

9-1-1973

Six Christian Sermons on the Way to Lutheran Unity

Robert Kolb

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis

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



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

Recommended Citation

Kolb, Robert (1973) "Six Christian Sermons on the Way to Lutheran Unity," *Concordia Theological Monthly*. Vol. 44, Article 26.

Available at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/ctm/vol44/iss1/26>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Print Publications at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Concordia Theological Monthly by an authorized editor of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

Six Christian Sermons on the Way to Lutheran Unity

Robert Kolb

The author is acting executive director of the Foundation for Reformation Research, St. Louis, Mo.

Four hundred years ago this year Evangelical theologians throughout Germany were picking up a new ninety-nine page book published in Tuebingen and saying something like, "What has the smithy forged this time?" James Andreae, or Schmiedlein, born the son of a smith—a fact his better-born antagonists never let him forget—was in 1573 one of the most prominent and one of the most reviled theologians in Germany.¹ It is perhaps a wonder that his new book actually did mark the turning point in efforts to bring a large part of Evangelical Germany together in doctrinal agreement.² For his *Six Christian Sermons on the Divisions Which Have Continued to Surface Among the Theologians of the Augsburg Confession from 1548 until This Year 1573*³ were written less

than two years after the collapse of Andreae's first drive toward Lutheran unity. That drive had centered on his invitation to subscribe to his unpublished "Confession and Brief Explanation of Certain Disputed Articles According to Which Christian Unity Might Be Attained in the Churches Subscribing to the Augsburg Confession and the Offense-Giving, Wearisome Division Might Be Put Aside." In connection with this document Andreae had managed to bring a number of Lutheran theologians together in what he had hoped would be a celebration of unity at Zerbst in Saxony in May 1570. But the taste of the honey of success quickly turned to the ashes of rancor and recrimination in the months following that convocation. That failure set the stage for the *Six Sermons* of 1573 and for the series of meetings and documents which ran from their publication in February 1573 to the publication of the Formula of Concord four years later.

At the age of eighteen, in 1546, Andreae left the University of Tuebingen and became a deacon in Stuttgart. At the introduction of the Augsburg Interim, Andreae moved to Tuebingen and went underground, preaching the Lutheran Gospel behind closed doors. In 1553 he was appointed superintendent in Goepingen and became along with John

Confession von Anno 1548. biss auff diss 1573. Jar[nach vnnnd nach erhaben]Wie sich ein einfaltiger Pfarrer vnd gemeiner Christlicher Leyer so dardurch moecht verergeret sein worden auss seinem Catechismo darein schicken soll. (Tuebingen: Georg Gruppenbach, 1573); published in at least three other editions.

¹ A modern biography of Andreae (1528-1590) has not yet been written. In English the best summary of his life is the article by Arthur Carl Piepkorn in *The Encyclopedia of the Lutheran Church*, ed. Julius Bodensieck, I (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1965), 73-74. See also the article by Wagenmann in the *Realencyclopaedie fuer protestantische Theologie und Kirche*, 3. ed., ed. Albert Hauck, I (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1896), 501-505; Christian Moritz Fittbogen, *Jacob Andreae, der Verfasser des Concordienbuchs. Sein Leben und seine theologische Bedeutung* (Hagen/W: Risel, 1881); J. C. G. Johannsen, "Jakob Andreae's concordistische Thaetigkeit," *Zeitschrift fuer die historische Theologie*, XXIII (1853), 344-415; Rosemarie Mueller-Streisand, "Theologie und Kirchenpolitik bei Jakob Andreae bis zum Jahre 1568," *Blaetter fuer Wuertemberg. Kirchengeschichte* 60/61 (1960/1961), 224-395.

² Heinrich Heppe begins his *Geschichte der lutherischen Concordienformel und Concordie* (Marburg: Elwert, 1857) with the work under discussion.

³ *Sechs Christlicher Predig|Von den Spaltungen| so sich zwischen den Theologen Augspurgischer*

Brenz one of the most important ecclesiastical advisers of Duke Christoph of Wuerttemberg, one of the most prominent and powerful Lutheran princes since the imprisonment of Elector John Frederick of Saxony and Landgrave Philip of Hesse by Charles V in 1547. In 1561 the duke appointed Andreae professor of theology, provost, and chancellor of the University of Tuebingen. Christoph used Andreae as his personal emissary to a host of cities and principalities, where this staff theologian and ecclesiastical "whiz kid" made his mark by assisting in disputations against non-Lutherans, in organizing Evangelical church life in areas newly reformed, and in refereeing arguments among Lutheran theologians. Over a decade of such service on the road throughout Germany and beyond gave Andreae a visibility and a familiarity with his brothers in the faith that was probably unmatched by any contemporary theologian. He was thus a logical choice of the princes as the human instrument to use in their search for theological concord in the Evangelical camp.

Political considerations had continued to be a powerful motivating force for Lutheran theological unity ever since that unity had been shattered by the defeat of the Smalcaldic League armies at Muehlberg in 1547 and by the ensuing battle over the Augsburg and Leipzig Interims.⁴

⁴ Emperor Charles V, victorious over Elector John Frederick of Saxony and Landgrave Philip of Hesse, at Muehlberg, introduced the "Augsburg Interim" (Spring 1548), a document basically Roman Catholic in theology but with minor concessions to the Evangelicals, for his Evangelical lands, on the basis of his superior military position following the battle. Elector Moritz of Saxony, who was awarded John Frederick's title and some of his lands for assisting Charles, bowed to pressure from his Lutheran subjects and composed another compromise document, the "Leipzig Interim" (December 1548). His theologians, including Melancthon, Bugenhagen, and George Major at Wittenberg and John Pfeffinger at Leipzig, defended the Leipzig

After the religious peace of Augsburg it became imperative for the Evangelical estates of the empire to form a united front, in the view of the princes, but continuing theological disputes made that impossible. With the accession of Maximilian II in 1564, the emperor was not an avid supporter of Rome, as his father Ferdinand I had been, but was a somewhat cryptic sympathizer of the Lutheran party. That was all the more reason to show a united front, for no emperor desires discord in his lands. Furthermore, in the late 1560s the worsening situation of Protestants in France and the Netherlands, and diplomatic approaches from Elizabeth of England, made at least some German Evangelical princes eager to build a united German Evangelical party which could act as a unit in religious politics outside the Holy Roman Empire.⁵

Interim; it was attacked by other Lutherans, including a group at Magdeburg led by Nikolaus von Amsdorf and Matthias Flacius Illyricus (1520-1575). From this dispute grew the Adiaphoristic, Majoristic, and Synergistic controversies (see notes 8, 9, 10). It divided north German Lutherans into two major parties for a quarter century. The one, located primarily in electoral Saxony, was called the "Philippists" because its members were largely loyal students of Philip Melancthon. The other was called the "Gnesio-Lutherans," (genuine Lutherans) or the "Flacianists" (because of the prominence of Matthias Flacius Illyricus in the group) by the Philippists. However, few of the party followed Flacius in all details of his teaching. Members of this party were located primarily in ducal Saxony and a number of north German cities. The third major party in German Lutheranism at this time was that of the south German principedom of Wuerttemberg; its leaders were John Brenz (1499-1570) and James Andreae. Undoubtedly, most pastors of the time were active in none of the three parties.

⁵ Heinrich Heppe, *Geschichte des deutschen Protestantismus in den Jahren 1555-1581*, II (Marburg: Elwert, 1853), 168-171, 176-200. Letters to William of Hesse concerning the political situation of the German Evangelical princes from a number of these princes are to be found in Christian Gotthold Neudecker, *Neue Beitræge zur Geschichte der Reformation mit historisch-kritischen Anmerkungen*, II (Leipzig: Fleischer, 1841), 128-155. The royal governments of both

Andreae's own inclinations made him a willing tool for those princes eager for Evangelical unity. By 1568 he had resolved to devote his energies to reconciling the warring factions within the churches of the Augsburg Confession. In that year he found support and an opportunity to begin his drive toward concord. The arch-Romanist was succeeded by his son, Julius, a cousin of Christoph of Wuerttemberg, and a Lutheran. Julius asked Christoph for Andreae's help in the first Evangelical visitation of the churches in his lands. Christoph urged Andreae to draw the Lower Saxons into his plans for establishing concord among the Lutherans. Thus, Julius became one of Andreae's warmest supporters. So did Christoph's son-in-law, Landgrave William of Hesse, after Christoph's death on December 28, 1568.⁶

With his "Confession and Brief Explanation" Andreae toured Evangelical Germany during 1569, trying to collect subscriptions to its five articles, which dealt with what he regarded as the most serious causes of division among Lutherans. The first article confessed that the sinner is pronounced free from his sins and receives forgiveness only through faith for the sake of Christ's sufferings and death, not because of the indwelling, essential righteousness of God.⁷ The second

France and Spain (which controlled the Netherlands) were moving against Protestants in these two lands at certain times throughout this period.

⁶ William, deeply interested in the French situation, first aroused Christoph to renew his efforts toward Evangelical concord at Heidelberg in June 1567. See Andreae's own report on the period 1567-1570 in his *Gruendlicher, warhafftiger und bestendiger Bericht: Von christlicher Einigkeit der Theologen und Predicanten, so sich in einhelligem, rechten, warhafftigem, und eigentlichem verstand, zu der Augspurgischen Confession, in Ober und Niedersachssen, sampt den oberlendischen und schwebischen Kirchen bekennen* (Wolfenbuettel: Horn, 1570), and Heppel, *Protestantismus*, II, 247-248.

⁷ Andreas Osiander (1498-1552) was attacked by both Philippists and Gnesio-Lutherans

article stated that the believer is saved only through faith, not through the good works which demonstrate his faith and thankfulness.⁸ The third article taught that the sinner is spiritually dead until the Holy Spirit gives him a new will to replace his perverse, blind will.⁹ Adiaphora are no longer free when associated with the confession or denial of the faith, Andreae stated in the fourth article of his confession.¹⁰ Article five treated the Lord's Supper; Andreae taught that Christ's body and blood are present in the Sacrament with the bread and wine in a heavenly way, unfathomable by human reason, and that godless and unrepentant hypocrites also receive Christ's body and blood to their judgment.¹¹ In each article Andreae rejected those who taught

for teaching that the righteousness which God bestows upon the sinner is Christ's essential divine righteousness dwelling within the believer, not the righteousness of Christ in his obedience, suffering, and death, imputed to the believer.

⁸ George Major (1502-1574), professor at Wittenberg and prominent Philippist, taught that "good works are necessary for salvation." Against that position Nikolaus von Amsdorf (1483-1565), without support from Gnesio-Lutheran friends, taught that "good works are harmful to salvation."

⁹ The Philippists Viktorin Strigel (1524-1567) and John Pfeffinger (1493-1573) aroused attack from Gnesio-Lutherans for their elaboration of Melancthon's view that the human will as well as the Word and the Holy Spirit play a role in conversion. The two students of Melancthon did not clearly rule out contribution to conversion by the human will before rebirth and thus incited the "Synergistic" (cooperationistic) controversy.

¹⁰ The Adiaphoristic controversy developed over concessions in Adiaphora made in the Leipzig Interim to the Roman Catholics for the sake of peace. Flacius, Nikolaus Gallus, Amsdorf, and others insisted that, in a time when confession of the faith is required or offense will be given, adiaphora do not remain indifferent.

¹¹ Joachim Westphal (1510-1574) and Tilemann Heshusius (1527-1588) attacked the Calvinist position on the Lord's Supper in the 1550s and 1560s, while the Philippists at Wittenberg were more sympathetic toward Calvin's position, though they did not openly support it.

contrary to his confession.¹²

In the summer and autumn of 1569 Andreae took his confession to Wittenberg and to the court of August of Saxony; to the courts of Elector Joachim of Brandenburg and his brother Margrave Hans of Kuestrin; to the courts of the dukes of Pomerania, Mecklenburg, Brunswick-Lueneburg, Lauenberg, and Holstein, and to that of the princes of Anhalt. He also visited the dowager queen of Denmark. He ventured into the citadel of recalcitrant Gnesio-Lutheranism, Weimar, and tried to line up support in the cities of Magdeburg, Hamburg, Luebeck, Lueneburg, and Bremen.¹³

He met with frustration, suspicion, and opposition as well as some support and encouragement on his subscription-selling travels. George Major offered support in Wittenberg when Andreae visited there in early 1569, but when Major's colleagues returned from the Altenburg Colloquy and together studied Andreae's "Confession," they refused to endorse it. The general synod in Landgrave William's own lands did not support the "Confession" when it met in June 1569 but took a wait-and-see attitude toward Andreae's effort.¹⁴

Much of the outright opposition to Andreae's efforts came from the Gnesio-Lutherans. Flacius and his friends charged that the fifth article of the "Confession" could easily be given a Zwinglian interpretation. So Andreae added a long appendix in

which he condemned a figurative interpretation of the words of institution and taught the ubiquity of the human nature of Christ.¹⁵ Andreae complained of the attacks of the "Spangenbergers," the ministerium of Mansfeld so-named for its superintendent Cyriakus Spangenberg, a lifelong supporter of Flacius.¹⁶ He protested against the slander and abuse in a newly published work by the theologians at the ducal Saxon university at Jena, Heshusius, Wigand, Kirchener, and Coelestinus. In early February 1570 he conferred with Duke John William of ducal Saxony, the protector of these antagonists, in Weimar. During his stay there the court preacher, Christoph Irenaeus, attacked him from the pulpit, as did Heshusius. Andreae interpreted Heshusius' remarks as an attack against Landgrave William and Duke Julius, and a small political imbroglio resulted.¹⁷ Two months later the frustration and anger which this incident and similar conflicts must have built up in Andreae spilled over into a letter to Landgrave William. Andreae observed that the theologians at Weimar had not only lost the Holy Spirit but their reason and common sense as well.¹⁸ Andreae hoped to fix the ducal Saxon theologians and end their slander and quarreling through an assembly of theologians which he had persuaded his princely sponsors and Elector August of Saxony to call. In early April 1570 Landgrave William and Duke Julius invited a

¹² The text of the "Confession" is printed, *ibid.*, II, 250-254; and in Leonhart Hurter, *Concordia concors. De origine et progressu Formulae Concordiae ecclesiarum confessionis Augustanae liber unus* (Wittenberg: Berger, 1614), lvs. 28-29.

¹³ Andreae reported on his travels in *Gruendlicher Bericht*, lvs. Aiiij^r-Fij^r and in letters printed in Neudecker, II, 159-160, 170-172, 181-186, 189-201; see Heppé, *Protestantismus*, II, 257-272.

¹⁴ *Gruendlicher Bericht*, lvs. Aiiij^r-Aiiij^r; see Heppé, *Protestantismus*, II, 264-268.

¹⁵ The text of this addendum is given, *ibid.*, II, 260-264, and in Hurter, lvs. 30-31. Not all Gnesio-Lutherans yet supported or understood the sacramental argument based on the omnipresence or ubiquity of Christ's human nature, the argument used by the "Swabians" (so named from the general area in south Germany where Wuerttemberg is located), led by John Brenz.

¹⁶ Neudecker, II, 185, in a letter dated Oct. 19, 1569.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, II, 204-210.

¹⁸ Neudecker, II, 241-242, in a letter dated April 1, 1570.

number of princes and cities to send theologians to a meeting at Zerbst, the goal of which was Evangelical unity.¹⁹ Representatives from electoral Saxony, Brandenburg-Kuestrin, Hesse, Holstein, Anhalt, Hamburg, Lueneburg, and Luebeck joined Andreae, who represented Wuerttemberg unofficially and Brunswick-Wolfenbuettel officially, at Zerbst for a two-day meeting in early May. The assembled theologians were at odds over the question of setting up a new confession. The electoral Saxon representatives insisted that they would subscribe to no new confessional document, for none was needed. Andreae pointed out that both sides in the intra-Lutheran controversies cited the Augustana against each other. He believed that his five articles could serve as a declaration of the Lutheran position on these controverted points rather than as a new confession. The electoral Saxons were still reluctant to subscribe. The group argued over which documents should be regarded as definitive for Lutheranism, and they finally agreed that the Scriptures are interpreted by the ecumenical creeds, the Augsburg Confession, the Apology of the Augsburg Confession, the Smalcald Articles, Luther's catechisms, and other writings of Luther. The Wittenbergers thought that Melancthon's writings, at least the *Corpus Doctrinae Misnicum*, ought to be regarded as confessional, but Andreae knew that that could only stir up the Gnesio-Lutherans to new heights of rage. So in the "Recess" which he composed as a summary agreement for the conference he suggested that Melancthon's works, along with those of Brenz, be recognized as helpful interpretations of the other confessional documents. The solution displeased the electoral Saxon delegation because it reduced Melancthon's corpus to secondary status and put

Brenz, the "Ubiquitist," on the same level as the Preceptor. As was their habit, however, they did not make an issue of it and were content to let well enough alone. The conference ended in some confusion since the electoral Saxons were granted the right by the entire assembly to prepare their own "Recess" and then had this right rescinded after they had left the general assembly. Disagreement also arose over the significance of Andreae's official "Recess of Zerbst"; the electoral Saxon theologians could not regard it as a confession but only as an affirmation of their previous confessional integrity.²⁰

It is not clear whether Andreae knew already at Zerbst that seeds of discord had been sown at the conference which he had hoped would proclaim and hasten the end of all discord among the Lutherans. He found out rather quickly. From Zerbst he proceeded to Wittenberg and there attended a disputation over theses which had just been published for a doctoral promotion at Leipzig.²¹ In one thesis in particular the Saxons attacked the Swabian²² Christology, and Andreae protested against their "unchristian, mohammedan" beliefs. The Saxons insisted that they were only opposing Monophysitism in accord with Luther and the Augustana. Andreae began to realize that accord with the new Wittenberg theology could not be achieved without sacrificing what he understood to be Luther's and Brenz' doctrine of the

²⁰ Ibid., II, 301-311, used materials printed in Neudecker, II, 285-295, Andreae's *Gruendlicher Bericht*, lvs. Kij'-Liiij', and a report by the electoral Saxon delegation in preparing its description of the Zerbst meeting.

²¹ *Gruendlicher Bericht* lvs. Liiij'-N^r. Heppe, *Protestantismus*, II, 312, gives the title of the published propositions: *Propositiones complectentes summam praecipuorum capitum doctrinae christinae sonantis, Dei beneficio in academia et ecclesia Witebergensi*, 1570.

²² See note 15 above.

¹⁹ Heppe, *Protestantismus*, II, 301.

Lord's Supper. This he refused to do.²³

Other irritations and differences of viewpoint widened the rift which Andreae was beginning to feel between himself and the Wittenbergers. The secrecy which followed Zerbst, the failure to publish its "Recess," naturally aroused suspicion among those who had not been invited to the meeting. The participating theologians and their princes were divided on the issue of publication. The Wittenbergers claimed the assembled theologians had agreed to keep silent concerning the outcome of the conference, and Elector August grumbled to William of Hesse that Andreae ought to be muzzled.²⁴ On the other hand, Andreae had wanted a public confession to affirm and proclaim unity, and Duke Julius supported him in this desire.²⁵ So in midsummer 1570 Andreae issued his version of the proceedings at Zerbst in print. He thus unknowingly provoked the final break between himself and the theologians of electoral Saxony.²⁶

Andreae must have anticipated the imminent collapse of his drive for concord, which had begun with his "Confession" and which he had thought would climax near triumph at Zerbst. As he was returning to Wuerttemberg in September 1570, he stopped in Kassel, where Landgrave William informed him of Elector August's displeasure with his publica-

²³ Heppé, *Protestantismus*, II, 312-314. Andreae's dissatisfaction with the "young Wittenbergers" is reflected in letters to William of Hesse, July 27, 1570, Neudecker, II, 319-320; and Sept. 30, 1570, II, 330-334.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, II, 323-325, in a letter from August to William of Hesse, Aug. 4, 1570. August protested Andreae's publication of the "Recess" in a letter to William, Sept. 4, 1570, *Ibid.*, II, 327-329.

²⁵ In a letter to William of Hesse, May 20, 1570, *Ibid.*, II, 310-312, although he agreed in a letter of June 14 that the publication should be temporarily held up, *Ibid.*, II, 313-315. Andreae mentioned Duke Julius' support in a letter of Sept. 30, 1570, *ibid.*, II, 331, 334.

²⁶ Title given in footnote 6 above.

tion of the "Recess of Zerbst." Two letters to the Landgrave from the following February and March reveal Andreae's growing bitterness against the Wittenbergers; it stands in marked contrast to the hope with which he had viewed that faculty just a year earlier. He complained to the prince about the poor thanks he had gotten from the Wittenbergers for all he had done for them; he had reaped only suspicion and mockery for his troubles.²⁷ The second letter conveys the Wittenbergers' critique of Andreae's *Report on Zerbst* with Andreae's own comments on that critique in the margin. He denied that he had changed a word when he prepared his *Report on Zerbst* for print. He accused the Wittenbergers of running off with the papists at the time of the Interims (a charge that the Gnesio-Lutherans had made for over twenty years). An entire change in his outlook and his understanding of the Evangelical scene comes in another marginal comment. The Wittenbergers had stated in their critique that the articles of Andreae's *Report on Zerbst* were "incomplete, murky, doubtful, and in some places more of a Flacian²⁸ opinion." Andreae observed alongside the last phrase, "That's where the whole matter lies and is to be found. They [the Flacianists] are too Lutheran and not papistic or Calvinistic enough for you."²⁹ That phrase is a signpost pointing in a new direction for Andreae. Setting out in that new direction, he composed his *Six Sermons*.

After the failure of Zerbst, in late 1570, Andreae returned home to Wuerttemberg and assumed once more his duties at the court and university of young Duke Ludwig. There in late 1572 he wrote the *Six Sermons*.

²⁷ Neudecker, II, 358, a letter of Feb. 19, 1571.

²⁸ The slur word of the Philippists for their Gnesio-Lutheran opponents; see note 4 above.

²⁹ Enclosure in a letter of March 26, 1571, *Ibid.*, II, 364-366.

They resemble in some ways thirty-three sermons he had actually preached in Esslingen in 1567, when the Tuebingen faculty held classes in that city during an outbreak of the plague in Tuebingen. In these *Thirty-three Sermons on the Most Important Divisions in the Christian Religion, Which Exist Between Papists, Lutherans, Zwinglians, Schwenckfelders, and Anabaptists*,³⁰ Andreae outlined for his hearers the differences between the teachings of Scripture and its misinterpretation at the hands of those sects. The *Six Sermons* dealt with the five Lutheran disputes which he had treated in his "Confession" and with five additional disputes in much the same way that he had treated questions at issue between Lutherans and those outside Lutheranism in the *Thirty-three Sermons*.

It might be said that the *Six Sermons* are a direct descendant of the "Confession." Andreae had undoubtedly introduced approaches, examples, and phrases into the discussion of the "Confession" which he used in the *Six Sermons*.³¹ However, the ninety-nine pages of the *Six Sermons* contain about seventy-five times as many words as the "Confession." They employ two new methods: specific condemnation of false teachers by name and use of the catechism as an aid for deciding the disputes under discussion. These new methods and the greatly expanded discussions of the

divisions among the Lutherans suggest that the *Six Sermons* really represent a new, fresh start on Andreae's part in the direction of concord.

In the preface, dated February 17, 1573, Andreae dedicated his *Six Sermons* to his patron, Duke Julius, who had invested so much in his earlier travels in pursuit of concord. In the preface Andreae explained his mission and the situation in which he was trying to carry it out.

Andreae felt compelled to defend his own calling to his work and the work itself in this preface. Particularly the staff of Duke John William of Saxony had been quick and severe in their judgments against Andreae while he was seeking subscriptions to his "Confession."³² He answered their accusations by insisting that he had never approved any falsification of doctrine in words or in essential content and had never covered up or spread such falsification.³³ Since Zerbst the Wittenbergers had also been attacking Andreae, and he reacted to their charges that he was not furthering the common cause but just pursuing the matter for his own sake, for personal glory.³⁴ Andreae began his defense by citing 1 Corinthians 9:19, "Although I am free from all men, I have made myself a slave to all, that I might win the more." Under that motif, following Paul's example, Andreae was setting out on "the necessary task of once again restoring wherever possible Christian unity among the theologians of the Augsburg Con-

³⁰ *Drey und dreissig Predigen von den fuernehmsten Spaltungen in der christlichen Religion, so sich zwischen den Baepstischen, Lutherischen, Zwinglischen, Schwenckfeldern, und Widerteuffern halten . . . Gepredigt zu Esslingen* (Tuebingen: Morhart, 1568). Andreae stated that he was continuing the sermons preached in Esslingen in his *Sechs Predig*, see *Sechs Predig*, p. 1.

³¹ For example, in his *Ein Christliche Predigt/ von Christlicher Einigkeit der Theologen Augspurgischer Confession/zu Dresden den XXII. Martij Anno 1570 gehalten* (Wolfenbuettel: Horn, 1570) he used the catechism to clinch arguments in behalf of his first and fifth articles of his "Confession," lvs. Diiij^r and G^r; and used the example of the martyr Barlaam in discussing the fourth article. l. f. Fijj^r.

³² The theologians of ducal Saxony had attacked Andreae's person and work in their *Der Theologen zu Jena Bedenken und Erinnerung auf einen Vorschlag einer Conciliation in den streitigen Religionsachen* (Jena, 1569), and countered his five articles with *Der Theologen zu Jena Bekenntnis von suenf streitigen Religionsartikeln*. (Jena, 1570); see Heppel, *Protestantismus*, II, 283. Andreae bitterly complained about the attacks made upon him by the ducal Saxons in his *Gruendlicher Bericht*, lvs. Fijj^r-K^r.

³³ *Sechs Predig*, p. 98.

³⁴ Neudecker, II, 334, 349.

fession without any compromise of the divine truth."³⁵ He had not set out to work for unity without a proper divine call, he insisted, or just for his own sake. He was performing this service "only out of dutiful obedience to the Christian and godly princes by whom I was sent for the benefit and welfare of the whole church of God."³⁶ Andreae believed that princes had a God-given duty to govern the affairs of the church and to root out troublemakers within it.³⁷ He also cited his acquaintance with all the churches of the Augsburg Confession, formed on his visits to them over the past years, as part of his peculiar suitability for the task.³⁸ Furthermore, Andreae assured Duke Julius, all who correctly understood what he was doing had not only approved the project but had also expressed gratitude for the princely support which Julius had given to Andreae's efforts. They had all urged Andreae to push forward without regard for the gossip, insults, and ridicule which he had had to suffer. Thus, Andreae was attempting once more to establish concord through the *Six Sermons*.³⁹

Andreae also felt compelled to defend his efforts in behalf of unity against those who said that unity in the church would never be achieved anyway. Here he was again referring to the ducal Saxon party.⁴⁰ Their view ran counter to a concern which had dominated Andreae's thinking

throughout much of his career. He had actively sought Christian unity even while attacking errors within Christendom. Charges and insinuations from non-Lutherans that the Lutherans were hopelessly split among themselves had provoked him to write a *Report on the Unity and Disunity of the Theologians of the Christian Augsburg Confession* after the diet at Augsburg in 1559.⁴¹ Again in 1573 Andreae was reacting against the accusation of the papal party that there were not ten who subscribed to the Augsburg Confession who actually agreed on its teaching. Andreae insisted that except for a few theologians who had created the ten controversies he discussed, the several thousand churchmen of the Augustana were united in one faith.⁴² Andreae was concerned that the slanders of these adversaries be met with a declaration of unity, which would bring the Lutherans comfort and joy. Around such a declared standard of unity true Lutherans could gather, and the deceivers within the Lutheran camp would have to stop their braying and would be revealed. Then, Andreae believed, the sweet and pleasant unity which the Evangelical churches knew at the time of the presentation of the Augsburg Confession in 1530 would return.⁴³ (By 1573 the Evangelicals were already looking back to a golden age.) The purpose of the restoration of unity, according to Andreae, was not just to affirm God's will that the church be one but also to confound the adversaries of the truth outside and also inside the Lutheran camp.

³⁵ *Sechs Predig*, lf. A2.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, lf. A3^r.

³⁷ *Christliche Predigt*, lvs. Giiij^r-H^r; see *Gruendlicher Bericht*, lf. Qij.

³⁸ *Sechs Predig*, lf. B2^r.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, lf. B3^r.

⁴⁰ Heshusius had stated this view from the pulpit while Andreae was in Weimar in February 1570, Neudecker, II, 205. Eberhart von der Thann, secular councillor to John William of Saxony and an ardent supporter of the Gnesio-Lutheran theologians, echoed this view in his letter of Feb. 25, 1570, to William of Hesse, *Ibid.*, II, 213-214.

⁴¹ *Bericht von der Einigkeit vnd Uneinigkeit der christlichen Augspurgischen Confessionsverwandten Theologen, &c. Wider den langen Lasszedel, der . . . auff juengst zu Augspurg Anno 1559 gebalnetem Reichstag öffentlich auffgeschlagen und aussgebreitet.* (Tuebingen: Morhart, 1560); Andreae laid out his concern for the unity of the church also in *Gruendlicher Bericht*, lvs. Piiij^r-Rij^r.

⁴² *Sechs Predig*, pp. 97-98.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, lf. B.

The Lord himself had inspired this effort, Andreae reminded Duke Julius, implying that the failure of his first attempt at restoring Lutheran unity need not mean that his second attempt would fail. Just as Christ told his mother at Cana, "My hour has not yet come," so he had spoken to the German Evangelicals, who must now wait for God's good time (Eccl. 3:1) to restore the unity they sought. They could only plant and water; God would have to give the increase (1 Cor. 3:6).⁴⁴

That process of planting and watering the tender shoot of Evangelical unity involved facing squarely the obstacles to that unity. Within the sermons themselves, Andreae did not suggest that all these disputes had been caused by one of the two parties which were opposing his efforts in 1573. In the sermons he dwelt on the specific individuals or groups involved in the specific disputes. But in the preface he pointed to two parties who in 1573 were frustrating the drive for concord among the Lutherans.

The first party, Andreae conceded, did want to suppress divisive errors, but its members also wanted to suppress faithful servants in the churches of the Augsburg Confession. He identified this group in the margin of the preface as the theologians of Thuringia (ducal Saxony), Mansfeld, and Regensburg.⁴⁵ But his slap on the wrist of this group was quite mildly stated, and in the *Six Sermons* he made one major methodological accommodation to the Gnesio-Lutherans of ducal Saxony and supported their doctrinal position in general.

The methodological concession involved the matter of condemnations. Both the Philippist-princely party and the Flacianists had agreed in the 1550s and 1560s that false doctrine must be condemned. But Flacius and

his comrades had always insisted that false teachers, not just false doctrines, be specifically condemned.⁴⁶ Andreae's "Confession" had included the rejection of "those who teach otherwise," but it had mentioned no one by name. In the text of the *Six Sermons* Andreae also disregarded names and labeled the sides in each controversy as "the one party" and "the other party" as a general rule. (The exception came in the sixth sermon, where he spoke directly of the "new theologians in Wittenberg."⁴⁷) However, even though personal condemnations were not placed in the text itself, the names of theologians who supported the accepted and the rejected positions were printed in the margin alongside their views. Andreae thus could say, on the one hand, that he was not using personal condemnation in the declaration upon which he hoped to base unity. But on the other hand, he could point out, since the printed version of the sermons is the primary version, that he was clearly demonstrating whose interpretation on each given question was to be accepted and whose was to be rejected.

In the sermon on the righteousness of faith in God's sight, Osiander's name is associated with the one party while the correct view is assigned to "the theologians of the Augsburg Confession, Dr. Moerlin, and others."⁴⁸ Joachim Moerlin had been one of the East Prussian theologians who had opposed Osiander early in that controversy. He had also been closely associated with the Gnesio-Lutherans of Lower Saxony. George Major's proposition "good works are necessary for salvation" and Nikolaus

⁴⁶ See Hans-Werner Gensichen's study of condemnations in sixteenth century Lutheranism in his *We Condemn. How Luther and 16th-Century Lutheranism Condemned False Doctrine*, trans. Herbert J. A. Bouman (St. Louis: Concordia, 1967); especially pp. 123-152.

⁴⁷ *Sechs Predig.*, p. 77.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 3, 7.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, lf. B3^r.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, lf. A2^r. In part, his defense of the validity of his call and the sincerity of his effort was also aimed at these Gnesio-Lutherans.

von Amsdorf's proposition "good works are harmful to salvation" were both condemned, and names were named in the margin of the text. Andreae saw as much danger in the so-called Epicurean faith which does not devote itself to good works at all as he did in the hypocritical reliance on good works.⁴⁹ Besides, Amsdorf, the revered "uncle" of the Gnesio-Lutherans, had alienated himself from Heshusius and Wigand, the ducal Saxon theological leaders whom Andreae was trying to court in early 1573. Andreae also rejected the opinion of Flacius in his discussion of original sin.⁵⁰ He held instead to the opposing position expressed by Heshusius and Wigand, even though they so vehemently opposed his drive for concord.⁵¹ In commenting on the freedom of the will, Andreae included Flacius with Heshusius, Wigand, and the other Gnesio-Lutherans, Nikolaus Gallus and Simon Musaeus, as those whose judgment ought to be respected, against that of the Philippist Viktorin Strigel and his synergistic

followers.⁵²

Flacius, Gallus, Heshusius, Wigand, and the Lower Saxons were again mentioned as those who upheld the correct position in the Adiaphoristic controversy against "one part of the Wittenbergers and the papist theologians."⁵³ The same group of Gnesio-Lutherans presented the proper judgment, according to Andreae's marginal comment, in the dispute over the definition of the Gospel and the place of repentance in that definition. The rejected opinion was that held by "Dr. Pezel and the Wittenberg theologians."⁵⁴

The marginal comments reinforce the statements of the text in Andreae's sixth sermon, on the Lord's Supper and the person of Christ. In the historical introduction section of that sermon Andreae charged that the Wittenbergers had come out from behind the bushes at long last to support the Zwinglian view of Christ's person, and he observed in the margin, "The new theologians at Wittenberg have given public support to the Zwinglians."⁵⁵

This aggressively anti-Wittenberg stance in the sixth sermon was heralded already in the preface. Andreae only briefly mentioned the party which blocked unity by condemning the faithful servants of the church, the Gnesio-Lutherans. He dwelt at some length on the other group. His description bristles with the anger born of betrayal. For up to and at Zerbst Andreae had believed that the Wittenbergers were in his camp; he had set himself up for attack from the

⁴⁹ Ibid., pp. 20-24.

⁵⁰ Ibid., p. 29. Flacius was drawn into using Aristotelian terminology in his anthropology by Viktorin Strigel. Against Strigel's assertion that "the first sin" (Strigel tried to avoid using the term "original sin") was an (Aristotelian) accident in man, Flacius taught that original sin is the substance or essence of man after the fall. Andreae had tried to find common ground between himself and Flacius in a series of meetings in the years between 1567 and 1571, but their last encounter ended in August of 1572 without agreement (Wilhelm Preger, *Matthias Flacius Illyricus und seine Zeit*, II [1859-1861; reprint edition, Hildesheim: Olms, 1964], 295-296, 300-301, 364-368). In the early 1570s the close friendship between Flacius and the members of the Jena faculty had finally broken under the weight of the dispute over original sin. Wigand, Heshusius, and others attacked Flacius' doctrine of original sin in a number of writings, including *De peccato originis scripta quaedam contra Manichaeorum delirium, quod peccatum originis sit substantia. D. Wigandi. D. Heshusii. D. Morlini. D. Kemnicii.* (Jena, 1571).

⁵¹ *Sachs Predig.* p. 30.

⁵² Ibid., pp. 34, 36. See note 10 above.

⁵³ Ibid., pp. 47-49.

⁵⁴ Ibid., pp. 59-60, 63. In the margin the Wittenbergers were accused of "wicked stubbornness" in refusing to agree with the other side that not believing in Christ is a sin against the Law.

⁵⁵ Ibid., p. 77. Andreae went on to describe how they condemned and rejected Luther's position while still praising his name, and the marginal comment labels that the "cunning of the new theologians at Wittenberg."

Gnesio-Lutherans through his defense of the theologians of electoral Saxony. They, he now recalled, had told him in front of witnesses at Zerbst that they were totally satisfied with the Swabian and Lower Saxon churches, particularly with Andreae's friend, John Brenz. Later they were found condemning Andreae's activities in behalf of concord and rejecting the doctrine of Brenz and Luther on the Lord's Supper and the person of Christ.⁵⁶ Their rejection of Brenz' Christology was only the latest of a number of roadblocks which they had thrown in the path toward Lutheran concord. They were also forbidding the sale of books composed by servants of the churches of the Augsburg Confession, thus bewitching and poisoning the youth at their own schools.⁵⁷ Only one thing could be done to counter them. The authorities in electoral Saxony would not act until they understood what was really going on. To hasten that realization Andreae urged that the churches and schools which taught pure doctrine should declare their unity.⁵⁸ He conceived of his effort toward concord also as an instrument which would drive those in error out of electoral Saxony by enlightening their victims. Whatever factors were actually involved, Elector August of Saxony did drive Andreae's antagonists out of their offices the next year—with a vengeance.⁵⁹

Andreae's shift toward the Gnesio-Lutherans can be seen not only in his adopting the method of personal condemnation but also in the way he viewed the nature of the Lutheran controversies as well. In 1570 he expressed his opinion that the contro-

versies were largely—though certainly not completely—battles over words, caused by the arrogance, ambition, pride, and envy of the theologians.⁶⁰ In the *Six Sermons* he recognized, too, that some of the disputes among Lutherans had been largely battles over words, for example, the Majoristic controversy. But the phrases "good works are necessary for salvation" and "good works are harmful to salvation" were to be rejected even though both sides knew that only faith in Christ justifies and saves and that this faith is not dead but living through love. For St. Paul commanded Timothy to hold onto the pattern of sound words (2 Tim. 1:13); that means that Christians should not only teach edifying doctrine but also use salutary words and ways of speaking which do not give rise to quarreling, controversy, or error, Andreae insisted.⁶¹ Furthermore, with his discovery that the Wittenbergers had rejected the Christology which he held, Andreae found another very serious doctrinal division within the Lutheran camp. He could see shades not only of Nestorianism but also of Arianism in the position of the Wittenbergers.⁶² He had never said that all the disputes among the Lutherans were merely battles over words, but now he was beginning to share the Gnesio-Lutherans' view of just how serious the error involved in some of these controversies was.

Andreae's *Six Sermons* mark a definite shift in the way he viewed his situation and in the way in which he sought concord. No longer did he try to hold inoffensive middle ground between the Flacianists and the Philip-pists. He joined with the Gnesio-Lutherans in 1573 in forthright condemnation of the Wittenbergers, and in so doing he adopted temporarily an important part of the Gnesio-Lu-

⁵⁶ Ibid., lvs. A2^r-A3^r.

⁵⁷ Ibid., lf. B^r.

⁵⁸ Ibid.

⁵⁹ In 1574 Elector August dismissed a number of theologians and political councillors for political intrigue and Calvinistic theological leanings; he imprisoned a number of them. See *Hepp, Protestantismus*, II, 416-455.

⁶⁰ *Christliche Predigt*, especially lvs. Bij^r-Bijij^r, D^r, Gijij^r.

⁶¹ *Sechs Predigt*, pp. 24-25.

⁶² Ibid., pp. 94-95.

theran method of seeking concord in the church. He also came to share their understanding of the nature and seriousness of the controversies within the Lutheran churches.

Andreae did not trim his beliefs to woo the Gnesio-Lutheran party although their positions may well have influenced the way he formulated and dealt with certain questions.⁶³ Andreae found himself drawn toward the Gnesio-Lutherans when he discovered a genuine conflict between his own beliefs and those of the Wittenbergers, as their position finally became clear to him. He reacted angrily against what he regarded as their betrayal of Luther and their rejection of Brenz on the doctrine of the person of Christ. He reacted with a fury against their betrayal of him in their transforming their seeming support into firm opposition to his plans for concord. He decided that that part of the Gnesio-Lutheran party which had separated itself from Flacius agreed with the Swabian church on the important issues under discussion among the theologians of the Augsburg Confession.

But the *Six Sermons* were not written for Gnesio-Lutheran theologians, however much they may have been directed toward those listening from Jena and Weimar. The *Sermons* were

composed for the average Christian layman and his pastor, who had found the controversies among the theologians an offense to their faith. The form in which Andreae presented each issue reflects this concern. He reviewed briefly the history of the dispute and set down the basic arguments of each side with the Scriptural support they claimed. Then, through the use of the catechism, he showed the layman how to decide which party was teaching correctly.

Andreae had always been concerned about the instruction of the simple Christian layman. His first publication, in 1557, was his *Short and Simple Report on the Lord's Supper, and How a Simple Christian Shall Find His Way Through the Protracted Dispute over It*.⁶⁴ The next year he composed a *Simple Report, How Every Christian Should Give Answer out of His Catechism. Why He No Longer Attends Mass*.⁶⁵ His *Thirty-three Sermons* had dealt with differences between other Christian groups and the Evangelicals on a popular level.⁶⁶

In the *Thirty-three Sermons* Andreae discussed the plight of the layman facing the theological disputes of his day. Most Christians could not read or write and were unable to dispute with Satan or man, Andreae observed. Others read the Scriptures but did not have the gift of the Holy Spirit, which is necessary for interpretation. As a result the learned were leading the simple astray.⁶⁷ The layman's weapon against such deception was his faith, which must always be

⁶³ On that issue on which Lower Saxons and Swabians had disagreed twenty years earlier, Osiandrist, Andreae went to great lengths to assure the readers of his first sermon that he supported the Saxon rejection of Osiander's position and did not share Brenz' early mediating position on that issue. [On Brenz' view of the Osiandrian controversy, see Theodor Pressel, *Anecdota Brentiana. Ungedruckte Briefe und Bedenken* (Tuebingen: Heckenhauer, 1868), Nrs. 315, 323; Emanuel Hirsch, *Die Theologie des Andreas Osianders und ihre geschichtlichen Voraussetzungen* (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1919), pp. 254-265; Wilhelm Moeller, *Andreas Osiander. Leben und ausgewahlte Schriften* (Elberfeld: Friderichs, 1870), pp. 470-473, 506-508]. However, he had opposed Osiander's understanding of righteousness in

⁶⁴ *Kurtzer vnd einfaltiger Bericht von des Herren Nachmal, und wie sich ein einfaltiger Christ in die langwirrige zwyspalt, so sich daruerber erhebt, schicken soll.* (Augsburg: Gegler, 1557).

⁶⁵ *Einfeltiger Bericht, wie ein jeder Christ antworten soll auss seinem Catechismo, warumb er nicht mehr zu der Mess gebe.* (Tuebingen: Morhart, 1558).

⁶⁶ See note 30 above. He expressed a similar concern in *Gruendlicher Bericht*, lvs. Piiij^r-Piiij^r.

⁶⁷ *Drey und driessig Predigen*, pp. 44-45; see a similar passage in the *Sechs Predig*, pp. 38-39.

coupled with God's Word for the Word to be properly understood. Christ should be the Christian's rock which he hurls with the sling of his faith against the devil's head. What is that faith, Andreae asked. It is the twelve articles of the Creed; it is the simple catechism.⁶⁸

This concern for the layman surfaced again in his drive for concord on the basis of the "Confession." He noted in his sermon on March 22, 1570, in Dresden that the controversies within Lutheranism had led laymen astray and harmed them. The layman who reads at best only an occasional German tract cannot gain an understanding from what he reads nor from the slanders he hears from the pulpit, Andreae said.⁶⁹

So in the *Six Sermons* Andreae turned to the catechism,⁷⁰ particularly to the creed, as the instrument by which the layman might determine who was right in the controversy under discussion. He did not appeal to the catechism as the deposit of the wisdom of the church; his is in no way an argument from tradition. He appealed instead to something that might be called "Christian common sense": simply the analogy of faith. In each sermon, after outlining the arguments of each side, with a battery of Scriptural proof passages used by each, Andreae presented a little dialog between layman and author. The layman asks, "I hear, to be sure, that both parties cite the Holy Scripture. Who will tell me which party speaks correctly or incorrectly about this matter? For I am a simple layman and can neither read nor write. Whom should I believe and follow?" Andreae an-

swers, "Here a simple layman should take the simple creed of the children and seek in it his righteousness,"—in the case of the first sermon, on Osiandrisms.⁷¹ There he finds in the sentence "I believe in the forgiveness of sins" the assurance that God will not let him suffer for his sins but will forgive him by grace. The layman then looks at the whole of the second article and finds no mention of the indwelling righteousness of God, which Osiander equated with the righteousness of the sinner. Instead, from the second article the layman learns that his righteousness consists in the obedience, suffering, and death of Jesus Christ.⁷²

In his use of the Creed Andreae usually did not refer to anything but the words of the Creed itself. Twice, however, in his third sermon, he referred to Luther's explanations of the articles of the Creed. In discussing whether original sin has become the substance of man, Andreae paraphrased and summarized Luther's explanation of the first article, to demonstrate that God, who created all things, did not create original sin.⁷³ Andreae quoted the explanation to the third article directly, "I cannot by my own reason or strength believe in Jesus Christ, my Lord, or come to Him, . . ." in refuting the synergists.⁷⁴

He also used other elements of the catechism. The First Commandment gives the layman direction when faced with the dilemma of suffering or permitting adiaphora to be imposed upon him in violation of Christian freedom and at the cost of a clear confession of the truth.⁷⁵ Andreae searched the entire catechism to ascertain whether anything but the Law accuses the sinner of his sin. Since only the Ten

⁶⁸ *Drey und dreissig Predigen*, pp. 49-53.

⁶⁹ *Christliche Predigt*, lf. Ciiij'.

⁷⁰ Andreae does not appear to have used the catechism of his friend Brenz at all in the *Six Sermons*. He used basically the text of the medieval catechism, with clear and obvious references to Luther's own development of it at points.

⁷¹ *Sechs Predig*, pp. 15-16.

⁷² *Ibid.*, p. 16.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, p. 33.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 37.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 51.

Commandments point to man's sin, and since Christians still sin, the layman must reject the antinomianism of John Agricola.⁷⁶ In arriving at the definition of the Gospel as solely the proclamation of forgiveness of sins, Andreae consulted the Office of the Keys, and there he found his definition of the Gospel.⁷⁷

This appeal to the catechism is not an appeal to an authority above or alongside Scripture. The catechism is merely the tool with which the layman, unskilled in the techniques of exegesis, may find his way through the maze constructed by conflicting interpretations of passages from the Bible and by uses of one passage by one side and another by the other to support opposing viewpoints. Andreae's layman asks at one point if the Holy Spirit speaks against himself, and Andreae replies in such a way as to make it clear that he does not believe the Creed is a final arbitrator over Scripture. It is just that not all who read and use Scripture have the gift of proper interpretation which the Holy Spirit alone provides.⁷⁸ The catechism enables even the simple layman to determine which side is reading Scripture correctly and which is misinterpreting it, according to Andreae.

The *Six Sermons* mark the turning point in the effort of James Andreae and many other Lutherans to reestablish concord among those who subscribed to the Augsburg Confession in the last third of the sixteenth century. The *Six Sermons* convinced key Lutheran churchmen that Andreae was more than just a compromiser, that he was indeed a confessor. Westphal, Chemnitz, and Chytraeus read the *Six Sermons* and decided that on the basis of this document concord

could be sought and reached. They combined their energy and effort with Andreae's and that of many other concerned Lutherans, and a new drive toward concord began. The *Six Sermons* were the basis of Andreae's Swabian Concord of 1573 which formed the basic text of the Swabian-Saxon Concord of 1575. The Maulbronn Formula and the Torgic Book form the last steps in the path which leads from *Six Sermons* to Solid Declaration.⁷⁹

The prominence of the catechetical argument receded in the revisions and reworking of the next four years; the personal condemnations also disappeared, though both catechism and condemnation survived the conferences which worked on improving the document on which concord could be based.

In and through his *Six Sermons* Andreae not only helped create the text of the Formula of Concord but also the climate in which such a Formula could be written and accepted. He did that in part by emphasizing his pastoral concern for pastors and laymen who were being offended by controversy and who were being deceived by false teachers. He did that in part by taking his stance as confessor of the central truths of Scripture as he had learned them from reading Luther and from talking with Brenz. Both these factors—his pastoral concern and his confessional stance—put him in the mainstream of sixteenth century Lutheranism. Both help account for the success of his second venture in the pursuit of concord.

St. Louis, Mo.

⁷⁶ Ibid., p. 59.

⁷⁷ Ibid., pp. 61-62.

⁷⁸ Ibid., pp. 38-39.

⁷⁹ See the summary of the history of the Formula of Concord in *Die Bekenntnisschriften der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche*, 6. ed. (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967), XXXV-XXXVIII.