

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

Master of Sacred Theology Thesis

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

5-1-1967

The Goodness of Creation and the Natural Knowledge of the Goodness of God in Nicholas Selnecker, David Chytraeus and Martin Chemnitz

Philip Secker

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, Phil@TheSeckers.net

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



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

Recommended Citation

Secker, Philip, "The Goodness of Creation and the Natural Knowledge of the Goodness of God in Nicholas Selnecker, David Chytraeus and Martin Chemnitz" (1967). *Master of Sacred Theology Thesis*. 531. <https://scholar.csl.edu/stm/531>

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

THE GOODNESS OF CREATION

AND

THE NATURAL KNOWLEDGE OF THE GOODNESS OF GOD

BY FRANKLIN H. FRANKEL, DAVID CHYZASUS AND MARTIN CHIDNITZ

SHORT TITLE:

NATURAL KNOWLEDGE OF GOD'S GOODNESS, Secker; S.T.M., 1967

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

BY

Philip James Secker

May 1967

Approved by:


Secker


Bowman
Reader

43295

THE GOODNESS OF CREATION
AND
THE NATURAL KNOWLEDGE OF THE GOODNESS OF GOD
IN NICHOLAS SELNECKER, DAVID CHYTRAEUS AND MARTIN CHEMNITZ

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

by
Philip James Secker
May 1967

49295

Approved by:


Advisor


Reader

BV
4070
C69
M3
1967
no. 21

49295

	Page
.....	1
.....	2
.....	3
.....	10
.....	11
.....	12
.....	15
.....	16
.....	18
.....	20
.....	27
.....	28
.....	28
.....	29
.....	37
.....	43
.....	51
.....	52
.....	52
.....	57
.....	65
.....	73
.....	77
.....	77
.....	78
.....	81

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. THE GOODNESS OF CREATION	1
God's Goodness Moved Him to Create the Universe	1
Everything that God Made Was Very Good	2
The Substance--Accident Distinction	4
Government and Marriage	10
II. THE NATURAL KNOWLEDGE OF THE GOODNESS OF GOD	12
The Universe Reveals God's Goodness	12
The Natural Knowledge of the Goodness of God Inferred from Statements of Selnecker and Chytraeus	15
The Natural Knowledge of the Goodness of God Explicitly Stated by Selnecker	16
The Natural Knowledge of the Goodness of God Explicitly Stated by Chytraeus	18
The Natural Knowledge of the Goodness of God Inferred from Statements of Chemnitz	20
Conclusion	27
III. THE NATURE AND FUNCTION OF THE NATURAL KNOWLEDGE OF THE GOODNESS OF GOD	28
Introduction	28
Chemnitz	29
Selnecker	37
Chytraeus	45
Conclusion	51
IV. THE FORMULA OF CONCORD AND THE DOCUMENTS LEADING UP TO IT	52
Introduction	52
The <u>Swabian Confession</u>	52
The <u>Saxon-Swabian Concordia</u>	57
The <u>Torgic Book</u> and the <u>Solid Declaration (Bergic Book)</u> and the Official 1584 Latin Translation of the Latter	65
The <u>Epitome</u>	73
Selnecker's Unofficial Latin Translation of the <u>Formula of Concord</u>	77
Conclusion	77
V. CONCLUSION	79
BIBLIOGRAPHY	81

It has been repeatedly said that Lutheran theology has tended to neglect the First Article of the Creed. This thesis is an attempt to do some exploratory study in the First Article. The specific concern of this thesis is the goodness of creation and the natural knowledge of the goodness of God.

The sources for this study are certain of the private and public writings of the three authors of the Formula of Concord who represent the Melanchthonian tradition, namely, Blessed Martin Chemnitz (1522-1586), Blessed Nicholas Selnecker (1530-1592) and Blessed David Chytraeus (1531-1600). The private writings selected for consideration were those available to the present writer in Fuerbringer Library of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, Missouri, or in the private libraries of Seminary Faculty members. The public writings considered were those leading up to and including the Formula of Concord. The private writings are treated in Chapters One, Two and Three; the public writings in Chapter Four where the private and public writings are also compared.

CHAPTER I

THE GOODNESS OF CREATION

God's Goodness Moved Him to Create the Universe

In almost identical statements Nicholas Selnecker and David Chytraeus affirmed that the impelling cause of creation in God's mind was His immense goodness.¹ Selnecker also quoted

¹"Quarto, causa finalis, seu ad aliquid impellens, et usus rei, est principium alicuius, quod sequitur. Sic homo est principium creationis, quod sequitur. Sic homo est principium creationis. Omnia enim condidit Deus propter hominem. Et Deus est principium, qui hominem condidit propter se, cum Deus sit summe et perfecte bonus, et causa impulsiva creationis in mente divina nihil sit aliud, nisi ineffabilis bonitas Dei, qui suam sapientiam, iusticiam, vitam et laeticiam voluit creaturis rationalibus communicare, et vicissim ab eis agnosci et celebrari. Nam bonum est communicativum sui. Sic ergo ipsa bonitas Dei est principium creationis." Nicholas Selnecker, Paedagogia Christiana, continens Decalogi explicationem, iam postremo recognita et aucta (Frankfurt on the Main: Georgius Corvinus, 1571), II, 78, cf. 75. Hereafter this work will be cited Paedagogia. "Causa Impulsiva Creationis in mente divina, est immensa bonitas Dei, qui suam sapientiam, iusticiam, vitam et laeticiam voluit creaturis rationalibus communicare, et vicissim ab eis agnosci et celebrari. Nam bonum est communicativum sui: Sic. D. Irenaeus lib. 4. cap. 28 inquit: Deus hominem plasmavit Adam, ut haberet, in quem sua beneficia collocaret. Non igitur Stoica necessitate, sed volens mundum condidit." David Chytraeus, In Genesin enarratio, tradita ut ad lectionem, in Operum Tomus Primus (Leipzig: Henningus Grosius, 1599), chapter I, part ii, p. 15. Hereafter this work will be cited In Genesin enarratio, followed by the chapter, part and page number. The Irenaeus reference is in the modern chapter 14 of Book 4 of Against the Heresies (Migne, Patrologia Graeca, 7 [1857], 1010A). Selnecker identified Gott, which he derived from the Greek agathon, with the word gut: "Germani habent vocem Gott, decurtatam e voce Agathon, quasi dicas, Gut: Quoniam Deum bonus est, et in aeternam misericordia eius." Paedagogia, II, 66. Selnecker also called God the fons omnis boni. Ibid., I, 408; cf. I, 414, 426; II, 66, 67, 68.

St. Augustine's statement that God created the universe "because He is good."²

Selnecker cited both St. Gregory of Nyssa and St. Bernard in support of the more limited assertion that it was God's goodness that moved Him to create man.³ Chytraeus quoted St. Irenaeus to the same effect.⁴

Everything that God Made Was Very Good

Chemnitz, Selnecker and Chytraeus repeatedly found occasion to assert that everything which God made was very good.⁵ Selnecker argued that because God is good, "what He

²"Augustinus sic inquit . . . de creatura Si quare [Deus] fecerit? Quia bonus est, etc." Selnecker, II, 80.

³"Terminus vero erit ipsa similitudo et congruentia rerum summarum in nobis cum Deo, de qua verba G[regorii] Nissenii libenter adjicio, qui ita inquit: Deus natura sua tale ac tantum quoddam bonum est, quanta ulla cogitatione comprehendi potest, vel potius etiam omne bonum exuperat, quod intelligendo et cogitando comprehenditur. Itaque naturam humanam non alia de causa condidit, nisi quod bonus esset." *Ibid.*, II, 112. "Considera, [Bernhardus] inquit Quod creavit te commodo non suo, sed immensa bonitate." *Ibid.*, II, 79; cf. I, 86-87.

⁴See note 1 above.

⁵Martin Chemnitz, Loci theologici (Frankfurt: Christianus Henricus Schumacher, 1690), part I, locus iv, chap. 2, Introduction, p. 106B; chap. 2, sec. 5, p. 108A. Hereafter this work will be cited Loci. See also his Theses de doctrina articuli creationis, bound with Loci, part III, p. 220. Nicholas Selnecker, In Genesin, primum librum Moysi, commentarius (Leipzig: Johannes Rhamba, 1569), chapter I, p. 60. See also his Paedagogia, II, 107; and his Catechesis D. Martini Lutheri minor graecolatina, et eiusdem repetitio, additis definitionibus et quaestionibus de praecipuis doctrinae capitibus, edited by Paulus Heuslerus (Leipzig: Johannes

made cannot be evil."⁶ Chytraeus quoted Genesis 1:31, Psalm 92:15 and James 1:17 in support of the assertion that "since God is good, nothing but good can come from Him."⁷

Chemnitz,⁸ Selnecker⁹ and Chytraeus¹⁰ specifically rejected the Manichean and Stoic denial of the goodness of everything that God made.

Selnecker listed four reasons why all things created by God are good: (1) Because they were created by a good God;

Rhamba, 1575), First Article, p. 183. Hereafter this work will be cited Catechesis. In addition, see his Symbolorum exegesis (Leipzig: Johannes Rhamba, 1575), First Article, pp. 94-95. Chytraeus, In Genesin enarratio, chap. I, sec. v, pp. 32-33. See also his Dispositiones epistolarum quae diebus dominicis et aliis in ecclesia usitate populo proponi solent (Wittenberg: Joh. Lufft, 1576), Dominica Cantate, Epistola Iacobi 1, pp. 233-234. Hereafter this work will be cited Dispositiones epistolarum. And see note 10 below.

⁶"Deus solus bonus est, scilicet natura, causa et origine, non habens aliunde bonitatis suae rationem. Et quia solus bonus est, Ideo, quod per eum fit malum esse non potest. Res igitur a Deo creatae, bonae sunt, quia a Deo bono conditae sunt, et ad bonos usus ordinatae sunt, et singulae in suo ordine Deo bono serviunt, et Deo placent." Catechesis, First Article, p. 183. Cf. Symbolorum exegesis, First Article, pp. 94-95.

⁷"Ut enim Deus bonus est: ita nihil nisi bonum ab eo proficiscitur." Dispositiones epistolarum, Dominica Cantate, Epistola Iacobi 1, pp. 233-234.

⁸Loci, part I, locus iv, ch. 2, sec. 5, p. 108A; chap. 4, p. 110A. See also his Theses de doctrina articuli creationis, p. 220.

⁹In Genesin, primum librum Moysi, commentarius, Chapter I, Dies Sextus, p. 118.

¹⁰In Deuteronomium Mosis enarratio, in Operum Tomus Primus (Leipzig: Henningus Grosius, 1599), chap. XXXII, locus iii, Sextus versus Carminis Mosaici, p. 168, lines 7-14.

- (2) Because God ordained that they be used for good purposes;
 (3) Because each serves the beneficent God in the way that He ordained; and (4) Because they are pleasing to God.¹¹

The Substance--Accident Distinction

All three writers--Chemnitz, Selnecker and Chytraeus--employed the distinction between "substance" and "accident," especially in connection with the doctrine of original sin.

Although Chemnitz believed that common people should be spared the terms "substance" and "accident,"¹² he cautiously approved the use of these terms in professional discussions in the doctrine of original sin.¹³ He cited 1 John 3:4 and

¹¹See note 6 above. Cf. also Selnecker's Symbolorum exegesis, First Article, pp. 94-95; his In Genesin, primum librum Moysi, commentarius, Chapter I, pp. 60-61, pp. 117-118, p. 258; and his Paedagogia I, pp. 72-73; II, p. 76.

¹²"Weil die philosophica et dialectica vocabula substantiae et accidentis dem gemeinen Manne unbekannt, und nicht genugsam erkläret können werden, soll billig die einfältige Kirche mit solchen Schulworten verschonet werden, weil man sonst in dem Vorbilde der gesunden Worte andere bekannte, gebräuchliche Rede hat, dadurch man diese Lehre dem gemeinen Volke kann vortragen und erklären." Enchiridion, edited by A. L. Gräbner (Milwaukee: Georg Brumder, 1886), p. 65. Cf. his Wolgegründter Bericht / von den fürnemsten Artikeln Christlicher Lehre, / so zu unsern Zeiten streitig worden sein, in Corpus Doctrinae, Das ist / Die Summa / Form und Furbilde der reinen Christlich Lehre (Heinrichstadt: Conrad Horn, 1576), Von Ersünde, pp. 71-75.

¹³"Manifestum est, quod vocabula dialectica [substans, accidens, natura, qualitas, etc.] ad doctrinam de peccato originis congruunt." Enchiridion, pp. 65-66. Cf. the second reference in note 12 above; and Chemnitz' Theses de peccato, bound with Loci, Part III, Theses X and XII, p. 224.

St. Augustine in support of the assertion that "evil is not nature or a positive thing,"¹⁴ and quoted Augustine's definition of sin as privation.¹⁵ Chemnitz also repeated a statement of St. Basil that is quoted by Julian: "Sin is not a substance, but an accident."¹⁶ The Manicheans, Chemnitz asserted, "did not distinguish between nature itself, which is both good and the work of God, and the corruption of nature, which passed upon all things through one man."¹⁷ In one of his statements, Chemnitz implied that the distinction between substance and accident can be "deduced from the reasonings of the mind."¹⁸

¹⁴"Est autem duplex privatio in peccato. 1. Defectus ordinis et finis debiti inesse. 2. Corruptio, conturbatio seu confusio ordinis divini, id est, nihil privativum. Et nihil aliud dicit Johannes 1. epist. cap. 3. v. 4. quando peccatum vocat anomian, id est, defectum a lege divina. Hanc regulam Augustinus in multis voluminibus contra Manichaeos tractat, et praecipuos nervos refutationis in ea constituit: 'Malum non esse naturam, seu rem positivam.'" Loci, part I, locus v, chap. 5, Primum Argumentum, p. 146A.

¹⁵"Ex Augustino allegantur tales definitiones. Peccatum. . . Est privatio modi, speciei et ordinis." Ibid., part I, locus vii, chap. 3, p. 200A.

¹⁶"Julianus [the bishop of Acculanum whose Pelagianism brought him into conflict with St. Augustine?] allegarat [sic] Basilii sententiam: Peccatum non est substantia, sed accidens." Ibid., part I, locus vi, chap. 9, sec. 3, p. 194B.

¹⁷The Manicheans "non distinguerent [sic] substantiam naturae, quae et bona est, et opus Dei, a vitio naturae, quod per unum hominem in omnes pertransiit." Ibid., part I, locus vii, chap. 5, p. 221B. Cf. his Examen Concilii Tridentini, edited by Eduard Preuss (Berlin: Gust. Schlawitz, 1861), part III, locus i, sec. 1, chap. 3, p. 522B; and his Theses de peccato, Thesis IX, p. 224.

¹⁸"Triplicia sunt autem contraria argumenta [against the

Chemnitz gave four reasons why the substance of a man must be distinguished from the corruption of his substance:

- (1) Because according to Scripture, even in this corrupted world God is the creator of the substance of man including both his soul and his body, but is not the author of sin;
- (2) Because the incarnate Son of God is consubstantial with men according to the flesh even though He assumed human nature without sin;
- (3) Because in the resurrection the very same flesh which the elect have now will arise; nor will they have a different soul at that time;
- (4) Because the ancient Church condemned the Manicheans for making sin into a substance or nature.¹⁹ Sin, Chemnitz contended, is not man's substance, but an "accident," "defect," or "deprivation."²⁰

understanding of free will held by the Manicheans], 1. Philosophica, ubi consequentiae ex rationis cogitationibus deducuntur." Among these "philosophical" arguments Chemnitz seems to include the assertion that "Peccatum non est natura, non est substantia aliqua, sed accidens." Loci, part I, locus vi, chap. 9, sec. 1, p. 191A. Cf. his Harmonia quatuor evangelistarum (Geneva: Petrus Chouët, 1645), chap. 1, pp. 39-40.

¹⁹"Nec otiosae subtilitates, sed necessariae sunt, retinendi discriminis huius causae. 1. Quia Scriptura tradit Deum etiam in hac corruptione esse creatorem, seu formatorem et factorem substantiae nostrae, animae scilicet et corporis. Deus autem non est autor peccati. 2. Quia summa consolatio est, quod Filius Dei incarnatur, licet naturam humanam absque peccato assumpserit: tamen secundum carnem nobis sit consubstantialis, sicut veteres recte loquuntur. 3. Quia resurrectione, licet natura glorificata in electis futura sit sine peccato: tamen haec ipsa caro nostra, et non alia resurget, nec aliam tunc habebimus animam. 4. Quia vetus Ecclesia Manichaeos ideo damnavit, quod fingerent peccatum esse substantiam seu naturam." Theses de peccato, Thesis XI, p. 224. Cf. his Enchiridion, pp. 62-64.

²⁰"Inde extracta [sic] usitata definitio, quod peccatum sit, vel defectus in natura, vel depravatio omnium virium

Human nature is corrupted, but not evil.²¹ Human nature can even be called good, if that assertion is not meant to deny that human nature is corrupted by sin.²² The works of God in man, also after the Fall, are in themselves good, although they are corrupted by sin.²³ "The insanities of the Manicheans, who make no distinction between the substance of human nature

humanarum." Theses de peccato, Thesis III, p. 224. "Peccatum originale non est substantia, sed accidens." Ibid., Thesis XIII, p. 224. Cf. his Loci, part I, locus iv, chap. 4, pp. 109A-110A.

²¹"Usitatus [at the time of St. Augustine] ergo est, dicere: Naturam esse corruptam, depravatam, laesam, contaminatam, quam malam." Chemnitz, Loci, part I, locus vii, chap. 6, sec. 2, p. 225B.

²²"Dicat [sic] Augustinus de dogmat. Eccl. cap. 26. et de duab. animab. 'Caro nostra est bona, et non est mala, ut volunt Sethianus, Aphianus, Patricius: Nec mali causa, ut Florianus voluit: nec ex bono et malo compacta, ut Manichaeus blasphematur, etc.'" Ibid., part I, locus vii, chap. 6, sec. 2, p. 226A. Cf. Pseudo-Augustine, De ecclesiasticis dogmatibus, in Patrologia, Series Latina, edited by J. P. Migne (Paris: Chez l'editeur, 1886), XLII, 1220, chap. 43 (al. 76): "Bona est caro nostra et valde bona, utpote a bono et a solo Deo condita: et non est mala, ut volunt Sethianus et Ophianus et Patricianus: nec mali causa, ut docuit Florianus: nec ex malo et bono compacta, ut Manichaeus blasphematur." And see: St. Augustine, De duabus animabus, in Patrologia, Series Latina, XLII, 93-112. The present writer did not find the quoted words in the latter writing, but St. Augustine affirms the same idea when he says in chapter 3: "Ego vero non modo de anima, sed de quovis etiam corpore, quin ab ipso esset, nihil omnino, ne tum quidem, homo scilicet illius imperitiae atque illius aetatis ambigerem, si forma quid esset quidve formatum, quid species et quid indutum specie, deinde quid horum cui causa esset, pie cauteque cogitarem" (col. 95). And see Chemnitz' Enchiridion, p. 61.

²³"Primo in hominis natura quaedam per se sunt bona, quia opera Dei: ut notitiae, quas Paulus vocat veritatem Dei, et affectus praeceptos Lege Dei: Quaedam per se sunt vitiosa. Discernendae ergo sunt res conditae, et depravatio non condita. 2. Illa etiam quae per se sunt bona, contaminantur, et fiunt per accidens mala." Chemnitz, Loci, part I, locus vii, chap. 6, sec. 2., p. 226A. Cf. his Examen Concilii Tridentini,

and the defect by which human nature is corrupted or depraved, must be avoided."²⁴

Selnecker argued that the distinction between substance and accident must be retained in the schools so that the work of God in man and the work of devil in man can be explained.²⁵ The distinction must be retained on account of the chief articles of the Christian faith: creation, redemption, sanctification and resurrection.²⁶ "Sin," Selnecker contended,

is not man's substance, which was created by God and is preserved by Him, or man's human nature, which the Son of God assumed, or man's soul, or his mind or his will. Rather, sin is the corruption of all of nature, and the conversion of that which was good, sound and whole into that which is evil, morbid and depraved. For sin is a foreign quality that originated with the devil and with man, and has disfigured human nature and

part I, locus vi, sec. 3, par. 1, 2, 3, 6, pp. 126A-127A.

²⁴"Manichaeorum deliria cavenda sunt, qui nullum faciunt discrimen inter substantiam humanae naturae, et inter vitium, quo corrupta seu depravata est humana natura." Martin Chemnitz, Theses de peccato in genere ac praecipue de peccato originis, bound with Loci, Part III, p. 225, Thesis XI.

²⁵"Hic observentur hae quoque . . . vocabula substantiae et Accidentis in scholis necessario retinenda esse, ut res et substantia ab eo, quod ei accidit, discerni, et discrimen inter opus Dei et opus diaboli in homine explicari possit." In omnes epistolas D. Pauli apostoli commentarius plenissimus, edited by Georgius Selneckerus (Leipzig: Jacobus Apellius/ Abraham Lamberg, 1595). on Romans 3:23-25, p. 115.

²⁶"Doctrina affirmativa est: 1. quod sit aliquod discrimen inter hominis naturam et peccatum originis. 2. quod summo studio hoc discrimen sit conservandum, propter praecipuos fidei nostrae articulos de Creatione, Redemptione, sanctificatione, resurrectione." Ibid., pp. 113-114.

made it subject to wrath and everlasting death.²⁷

The works of God in man after the Fall are in themselves good--even though they are corrupted by sin, Selnecker maintained.²⁸ The contrary teachings of the Pelagians and the Manicheans are to be rejected.²⁹

"God is not the cause of evil," Chytraeus asserted, "and so sin does not stem from God, but from concupiscence dwelling in us, or from the vice of origin born with us."³⁰ "It is manifest insanity," Chytraeus asserted,

to contend that original sin is a substance or a self-subsisting nature, and not an accident, defect and deprivation of nature, or to contend that there is no difference between sin and corrupted nature. For even after the Fall, God is the creator of nature, not of sin. God hates, rejects and destroys sin but not nature, which He has created and on which, when He has turned it to Himself, He has mercy for the

²⁷"Non est autem peccatum ipsa substantia hominis, natura, anima, mens, voluntas: quae substantia a Deo est condita, et conservatur a Deo, et quam naturam humanam Filius Dei assumpsit: sed est corruptio naturae totius, et conversio eius, quod bonum, sanum et integrum fuit, in malum, morbidum, et depravatum. Est enim peccatum adventitia qualitas a diabolo et homine orta, qua deformata est humana natura, et rea facta irae et mortis aeternae." Symbolorum exegesis, First Article, De peccato, p. 152. Cf. his In omnes epistolas D. Pauli apostoli commentarius plenissimus, on Romans 3:23-25, p. 114.

²⁸"Certum est, quae ex prima creatione homo etiam non renatus reliqua habet, per se bona esse, sed per peccatum tamen ita depravata." Selnecker, Paedagogia, I, p. 376. Cf. I, p. 107.

²⁹Ibid.

³⁰"Loci praecipui quinque sunt. I. Illustre testimonium quod Deus non sit causa mali. . . . Atque ita peccatum non a Deo, sed a concupiscentia in nobis haerente seu vicio originis nobiscum nascente existit." Dispositiones epistolarum,

sake of His Son, and to which He gives life and everlasting salvation. With His own precious blood, He who is the Son both of God and the Virgin Mary redeemed our nature, not sin. In baptism our nature--not sin--is reborn and renewed; sin is purged. The Holy Spirit sanctifies our nature--not sin--so that we serve God in true justice and holiness. When sin has been abolished, our nature--not sin--will rise blameless. Then, cleansed from all sin, our nature--not sin--will enter the kingdom of God and be saved.³¹

Government and Marriage

According to Chemnitz, government is ordained by God and therefore approved by Him.³² "Marriage," he asserted, "is an order of life instituted by God, and therefore it is good,

Dominica Cantate, Epistola Iacobi 1., p. 233.

³¹"Manifesta autem insania est, contendere peccatum Originis substantiam, seu naturam subsistentem, non Accidens naturae vitium ac depravationem esse: et discrimen Peccati ac naturae corruptae negare. Cum Deus etiam post lapsum conditor sit naturae, non peccati. Deus odit, abiicit et delet peccatum, non naturam a se creatam, cuius ad se conversae propter filium miseretur, eamque vita et salute aeterna donat. Filius Dei et Mariae virginis precioso sanguine nostram naturam, non peccatum redemit. Nostra natura in Baptismo regeneratur et renovatur, non peccatum quod expurgatur. Spiritus sanctus nostram naturam sanctificat, non peccatum, ut Deo in vera Iusticia et Sanctitate serviamus. Nostra natura abolito peccato anamartētos resurget, non peccatum. Denique nostra natura mundata ab omni peccato, non peccatum, ingrediatur regnum Dei et salvabitur." Oratio de studio theologiae, exercitiis verae pietatis et virtutis potius quam contentionibus et rixis disputationum colendo (Wittenberg: Clemens Schleich, 1581), Peccatum Originis, B8 recto-C1 verso.

³²"III. Est enim Caesar seu Magistratus persona politica, Dei ordinatione constituta. . . . V. Approbat ergo Magistratum, et politicum ordinem, huius vitae causa institutum sanxit." Theses de dicto Christi, Matth. 22:21. Date Caesari, quae sunt Caesaris, et Deo, quae sunt Dei, bound with Loci, Part III, Theses III and V. pp. 230-231.

and pleasing to God."³³

Selnecker applied a form of the substance/accident distinction to government. Government in itself, he said, must be distinguished from its accidents.³⁴ Government, in itself, is ordained and approved by God.³⁵ Marriage, too, he contended is an order of life ordained by God and therefore approved by Him.³⁶

³³"Sed videtur simplicius esse, si respondeatur. Conjugium esse vitae genus a Deo institutum et ideo bonum et placens Deo." Chemnitz, Loci, part I, locus vii, chap. 6, sec. 3, p. 226A-B.

³⁴"Faciendum est discrimen inter rem ipsam, et inter accidens. Res ipsa est accusare, quod per se vitiosum non est. Nam Evangelium non abolet politicam ordinationem. Et Paulus Christianis concedit arbitros et iudicia. Accidens autem est, affectus adhaerens, ulciscendi cupiditas, odium, pertinacia. . . . Necesse est autem scire, aliud esse rem ipsam, et aliud esse abusum." Selnecker, Paedagogia, I, 184.

³⁵"Magistratus est ordinatio Dei, ut Paulus testatur, Rom. 13. Ergo et iudicia a Deo approbantur." Ibid. Cf. his Catechesis, Fourth Commandment, p. 109; Seventh Commandment, p. 140.

³⁶Ibid., Sixth Commandment, p. 137.

CHAPTER II

THE NATURAL KNOWLEDGE OF THE GOODNESS OF GOD

Both Selnecker¹ and Chytraeus² asserted that God created everything in order to reveal His goodness.

The Universe Reveals God's Goodness

Chemnitz joined Selnecker and Chytraeus in affirming ² that the universe reveals God's goodness.

Chemnitz, for example, stated that God allows His beneficent acts "to be seen by all men, including those ³

¹"Deus omnis condiderit ad hunc finem, ut se patefaceret, et ipse agnosceretur et celebraretur a creaturis rationalibus, et suam sapientiam et bonitatem eis communicaret in omni aeternitate." Catechesis D. Martini Lutheri minor graecolatina, et eiusdem repetitio, additis definitionibus et quaestionibus de praecipuis doctrinae christianae capitibus, edited by Paulus Heuslerus (Leipzig: Johannes Rhamba, 1575), Apostles' Creed, First Article, p. 182. Hereafter this work will be cited Catechesis. See also his Paedagogia Christiana, continens Decalogi explicationem, iam postremo recognitae et auctae (Frankfurt on the Main: Georgius Corvinus, 1571), II, 103. Hereafter this work will be cited Paedagogia. And see his Symbolorum exegesis (Leipzig: Johannes Rhamba, 1575), First Article, pp. 90-92. See also supra, p. 1, n. 1.

²"Finis creationis est, ut universum hoc theatrum naturae rerum miranda arte et sapientia distributum et ornatum, Schola sit sapientiae, bonitatis, praesentiae et omnipotentiae Dei, et hominum utilitatibus commodisque serviat, ac ut ex Angelis et hominibus aeterna Ecclesia Deo colligatur, a qua agnoscatur et celebretur, et cui suam bonitatem in omni aeternitate communicet." In Genesin enarratio, tradita ut ad lectionem, in Operum Tomus Primus (Leipzig: Henningus Grosius, 1599), sec. 2, p. 15. Hereafter this work will be cited In Genesin enarratio. Cf. also Chytraeus' more limited assertion that God created man in order to reveal His goodness: Ibid., the opening paragraph, p. 7; and chap. 1, sec. 4, p. 28. See

outside the community of saints."³

Selnecker asserted that God has impressed vestiges of His wisdom on His creatures and left the likeness of the divine wisdom on them,

so that the heavenly bodies and their perpetual and ordered motion, the structure of the human body, [and] the powers and effects of herbs might reveal . . . [the presence of God]. . . . The wisdom and goodness of God shines in each and every one of these, so that we are compelled to confess that "these things are the works of a wise architect who loves men," . . . to use Xenophon's lucid observation.⁴

Selnecker rejected the position of the Stoics, Epicureans and others who deny God and His providence, for "the created

also supra, p. 1, n. 1.

³Chemnitz wrote that in Psalm 103:19-22 David speaks of "Gottes seine herrliche Thaten und löbliche Wercke/ die er sehen läst: Erstlich an allen Menschen/ auch ausser der gemeine der Heiligen/ 2. Darnach auch an allen Creaturen/ und zum 3. fürnemlich im Himmel/ dafür in alle Engel loben und preisen. Dass also in diesem Psalm eine völlige Erinnerung ist aller Wolthaten Gottes. Aber die erste beide Stück in den Artickel der Schöpfung gehörend/ berüret David allhie nur gar kurtz/ Weil in den folgenden Psalmen diese Stücke weitleufftig erkläret werden." "Erklärung dess CIII. Psalms," D. Martini Chemnitii Richtige und inn H. Schrifft wolgegründte erklärang etlicher hochwichtiger und nötiger Artickel unser Christlichen Religion in sonderliche Tractat und Predigten gefasset (Frankfurt on the Main: Johann Spiess, 1592), pp. 561-562, cf. pp. 563-564. Hereafter this work will be cited "Erklärung dess CIII. Psalms."

⁴"Mundus non cognovit Deum, qui sapiens est, et suae sapientiae vestigia creaturis impressit sapienter a Deo conditis, et simulacra divinae sapientiae referentibus, ut ostendunt corpora coelestia, et eorum perpetuus et ordinatus motus, fabricatio humani corporis, vires et efficaciae herbarum, ut pulcerrime in versu dicitur: praesentemque refert una vel herba Deum. In his enim omnibus et singulis sapientia et bonitas Dei lucet, ut fateri cogamur, tauta sophou tinos demiourgou kai philozöou technema einai, hae sapientis architecti et amantis hominum opera esse, ut praeclare Xenophon loquitur." In omnes epistolas D. Pauli

world testifies to the eternal, omnipotent, wise, good, just, merciful and truthful God."⁵ The fact that everything which God has created was created to fulfill a specific function, Selnecker added, is a testimony to God's goodness.⁶

According to Chytraeus "the first work of God, in which He wished to reveal Himself and in which He wished His goodness and wisdom to shine and to be seen, was His creation of this most beautiful realm of nature which we see around us."⁷ Angels and men who piously worship God, Chytraeus stated elsewhere, are

living witnesses to and proclaimers of the divine goodness, wisdom and mercy. Other creatures, which do not have reason and speech, are silent proclaimers and glorifiers of God the creator, and of His omnipotence, goodness and wisdom.⁸

apostoli commentarius plenissimus, edited by Georgius Selneckerus (Leipzig: Jacobus Apelius/Abraham Lamberg, 1595), on 1 Corinthians 1:21, p. 481.

⁵"Et hic statim exploduntur negantes Deum, et negantes providentiam, Stoici, Epicurei, et alii. Nam creatura rerum testis est, de Deo, aeterno, omnipotente, sapiente, bono, iusto, misericorde, et veraci." Paedagogia, II, 34.

⁶"Proprietas virium, et vis rebus insita, demonstrat eius bonitatem, qui omnia ad certas utilitates condidit." Ibid., II, 76.

⁷"Primus opus Dei, in quo se patefacere et bonitatem ac sapientiam suam lucere et conspici voluit, est Creatio huius pulcherrimi theatri naturae rerum, quam in hoc capite Moses describit." In Genesin enarratio, chap. 1, sec. 2, p. 14.

⁸"Angeli et homines sunt vivi testes ac praecones bonitatis, sapientiae et misericordiae divinae, qui pia cogitatione et voce et omnium virium obedientia Deum celebrant. Caeterae creaturae rationis et orationis expertes, sunt taciti praecones et laudatores Dei opificis, cuius omnipotentiam,

The Natural Knowledge of the Goodness of God
Inferred From Statements of Selnecker and Chytraeus

A number of times Selnecker and Chytraeus implied that man has by nature a knowledge of the goodness of God.

For example, both Chytraeus and Selnecker could speak of the natural knowledge of God without restricting this knowledge to knowledge of God's existence or to some--but not all--of His attributes. Chytraeus contended that there was a heavenly light innate in men's minds by which they "know God."⁹ Selnecker held that God had revealed "Himself" in the universe.¹⁰ Selnecker called this knowledge of God, "true knowledge."¹¹

In commenting on St. Paul's statement in Romans 2:4 that God's goodness is meant to lead men to repentance,

bonitatem et sapientiam, non tantum superioria mundi corpora coelestia: verum etiam minimae corporis nostri particulae, et vilissimae plantulae demonstrant. Et levis est cespes, qui probat esse Deum, Praesentemque. refert quaelibet herba Deum." "Erklärung dess CIII. Psalms," on verse 22, p. 701.

⁹"Ut autem oculis res propositas aspicimus, et colorum discrimina dijudicamus: ita mentibus nostris divinitus insita est lux, qua Deum agnoscimus, et discrimen honestorum et turpium cernimus, et ordinem, numerum, distinctionem, naturam et proprietates rerum a Deo conditarum quasi aspicimus." In Genesin enarratio, chap. 1, sec. 3, p. 19.

¹⁰"Consideremus tres esse modos, quibus Deus se et suam voluntatem hominibus patefecit. Primus modus est inspectio et consideratio totius huius opificii, palatii et theatri, quod mundus nominatur." Selnecker listed "inspiration" as the second mode of revelation, and God's "living voice" as the third mode. Paedagogia, II, 5-6.

¹¹"Homines veritatem in iniusticia captivam detinent,

Selnecker maintained that the goodness referred to was God's goodness toward all men. In view of the context of Romans 2:4, Selnecker's interpretation of this verse would appear to be an implicit assertion that all men have a natural knowledge of the goodness of God.¹²

It should also be noted that Selnecker¹³ and Chytraeus¹⁴ repeatedly called the Manichean assertions that the universe is evil "insanities," to which the "saner" pagans did not succumb.

The Natural Knowledge of the Goodness of God
Explicitly Stated by Selnecker

In his comment on Psalm 19:1-4, Selnecker asserted that

id est, veras noticias de Deo, et de Lege corrumpunt inobedientia." Ibid., I, 57. Selnecker is commenting on Romans 1 and 2.

¹²Selnecker is commenting on this Latin translation of Romans 2:4: "Aut divitias bonitatis eius, patientiae et longanimitatis contemnis, ignorans quod bonitas Dei ad poenitentiam te aget?" Selnecker's comment is: "Bonitas Dei est divina voluntas et voluptas, cura et studium optime merendi de toto genere humano, etiam immerito et malo, ex mera gratia. Patientia seu tolerantia est, quae malum sustinet, et benefacit etiam ingratis. Longanimitas seu tarditas irae, makrothumia, quae non properat ad poenam, sed concredit lapsis spatium ad conversionem, ac tarde irascitur." In omnes epistolas D. Pauli apostoli commentarius plenissimus, on Romans 2:4, p. 87. Cf. infra, p. 17, n. 15.

¹³Paedagogia, I, 78; In Genesin, primum librum Moysi, commentarius (Leipzig: Johannes Rhamba, 1569), chap. 1, pp. 17, 118.

¹⁴In Genesin enarratio, chap. 1, sec. 4, p. 33. Dispositiones epistolarum quae diebus dominicis et aliis, in ecclesia usitate populo proponi solent (Wittenberg: Joh. Lufft, 1576), pp. 234, 303. Hereafter this work will be cited Dispositiones epistolarum. In Deuteronomium Mosis enarratio, in Operum Tomus Primus (Leipzig: Henningus Grosius, 1599), chap.

"all men should recognize God's almighty power, wisdom and goodness," and therefore "are without excuse, as Paul says."¹⁵

"As often as one observes and considers the heaven, sun, moon, stars, air, water, earth, and all that is in it," Selnecker stated in the same context, "they testify that God is almighty, wise, good, merciful, righteous and truthful."¹⁶

In five different writings spanning four decades of his life, Selnecker interpreted Romans 1:18-20 as teaching the natural knowledge of the goodness of God.¹⁷

In a number of different writings Selnecker taught that man has a natural knowledge of what sort (qualis) of a deity God is, and then defined this as including a knowledge of

32, sec. 3, p. 168.

¹⁵"[Die] allgemeine erkantnuss Gottes in disen zweyen puncten stehet/ das nemlich alle Menschen sollen Gottes Allmacht/ Weissheit und Gütigkeit darauss erkennen/ auff das sie keine entschuldigung haben müßen/ wie Paulus davon redet." Der gantze Psalter des Koniglichen / Propheten Davids ausgelegt / und in drei Bücher getheilt (Nuremberg: Christoff Heusler, 1569), part I, on Psalm 19:1-4, fol. 109b. Hereafter this work will be cited Der gantze Psalter.

¹⁶In his discussion of the "universal knowledge" of God ("cognitio universalis, das ist/ wie alle Menschen von natur auss den Creaturen oder auss dem Geschöpff Gott erkennen/ wie Paulus Roma: I. klerlich anzeygt") Selnecker comments: "Himel/ Sonn/ Mond/ Sterne/ Lufft/ Wasser/ Erden/ und alles was darinnen ist/ so oft mans ansihet und betrachtet/ zeyget an/ das Gott Allmechtig/ weiss/ gütig/ unnd barmhertzig/ gerecht und warhafftig sey." Ibid., part I, on Psalm 19: 1-4, fol. 109a. Cf. his Paedagogia, II, 36; and his In Genesin, primum librum Moysi, commentarius, chap. 1, p. 18.

¹⁷Der gantze Psalter, part I, on Psalm 19:1-4, fol. 109a (note 16 above). In Genesin, primum librum Moysi, commentarius, chap. 1, p. 17. Paedagogia, II, 35-36. Symbolorum exegesis, First Article, pp. 47-48. In omnes epistolas D. Pauli apostoli commentarius plenissimus, on Romans 1:19, pp. 79-81.

God's goodness.¹⁸

In the Paedagogia Selnecker claimed that "we all carry around some knowledge that 'God is an eternal mind and the cause of good in nature,' as Plato said."¹⁹ Later in the same work Selnecker wrote, "All sane pagans affirm that God is the cause of good in nature."²⁰

Selnecker also asserted that man knows from his natural knowledge of the law that God is good.²¹

The Natural Knowledge of the Goodness of God
Explicitly Stated by Chytraeus

In his commentary on Genesis Chytraeus asserted that "the greatness of the divine wisdom and goodness" can be observed and considered in the structure of the heavens and in the orderly movements of the heavenly bodies.²²

¹⁸In Genesis, primum librum Moysi, commentarius, chap. 1, Dies Sextus, p. 109. Paedagogia, I, 396-397. Symbolorum exegesis, First Article, pp. 47-48. Catechesis, First Commandment, p. 82. One instance was found where Selnecker used the word qualis without defining it further: In omnes epistolas D. Pauli apostoli commentarius plenissimus, on Romans 1:18-21, p. 79.

¹⁹"Cupimus omnes natura et nosse et videre Deum, et omnes circumferimus noticiam aliquam, esse Deum mentem aeternam, causam boni in natura, ut Plato dixit." Paedagogia, I, De Verbo Dei, sec. 3, 52; cf. II, 35-36.

²⁰"Omnes Ethnici sani affirmant esse Deum causam boni in natura." Ibid., I, 78, cf. 79.

²¹"Lucent in parte cognoscente noticiae legis divinitus insitae, et affirmantes esse Deum, sapientem, bonum, vindicem scelerum, sunt et regula honestae vitae." Ibid., I, De discrimine Legis et Evangelii, 57.

²²"Ut autem amplitudo sapientiae ac bonitatis divinae,

In both the Genesis commentary of 1558 and the 1590 commentary on Psalm 113 Chytraeus maintained that man has a natural knowledge of what sort (qualis) of a deity God is, and then defined this knowledge as including God's goodness.²³

According to Chytraeus both the creation of man and the image of God in man testify that God is a good God who loves man.²⁴

Chytraeus repeatedly asserted that "the pagans," or at

in fabricando hoc immenso et mirando Coeli opificio, et ordinandis motuum immotis legibus, aliquo modo aspici a nobis et considerari attentius possit, tota doctrina Astronomica huc adhibenda est." In Genesin enarratio, chap. 1, sec. 3, "Fiat Fundamentum," p. 20

²³The doctrine of the image of God, Chytraeus wrote, is a most illustrious testimony of what God is: "Impossibile enim est mentem et insitas menti noticias, numeros, lumen discernens honesta et turpia, libertatem voluntatis, iudicium conscientiae, laeticiam in recte factis casu existere. Necesse est igitur esse Deum Mentem sapientem, bonam, iustam, liberam, iudicem. Docet QUALIS sit DEUS, videlicet qualem se in hac sua imagine expressit. Essentia intelligens seu sapiens, iusta, verax, bona, benefica, iustis amica, casta, vindex scelerum, approbatrix iusticiae, fons laeticiae et vitae aeternae." In Genesin enarratio, chap. 1, sec. 4, p. 30; cf. Prolegomena, p. 9 and chap. 1, sec. 3, p. 16. "Benedicit enim Domino, seu bona de Deo, de Dei bonitate, sapientia, amore erga nos et omnipotentia dicit, et praeconium Dei clarissimum in omnium oculos et aures penetrans est universum hoc mundi seu totius rerum naturae theatrum." "Ps. CIII, Benedic anima mea Domino," In historiam Josuae, Judicum, Ruth, in Prophetas et Psalmos aliquot et Sententias Syracidae (Leipzig: [Michael] Lantzenberger, 1592), on verse 22, pp. 701-702. Hereafter this work will be cited "Ps. CIII."

²⁴"Amplissima Sapientia, quae penitus exhauriri non potest, in hoc brevi dicto comprahenditur, quod HOMINIS CREATIONEM describit. Quae primum immensi erga nos amoris et bonitatis Dei testimonia omnium maxime illustria continet." In Genesin enarratio, chap. 1, sec. 4, p. 27; cf. chap. 1, sec. 1, p. 12; chap. 1, sec. 4, p. 30; and the first quotation in note 23, above.

least "the saner pagans," know that God is good.²⁵ Chytraeus specifically listed Plato,²⁶ Galen²⁷ and Xenophon²⁸ as examples of pagans who knew that God is good.

The Natural Knowledge of the Goodness of God
Inferred from Statements of Chemnitz

"The knowledge of God," Chemnitz wrote in the Loci, "is twofold: one natural, the other revealed."²⁹ The former, 4
Chemnitz contended, is "by nature innate in the minds of all men, and is acquired from the works of God in creation and from the divine vestiges which are dispersed in the whole

²⁵"Etsi enim Ethnici ex naturali luce mentibus insita, et pulcherrimo hoc theatro naturae rerum, utcunque agnoscunt, esse Deum, mentem aeternam, sapientem, beneficam, iustam, inspectricem et iudicem rerum et actionum humanarum, cui iuxta lucem discernentem honesta et turpia mentibus insitam, obediendum sit: tamen nec descrima trium personarum, nec voluntatem Dei in Evangelio revelatam noverunt." Dispositiones epistolarum, Dominica Trinitatis, Epistola Rom. 11, pp. 301-302. See also: Ibid., Dominica Cantate, Epistola Iacobi 1, p. 234; his In Genesin enarratio, chap. 1, sec. 4, p. 33; his In Deuteronomium Mosis enarratio, chap. 4, sec. 2, p. 26; and his "Ps. CXVIII, Confitemini," In historiam Josuae, Judicum, Ruth, in Prophetas et Psalmos aliquot et Sententias Syracidae, introduction, p. 731. Hereafter this last work will be cited "Ps. CXVIII."

²⁶Chytraeus, In Genesin enarratio, chap. 1, sec. 4, p. 33; Chytraeus, "Ps. CXVIII," introduction, pp. 730-731.

²⁷Chytraeus, "Ps. CXVIII," introduction, pp. 730-731; Chytraeus, "Ps. CIII," on verse 22, p. 702.

²⁸Chytraeus, In Genesin enarratio, chap. 1, sec. 3, p. 16.

²⁹"Est autem notitia Dei duplex. Una naturalis, altera revelata." Loci theologici (Frankfurt: Christianus Henricus Schumacher, 1690), part 1, locus i, chap. 1, introduction, p. 19B. Hereafter this work will be cited Loci.

realm of nature.³⁰ Both Romans 1:19 and 2:15, Chemnitz claimed, make reference to this natural knowledge.³¹ "It is clear," Chemnitz argued on the basis of Romans 1:21, "that unregenerate men think about God."³² Chemnitz also cited Romans 1:20-21 in support of the assertion that God has placed "a knowledge of Himself in the minds of all men."³³ Commenting on the Prolog of John, Chemnitz asserted that the Logos "manifested His presence to the world by the creation and preservation of all things," as Paul says in Romans 1:19.³⁴ On a number of different occasions Chemnitz called attention to the fact that "that which God has manifested

³⁰ Chemnitz asks, "An praeter et extra verbum revelatum sit aliqua notitia Dei?" and answers: "Est ergo aliqua Dei notitia naturalis, quae insita est omnium hominum mentibus naturaliter, et colligitur ex operibus Dei in creatione, et in vestigiis illis Divinitatis, quae sparsa sunt in tota rerum natura." Ibid., part I, locus i, sec. 1, p. 19B. See also Ibid., part I, locus iv, sec. 6, p. 121A.

³¹ Theses de doctrina articuli creationis, bound with Loci, Part III, Thesis XIII, p. 220.

³² "Manifestum est, homines non renatos cogitare de Deo, Rom. 1:21." Loci, part I, locus vi, sex. 6, Primus Gradus, p. 181B.

³³ "Sed aliae sunt causae, quare Deus externam illam sui notitiam omnium hominum mentibus indiderit." Chemnitz lists the third cause as follows: "Tertia causa Rom. 1:20 exprimitur, ut reddat homines inexcusabiles. Natura enim dictat: Deus est creator tuus. Ergo est colendus. . . . Nam ut Paulus loquitur, v. 21. Cum Deum cognoverint, non ut Deum glorificaverunt." Loci, part I, locus i, sec. 4, p. 21A. Cf. Theses de doctrina articuli creationis, Thesis I, p. 220.

³⁴ "Mundus per ipsum [the Logos] factus est, hoc est, creatione et conservatione rerum omnium praesentiam suam mundo manifestavit, sicut Paulus Rom. 1:19 inquit." Harmonia quatuor evangelistarum (Geneva: Petrus Chouët, 1645), chap. I, p. 42A.

to the Gentiles, Paul calls 'truth.'"³⁵

It was shown above that both Selnecker and Chytraeus held that man has a natural knowledge of "what sort" (qualis) of a deity God is. Both writers included in this "qualitative knowledge" of God a knowledge of God's goodness.³⁶

Chemnitz, also, held that man has a natural knowledge of "what sort" (qualis) of a deity God is. On one occasion Chemnitz quoted with approval Melanchthon's definition of the moral law: "The moral law . . . was revealed to men in creation, and afterwards was often repeated and enunciated by the divine voice, so that we might know that there is a God and of what sort (qualis) He is."³⁷ In another place Chemnitz wrote:

although human nature was deprived of the true gifts of intelligence by the fall, nevertheless God wanted some portion of his gifts to remain in man's mind by which man might recognize both what God is and of what sort (qualis) He is. God desired this furthermore, in order that there might be an instruction (paedagogia) toward Christ which is not in devils.

³⁵"Rom. 1:18 Paulus vocat veritatem, quam Deus manifestavit Ethnicis." Loci, part I, locus vi, chap. 2, sec. 1, p. 171A [Martin Chemnitz, The Doctrine of Man in Classical Lutheran Theology, edited by Herman A. Preus and Edmund Smits and translated by Mario Colacci and others (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1962), p. 82]; Loci, part I, locus i, chap. 3, p. 20A; chap. 5, p. 21B.

³⁶See supra, p. 18, n. 18 and p. 19, n. 23.

³⁷"Lex moralis . . . patefacta est hominibus in creatione, et postea saepe repetita et declarata voce divina, ut sciamus, quod sit Deus, et qualis sit." Loci, part II, locus i, chap. 2, p. 4B. For another example of the use of qualis by Melanchthon see infra, p. 27, n. 50.

This gift of intelligence in the unregenerate is surely related to the general activity of God.³⁸

It can only be argued from silence, therefore, that Chemnitz would have indicated it in these passages if he understood the "qualitative" natural knowledge of God in a more restricted sense than Selnecker and Chytraeus.

In his commentary on Psalm 103 Chemnitz wrote:

We know from the second commandment that we should recognize God's benevolent deeds and thank, honor and praise Him for them. However, our poor nature is so wretchedly corrupted through sin that we easily forget the kind deeds of God, and thank Him only rarely and too little and with hardly any thought.³⁹

It could be argued from this passage and from Chemnitz' concept of the moral law,⁴⁰ that Chemnitz believed that men have a natural knowledge of God's benevolence. It is more likely, however, that in the passage just cited Chemnitz is thinking of believers, not pagans. This is clearly the case with two somewhat similar passages that occur later in

³⁸"Cum natura humana, per lapsum, veris donis intellectus spoliata sit, Deus tamen aliquid suorum donorum in mente reliquum esse voluit, unde cognosci possit et quid sit Deus, et qualis sit. Item, ut possit esse paedagogia in Christum, quae in Diabolis non est. Et pertinet sane hoc donum intellectus in non renatis, ad generalem Dei actionem." Ibid., part I, locus vi, chap. 2, sec. 1, p. 171A. Translation, with modifications, from The Doctrine of Man in Classical Lutheran Theology, p. 82.

³⁹"Wir wissen auss dem andern Gebott / dass wir Gottes Wolthaten sollen erkennen / und im dafür dancken / loben und preisen. Nun aber ist unsere elende Natur durch die Sünde so jämmerlich verderbt / dass wir den Gutthaten Gottes leichtlich vergessen / selten / wenig unnd mit geringer Andacht im dafür dancken." "Erklärung dess CIII. Psalms," p. 498.

⁴⁰Supra, p. 22, n. 37.

Chemnitz's commentary on Psalm 103.⁴¹

A stronger case, however, can be made that Chemnitz was thinking of all men when he explained Christ's warning against anxiety⁴² as follows: Christ wishes to teach men that "the power, goodness and operation of God can be seen very clearly in secondary causes, themselves, such as the bestowal and preservation of life."⁴³

In the Locis Chemnitz distinguished between the "general action" of God and His "special action" toward believers. In the former Chemnitz included the "kindness, forbearance and patience" of God which, according to Romans 2:4, is supposed to lead men to repentance. This would appear to be an implicit assertion that the goodness of God is a part of man's natural knowledge.⁴⁴ A somewhat similar passage occurs in the Harmonia.⁴⁵

⁴¹Ibid., pp. 506, 521.

⁴²Matthew 6:25.

⁴³"Christus vult docere. . . . 3. In ipsis causis secundis Dei potentiam, bonitatem et operationem potissimum inspiciendam, ut in nutritione et vivificatione." Harmonia quatuor evangelistarum, chap. 51, pp. 504-505.

⁴⁴Part I, locus 5, chap. 5 (De Generali et Speciali actione Dei), Quartum Argumentum, pp. 147B-148A.

⁴⁵"Et Deus patientia et longanimitate sua, propter intercessionem filii hanc confusionem tolerat, non quod vel imperio mundi Deus se abdicarit, vel quod falsum sit verbum Dei, promittens benedictionem piis et minitans maledictione impiis. Sed causam exponit Paulus, Rom. 2:4 ut bonitate sua adducat nos ad poenitentiam." Harmonia quatuor evangelistarum, chap. 19, p. 192A.

In the Loci Chemnitz quoted without comment Plato's definition of God as "an eternal mind, and the cause of good in nature."⁴⁶ Elsewhere in the Loci Chemnitz noted that "the philosophers--such as Xenophon--speak only about an eternal mind, the cause of good in nature."⁴⁷ Like Selnecker and Chytraeus, Chemnitz called the Manichean teachings that the universe is evil "insanities."⁴⁸

In the Handbüchlein Chemnitz raised the question: "Whether there is a God and how one knows that [there is one]." Chemnitz responded by saying that the answer should be taken from the Catechism, the Loci Communes and the Examen of Melanchthon.⁴⁹ It is clear from the Loci Communes of 1543

⁴⁶"Deus est . . . mens aeterna et boni in natura causa." Part I, locus i, chap. 3, p. 25A.

⁴⁷"Philosophi tantum dicunt de aeterna mente, causa boni in natura, ut Xenophon." Part I, locus iv, chap. 3, p. 108A.

⁴⁸Ibid., part I, locus iv, chap. 4, p. 110A; Theses de peccato in genere ac praecipue de peccato originis, bound with the Loci, part III, Thesis XV, p. 225.

⁴⁹To a number of questions, including "Ob ein Gott sei und woher man das erkenne," Chemnitz answered: "Auf diese Fragen soll Antwort und Bericht genommen werden aus dem Katechismus, ex Locis Communibus et Examine D. Philippi." Enchiridion, edited by A. L. Graebner (Milwaukee: Georg Brumder, 1886), Von Gott, p. 42. The Loci Communes is cited in note 50, below. In the 1558 German edition of the Examen Melanchthon wrote: "Wie sol man Gott erkennen? Antwort. Wie er sich selb [sic] genediglich geoffenbaret, und seine offenbarung in der Propheten und Aposteln schrifft, und in die Symbola gefasset hat." "Examen Eorum, qui audiuntur ante ritum publicae ordinationis, qua commendatur eis ministerium evangelii," Corpus Reformatorum, edited by C. G. Bretschneider and H. E. Bindseil, XXIII (Brunswig: C. A. Schwetschke et Filium, 1855), col. XL. In a section entitled "Vom ersten Stück, namlich, von der Lere" Melanchthon wrote: "Der

that Melanchthon believed in the natural knowledge of the goodness of God:

so that we might have a description of some sort, of God, I will compare two: the first, Plato's mutilated description; the second, the pure description which has been handed down in the Church as we learn it from the words of Baptism. The Platonic description of God is: "God is an eternal mind, the cause of good in nature." Even though this Platonic description is composed in a sufficiently erudite fashion that it is difficult for those with little training to judge what it is [variant reading: "what is lacking"], nevertheless because it does not describe God as he reveals Himself, there is need for a better and more precise description. These are the words: God is "an eternal mind," that is, a spiritual essence, intelligent, eternal; "the cause of good in nature," that is, veracious, good, just, omnipotent, the creator of all good things and of all order in nature and of human nature toward a certain order, that is, toward a certain obedience. Plato has included all these things. However, these things are thoughts of the human mind. Although they are true and erudite and have been formed on the basis of

allmechtige, warhaftige Gott, hat gewislich Engel und Menschen geschaffen, mit wunderbarlichen rath, das er Creaturn habe, welchen er seine weisheit und gütigkeit mitteile, und von jnen dagegen erkand und gepreiset werde." Ibid., col. XXVII. In the 1558 Latin edition Melanchthon wrote: "Lex moralis est aeterna et immota sapientia, et regula iustitiae in Deo, discernens recta et non recta, et horribiliter irascens contumacibus, seu denuntians horrendam iram adversus contumaciam, repugnantem huic ordini in Deo, et patefacta est hominibus in creatione, et postea saepe repetita, et declarata voce divina, ut sciamus, quod sit Deus, et qualis sit, obligans omnes creaturas racionales, et postulans, ut omnes sint conformes Deo, et damnans ac destruens omnes non conformes Deo, nisi fiat remissio et reconciliatio propter Filium Mediatorem." Ibid., Quid est Lex Moralis?, col. 8. In the 1558 edition of the Catechesis Puerilis Melanchthon wrote: "[Primum praeceptum] tradit modum, quo Deus vult apprehendi, et cultum quo coli. Docet enim Deum esse verbo et aliquo ipsius testimonio apprehendendum. . . . Ita et nos debemus apprehendere Deum verbo, quod nobis datum est, et testimonio, scilicet, quia exhibitus est nobis Christus." Corpus Reformatorum, XXIII, Quid praecipit primum Praeceptum?, col. 118.

reliable demonstrations, nevertheless, to them must be added God's own revelation of what sort [qualem] of a God He is."⁵⁰

Conclusion

Both Selnecker and Chytraeus implicitly and explicitly taught that man has a natural knowledge of the goodness of God. The same teaching is implicit in Chemnitz's writings.

⁵⁰"Ut autem descriptionem aliquam Dei teneamus, conferam duas: alteram mutilam Platonis, alteram integram, quae in Ecclesia tradita est, ut ex baptismi verbis discitur. Platonica descriptio Dei haec est: DEUS EST MENS AETERNA, CAUSA BONI IN NATURA. Quamquam autem haec Platonica descriptio adeo erudite composita est, ut difficile sit iudicare parum exercitatis, quid sit [desit?], tamen quia nondum ita describit Deum, ut se patefacit ipse, requirenda est alia illustrior et propior descriptio. Verba sunt haec: Deum esse mentem aeternam, id est, essentiam spiritualem, intelligentem, aeternam, causam boni in natura, id est, veracem, bonam, iustam, omnipotentem, conditricem bonarum rerum omnium et totius ordinis in natura et humanae naturae ad certum ordinem, i. e., ad certam obedientiam. Haec omnia complexus est Plato. Sed hae sunt adhuc humanae mentis cogitationes, quae etsi verae et eruditae sunt et ex firmis demonstrationibus natae, tamen addendum est, qualem se Deus ipse patefecerit." From the 1543 edition of the Loci Communes as reproduced in the 1690 edition of Chemnitz' Loci, part I, locus i, chap. 1, sec. 1, p. 18. The first edition of the Enchiridion was published in 1569. Several variations, including the reading "desit" in place of "sit," are found in the text as published in Corpus Reformatorum, XXI, col. 610.

CHAPTER III

THE NATURE AND FUNCTION OF THE NATURAL KNOWLEDGE OF THE GOODNESS OF GOD

Introduction

Chemnitz, Selnecker and Chytraeus all taught that man has a natural knowledge of the goodness of God. They also displayed a broad agreement in their understanding of the nature and function of this knowledge. For them this knowledge--far from serving as an adequate basis for trust or faith in God--ultimately served as a revelation of God's wrath. This was so because the natural knowledge of the goodness of God confronted men with their ingratitude to God for His goodness and at the same time completely failed to give the individual any assurance that God really meant to be gracious to him.¹

¹Cf. Blessed Martin Luther's remarks on the First Article of the Creed: "Hieraus will sich nu selbs schliessen und folgen: weil uns das alles, so wir vermügen, dazu was im Himmel und Erden ist, täglich von Gott gegeben, erhalten und bewahret wird, so sind wir ja schuldig, ihn darumb ohn Unterlass zu lieben, loben und danken und kürzlich ihm ganz und gar damit zu dienen, wie er durch die zehen Gepot fodert und befohlen hat. Hie wäre nu viel zu sagen, wenn man's solt' austreichen, wie wenig ihr sind, die diesen Artikel gläuben. Denn wir gehen all überhin, hören's und sagen's, sehen aber und bedenken nicht, was uns die Wort fürtragen. Denn wo wir's von Herzen gläubten, würden wir auch darnach tun und nicht so stolz hergehen, trotzen und uns brüsten, als hätten wir das Leben, Reichtumb, Gewalt und Ehre etc. von uns selbs, dass man uns furchten und dienen müsste, wie die unselige verkehrte Welt tuet, die in ihrer Blindheist ersoffen ist, aller

This chapter is an attempt to explain the nature and function of the natural knowledge of the goodness of God according to Chemnitz, Selnecker and Chytraeus. In order to have sufficient material with which to work it has been necessary to include statements made by these men in which they speak of the natural knowledge of God without explicitly mentioning the natural knowledge of His goodness. The writings of the three men are cited in chronological order.

Chemnitz

In the Enchiridion Chemnitz raised the question if man, by means of his own natural reason, can understand God's nature and will. Chemnitz answered as follows:

As man's nature has now been corrupted by sin, reason does not know and understand these things thoroughly or with any degree of certainty (1 Corinthians 1 and 2), for in these things reason is not only blind, but is total darkness (John 1, Ephesians 5). Reason, to be sure, has a dim knowledge--like something recalled from a dream--that there is a God and that He should be honored. But who that God is, and how He wants to be honored--of that reason knows nothing. Indeed, when reason follows its own clever ideas, it only produces an atrocious idolatry (Romans 1). . . . But . . . of the true worship of God reason knows simply nothing (Romans 1 and 7), and all of the

Güter und Gaben Gottes allein zu ihrer Hoffart, Geiz, Lust und Wohltaten missbraucht und Gott nicht einmal ansehe, dass sie ihm dankete oder für ein Herrn und Schöpfer erkannte. Darümb sollt' uns dieser Artikel alle demütigen und erschrecken, wo wir's gläubten. Denn wir sundigen täglich mit Augen, Ohren, Händen, Leib und Seele, Geld und Gut und mit allem, das wir haben, sonderlich diejenigen, so noch wider Gottes Wort fechten." "Der grosse Katechismus," Die Bekenntnisschriften der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche (4. durchgesehene Auflage; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1959), I, 649, paragraphs 19-22, lines 7-38.

teaching of the Gospel is a mystery, unknown and hidden to reason (1 Corinthians 1). But God, moved by His great grace, has revealed those things to His Church by means of His special Word which He has given partly without means and partly through means.²

In the Examen Concilii Tridentini Chemnitz granted that man is capable of composing a beautiful sounding prayer from the conclusions of human reason about religion and divine worship and without reference to the "rule of faith" or the Divine Word. But such activity, Chemnitz continued, "is the very origin itself of idolatry," for without the Word of God men are "led astray by their clever reasonings" so that "they change the glory of the incorruptible God into the likeness of man or another image."³

²"Wie jetzund die Natur durch die Sünde verdorben ist, weiss und verstehet sie davon nicht gründliches oder gewisses, I. Cor. 1 und 2; denn in diesen Sachen ist die Vernunft nicht allein blind, sondern eitel Finsternisse, Joh. 1, Eph. 5. Sie hat wohl eine dunkle Erkenntnis, gleichwie im Traum, dass Gott sei, und dass er solle geehret werden. Aber wer derselbige Gott sei, und wie er wolle geehret sein, davon weiss die Vernunft nichts; ja wenn sie ihren klugen Gedanken folget, so richtet sie nur greuliche Abgötterei an, Röm. 1. Also vom Gesetz hat die Vernunft nur ein Stücklein, was belanget etliche weltliche und Müsserliche Laster und Tugenden. Aber von der rechten Grundsuppe der Sünden und von wahren Gottesdienst weiss die Vernunft lauter nichts, Röm. 1 und 7, und die ganze Lehre des Evangelii ist ein Geheimnis, der Vernunft unbekannt und verborgen, 1 Cor. 1. Sondern Gott hat aus grossen Gnaden durch sein eigenes sonderliches Wort, das er selbst zum Theil ohne Mittel, zum Theil durch Mittel gegeben, solches seiner Kirche geoffenbart." Edited by A. L. Graebner (Milwaukee: George Brumder, 1886), "Kann ein Mensch von Natur aus seiner eigenen Vernunft solches nicht verstehen?," p. 31; cf. "Worin stehet denn der Unterschied des Gesetzes und der Evangelii?," p. 82.

³"Speciosa sane oratio, si remota regula et extincta lucerna verbi divini, ex humanae rationis consequentiis, de

In his Theses de doctrina articuli creationis Chemnitz argued that men possess a weak and indistinct knowledge of God which is aided by a contemplation of the "traces of the deity" dispersed throughout nature. "Nevertheless," Chemnitz added, "if the pagans follow the lines of reasoning which appear natural to them, they end up in dreadful idolatry." Therefore, what they know about God, Chemnitz concluded, Scripture calls "ignorance of God rather than knowledge of Him."⁴

In his comment on Matthew 6:8⁵ in the Harmonia quatuor evangelistarum Chemnitz stated that the pagans "are not able

religione et cultu divino statuendum esset. Sed Rom. 1 Paulus dicit, hanc esse ipsissimam idolotatriae seu vanitatis originem, quod homines sine verbo Dei per dialogismos, hoc est, per argutas suas ratiocinationes seducti, gloriam incorruptibilis Dei in similitudinem hominis aut alterius imaginis mutarint." Edited by Eduard Preuss (Berlin: Gustav Schlawitz, 1861), part I, locus ii, sec. 3, par. 5, p. 768B.

⁴"Ex his vestigiis divinitatis, quae per totam rerum naturam sparsa sunt, etiam gentes, id quod de Deo cognosci potest, intellexerunt, Rom. 1:19. Supersunt enim tenues et obscurae quaedam notitiae de Deo in mente humana, quae consideratione illa vestigiorum divinitatis in creaturis adjuvantur, Rom. 1:19 et 2:15. Sed si suas naturales sequuntur ratiocinationes, exeunt in horrendam idolatriam, Rom. 1:25. Ideo non tam notitia quam ignorantia Dei appellatur, Eph. 4:18 et 1 Cor. 1:21. Quomodo vero recte usurpari et praelucent verbo excoli possit, traditur Rom. 1:20, Heb. 11:3 et Acts 17:23." Theses de doctrina articuli creationis, bound in part III of Loci theologici (Frankfurt: Christianus Henricus Schumacher, 1690), Thesis XIII, p. 220; cf. Thesis II. And see Theses de causa peccati, bound in part III of Loci theologici, Thesis I, p. 221. Cf. also Theses de unitate essentiae divinae personarum trinitate, bound in part III of Loci theologici, Thesis II, p. 227. For Chemnitz' distinction between the innate and acquired natural knowledge of God see: Loci theologici, part I, locus i, chap. 1, sec. 3, p. 20A. Hereafter this work will be cited Loci.

⁵"Do not be like them [the Gentiles], for your Father

to establish for certain whether God is concerned about human affairs or affected by their adversities and disposed to give help."⁶

Commenting on the phrase, "They who honor not the Son, honor not the Father,"⁷ Chemnitz wrote:

That sentence also contains this doctrine: God should not be sought, nor can He be known or found, except in Christ and through Christ. Thus whoever wishes to believe in God, to apprehend and worship Him, cannot do this by means of wandering speculations, but only in Christ and through Christ. "For he who honors not the Son, honors not the Father." And "no one comes to the Father except through the Son," John 14:6. Indeed, we seek and find the Son in His assumed flesh. For without that flesh and apart from that flesh, we can think neither rightly nor piously of the incarnate Son of God.⁸

In the Loci Chemnitz declared that the natural knowledge of God is "either nonexistent, or imperfect, or weak." It is nonexistent because all of philosophy knows nothing of the gratuitous promise of the forgiveness of sins. It is imperfect

knows what you need before you ask him."

⁶"[Ethnici] non possunt certo statuere, Deum curare res humanas aut calamitatibus suorum affici, et habere animum ad juvandum propensum." Harmonia quatuor evangelistarum (Geneva: Petrus Chouët, 1645), chap. 51, p. 471A.

⁷Cf. John 5:25.

⁸"Qui non honorant Filium, non honorant Patrem. . . . Continet vero et hanc doctrinam illa sententia, Deum non debere quaeri, nec posse agnosci aut inveniri, nisi in Christo and per Christum. Ut quicumque vult in Deum credere, Deum apprehendere et colere, faciat hoc non vagabundis speculationibus, sed in Christo et per Christum. Qui enim non honorat Filium, non honorat Patrem: Et nemo venit ad Patrem nisi per filium, Joh. 14:6. Filium vero in assumpta sua carne quaerimus et invenimus. Sine enim illa carne et extra illam carnem, nec recte nec pie de Filio Dei incarnato cogitare possumus." Harmonia quatuor evangelistarum, chap. 46, on John 5:16-47, p. 366B.

because the pagans know only a small part of the law. It is weak, because even though men know that there is a God and that He demands obedience, their assent to this is not only weak, but often shaken by terrifying doubts.⁹

In response to the question of why God gave the Gentiles a natural knowledge of Himself Chemnitz replied that it was not so that men might be saved "without Christ." The real reasons God gave this knowledge of Himself were these: (1) For the sake of external discipline; (2) So that men might be driven by their imperfect knowledge of God to seek the proclamation of the divine revelation in the Church; and (3) So that He might render men inexcusable. Chemnitz explained the third reason as follows:

The third reason is stated in Romans 1:20: "that He might render men inexcusable." For nature says: "God is your creator; therefore He should be worshipped." Now if men invent their own acts of worship, they cannot determine what is pleasing to God. Rather, as Paul says in verse 23, they insult God with their acts of worship. Consequently even the most virtuous thoughts of the Gentiles pronounce them guilty before God. For

⁹Under the heading "Sed quae qualis et quanta illa notitia naturalis, et quousque progreditur," Chemnitz says, "Vere loquendo aut nulla, aut imperfecta, aut languida est: NULLA: quia de gratuita promissione remissionis peccatorum nihil novit tota Philosophia: illa enim Filius Dei e sinu aeterni Patris prolatam revelavit Ecclesiae, Joan. 1. v. 18, Matt. 11. v. 27 et 1 Cor. 1. v. 21 et 2. v. 7. IMPERFECTA: quia gentes aliquam tantum particulam legis noverunt. . . . LANGUIDA: quia etiamsi impressum est humanis mentibus, esse Deum, et praecipere obedientiam, juxta discrimen honestorum et turpium; tamen assensio non tantum languida est, sed horrendis dubitationibus saepe excutitur." Loci, part I, locus i, chap. 2, p. 20A.

as Paul says in verse 21, "Although they knew God, they did not glorify Him as God."¹⁰

Within the Church, Chemnitz contended, faith must be added to the natural knowledge of God and two precautions must be observed. First, a study of the natural knowledge of God should be preceded by a study of the Word of God and the illustrious evidences by which God has revealed Himself to men. Second, "natural knowledge should be subordinated to the divine revelation in the Word, so that wherever there is a difference or a conflict the natural can yield to the divine."¹¹

¹⁰"Sed quare Deus illam sui notitiam gentibus naturaliter manifestavit? Non ideo; ut (quemadmodum Thammerus et ante ipsum Zwinglius, insaniit) si dikaiōma Dei, quatenus ipsi notum fuit, opere implevissent, hac ratione sine Christo solvarentur. Quia diserte inquit Christus John 14:6. Nemo venit ad Patrem, nisi per me.

"Sed aliae sunt causae, quare Deus externam illam sui notitiam omnium hominum mentibus indiderit. Primo videlicet propter externam disciplinam, quam Deus vult ab omnibus hominibus etiam non renatis, praestari.

"Secundam causam exponit Paulus. Acts 17:27 zētein ton kurion, quod in constructione causali positum est per elleipsin scilicet tou eneka. Ideo nimium manifestata est haec notitia, ut quaeratur Deus. . . . Cum omnes naturaliter agnoscant esse Deum, et illum esse glorificandum ut Deum, et simul cogantur fateri se ignorare quomodo sit colendus: Deum invisisse ipsis hanc notitiam, ut quaerant, annuntiationem revelationis divinae in Ecclesia. . . .

"Tertia causa Rom. 1:20 exprimitur, ut reddat homines inexcusabiles. Natura enim dictat: Deus est creator tuus. Ergo est colendus. Jam si excogitarent cultus, non possunt statuere quod Deo placeant. Imo sicut Paulus inquit, v. 23 suis cultibus Deum contumelia afficiunt. Accusant ergo etiam cogitationes quantumvis optimae, homines Ethnicos, quod sint rei Deo. Nam ut Paulus loquitur, v. 21. Cum Deum cognoverint, non ut Deum glorificaverunt." Ibid., part I, locus i, chap. 1, sec. 4, p. 20B-21A. Chemnitz' reference to "Thammerus" may be to Theobald Thamer (c.1500-1569) who converted from Lutheranism to Roman Catholicism about 1553 or 1554.

¹¹"Quis ergo in Ecclesia est verus et pius usus huius

Comparing the natural and the revealed knowledge of God, Chemnitz argued that in Galatians 4:8¹² St. Paul calls the natural knowledge of God "ignorance of God." In 1 Corinthians 1:21¹³ Paul says that the world--in spite of its natural knowledge of God--did not know God in His divine wisdom. John 17:3¹⁴ teaches that everlasting life can be obtained only through knowledge of God the Father and Him whom He sent, His Son Jesus Christ. "Therefore," Chemnitz concluded, "no one is saved by this natural knowledge." The

saving knowledge of God, by which everlasting life is obtained, is another knowledge--namely--that revealed through the Word in which God has manifested Himself and His will

and which God has confirmed with marvelous miracles. "To this

naturalis Notitiae? Heb. 11:2 scriptum est: Creationem mundi esse simulacrum invisibilium Dei. Sed additur per fidem. Haec sententia ostendit verum usum vestigiorum divinitatis in rerum natura. Affirmat enim rationem non posse vere et utiliter ex effectibus opificem cognoscere, nisi accedat fides.

"Non ergo initium faciendum est a naturali notitia; sed 1. mens confirmanda est ex verbo Dei, et illustribus testimoniis, in quibus se Deus generi humano peculiariter patefecit. Postea utiliter potest addi consideratio Philosophicarum demonstrationum. 2. Notitis naturalis debet subordinari divinae revelationi in verbo: ita, ut sicubi diffentiat vel pugnet, cedat naturalis divinae." Ibid., part I, locus i, chap. 1, sec. 6, p. 21A.

¹²"Formerly, when you did not know God, you were in bondage to beings that by nature are no gods."

¹³"For since in the wisdom of God, the world did not know God through wisdom, it pleased God through the folly of what we preach to save those who believe."

¹⁴"And this is eternal life, that they know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent."

revelation God has bound His Church which alone knows, invokes and worships God as He has revealed Himself in this Word."¹⁵

In the final section of the Loci on the natural knowledge of God Chemnitz drew two conclusions. One was

that it should not be thought that a theology of Homer is of the same value as one of Isaiah; or that all religions are equal, whether they are established in accord with the natural knowledge of God, or in accord with the knowledge revealed in the Word.¹⁶

The second conclusion was that

although the pagans look upon the works of God in creation and in the preservation [of the world], nevertheless, they go astray from the true God because they neglect the Word revealed by God and confirmed by

¹⁵"Ostende differentiam inter naturalem Dei notitiam et revelatam? Paulus naturalem hanc universalem et generalem notitiam Dei, quae ex notitiis naturalibus et ex demonstrationibus colligitur, vocat ignorantiam Dei, Galat. 4:8. Tunc quidem ignorantes, serviebatis iis, qui natura non sunt Dii, Et 1. Cor. 1:21. dicit: Mundus per suam sapientiam (i.e. per notitias et demonstrationes naturales) non cognovit Deum in divine [sic] sua sapientia, Sed novisse Deum Patrem, et quem misit Filium suum Iesum Christum, solum vita aeterna est, Joan. 17:3. itaque nemo hac notitia naturalis salvatur.

"Esto ergo alia notitia Dei salvans, per quem consequitur vitam aeternam, REVELATA scil. per verbum in quo Deus et se et suam voluntatem patefecit, eamque patefactionem illustribus miraculis confirmavit. . . .

"Ad hanc patefactionem Deus suam Ecclesiam alligavit, quae sola Deum novit, invocat et celebrat, sicut se in hoc verbo manifestavit, ut et hoc modo vera et una Dei Ecclesia [sic] ab omnium gentium religione discerneretur." Loci, part I, locus i, chap. 1, sec. 7, p. 22A-B. Elsewhere in the Loci Chemnitz noted that "the philosophers" make no mention of the three persons within the Godhead. Part I, locus iv, chap. 3, p. 108A.

¹⁶"Hinc sequitur: PRIMO, non esse existimandum, Theologiam Homeri tantundem valere, quantum Esariae: aut omnes Religiones esse pares, sive instituantur juxta notitiam Dei naturalem, sive juxta notitiam in verbo revelatam." Part I, locus i, chap. 1, Usus harum regularum, p. 22A.

testimonies.¹⁷

Elsewhere in the Loci Chemnitz distinguished between "acts of external discipline" and "spiritual impulses":

here there is a clear difference in the thoughts of the unregenerate in those matters which pertain to God. "They became vain in their imaginations. . . . Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools" (Rom. 1:21-22). . . . Thus the flesh has thoughts about God, but these are not the beginning of conversion, though a reprobate mind follows them (Rom. 1:28).¹⁸

Selnecker

In his commentary on Psalm 19 Selnecker stated that the created universe testifies to the goodness of God.¹⁹ "Nevertheless," Selnecker added, "all men should know that the knowledge of God possessed in common by all men is completely insignificant and of no value unless the knowledge of the Son

¹⁷"SECUNDO, quod licet Ethnici intueantur opera Dei, creationis et sustentationis: tamen aberrant a vero Deo. Quia verbum a Deo revelatum et testimoniis confirmatum negligunt." Ibid., part I, locus 1, chap. 1, Usus harum regularum, p. 22B.

¹⁸"In mentem revocanda est distinctio inter actiones externae disciplinae, et motus spirituales. Et hoc loco illustris est differentia de cogitationibus non renatorum in illis, quae ad Deum pertinent. Roman. 1:21 [21-22]. Vani facti sunt incogitationibus suis: cum putarent se sapienter cogitasse, stulti facti sunt. . . . Habet ergo caro cogitationes de Deo; sed illae non sunt initium conversionis; sed sequitur mens reprobata, Rom. 1:28." Ibid., part I, locus vi, chap. 6, p. 181B. Translation from Martin Chemnitz, The Doctrine of Man in Classical Lutheran Theology, edited by Herman A. Preus and Edmund Smits and translated by Mario Colacci and others (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1962), pp. 112-113.

¹⁹See supra, p. 17, nn. 15 and 16.

of God is added to it." From the knowledge of God possessed by all men "we cannot know at all what or who God is, or what His will is." The "special knowledge of God" which is possessed by the sons of God is contained only in the doctrine of the holy Gospel, as Christ testified when he said: This is everlasting life, that they know Thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent. Such knowledge of God is contained in the Word and in the testimonies. The Word is the doctrine of the Gospel contained in both the Old Testament and the New. The testimonies are the holy Sacraments, Baptism and the Holy Supper. From these exalted things comes the knowledge of God. That is, from them a person knows the essence and will of God and trusts and hopes in His grace and mercy, which He has manifested, confirmed and sealed for us in His Son.²⁰

²⁰"Es sollen aber alle Menschen wissen/ das diese gemeine erkantnuss Gottes gantz gering und schlecht sei/ wo nicht das erkantnuss des Sons Gottes darzu kompt. . . . Jedoch können wir auss diser blossen erkantnuss gar nicht wissen/ was/ oder wer Gott sey/ was sein wille sei. Darumb gehöret hiehero ein hellere und klerere erkantnuss/ welche ist peculiaris agnitio Dei, et propria filiorum Dei, darvon allein die Christglaubigen reden/ und etwas gewiss haben/ lehren/ und halten können.

"Diese erkantnuss Gottes stehet allein in der Lehr des heyligen Evangelii/ wie Christus bezeuget/ und spricht: Das ist das ewige Leben/ das sie dich den waren Gott erkennen/ unnd den du gesandt hast/ Ihesus Christum. Solche erkantnuss Gottes stehet im Wort unnd im Zeugnuss. Das Wort ist die Lehr des Evangelii/ welche beyde im altan Testament/ und im Newen gefasset ist. Das Zeugnuss sind die heyligen Sacrament; die Tauffe; unnd das hochwirdige Abentmal. Auss disen hohen dinger [sic] kompt die erkantnuss Gottes/ das ist/ das man weiss Gottes Wesen und willen/ und trawet und hoffet auff sein Gnade und Barmhertzigkeyt/ die er uns in seinem Son anzeygt/ bekreffiget/ und versiegelt hat." Der gantze Psalter des Koniglichen / Propheten Davids ausgelegt / und in drei Bücher getheilt (Nuremberg: Christoff Neusler, 1569), part 1, on verses 1-4,

In his commentary on Genesis Selnecker stated that the universal knowledge of God is very useful and greatly to be commended because from it one can know God's eternal nature, His power, wisdom, goodness, justice and other attributes. "Nevertheless," Selnecker added, "this knowledge is very weak." Similarly, the things that man knows innately about God "are very obscure and easily dislodged from the mind, especially when contradictory evidence is perceived by the mind." Those things which are known by natural knowledge, Selnecker continued, are--as Plato said--like reflections in water which do not offer a clear and sharp image because of the fluctuation of the water.²¹

The "weakness and frailty" of the universal knowledge of God, Selnecker asserted, can be seen from the fact that it plainly knows nothing of the three persons of the Godhead; that its knowledge of the will of God, especially of those things which He reveals in the Gospel, has been altered; that

fol. 109b. The Bible verse quoted is John 17:3. Hereafter this work will be cited Der gantze Psalter.

²¹"Huius universalis cognitionis Dei etsi commendatio et utilitas magna est, ita, ut aeternitas Dei ex ordine causarum, et potentia Dei ex dispositione, et bonitas ex usu, iusticia ex administratione, et aliae virtutes ex operibus colligi possint: tamen valde languida est haec ipsa cognitio, et noticiae nobis natura insitae admodum obscurae sunt, et facile animis excutiuntur, praesertim quando obiecta contraria occurrent, ut et Plato de noticiis dixit, eas esse similes rebus, quae in aqua cernuntur, et ob mobilitatem quae fluctuantis nullam stabilem et firmam imaginem spectatori offerunt." In Genesis, primum librum Moysi, commentarius (Leipzig: Johannes Rhamba, 1569), chap. 1, p. 17.

it has only part of the Law and knows nothing either of inner obedience or of inner uncleanness or of the sin of concupiscence; and finally, that it has no intimation whatever of the resurrection of the body and only with effort and difficulty asserts the immortality of the soul.²²

In his commentary on Genesis Selnecker also stated:

we give thanks to God that He has revealed Himself to us not only in that universal knowledge of Him which is common to all men and yet uncertain and very weak, but has also desired that we be trained, instructed and strengthened in the special and certain knowledge of Himself.²³

A number of times in the Paedagogia Selnecker referred to the obscure or uncertain character of the natural knowledge of God. Man is not able by means of it to determine for certain who God is or what sort of a god He is.²⁴ The more man seeks

²²"Potest autem huius universalis et imperfectae sive Philosophicae noticiae Dei tenuitas, et imbecillitas perspici ex eo, quod de / tribus personis divinitatis plane nihil novit: deinde quod de voluntate Dei, praecipue vero ea, quae in Evangelio patefit [sic], muta est: postea tantum quaedam particulas legis habet, nec novit quidquam de interiore vel oboedientia vel immundicie et concupiscentiae peccato; tandem quod de resurrectione corporum nihil sibi imaginari, nedum aliquid certi statuere potest, imo et immortalitatem animae aegre et difficulter asserit." Ibid., chap. 1, pp. 17-18.

²³"Agamus igitur Deo gratias, quod sese nobis patefecit, et non tantum in universali illa sui agnitione, quae omnium hominum communis, et tamen lubrica et admodum tenuis est, sed et in peculiari et certa sui noticia nos exerceri, erudiri, et confirmari voluit." Ibid., chap. 1, p. 17; cf. p. 18.

²⁴"Cum autem ex hac universali cognitione nihil certi de Deo, quis et qualis sit, scire possimus, necesse est nos inquirere et consulere verbum Dei, ex quo solo caecitati et ignorantiae nostrae succurrimus." Paedagogia Christiana, continens Decalogi explicationem, iam postremo recognitae et auctae (Frankfurt on the Main: Georgius Corvinus, 1571), II,

to determine who God is or of what sort He is, or what His will is, the more he goes astray and wavers in uncertainty.²⁵

Selnecker marveled at the extent to which the pagans were able to enumerate the attributes of God, including His goodness. Yet, Selnecker continued, they know nothing of the distinction of persons within the Godhead. Only with difficulty do they assert the existence of providence, for they doubt when they see that things go badly for those who are good and well for those who are evil. They are ignorant of the will of God. They do not know of the resurrection of the body and they assert the immortality of the soul only with difficulty.²⁶

There is in the mind of unregenerate man a darkness which does not know God.²⁷

35; cf. II, 34. Hereafter this work will be cited Paedagogia.

²⁵"Nam mens humana errat, nec scire potest, quis et qualis sit Deus, quae sit eius essentia et voluntas, et quo plus quaerit, eo magis errat, et incerta fluctuat." Ibid., II, 38; cf. I, 79.

²⁶"Quid sit Deus, Ethnici integre non sciunt, qui tantum recitant proprietates, et attributa Dei, videlicet, Deum esse mentem aeternam, causam boni in natura. Sed de discrimine personarum nihil prorsus sciunt. Esse providentiam, difficulter asserunt. Dubitant enim, cum videant bonis saepe male esse, malis bene. . . .

"Voluntatem Dei prorsus ignorant, et tantum secundum umbram virtutum, sine vera luce, de Deo iudicant. Resurrectionem corporum ignorant. Immortalitatem animae aegre statuunt." Ibid., I, 79; see also I, 58 and note 27, below.

²⁷"Videmus naturam nostram pugnare cum Lege, et esse in mente caligem ignorantem Deum, et dubitationes de providentia, et voluntate Dei, et in voluntate aversionem a Deo." Ibid., I, 67-68; see also I, 58.

In the Paedagogia Selnecker distinguished two uses of the natural knowledge of God. The first use was this: "that all men might be without excuse and know that they are justly condemned and rejected by God, as Paul makes clear in Romans 1." The second use involved the combination of faith and natural knowledge in the believer.²⁸

Selnecker concluded that since by means of the universal knowledge of God

we are not able to know anything for certain about God, either who He is or of what sort He is, it is necessary for us to inquire into and consult the Word of God which is the only means by which we can remedy our blindness and ignorance.²⁹

The true knowledge and worship of God, Selnecker insisted,

must not be sought except from the Word of God, for God does not wish to be known or worshiped in any other way than as He has revealed Himself in His Word.³⁰

²⁸"Huius universalis cognitionis Dei usus est, ut omnes homines sint inexcusabiles, et sciant, se iure damnari, et rejici a Deo, ut Paulus ostendit Rom. 1. Deinde est quidam specialis usus, cuius epistola ad Ebraeos mentionem facit, inquiens: Per fidem intelligimus, perfecta fuisse secula verbo Dei, id est, fides facit, ut in mundi creatione pii proficiant magis magisque in gloriam Creatoris, sicut David inquit Psal. 92, Delectasti me Domine in factura tua, et in operibus manuum tuarum exultabo, etc." II, 34-35.

²⁹"Cum autem ex hac universali cognitione nihil certi de Deo, quis et qualis sit, scire possimus, necesse est nos inquirere et consulere verbum Dei, ex quo solo caecitati et ignorantiae nostrae succurrimus." Ibid., II, 35.

³⁰"Quod haec [vera] agnitio et celebratio Dei, non nisi ex verbo Dei petenda sit, siquidem Deus non vult aliter agnoscī aut coli, quam sicut se in verbo suo patefecit." Ibid., II, 5; cf. II, 37.

In his commentary on Blessed Martin Luther's Small Catechism Selnecker contended that:

The knowledge of God peculiar to the Church consists of God's own revelation--in both the Law and in the teaching of the Gospel--of His divine essence and will. However, other men who talk about God without this revelation--even though they know that God is an eternal mind and the cause of good in nature--nevertheless err in three ways: (1) First, they know nothing about the three persons in the essence of God. (2) Second, they reflect upon only a part of God's will as revealed in the Law and do not possess the entire Law. They are wholly silent about the first table [of the Law]. They discuss the sixth commandment superficially and only in passing. Indeed, they are clearly unable to determine anything at all about the inner obedience and purity which is required in the ninth and tenth commandment. (3) Thirdly, they know nothing of the will of God expressed in the Gospel, and do not know the Son of God.³¹

God has revealed Himself in His Word and in the sending of His Son, Selnecker argued, and there is no God other than the Father, Son and Holy Spirit. Therefore, all who are outside the Church and ignorant of this revelation neither know

³¹"Quid interest inter agnitionem Dei propriam Ecclesiae, et eam, quam habent alii homines extra Ecclesiam? Agnitio Dei propria Ecclesiae, constat ipsius Dei patefactione, de essentia et voluntate divina, cum in lege, tum in doctrina Evangelii revelata. Alii autem homines, qui sine hac patefactione de Deo loquuntur, etsi sciunt Deum esse mentem aeternam, causam boni in natura, tamen errant tribus modis. I. Primum, in Dei essentia nihil norunt de tribus personis. II. Secundo, in Dei voluntate legali, tantum particulas legis considerant, et integram legem non habent, et de prima tabula prorsus muti sunt, et de Sexto praecepto leviter, et vix obiter disserent. De interiore vero obedientia et puritate, quae requiritur in nono et decimo praecepto, plane nihil statuere possunt. III. Tertio, De voluntate Dei in Evangelio comprehensa nihil norunt, sed Filium Dei ignorant." Catechesis D. Martini Lutheri minor graecolatina, et eiusdem repetitio, additis definitionibus et quaestionibus de praecipuis doctrinae christianae capitibus, edited by Paulus Heuslerus (Leipzig: Johannes Rhamba, 1575), First Commandment, p. 83; cf. p. 82.

God nor worship Him. Although they think they worship God, they really have no God at all and are nothing but idolaters.³²

In his commentary on Romans, Selnecker insisted that the true knowledge of God did not exist outside the Church or apart from the Word, the Sacraments and the Holy Spirit.³³

On a number of occasions Selnecker admitted that Abraham may have been led by the natural knowledge of God to reject the

³²"Argumentum. Qui invocat Deum creatorem coeli et terrae, invocat verum Deum. Ethnici, Turcae, et Iudaei invocant Deum creatorem coeli et terrae. Ergo invocant verum Deum.

"Respondeo ad Maiorem, Qui invocat Deum, scilicet, sicut se Deus patefecit in verbo suo et misso filio. Hunc Deum, qui se misso filio patefecit, Ethnici non invocant, Quare nunc ad Minorem respondendum est. Ethnici non invocant Deum creatorem coeli et terrae; quia non est alius Deus creator coeli et terrae, nisi Pater, Filius, et Spiritus S. Hunc Deum cum nec agnoscant, nec invocant, prorsus nullum Deum habent. Fingunt quidem sibi Deum, qui non est Deus, et creatorem, qui non est creator, et nihil aliud sunt, nisi Idolatrae." Ibid., First Article, p. 183. And: "Quod est discrimen verae invocationis in Ecclesia, et ethnicae invocationis?"

"Discrimen consistit in duobus, videlicet, in agnitione essentiae divinae, et in agnitione voluntatis divinae. Sola enim Ecclesia Christi novit essentiam et voluntatem Dei, quia credit Deo seipsum patefacienti. Caeteri omnes, quotquot sunt extra Ecclesiam, cum Deo seipsum patefacienti non credant, Deum nec norunt, nec invocant, quia non est alius Deus praeter hunc, qui est Pater Domini nostri Iesu Christi, et filius Dominus noster Iesus Christus, et Spiritus sanctus procedens a patre et filio, sicut se patefecit divinitas." Ibid., The Lord's Prayer, p. 251. See also his Symbolorum exegesis (Leipzig: Johannes Rhamba, 1575), Apostles' Creed, First Article, p. 92.

³³"Vult enim Deus omnes homines saluos fieri, et ad agnitionem veritatis pervenire. Haec agnitio non sit extra ecclesiam, sed in ecclesia: non sine verbo, sed per verbum: non sine Spiritu sancto, sed motu et efficacia Spiritus sancti operantis per verbum et usum sacramentorum: non sine poenitentia, sed in vera conversione ad Deum, et invocatione, et pietate." In omnes epistolas D. Pauli apostoli commentarius plenissimus, edited by M. Georgius Selneckerus (Leipzig:

idolatry of the Chaldeans.³⁴

Chytraeus

In his commentary on Matthew, Chytraeus asserted that the pagans do not know the true God revealed in His reliable Word, but doubt if there is a God and whether He is deaf or aware of what is going on. They do not know God's will, but are in doubt if God cares about men. The Church, on the other hand, prays to the true God, the Father of Jesus Christ, who has revealed Himself through the sending of His Son and the giving of the Gospel.³⁵

Jacobus Apelius/Abraham Lamberg, 1595), Romans: *Doctrina De Praedestinatione*, p. 212. See also: *Ibid.* on Romans 1:18-21, pp. 81-82, on 1 Corinthians 1:21-31, pp. 481-482.

³⁴This explanation of Abraham's rejection of idolatry was offered by the tenth century lexicographer, Suidas: Suidae Lexicon post Ludolphum Kusterum ad codices manuscriptos, recensuit Thomas Gaisford (Oxford: Typographeum Academicum, 1834), I, 19. Selnecker comments on Suidas' account in *Der gantze Psalter*, part I, on Psalm 19:1-4, fols. 109a and 109b; *Paedagogia*, II, 35, 97; In omnes epistolas D. Pauli apostoli commentarius plenissimus, on Romans 1:18-21, p. 80.

³⁵"Ethnici adorant quod nesciunt, hoc est, non agnoscunt verum Deum conditorem rerum, et patefactum in certo verbo, sed dubitant, an sit et quae res sit Deus, surda ne an intelligens. Ecclesiae autem invocatio directa est ad verum Deum patrem Domini nostri Jesu Christi, qui se patefecti misso filio, dato Evangelio et editis miraculis. II. Ethnici nesciunt voluntatem Dei, dubitant an Deus curet et exaudiat homines. Ecclesia autem scit se et suam invocationem Deo placere, et certa recipi et exaudiri propter Christum mediatorem." Commentarius in Matthaeum evangelistam, ex praelectionibus Davidis Chytraei collectus (Wittenberg: Johannes Crato, 1558), on Matthew 6:5-15, III. De Precatione, p. 155

Plato, Xenophon, Cicero and others, Chytraeus wrote in the foreword to his Genesis commentary, know that there is a God and of what sort He is. The books of Moses, the Prophets and the Apostles, however, teach the whole Law, the essence of God, the distinction between the three persons of the God-head, the creation of man, the cause of sin, the cause of human suffering and death, the wrath of God which must be placated, the forgiveness of sins for the sake of Jesus Christ, the immortality of man, the resurrection of the body, and everlasting life. All of these things are unknown to Plato, Numa and all the pagans.³⁶

Man is able to deduce that there is a God and that He is good, Chytraeus asserted later in the commentary on Genesis. Nevertheless, he continued, there is in man's mind since the fall into sin a dark ignorance of God, doubts about God's providence and will, and a lack of fear of God and faith and

³⁶"Agnoscunt Plato, Xenophon, Cicero, et similes, esse Deum, et tradunt praecepta de honesta vitae, imperiorum et morum gubernatione, quae pars sunt Legis divinae, quae naturae hominum divinitus insita est, ut doceat, quod sit, et qualis sit Deus. . . . Sed hi libris, Mosis, Prophetarum et Apostolorum, non modo totius Legis divinae doctrinam illustrant, sed etiam docent nos de essentia Dei, et tribus personis distinctis, Patre, Filio, et Spiritu sancto, de conditione Hominis, de causa Peccati, calamitatis et mortis humanae, de placanda ira Dei, de remissione peccatorum propter Filium Dei, Dominum nostrum Iesum Christum, de immortalitate hominum, de Resurrectione corporum, et vita aeterna. Has res tantas Platonius, Numae, Ciceroni, et omnibus ethnicis ignotas, patefecit Evangelion, quod cum prius ignotum esset omnibus creaturis, a Deo per Mosen, Prophetas, Christum, et Apostolos traditum et illustratum est." In Genesis enarratio, tradita ut ad lectionem, in Operum Tomus Primus (Leipzig: Henningus Grosius, 1599), Prolegomena, pp. 9-10.

love.³⁷

In a short treatise entitled De studio theologiae recte inchoando, Chytraeus contended that God does not want to be known or worshipped by men in any other way than as He has revealed Himself in His Word or in the Book written by the Prophets and Apostles.³⁸ The teaching of the Gospel about Christ is not a part of men's natural knowledge, Chytraeus added, but is a part of the divine revelation which is contained in the books written by the Prophets and Apostles.³⁹

The pagans are without the Word of God, the Promise and the Mediator, Chytraeus wrote in his commentary on Deuteronomy, and therefore are constantly in doubt if their prayers are received or heard by God.⁴⁰ God's Word adds certainty to

³⁷ See supra, p. 12, no. 1, and: "Nunc enim omnes ex virili semine nascentes adferunt in mente caliginem ignorantem Deum, et dubitationes de providentia et voluntate Dei. [Sic] in Voluntate aversionem a Deo, vacuitatem timoris Dei, fidei, dilectionis." Chytraeus, In Genesis enarratio, tradita ut ad lectionem, chap. 1, sec. 4, De doctrina imagine Dei, p. 30.

³⁸ "Cum enim Deus doctrinam de sua essentia et voluntate, scribi, et libris certis comprehendere voluerit, nec aliter a nobis agnosci et coli velit, quam sicut se in suo verbo, seu libro prophetarum et Apostolarum patefecit: perspicuum est, assiduum, et attentam huius libri lectionem, omnibus hominibus necessariam esse." (Wittenberg: Johannes Crato, 1562), II. Textus Bibliorum, fols. 5a-5b.

³⁹ "Cum enim doctrina Evangelii de Christo non ex noticiis natura notis, sed ex patefactionibus divinis, quae in libris Prophetarum et Apostolorum continentur, discenda sit: diligens, et accurata, et attentata horum librorum cognitio ab omnibus piis flagituratur." Ibid., fol. 5b.

⁴⁰ "Ethnici vero sine certo Dei verbo et promissione, et sine mediatore ad Deum accedentes, iudicant commune et naturale

man's natural knowledge. Nevertheless, the doctrines which are peculiar to the Christian religion are discerned neither through man's senses nor through the natural light of his mind. These doctrines are: the true knowledge of God and of the three persons of the Godhead, the Son of God, the cause of sin, the cause of human suffering and death, the forgiveness of sins and reconciliation with God, and the life everlasting.⁴¹ Because there is such great darkness and obscurity in men's minds, Chytraeus contended, it is impossible for man to know God without God's assistance. God wishes to be known, invoked and worshiped in this way only: as He has revealed Himself in His Word which He has confirmed with certain and infallible evidences. He rejects and condemns all human opinions and acts of worship that conflict

pathos esse, in aerumnis et miseriis auxilium a numine quodam coelesti petere, et manent in perpetua dubitatione an recipiantur et an exaudiantur." In Deuteronomium Mosis, in Operum Tomus Primus (Leipzig: Henningus Grosius, 1599), chap. 3, sec. 3, Discrimen inter invocationem Ecclesiae Dei et aliarum Gentium, p. 39.

⁴¹"Multa quidem nota nobis naturaliter, divina voce repetita sunt, ut omnia praecepta de honestis moribus et de vitae gubernatione, quorum summa in Decalogo comprehensa est, In his cum ad noticiam naturalem, divini verbi testimonium accedat, certitudo illustrior est et adsensio firmior, sicut navis stat firmiter nixa duabus anchoris: Sed tamen propria Religionis Christianae doctrina est de vera agnitione Dei et trium personarum divinitatis, de Filio Dei domino nostro Iesu Christo mediatore, de causa peccati, calamitatis et mortis humanae, de remissione peccatorum et reconciliatione cum Deo, et vita aeterna gratis propter Filium Dei pro nobis passum et resuscitatum donanda. Hae sententiae etsi nec per sensum per naturalem mentis lucem cernuntur: tamen propter divinam auctoritatem et patefactionem, verae, certae et immotae sunt, ac firmissima adsensione amplectendae." Ibid., chap. 4, sec. 2, p. 27.

with this Word which He Himself has given to men.⁴²

The pagans know that there is a God and that He is kind, Chytraeus asserted in a sermon. But they do not know the distinction between the three persons of the Godhead nor the will of God revealed in the Gospel. Although they know better, they approve of idolatrous worship of many gods. When they see things going badly for those who are good and well for those who are evil, they are oppressed by doubt.⁴³

In his Oratio de studio theologiae Chytraeus maintained that it is only through the doctrine of the Law and the Gospel revealed in the Word of God that God kindles faith in men's mind and bestows all of Christ's benefits and everlasting

⁴²"Cum enim in tanta caligine et tenebris mentium humanarum impossibile sit Homini sine Deo Deum cognoscere: a Deo ipso discendum est, quid de Deo, qui [sic] non, nisi se doctore, discitur, sentiendum et loquendum sit. Vult itaque Deus hoc uno modo se agnosci, invocari et coli, sicut ipse in suo verbo, certis et non fallen tibus testimoniis confirmato patefecit: et ad hanc patefactionem universam ecclesiam alligavit: et reijcit ac damnat omnes omnium hominum opiniones et cultus, cum hoc verbo a se tradito pugnantes." Ibid., chap. 4, sec. 2, p. 25.

⁴³"Etsi enim Ethnici ex naturali luce mentibus insita, et pulcherrimo hoc theatro naturae rerum, utcunque agnoscunt, esse Deum, mentem aeternam, sapientem, beneficam, iustam, inspectricem et iudicem rerum et actionum humanarum, cui iuxta lucem discernentem honesta et turpia mentibus insitam, obediendum sit: tamen nec discrimina trium personarum, nec voluntatem Dei in Evangelio revelatam noverunt, Et contra hanc ipsam noticiam naturae insitam, Idolatricos cultus monstrosae multitudinis Deorum approbant, et cum in praesentis vitae confusione, bonis saepe male esse, malis bene esse vident: opprimuntur dubitationibus Epicureis vel Academicis, quibus omnis illa religio labefactata cadit." Dispositiones epistolarum quae diebus dominicis et aliis, in ecclesia usitate populo proponi solent (Wittenberg: Joh. Lufft, 1576), Dominica trinitatis, Epistola Rom. 11, pp. 301-302.

salvation.⁴⁴

Commenting on Psalm 117, Chytraeus stated that the pagans have a natural knowledge of God, but do not know the Gospel promise of mercy for the sake of Jesus Christ. Instead, they remain in perpetual doubt whether God cares about them or hears their prayers or helps or delivers them. Their doubt strongly opposes faith and impedes and extinguishes prayer and praise to God.⁴⁵

In his commentary on Psalm 118, Chytraeus maintained that the philosophers do not know the mercy of God which has been revealed only in the Gospel.⁴⁶

⁴⁴"In hac verae Pietatis arte [theologia], artium omnium regina, primum doctrinam Legis et Evangelii, verbo Dei patefactam, cognosci necesse est, per quam solam et non aliter Deus fidem in mentibus discentium accendere, et consilia actionesque vitae omnes gubernare, et omnia Christi beneficia, aeternamque salutem tribuere decrevit." Oratio de studio theologiae, exercitiis verae pietatis et virtutis potius quam contentinibus et rixis disputationum colendo (Wittenberg: Clemens Schleich, 1581), fol. 5a.

⁴⁵"Habent quidem gentes naturae insitam et inscriptam cordibus suis notitiam legis, quod sit Deus, quod puniat scelera, benefaciat iustis: Sed Evangelii de gratuita misericordia propter Christum promissa ignari, non possunt statuere, se indignos et iniustos, si poenitentiam agant, et fide ad Christum mediatorem confugiant, in gratiam a Deo recipi, exaudiri, iuvari et liberari: Sed haerent in perpetua dubitatione, an Deo curae sint? an Deus invocantes exaudiat, iuvet, ac liberet, sicut illa apud Euripidem invocatur: O Dii. Sed quid Deos invoco? Nam et ante invocati non exaudiverunt. Haec dubitatio extreme pugnat cum fide, et impedit ac extinguat invocationem et laudem Deo." "Ps. CXVII, Laudate Dominum omnes gentes," In historiam Josuae, Judicum, Ruth, in Prophetas et Psalmos aliquot et Sententias Syracidae (Leipzig: [Michael] Lantzenberger, 1592), sec. 3, De Vocatione Gentium, p. 713.

⁴⁶"Haec aeterna Dei misericordia philosophis ignota, et in solo Evangelio patefacta est." "Ps. CXVIII, Confitemini,"

Conclusion

Chemnitz, Selnecker and Chytraeus displayed a broad agreement in their understanding of the nature and function of the natural knowledge of God. They saw it as forming part of God's external governance of the world. It rendered men inexcusable. It might drive men to seek the perfect revelation in the Church, but it did not provide the beginning of conversion. Instead, it always led men astray and into horrible idolatry. Even man's natural knowledge of God's goodness did not provide an adequate basis for trust or faith in God, but ultimately served as a revelation of God's wrath. This was so because the natural knowledge of the goodness of God confronted men with their ingratitude to God for His goodness and at the same time completely failed to give the individual any assurance that God really meant to be gracious to him.

In historiam Josuae, Judicum, Ruth, in Prophetas et Psalmos aliquot et Sententias Syracidae, Introduction, p. 732.

CHAPTER IV

THE FORMULA OF CONCORD AND THE DOCUMENTS LEADING UP TO IT

Introduction

Chemnitz, Selnecker and Chytraeus participated in the drafting of the Saxon-Swabian Concordia, the Torgic Book and the Formula of Concord. This chapter attempts to summarize what these documents assert about the goodness of creation and the natural knowledge of the goodness of God. The Swabian Concordia has been included for purposes of comparison. The pertinent passages will be cited from each of the documents in turn, and then a summary statement will be made comparing these passages with the material contained in Chapters I, II and III, above.

The Swabian Confession¹

Article I

Der Ander theil aber hatt dargegen
gelehrt, dass die Erbsünde, ei-
gentlich, nicht seie dess Menschen

¹H. Hachfeld, "Die schwäbische Confession, nach einer Wolfenbüttler Handschrift," Zeitschrift für die historische Theologie, Neue Folge, XXX (Zweites Heft, 1866), 230-301. Hereafter this work will be cited in the comparison of documents as SC, followed by article, page and line number.

Natur, Leib oder Seel, oder derselben Vornembste Kräfte, Welche zumahl alle geschöpff und Creatur Gottes seien und bleiben, auch nach dem fahl dess Menschen.
SC I, 239, 21-25.

Wir halten aber hinwiderumb auch gueten Unterschid, Zwischen der Natur dess Menschen, nemblich der Person seiner Seel, Und Leibs (So ferne sie Gott erschaffen) Und Zwischen de Erbsünde. Dann die Natur dess Menschen an Ihr selbst, nach Ihrem Wesen, Ist und bleibt auch nach dem fahl Unserer ersten Eltern, ein geschöpff Gottes, Wie geschriben steht: Er hatt Uns gemacht, Und nicht Wir Uns selber.
SC I, 240, 18-24.

Demnach befinden sich bei einem Jeden Menschen, Viererlai Unterschidliche Ding, nemblich 1. die Natur oder Person, 2. gedancken, 3. Wort, 4. Wercke, Wölche an In selber, alss Person, alss gedancken, alss Wort, alss Werck,

Gottes Geschöpf sein. Dann nicht allein die Natur des Menschen, Ist ein Geschöpf Gottes, sondern auch dass ein Mensch etwas gedencken, Reden Und Wirken kan, kompt alles von Gott her, dess Werk es ist, dann ohn Gott köndt Unser Leib und Seel, keinen augenblick bestehn, Wir köndten auch keine gedancken, Wort, Wirkung und Krefft haben.

SC I, 240, 28-33. Cf. 242, 17-20.

Diss Ist Wol zu mercken, den Unterscheid der Natur, oder Person, so In der erschaffung guett gewesen, Und der Sünde die Niemahls guet gewesen Ist, noch sein Würdt (Zur Ehr Gottes Unsers schöpffers, dessen Werck, des Menschen Natur, Und nicht die Sünde Ist) dadurch zu behalten.

SC I, 241, 24-28.

Also sind aller Unwidergeborner Menschen, gedancken, Wort, Und Werck, sündig, den Unterscheid, zwischen den gedanken, Wort, Und

Wercken (alss dem geschöpff Gottes) Und der Sünde, So Inn den gedanken, Wort Und Wercken (Alss dem Werck dess Teuffels) anzuzeigen, die dem Werck Gottes anhanget und Dasselbig Verderbet, Dann die Sünd Ist nicht etwass selbstendig, für sich selbst, sondern all Weg In einem Andern, Also dass das Böss nicht sein, Und für sich selbs bestehn kündte, Wann es nicht In einem gueten geschöpff Gottes Wer, dess Verderbung es Ist.

SC I, 241, 29-37.

Article II

Nachdem der Mensch nicht auss Aigner, eingepflantzter naigung, sonder aus Anregung und betrug Der Alten schlangen dess Teuffels beredt, dass er Gottes gebott Avertretten, hatt er die Bildnuss Gottes, der Gerechtigkait Und Hailigkait, darinnen er Anfangs, Von Gott erschaffen, durch solche Avertretten, Und demnach auch die Rechte, Wahrhaftige Erkenntnuss

Gottes, Und die Krafft seines
 freien Willens, zum gueten, In
 Gaistlichen sachen, Verlohren:
 Also, dass er alss ein Natürlich
 Mensch, nicht mehr vernimpt, Wass
 des Gaistes Gottes Ist, Es Ist Im
 ein thorhait, Und kan es nicht er-
 kennen, dann er würdt Von Gaist-
 lichen sachen gefragt: Dessglei-
 chen sein wille also verkeret,
 dass er nicht mehr Gott liebet,
 sonder ein Feind Gottes worden
 Ist, Wie geschriben steht:
 Fleischlich gesinnet sein, Ist ein
 feindschafft wider Gott, sintemahl
 er dem gesetz nicht underthan Ist,
 denn er vermag es auch nicht.
SC II, 244, 8-22.

Je lenger er [der Natürlich Mensch]
 auss aignen Kräfteften, Und seiner
 Vernunfft nach Gott und seinem
 Willen gedenckt, Je weniger er In
 recht erkent, sonder Immermehr Und
 mehr, Von seiner rechten Wahrhaff-
 tigen erkentnuss abweichet, so
 lang und vil, biss In der H. Gaist

Widerumb erleuchtet und dass Wahr-
hafftig erkenntnuss Gottes In Im
recht anzündet.

SC II, 247, 8-13.

The Saxon-Swabian Concordia

An early form of
The Saxon-Swabian Concordia²

Article I

Der ander teill aber hatt
dagegen gelehrett, das die
erbsunde eigentlich nicht sei
des Menschen Natur, substantz
oder wessen leib oder Seel,
welche Gescheppe und
Creatur gottes sein und bleiben
auch nach dem fall des mens-
chen.

VSSC I, 82, 20-23, Cp. 31-33.

The Saxon-Swabian Concordia³

Article I

Der ander teil aber hatt
dargegeben gelehret, das
die Erbsunde eigentlich
nichtt sei des menschen
Natur, substantz oder wesen,
das ist, des menschen leib
oder Seele, welche auch
itzundt nach dem fall in
uns gottes geschepff und
Creaturen sein und bleiben.

²"Die Schwäbisch-Sächsische Concordie," Heinrich Heppe, Geschichte des deutschen Protestantismus in den Jahren 1555-1581 (Marburg: N. G. Elwert'scher Druck und Verlag, 1857), III. B., 75-166. The editor of Die Bekenntnisschriften der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche (4. durchgesehene Auflage; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1959, p. xxxv) says that this is "eine Vorform der S[chwäbisch]-S[ächsische] K[onkordie] auf grund einer späten (1647, vgl. Heppe III 40, Anm.) Abschrift." Hereafter this work will be cited in the comparison of documents as VSSC, followed by article, page and line number.

³"Formula concordiae inter Sueuicas et Saxonicas Ecclesias,"

Es wirdt auch Gotte sein Ehr
gegeben, wen gottes werck und
gesceph an menschen von des
Teuffels wercke dadurch die
natur verderbt, recht unter-
scheiden wirtt.

VSSC I, 83, 6-8.

Und noch heutt zw tage in
dieser verderbung schafftt
und machtt Godt die sunde
nichtt, sondern mitt der
Natur, welche godt heut zw
tage an dem menschen noch
schapfett und machett, wirtt
die Erbsunde durch die
fleischliche entpfengenuss
und geburtt von Vatter und
mutter auss sundtlichem
samen mitt propagirett und
forttgeplantzett.

VSSC I, 83, 34-84, 3.

SSC I, 174, 25-29. Cp.
175, 1-3.

Es wirt auch gotte sein Eher
gegeben, wen gottes werck und
gescheppf am Menschen von des
teuffels wercken, dadurch die
Natur verderbt, recht unter-
scheiden wirt.

SSC I, 175, 10-13.

Und noch heut zw tage in
dieser verderbung schaffet
und macht godt in uns die
sunde nicht, sondern mit
der Natur (welche godt heut
zu tage in dem menschen noch
schaffet und machet) wird
die Erbsunde durch die
fleischlich entpfengenuss
und geburdt von vatter und
mutter auss sundtlichem
samen mit propagiret und
geplantzett.

SSC I, 176, 2-7.

Ibid., III. B., 166-325. Hereafter this work will be cited in
the comparison of documents as SSC, followed by article, page
and line number.

Also muss auch diese lehr auff der andere seiten vor dem Manicheischen irthumb verwharett werden, auch diese und dergleichen Opiniones verworffen, Als wurde itzundt nach dem fall die menschliche Natur erstlich rein und gutt geschaffen und das darnach von aussen die Erbsunde hineinkome.

VSSC I, 86, 10-14. Cp. 83, 2; 85, 3; 86, 23-28; 90, 9-12.

Es beklaget aber und verdammeth das gesetz unsere natur nicht darumb; so fern sie ein werck und Creatur gottes ist, sondern darumb, wie sie durch die sunde vergiftet und verderbt ist.

Also muss auch diese lehr auff der andern seiten fur dem Manicheer irthumb verwaret werden, Derhalben werden auch diese und dergleichen Opiniones verworffen, als das itzt nach dem fall die menschliche Natur erstlich rein und gutt geschaffen, und das darnach von Aussen die Erbsund als etwas wesentliches durch den Satan in die Natur eingegossen oder eingemenget wurde, wie gifft unter wein gemenget wirdt.

SSC I, 178, 31-179, 1; 175, 7; 177, 22; 179, 1-6, 23-29; 184, 24-27; 186, 10-12.

Es beklaget aber und verdammeth das gesetz unsere Natur nicht darumb, das wir menschen von godt erschaffen sindt, sondern darumb das wir sundig und bose sind, oder nicht darumb und so

VSSC I, 86, 36-87, 2.

So ists aber doch gleich-
woll nichtt ein ding, die
Natur oder das wesen leib
und secle oder der mensch
selber . . . und die Erb-
sunde die in des mens-
chen natur oder wesen wonett
und dieselbige verderbett.

VSSC I, 87, 7-12.

ferne die Natur und das
wesen auch nach dem fall in
uns ein werck geschepff und
Creatur Gottes ist, sondern
darumb und so ferne sie
durch die sunde vergifttet
und verderbtt ist.

SSC I, 180, 6-11

So ists doch gleichwoll nicht
ein dingk, die Natur oder das
wesen des Menschen, leib und
seel, oder der mensch selber
von gott erschaffen . . .
und die Erbsunde selbst, die
in des menschen Natur oder
wesen wonett und dieselbige
verderbtt. . . . Es muss
ein unterscheidt gehalten
werden zwischen unser Natur,
wie sie von Godt erschaffen
ist und erhalten wird, darin
die sunde wohnt, und zwischen
der Erbsunde, so in der Natur
wohnett.

SSC I, 180, 16-27.

In Articulo Creationis zeugett die schrift, das godt nicht allein fur dem fall menschliche natur geschaffen habe, sondern das auch nach dem fall in hac naturae corruptione Gott ein scephpher formator et factor sei dieser unser Natur dieses unsers wesens, unsers leibs und unserer seele, also das der mensche nach dem wesen wie er leib und seele hatt Ein Creatur und werk gottes sei, wiewoll die Creatur und das werk Gottes durch die sunde iemmerlichen verderbett ist. Deut. 32. Esa. 45. 54. 64. Acto. 17. Tob. 10. Psal. 139. Eccle. 12. Item Apoca. 4 Herr du hast alle ding geschaffen und auss deinem willen haben sie das wesen und sind erschaffen, wie auch unser kleiner Catechismus in der ausslegung des ersten artickels solchs bekennett.

Im Artikel von der schepfung zeuget die schrift, das godt nicht allein fur dem fall die menschliche Natur geschaffen habe, sondern das auch nach dem fall in dieser verderbung der menschlichen Natur Godt ein scephfer sei dieser unser Natur, dieses unsers wesens unseres leibs und unserer seele, Also das der Mensch nach dem wesen wie er leib und seele hatt, auch itzundt nach dem fall eine Creatur und werck Gottes sei: Deuteron. 32. Esaiiae 45. 54. 64. Acto. 17. Job. 10. Psal. 139. Eccles. 12. Apo. 4.

wie
auch unser kleiner Catechismus in der ausslegung des ersten artickels solches bekennett.

VSSC I, 87, 16-27. Cp.
34-35.

Derwegen das gottes geschepff
und werck im menschen von des
Teuffels werck unterscheiden
muge werden, sagen wir, das
es gottes geschepff sei das,
der mensch leib und seel hatt,
Item das es gottes werck sei,
das der mensch etwas gedenk-
ken, reden, thun and wurcken
konne. Dan in ihm leben
weben und sind wir. Acto. 17
VSSC I, 88, 4-9.

Was aber die schulwordtt
Dialectica et philosophica
vocabula substantiae et acci-
dentis anlangett, soll die
einfeltige kirche, weil die
wordtt dem gemeinen man unbe-
kandt, dammit billich ver-
schonett werden, man aber
gelerte in schulen oder son-
sten vocabulis artium vel
terminis dialecticis hievon

SSC I, 180, 31-181, 4.
Cp. 181, 4-6, 11-12, 23-24.

Derwegen das gottes geschepff
und werck am Menschen von des
Teuffels wercke unterschieden
muge werden, sagen wir, das
es gottes geschepff sei, das
der mensch leib und seele
hatt, Item das es gottes
werck sei, das der mensch
etwas gedenkken, reden, thun
und wircken konne. Dan in
ihm leben, weben und sind
wir, Acto. 17.

SSC I, 181, 30-36.

Dan wen die Geslehrten unter
sich in schulen oder sunst in
dieser Disputation solche
Schule und kunstworter, die
eigentlich in die Dialectica
gehoren, gebrauchen, so nennen
sie fur immediatam divisionem
solche teilung, da zwischen kein
mittel ist, das alles was da
ist, musse entweder Substantia
ein selbstendig wesen, oder

disputiren, weiss man woll,
 das es pro immediata divisione
 gehalten wird ut quicquid sit
vel substantia sit vel Acci-
dens.

VSSC I, 90, 3-9.

Article II

Nachdem der Mensch auss ahnre-
 gung undt betruch der alten
 Slangen des Teuffels fur-
 furet das Gottes gebodt uber-
 tretten hat er die bildniss
 Gotts die gerechticheit undt
 heiligkeit, darinnen er an-
 fangs von Godt erschaffen,
 durch solche ubertrettung
 und dennoch auch die rechte
 wharhaftige erkendniss Godts
 undt die krafft seins freien
 willens zhum guthen in geist-
 lichen sachen verlhorn also
 das ehr alss ein Naturlich
 Mensch nicht mher vornimpt,
 was des Geistes gottes ist,

accidens ein zufelliges ding
 sein, das nicht fur sich
 selbs wesentlich' bestehet,
 sondern in ciem andern selb-
 stendigen wesen ist und
 davon kan unterscheiden wer-
 den.

SSC I, 185, 33-186, 5.

Article II

Den erstlich des menschen vor-
 nunfft oder naturliche ver-
 standt, ob er noch wol ein
 dunckel funcklein der erken-
 tenisse [sic], das ein godt
 sei, und von der lehre des
 gesetzes hat, dennoch also un-
 wissendt blindt und verkeret
 ist, das wen schon die aller
 sinnreichsten und gelerten
 leute auff erden das Evange-
 lium vom sone godtes und
 verheissunge der ewigen salig-
 keit [sic] lesen oder horen,
 dennoch dasselbige uss [sic]
 eigen krefftten nicht verneh-
 men, fassen, recht verstehen

es ist ihm ein thorheit undt
 kan es nicht erkennen, den
 es wirdt von Geistleichen
 [sic] sachen gefraget 1 Cor.
 2.

VSSC II, 93, 15-23.

noch gleuben und vor warheit
 halten können, sunder wo mit
 grosserm fleiss und ernst sie
 die geistlichen sachen mit
 ihrer vernunft begreifen
 wollen, so sie es weniger
 [sic] verstehen oder gleuben,
 und allein fur thorheit und
 fabeln halten, ehe sie dorch
 den h. Geist erleuchtet und
 gelehret werden. [1 Corin-
 thians 1 and 2, Ephesians 4,
 Matthew 13 and Romans 3 are
 quoted.]

SSC II, 196, 15-26

Also nennet die schrift den
 naturlichen menschen in
 geistlichen und godtlichen
 sachen stracks eine finster-
 nisse, die gott nicht ken-
 net noch achtet, Eph. 5
 Act. 26 und Johan. 1, Das
 licht leuchtet in der fin-
 sternisse, das ist in fin-
 stern blinden welt, und die
 finsternisse habens nicht

begreifen.

SSC 197, 7-11.

The Torgic Book⁴ and the Solid Declaration
 (Bergic Book)⁵ and the Official 1584
 Latin Translation of the Latter⁶

Article I

Der ander Teil hat dagegen
 gelehret, dass die Erbsünde
 eigentlich nicht sei des
 Menschen Natur, Substanz
 oder Wesen, das ist des
 Menschen Leib oder Seel,
 welche auch itzund nach dem
 Fall in uns Gottes Geschöpf
 und Kreaturen sein und
 bleiben. . . .

SD I, 2, 845, 10-15. Cp.

845, 26-846, 5.

Altero vero pars contrarium
 asseruit: peccatum videlicet
 originale non esse ipsam
 hominis naturam, substantiam
 aut essentiam, hoc est ipsius
 hominis corpus et animam
 (quae hodie in nobis etiam
 post lapsum sunt manentque
 Dei opus et creatura). . . .

SD I, 2, 845, 10-16. Cp.

846, 3-10

⁴"Das Torgische Buch," Die Bekenntnisschriften der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche, pp. 829-1100. Hereafter this work will be cited in the comparison of documents as TB. Its text is substantially the German text above, minus words or phrases enclosed in | } or ><.

⁵"Solida Declaratio," Ibid. Hereafter this work will be cited in the comparison of documents as SD, followed by article, paragraph, page and line number. The SD text is the German text above, minus words or phrases enclosed in []. Words and phrases so enclosed are significant omissions from the TB.

⁶Ibid.

Es wird auch Gott seine Ehr gegeben, wenn Gottes Werk und Geschöpf an Menschen von des Teufels Werk, dardurch die Natur vorderbt, recht unterschieden wird.

SD I, 3, 846, 20-24.

Und noch heutzutage in dieser Vorderbung schafft und macht Gott in uns die Sünde nicht, sondern mit der Natur, welche Gott heutzutage an den Menschen noch schafft und machet, wird die Erbsünde durch die fleischliche Empfängnis und Geburt von Vater und Mutter aus sündlichem Samen mit fortpflanzet.

SD I, 7, 847, 29-36.

Also muss auch diese Lehr auf der andern Seiten für dem manichäischen Irrtumb verwahrt werden. Derhalben werden auch diese und dergleichen irrigte Lehren verworfen, als: dass itzo nach

Ac insuper Deo gloria sua tribuitur, quando opus Dei et creatura in homine a diaboli opere (per quod natura corrupta est) recte discernitur.

SD I, 3, 846, 22-25.

Et hodie, etiam in hac naturae corruptione, Deus non creat aut facit in nobis peccatum, sed una cum natura, quam Deus etiamnum in hominibus creat et efficit, peccatum originale per carnalem conceptionem et nativitatem a patre et matre (ex semine per peccatum corrupto) propagatur.

SD I, 7, 847, 28-36

Vera autem haec doctrina etiam ab altera parte contra Manichaeorum errores probe munienda est. Quare haec et similia alia falsa dogmata reiiciuntur, ut: quod initio quidem humana natura bona et

dem Fall die menschliche Natur
|anfangs | rein und gut geschaf-
fen und darnach von aussen die
Erbsünde (als etwas Wesentlichen)
durch den Satan in die Natur
eingegossen und eingemenget
werde, wie Gift under Wein
gemengt wird.

SD I, 26, 852, 10-20. Cp. 3,
846, 15; 16, 850, 7; 27, 852,
21-28; 30, 853, 26-34; 55,
862, 18-22.

Es beklaget aber und verdam-
met das Gesetz unser
Natur nicht darumb, dass
wir Menschen von Gott erscaf-
fen sind, sondern darumb,
dass sündig und böse sind, |
wie auch | nicht darumb und
sofern die Natur und das
Wesen auch nach dem Fall in
uns ein Werk; Geschöpf und
Kreatur Gottes ist, sondern
darumb und soferne sie durch
die Sünde vergiftet und ver-
derbt ist.

pura a Deo creata sit, verum
iam post lapsum extrinsecus
peccatum originale (tanquam
quiddam essenziale) per Sata-
nam in naturam infusum et cum
ea permixtum sit, quemadmodum
venenum vino admiscetur.

SD I, 26, 852, 10-20. Cp.
3, 846, 16-17; 16, 850, 7;
27, 852, 21-28; 30, 853, 26-
35; 55, 862, 16-22.

Lex autem naturam nostram
non eam ob causam accusat
et damnat, quod homines
simus, a Deo creati, sed ea
de causa, quod peccatores
et mali simus. Neque eate-
nus lex naturam accusat et
damnata, quatenus etiam post
lapsum ea in nobis est opus
et creatura Dei, sed propte-
rea et eatenus, quod per pec-
catum infecta et corrupta
est.

SD I, 32, 854, 12-20.

SD I, 32, 854, 12-20.

So ist doch gleichwohl nicht ein Ding die verderbte Natur oder das Wesen des [verderbten] Menschen, Leib und Seel oder der Mensch selber von Gott erschaffen . . . und die Erbsünde selbst, die in des Menschen Natur oder Wesen wohnt und dieselbige verderbet. . . . Es muss ein Unterschied gehalten werden >auch< zwischen unser [verderbten] Natur, wie sie von Gott erschaffen und erhalten wird, darinne die Sünde wohnt, und zwischen der Erbsünde, so in der Natur wohnt; die beide müssen und können auch unterschiedlich | nach der H. Schrift betrachtet, gelehret und gegläubet | werden.

SD I, 33, 854, 28-855, 8.

Cp. 38, 856, 4-6.

Tamen non unum et idem est corrupta natura seu substantia corrupti hominis, corpus et anima aut homo ipse a Deo creatus . . . et ipsum originale peccatum, quod in hominis natura aut essentia habitat eamque corrumpit.

. . . Discrimen igitur retinendum est inter naturam nostram, qualis a Deo creata est hodieque conservatur, in qua peccatum originale habitat, et inter ipsum peccatum originis, quod in natura habitat.

Haec enim duo secundum s. scripturae regulam distincte considerari, doceri et credi debent et possunt.

SD I, 33, 854, 29-855, 10.

Cp. 38, 856, 4-7.

Im artikel von der Schöpfung zeuget die Schrift, dass Gott nicht alleine für dem Fall menschliche Natur geschaffen habe, sondern dass > sie < auch nach dem Fall [unser, wiewohl verderbte menschliche Natur] eine Kreatur und Werk Gottes sei. Deut. 32.; Isai. 45. 54. 64.; Actor. 17.; Apoc. 4 [Job 10:8-12, Psalm 139: 14-16, and Ecclesiastes 12:7 are quoted in paragraphs 35-37.]

SD I, 34, 855, 14-19. Cp. 38, 856, 23-26; 39, 856, 38-39; 41, 857, 7.

Unser kleiner Catechismus in der Auslegung des ersten Artikels bekennet, da also geschrieben: "Ich gläube, dass > mich < Gott geschaffen hat sambt allen Kreaturen, mir Leib und Seel, Augen, Ohren und alle Glieder, Vernunft und alle Sinne gegeben

In primo enim articulo de creatione docet sacra scriptura Deum non modo ante lapsum humanam naturam creasse, verum etiam eandem post lapsum esse Dei opus et creaturam.

SD I, 34, 855, 14-19. Cp. 38, 856, 27-30; 39, 42-43; 41, 857, 6-7.

Minor noster Catechismus in explicatione primi articuli testatur, ubi ita scriptum est: Credo, quod Deus me creaverit, sicut et omnes alias creaturas, quodque mihi animam et corpus, oculos, aures et omnia membra, rationem et sensus

hat und noch erhält."

SD I, 38, 856, 10-16.

Im grossen Catechismo stehet also geschrieben: "Das meine und glübe ich, dass ich Gottes Geschöpf bin, das ist, dass er mir gegeben hat und ohne Unterlass erhält Leib, Seel und Leben, Gliedmass, klein und gross, alle Sinne, Vernunft und Vorstand," etc.

SD I, 38, 856, 16-22.

Derwegen und auf dass Gottes Geschöpf und Werk am Menschen von des Teufels Werk unterschieden muge werden, sagen wir, dass es Gottes Geschöpfe sei, dass Der Mensch Leib und Seele hat. Item dass es Gottes Werk sei, dass der Mensch etwas gedenken, reden, tun und wirken könne, dann "in ihm leben, weben und sind wir,"

omnes largitus sit et adhuc conservet.

SD I, 38, 856, 12-19.

Et in Maiore Catechismo haec verba exstant: Hoc : sentio et credo, me esse Dei creaturam, hoc est, mihi ab ipso donata esse et semper conservari corpus meum, animam, vitam, membra tam minima quam maxima, omnes sensus totamque meam rationem et intellectum etc.

SD I, 38, 856, 19-26.

Quapropter, ut opus et creatura Dei in homine ab opere diaboli discerni queat, asserimus, quod homo corpus et animam habet, id habere eum beneficio creationis divinae, et quidem id ipsum Dei esse opus, quod homo aliquid cogitare, loqui, agere, operari potest. In ipso enim vivimus, movemur et sumus, inquit apostolus.

Act. 17.

SD I, 42, 857, 18-26.

Cp. 29.

Sollich Wort [accidens] dienet allein darzu, den Unterscheid zwischen dem Werk Gottes, wölchs ist unser Natur, unangesehen dass sie verderbt ist, und zwischen des Teufels Werk, wölchs ist die Sünde, die im Werk Gottes steckt, und derselben allertiefeste und unaussprechliche Verderbung ist, anzuzeigen.

SD I, 61, 865, 12-18.

Cp. 55, 862, 17.

SD I, 42, 857, 19-28.

Cp. 31.

Vocabulum autem accidentis in hunc tantum finem usurpatur, ut discrimen inter opus Dei (quod est nostra natura, etiam corrupta) et inter diaboli opus (quod est peccatum in opere Dei inhaerens, eius videlicet operis intima et ineffabilis corruptio) monstretur.

SD I, 61, 865, 12-19. Cp.

55, 862, 15.

Article II

Dann erstlich, des Menschen Vernunft oder natürlicher Verstand, ob er gleich noch wohl ein tunkel Fünkeln des Erkenntnus, dass ein Gott sei, | wie auch, Ro. 1., | von der Lehr des Gesetzes hat: dennoch also

Primo, etsi humana ratio seu naturalis intellectus hominis obscuram aliquam notitiae illius scintillulam reliquam habet, quod sit Deus, et particulam aliquam legis tenet: tamen adeo ignorans, caeca et

unwissend, blind und verkehret ist, dass, wann schon die allersinnreichsten und gelehrtesten Leute auf Erden das Evangelium vom Sohn Gottes und Vorheissung der ewigen Seligkeit lesen oder hören, dennoch dasselbige aus eigenen Kräften nicht vernehmen, fassen, verstehen noch gläuben und vor Wahrheit halten können, sondern je grössern Fleiss und Ernst sie anwenden und diese geistliche Sachen mit ihrer Vernunft begreifen wollen, je weniger sie vorstehen oder gläuben und solchs alles allein für Torheit und Fabeln halten, ehe sie durch den Heiligen Geist erleuchtet und gelehret werden. [1 Corinthians 2:14, 1:21; Ephesians 4:17, 18; Matthew 13:13, 11; Romans 3:11-12 are quoted.]
SD II, 9. 874, 34-875, 6.

perversa est ratio illa, ut, etiamsi ingeniosissimi et doctissimi homines in hoc mundo evangelion de filio Dei et promissiones divinas de aeterna salute legant vel audiant, tamen ea propriis viribus percipere, intelligere, credere, et vera esse statuere nequeant. Quin potius, quanto diligentius in ea re elaborant, ut spirituales res istas suae rationis acumine indagent et comprehendant, tanto minus intelligunt et credunt, et ea omnia pro stultitia et meris nugis et fabulis habent, priusquam a spiritu sancto illuminentur et doceantur. [1 Corinthians 2:14, 1:21; Ephesians 4:17, 18; Matthew 13:13, 11; Romans 3:11-12 are quoted.]
SD II, 9, 874, 34-875, 7.

Also nennet die Schrift den natürlichen Menschen in geistlichen und göttlichen Sachen stracks "eine Finsternus."

Eph. 5. Act. 26. Johan. 1.: "Das Licht leuchtet in der Finsternus (das ist, in der finstern, blinden Welt, die Gott nicht kennet noch achtet) und die Finsternus habens nichtbegriffen."

SD II, 10, 875, 32-39.

Et sacra scriptura hominem naturalem in rebus divinis et spiritualibus tenebras vocat. Lux in tenebris lucet, hoc est, in tenebricoso et excaecato mundo, qui Deum neque novit neque curat, et tenebrae eam non comprehenderunt.

SD II, 10, 875, 28-34.

The Epitome⁷

Article I

Wir glauben, lehren und bekennen, dass ein Unterschied sei zwischen der Natur des Menschen, nicht allein wie er anfangs von Gott rein und | heilig | ohne Sünde erschaffen

Credimus, docemus et confitemur, quod sit aliquod discrimen inter ipsam hominis naturam, non tantum quemadmodum initio a Deo purus et sanctus et absque peccato homo

⁷"Epitome," Ibid., pp. 767-827. Hereafter this work will be cited in the comparison of documents as EP, followed by article, paragraph, page and line number.

sonder auch wie wir sie
 itzunder | nach dem Fall |
 haben, nmblich zwischen
 der Natur, | so auch nach dem
 Fall noch ein Creatur Gottes
 ist und bleibt, | und der
 Erbsnde, und dass solcher
 Unterschied so gross als der
 Unterschied zwischen Gottes
 und des Teufels Werk sei.

EP I, 2, 770, 26-36.

Dann nicht allein Adams und
 Eva Leib und Seel vor dem
 Fall, sondern auch unser
 Leib und Seel nach dem Fall,
 unangesehen dass sie vor-
 derbet, Gott geschaffen,
 welche auch Gott noch fr
 sein Werk erkennenet, | wie
 geschrieben stehet | Job.
 10.: "Deine Hnde haben
 mich gearbeitet und gemacht,
 alles was ich umb und umb

conditus est, verum etiam
 qualem iam post lapsum natu-
 ram illam habemus; dis-
 crimen, inquam, inter
 ipsam naturam, quae etiam
 post lapsum est permanetque
 Dei creatura, et inter pec-
 catum originis, et quod
 tanta sit illa naturae et
 peccati originalis dif-
 ferentia, quanta est inter
 opus Dei et inter opus
 diaboli.

EP I, 2, 770, 26-38.

Deus enim non modo Adami
 et Hevae corpus et animam
 ante lapsum, verum etiam
 corpora et animas nos-
 tras post lapsum creavit,
 etsi haec iam sunt cor-
 rupta. Et sane hodie
 Dominus animas et corpora
 nostra creaturas et opus
 suum esse agnoscit, sicut
 scriptum est: Manus tuae
 fecerunt me at plasmaverunt

bin."

EP I, 4, 771, 11-18.

Wir verwerfen und verdammen auch als ein manichäischen Irrtumb, wann gelehrt wird, dass die Erbsünde sei eigentlich und ohne allen Unterschied des vorderbten Menschen Substanz, Natur und Wesen selbst, also dass kein Unterscheid zwischen der Natur | nach dem Fall | an ihr selbst und der Erbsünde sollte auch nicht gedacht, > noch < nut Gedanken voneinander unterscheiden werden | könnten. |

EP I, 19, 774, 13-22.

Cp. 17, 773, 42-774, 6.

Dann der Unterscheid zwischen Gottes und des Teufels Werk auf das deutlichts dardurch angezeigt, weil der Teufel kein Substanz

me totum in circuitu.

EP I, 4, 771, 11-19.

Reiicimus etiam atque damnamus ut Manichaeum errorem, quando docetur originale peccatum proprie et quidem nullo posito discrimine esse ipsam hominis corrupti substantiam, naturam et essentiam, ita ut inter naturam corruptam post lapsum per se ipsam consideratam, et inter peccatum originis nulla prorsus sit differentia neque ulla distinctio cogitari aut saltem peccatum illud a natura cogitatione discerni possit.

EP I, 19, 774, 13-23. Cp.

17, 773, 42-774, 6.

Nam hisce vocabulis discrimen inter opus Dei et inter opus diaboli quam maxime perspicue explicari potest. Diabolus enim

schaffen, sondern allein zufälligerweise aus Gottes Verhängnis die von Gott erschaffene Substanz verderben kann.

EP I, 25, 776, 1-6.

substantiam nullam creare, sed tantummodo per accidens, permittente Domino, substantiam a Deo creatam depravare potest.

EP I, 25, 776, 1-7.

Article II

Hiervon ist unser Lehre, Glaub und Bekenntnus, dass des Menschen Vorstand und Vornunft, in geistlichen Sachen blind, nichts vorstehe aus seinen eigenen Kräften, wie geschrieben stehet: "Der natürliche Mensch vernimmt nicht vom Geist Gottes; es ist ihm ein Torheit, und kann es nicht begreifen," > wann <er wird von geistlichen Sachen gefraget.

EP II, 2, 776, 33-777, 5.

De hoc negotio haec est fides, doctrina et confessio nostra, quod videlicet hominis intellectus et ratio in rebus spiritualibus prorsus sint caeca, nihilque propriis viribus intelligere possint. Sicut scriptum est: Animalis homo non percipit ea, quae sunt spiritus; stultitia illi est, et non potest intelligere, quia de spiritualibus examinatur.

EP II, 2, 776, 33-777, 5.

Selnecker's Unofficial Latin Translation
of the Formula of Concord⁸

A comparison of Selnecker's unofficial 1580 Latin translation of the Formula of Concord and the official Latin translation cited above disclosed no significant differences in Article I or II on the subjects under consideration in this thesis.

Conclusion

A comparison of the private writings of Chemnitz, Selnecker and Chytraeus as cited in Chapters One, Two and Three above and their public writing cited in this chapter reveals these similarities: Both affirm that man, even after the fall into sin, is and remains a creature and work of God. Both accept the substance/accident distinction as a valid way of distinguishing between God's creation and the corruption of it by sin. Both affirm that man has a natural knowledge of God and His Law. Both deny that this natural knowledge of God is sufficient for salvation or is a beginning of conversion.

A comparison of the private writings of Chemnitz, Selnecker and Chytraeus as cited in Chapters One, Two and Three above and their public writings cited in this chapter reveals these differences: The goodness of the created

⁸ In Concordia (Leipzig: Johannes Steinman, 1580), pp. 541-790.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

Martin Chemnitz, Nicholas Selnecker and David Chytraeus repeatedly affirmed the goodness of creation, even after its fall into sin.

All three writers asserted explicitly and/or implicitly that man has a natural knowledge of the goodness of God.

The three writers displayed a broad agreement in their understanding of the nature and function of the natural knowledge of God. According to them it formed part of God's external governance of the world. It also rendered men inexcusable. It might drive men to seek the perfect revelation in the Church, but it did not provide the beginning of conversion. Instead, by itself, it always led men astray and into horrible idolatry. Even man's natural knowledge of God's goodness did not provide an adequate basis for trust or faith in God, but ultimately served as a revelation of God's wrath. This was so because the natural knowledge of the goodness of God confronted men with their ingratitude to God for His goodness and at the same time completely failed to give the individual any assurance that God really meant to be gracious to him.

Finally, a comparison of the private writings of Chemnitz, Selnecker and Chytraeus as cited in Chapters One, Two and Three and their symbolical writings as cited in Chapter Four

reveals these similarities and differences: Both sets of writings affirm that man, even after the fall into sin, is and remains a creature and work of God. Both accept the substance/accident distinction as a valid way of distinguishing between God's creation and the corruption of it by sin. Both affirm that man has a natural knowledge of God and His Law. Both deny that this natural knowledge of God is sufficient for salvation or is a beginning of conversion. The goodness of creation is explicitly affirmed in the former set of writings, but not in the latter. The natural knowledge of the goodness of God is explicitly and/or implicitly affirmed in the former, but not in the latter.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Primary Sources

Die Bekenntnisschriften der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche.
Vierte durchgesehene Auflage. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck
und Ruprecht, 1959.

Chemnitz, Martin. "An Autobiography of Martin Kemnitz,"
translated from the German and Latin by A. [L.]
G[raebner], Theological Quarterly, III (October 1899),
472-487.

----- . De controversia, utrum in Ecclesia retinenda sit
propositio: Quod bona opera renatorum sint necessaria.
Bound with Loci theologici. Frankfurt: Christianus
Henricus Schumacher, 1690. Part III, pages 27-62.

----- . The Doctrine of Man in Classical Lutheran Theology.
Edited by Herman A. Preus and Edmund Smits and trans-
lated from the works of Martin Chemnitz and Johann
Gerhard by Mario Colacci and others. Minneapolis:
Augsburg Publishing House, 1962.

----- . De duabus naturis in Christo de hypostatic earum
unione de communicatione idiomatum, et aliis quaestio-
nibus inde dependentibus libellus ex scripturae sen-
tentiis, et ex purioris antiquitatis testimoniis summo
studio, et mira dexteritate. Bound with Loci theo-
logici. Frankfurt: D. Tobias Mevius et Elerd
Schumacher, 1653.

----- . D. Martini Chemnitii Richtige und inn H. Schrifft
wolgegründete erklärungs etlicher hochwichtiger und
nötiger Artickel unser Christlichen Religion in son-
derliche Tractat und Predigten gefasset. Frankfurt
on the Main: Johann Spiess, 1592.

----- . Enchiridion. Handbüchlein der vornehmsten Haup-
stücke der christlichen Lehre, durch Frage und Antwort
aus Gottes Wort einfältig und gründlich erkläret, an-
fänglich gestellet zum Unterrichts der Pastoren in der
Visitation des Fürstentums Braunschweig, jetzund von
neuem überlesen und gebessert. Edited by A. L.
Grübner. Milwaukee: Georg Brumder, 1886.

----- . Examen Concilii Tridentini. Edited by Eduard
Preuss. Berlin: Gustav Schlawitz, 1861.

- . Die fürnemsten Hauptstück der Christlichen Lehre.
Wie darinn die Pastoree [sic!] der Kirchen/ im Fürstent-
humb Braunschweig/ etc. in den Jerlichen Visitationibus/
also examiniret unnd befraget werden/ das sie zuleich
darin gründtlich berichtet unnd unterweiset werden.
Wulffenbüttel: Conrad Horn, 1569. Bound with Tilemanus
Heshusius, Examen Theologicum (Jena: n.p., 1571).
- . Fundamenta sana doctrinae de vera et substantiali
praesentia. Bound with Loci theologici. Frankfurt:
D. Tobias Mevius et Elord Schumacher, 1653.
- . Harmonia quatuor evangelistarum. Geneva: Petrus
Chouët, 1645.
- . Loci theologici. Frankfurt: Christianus Henricus
Schumacher, 1690.
- . Simplex et brevis resolutio scripti, in quo dispu-
tatur, originale peccatum esse ipsam substantiam hominis.
Item, ipsam animam hominis esse peccatum originale.
Bound with Loci theologici. Frankfurt: Christianus
Henricus Schumacher, 1690. Part I, pp. 241-245.
- . Theses. Bound with Loci theologici. Frankfurt:
Christianus Henricus Schumacher, 1690.
- . "Von Doct. Martini Chemnitii Leben und Verrich-
tungen/ nebst andern dabei vorfallenden Materien,"
Antiquitates Ecclesiasticae inclutae urbis Brunsvigae;
Oder, Der berühmten Stadt Braunschweig Kirchen-Historie.
Edited by P. J. Rehtmeier. III. Braunschweig:
Friedrich Zilliger, 1707. Pp. 273-536.
- . Wolgegründter Bericht/ von den fürnemsten Artikeln=
Christlicher Lehre/ so zu unsern Zeiten streitig worden
sein/ was eines jeden Artikels rechter verstandt sei/
und wie man in Gottes furcht/ ohne abbruch der warheit
von einem jeden Artikel/ aus der rechten Grundfest des
Göttlichen worts/ mit bescheidenheit reden möge oder
solle. Bound with Corpus Doctrinae, Das ist/ Die Summa/
Form und Fürbilde der reinen Christliche Lehre/ aus der
heiligen Göttlichen Schrift der Propheten und Aposteln
zusammen gezogen. Heinrichstadt: Conrad Horn, 1576.
In the 1577 Anhang, pp. 45-124.
- Chytraeus, David. Commentarius in Matthaeum evangelistam,
ex praelectionibus Davidis Chytraei collectus. Witten-
berg: Johannes Crato, 1558.
- . De studio theologiae recte inchoando. Wittenberg:
Johannes Crato, 1562.

- . Dispositiones epistolarum quae diebus dominicis et aliis, in ecclesia usitate populo proponi solent. Wittenberg: Joh. Lufft, 1576.
- . Explicatio Apocalypsis Joannie perspicua et brevis. Wittenberg: Johannes Crato, 1564.
- . Explicatio Malachiae. Rostock: Jacobus Transylvannus [i.e. Lucius], 1568.
- . In Exodum Enarratio. Wittenberg: Johannes Crato, 1563.
- . In historiam Josuae, Judicum, Ruth, in Prophetas et Psalmos aliquot et Sententias Syracidae. Explicationes utilissimae et Onomasticon Theologicum, postremo recognitum: Coniunctum ac Emendate edita. Leipzig: [Michael] Lantzenberger, 1592.
- . On Sacrifice; A Reformation Treatise in Biblical Theology. Edited and translated from the 1569 Latin edition by John Warwick Montgomery. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1962.
- . Operum Tomus Primus, continens enarrationes in quinque libros Mosis, fontis totius scripturae Propheticae et Apostolicae. Leipzig: Henningus Grosius, 1599.
- . Oratio de studio theologiae, exercitiis verae pietatis et virtutis potius quam contentinibus et rixis disputationum colendo. Wittenberg: Clemens Schleich, 1581.

Hachfeld, H. "Die schwäbische Confession, Nach einer wolffenbüttler Handschrift," Zeitschrift für die historische Theologie, Neue Folge, XXX (Zweites Heft, 1866), 230-301.

Heppe, Heinrich, editor. "Formula concordiae inter Suevicas et Saxonicas Ecclesias," Geschichte des deutschen Protestantismus in den Jahren 1555-1581. Vol. III. B. Marburg: N. G. Elwert'scher Druck und Verlag, 1857, 166-325.

----- . "Die Schwäbisch-Sächsische Concordie," Geschichte des deutschen Protestantismus in den Jahren 1555-1581. III. B. Marburg: N. G. Elwert'scher Druck und Verlag, 1857. Pp. 75-166.

Selnecker, Nicholas. Catechesis D. Martini Lutheri minor graecolatina, et eiusdem repetitio, additis definitionibus et quaestionibus de praecipuis doctrinae

christianae capitibus, its instituta, ut doctibus in Ecclesiis et Scholis, praesertim hac aetate, usui esse possit, inprimis vero accommodata ad usum Scholarum puerilium, cum pro magistris, tum pro discipulis. Edited by Paulus Heuslerus. Leipzig: Johannes Rhamba, 1575.

- . editor-translator. Concordia. Pia et unanimi consensu repetita confessio fidei et doctrinae electorum, principum, et ordinum imperii, atque eorundem theologorum, qui Augustanam Confessionem amplectuntur, et nomina sua huic libro subscripserunt. Leipzig: Johannes Steinman, 1580.
- . Der gantze Psalter des Koniglichen / Propheten Davids ausgelegt und in drei Bücher getheilt. Nuremberg: Christoff Heusler, 1569.
- . In Genesis, primum librum Moysi, commentarius ita scriptus, ut doctibus et discentibus coelestem doctrinam magno usui esse possit, hoc praesertim tempore. Leipzig: Johannes Rhamba, 1569.
- . In omnes epistolas D. Pauli apostoli commentarius plenissimus, continens omnium fere christianae et syncerae religionis locorum explicationes succinctas et dilucidas; ad usum tam doctium quam discentium in ecclesia Christi directas. Edited by Georgius Selneccerus. Leipzig: Jacobus Apelius/Abraham Lamberg), 1595.
- . Paedagogia Christiana, continens Decalogi explicationem, iam postremo recognitae et auctae. Accessit doctrina de libero et servus arbitrio: et de fine hominis disputatio Christiana et Ethica. Frankfurt on the Main: Georgius Corvinus, 1571.
- . Symbolorum, Apostolici, Niceni, et Athanasiani exegesis, fideliter repetens doctrinam perpetuam ecclesiae Dei de praecipuis capitibus et articulis Christianae fidei, inprimis de divinitate aeterna Filii Dei, de unione hypostatica duarum naturaum in Christo, de maiestate Filii hominis, de communicatione idiomatum, de coena Domini etc. Leipzig: Johannes Rhamba, 1575.

B. Secondary Sources

Baier, Johann Wilhelm. Compendium Theologiae Positivae. Edited by C. F. W. Walther. 3 vols. St. Louis: Concordia-Verlag, 1879.

- Barth, Karl. Die Kirchliche Dogmatik. Vols. I-IV.
Zollicon-Zürich: Evangelischer Verlag, 1939-59.
- Birkner, H. J. "Naturliche Theologie und Offenbarungstheologie. Ein theologiegeschichtlicher Überblick," Neue Zeitschrift für Systematische Theologie, III (1961), 279-295.
- Elert, Werner. Theologie und Weltanschauung des Luthertums hauptsächlich im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert. Vol. I of Morphologie des Luthertums. Munich: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1931.
- Frank, F. H. R. Die Theologie der Concordienformel, historisch-dogmatisch entwickelt und beleuchtet. 4 vols. in 2. Erlangen: Verlag von Theodor Blaesing, 1858.
- Gass, W. Geschichte der Protestantischen Dogmatik in ihren Zusammenhänge mit der Theologie überhaupt. 4 vols. Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1854-1867.
- Harnack, Adolf von. History of Dogma. Translated from the 3rd German edition by Neil Buchanan. New York: Russell and Russell, 1958.
- Hirsch, Emanuel. Hilfsbuch zum Studium der Dogmatik; die Dogmatik der Reformatoren und der altevangelischen Lehrer quellenmässig belegt und verdeutscht. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1937.
- Janetzki, Elvin Walter. "Natural Theology in Lutheran Theology." Unpublished Bachelor's Thesis, Concordia Seminary, 1957.
- Kinder, Ernst. "Das vernachlässigte Problem der natürlichen Gotteserfahrung in der Theologie," Kerygma und Dogma, IX (October 1963), pp. 316-333.
- Krabbe, Otto. David Chytraeus. Rostock: Stiller'sche Hofbuchhandlung, 1870.
- Krauth, Charles P. The Conservative Reformation and its Theology. As Represented in the Augsburg Confession, and in the History and Literature of the Evangelical Lutheran Church. Philadelphia: The United Lutheran Publication House, 1871.
- Kriewaldt, E. "The Life and Work of Martin Chemnitz," Australasian Theological Review, VII (April 1936), pp. 33-48.

- Lackmann, Max. Vom Geheimnis der Schöpfung; die Geschichte der Exegese von Römer 1, 18-23, 11, 14-16 und Acta XIV, 15-17, XVII, 22-29 vom 2. Jahrhundert bis zum Beginn der Orthodoxie. Stuttgart: Evangelisches Verlagswerk, 1952.
- Löfgren, David. Die Theologie der Schöpfung bei Luther. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1960.
- Lossner, Arthur B. "Martin Chemnitz and his locus De Sacra Scriptura against Roman errors." Unpublished Bachelor's Thesis, Concordia Seminary, 1947.
- Neve, Juergen Ludwig. A History of Christian Thought. Vol. I. Philadelphia: United Lutheran Publishing House, 1943.
- Noth, Gottfried. "Grundzüge der Theologie des Martin Chemnitz." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Erlangen, 1930. On microfilm in Fuerbringer Library, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, Missouri.
- . "Peccata contra conscientiam," Gedenkschrift für D. Werner Elert: Beiträge zur historischen Theologie. Edited by Ernst Kinder and Others. Berlin: Lutherisches Verlagshaus, 1955.
- Pelikan, Jaroslav. "The Doctrine of Creation in Lutheran Confessional Theology," Concordia Theological Monthly XXVI (August 1955), pp. 569-579.
- . "The Doctrine of Man in the Lutheran Confessions," Lutheran Quarterly, II (February 1950), pp. 34-44.
- . "The Tyranny of Epistemology; Revelation in the History of Protestant Thought," Encounter, XVIII (Winter 1957), pp. 53-56.
- Mueller, John Theodore. "Der 'ander Martin' und seine hohe Bedeutung für lutherische Theologen in Amerika," Concordia Theological Monthly, VII (September 1936), 661-670.
- Pressel, Theodor. "David Chyträus. Nach gleichzeitigen Quellen," Leben und ausgewählte Schriften der Väter und Begründer der lutherischen Kirche. VIII. Edited by J. Hartmann and Others. Elberfeld: Verlag von R. L. Friderichs, 1862. Pp. 1-48.
- . "Martin Chemnitz," Leben und ausgewählte Schriften der Väter und Begründer der lutherischen Kirche. VIII. Edited by J. Hartmann and Others. Elberfeld: Verlag von R. L. Friderichs, 1862. Pp. 1-75.

- Ratschow, C. H. "Das Heilshandeln und das Welthandeln Gottes; Gedanken zur Lehrgestaltung des Providential-Glaubens in der evangelischen Dogmatik," Neue Zeitschrift für Systematische Theologie, I (Heft 1, 1959), 25-30.
- Reimann, Henry W., Jr. "Luther and Brunner on Creation." Unpublished Master's Thesis, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, 1951.
- "Luther on Creation: A Study in Theocentric Theology," Concordia Theological Monthly, XXIV (January 1953), 26-40.
- Ritschl, Otto. Dogmengeschichte des Protestantismus. 4 vols. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrich, 1908-27.
- Seeberg, Reinhold. Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte. 4 vols. in 5. Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1913-23. Author's personal copy, with annotations; in Fuerbringer Library, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, Missouri.
- Tschackert, Paul. Die Entstehung der lutherischen und der reformierten Kirchenlehre samt ihren innerprotestantischen Gegensätzen. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1910.