

# THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

VOL. VIII.

SEPTEMBER, 1928.

No. 9.

## Full Forgiveness.

Translated from Dr. E. Preuss's *Die Lehre von der Rechtfertigung*, Part V.  
The Rev. JUL. A. FRIEDRICH, Iowa City, Iowa.

All statements of the Scriptures concerning redemption, imputation, faith, and the means of grace rest on God's full forgiveness as their foundation stone. If God forgives half, then all the texts which speak of the all-sufficient redemption through the blood of Christ become uncertain. If God forgives half, then He does not impute the righteousness of Christ unto us in the same manner as He imputes our sins unto Him. If God forgives half, then faith loses its life-line, and the Word of God its contents. For if anything is clearly testified to in God's Word, it is God's full forgiveness. 1 John 1, 7: "The blood of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, cleanseth us from *all* sin." [*Note.* Nobody will claim that this full forgiveness remains in force if one wallows in filth.] Not of some, no, of all. And Col. 2, 13: "And you, being dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath He quickened together with Him [Christ], having forgiven you all trespasses." [*Note.* Evidently Baptism is here spoken of, as in this whole passage from V. 11 on. Also the word *συνεζωπολήσεν*, which is separated from *χαρισάμενος* by only three words, shows this.] Yes, Rom. 8, 1 the Apostle says: "There is therefore no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus." [*Note.* Of course, this does not exclude that one may fall from grace, that one may be cut out of the olive tree, if one does not, by watching and praying, continue in His goodness . . . it follows indisputably from this text that as long as a man abides in Christ Jesus through faith (Gal. 3, 26) — so long, not longer, but surely so long — the word applies to him: "No condemnation to thee."] In Paul's epistles condemnation and justification are antitheses which exclude one another like darkness and light. Rom. 5, 18. Where there is no light at all, there is complete darkness; and where there is no darkness at all, there is complete light. So, then, where there is

---

## The Historical Significance of the Formula of Concord.

PROF. R. W. HEINTZE, St. Louis, Mo.

(Concluded.)

Melanchthon was very much concerned about having the ethical seriousness of the Reformation duly stressed, "so that the pastors would teach the fear of God, faith, love, as eagerly as they thundered against the Pope." When Conrad Cordatus, in 1536, heard one of Cruciger's lectures in which the professor used the phrase, "*Contritio est causa sine qua non justificationis*," and protested against it, he found that Melanchthon agreed with Cruciger. In fact, Melanchthon admitted that he himself, when asked about justification, had stated that the new obedience is necessary for eternal life (*ad salutem*). Luther at that time was dean of the university and as such had to take up the complaint of Cordatus, as he had been obliged to hear the earlier protest of Nicholas Amsdorf against Melanchthon. Luther did not discipline the two defendants, but in a *disputatio*, June 1, 1537, he expressly rejected the phrase *opera necessaria ad salutem esse*, and Melanchthon did not make further efforts to defend the phrase. But almost his

entire concept of the relation between faith and sanctification was shared by one of his stoutest adherents, Prof. George Major, his colleague. In the turbulent days of the Augsburg and the Leipzig Interim, Major was Melancthon's champion. The Interim had described the doctrine of justification, omitting *sola fide*, stressing the necessity of Christian virtues for attaining eternal life (*zur Seligkeit*), and emphasizing the reward of good works. Amsdorf at Magdeburg, during the Interim disputes, published *Dass Dr. Pommer und Dr. Major Aergernis und Verwirrung angericht*, 1551, rousing the fear of false prophets particularly among the Mansfeld clergy, for whom Major had been designated as superintendent. Count Albrecht of Mansfeld expelled Major without giving him an opportunity to defend himself. The Doctor had answered Amsdorf's attack in *Auf des ehrw. Herrn Niclas v. Amsdorf's Schrift G. Majors*, Wittenberg, 1552. The tenor is respectful toward his "dear father and teacher." He denied ever having doubted the *sola fide*; yet he added: "But this I admit, that I did teach, and do teach, and intend to teach all my life, that good works are necessary for eternal life (*zur Seligkeit*), and I say publicly, in clear and plain words, that nobody attains eternal life (*selig werde*) through evil works and that nobody attains eternal life without good works; more: whoever teaches otherwise, even though it be an angel from heaven, let him be anathema."<sup>1</sup>) Though he explained, ten pages later, that he did not mean to ascribe any merit to works, Flacius and Gallus assailed him most severely, and Amsdorf joined their forces with his *Kurtzer Unterricht auf Dr. Georg Majors Antwort, das er nit unschueldig sey, wie er sich tragice rhuemet*, Basel (!), 1552; from Hamburg and Luebeck protesting voices were heard, and throughout the next eighteen years ever new pens were set agoing against Major's contentions. Major preached on them and turned most vehemently upon Flacius<sup>2</sup>) with acrid criticism. At the same time the question as to the place of the divine Law in the Christian religion and the question as to the quality of the human will and as to differences in sins, the essence of original sin, the essence and the value of a good conscience, were being discussed, mixed up, misunderstood, sidetracked, cleared up. A synod of Eisenach and a colloquy at Altenburg<sup>3</sup>) (1568—69) were kept busy with Major's

1) Folio C, l. See also Schluesselberg, *Cat. Haer.*, Part 7, p. 30.

2) *Sermon von der Bekehrung Pauli*.

3) Eisenach: in Flacius's *De Voce et Re Fidei*, 1563, p. 199; in Altenburg: *Ganze und unverfaelschte acta und Handlungen des Colloq.* There are two texts, which somewhat differ from each other.

and these other matters. Yet Major remained professor at Wittenberg and, in 1558, even became dean of the theological faculty, which office he kept to his death, in 1574. During the polemics there were several derailments of argument trains: Amsdorf's *Das die propositio, gute Werk sind zur Seligkeit schedlich, eine rechte, ware, Christliche propositio sey*, Witt., 1559, has reference, it is true, to works through which men wish to merit eternal life, and in this sense Luther had used the same terms, *noxius* and *schaedlich*.<sup>4)</sup> But Amsdorf, in our connection, certainly was guilty of a dangerous slip, and it is rather surprising how mildly he was handled in this derailment by the Gnesio-Lutherans.<sup>5)</sup> Another case is that of Flacius, who had been "driven" by Strigel, in the synergistic controversy, to the unguarded, but later on defended, statement that original sin is the *substance* of natural man.<sup>6)</sup> Justus Menius, who had been expected to condemn Major, unexpectedly supported him.<sup>7)</sup>

However, in order to silence the objection that *necessaria ad salutem* must ascribe merit to Christian living in sanctification, both Melancthon and Major (the latter repeatedly) declared their willingness to drop the phrase *ad salutem*.<sup>8)</sup> Nevertheless, there was more involved in this entire matter than the choice of an unhappy phrase owing to Major's and his companions' unskilled dialectics and their awkwardness in choosing adequate terminology. The Mansfeld clergy was somewhat mollified by Major's declaration against the meritoriousness of good works. But if good works are not to be a sort of concomitant condition of justification, then Flacius was right when he asserted that his opponents' twofold

---

4) In *Freiheit eines Christenmenschen*: Good works are *noxia* to *justitia fidei* if some one presumes to be justified through them. In a sermon of October 24, 1522: The great works of the monks "*sind uns schaedlich zur Seligkeit und dem Reiche Gottes*."

5) Melancthon called Amsdorf's phrase "*eine unstaetige Rede*." C. R., 9, 407.

6) *De Peccati Originalis aut Veteris Adami Appellationibus et Essentia*, an essay appended to his *Clavis Scripturae Sacrae*, 1567.

7) *Verantwortung Justi Menii auf Matt. Flacii giftige und unwarhaftige Verleumbdung*, Witt., 1557; his *Bereitung zum seligen Sterben*, 1556; *Justi Menii kurtzer Beschaid auff den Vortrab. Fla. Ill.*, Witt., 1557; *Justi Menii Bericht der bittern Warheit*, Witt., 1558.

8) Melancthon, in his report on the Frankfort Argument of 1558, C. R. 9, 498; Major, in his *Bekentnis v. d. Artikel d. Justif.*, Witt., 1558, fol. B 1 a. The sarcastic charge that Major seems to have had a defective memory, because in the same *Bekentnis* he says: "*Dass ich aber diese Wort, gute Werk sind den Glaebigen zur Seligkeit noetig, mein Leben lang . . . nie nicht gebraucht habe, berufe ich mich auf alle diejenigen*," etc., is unjust, because he here refers to the time before Amsdorf's attack in 1551.

explanation led to absurd confusion, namely, the explanation that faith, which *alone* obtains righteousness and eternal life, must be *followed* by good works, *and* that such works are necessary unto life eternal *because* faith must prove itself by good works.<sup>9)</sup>

Major, in the same *Sermon von der Bekehrung Pauli* in which he admitted that obedient life does not earn justification, declared that, as a fruit of faith, it is necessary for the *retention* of salvation and to insure against its loss.<sup>10)</sup> For him forgiveness *and* sanctification are the *two* factors that make for eternal life, or justification. It naturally follows that justification in life here on earth is merely begun. He wrote: "There is a double *salvificatio* or (*seu*) *justificatio*, one in this, the other in eternal life. The one in this life consists, first, in the remission of sins and the imputation of righteousness; secondly, in the gift of the Holy Ghost, His work of renewing, and in the hope of eternal life which is to be given gratis on account of Christ. This *salvificatio* and *justificatio* is only *inchoata* and incomplete, because in the persons justified and saved (*justificati et salvati*) by faith there still remains sin." And further on: "Thus through faith and the Holy Ghost we *begin* (*coepimus*), indeed, to be *justificari, sanctificari et* [!] *salvari*; but we are not yet *justi et salvi*. *Reliquum igitur est, ut PERFECTI justi et salvi FIAMUS.*"<sup>11)</sup> And his "associate," Menius, answers the question why we are "*gerecht und selig*" before God only through faith thus: "Because through faith we receive, in the first place, remission and the righteousness or obedience of Christ with which He has fulfilled the Law for us; secondly [or: afterwards? *danach*], because we also receive the Holy Spirit, who works and fulfils (*ausrichtet und erfuehlt*) in us the righteousness demanded in the Law, in this life beginning it and perfectly in the life beyond."<sup>12)</sup> Even if he wanted his *danach* to be taken as expressing chronology, the one *following* the other (which is contrary to the entire concept of those men), the fact remains that he made both, the Savior's work *for* us and our sanctification, the *cause* of our justification.

Now, it may be that some of the clergy and theologians had been rather mechanical in their insistence that Christian life in

---

9) *Wider den Evangelisten des hl. Chorrocks*, fol. C (quoted by Thomasius in his *Dogmengeschichte*).

10) *Bekenntnis v. d. Artikel der Justif.*, fol. A, 4 b.

11) Quoted by Schluesselburg, Part 7, p. 348, from Major's *Dispos. Epist. ad Rom.*

12) *Verantwortung*, 1557, fol. N, 4.

good works *follows* faith, placing the sequence rather in chronology than in logic or the psychology of conversion. But though such occurrences may have prompted the Majorists to express themselves as they did, this certainly did not explain everything. The real fact of the matter is that they had fundamentally false views regarding free grace, views which destroyed the forensic character of the divine act of justification just as effectively as did those of Osiander.

Besides Biblical, exegetical, dogmatic objections, the opponents also pointed out the nefarious practical results of Majorism. Christians in great anguish of soul because of their sinfulness, sinners grasping Christ in faith in the hour of death, men and women in their trials and doubts, would find no peace; or they said, Majorists were leading Christians toward self-righteousness. There was enough healthy circumspection in the young Church to repel this destructive doctrine everywhere; Major was fought until his death, 1574. Particularly Flacius was ever active — against Philippism; that is what, after all, Major represented.

The general denunciation of the Leipzig Interim had also been directed against some statements of Melancthon on the power of natural man's will in regard to its attitude to God's offer in the Gospel, that is, the power of his will in the act of conversion. Melancthon's position *de libero arbitrio* had changed; *e. g.*, the 1543 edition of his *Loci* breathes quite a different spirit from that found in the Augsburg Confession. Already in the second edition of the *Loci* he attributed an active part to human will in conversion, naming three causes of conversion: the Word of God, the Holy Spirit, and human will, *non sane otiosa, sed infirmitati suae repugnans. . . Deus nos . . . vocat, movet, adiuvat, sed nos viderimus ne repugnemus.*<sup>13)</sup> And the next edition says: . . . "a will that agrees with the Word of God, though *languide*, and does not resent it. . . . Why is Saul rejected, David accepted? There must be some different act in these two (*aliqua dissimilis actio in his duobus*).<sup>14)</sup> . . . *Praecedat gratia, comitatur voluntas.*" The Leipzig Interim contained declarations which were at least ambiguous, allowing the interpretation in the *liberum arbitrium*

13) *C. R.*, 21, 376.

14) *C. R.*, 21, 658. 660; *Loci*, 1543, p. 659: "*Non possum, inquires. Imo aliquomodo potes, et cum te voce evangelii sustentas, ADIUVARI a Deo petito.*"

sense.<sup>15</sup>) All Philippists shared these views, giving up, in a smaller or larger measure, the fruit of Luther's debate with Erasmus. Luther had upheld the truth that there is in man a *capacitas conversionis*, but not a *facultas se convertendi*. The anti-Interim people balked at Melanchthon's phrases, but at the time just this matter did not develop particular polemics.

However, in the year of the Augsburg religious peace, 1555, Prof. John Pfeffinger, of the University of Leipzig, one of the coauthors of the Interim, published two series of academic lectures on Melanchthon's theory of the free will, in which he merely collected Melanchthon's various views on the three causes of conversion, the universal promises, and the method of knowing about predestination (*a posteriori*), and, in conclusion, pointed to the "more detailed explanation" of the doctrine on free will in the Magister's works. Pfeffinger's own views were Melanchthonic: several factors work together (*causae agentes concurrunt*): the Spirit, who influences through the Word, a mind which thinks, and a will which does not reject, but obeys the already working (*movens*) Spirit. In this connection he mentioned *aliqua synergia voluntatis nostrae*, and according to a quotation reported by Flacius he said: "But all those who wish to be in the light of eternal God . . . must look toward the rising sun and not turn their eyes from the light. *Haec certe est synergia.*"<sup>16</sup>) Of course, this was equivalent to a retraction of the *pure passive*. The Thuringian opponents of Philippism, in a convention at Weimar, January, 1556, energetically rejected Pfeffinger's theses. (Hauck's *Realenzykl.*, 3. ed., Vol. 19, p. 231.)<sup>17</sup>) There followed some exchange of arguments between Melanchthon and Gnesio-Lutherans, but without reference to Pfeffinger. But in 1558 Stolz had his theses printed and circulated, and both Amsdorf, of Magdeburg, and Flacius, of Jena (where lately a university had been founded), began a vehement attack upon him.<sup>18</sup>) Pfeffinger was rebuked for having asserted,

15) The full text of the Leipzig Interim is contained in Bieck's *Das dreifache Interim*, 1721, p. 361 ff.

16) *Refutatio Propositionum Pfeffingeri*, fol. E, 4 vols.; quoted in O. Ritschl., *Dogmengesch. des Prot.*, 1912; Vol. II, 1, p. 431, note 4; also in *Acta Colloq.*, Altenburg, fol. 498 a.

17) Thomasius-Seeburg's remark is misleading in *Dogmengesch.*, Vol. 2, 1889, p. 498: "*Dagegen* [against Pfeffinger's *disputationes*] *erbot sich nach EINIGEN JAHREN* [1558] *Amsdorf*," which seems to make Amsdorf's the first reply. Also, John Stolz, of Weimar, in 1556, wrote 110 theses against Pfeffinger.

18) Tschackert calls the two books of Flacius "*gewissermassen als Programm der* [Jenaer] *theol. Fakultät gegen die Witt. u. Leipz.*" *Entstehung der luth. u. ref. Kirchenlehre*, 1910, p. 522.

“*ganz frech und vermessen*,” that man could, with the natural strength of his free will, prepare himself for the reception of divine grace and of the Holy Spirit; he was put on a level with Thomas Aquinas, Scotus, etc. “Natural man has been changed to an image of Satan,” and: “How can our conversion not be a work of God alone when our satanic ill will (*malitia*) of the flesh or of the free will not only does not cooperate, but even draws back and rejects (*reluctante et repugnante*)?” (Flacius.) In his answer to Amsdorf (Flacius is barely mentioned), Pfeffinger plainly, extensively, and without hedging expressed his synergism, *viz.*, that not only the regenerate, but even the natural will of man possesses the ability to follow the divine Spirit *or* to decline to do so. Many public lectures and debates on this subject were held in Jena, Wittenberg, and Leipzig, and Melancthon took a hand in them.

Duke John Frederick of Saxony, in 1559, commissioned Jena professors to work out a *Confutatio et Condemnatio Praecipuarum Corruptelarum*, etc., which condemned Servetus, Schwenkfeld, Antinomians, Anabaptists, Osiander, etc., etc., and in the sixth paragraph contained a refutation of the errors *in articulo de libero arbitrio sive de viribus humanis*. This book was to be read from the pulpits as the norm of doctrine strictly to be adhered to in ducal Saxony. But in Jena itself obstacles arose. Rev. Huegel refused to read this *Confutatio* to his congregation, and Prof. Victorinus Strigel objected to it on the ground that Flacius had “invented a new theology.” Both were arrested, but discharged after half a year, and the duke ordered a public disputation between the Jena professor and the ex-professor (Strigel was suspended) at Weimar in August, 1560.<sup>19</sup> Thirteen sessions were held, in the course of which Flacius was led to that regrettable expression about original sin.<sup>20</sup> Strigel, who, like almost all the others, took recourse to similes, argued from the magnet, which, smeared with onion juice, does not exercise its power of attraction, yet remains a magnet, while, when goat’s blood takes the place of the onion juice, the magnet again exercises its innate power. This led to Melancthon’s “*Concurrunt in conversione haec tria: Spiritus Sanctus,*

19) Salig, III, 587 ff., and *Disputatio de Originali Peccato et Libero Arbitrio inter Matth. Flac. Ill. et Vict. Strigel*, 1562 (published 1563), and *Acta Disp. Vin.*

20) For the narrative of this part see *Flac. Ill.*, by Preger, Vol. II, 310 ff.



*movens corda; vox Dei; voluntas hominis, quae voci divinae assentitur.*" Natural man is not dead, but merely sick.<sup>21)</sup> The Illyrian had hard work to get his opponent to stick to the *status controversiae*. He said: "I want you to tell me whether you say that the will cooperates either before the gift of faith or after faith has been kindled; whether you say that cooperation in conversion flows from natural powers, or to what extent the good will is given in consequence of the renewing of the Spirit: *two questions literally and in spirit one.*"<sup>22)</sup> Strigel would either evade the question, or he would say: "*Homo non renatus non cooperatur; at in conversione cooperatur.*" At any rate, conversion is brought about by two factors, God's and man's will.<sup>23)</sup>

The debate brought no decision, partly on account of Flacius's erroneous statement regarding original sin. Both sides were commanded to remain silent. But the clergy of Mansfeld, Hamburg, Rostock, and several other places, and such men as Brenz, J. Moerlin, and J. Andreae expressed their disagreement with Strigel, and even theologians of Wittenberg and Leipzig (the latter, however, with the modification that man is *pure passivus quoad MERITUM JUSTIFICATIONIS et vivificationis*). Martin Chemnitz, of Brunswick, gave a clear survey in 1561, *sine ira*, and defined the doctrine calmly.<sup>24)</sup>

All the following years saw a very large number of publications, conferences, and colloquies, which present a veritable medley of views on all sorts of issues closely or loosely related to this psychological question: *Duplex repugnantia*; character of enmity against God; variety among natural men; is man like a stone or a log? relation between actual events and God's determination; *justitia civilis* and longing for redemption; "external" hearing of the Word; contemplating "diligently"; the effect of the means of grace; relation between Spirit and Word, between intellect and will; identity of consciousness in unconverted and converted condition; foreknowledge of God; the lost image of God; mortal and venial sin, etc., etc. Upon the whole, the opponents of the Philippists wanted to have the question of predestination excluded from this discussion. Yet they were not unanimous in stating the very point of controversy. At the Altenburg colloquy, 1568—69, this

21) *Disputatio*, pp. 24. 101.

22) *L. c.*, pp. 43. 71. 100. 233.

23) *L. c.*, p. 131.

24) *De Controversiis Quibusdam*, 1561.

was agreed upon: "As Luther says against Erasmus, we are not contending about the question what man can do spiritually before his rebirth, nor what he can do after it, but the main question is what man can accomplish *in* and *toward* his own conversion, from his natural, innate faculties."<sup>25)</sup> But the Pomeranians considered the most important point to be "what kind of liberated will man receives in conversion through the renewing power of the Spirit, and how conversion comes about."<sup>26)</sup> Even when preparations were being made to formulate the Lutheran doctrine on this question, there were arguments not only on the correctness of the answer, but also as to which question should be answered. Anhalt, Nuremberg, and Rostock were not satisfied with the definition of the point of controversy.<sup>27)</sup> Nor was there harmony with respect to methods. Arguments had been adduced, on the Melanchthonian side, from Aristotle, from personal experience, and self-introspection; and when these theologians had been rebuked because of this, being told that this was not a truly theological method, the reply had calmly been given that in a question of this kind human knowledge of psychology decided matters.

Aside from many differences among individual members of the two opposing parties, the fact remains that the Melanchthonian school, trying to solve the *arcana Dei*, had entered a road which was apt to reach its goal, but in — Rome. One of the ethical fruits of the Reformation is the knowledge that man, for his own salvation, can absolutely not place his trust in his own power, but merely and solely in God's mercy and Christ's merits; nothing in us, not a God-impelled and God-supported will, is the cause of our spiritual welfare, and, as Professor Frank says<sup>28)</sup>: "For the crushed heart it is absolutely all the same whether much or little is demanded of the *liberum arbitrium* as *facultas se applicandi ad gratiam*." There is hardly any difference between Strigel and the Tridentinum, in the latter of which the "will is like a fettered man, who *possesses innate* strength, but is hindered by chains."<sup>29)</sup>

Calvinists and Romanists were eagerly watching: would the apple of the shaking tree fall into Zwingli-Calvin's or into Rome's lap?

---

25) *Coll. z. Altenb.*, Jena, 1569, fol. 489 B (also Wittenberg, 1570).

26) Balthasar, *Historie des Torgauer Buches*, P. 3, p. 47.

27) O. Hutter, *Concordia Concors*, p. 510.

28) *Theol. d. Konkordienformel*, Vol. 1, 1858, p. 134.

29) Chemnitz, *Examen Conc. Trid.*, I, 214.

At the synod of Eisenach, 1556, convened for the purpose of settling the Major controversy, naturally the question about the validity of the divine Law, its function, its place in man's religious life, was touched upon. In this field, too, there were not only two camps, but there was disharmony in each. Between 1527 and 1540 Melancthon and then Luther had been charged with false teaching on the influence of the Law in bringing about repentance. The charges had been brought by John Agricola in Eisleben, who taught that God's Law exerted no beneficial influence, but only damned and killed and consequently could not bring sinners to a knowledge of their sins, but that this is brought about when the sinner embraced the Gospel of Christ. The Antinomian was flayed by Dr. Martin, and he revoked several times until the demand of retraction became so weighty that he accepted a call to the court of Berlin, 1540, where, later on, he was coauthor of the Augsburg Interim.<sup>30)</sup> This kind of Antinomianism seemed to have been settled. However, in connection with the discussions on justification, on sin, on good works, on free will, the question grew exciting as to the relation between Law and Gospel, *after* conversion, in the believing Christians' lives. Many "Lutheran" theologians held that believers have nothing whatever to do with the Law, not even as a guide in Christian living; Moses knew nothing of our faith and religion, *ergo*; the Law had no business in church and pulpit, but only in the courthouse; evangelical preachers must preach no Law; no man can go to heaven if the "third use" of the Law is taught.<sup>31)</sup> Consistently, on the other hand, Agricola's transfer of the function of the Law into the Gospel was rejected as well as Melancthon's thesis that the Gospel is a proclamation of repentance, on account of which the entire Philippist school was suspected of Antinomianism. The Altenburg colloquy, 1568—69, dealt with the trouble which had settled down to a question as to the *tertius usus legis*. True, the facts of Golgotha may give a heavy evaluation of the greatness of the sinner's guilt to a believer, but he will appreciate so much more the blessed mercy and forgiveness. God's Law not seriously meant? not crushing? The Christian's inner voice only *one*, only the Spirit's? No conscience which needs a corrective, a guide, a norm to distinguish between the two voices within? Antinomians dealt much with the terms *in abstracto* and

---

30) Luther's theses in E. A., *Opera Varii Argumenti*, Vol. 4.

31) A selection of Antinomian theses is found in J. Seehawer, *Zur Lehre vom Gebrauch des Gesetzes*, etc., 1887, p. 97 f.

*in concreto*. Antinomianism was on the point of creating an abstract Christianity; it would have had to make abstract Christians. Any man who follows these discussions of that time repeatedly will feel like calling out: "I want my whole concrete self to be a Christian, die a Christian, and rise to eternal life!"

The religious peace of Augsburg, 1555, gave additional importance to the Augustana: it became a protective charter for the churches which adhered to it. So, then, the question would have to arise, Which churches or which territories really represent the Augustana? And in those days the question was hard to answer. Some of the problems had been solved in 1530 only in a general way, while some had not been thought of or even mentioned. What was needed, then, was closely to define the various articles held by Lutherans and to fill the gaps by definite statements, and all that in strict harmony with the sense and spirit of the earlier documents. That was done by the Formula of Concord for all those realms whose eight thousand clergymen and officials set their names to it.

Calvin had subscribed to the Augsburg Confession as interpreted by Melancthon. Politically speaking, that gave him the protection which no other fact under the conditions of the century could give him; for Calvin's Church as such was not recognized. Calvin could not sign the Formula, not only because he was in the grave by that time, but because the Formula told him that he had misunderstood the Augustana. Without such signature the Calvinistic churches, strictly speaking, had no legal status in the Holy Roman Empire, which status was granted a hundred years later, in the peace of Osnabrueck and Muenster, 1648. Thus, unfortunately under an imperial denial of religious liberty, but nevertheless in fact, a clean-cut differentiation was established between the truly renovated Church and the church that had come into existence through defection from the first, original principles of Protestantism. The continuity of genuine back-to-the-Bible Protestantism had been interrupted by Calvino-Philippism and was reestablished by the Formula of Concord.

We are not speaking of the benefits derived from these thirty years' polemics. They exist: theses became clarified by antitheses; exegesis was intensified and made systematic; all intelligent debate is helpful. What, however, if concord had been reached, but a different one? Some writers of histories of dogma present the doctrinal divergences among the Lutherans at that time almost as distinctions without differences. It is possible that some merely

misunderstood each other. It is true that, *e. g.*, Flacius, finding that a phrase he used, resembled too closely that used by the opponents changed that phrase in the printed book, and that, *e. g.*, Amsdorf "was taken in" with the entire conference at Eisenach, in agreeing upon a certain term.<sup>32</sup>) But there were real divergences, diverging more and more, in degree and expansion, like the sides of angles. An unchecked Osiander will soon be in medieval Rome; an unchecked synergist will be with the scholasticists; some opponents of theirs will arrive at Calvin's predestination. *Sola gratia, sola fide, sola Scriptura, soli Deo gloria*, those were the things at stake, and many a "theologian" was playing *va banque*. No wonder Chemnitz is called "the other Martin."

---