutes the Sacrament. Properly treated, Chemnitz maintains, the question of unworthy eating, or more specifically, what an unworthy communicant receives

zeigt vnd weiset/ dis nöthige stück/ Nemlich das die höchste geheimnis/ der gegenwertigkeit vnd entpfahung des Leibs Christi/ nicht stehe auff wirdigkeit vnd verdienst/ weder des/ so es reichet/ noch des/ so es empfalet/ sondern allein/ auff der stiftung vnd einsetzung des Son Gottes.¹¹

The faith of the celebrant and the communicant contribute nothing to the substance of the sacrament. Neither does their unbelief take anything away. Chemnitz here approvingly quotes Augustine, who writes thus:

¹⁰See above, 166-196, 201-220.

¹¹Ibid., 270. For Chemnitz' more extended discussion see also, 273-275. There Chemnitz states while he is discussing three arguments concerning the *manducatio indignorum*: "Erstlich der Glaub deren/ so da reichen/ oder so da entpfangen/ machet nicht das Sacrament/ sondern die einsetzung/verordnung/ vnd wort des HERren/ machen das Sacrament in seinem gebrauch" (ibid., 273). Cf. the discussion of the *sedes doctrinae* above, 129-134.

Der da vnwirdig entpfehet des HERren Sacrament/der machet damit nicht/ das gleich wie Er böse ist/ auch dasselbe böse sey/ oder dieweil er es nicht zu seligkeit empfehet/ das er darumb nicht empfahe.¹²

Therefore, even the unworthy communicants -- Judas as well as Peter as Chemnitz often emphasizes -- receive the true body and blood in and with the elements.¹³

The substance of the Sacrament does not depend on anything the communicants or celebrant, Chemnitz frequently emphasized. In view of our main theme -- namely, the gifts of the Supper -- we notice that Chemnitz regards it as Christ's gracious and pastoral concern for his people. He writes:

So ist es nun ein vnermessliche vnd vnaussprechliche Liebe des Sons GÖttes/ gegen vns arme menschen/ das er beweiset/ wie er so mit ernst/ wölle vnd suche aller Menschen heil vnd seligkeit/ das er auch denen so vnwirdig essen/ seine Leib reichet/ mit fleissigem unterricht/ vnd ernsthaftiger ermanung/ wie sie den heilsam/ in warer Buße vnd rechten Glauben/ sollen gebrauchen.¹⁴

If anything that pertains to the substance of the Sacrament depends on the communicant, there would be "ein steter und schrecklicher zweiffel in unseren Hertzen," whether he has

¹²Ibid., 275. Cf., *ibid.*, 273: "Derhalben wirdt er umb vnwirde oder bosheit der jenen/ so es empfaen/ die warheit seiner einsetzung/ nicht verendern oder fallen lassen." As for Wolgegründeter Bericht, see, 947.

¹³Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 273-274. This is a stock argument wherever Chemnitz speaks of this question.

¹⁴Ibid., 277. It is not unimportant that Chemnitz joins the wholesome use of the Supper with the teaching and preaching of the same doctrine. That this teaching not only must be in harmony with with the Scripture's doctrine of the Supper, but also the doctrine of contrition and faith, that is, Law and Gospel, is evident from what will be shown below (*ibid.*, 230-241).

received Christ's body and blood. For we must admit "das wir in viel wege/unwirdig dazu sein."¹⁵ But Christ knew our needs.

Derhalben hat CHRistus seiner Kirchen/ diese einsetzung und stiftung/ so gewiss und bestendig wöllen machen . . . das er auch seine böse Jünger lesset essen seinen Leib/ und trincken sein Blut/ auff das wir nicht zweiffeln sollen/ so mit warem Glauben/ diese einsetzung halten/ warhafftig und wesentlich entpfahen/ den Leib unnd das Blut Christi.¹⁶

Unworthy eating "does not consist in this, that we are miserable sinners." For the Lord's Supper "is prepared and intended especially for sinners."¹⁷ Rather, unworthiness consists in lack of serious repentance and lack of true faith.

Worthy Reception: A Penitent Faith versus Unbelief

In a way that also points to the proper and worthy use of the Lord's Supper, Chemnitz in general says the following of unworthy eating:

So heist das unwirdig essen/ wenn das Abendmal nicht recht gebraucht wirdt/ wie Ambrosius sagt/ Der dis geheimnis anderst handelt/ vnd mit anderem Hertzen vnnnd Gemüth hinzu gehet/ denn von dem HERren geordnet ist/ der jsset unwirdig.¹⁸

The key words here are (1) "von dem HERren geordnet" and (2) "mit anderem Hertzen vnnnd Gemüth hinzu gehet." The criterion for a proper use the Sacrament is its institution. When we

¹⁵Ibid., 270; cf., ibid., 278-279.

¹⁶Ibid., 270.

¹⁷Enchiridion, 130, q. 277; cf., Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 278-279. See also below, 260-263.

¹⁸Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 279.

look at the recipients, the matter of first importance is in what kind of heart and mind they come to the Supper.

We will now take a closer look at the recipient of the Sacrament. What kind of heart and mind is in harmony with the immense treasures which are received? The whole issue of worthy eating can be divided in two parts; one focusing on faith - unbelief, the other on discerning - not discerning the body. We start our discussion with the former issue.

Faith and Unbelief in Relation to the Lord's Supper

Even though faith does not contribute anything to the substance of the Supper, Chemnitz carefully makes plain that faith is all important when it comes to its use.

Denn das ist jha gewiss/ das der Glaub das mittel/ vnnd gleich der werckzeug ist/ dadurch Christi leben krefftiglich in vns wonet. Ephes 3[:17] Vnd das ohn den Glauben/ Christus nicht lebendig macht.¹⁹

Chemnitz doctrine of conversion shows that this emphasis is common for all the means of grace. There can be no wholesome use of any of them without faith. Without the receiving hand of faith grace is not received.²⁰

This last point is an important issue when Chemnitz at the end of the chapter on unworthy eating summarizes the main points that pertain to unworthy eating. The best way to recognize clearly what is at stake in this issue is to compare

¹⁹Ibid., 276.

²⁰Wolgegründeter Bericht, 931; Enchiridion, 75-76, q. 153.

the proper and improper attitude to, and use of, the Lord's Supper.²¹ The positive part is not always stated, but it can easily be read out of the negative. However, in the following chapter: "Wie man dis Sacrament Ehren sol," Chemnitz presents the counterpart; that is a description of that "hertz vnd gemüth" which receive the Supper worthily. These chapters, therefore, supplement each other on this issue.

The first of the six points concerns the substance of the Lord's Supper. The Supper is unworthily eaten

Erstlich wenn man nicht helt die einsetzung Christi/
sondern wenn die wirdt gebrochen/ vbertreten vnd
verfelscht/ in denen stücken/ so zu dem wesen dieses
Sacrament gehören.²²

Not to maintain the Institution in matters of the substance of the sacrament, that is, to question the Real Presence of the true body and blood of Christ in, with, and under the bread and wine, is to approach the Supper "mit anderem Herten vnnnd Gemüth" than the *Verba* call for. Sometimes Chemnitz uses the adjective "lebendige" to characterize faith. Most frequently, however, he uses the adjectives "rechte" and "ware" to characterize faith. In most cases the latter are used in a comprehensive manner. A true faith always looks to the Scripture and lets itself be informed by what it teaches. As

²¹Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 279: "Derhalben wenn du recht gründtlich wilt wissen/ was da sey vnwirdig essen/ dafür du dich hüten solt/ so halt es nur gegen die lehre/ wie man das Abendmal/ recht vnd seliglich gebrauchen sol."

²²Ibid.

for the Lord's Supper that means that faith fixes its eyes on the *Verba*. Chemnitz states:

Derhalben wenn vnser Glaube/ den worten der einsetzung/ sol gleichförmig vnd gemess sein/ so müssen wir im Abendmal/ nicht allein [sic!] vom Geistlichen essen/ reden/ sondern vber das *de sacramentali manducatione*²³

To Chemnitz this is anything but a legalistic demand for orthodoxy. He is, as our analysis of his hermeneutics shows, concerned about the single-minded Christians and the simplicity of faith.²⁴ It is the nature of faith that "das Hertz fasset die wort im glauben" and perceives what the senses never can grasp; in this case, the immense treasure which Christ gives through these lowly means.²⁵ By clinging to the *Verba* in their simple meaning, we receive Christ and all his benefits which he procured for us through his death and resurrection. This is Chemnitz' concern and the dominant theme throughout the book. On the other hand, where the presence of the true body and blood of Christ is not recognized or discerned, the substance of the Sacrament is not hurt, but the benefits are negated for the recipient. Chemnitz explains:

Sol nun der Leib des HERren in diesem Abendmal/ unterscheidet werden/ so mus man jha nothwendig vorhin haben/ warhafftigen/ rechten/ gewissen/ grüdtlichen verstandt/ vber die wort/ das ist mein Leib/ etc.²⁶

²³Ibid., 39.

²⁴Ibid., 363, 365 et a..

²⁵Ibid., 48-49.

²⁶Ibid., 19.

Because Chemnitz relates this directly to the use of the Supper, it does not only apply to theologians and teachers,²⁷ but to all the members of the church. The words "warhaftigen/ rechten/ gewissen/ gründtlichen verstandt" of the Sacrament clearly indicate an undiminished recognition of the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. The quotation shows that to Chemnitz this is a necessary presupposition for a proper use of this Sacrament. It implies doctrinal correctness, thorough insight, and personal apprehension in faith.²⁸ The emphasis on the correct doctrine is heavily underlined as Chemnitz continues thus:

Denn wo du der rechten meinung dieser wort feilest/ das der verstandt vnd Glauben nicht recht ist/ so can auch das unterscheiden des Leibs des HErrren/ welchs Paulus mit so ernstern worten im Abendmal fordert/ nicht recht geschehen/ vnd folget denn also/ das ernste/ schreckliche vrtheil/ Er ist schuldig an dem Leib vnd Blut des Herren. Er jssset jhm das Gerichte.²⁹

Here Chemnitz asserts very plainly that there is a direct connection between a belief that is not in harmony with correct doctrine and the severe judgment which 1 Cor. 11:27, 29 speak of. When he treats how one should honor this Sacrament,

²⁷Was das Corpus Doctrinae, das ist: Die Form und Fürbilde der reine Lehre in den Kirchen dieses Fürstenthums hinführro seyn soll, Reprinted in Emil Sehling, ed. Die evangelischen Kirchenordnungen des XVI. Jahrhunderts, vol. 6, part 1, (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1955), 92, which indicate that not only the pastors, but also the school teachers had to subscribe the *Corpus doctrinae*.

²⁸Cf., The Lord's Supper, 79, 93, 107.

²⁹Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 19.

Chemnitz underlines the same. The proper way of honoring the Sacrament with "innerliche ehrerbietung" of "das gemüth vnd Hertze" consists "in der anruffung/ dancksagung vnd bekantnis." To discern the body is part of this confession.³⁰ This is, however, not all Chemnitz has to say. He also has something to say of the weak and troubled believers. This issue will be further discussed below.

Chemnitz' second point deals with the way in which the Supper is conducted. They eat unworthy, Chemnitz claims,

Zum Andern/ die ohn alles bedencken/ ruchloss vnd wiltd/ hinzu gehen/ vnd nicht betrackten dis grosse geheimnis/ sondern handeln dasselbe/ nicht mith grösserer ehrerbietung/ denn das Brot in gemeinen Abendmalen/ denn das straffet Paulus ausstrücklich an den Corinthern.³¹

The reference is obviously to 1 Cor. 11: 20-22, 30-34. So far as I can see, Chemnitz nowhere discusses these verses in his early works or even relates these verses to his discussion of unworthy eating and its consequences,³² namely, being "guilty of the body and blood of the Lord" (v.27) and to "eat and drink judgement to oneself" (v.29). On the other hand, when Chemnitz discusses 1 Cor. 1:27, 29 he relates these verses primarily to the substance of the Sacrament, but then also to "ernster Busse vnd warer Glaube". Although Paul in the sur-

³⁰Ibid., 286 and 289-290.

³¹Ibid., 280.

³²In some few places Chemnitz speaks of an attitude toward the elements that allows for a handling of them "als ein gemein schlecht Brot" (ibid., 275; cf., 206).

rounding context treats the issue stated above, Chemnitz does not ask what "unworthily" might refer to.³³ Since this is the only place Chemnitz comments upon these verses, material for comparison is lacking.³⁴ Chemnitz does not say, at least not directly, that the Corinthians denied the Real Presence. The overall impression, however, is that such an attitude to this most holy Sacrament amounts to a denial of the Real Presence. They did celebrate the Lord's Supper in a way which was unacceptable and incompatible with the doctrine of the presence of the true body and blood of Christ.³⁵

The third, fourth, and fifth points we treat together since they are closely related. The third Chemnitz states as follows: Those eat the Supper unworthily,

Zum Dritten/ die ohn erkenntnis jhrer vnreinigung/
gebrechen vnnd Sünden/ aus vertrauen eigener Gerechtigkeit/
auffgeblasen/ der meinung hinzu gehen/ nicht das sie da

³³Ibid., 203-206.

³⁴In The Lord's Supper Chemnitz refers to 1 Cor. 11:18 and 20, but only to pick up the phrase "come together in church." For the references, see "Scripture Index," 301.

³⁵The closest parallel we find in the chapter on "Wie man dis Sacrament ehren sol." There Chemnitz maintains that where the necessary "innerliche ehrerbietung" exists, the proper external conduct will follow. On the other hand, "wo man eusserlich/ das Abendmal mit leichtfertigkeit handelt/ ists ein zeichen/ das das Hertz nicht vie dauon helt/ wie auch Paulus sagt/ das die Corinther/ dieweil sie nicht mit grösserer verehrung des HERren Abendmal hielten/ als sonst die gemeinen Abenmalen/ das sie also des HERren Leib nicht vnterscheiden" (ibid., 291; cf., 284-285, 287, 290-291). Chemnitz does not seem to take into account, at least he does not discuss whether there in true Christians may be a discrepancy between faith and doctrinal conviction on the one hand, and practice and conduct on the other hand.

suchen/ holen vnd bekommen wolten/ vergebung jhrer Sünden/
vnd heiligung jhrer schwachhet/ sondern als die nun
solcher Himlischen Speise wol wirdig sein/ solche essen
warhaftig vnwirdig.³⁶

The forth reads thus: They receive the Sacrament unworthy,

Zum Vierdten/ welche ohn Busse/ wider jhre gewissen/ in
eusserlichen oder innerlichen sünden verharren. Item/ die
einen fürsatz haben/ entweder fort zu Sünden/ oder in die
vorige Sünde wider zu treten/ den Christus hat dieses
Sacrament eingesetzt/ das wir im Glauben sollen suchen/
vnd darnach trachten/ wie wir der Sünden möchte loss
werden. Solchem glauben aber/ ist stracks zu wider der
fürsatz/ so bedacht ist/ in Sünden zuerharren/ oder sich
vorthin auff's new/ in die Sünde/ wie die Saw im koth zu
sülen vnd ergeben.³⁷

Fifth, also those receive the Supper unworthily,

Zum Fünfften/ welche in der geniessung nicht haben einen
waren Glauben/ welcher mit welcher mith gantzem vertrauen
animet/ *appliciret* vnd zueignet die verdienste des Todes
vnd der Aufferstehung Christi/ sondern schreibet das zu
der entpfahung/ als *ex opere operato*, aus geschehenen vnd
geleistem werck/ oder anderen wercken.³⁸

The recurring key word in Chemnitz discussion of worthy and
unworthy eating is that the communicants come to the Lord's
Supper with or without "ware Buße vnd rechte Glaube."³⁹ This
shows that Chemnitz relates what he here teaches about the
proper use of the Lord's Supper to the doctrine of conversion
or repentance.⁴⁰ It should be emphasized that Chemnitz, when

³⁶Ibid., 280.

³⁷Ibid., 280-281.

³⁸Ibid., 281.

³⁹Ibid., 277; cf., 270-271, 272, 277, 283, 288-289 et al..

⁴⁰For of the discussion of Chemnitz doctrine of
conversion, see Brynjulf Hoaas, The Doctrine of Conversion in
the Theology of Martin Chemnitz: What Conversion is and how
it is Worked (Ft. Wayne: STM Thesis, Concordia Theological

he discusses those who "ohn ware Buße vnd rechten Glauben," unworthily receive of the Sacrament, he speaks "nicht von Türcken/ Jüden vnd anderen/ so öffentlich von den Christlichen Religion frembd sein."⁴¹ Rather, with reference to 1 Cor. 11: 16-17, he speaks "von eusserlicher versamlung der sichtlichen Kirche/ darinnen auch viel böse sind/ die doch eusserlich sich zum Glauben bekennen".⁴² Such communicants do receive "die Hauptgabe," the immense treasure of the true body and blood of Christ. Right here Chemnitz repeats some of the main arguments for the *manducatio indignorum*.⁴³ It is important to keep this in mind, because it is too easy to think that the impenitent is outside the church, at least outside our congregation. Chemnitz definitely does not think so.

On the basis of points three, four, and five the following picture of the unworthy communicants appears:

Seminary, 1985, 55-74 and 155-168.

⁴¹Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 271.

⁴²Ibid., 272. Whether Paul in in these verses speaks of the external church is, however, very doubtful. When Chemnitz discusses the fifth benefit, however, he interprets the *communio* to mean "die heilige Christliche gemeine," whose members are joined together with Christ their head and with each other (ibid., 65-66; cf., above, 194). His discussion of them in connection with the *Verba*, seems to restrict the meaning to the distribution of the body and blood (ibid., 207-215). In The Lord's Supper, 144-146, Chemnitz joins the two last mentioned interpretations.

⁴³Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 273-275. The three arguments are: Not faith but the *Verba* makes the Sacrament; both Judas as well as Peter received the same; and those who eat unworthy and do not discern the body, are guilty of the body and blood of Christ and eat to their own judgment (1 Cor.1:27,29).

Because they do not acknowledge their uncleanness [Naturesünde] and sins [actual sin], they go to the Supper thinking they are worthy of this heavenly food. Trusting in their own righteousness, they do not in true faith and with full confidence apprehend the merits of Christ's death and resurrection, and so receive forgiveness for their sins. Being impenitent, they have no desire to get out of their sins. Neither do they consider that the Supper was instituted that we should seek help against them. Rather, they have the intent to continue in their old way, be it in open or hidden sins. So far as they consider forgiveness of sins, they think that Christ's benefits become theirs simply by taking part in the external celebration of the Supper. Chemnitz' verdict is unmistakable: "Solche essen warhafftig vnwirdig." And he names these church members "Böse" and "Gottlose," since "diese innerliche ehrerbietung/ mus in allewege im Hertzen zuuor sein/ sonst ist die eusserliche verehrung/ ein lautere gleissnerey vnd heuchlerey."⁴⁴

The last of Chemnitz' six points, the *extra usum* of the papalists, also fits in here in our discussion of contrition and faith. It reads:

Zum Sechsten/ welche dis Sacrament/ zum anderen brauch vnd ende richten/denn es eingesetzt ist. Als die daraus machen ein versön Opfer. Item/ Messe/ für allerley noth/ etc.⁴⁵

⁴⁴Ibid., 290.

⁴⁵Ibid., 281.

Chemnitz brands as "ein schrecklicher Abgötterey/ dem Brot diese ehre zeigen/ die allein Gott gehöret." This misuse is particularly grave since it makes people think

das durch solches geleistes werck/ den jenen so ohn Buss vnd Glauben/ in Sünden vnd schanden beharren/ geholffen werden/ dadurch das sie allein anschawer sind/ des eingeschlossenen vmbgetragenen Brots/ oder der schirmschlege in der Papistischen Messe.⁴⁶

Through this misuse people are not helped. On the contrary, they are confirmed in their impenitence.

Chemnitz is, however, aware that there are ditches on both sides of the road. At this stage of his argument he warns the pastors that

diese Lehre von vnwürdigen essen/ nicht dahin deuten vnd ziehen/ als ob die heilsame geniessung stünde auff vnserer würdigkeit/ wie die papisten lehren/ das welche hinzu wöllen gehen/ die sollen sich zuuor/ mit wercken/ verdiensten/ eigener genugthuung bereiten/ also/ das sie rein von sünden sein/ vnnd also würdig werden dieser Himlischen Speise.⁴⁷

That would be directly against the proper use for which the Supper was instituted.⁴⁸ Even the most pious Christian will always be unworthy in himself. But also in the Lord's Supper the gift of the Gospel is for the needy.

The picture Chemnitz draws of those who receive the Supper worthily, according to its institution, is different on every point. They are not in themselves "worthy" of the

⁴⁶Ibid., 283.

⁴⁷Ibid., 278.

⁴⁸Ibid., 278.

Sacrament. "Denn wir müssen erkennen/ das wir in viel wege/ vnwirdig dazu sein."⁴⁹ However, the Lord's Supper is ordained, Chemnitz maintains, for the communicants who have a penitent heart, that is,

für die jenen/ die da fühlen empfinden/ die Sünde in jhrem Fleisch leben/ die da jhrer Busse vnuolkommenheit/ jhres Glauben schwachheit/ vnd jhrer Liebe vnreinigkeit/ erkennen vnd bekennen/ denn die gesunden dürffen keiner Artzeney/ sondern die jenen/ so jhre kranckheit also erkennen/ das sie begehren/ das jhnen geholffen werde.⁵⁰

To Chemnitz this kind of penitent heart is essential for faith. Without a penitent heart faith cannot even exist. Actually "ware Busse" is heavily emphasized throughout his discussion of the proper use of the Supper. Chemnitz explains the issue thus:

Zu der vbung einer waren Glauben/ gehöret auch dis/ das der jhene/ so dis Sacrament empfahren wil/ behertzige vnd betrachte/ seine vielfeltige/ grosse schwere Sünde/ vnd ernstlich bitte/ das er möge angenommen vnd erhalten werden/ in dem Bunde des newen Testaments/ dadurch Gott allen Gleubigen / umb des Leibs Christi willen für vns gegeben/ vnd sein Blut für vnsvergossen/ wil gnedig vnd versönet sein/ vber jhre Sünde/ vnd jhrer missethat nicht mehr gedencken.⁵¹

⁴⁹Ibid., 270. Cf., 278: "Wir sind allzumal vnwirdig/ auch das teglichen Brot."

⁵⁰Ibid., 278-279.

⁵¹Ibid., 288-289. Cf., 289: "Dieweil der Glaube nöthig ist/ wenn wir denn nun recht betrachten/ wie gantz gering vnd schwach derselbige in vns sey/ werden wie ohn allen zweiffel/ mit warhafftigen zeuffen anruffen/ den/ welcher genennet wirdt/ ein anfenger vnd vollender des Glaubens/ Hebr.12[:2]. Ich glaube Herr/ du aber komme mein vnglauben zu hilff/ Marc.9[:24]."

Here both "Buss vnd warer lebendiger Glauben" are voiced. Faith exists only in penitent hearts. To Chemnitz, to put it succinctly, faith is not contrition, but it does not exist without contrition; that is, a true and living faith which "mith gantzem vertrauen annimet/ *appliciret* vnd zueignet die verdienste des Todes vnd Aufferstehung Christ."⁵² This Chemnitz reiterates again and again, with only slightly different words, wherever he deals with the gifts and proper use of the Lord's Supper.

The element "gantzem vertrauen" should, however, not be emphasized too much. From Scripture and experience Chemnitz knows that Christians are full of shortcomings and weaknesses, and are often plagued with "Anfechtungen." When he deals with the first, very general gift of the Real Presence, the strengthening of faith, Chemnitz writes:

Denn es wissen vnd erfahren teglich alle Heiligen vnd Gleubigen/ in diesem ellenden Sündlichen fleisch/ mit was mancherley grossen schwachheit/ der Glaube angefochten wirdt/ wie leichtlich geschwechet werde/ wie baldt vnd offt/ der Glaube durch die dörnne der sicherheit/ ver-
trückt vnd fast ersticket werde/ das er sich nicht be-
weist mit ernster betractung/ mith anruffung/ danck-
sagung/ etc.⁵³

As Luther before him, Chemnitz regards the confident reliance of the heart on Christ and his merits as vital. As his

⁵²Ibid., 281; cf., 46, 284.

⁵³Ibid., 55-56. This ". . . mit ernster betractung/ mith anruffung/ dancksagung/ etc," Chemnitz deals with at length in the chapter "Wie man dis Sacrament Ehren sol" (ibid., 282-293).

doctrine of conversion shows, not specific attributes of faith such as firmness, confident trust, and so forth, make it a saving faith. Strictly speaking, these attributes of faith belong to renewal and not to justification.⁵⁴ Everything but *fides apprehensiva*, the faith that in all its weakness and infirmity looks to Christ and lays hold on his grace, belongs to renewal. According to Chemnitz even *scintilla fidei* or *desiderium fidei* is a true, saving faith as it is directed toward Christ.⁵⁵

The Lord's Supper and Repentance

We have maintained that what Chemnitz teaches about the proper use of the Lord's Supper is part and parcel of his doctrine of conversion or repentance. To make this assertion more evident, we will outline the main features of his doctrine of conversion based on the chapter "Von der Busse" in Kurtzer Bericht (1569).⁵⁶

⁵⁴See Hoaas, The Doctrine of Conversion in the Theology of Martin Chemnitz, 163-168.

⁵⁵Iudicium, 49-50, 53, 62; cf., Hoaas, The Doctrine of Conversion in the Theology of Martin Chemnitz, 66-67, 72-73, 166-168.

⁵⁶Also the new edition of the *Corpus doctrinae* of the city of Braunschweig of 1570 included a new document: "Eine einfeltige Christliche Erklärung vnd Bekänthiß des Ministerii der Kirchen in der Stadt Braunschweig", which also include an article on "Wie der Mensch bekehret werde." The text is printed in Heppe, Die Entstehung und Fortbildung des Luthertums, 120-129. See also Iudicium, 20-77.

The proper and foremost parts of "der Busse" are contrition and faith. But as in Melanchthon, the new obedience is so closely related to conversion that Chemnitz actually works with a threefold concept of conversion: contrition, faith, and new obedience. His concern is only

daß *de rebus ipsis* fein unterschiedlich gelehret werde/ nemlich/ daß zu der Göttlichen Traurichkeit . . . 2 Cor. 7[:10] gehören zwei stück/ *Contrition et Fides*, Reu und Glauben. Der neue Gehorsam aber gehöret nicht darzu/ und dahin/ wenn die Frage ist/ wie und wodurch man erlangen möge Vergebung der Sünden/ und die Seligkeit/ sondern/ wenn erstlich durch den Glauben die Sünden vergeben ist/ alsdann folgen die Früchte in guten Wercken/ so GOTT geboten/ und im Leiden des Creutzes/ so GOTT dem alten Adam aufflegt.⁵⁷

This means that the new obedience belongs to conversion [Busse] except that it must not be brought into the circle of justification.⁵⁸ The short definition of each of the three parts of conversion reads as follows:

Die Busse habe drey Theil oder Stücke: Erstlich/ Reu und Leid/ oder Schrecken des Gewissen von wegen der Sünde. Zum Andern/ Den Glauben/ der in Evangelio suchet und ergreiffet Vergebung der Sünden/ aus Gnaden um Christus willen. Zum dritten/ die Früchte der Busse/ das ist/ den Anfang eines neuen Lebens/ oder neue Gehorsams.⁵⁹

⁵⁷Kurtzer Bericht, 14.

⁵⁸Ibid.: "Die Reue muß vorher gehen . . . Die Gnade aber/ Vergebung der Sünden/ und das ewige Leben hat allein Christus verdient/ und wird allein durch den Glauben ergriffen und angenommen/ und darnach/ darauf und daraus folgen denn gute Früchte/ daß also die dreyerley/ Busse/ Glauben neuer Gehorsam/ in warhafftiger Bekehrung der Menschen seyn und gelehret müssen werden." Cf., Wolgegründeter Bericht, 912.

⁵⁹Ibid., 13.

In the context of the doctrine of the Lord's Supper Chemnitz obviously does not go into a detailed discussion of "die Busse." But even there, as shown above, the contours of this doctrine stand forth clearly enough.

Chemnitz does recognize that there is a definite "before" and "after" faith is kindled in man. But that does not exclude that repentance must be ongoing and lifelong in the believers.⁶⁰ In this context he speaks of the "Brauch und Übung" of repentance.⁶¹ Significantly Chemnitz not only, as seen above, relates the use of the Lord's Supper to "Busse vnd Glaube," but also maintains with explicit reference to the *manducatio indignorum* that

diese Lehre [erreget] in der entpfahung vnd geniessung/ ernsthaftige vbung der Busse/ vnd des Glaubens/ denn wo du vnwirdig jssset/ so empfehestu nicht Brot allein/ sondern den Leib Christi/ an welchem du auch schuldig wirst/ wo du ohn Buss vnnnd Glaube darzu gehest.⁶²

This certainly has to do with the self-examination which Chemnitz wants to stimulate. The emphasis on the seriousness of the use of the Supper is one of the most prominent features in all the parts of his Die Reine Gesunde Lehre. The Son of God gives his body and blood also to those who eat unworthily. His concern for their salvation is display in that he does so

⁶⁰Examen I, 582, pt. 26: "The Apology of the Augsburg Confession sets forth from Scripture this mark of true faith, that it exists in true repentance, and that it works by love."

⁶¹Kurtzer Bericht, 21-22. Cf., Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 288-289.

⁶²Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 270-271.

mit fleissigem vnterricht/ vnd ernsthaftiger ermanung/
wie sie den heilsam/ in warer Busse vnd rechtem Glauben/
sollen gebrauchen. Sie aber/ vber alle vorige Sünde/
begehen diese schreckliche Sünde/ das sie den gereichten
vnd entpfangenen Leib . . . mith füssen treten/ schmähen
vnd lestern.⁶³

It is, however, as we now will show, the particular responsibility of the pastors to be the voice of God's Son and remind the people of his most serious warning.

There is one feature of the use of the Supper and this "fleissigem vnterricht/ vnd ernsthaftiger ermanung" which neither Die Reine Gesunde Lehre nor Anatome mentions, a feature which, nevertheless, ought to be mentioned here. In Melancthon we saw that the administration of the Lord's Supper was tied firmly to confession and absolution.⁶⁴ The chapter "Von der Beicht und Absolution" in Kurtzer Bericht (1569) shows that the same is the case in Chemnitz.

Wenn jemand zum Abendmal des HErrn gehen will/ soll also und darum gehalten werden: Erstlich/ daß ein Christ gegen seinem Seelsorger sich in und mit der Beichte erkläre/ wie er seine Sünde erkenne/ und seinem lieben GOTT bekenne/ was er für Busse habe/ wie sein Glaube stehe/ was er für einen fürsatz zur Besserung habe/ daß daraus der *Pastor* vernehmen möge/ ob er zu lösen oder zubinden sey.⁶⁵

This corresponds directly to the ruling of the church order of Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel which prescribes confession and

⁶³Ibid., 277.

⁶⁴See above, 76-79.

⁶⁵Kurtzer Bericht, 120.

absolution before the Lord's Supper.⁶⁶ Secondly, this enables the pastor to teach, guide, and admonish the communicants in person in the issues mentioned above; and, thirdly, if necessary "desto bequemer aus Gottes Wort straffen und zu Busse vermahnen."⁶⁷ Confidently Chemnitz adds the following:

Wenn aber in solcher *Privat*-unterredung/ Bericht und Vermahnung geschicht aus Gottes Wort/ so ist ohne Zweiffel Gott durch sein Wort kräftig wahre Busse/ Glauben und Besserung zu wircken und zu geben.⁶⁸

As a last point that applies directly to one of the major concerns in Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, Chemnitz writes:

Zum Fünften/ daß nicht jemand aus Unwissenheit oder Unbedacht des Abenmahl des HErrn zum Gericht empfangen/ so wird er in der Beicht/ erinnert und vermahnet/ daß/ und wie er sich prüfen solle.⁶⁹

If anything is clear from what has now been reviewed, it is the close connection in Chemnitz theology between the two major issues of controversy among the Lutherans in the period

⁶⁶Sehling, Emil, ed. Kirchenordnung unser, von Gottes genaden Julii, hertzen zu Braunschweig und Lüneburg etc., Vol. 6, part 1 (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1955), 166: "Derhalben soll keiner zum sacrament des altars gehen, er hab sich dann bey dem priester angeben und sich vor einen sünder bekant und die privatam absolutionem erlanget." Chemnitz did not draft the Agenda, but the correspondence between it and Kurtzer Bericht, is evident.

⁶⁷Kurtzer Bericht, 120.

⁶⁸Ibid.

⁶⁹Ibid. Chemnitz lists two more points which not so directly or exclusively relates to the Lord's Supper. The fourth reads: "Wenn ein armes Gewissen etwa Anliegen, Beschwerung oder Anfechtung hat/ kan es in solcher Unterredung bey seinem Seelsorger Rath und Trost finden" (ibid.) The sixth and last point only emphasizes the value of private absolution in general (ibid.).

between the Interims (1548) and the Formual of Concord, namely, anthropology-soteriology and the Lord's Supper-Christology. Without faith no means of grace can be used beneficially. In this respect the Lord's Supper does not differ in the least from the Word or from Baptism. But there exists no such a thing as a true and living faith which is not intimately bonnd up with contrition and renewal. That is Chemnitz' concern when he calls for truly penitent hearts that are sorry for their sins and want to lead a godly life.

Worthy Reception: To Discern the Body of the Lord

The other part of the worthy use of the Lord's Supper is "to discern the body." This is an important issue in all Chemnitz' works on this sacrament. Except for the chapters which deals with hermeneutical questions, references to this subject follows Chemnitz discussion like a shadow. 1 Cor. 11:27,29 is the only Scripture passage which specifies the detrimental consequence of the unworthy eating. The communicant who receives the Supper unworthily is "schuldig an dem Leib vnd Blut des Herren" and "jsset vnd trincket jhme das Gericht." These two statements are always the underlying reason when Chemnitz urges the different aspects of the seriousness of the use of the Supper.⁷⁰ Our task here will be

⁷⁰A clear example of this is that private confession and absolution were required before the Supper ". . . daß nicht jemand aus Unwissenheit oder Unbedacht das Abendmahl des HErrn zum Gericht empfangen möge" (ibid.). Cf., above, 260-262 and 267-269.

to demonstrate how Chemnitz understands this passage, particularly how he understands the phrase "to discern the body," the two cited statements about guilt and judgment, and then how our findings on these issues relate to what we have found about faith and unbelief.⁷¹

Not surprisingly, Chemnitz opens his discussion of 1 Cor. 11:27-29 by calling attention to the seriousness of the issue. From these verses, which explicitly deal with the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, "wirdt beweiss geführt/ ernste vermanung vnd scharffe drawung genommen."⁷² Relating this to the hermeneutical principles he previously has worked out, Chemnitz claims that "solche sprüche der Schrifft/ daraus man Argument/ drawungen vnd vermanungen nimet/ in jhrem verstandt müssen gewiss/ deutlich vnd klar sein".⁷³ Therefore, they must be understood according to their simple, literal meaning "wie sie lauten." Then together with Paul we can be sure that "wir des HERren CHristi eigentliche meinung haben."⁷⁴

⁷¹The issue is discussed fairly detailed in Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 199-207, and 269-282. In The Lord's Supper, 127-135, correspond to the former section in Die Reine Gesunde Lehre.

⁷²Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 200.

⁷³Ibid.

⁷⁴Ibid., 201. Chemnitz continues in repeating the hermeneutical version of the *status controversiae* in a pregnant form: "Denn das ist der *Status* darauff dieser gantzer handel beruhet/ Nemlich ob man die wort (das ist mein Leib) verstehen sol/ wie sie lauten/ oder denselben eine andere deutung geben" (ibid.).

As for the subject-matter of the passage, the first issue Chemnitz raises is the meaning of the word "body". If it can be shown that Paul speaks of the same body as in previous verses, the battle is won, Chemnitz confidently declares, since "so haben wir/ was wir gesucht haben."⁷⁵ Paul expresses himself very carefully, Chemnitz maintains. "Denn nach dem Paulus die beschreibung der einsetzung vollendet hatte/ setzet er diesen spruch wie eine folge/ aus den worten der einsetzung."⁷⁶ Therefore, Paul, no doubt, speaks of no other body than in the *Verba* in the immediately preceding verses. This even the opponents have to confess.⁷⁷ This argument seems to serve as proof that Paul speaks of the same body and to relate the word "unworthy" to the *Verba*.⁷⁸ So far Chemnitz has laid the groundwork for his discussion of the main issues: the meaning of "guilty," "judgment," and "to discern the body." Because Chemnitz' conclusions on these issues are so important in his entire argument, and if they are conclusive, also have considerable consequences, we will follow his arguments step by step.

⁷⁵Ibid., 202.

⁷⁶Ibid., 203.

⁷⁷Ibid., 202. Oecolampadius is the only who is explicitly mentioned.

⁷⁸For the latter he also refers to the conjunction at the beginning of v. 27: "Warumb aber/ vnnd woher kompt die schuldt? das zeigt an/ *particula illatiua*, das folgwort/ *Itaque*, derhalben wirdt er schuldig" (ibid., 203).

Next, Chemnitz examine the meaning of the word "guilty."

The usage of this word he explains thus:

So zeucht sich nun das wörtlin (schuldig) in der Schrift zu zeiten auff die peen vnd straffe. Als/ er ist des Todes schuldig/ zu zeiten aber auff die vrsache/ dadurch wir die straffe vber vns führen.⁷⁹

This Chemnitz applies to verse 27, and he maintains that both meanings of the word "guilty" are apply here. The quotation continues thus:

So setzen nun Paulus/ was die straffe sey/ derer die vnwirdig essen/ Nemlich das Gericht. Er nennet auch die vrsach/ warumb straffe vber sie gehe/ Nemlich dieweil sie jene/ das in Abendmal gegenwertig ist vnd gereicht wirdt/ vnwirdig entpfangen.⁸⁰

What Chemnitz here says of the reason for the guilt is already very familiar. All communicants, the unworthy included, receive the same "Hauptgabe," the substance of the Sacrament. This needs no further discussion. When somebody receives the Lord's Supper to his own judgment, the reason is to be located, not in the gift, but in the recipient himself. He receives God's most gracious gift unworthily. In every statement in the discussion of verse 27 the word "unworthy" occupies a key position. The following conclusion is typical: "Er ist schuldig an dem Leib vnd Blut des Herren/ dieweil er das Brot vnwirdig jset/ dauon der Son Gottes sagt/ das ist mein

⁷⁹Ibid.

⁸⁰Ibid., 204.

Leib."⁸¹ When it is asked: What makes this eating unworthy, Chemnitz gives the following answer:

So wirdt nun der Leib Christi im Abendmal gereicht vnd empfangen/ nicht allein von den wirdigen/ das ist/ die in ernster busse durch warer glaube/ die verdienste Christi gegreiffen/ vnnd jhnen zueignen/ sondern auch von denen so vnwirdig essen/ denn die wort Pauli stehen klar.⁸²

The crucial question: Who are the unworthy, is here not answered directly. They are, however, contrasted with the worthy who are described in line with our earlier findings as people who "in ernster busse durch warer glauben" lay hold of Christ's merits. By contrast then the unworthy receive the Sacrament "ohn ware busse vnd rechte glauben." It must be noted, however, that the unworthy reception is related directly to the Real Presence of the true body and blood of Christ in the Supper.

So far we can conclude that Chemnitz' discussion of 1 Cor.11:27 does not add much beyond what is already related concerning his view of faith and unbelief in relation to the Lord's Supper. The unworthy are guilty of the body and blood of Christ because they receive the Supper without a truly penitent faith.

On 1 Cor.11:29 Chemnitz discusses only the last part of the verse. The unworthy communicant eats and drinks judgment to himself "damit/ das er nicht vnterscheidet den Leib des

⁸¹Ibid.

⁸²Ibid.

HErren." The key word on which Chemnitz concentrates here is "vnterscheiden." He does not comment on the grammatical construction of the sentence. Chemnitz begins with an explanation of the general meaning and usage of the word *diakrinein*, which is the basis for the *dijudicare* in the Latin and *vnterscheiden* in the German translations:

Nu heist vnterscheiden/ in der sprach/ darinn Paulus geschrieben/ wenn man die wehrde eines dinges/ wie vnnd was es sey/ also ansihet vnd betrachtet/ das mans von andern gemeinen dingen absondert/ vnnd dauon anders mehr vnd höher helt⁸³

Linguistic support from the New Testament for this usage of *diakrinein* Chemnitz draws from the Epistle of Jude [22-23] and Acts 15[:9].

When he goes on to apply this conclusion from the general usage of *diakrinein* to 1 Cor 11:29, he first makes two distinctions in order to eliminate some misinterpretations. First, Chemnitz maintains, Paul does not speak of people

die von der Menscheit CHRisti vnchristlich halten, sondern/ er redet von dem vnterscheiden/ die da geschehen sol/ wenn im Abendmal das Brot gegessen wirdt/ vom welchem der HErr sagt/ das ist mein Leib.⁸⁴

⁸³Ibid., 205.

⁸⁴Ibid., 205. In the Latin version he uses the phrase "think lightly of Christ human nature" (*Repetitio*, 147). Chemnitz does not explain what he has in mind. In the Lord's Supper, however, he writes: "Paul is not speaking at this point primarily about those people who do not rightly judge concerning Christ's nature in itself, so that they do not attribute to him a true and perfect human nature and do not discern it in Christ as being more excellent in glory than other creatures" (133-134).

This means that the "vnterscheiden" refers to that which is present and is received orally by the communicants. The second distinction corresponds directly to what Chemnitz teaches about "die Hauptgabe" and sacramental eating.⁸⁵ The "vnterscheiden" does not pertain to the external element, consecrated for this special usage (for example, the shewbread in the OT), not to speak of ordinary bread from the baker.⁸⁶ By joining the discerning of the body to the self-examination of the previous verse Chemnitz explains what it is all about thus:

Er [Paul] spricht/ Der Mensch prüfe sich selbs/ das er den Leib Christi vnterscheide/ wenn er im Abendmal essen wil/ das ist/ das er mit allem ernst vnd fleiss bedencke vnd betrachte/ was/ wie gross/ thewr/ vnd werth/ das jene sey/ so mith dem Brot im Abendmal zugegen ist/ dargereicht vnd genomen wird.⁸⁷

Here the discerning pertains to (1) what is received and orally eaten, namely, the true body and blood of Christ, and (2) the immense value of this gift.⁸⁸ It is not possible, even though it would be tempting to do so, to interpret this quotation as if it presupposes that the Real Presence is confessed, although the ceremony is celebrated in an inappropriate way.

⁸⁵See the very parallel distinction Chemnitz makes when he discusses the honoring of the Sacrament, Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 285; cf., below, 278, note 777.

⁸⁶Ibid., 206.

⁸⁷Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 206.

⁸⁸Ibid., 206. The Latin text reads: "dijudicare de qualitate" (Repetitio, 148).

Whatever the Corinthians, or some of them, may have thought of the Real Presence, Chemnitz has primarily the view of the Sacramentarians in mind. His conclusion in this part reads thus:

Derhalben welcher in solcher geniessung/ nicht vnterscheidet/denselben Leib so zugegen ist/ dargereicht/ vnd genomen wirdt/ sondern handelt damit/ vnnnd helt nicht mehr dauon/ den von einem andern Brot vom Becker genomen/ oder/ wie die im alten Testament von den Schawbrotten hielten/ der jsset vnwirdig/ jhm zum Gericht. Diese meinung gibt der Text offenbar vnd weiset Paulus abermal dahin/ das wir bey den worten/ wie sie lauten/ bleiben sollen.⁸⁹

Two points should be recognized in this conclusion: (1) Not to discern the body of the Lord equals to eat unworthily. "Derhalben welcher . . . nicht vnterscheidet . . . der jsset vnwirdig/ jhm zum Gericht"; and (2) two kinds of, or two elements of, unworthy eating are singled out. The first is to handle the gift received in the Supper as if it was a common meal; secondly, to think of the gift received as if it were nothing but ordinary bread. These two points, it should be noted, are the same as the two first in Chemnitz' six-point summary of unworthy eating.⁹⁰ His discussion of verse 27 ended by contrasting unworthy eating with eating "in ernster busse durch waren glauben." This corresponds to point three, four and five in Chemnitz' summary.⁹¹

⁸⁹Ibid., 206-207; cf., ibid., 274-275.

⁹⁰See above, 253-256.

⁹¹See above, 259-262.

Finally, our conclusions from 1 Cor.11:27-29 should be compared with the main points in the chapter on "Wie man die Sacrament Ehren sol." There Chemnitz describes the main features that should characterize the heart and mind of the communicant when he comes to the Lord's Supper. A proper worship of the Lord consists in three parts: "anrufung/ dancksagung vnd bekantnis."⁹² In each of these Chemnitz strongly emphasizes the presence of Christ's true body and blood. First, on "dancksagung" he writes:

Wie wir sonst alle zeit/ also fürnemlich vnd sonderlich in dieser handlung/ mith danckbaren hertzen bedencken/ betrachten/ bekennen vnd rühmen sollen/ diese vnmesliche wolthaten des Sons Gottes/ das er als das wort/ das Fleisch worden ist/ nicht allein den Leib seines Fleisches/ für vnser erlösung am Creutz hab auffgeoffert/ vnd sein Blut vergossen/ sondern/ das er auch darüber vns/ denselben Leib zu essen/ vnd dasselbe Blut zu trincken/ in diesem Sacrament communiciret vnd mittheilt . . . auff das er also . . . das newe Testament/ *applicire* vnd zueigne/ einem jeden in sonderheit/ der mit warem Glauben/ solches Isset vnd trincket.⁹³

Without such thanksgiving there can be no worthy and beneficial use of the Lord's Supper, Chemnitz emphatically declares;

⁹²Ibid., 286. Chemnitz is here very careful to exclude any worship and the like of the elements. He writes: "Es mus aber nothwendig/ diese erinnerung allzeit geschehen/ das das Sacrament/ nicht also sey an zu beten/ wie wir in der person Christi/ vmb der persönlichen vereinung willen/ mith einerley anbeten/ sein Menschheit vnd Gottheit ehren/ denn im Abendmal/ ist nicht ein solche vereinigung/ des Brots vnd Leibs Christi" (ibid., 285).

⁹³Ibid., 286-287.

then "solche dancksagung/ ist ohn allen zweiffel/ ein rechtes stück vnd theil eines warhafftigen anbetens."⁹⁴

Secondly, concerning "die anruffung," the calling upon the Lord, Chemnitz initially says this:

Zum Andern/ wo ein rechter Glaube verhanden ist/ kan es nicht sein/ das der jene/ so hinzu gehen wil/ nicht betrachten solte/ was für ein grosse geheimnis dis sey/ vnd das er nicht von hertzen/ mit ernstem gebet anruffen solte/ Christum/ Gott vnd menschen/ welcher er gleubet/ in dieser handlung warhafftig vnd wesentlich gegenwertig zu sein/ auff das er nicht durch vnwürdiges essen schuldig werde/ vnd das Gericht empfahe⁹⁵

The importance of statement is that it very definitely confirms the general impression that in Chemnitz a true faith necessarily will without hesitation acknowledge and confess the Real Presence of the true body and blood in, with, and under the external elements. At this point Chemnitz also strongly underlines that this faith is a contrite faith.⁹⁶

Thirdly, what Chemnitz states on "bekantnis" pertains directly to "the discerning of the body." "Zur bekentnis gehört das/ da Paulus sagt/ das man in dem essen vnd trincken des Abendmals/ vnterscheiden sol/ den Leib des HERren."⁹⁷ The whole issue is "klar vnd gewisslich" when the Real Presence

⁹⁴Ibid., 287.

⁹⁵Ibid., 287-288. We here note the very Melanchthonian phraes: ". . . in dieser handlung warhafftig vnd wesentlich gegenwertig zu sein" In Chemnitz this refers not only to the act of eating, but to the whole sacramental act (Cf., Wolgegründeter Bericht, 941).

⁹⁶See above, 268-276.

⁹⁷Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 289.

of Christ's true body and blood in the Supper is believed.⁹⁸

Particularly the last part of our present discussion illustrates clearly that to Chemnitz the confession of the Real Presence of Christ's true body and blood in the Supper is no academic issue. It cannot be severed from a true and living faith, but is embedded in and part and parcel of a true faith which always wants to be informed by the Scripture and look to Christ, human and divine, for help in every need.

Eating to One's Judgment

We have seen that those who receive the Sacrament unworthy eat and drink judgment to themselves. How does Chemnitz speak of this judgment? And what does it imply? Chemnitz does not enlarge much on this theme. His belief should by now be clear enough. For the most part we need to bring together evidence already discussed.

First, we recall what was said of the seriousness of taking part in the Supper without discerning the Lord's body.

Denn wo du der rechten meinung dieser wort feilest . . .
so kan auch das unterscheiden des Leibs des HErrn . . .
nicht recht geschehen/vnd folget denn also/ das ernste/
schreckliche urtheil/ Er ist schuldig an dem Leib und Blut
des Herren. Item/ Er isset ihm das Gericht.⁹⁹

Paul's words in 1 Cor.11: 27,29 are called "harte scharffe vnnnd schreckliche wort."¹⁰⁰ The phrase "das ernste/ schreck-

⁹⁸Ibid., 290.

⁹⁹Ibid., 19; cf., above, 246-247 and 251-256.

¹⁰⁰Ibid., 18-19.

liche urtheil" from the quotation above, most probably alludes to Heb.10:31.¹⁰¹ In his discussion of unworthy eating Chemnitz asserts that the Son of God "mit ernst/ wölle vnd suche aller Menschen heil vnd seligkeit." Therefore he earnestly admonishes the unworthy to use the Sacrament "in warer Busse vnnnd rechtem Glauben"; that is, that they repent and so go to the Sacrament. About those who receive the Supper without a repentant faith, Chemnitz says:

Sie aber/ vber alle andere vorige Sünde/ begehen auch diese schreckliche Sünde/ das sie den gereichten vnd entfangenen Leib/ das gereichte vnd entpfangene Blut des HERren/ mith füssen treten/ schmehen vnnnd lestern. [Heb. 10:29] Vnd dasselbig wirdt der Richter/ welchem der Vater alles Gericht vbergeben hat. Johan.3[:17-19,35]. 5[:22, 27]. 9[:39].¹⁰²

The meaning of this statement cannot be doubtful. Those who receive the Sacrament unworthily, those who do not discern the body of the Lord included, are already under God's wrath and judgment on account of their "vnbusfertigkeit vnd unglaube". But by eating and drinking the body and blood unworthily, to their former sins they add this most dreadful sin: they despise the Lord and his blood. Chemnitz believed that many in the church confessed the faith only outwardly.¹⁰³ It is also

¹⁰¹Cf., *ibid.*, 20, where the reference to Heb. 10:(30-)31 is clearer: "Denn es jha schrecklich ist/in GOTTes gericht zu fallen/ vnd schuldig werden/ an dem Leib vnd Blut des HERren."

¹⁰²Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 277.

¹⁰³*Ibid.*, 272; cf. Kurtzer Bericht, 95-98, where different kind of unrepentent hearts are described, from "die rohe sichere Leute" to those who speak much about faith and ever pride oneself if it, but do not really repent.

possible to eat and drink judgment to oneself "aus Unwissenheit oder Unbedacht." For this reason he regarded confession and absolution before the Supper as very important.¹⁰⁴

The last part of what now has been reviewed explicitly refers to those who are without repentance and faith. When we consider the true believers the picture is both clear and at the same time loaded with tension. Chemnitz is, on the one hand, firmly convinced that believers do discern the body of the Lord. Chemnitz very definitely rejected Albert Hardenberg's view who distinguished between *manducatio indignorum* and *manducatio impiorum*. Chemnitz denounces as a invented and deceitful counterfeit that

Paulus in der 1. Corinth. 11[:27-29] nicht von der Gottlosen oder vngleubigen/ sondern von solchen vnwürdigen (wie ers im 5. Artickel erkleret) welcher eines Missbrauche willen (das ist/ im Glauben oder leben) kreftlich sind.¹⁰⁵

His counter-argument is precisely that those who eat unworthily incur judgment on themselves in that they by their eating they are guilty of the body and blood of the Lord. "Vnd solche sind ja gewiss on alles einrede Gottlose Leute."¹⁰⁶ The reason for this conclusion is this: "Trawn dieser *reatus/*

¹⁰⁴Kutzer Bericht, 120; cf., above, 265-268.

¹⁰⁵Anatome, E i v.

¹⁰⁶Ibid., D viii v.

vnd so schuldig werden/ gehet allein auff die Gottlosen vnd Vngleubigen."¹⁰⁷ True believers are not under God's judgment.

The conclusion from this must be that if a believer fails to recognize the body of the Lord in the Supper, this is such a serious sin that he would be a fallen sinner who needed to repent and confess his sin in order to be raised up again; that is, it cannot be thought of as a venial sin. Beyond that only impenitent communicants receive the Supper unworthily.

The other part of the picture is that Chemnitz is fully aware that many Christians in many respects are weak and even loaded with sin. Only in "great infirmity" do they apprehend Christ and his merits. In his doctrine of conversion and justification he even asserts that the *scintilla fidei* or *desiderium fidei* is a justifying faith.¹⁰⁸ The decisive thing is whether they have a repentant heart that looks to Christ for help. Chemnitz, therefore, wants the pastors to take into account that this Sacrament is a means of grace ordained not least

für die jenen/ die da fühlen vnd entpfinden/ die Sünde in jhrem Fleisch wohnen/ die da jhrer Busse vnuolkommenheit/ jhres Glaubens schwachheit/ vnd jhrer Liebe vnreinigkeit/ erkennen vnd bekennen¹⁰⁹

¹⁰⁷Ibid., E i i r.

¹⁰⁸See above 262-263.

¹⁰⁹Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 278-279.

Further, when Chemnitz treats repentance, confession and absolution, and justification, he emphasizes strongly that no one is aware of all his sins. Therefore, it is also impossible to confess all sins before the pastor. With this in mind Chemnitz admonishes the pastors that they "diese Lehre/ von denen/ die vnwirdig essen/ recht vnd bescheidenlich fürtragen/ auff das nicht die furchtsamen gewissen/ verwirret vnd betrübet werden."¹¹⁰ To do so would be "stracks wider den rechten gebrauch/ und das ende dieses Sacrament."¹¹¹

But as we already have seen, when it comes to the Lord's Supper, and particularly the doctrine of the Real Presence of Christ's true body and blood in the Supper, Chemnitz speaks otherwise.¹¹² Before one goes to the Lord's Supper one must have "warhafftigen/ rechten/ gewissen/ grüdtlichen verstandt/ vber die wort/ das ist mein Leib/ etc."¹¹³

Denn wo du der rechten meinung dieser wort feilest . . . so kan auch das unterscheiden des Leibs des HERren . . . nicht recht geschehen/ vnd folget denn also/ das ernste/ schreckliche vrtheil/ Er ist schuldig an dem Leib vnd Blut des Herren. Er jssset jhm das Gerichte.¹¹⁴

It is difficult not to perceive at least a tension here in Chemnitz' attitude vis-a-vis those who experience "jhres

¹¹⁰Ibid., 278.

¹¹¹Ibid.

¹¹²See above, 251-255 and 275-277.

¹¹³Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 19.

¹¹⁴Ibid., 19.

Glaubens schwacheit" and those who have failed yet to grasp "der rechten meinung dieser wort"; that is, of the *Verba*. This would too easily keep the weak and troubled Christians away from the Lord's Supper, which first and foremost was ordained for their help and support. Even compared with the doctrine of justification by faith, the fundamental article of the Lutheran faith, the doctrine of the Real Presence, seems to be in an unique position. Here a firm and thorough doctrinal conviction is a prerequisite. If not, the blessing is turned into curse. This is all the more striking since otherwise the doctrine of the Lord's Supper is so closely imbedded in the doctrines of conversion and justification. Chemnitz does not raise this issue. Therefore, no direct answer is given. The overall impression is that in dealing with the common Christian, Chemnitz' pastoral concern is that "die furchtsame gewissen," who often are "verwirret vnd betrübet," should be helped and not chased away.

CHAPTER 9
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Chemnitz' Repetitio (1561) was received very favorably among the Lutherans in Lutheran circles in Northern Germany. The book raised his reputation as a leading theologian of the younger generation.

Chemnitz started out as a student of Melanchthon, who also studied Luther and Lutheran polemical literature. As time passed his attitude toward Melanchthon gradually changed. Our findings agree with a clear trend in newer research, which maintains that Chemnitz at the time when his Repetitio was published, stood forth as a representative of the moderate Gnesio-Lutherans in Northern Germany. When we say "moderate" we mean [1] that with a certain Melanchthonian "Mässigung" he exercised restraint and did not go to the kind of excess which was not uncommon by some leading Gnesio-Lutherans, for example Flacius and Amsdorf.¹ He repudiated the strong individualism or "Personalismus" which characterized others, for example

¹Robert Kolb, "Martin Chemnitz, Gnesio-Lutheraner," in Der zweite Martin der lutherischen Kirche. Festschrift zum 400. Todestag von Martin Chemnitz, ed. W. A. Junke (Braunschweig: Ev.luth. Stadtkirchenverband und Propstei, 1986), 116, 122-127.

Heshusius.² Chemnitz did not want to go his own ways; he wanted to go with the Lutheran Church and its confessions. This attitude is manifest in his emphasis on theological discipline in church. The pastors were held not only to the doctrinal content of the *corpus doctrinae*, but also to the way it was expressed.³ [2] Theologically he outlined his position on the issues of the days in his Iudicium, a position which on all main doctrinal issues was that of the Gnesio-Lutherans.⁴ We have not compared Chemnitz doctrine of the Lord's Supper with the doctrine of leading Gnesio-Lutherans. From the favorable reception of Repetitio in Lower Saxony, a Gnesio-Lutheran area, we learn that the doctrine of the Lord's Supper is no exception.

For seven years Chemnitz had been the coadjutor of Joachim Mörlin, the superintendent of the Church of the city of Braunschweig, who was a recognized Gnesio-Lutheran leader. The two men were personal friends, they worked very well together, and they had good relations with and cooperated closely with the churches in the cities in Lower Saxony. From

²Peter F. Barton, Um Luthers Erbe. Studien und Texte zur Spätreformation. Tilemann Heshusius (1527-1559), Untersuchungen zur Kirchengeschichte, Bd. 6 (Witten: Luther-Verlag, 1972), 14-15.

³Emil Sehling, ed. Die evangelischen Kirchenordnungen des XVI. Jahrhunderts, vol. 6, part 1 (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1955), 92.

⁴Kolb, "Martin Chemnitz, Gnesio-Lutheraner," 123-124; see above, 62-65.

the beginning of the *Interim Controversy* these churches had taken a firm Lutheran stand in doctrinal issues. This position was maintained and had been strengthened over the years. Historically this is Chemnitz' "place" in the church in Northern Germany.

In the difficult theological situation which followed in the wake of the *Interims* (1548) the Lower Saxon theologians realized that Melanchthon's works alone would not be sufficient as the theological standard. In the doctrine of the Lord's Supper the Sacramentarians adopted Melanchthonian terms, which they to a certain extent reinterpreted, to express their own doctrine. Chemnitz as well as other Lutherans of the late Reformation period would not allow the Reformed to lay claim on Melanchthon. Therefore, they interpreted him as Lutheran as possible.

This is the theological background of Chemnitz' Repetitio. The contested issue was, as we have seen, above all the doctrine of the Real Presence of Christ's true body and blood in the Lord's Supper. The explicitly-stated purpose of Repetitio is to counter this challenge from a biblical Lutheran position. The best way to accomplish this, Chemnitz thought, was to work out in detail the biblical foundation for the doctrine of the Real Presence of the true body and blood of Christ in the Supper. The strength of his work is his thorough methodological discussion of the biblical evidence for

the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. Helmut Gollwitzer rightly writes of Chemnitz:

Durch die Umsicht der exegetischen Durchführung zeichnet er sich vor allen anderen aus. . . . So ist das exegetische Kapitel der Fundamenta ein Kompendium der lutherischen Argumentation; denn was sich bei den anderen an wirklich exegetischen Bemerkungen verstreut findet, hat man hier in ein Einheit eines durchgedachten Aufbaus. . . . Chemnitz ganzes Bemühen [war] darauf gerichtet totam controversiam revocare ad fontes et fundamenta institutionis.⁵

The weakness of his position can be spotted particularly at those points where he does not follow his hermeneutical principles strictly.

There are two features of Repetitio, Chemnitz' first theological work which was published, that stand out. First, the book shows Chemnitz' strenuous effort to establish the doctrine of the Lord's Supper on firm, immovable ground. The means for this is a biblical hermeneutics taken from the Bible itself. Chemnitz often speaks of the rules of the Holy Spirit laid down in Scripture for the interpretation of the articles of faith. It is an amazing fact that a major part of his main presentation of the doctrine of the Lord's Supper consists of a discussion of general hermeneutical principles, which he then applies to the *Verba*.

The first and most fundamental of Chemnitz' rules is that the doctrine of the Lord's Supper as well as all other

⁵Helmut Gollwitzer, Coena Domini. Die altlutherische Abendmahlslehre in ihrer Auseinandersetzung mit dem Calvinismus dargestellt an die lutherische Frühorthodoxie (Munich: Chr. Kaiser, 1937; rep. 1988), 8.

articles of faith have particular biblical passages as their basis. This applies to the whole doctrine of the Lord's Supper, to its substance as well as to its use and benefits. The whole must be based on the *Verba*. Further, man's natural reason cannot determine how the *sedes* are to be read. These passages, *sedes doctrinae*, must be understood in their simple, literal meaning. If figurative language should appear in these passages -- and this does happen -- the Holy Spirit has always so interpreted them in other passages. Such repetitions are not only another account of the same biblical material. According to Chemnitz, repetition is the Holy Spirit's method to safeguard the wholesome doctrine of the Bible. Comparison is, therefore, a most helpful and necessary method in biblical interpretation. The concern for the simple, natural, literal meaning is a recurrent theme throughout Repetitio. It shows that theology, according to Chemnitz, is not the preserve of sophisticated theologians, but is for the people of the church.

Secondly, in Repetitio Chemnitz includes two major sections on the fathers, one at the end of his discussion of the *Verba* (219-238), and a lengthy history of the Sacrament "Schwermereien" (383-456). The most interesting, but also partly disturbing feature, is the part the ancient fathers, or "alte pure Kirche" play at certain points in Chemnitz' argumentation. Our analysis has demonstrated that in the sections where Chemnitz treats Christ's union with the

believers in the context of the Lord's Supper and the bestowal of life and immortality upon our miserable and mortal body, the arguments taken from the fathers are all-decisive. We cannot say that they prevail over Scripture. Material from Scripture is actually almost completely absent, at least material that relates directly to the Lord's Supper. On the other hand, when Chemnitz treats the *Verba*, not only are the fathers absent, but the particular emphasis on the gift of immortality and incorruptibility to our mortal body are absent. These two features put together almost amount to a proof that the source of this theme in Chemnitz is not Scripture, not to say the *Verba*, but the tradition from the fathers. At this point we must conclude that Chemnitz hermeneutically is at variance with his own principles. Theologically his position on these issues cannot be said to be in agreement with his doctrine of justification, with which it is connected. To put it mildly, his position on these issues is very vulnerable. From Chemnitz' basic principles we would expect something else and better. It should, however, be emphasized that this is not Chemnitz' general way of doing theology; on the contrary, it is the exception. In his later works the more blatant expressions of this view, particularly the the bodily effects of the Supper in this life,⁶ and that the Lord's Supper is the only means by which life is

⁶This is most clearly stated in Examen II, 232-235.

conveyed to the believers' body, is no longer present. This should, therefore, be regarded as Chemnitz more considered view.⁷

The purpose of the Lord's Supper, according to Chemnitz, is to bestow Christ and all his merits and benefits upon all those who receive the Sacrament in faith. It is, therefore, a real means of grace ordained for the upholding and strengthening the faith of those who through Baptism have been taken into the covenant of grace. For this purpose the Lord's Supper gives, confirms, and seals in the believers the gifts of the New Testament.

The particular feature of the Lord's Supper, its *proprium*, is that it applies through external, visible means to "ein jeder in sonderheit für sich" "die geschenck vnd gaben des newen Testament so es [Christus] mit dargebung seines Leibes/ vnd vergiessung seines Blutes erworben hat."⁸ This *proprium* which Chemnitz frequently underlines, the Lord's Supper has in common with the sacrament of Baptism. Both Lord's Supper and Baptism follow the believers throughout their life, but in a different way. In addition, Chemnitz maintains that there is a particular *proprium* in the bestowal

⁷See above, 191-192 and 241.

⁸Wolgegründeter Bericht, 930; Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 284; quoted more in full above, 156-158, in our discussion of the purpose of the Lord's Supper, 153-165. Cf. Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 58.

of life and union with Christ also to the bodily life of the believers.

Differently from Melanchthon and in line with the back-to-Luther-trend among the Gnesio-Lutherans, Chemnitz regards the true body and blood of Christ in, with, and under the elements as the "Hauptgabe" of the Supper, the most precious treasure which is given to all the communicants. We have, however, noticed that Chemnitz generally reserves the terms "benefits," and "fruit" of the Sacrament when the "Hauptgabe" is received in faith. The "Hauptgabe" is given to all the communicants, but it becomes a benefit or is enjoyed beneficially when it is received in faith.

The question how the gift of Christ's body and blood is received by the communicants in the Lord's Supper Chemnitz expounds in his discussion of the three kinds of eating, *manducatio physica*, *manducatio sacramentalis*, and *manducatio spiritualis*. The latter two are dealt with as the important ones. Spiritual eating is not restricted to the Supper. It takes place whenever the heart put its trust in Christ's death and resurrection. In the Lord's Supper spiritual eating takes place in this particular way: sacramental and spiritual eating, that is, the reception of the same body and blood of Christ with mouth and heart in faith are joined in one act; they are not separated into two acts. According to Chemnitz there can be no beneficial sacramental eating, only a detrimental eating to one's own judgment when the Supper is not

received in "wahre Busse und rechte Glaube." In Repetitio this is repeated over and over again.

A notable but often overlooked feature of Chemnitz' doctrine of the Lord's Supper is the close connection with confession and absolution. It may be overlooked because it is not separately treated in any of his works on the Supper. Just as in Wittenberg in the early 1520s, all communicants were required to appear before the pastor for private confession and absolution. Chemnitz seems to take this usage for granted. The step from Scripture's admonition to self-examination to mandatory examination before the pastor was taken without any scriptural support. The history of the Lutheran Church gives sufficient evidence of the problems inherent in this practice, particularly a in folk-church context such as in Braunschweig.

The way Chemnitz taught and preached the proper use of the Lord's Supper shows very definitely that in his theology the use of the Supper is part and parcel of the doctrine of conversion or repentance. In the life of the church it is tied tightly to confession and absolution. This theological "place" of the Lord's Supper in Chemnitz theology is also the basis for the internal comparison and criticism of some features of Chemnitz doctrine of the Lord's Supper.

At the end of the chapter "Vom Abendmahl des HErrn" in Wolgegründeter Bericht Chemnitz summarizes the issue of the

relation between the substance and the beneficial use of the Lord's Supper thus:

Wenn gefragt wird vom wesen oder von der Vollkommenheit und Heiligkeit der Sacrament/ its nicht daran gelegen/ was der gläubet der sie empfänget/ wenn aber die Frage hievon angestellt wird/ wie man den Nutz/ die Frucht und die Krafft des Sacraments empfangen möge/ its zwar am Glauben am meisten gelegen/ den solches Nutzens/ solcher Frucht/ Krafft und Wirckung/ allein diejenigen theilhaftig werden die se mit Glauben empfaen⁹

To the first part of the statement it should be added that faith, neither that of the communicant nor that of the celebrant, only "die einsetzung vnd die wort Christi/ [macht] dis Sacrament/ in seinem gebrauch."¹⁰

Chemnitz strong emphasis on the Real Presence of the true body and blood of Christ and his concern for a repentant faith helped Chemnitz keep the right track in the middle of the road and safeguarded his doctrine of the Lord's Supper from the ditches on both sides of the road: sacramentalism and spiritualism; from neglect of a true and living faith and reliance on the mere participation in the external act of the Supper, and from disregard for "die Hauptgabe," the most precious treasure of Christ's body and blood which he offered up on the cross for our salvation.

⁹Wolgegründeter Bericht, 948.

¹⁰Die Reine Gesunde Lehre, 282-283.

A SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Chemnitz, Martin. Repetitio sanae doctrinae de vera praesentia corporis et sanguinis in Coena Additus est Tractatus complectens doctrinam de Communicatione idiomatum. Leipzig: Ernst Vögelin, 1561. [Short title: Repetitio].

_____. Die Reine Gesunde Lehre/ von der wahren gegenwertigkeit/ des Leibs vnd Bluts Christi in seinem Abendmal/ wie dieselbe in den Euangelischen Kirchen/ der Augspurgischen Confession verwandt/ bissanher gelehret ist/ vnd noch gelehret wirdt/ in kurtze/ deutliche/ einfeltige Hauptstücke inm latein zusammen gezogen durch M. Martinum Kemnitz Jetzundt aber dem einfeltigen Leser zu gut/ ins deutsch verfertiget durch Johannem Zanger. Preface by Joachim Mörlin. Leipzig: Ernst Vögelin, 1561. [Short title: Die Reine Gesunde Lehre].

_____. Anatome propositionum Alberti Hardenbergii de Coena Domini quas exhibuit ordinibus Saxoniae inferioribus in conventu Brunsvigensi. Additae sunt etiam propositiones ministrorum Bremensis. Et Declaratio articuli decimi in Confessione Augustana de Coena Domini sumpta ex publicis confeßionibus et historiis nostrorum temporum. . . . Preface by Joachim Mörlin. Eisleben: Urban Graubisch, 1561. [Short title: Anatome].

_____. Leuterungen der proposition oder schlussreden Alberti Hardenbergs von dem Abendmal des Herrn, welche er auff dem kreistag zu Braunschweig den stenden des Nidersechsischen kreis ubergeben hat. Sampt Erklerung des zehenden artickels der Auspurgischen Confession, wie die lere vom Abendmal des Herrn bey Lutheri zeit und leben verstanden sey worden. Auch von den propotionibus oder schlussreden der prediger von Bremen etc.. Translated by Johannes Zanger. Eisleben: Urban Graubisch, 1561. [Short title: Leuterungen].

_____. De controversiis quibusdam que superiori tempore, circa quodam Augustanae Confessionis Articulos, motae et agitate sunt; Iudicium D. Martini Chemnitii Edited by Polykarp Leyser. Wittenberg: Simon Gronenberg, 1594. [Short title: Iudicium].

- _____. Theologiae Iesvitarum praecipua capita
Leipzig: Ernst Vögelin, 1562.
- _____. Examination of the Council of Trent. 4 vol. Trans-
lation of Examen Concilii Tridentini (1565-1573) by Fred
Kramer. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1971-1986.
[Short title: Examen]
- _____. Propositiones de persona et beneficiis filii Dei,
Domini et redemptoris nostri Iesu Christi
Rostock: Jacobus Transylvanus, 1568.
- _____. The Lord's Supper, translation by J. A. O. Preus of
Fundamenta Sanae doctrinae de vera et substantiali
praesentia, exhibitione et sumptione corporis et
sanguinis Domini in Coena. Repetiat 1570. St.
Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1979.
- _____. Bedenken der theologen zu Braunschweigk von der
newen Wittenbergischen Catechismo gestellt, der gantzen
christenheit zur warnung ausgegangen. Jena, 1571
- _____. Wiederholte Christliche Gemeine Confeßion und
Erklerung. Wie in der Sechsischen Kirchen vermöge der
heilige Schrifft/ und Augspurgische Confession/ nach der
alten Grundfest Lutheri/ wieder die sacramentierer
gelehret wird: Wolfenbüttel: Conrad Horn, 1572.
- _____. Repetitio Corporis Doctrinae Ecclesiasticae. Oder
Widerholung der Summa und Inhalt der rechten, allge-
meynen, christlichen Kirchen Lehre . . . von Fürstlicher
Durchleuchtigkeit zu Preussen Königsberg: Johann
Daubmann, 1567; rep. in Walter Hubatsch. Geschichte der
evangelischen Kirche Ostpreussens. Vol. 3. Göttingen:
Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1968.
- _____. Was das Corpus Doctrinae, das ist: Die Form und
Fürbilde der reine Lehre in den Kirchen dieses Fürst
entums hinführro seyn soll. [Im Anschluss daran:] Kurtzer,
einfeltiger und nothwendiger Bericht von etlichen für
nemen Artickeln der Lehr Wolfenbüttel, 1569.
Rep. in Emil Sehling, ed. Die evangelischen Kirchen
ordnungen des XVI. Jahrhunderts. Vol.6, part 1. Tübingen:
J. C. B. Mohr, 1955. [Short title: Kurtzer Bericht].

- _____. "Wolgegündeter Bericht von dem fürnemsten Artickeln Christlicher Lehre, so zu unseren Zeiten streitig worden seyn . . . ," Corpus doctrinae, das ist die summa, form und fürbilde der reinen christlichen lehre, aus der heiligen göttlichen schrift der propheten und aposteln zusammengezogen . . . aus gnediger verordnung . . . Julii, hertzen zu Braunschweig und Lüneburg etc . . . Heinrichstadt, 1576. The edition used in this work is Corpus doctrinae Julii. Braunschweig: Christoph-Friedrich Zilligers, 1690. [Short title: Wolgegründeter Bericht].
- _____. The Two Natures in Christ. Translation by J. A. O. Preus of De duabus naturis in Christo Jena: Donat Richtzenhan, 1570, St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1971
- _____. Ministry, Word, and Sacraments. An Enchiridion. Translated by Luther Poellot. Enchiridion D. Martini Chemnitii. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1981. [Short title: Enchiridion].
- _____. Loci Theologici. Translation of Loci Theologici . . . D. Martini Chemnitii . . . Frankfurt, 1591/1592, by J. A. O. Preus. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1989.
- _____. "An Autobiography of Martin Chemnitz," translated by A. G. Theological Quarterly 3 (1899): 472-487.
- Clemen, Otto. Melanchthons Briefwechsel, Supplementa Melanchtoniana, IV, 1, Leipzig: Rudolf Haupt, 1926
- Luther, Martin. D. Martin Luthers Werke. Kritische Gesamtausgabe. Weimar: Hermann Bohlau, 1883-. [Short title: WA].
- _____. Luther's Works. American Edition. Edited by J. Pelikan and Helmut T. Lehmann. Philadelphia and St. Louis: Fortress Press and Concordia Publishing House, 1955-1986.
- Melanchthon, Philipp: Philippi Melanthonis opera quae supersunt omnia. In C. G. Brechtschneider and H. E. Bindseil. Corpus Reformatorum. Vol. 1-28. Halle-Braunschweig: C. A. Schwetschke, 1834-.
- _____. Melanchthons Briefwechsel, Bd. 1-6. Edited by Heinz Scheible. Stuttgart - Bad Cannstadt: Friedrich Frommann Verlag Günter Holzboog GmbH & Co., 1977-
- _____. Melanchthons Werke im Auswahl. Edited by Robert Stupperich. Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann and Verlag Gerd Mohn, 1951-1963.

- _____. Loci Communes theologici. Translated by Lowell J. Satre, with revisions by Wilhelm Pauch, Library of Christian Classics, vol. 19. Melanchthon and Bucer. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1969.
- Melanchthon, Philipp. Selected Writings. Translated by Charles L. Hill. Edited by E. E. Flack and L. J. Satre. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1962.
- Lietzmann, Hans, ed. Die Bekenntnisschriften der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche. Edited for the Deutsche Evangelische Kirchenausschuss, 1930, 4th ed. revised. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1959
- Migne, J. P. Patrologiae cursus completus. Series Graeca, Paris: a l'imprimerie Catholique Petet Montronce, 1844-1892
- Oecolampadius, Johannes. Briefe und Akten zum Leben Oekolampads. 2 vol. Edited by Ernst Stähelin. Quellen und Forschungen zur Reformationsgeschichte, vol. X and XIX. Leipzig: M. Heinius Nachfolger: Eger & Sievers, 1924 and 1934.
- Sehling, Emil, ed. Die evangelischen Kirchenordnungen des XVI. Jahrhunderts. Vol. 6, part 1. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1955.
- Tappert, Theodore G., ed. The Book of Concord. The Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1959. [Short title: Book of Concord].

Works on Chemnitz' Life and Theology

- Bertram, Johann Georg. Das evangelische Lüneburg oder Reformations- und Kirchen-Historie der alt-berühmten Stadt Lüneburg. Braunschweig: Ludolf Schröder, 1719
- Baur, Jörg. "Martin Chemnitz," In Einsicht und Glaube. Aufsätze. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1976
- Ebel, Jobst Chr. Wort und Geist bei den Verfassern der Konkordienformel. Munich: Chr. Kaiser, 1981.
- _____. "Die Herkunft des Konzeptes der Konkordienformel." Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte 91 (1980): 237-281.
- Gollwitzer, Helmut. Coena Domini. Die altlutherische Abendmahlslehre in ihrer Auseinandersetzung mit dem Calvin-

ismus dargestellt an die lutherische Frühorthodoxie.
Munich: Chr. Kaiser, 1937; reprint, 1988.

Gozdek, Frank Georg. "Der Beitrag des Martin Chemnitz zur lutherischen Abendmahlslehre." In Der zweite Martin der lutherischen Kirche. Festschrift zum 400. Todestag von Martin Chemnitz. Edited by W. A. Junke, 9-47. Braunschweig: Ev.luth. Stadtkirchenverband und Propstei, 1986.

Hachfeld, Hermann. Martin Chemnitz nach seinem Leben und Wirken, insbesondere nach seinem Verhältnisse zum Tridentinum, Unter Benützung vieler, zum Theil wenig bekannten Handschriften. Leipzig, 1867.

Hägglund, Bengt. "Majestas hominis Christi." In Luther Jahrbuch 47 (1980): 71-88.

Hoas, Brynjulf. The Doctrine of Conversion in the Theology of Martin Chemnitz: What Conversion is and how it is Worked. Ft. Wayne: STM Thesis, Concordia Theological Seminary, 1985.

Jungkuntz, Theodore R. Formulators of the Formula of Concord. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1977

Keller, Rudolf. "In Konflikt über die Adiaphora. Martin Chemnitz auf dem Weg zum zehnten Artikel der Konkordienformel." In Der zweite Martin der lutherischen Kirche. Festschrift zum 400. Todestag von Martin Chemnitz. Edited by W. A. Junke, 93-114. Braunschweig: Ev.luth. Stadtkirchenverband und Propstei, 1986.

Klug, Eugene F. A. From Luther to Chemnitz on Scripture and the Word, Kampen: J.H. Kok, 1971.

Kolb, Robert. "Martin Chemnitz, Gnesio-Lutheraner." In Der zweite Martin der lutherischen Kirche. Festschrift zum 400. Todestag von Martin Chemnitz. Edited by W. A. Junke, 115-129. Braunschweig: Ev.luth. Stadtkirchenverband und Propstei, 1986.

Koldewey, Friedrich. "Neun bisher nicht gedruckte Briefe Melanthons über und an Martin Kemnitz. Mit Einleitung und Anmerkungen," Zeitschrift für Historische Theologie 42 (1872): 3-23.

Kramer, Fred. "Martin Chemnitz." In Shapers of Tradition in Germany, Switzerland, and Poland, 1560-1600. Edited by Jill Raitt, 39-51. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1981.

Krumwiede, Hans-Walter. Entstehung des landesherrlichen Kirchenregiments in Kursachsen und Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1967.

_____. "Gezetz und Evangelium. Zur Begrifflichkeit reformatorischer Theologie in niedersächsischen Lehrschriften." In Kerygma und Melos. Christian Mahrenholz 70 Jahre. Edited by Walter Blankenburg, Kassel-Hamburg: Bärenreiter-Verlag und Lutherische Verlagshaus, 1970.

Kunze, Johannes. "Chemnitz, Martin." In Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche, 3d ed., vol. 3: 796-804. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1896-1913.

Lau, Franz. "Chemnitz, Martin." In Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart, 3d ed., vol. 1, 1647-1648. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1957.

Lentz, Carolus G. H. Dr. Martin Kemnitz, superintendent in Braunschweig . . . Ein Lebensbild aus den 16. Jahrhundert, aus gedruckten und handschriftlichen Nachrichten. Gotha: Friedrich Andreas Perthes, 1866. [Short title: Martin Kemnitz].

Mager, Inge. Die Konkordienformel in Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel, . Die Entstehung - Rezeption - Geltung. Habil. diss., University of Göttingen, 1986.

_____. "Erbe und Auftrag nach dem Testament von Martin Chemnitz." In Der zweite Martin der lutherischen Kirche. Festschrift zum 400. Todestag von Martin Chemnitz. Edited by W. A. Junke, 146-170. Braunschweig: Ev.luth. Stadtkirchenverband und Propstei, 1986.

_____. ""Ich habe dich zum Wächter gesetzt über das Haus Israel." Zum Amtverständnis des Braunschweiger Stadtsuperintendenten und Wolfenbüttelschen Kirchenrats Martin Chemnitz." In Braunschweigisches Jahrbuch 69 (1988): 57-69.

Mahlmann, Theodor. Das neue Dogma der lutherischen Christologie. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1969.

_____. "Chemnitz, Martin (1522-1586)." In Theologische Realencyklopädie vol. 7: 714-721. Berlin-New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1977-. [Short title: "Chemnitz, Martin (TRE)"]

- _____. "Martin Chemnitz." In Gestalten der Kirchengeschichte, vol.6, Die Reformation, part II. Edited by Martin Greschat, 315-331. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1981-1985. [Short title: "Martin Chemnitz (GKG)"].
- _____. "Bibliographie Martin Chemnitz." In Der zweite Martin der lutherischen Kirche. Festschrift zum 400. Todestag von Martin Chemnitz. Edited by W. A. Junke, 368-425. Braunschweig: Ev.luth. Stadtkirchenverband und Propstei, 1986.
- Müller, Gerhard. "Martin Chemnitz (1522-1586). Ein Reformator der zweiten Generation." Luther 57 (1986): 119-127.
- Noth, Gottfried. Grundzüge der Theologie des Martin Chemnitz. Diss., University of Erlangen, 1930.
- Oftestad, Bernt Torvid. "Traditio und Norma - Hauptzüge der Schriftauffassung bei Martin Chemnitz." In Der zweite Martin der lutherische Kirche. Festschrift zum 400. Todestag von Martin Chemnitz. Edited by W. A. Junke, 172-189. Braunschweig: Ev.luth. Stadtkirchenverband und Propstei, 1986.
- _____. "'Historia' und 'Utilitas.' Methodologische Aspekte der Abendmahlstheologie Martin Chemnitz." Arkiv für Reformationsgeschichte 77 (1986): 186-225.
- Olsen, Arthur L. Scripture and Tradition in the Theology of Martin Chemnitz, Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, Cambridge, 1966.
- Pressel, Theodor. Leben und Ausgewählte Schriften der Väter und Begründer der lutherische Kirche, Eberfeld: R. L. Friedrichs, 1862.
- Preuss, Ed. "Vita Martini Chemnicii," Appendix in Examen Concilii Tridentini. Edited by Ed. Preuss. Berlin: Gust. Schlawitz, 1862, 925-958.
- Rehtmeyer, Philipp Julius. Antiquitas ecclesiasticae inclytæ urbis Brunsvigae, oder: Der berühmter Stadt Braunschweig Kirchengeschichte. Vol.3. Braunschweig: Chr. Fr. Zilligers, 1710.
- Ritter, Annelies. "Über die Lehrschriften in den Fürstentümer Wolfenbüttel und Lüneburg am Ende des 16. Jahrhunderts." Jahrbuch Gesellschaft für Niedersächsische Kirchengeschichte 50 (1952): 82-95.
- Stupperich, Martin. "Martin Chemnitz und der Osianderische Streit." In Der zweite Martin der lutherischen Kirche.

Festschrift zum 400. Todestag von Martin Chemnitz.
 Edited by W. A. Junke, 224-241. Braunschweig: Ev.luth.
 Stadt-kirchenverband und Propstei, 1986.

Teigen, Bjarne Wollan. "Martin Chemnitz und Solida Declaratio VII, 126." In Der zweite Martin der lutherischen Kirche. Festschrift zum 400. Todestag von Martin Chemnitz. Edited by W. A. Junke, 242-252. Braunschweig: Ev.luth. Stadt-kirchenverband und Propstei, 1986.

_____. The Lord's Supper in the Theology of Martin Chemnitz. Brewster, MA.: Trinity Lutheran Press, 1986.

Volk, Ernst. "Der andere Martin. Eine Erinnerung an der lutherischen Theologen Martin Chemnitz." Lutherische Theologie und Kirche 10 (1986): 81-95 and 145-155; 11 (1987): 16-23.

Volkman, Rolf. "Martin Chemnitz und die Gründung der Universität Helmstedt." In Der zweite Martin der lutherischen Kirche. Festschrift zum 400. Todestag von Martin Chemnitz. Edited by W. A. Junke, 353-367. Braunschweig: Ev.luth. Stadtkirchenverband und Propstei, 1986.

Works related to Chemnitz' Time and Theology

Aland, Kurt. "Die Theologische Fakultät Wittenberg und ihre Stellung im Gesamtzusammenhang der Leucorea während des 16. Jahrhunderts." In Kirchengeschichtliche Entwürfe. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1960, 332-391.

Albrecht, O and P. Flemming. "Das sogenannte manuscriptum Thomasianum, V," Arkiv für Reformationsgeschichte 13 (1916): 161-199.

Althaus, Paul. The Theology of Martin Luther. Translated by Robert C. Schultz. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966.

Barton, Peter F. Um Luthers Erbe. Studien und Texte zur Spätreformation. Tilemann Heshusius (1527-1559), Untersuchungen zur Kirchengeschichte. Bd. 6. Witten: Luther-Verlag, 1972.

_____. "Heshusius, Tilemann (1527-1588)." In Theologische Realenzyklopädie, vol. 15: 256-260. Berlin-New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1977-.

_____. "Umsturz im Bremen." In Geschichtsmächtigkeit und Geduld. Festschrift für der ev.theol. Fakultät Wien. Munich, 1972: 66-76.

- _____. "Chyträus, David 1531-1600)." In Theologische Realenzyklopädie, vol. 8: 256-260. Berlin-New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1977-.
- _____. "Matthias Flacius Illyricus," in Gestalten der Kirchengeschichte, vol. 6. Die Reformation, part II. Edited by Martin Greschat, 277-293. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1981-1985.
- _____. "Flacius Illyricus, Mathias (1520-1575)." In Theologische Realenzyklopädie, vol. 11, 256-260. Berlin-New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1977-.
- Baur, Jörg. "Christologie und Subjectivität. Geschichtlichen Ort und dogmatischen Rang der Christologie der Konkordienformel." In Vom Dissensus zum Konsensus. Fuldaer Hefte 24. Edited by Gottfried Klapper, 70-87. Hamburg: Lutherische Verlagshaus, 1980.
- _____. "Abendmahl und Christologie der Konkordienformel als Bekenntnis zum menschlichen Gott." In Bekenntnis und Einheit der Kirche. Studien zum Konkordienbuch. Edited by Martin Brecht and Reinhard Schwarz, 195-218. Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1980.
- Bente, Frederick. Historical Introduction to the Book of Concord. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1965.
- Bertheau, Carl. "Hardenberg, Albert Rizaesus." In Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche, 3d. ed., vol. 6: 408-414. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1896-1913.
- _____. "Äpinus, Johannes." In Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche, 3d. ed., vol. 1: 228-231. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1896-1913.
- Bizer, Ernst. Studien zur Geschichte des Abendmahlstreites im 16. Jahrhundert. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1940.
- _____. Theologie der Verheissung. Studien zur theologischen Entwicklung des jungen Melanchthons (1519-1524). Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlagshaus, 1964.
- _____. Reformationsgeschichte 1532-1555. Vol. 3. Die Kirche in ihre Geschichte. Edited by Franz Lau and Ernst Bizer. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963

- _____. "Die Abendmahllehre in der lutherischen Bekenntnisschriften." In Die Abendmahllehre in der reformatorischen Bekenntnisschriften. Edited by Ernst Bizer and Walter Kreck, Theologische Existenz Heute, vol. 47, Munich: 1955.
- Bornkamm, Heinrich: Luther in Mid-Career, 1521-1530, translated by E. Theodore Bachmann, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983.
- Brandy, Hans Christian. "Jakob Andrea's Fünf Artikel von 1568/69." Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte 98 (1987): 338-351.
- Brecht, Martin and Reinhard Schwarz, ed. Bekenntnis und Einheit der Kirche. Studien zum Konkordienbuch. Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1980.
- _____. Martin Luther. His Road to Reformation, 1483-1521, translated by James L. Schaaf, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985
- _____. Kirchenordnung und Kirchenrecht im Württemberg vom 16. bis zum 18. Jahrhundert. Quellen für Württembergische Kirchengeschichte 1, Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1967.
- _____. Johannes Brenz. Neugestalter von Kirche, Staat und Gesellschaft. Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1971.
- _____ and Hermann Ehmer. Südwestdeutsche Reformationsgeschichte, Stuttgart: Calwer, 1984.
- _____. "Andrea, Jakob (1528-1590)." In Theologische Realenzyklopädie, vol. 2: 672-680. Berlin-New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1977-.
- _____. "Brenz, Johannes (1499-1570)." In Theologische Realenzyklopädie, vol. 7, 170-180. Berlin-New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1977-.
- _____. "Abgrenzung oder Verständigung. Was wollten die Protestanten in Trient?" In Blätter für Württembergische Kirchengeschichte 70 (1970): 148-175.
- _____. "Brenz als Zeitgenosse. Die Reformationsopoke im Spiegel seiner Schriftauslegung." In Blätter für Württembergische Kirchengeschichte 70 (1970): 5-39
- Bühler, Pierre. "Der Abendmahlstreit der Reformatoren und seine aktuellen Implikationen," Theologische Zeitschrift 35 (1979) 228-241.

- Calinich, Robert. Kampf und Untergang des Melanchthonismus in Kursachsen in den Jahren 1570 bis 1574 und die Schicksale seiner vornehmsten Häupter. Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus, 1866.
- _____. Der Naumburger Fürstentag, 1561. Gotha, 1870.
- Cohrs, Ferdinand. "Curtius (Korte), Valentin." In Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche, 3d ed., vol. 4: 358-360. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1896-1913.
- Dieckhoff, A.W. Die evangelische Abendmahlslehre im Reformationszeitalter geschichtlich dargelegt. Vol. 1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1854.
- Diestelmann, Th. Die Letzte Unterredung Luthers mit Melanchthon über den Abendmahlstreit. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1874.
- Düfel, Hans. "Äpinus, Johannes (1499-1553)." In Theologische Realenzyklopädie, vol. 1, 535-544. Berlin-New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1977-.
- Ebel, Jobst Chr. "Jacob Andreae (1528-1590) als Verfasser der Konkordienformel." Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte 89, (1978): 78-119.
- Eckert, Alfred. "Aus dem Leben und Werk Nikolaus Seleneckers." Zeitschrift für bayerische Kirchengeschichte 48 (1978): 19-27.
- _____. "Die Abendmahllehre von Nikolaus Selenecker." Zeitschrift für bayerische Kirchengeschichte 54 (1985): 55-65.
- Elert, Werner. The Structure of Lutheranism. Translated by Walter A. Hansen. With a foreword by Jaroslav Pelikan. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1962.
- Engelhardt, Hanns. "Das Irrlehreprozeß gegen Albert Hardenberg 1560/61." Jahrbuch der Gesellschaft für Niedersächsische Kirchengeschichte 61 (1963): 32-62.
- Fagerberg, Holsten. A New Look at the Lutheran Confessions (1529-1537). Translated by Gene J. Lund. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1972.
- Fligge, Jörg Rainer. Herzog Albrecht von Preussen und der Osianderismus, 1522-68. Phil. diss. University of Bonn, 1972.

- Fraenkel, Peter. Einigungsbestrebungen in der Reformationszeit. Zwei Wege - Zwei Motive. Wiesbaden: F. Steiner Verlag, 1965.
- _____. "Ten questions concerning Melanchthon, the Fathers and the Eucharist." In Luther and Melanchthon. Edited by Vilmos Vajta, 146-164. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1961.
- Frank, F. H. R. Die Theologie der Concordienformel historisch-dogmatisch entwickelt, und beleuchtet. 3 vol. Erlangen: Theodor Blaesing, 1858-1863.
- Friedensburg, W. Geschichte der Universität Wittenberg. Halle: M. Niemeyer, 1917.
- Gebremedhin, Ezra. Life-Giving Blessing. An Inquiry into the Eucharistic Doctrine of Cyril of Alexandria. *Studia doctrinae christianae Upsaliensa* 17. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1977.
- Gensichen, Hans-Werner. We condemn. How Luther and 16th Century Lutheranism Condemned False Doctrine. Translated by H. J. A. Bouman. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1967.
- Gräbke, F. Die Konstruktion der Abendmahlslehre Luthers in ihre Entwicklung dargestellt, Leipzig: A. Deichert, 1908.
- Grass, Hans. Die Abendmahlslehre bei Luther und Calvin. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1954.
- Green, Lowell. "The Holy Supper," in A Contemporary Look at the Formula of Concord, ed. Robert D. Preus and Wilbert H. Rosin. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1977.
- _____. The Formula of Concord: An Histographical and Bibliographical Guide. *Sixteenth Century Bibliography* 11. St. Louis: Center for Reformation Research, 1977.
- Greschat, Martin. Melanchthon neben Luther. Studien zur Gestalt der Rechtfertigungslehre zwischen 1528 und 1537. Witten: Luther-Verlag, 1965.
- Hägglund, Bengt. "Die Rezeption Luthers in der Konkordienformel." In Luther und die Bekenntnisschriften. Veröffentlichungen der Luther-Akademie Ratzeburg 2, 107-120. Erlangen: Luther Verlag, 1982.
- _____. De homine. Menniskouppfattningen i eldre luthersk tradition. Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1959.

- _____. History of Theology. Translated by Gene J. Lund. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1968.
- Haikola, Lauri. Gesetz und Evangelium bei Matthias Flacius Illyricus. Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1952
- Hardt, Tom G. A. Venerabilis et adorabilis Eucharistia, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1988.
- Hase, Hans Christoph von. Die Gestalt der Kirche Luthers. Der causa confessionis im Kampf des Matthias Flacius gegen das Interim 1548. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1940.
- Hauschild, Wolf-Dieter. "Zum Kampf gegen Augsburger Interim in norddeutschen Hansastädten." Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte 84 (1973): 60-81. [Short title: "Kampf gegen Augsburger Interim"].
- _____. "Theologiepolitische Aspekte der lutherischen Konsensusbildung in Norddeutschland," in Widerspruch, Dialog und Einigung. Edited by W. Lohff and L. W. Spitz. Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1977. [Short title: "Theologiepolitische Aspekte"].
- _____. "Corpus doctrinae und Bekenntnisschriften. Zur Vorgeschichte des Konkordienbuchs." In Bekenntnis und Einheit der Kirche. Studien zum Konkordienbuch. Edited by Martin Brecht and Reinhard Schwarz, 235-252. Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1980.
- Heckel, Martin. "Deutschland im konfessionellen Zeitalter." In Deutsche Geschichte. Vol. 2: Frühe Neuzeit. Edited by Bernd Möller and Martin Heckel. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1985.
- Heppe, Heinrich. Die Geschichte des deutschen Protestantismus im Jahren 1555-1581, Vol. I. Marburg: N. G. Elwert'sche Druck und Verlag, 1852.
- _____. Geschichte der lutherischen Concordienformel, vol 1, with "Beilagen," Marburg: N. G. Elwert'sche Universitäts-Buchhandlung, 1857.
- _____. Die Entstehung und Fortbildung des Luthertums und die kirchlichen Bekenntnisschriften desselben von 1548-1576. Kassel: J. C. Krieger'sche Buchhandlung, 1863.
- _____. Dogmatik des deutschen Protestantismus im sechzehnten Jahrhundert. Vol. 1-3. Gotha: Andreas Perthes, 1857

- Hermelink, H. "Stuttgarter Synode." In Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche, 3d ed., vol. 19: 116-119. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1896-1913.
- Herrlinger, A. Die Theologie Melanchthon in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung und im Zusammenhange mit der Lehr-geschichte und Culturbewegung der Reformation. Gotha: Friedrich Andreas Perthes, 1879.
- Heussi, Karl. Geschichte der theologische Fakultät zu Jena. Weimar: Hermann Bohlaus nachfolger, 1954.
- Jeremias, Joachim. Die Abendmahlsworte Jesu. 4th ed.. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967.
- Junghans, Helmar. "Übereinstimmungen und Unterschiede zwischen 'Konkordienformel' von 1577 und der 'Leuenberger Konkordie' von 1973." In Themen Luthers als Fragen der Kirche heute. Edited by Joachim Rogge and Gottfried Schille, 128-148. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1982.
- Jünke, Wolfgang A., ed. Der zweite Martin der Lutherische Kirche. Festschrift zum 400. Todestag von Martin Chemnitz. Braunschweig: Ev.-luth. Stadtkirchenverband und Propstei Braunschweig, 1986.
- Kandler, Karl-Hermann. "Die Abendmahllehre der Lutherschen Orthodoxie." Kerygma und Dogma 33 (1987): 2-22.
- Kawerau, Gustav. "Major, Georg." In Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche, 3d ed., vol. 12: 85-91. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1896-1913.
- _____. "Wormser Religionsgespräche. II. Das Religions-gespreäch 1557." In Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche, 3d ed., vol. 21: 492-496. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1896- 1913.
- _____. "Naumburger Fürstentag." In Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche, 3d ed., vol. 13: 661-669. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1896-1913.
- _____. "Wigand, Johann." In Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche, 3d ed., vol. 21: 270-274. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1896-1913.

- _____. "Corpus doctrinae." In Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche, 3d ed., vol. 4: 293-298. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1896-1913.
- Keller, Rudolf. "Gnesiolutheraner." In Theologische Realenzyklopädie, vol. 5, 512-519. Berlin-New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1977-.
- _____. Der Schlüssel der Schrift. Die Lehre vom Wort Gottes bei Matthias Flacius Illyricus. Berlin: Lutherische Verlagshaus, 1984.
- Kelly, John. N. D. Early Christian Doctrine. Revised edition. New York-San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1978.
- Kittelsen, James. "The Confessional Age. Late Reformation in Germany." In Reformation Europe. A Guide to Research. Edited by Steven Ozment, 361-381. St. Louis: Center for Reformation Research, 1982.
- _____. "Martin Bucer and the Sacramentarian Controversy: The Origin of the Policy of Concord." Arkiv für Reformationsgeschichte 64 (1973): 166-183.
- Klein, Th. Der Kampf um die zweite Reformation in Kursachsen 1586-1591, Mitteldeutsche Forschungen 25. Köln: Bohlau, 1962.
- Kluckholm, August. "Der Sturtz der Kryptocalvinismus in Kursachsen 1574," Historische zeitschrift 18 (1867): 77-127.
- Klug, Eugene F. A. "Sacramental presence in Lutheran Orthodoxy." Concordia Theological Quarterly 50 (1986): 95-107.
- Koch, Ernst. "Die kursächsische Philippismus und seine Krise in der 1560er und 1570er Jahren." In Die reformierte Konfessionalisierung in Deutschland. Das Problem der "Zweiten Reformation". Schriften des Verein für Reformationsgeschichte, nr. 195. Edited by Heinz Schilling, 60- 77. Gütersloh: Güthersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1986.
- _____. Aufbruch und Weg. Studien zur lutherischen Bekenntnisbildung in 16. Jahrhundert. Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1983.
- _____. "Striving for Union of Lutheran Churches. The Church-Historical Background of the Work Done on the Formula of Concord at Magdeburg." Sixteenth Century Journal 7 (1977): 105-121.

- _____. "Der Weg zur Konkordienformel." In Vom Dissensus zum Konsensus. Fuldaer Hefte 24. Edited by Gottfried Klapper, 10-46. Hamburg: Lutherische Verlagshaus, 1980.
- _____. "Lutherflorilegien zwischen 1550 und 1600. Zum Lutherbild der ersten nachreformatorischen generation," Theologische Versuche, XVI. Edited by Joachim Rogge and Gottfried Schille, 105-117. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1986.
- Kolb, Robert. Andreae and the Formula of Concord. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1977.
- _____. "Augsburg 1530. German Lutheran Interpretations of the Diet of Augsburg to 1577." Sixteenth Century Journal 8 (1980): 47-61.
- _____. "Dynamics of Party Conflict in the Saxon Late Reformation. Gnesiolutherans vs Philippists." The Journal of Modern History 49 (1977), D1289-D1305.
- _____. "Historical Background of the Formula of Concord." In A Contemporary Look at the Formula of Concord. Edited by Robert D. Preus and Wilbert H. Rosin, 12-87. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1978. [Short title: "Historical Background"].
- _____. Nikolaus von Amsdorf (1483-1565). Nieukoop: De Graaf, 1978.
- _____. ed. Gnesio-Lutherans, Philippists, and Formulators. A Finding List. Sixteenth Century Bibliography 8. St. Louis: Center for Reformation Research, 1977
- Köhler, Walter. Zwingli und Luther. Ihr Streit über das Abendmahl nach seiner politischen und religiösen Beziehungen. 2 Vol. Leipzig: Verein für Reformationsgeschichte, 1924/1953.
- Kretschmar, Georg. "The diet of Regensburg and the 1541 Variata of the Augsburg Confession." In Piety, Politics, and Ethics. Reformation Studies in Honor of George Wolfgang Forell. Edited by Carter Lindberg, 85-102. Kirksville, MO: Sixteenth Century Journal Publications, 1984.
- Krumwiede, Hans-Walter "Kirchengeschichte. Geschichte der evangelischen Kirche von der Reformation bis 1803," in Geschichte Niedersachsens. Vol. 3, part 2. Edited by Hans Patze, 1-111. Hildesheim: August Lax, 1983.

- Landerer, M.A. von. "Philippisten." In Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche, 3d ed., vol. 15: 327-331. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1896-1913.
- Lau, Franz. "Die Zweite Reformation in Kursachsen. Neuen Forschungen zum sog. sächsischen Kryptocalvinismus," in Verantwortung. Untersuchungen über Fragen aus Theologie und Geschichte, Festschrift G. Noth, 137-154. 1964.
- _____. "Melanchthon und die Ordnung der Kirche." In Philipp Melanchthon: Forschungsbeiträge zur vierhundertsten Wiederkehr seines Todestages dargeboten in Wittenberg. Edited by Walter Elliger, 98-115. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1961.
- Loewenich, Walter von. "Luthers Erbe in der Konkordieformel." In Luther 4 (1977): 53-75.
- Lohse, Bernhard. "Von Luther bis zum Konkordienbuch." In Dogma und Bekenntnis in der Reformation. Edited by Bernhard Lohse and Wilhelm Neuser, 1-164. Vol. II. Handbuch der Dogmen und Theologiegeschichte. Edited by Carl Andresen. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1980.
- _____. "Das Konkordienwerk von 1580." In Kirche und Bekenntnis. Edited by Peter Meinhold, 194-222. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag GMBH, 1980. [Short title: Konkordienwerk].
- _____. "Philipp Melanchthon in seinen Beziehungen zu Luther." In Martin Luther 1526-1546. Festgabe zu seinem 500. Todestag, 2 vol. Edited by Helmer Junghans, vol. 1, 403-418 and vol. 2, [notes] 860-863. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983.
- _____. "Augsburger Bekenntnis (Confessio Augustana)." In Theologische Realencyklopädie, vol. 4, 616-628. Berlin-New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1977-.
- Lübeck, Clergy of. Bekennnisse und Erklärungen auf das Interim, durch der Erbarren Stede Lübeck, Hamborch, Lüneborch etc Superintendenten, Pastoren und Predigere tho Christliker und nödiger Unterrichtung gestellet, (Hamburg: Jochen Louw, August 1548).
- Mager, Inge. "Reformatorenische Theologie und Reformationsverständnis an der Universität Helmstedt im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert." Jahrbuch der Gesellschaft für Niedersächsische Kirchengeschichte 74 (1976): 11-34.

- _____. "Das Corpus doctrinae der Stadt Braunschweig . . ." In Vier Jahrhunderte lutherische Landeskirche im Braunschweig. Braunschweig: Landeskirchenamt, 1968.
- _____. "Jacob Andreaes lateinische Unionsartikel von 1568." Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte 98 (1987): 70-86.
- _____. "Aufnahme und Ablehnung des Konkordienbuchs in Nord-Mittel- und Ostdeutschland." In Bekenntnis und Einheit der kirche. Studien zum Konkordienformel. Edited by Martin Brecht und Reinhard Schwarz, 271-302. Stuttgart: Calver Verlag, 1980.
- _____. "Lutherische Theologie und aristotelische Philosophie an der Universität Helmstedt. Zur Vorgeschichte des Hofmannschen Streits im Jahre 1598." Jahrbuch der Gesellschaft für Niedersächsische Kirchengeschichte 73 (1975): 83-98.
- Mahlmann, Theodor. "Personeinheit Jesu mit Gott." Blätter für Württembergische Kirchengeschichte 70 (1970): 176-265.
- _____, ed. Johannes Brenz: Christologische Schriften, Teil 1. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1981.
- Manschreck, Clyde L. "The role of Melancthon in the Adiaphore Controversy." Arkiv für Reformationsgeschichte 48 (1957): 165-182.
- Maurer, H. M. "Herzog Christoph als Landesherr." Blätter für Württembergische Kirchengeschichte 68/69 (1968/1969): 117-138.
- Mehlhausen, Joachim. "Abendmahlsformel des Regensburger Buches." In Studien zur Theologie und Geschichte der Reformation. Festschrift für Ernst Bizer. Edited by Luise by Abramowski und Gerhard Goeters, 189-211. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1969.
- _____. Das Augsburger Interim von 1548. Deutsch und lateinisch. Texte zur Geschichte der evangelischen Theologie 3. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1970.
- _____. Duplex iustificatio. Die Rechtfertigungslehre des Augsburger Interim. Habil. diss., University of Bonn, 1971.
- _____. "Die Streit um die Adiaphora." In Bekenntnis und Einheit der Kirche. Studien zum Konkordienbuch. Edited by Martin Brecht and Reinhard Schwarz, 105-128. Stuttgart: Calver Verlag, 1980.

- _____. "Interim." In Theologische Realenzyklopädie, vol. 16: 230-237. Berlin-New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1977-.
- Meyer, Carl S. "Melancthon's Visitation Articles 1528." Journal of Ecclesiastical History 23 (1972): 309-322.
- Moeller, Bernt. "Deutschland im Zeitalter der Reformation." In Deutsche Geschichte. Vol. 2: Frühe Neuzeit. Edited by Bernd Moeller, 1-154. Göttingen: Vanderhoeck & Ruprecht, 1985.
- Moltmann, Jürgen. Christoph Pezel (1539-1604) und der Calvinismus in Bremen. Hospitium Ecclesiae. Forschungen zur bremischen Kirchengeschichte 2, Bremen, 1958
- Mörlin, Joachim. Historia Welcher gestalt sich doe Osianderische schwermerey im lande zu Preusen erhaben, und wie derselbige verhandelt ist. N.p., 1554.
- _____. Erklärung aus Gottes wort/ und kurtzer bericht/ der Herren Thoelogen/ Welcher sie der Erbarn Sechsischen Stedte Gesandten/ auff dem Tag zu Lüneburg/ in Julio des 61. jahrs gehalten/ fürnemlich auff drey Artickel gethan haben, Regensburg: Heinrich Geissler, 1562.
- _____. Wider die Landlügen, der Heidelbergischen Theologen. Eisleben: Andreas Petri, 1565.
- Müller, Gerhard. "Alliance and Confession: The Theological-Historical Development and Ecclesiastical-Political Significance of Reformation Confessions." Sixteenth Century Journal 8 (1977): 124-140.
- _____. "Die Kasseler Vereinbarung über das Abendmahl von 1534." Jahrbuch des hessischen kirchengeschichtlichen Vereinung 18 (1976): 125-134.
- _____. "Um die Einheit des deutschen Luthertum. Die Konkordienformel von 1577." In Jahrbuch Martin-Luther-Bundes 24, 16-36. Erlangen: Martin Luther Verlag, 1977.
- _____, ed. Die religionsgespräche der Reformationszeit. Schriften des Vereins für Reformationsgeschichte 191. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1980.
- Nagel, Norman. "The Presence of Christ's Body and Blood in the Sacrament of the Alter According to Luther." Concordia Theological Monthly 39 (1968): 227-238.

_____. "Sacramentum and Exemplum." In Luther for an Ecumenical Age; essays in commemoration of the 450th Anniversary of the Reformation. Edited by C. S. Meyer. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1967.

_____. Luther's understanding of Christ in relation to his doctrine of the Lord's supper. Ph.D. diss., University of Cambridge, 1961.

_____. "Martinus: Heresy, Doctor Luther, Heresy!" In Seven headed Luther: essays in commemoration of Quincentenary 1483-1983. Edited by Peter N. Brooks. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983.

Neuser, Wilhelm H. "Der Briefwechsel Ursinus mit dem Wittenberger Kryptocalvinisten Christoph Pezel im Jahre 1572." Blätter für Pfälzische Kirchengeschichte und religiöse Volkskunde 37 (1970): 216-222.

_____. "Die Versuche Bullingers, Calvins und der Strassburgers, Melanchthon zum Fortgang von Wittenberg zu bewegen." In Heinrich Bullinger 1504-1575. Gesammelte Aufsätze zum 400. Todestag. Edited by U. Gäbler and E. Herkenrath, 35-55. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1975.

_____. Der Ansatz der Theologie Philipp Melanchthons. Beiträge zur Geschichte und Lehre der reformierten Kirche, vol. 9. Neukirchen: Kr. Moers, 1957.

_____. "Die Aufnahme der Flüchtlinge aus England in Wesel (1553) und ihre Ausweisung trotz der Vermittlung Calvins und Melanchthons (1556/57)." In Weseler Konvent 1568-1968. Ein Jubiläumsschrift, Schriftenreihe des Vereins für Rheinische Kirchengeschichte, nr. 21, 28-49. Düsseldorf, 1968.

_____. "Hardenberg, Albert Rizaeus (ca. 1510-74)" In Theologische Realenzyklopädie, vol. 14, 442-444. Berlin-New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1977-.

_____. "Hardenberg und Melanchthon. Der Hardenbergische Streit (1554-1560)." Jahrbuch der Gesellschaft für Niedersächsische Kirchengeschichte 65 (1967): 142-186.

_____. Die Abendmahlslehre Melanchthons in ihre geschichtlichen Entwicklung (1519-1530). Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1968.

_____. "Melanchthons Abendmahlslehre und ihre Auswirkung im unteren Donaunraum." Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte 84 (1973): 49-59.

- _____. "Ein unbekanntes Unionsformel Melanchthons vom Marburger Religionsgespräch 1529." Theologische Zeitschrift 21 (1965): 185-199.
- _____. "Von Zwingli und Calvin zur Synode von Westminster." In Dogma und Bekenntnis in der Reformation. Edited by Bernhard Lohse and Wilhelm Neuser, 164-306. Vol. 2 Handbuch der Dogmen und Theologiegeschichte. Edited by Carl Andresen. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1980.
- _____. Luther und Melanchthon. Einheit im Gegensatz. Theologische Existenz Heute NF 91. Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1961.
- Nischan, Bodo. "The Exorcism Controversy and Baptism in the Late Reformation." Sixteenth Century Journal 18 (1987): 31-50.
- Peters, Albrecht. Realpräsenz. Luthers Zeugnis von Christi Gegenwart im Abendmahl. Berlin: Lutherische Verlagshaus, 1960.
- Peterson, Luther D. The Philippist Theologians and the Interim of 1548: Compromise and Controversies within German Lutheranism. Ph.D. diss., University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, 1974.
- Plitt, Gustav L. "Melanchthons Wandlung in der Abendmahllehre." Zeitschrift für Protestantismus und Kirche 56 (1868): 5-101.
- Preger, Wilhelm. Matthias Flacius Illyricus und seine Zeit. 2 vol. Erlangen: Theodor Bläsing, 1861.
- Press, Volker: "Die 'Zweite Reformation' in Kurpfalz." In Die reformierte Konfessionalisierung in Deutschland - Das Problem der 'Zweiten Reformation'. Edited by Heinz Schilling, 104-129. Schriften des Verein für Reformationgeschichte, vol. 195. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1986.
- Preus, Robert D. and Wilbert H. Rosin. A Contemporary Look at the Formula of Concord, St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1977.
- Quere, Ralph W. Melanchthon's Christum Cognoscere. Christ's Efficacious Presence in the Eucharistic Theology of Melanchthon. Nieuwkoop: B. De Graaf, 1977.

- _____. "Melanchthonian Motifs in the Formula's Eucharistic Christology." In Discord, Dialogue, and Concord. Edited by L. W. Spitz and W. Lohff, 58-73. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977.
- Rabe, Horst. Reichbund und Interim. Die Verfassungs und Religionspolitik Karl V und der Reichstag von Augsburg 1547/1548, Köln-Wien: Bohlau, 1971.
- Raitt, Jill. Shapers of Religious Traditions in Germany, Switzerland, and Poland, 1560-1600, New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 1981.
- Reimann, H. "Matthias Flacius Illyricus." Concordia Theological Monthly 35 (1964): 69-93.
- Reller, Horst. Vorreformatatorische und reformatorische Kirchenverfassung in Fürstentum Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1959.
- Rogge, Joachim. "Amsdorff, Nikolaus (1483-1565)." In Theologische Realenzyklopädie, vol. 2, 487-497. Berlin-New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1977-.
- Roht, Erich. "Ein Braunschweiger Theologe des 16. Jahrhunderts. Mörlin und seine Rechtfertigungslehre." Jahrbuch der Gesellschaft für Niedersächsische Kirchengeschichte 50 (1952): 59-81.
- Salig, Christian August. Vollständige Historie der Augsburgischen Confession, 3 vols. Halle, 1730-1735.
- Sasse, Hermann. This is my Body. Luther's contention for the Real Presence in the Sacrament of the Altar. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1959; revised ed., Adelaide: Lutheran Publishing House, 1981.
- _____. We confess the Sacraments. We confess series, vol. 2. Translated by Norman Nagel. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1985.
- Scheible, Heinz. Die Entstehung der Magdeburger Zenturien. Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1966.
- Schlichting, Günter. "Einheit in der Wahrheit. Das Ringen um die Konkordieformel in der Reichstadt Regensburg." In Bekennnis zur Wahrheit. Aufsätze über die Konkordienformel. Edited by Jobst Schöne, 121-150. Erlangen: Martin Luther Verlag, 1978.
- Schlink, Edmund. Theologie der lutherischen Bekenntnisschriften. Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1948.

- Schmid, Heinrich. Der Kampf der lutherische Kirche um Luthers Lehre vom Abendmahl im Reformationszeitalter. Leipzig: J. G. Hinrich'sche Buchhandlung, 1868.
- Schmidt, Gustav L. Justus Menius. Der Reformator Thüringens. 2 vol. Gotha: Perthes, 1867.
- Schornbaum, Karl. "Zum Tag vom Naumburg." Arkiv für Reformationsgeschichte 8 (1911): 181-214.
- Schöne, Jobst. Um Christi sakramentale Gegenwart. Der Saligersche Abendmahlstreit 1568/1569. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1966.
- Seeberg, Reinhold. Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte. Vierter Band, zweiter Teil: "Die fortbildung der Reformatorischen Lehre und die gegenreformatorische Lehre." Leipzig: Deichert'schen Verlagsbuchhandlung. Unveränderte photo-mechanischer Nachdruck. 3d. ed. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1959.
- Simon, Gerhard. "Gallus, Nikolaus (1516-1570)." In Theologische Realenzyklopädie, vol. 12: 487-497. Berlin-New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1977-.
- Sommerlath, Ernst. "Lord's Supper," The Encyclopedia of the Lutheran Church. Vol. 2: 1336-1342.
- _____. Der Sinn des Abendmahl nach Luthers Gedancken über das Abendmahl 1527/29. Leipzig: Verlag von Dörffling, 1930.
- Sperl, Adolf. "Die Bedeutung der kirchlichen Lehrtradition bei Melanchthon und in der Konkordienformel." In Widerspruch, Dialog und Einigung. Edited by W. Lohff and L. W. Spitz, 89-106. Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1977.
- Staedtke, Joachim. "Abendmahl III/3, 1. Protestantismus." In Theologische Realenzyklopädie, vol. 1: 106-122. Berlin-New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1977-.
- Starck, Caspar Heinrich. Lübeckische Kirchenhistorie, vol. 1. Hamburg, 1724.
- Stupperich, Martin. Osiander in Preussen 1549-1552. Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte 44. Berlin-New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1973.
- _____. "Zur Interpretation der osianderischen Theologie Herzog Albrecht von Preussen." In Arkiv für Reformationsgeschichte 64 (1973): 245-80

- _____. "Zur Vorgeschichte des Rechtfertigungsartikels in der Konkordienformel." In Bekenntnis und Einheit der Kirche. Studien zum Konkordienformel. Edited by Martin Brecht and Reinhard Schwarz, 175-194. Stuttgart: Calver Verlag, 1980.
- _____. "Melanchthons Gedanken zur Kirchenpolitik des Herzogs Moritz v. Sachsen." In Reformatio und Confessio. Festschrift für Wilhelm Maurer. Edited by Fr. W. Kantzenbach, 84-97. Berlin-Hamburg: Lutherische Verlagshaus, 1965.
- Sturm, Erdmann K. Der Junge Zacharias Ursin. Sein weg vom Philippismus zum Calvinismus (1534-1562). Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1972.
- Schwarz, Reinhard. "Lehrnorm und Lehrkontinuität." In Bekenntnis und Einheit der Kirche. Studien zum Konkordienbuch. Edited by Martin Brecht and Reinhard Schwarz, 253-270. Stuttgart: Calver Verlag, 1980.
- Themel, Karl. "Dokumente von der Entsehung der Konkordienformel." Arkiv für Reformationsgeschichte 64 (1973): 287-313.
- Thimme, Wilhelm. "Niedersächsisches Gemeindeleben um 1580." Jahrbuch Gesellschaft für Niedersächsische Kirchengeschichte 59 (1961): 44-66.
- Tratz, Max. "Matthias Flacius Illyricus." In Jahrbuch des Martin-Luther-Bundes 22. Edited by Ernst Eberhard, 9-42. Erlangen: Martin Luter Verlag, 1975.
- Tschackert, Paul. Die Entstehung der lutherische und reformierte Kirchenlehre samt ihren innenprotestantische Gegensätzen. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1910; reprint, 1979.
- Voit, Hartmunt. Nikolaus Gallus. Ein Beitrag zur Reformationsgeschichte der nachlutherische Zeit. Neustadt a.d. Aisch, 1977.
- _____. "Nikolaus Gallus und das Interim. Eine anonyme Druckschrift aus dem Jahr 1548." In Arkiv für Reformationsgeschichte 65 (1974) 277-285.
- Wagenmann, Julius Aug. "Mörlin, Joachim." In Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche, 3d ed., vol. 13: 237-247. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1896-1913.

_____ (C. Enders) "Frankfurter Rezess." In Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche, 3d ed., vol. 6: 169-172. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1896-1913.

Weber, Hans Emil. Reformation, Orthodoxie und Rationalismus. Vol.I, part 1. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1937; reprint, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1966.

Carl Fr. Wisløff. The Gift of Communion. Luther's Controversy with Rom on Eucharistic Sacrifice. Translated by Joseph M. Shaw. Mineapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1964.