

CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY

Martin Chemnitz' Views on Trent: The Genesis
and the Genius of the *Examen Concilii Tridentini*

ARTHUR CARL PIEPKORN

Current Contributions to Christian Preaching

RICHARD R. CAEMMERER

Homiletics

Book Review

Vol. XXXVII

January 1966

No. 1

The Genesis and the Genius of the *Examen Concilii Tridentini*¹

ARTHUR CARL PIEPKORN

"In recent centuries one or the other of [the] pillars supporting the Tridentine system have appeared to tremble, but as a whole the system has always survived the various crises which had only brought about certain individual degenerations. Beginning with 1958—1959, through a whole concourse of historical and spiritual factors, and certainly under an impulse of the Holy Spirit, the [Roman] Catholic Church (and more generally the entire Christian world) abandoned the Tridentine system on all fundamental themes. The brief intervening time cannot distract us from the global dimensions and the definitive significance of this abandonment."²

The author of this statement, Giuseppe Alberigo, is a respected Italian Roman Catholic church historian, philosopher, and academician.³ The statement appeared in

the pages of the influential multilingual international Roman Catholic hard-covered theological journal *Concilium*. Alberigo's words add relevance to a review of the genesis and genius of the great 16th-century Lutheran protest against the Council of Trent in the quadricentennial year of the publication of the first volume.

The *Examen Concilii Tridentini* ("A Weighing of the Council of Trent") is neither the first nor the last non-Roman-Catholic analysis of the synod that created the Roman Catholic Church. At the turn of the century, Reinhard Mumm (1873 to 1932) managed to list no fewer than 87 items written between 1546 and 1564 which polemicized against the Council.⁴

Milan. He is associate professor of church history and professor of philosophy at the University of Florence, secretary to the Centro di Documentazione of the Istituto per le Scienze Religiose of Bologna, and a frequent contributor to professional journals in the areas of theology and history.

¹ This article is a chapter in the *Symposium on the Council of Trent*, edited by Elmer Kiessling and scheduled for early publication by Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY acknowledges with gratitude the permission to publish the present article in advance of the appearance of the book itself.

² Giuseppe Alberigo, "The Council of Trent: New Views on the Occasion of Its Fourth Centenary," *Concilium*, 7 (1965), 69—87. The quotation appears on p. 86.

³ Alberigo (born 1926) holds a doctorate in jurisprudence from the Catholic University of

⁴ Reinhard Mumm, *Die Polemik des Martin Chemnitz gegen das Konzil von Trient* (Naumburg-an-der-Saale: Lippert und Co. [G. Pätz'sche Buchdruckerei], 1905), pp. 79—90. A subtitle reads: *Erster Theil, mit einem Verzeichnis der gegen das Konzil von Trient gerichteten Schriften*; the second part which this subtitle implies and to which Mumm makes frequent proleptic references in the footnotes of the first part was apparently never published. After a pastorate in Dortmund, Mumm moved more and more into the political arena, joined the Christian Social Party of Adolf Stöcker (1835—1909), later became successively a member of the German-National Party and (in 1929) of the Christian-

Arthur Carl Piepkorn is graduate professor of systematic theology at Concordia Seminary, St. Louis.

It is true that 41 of these titles are from the pen of a single author, Peter Paul Vergerio (1497?—1565),⁵ and that the list includes the third edition of the Heidelberg Catechism (1563) wholly on the basis of the revised answer to Question 80, deliberately formulated to condemn the Tridentine decree on the sacrifice of the mass. It is clear, however, that Chemnitz is far from having been the first to discover the peril that Tridentine theology represented for heirs of the Reformation.

In turn, down to 1760 at least, 39 critical works on the Council of Trent followed the *Examen*.⁶ The international roster of their authors includes Luke Bacmeister (1530—1608); George Carleton (1559 to 1628), bishop of Chichester; the Servite friar Paul Sarpi (1552—1623), who wrote

National *Arbeitsgemeinschaft*, entered the Reichstag in 1912, in association with Reinhold Seeberg (1859—1935) reorganized the Kirchlich-soziale Konferenz that Stöcker had founded into the Kirchlich-sozialer Bund, wrote *Theorie der christlich-nationalen Arbeiterbewegung* (1907) and *Der Christ und der Krieg* (1915), which went through 10 editions in three years, and from 1900 on edited *Kirchlich-soziale Blätter*. In 1899 the theological faculty of the University of Jena accepted his *Die Polemik des Martin Chemnitz* as an *Inauguraldissertation* for the degree of licentiate in theology. This writer has had access to this work in the form of an electrostatic copy of an original which the director of Universitätsbibliothek in Munich kindly made available to him on microfilm, and acknowledges his extensive dependence on it for many details.

⁵ As papal nuncio Vergerio faced Luther in 1535. The bishop successively of Modruš and of Capodistria, Vergerio inclined toward the Swiss Reformation, was tried, deposed, and excommunicated. After a 13-year-long ministry in Switzerland, he converted to the Lutheran Church, and in 1553 Duke Christopher of Württemberg (d. 1568) named Vergerio ducal counselor.

⁶ Mumm, pp. 94—104.

under the anagrammatic pseudonym Pietro Soave and whose historical study is the only critique of Trent to have been published in more editions than the *Examen*; John Hülsemann (1602—1661); Abraham Calovius (1612—1686); George Calixtus (1586—1656); Herman Conring (1606—1681); Balthasar Cellarius (1614 to 1671); John Henry Heidegger (1633 to 1698), who depends strongly on Chemnitz;⁷ John-Conrad Dannhauer (1603 to 1666); Peter Jurieu (1637—1713); Edward Stillingfleet (1635—1699), bishop of Winchester; Paul Anton (1661 to 1730); and Ernest Solomon Cyprian (1673 to 1745).

Yet, though the *Examen* is neither the first nor the last work of its kind on the subject, from its first appearance it asserted itself as the standard by which others were measured, and (with the possible exception of Sarpi's quite different *Istoria*) it has shown a capacity to survive the passage of time shared by none of its rivals.

THE AUTHOR

Martin Chemnitz (Chemnitius, Chemnicus, Kemnitz, Kemnitius, Kemnicus)⁸

⁷ So John George Schellhorn in *Amoenitates literariae*, V (Frankfurt and Leipzig, 1726), 207: *Praeter Chemnitiana pauca fere habeat de suis* (quoted by Mumm, p. 53, n. 9).

⁸ As sources for Chemnitz' life we have his autobiography to the year 1555 (with a few personal entries down to 1579), translated into English by A[ugustus] G[raebner], "An Autobiography of Martin Kemnitz, Translated from the German and Latin," in *Theological Quarterly*, III/4 (October 1899), 472—487; the invaluable collection of material in parts III—V of Philippus Julius Rehtmeyer, *Antiquitates ecclesiasticae inclitae urbis Brunsvigae, oder, Der berühmten Stadt Braunschweig Kirchen-Historie*, (Braunschweig: Christoph-Friederich Zilligers Wittib und Erben, 1710—1720); Eduard

was born in 1522 at Treuenbritzen, about 37 miles south-southwest of the Brandenburger Tor in Berlin. His father, a woolweaver and shopkeeper, died when Martin was 11. His mother apprenticed him to the woolweaver's craft, but the generosity of a friend of the family made it possible for him to resume his interrupted secondary education at Magdeburg. A brief stint of schoolteaching preceded his matriculation at the University of Frankfurt-an-der-Oder. In 1545, after another six months of schoolteaching at Wriezen-an-der-Oder (and of collecting the local sales tax on fish), he transferred to the University of Wittenberg, where he studied the classics and sciences and became interested in astrology. He was about to take his master's degree under Philip Melanchthon (1497—1560) when the Smalcald War broke out. He followed a relative, the poet-laureate and historian George Sabinus (1508—1560), to the newly established University of Königsberg (now Kaliningrad). Here he continued his studies while heading up the Kneiphof School, and in 1548, at the first degree-granting convocation of the new university, he took his master's degree, with Duke Albert of

Prussia (1490—1568) bearing the expenses of Chemnitz' promotion. When pestilence ravaged Königsberg in 1548, Chemnitz retired to Salfeld and studied Peter Lombard and Luther. Back at Königsberg, he sent Duke Albert a horoscope which he had cast for the prince and thereby won for himself the post of ducal librarian. His interests turned increasingly from astrology to theology, for which the resources of the library provided ample scope. Meanwhile Andrew Osiander (1498—1552) had come to Königsberg and had provoked the controversy on justification. At the duke's command, Chemnitz was one of the two theologians designated to oppose Osiander at a public disputation which was to end the year-and-a-half-old controversy, but Chemnitz' bold assault on the ducal favorite almost resulted in his own dismissal. Joachim Mörlin (1514—1571) managed to achieve a brief peace of sorts between the contending parties, but the conflict broke out anew. Caught in the conflict of loyalties to his friend Mörlin and to his ducal benefactor, Chemnitz resigned his post at the end of 1552 and left Königsberg in early 1553. En route to Wittenberg again, he stopped over at Danzig (now Gdansk) and at Cüstrin (now Kostrzyn); here he cast a horoscope for Margrave John (1535 to 1571) of Brandenburg-Cüstrin, who gave him a 50 *Thaler* honorarium for it. At Wittenberg he became a boarder in Melanchthon's home, and in January 1554 he was admitted to the philosophical faculty as an examiner. In June he began to lecture on Melanchthon's *Loci communes* ("Commonplaces") before large student audiences. In the meantime Mörlin had become *Superintendens* of the churches

Preuss, "Vita Martini Chemnicii," in the author's edition of *Examen Concilii Tridentini per Martinum Chemnicium scriptum* (Berlin: Gustav Schlawitz, 1861), pp. 925—988; Heinrich Schmid and Johannes Kunze, "Chemnitz, Martin," in *Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche*, 3d ed., III (1897), 796 to 804; Mumm, pp. 28—78. Inaccessible to this writer were Johannes Gasmer, *Oratio de vita, studiis et obitu Martini Chemnicii* ([Brunswick?:] No publisher, 1588), and Hermann Hachfeld, *Martin Chemnitz nach seinem Leben und Wirken, insbesondere nach seinem Verhältnisse zum Tridentinum* (Leipzig: Breitkopf und Härtel, 1867). A comprehensive biography of Chemnitz is a major desideratum.

in the Lower Saxon city of Brunswick and he invited Chemnitz to become his coadjutor. Chemnitz delivered his last lecture in Wittenberg on October 20. On St. Catherine's Day, John Bugenhagen (1485—1558) ordained him to the sacred ministry in St. Mary's Church, and Chemnitz entered upon his new office in Brunswick in mid-December. The following year he married Anna Jäger — described as *pia, pulchra et parca* — who bore him two sons and eight daughters.

Self-imposed tasks at Brunswick included a semiannual public disputation on a selected set of doctrinal theses, of which Polycarp Leyser the Elder (1552 to 1610) was able to include 19 in his edition of Chemnitz' *Loci theologici* ("Theological Commonplaces"), the continuation of his lectures on Melancthon's *Loci*. Chemnitz began the study of Hebrew in 1556 and made rapid progress. His association with Mörlin was most cordial, and Chemnitz' prudent moderation served as a brake upon Mörlin's occasional bursts of excessively vehement zeal. The year 1557 saw both of them first at Wittenberg attempting to help relieve the tensions evoked by the Adiaphoristic and Synergistic controversies and then, later, at Worms for the famous colloquy between the Roman Catholics and the Lutherans. Chemnitz' first published work, *Vera et sana doctrina de praesentia corporis et sanguinis Christi in sacra coena* ("The True and Sound Doctrine about the Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Holy Communion") came off the press at Leipzig in 1560, followed by a German version and (in 1561) a second Latin edition under the title *Repetitio sanae doctrinae* ("Repetition of the Sound Doc-

trine"). Moderate in tone, although unqualified in its rejection both of the papalist and of the Reformed positions, it won immediate approval; for example, in reply to a request for counsel from King John II Sigismund Zápolya (d. 1571), the theological faculty of the University of Rostock recommended Chemnitz' work as the simplest and most accurate exposition of Eucharistic doctrine to be had.

In 1562 Chemnitz became involved in his long controversy with the Jesuits and with the Roman Catholic Church that was to engage almost all his leisure for over a decade. From 1567 on, however, the needs of the Lutheran community made more and more levies upon his time. In that year, Mörlin and Chemnitz returned to Prussia to prepare a *corpus doctrinae*, or collection of symbolical books, for the Lutheran Church in Duke Albert's domains. After they had returned to Brunswick, Duke Albert sought to secure their services permanently, Mörlin to become bishop of Samland, Chemnitz to become dean of the cathedral in Königsberg. After some negotiations, the common council of the boroughs of Brunswick agreed to let Mörlin go provided that Chemnitz would accept the superintendency. This he agreed to do after the council in turn had accepted certain conditions designed to secure the freedom of the church and of the clergy from inappropriate interference, and he entered upon his new duties the same year. In 1568 he took the degree of doctor of sacred theology at the University of Rostock with the cost of his promotion borne by the Brunswick council. In the same year, at the invitation of Duke Julius (1529 to

1589), the new Lutheran ruler of the Duchy of Brunswick-Wolfenbüttel, Chemnitz, in association with James Andreae (1528—1590), supervised the introduction of the Lutheran Reformation into the previously Roman Catholic territory. For the guidance of the clergy Chemnitz drafted a set of symbols, a service-book, and *Die furnehmsten Hauptstücke der christlichen Lehre* ("The Most Important Chief Parts of Christian Teaching"), later retitled *Handbüchlein der christlichen Lehre* ("Little Manual of Christian Teaching"). The year 1568 also saw the issuance of his theological opinion in connection with the controversy on good works that centered around George Major (1502—1574) and Nicholas von Amsdorf (1483—1565), the quondam bishop of Naumburg-Weitz; this presaged a constantly increasing role in the adjudication of the controversies that had been dividing the Lutheran community since 1546. In 1571 Chemnitz wrote the Lower Saxon Confession, subscribed to at Heinrichstadt (now part of Wolfenbüttel) by the theologians of Rostock and Lower Saxony, and later by the clergy of Hamburg and Lübeck. In 1574 he reworked Andreae's *Swabian Concordia* to produce the *Swabian-Saxon Concordia*. In 1576—the same year in which Duke Julius formally published a slightly expanded version of the *Corpus Julianum* that Chemnitz had compiled (and in part written) as the doctrinal norm for his territories — Chemnitz participated in the conference at Torgau which welded into a single document (the "Torgau Book") the *Swabian-Saxon Concordia* and the *Maulbronn Formula* of Luke Osiander (1534—1604) and Balthasar Bidembach (1533—1578). In 1577 he

played an important role in the conference at Bergen Abbey at which the criticisms of the Torgau Book were taken account of and the Formula of Concord was produced and signed by Andreae, Nicholas Selnecker (1528—1592), Andrew Musculus (1514—1581), Christopher Cornerus (1518—1594), David Chytraeus (1531—1600), and Chemnitz. After the formal publication of the Book of Concord on June 25, 1580, half a century to the day after the reading of the Augsburg Confession before the imperial diet of 1530, Chemnitz was one of the three theologians designated to prepare the *Apologia oder Verantwortung des christlichen Concordienbuchs* ("An Apology or Defense of the Christian Book of Concord"), published in four parts in 1582 and 1583.

In 1576, Chemnitz participated in the formal inauguration of the new imperially chartered University of Helmstedt.⁹ That

⁹ When plans were being made for the formal opening, Chemnitz in a letter to Duke Julius spontaneously promised that "in view of the imminent inauguration and publication of the privileges [of the university] he would give careful attention to the arrangement of the sky, to ascertain when there would be a favorable constellation [for the occasion]." The practical-minded duke wrote back that "it was far more necessary to be concerned about the sources of the income for the support of the academy than about [a horoscope], since 'the stars incline but do not compel'" (Rehtmeyer, III, 418—419). —The 20th century is inclined to take what may be too jaundiced a view of the interest of men like Chemnitz in astrology. Until the mid-17th century it was a perfectly respectable avocation of a Lutheran clergyman; thus John Micraelius (1597—1658), rector of the Royal Paedagogium in Stettin (Szczecin), in his "Memoria . . . Dr. Christophori Schulteti [1602 to 1649]" gives a very careful horoscope cast for the exact hour of his subject's birth; it is reproduced in Henningus Witten, *Memoriae theologorum nostri saeculi clarissimorum renovatae*

same year — in consideration of a grant of 1,000 *Thaler* — he entered into an agreement with the city council of Brunswick not to accept any other vocation.

In 1578 a rift in his friendship with Duke Julius occurred, when, against Chemnitz' advice, the duke scandalized the Lutheran community by having his 14-year-old Lutheran son, the later Duke Henry Julius (1564—1613), who at the age of two had been elected bishop of Halberstadt through the influence of his Roman Catholic grandfather, Duke Henry (1514—1568) of Brunswick-Wolfenbüttel, receive the tonsure (along with two of his brothers) at the hands of the Roman Catholic Abbot of Huyseburg and by having him formally introduced into his see with the traditional Roman Catholic rite and ceremonial. The rift became wider in 1579, when Duke Julius attempted to muzzle Chemnitz and the clergy of the city of Brunswick. Ultimately the duke receded from his position, but the old intimacy with Chemnitz was never restored; the duke withdrew his subscription to the Book of Concord on a technicality, and so the *Corpus Julianum* rather than the Book of Concord became the symbolical standard of the duchy in the subsequent period.

In spite of Chemnitz' bold anti-Roman-Catholic stand, he was not anti-Roman-Catholic on principle and at all costs. Thus in 1582, in his *Bericht vom neuen päbsti-*

schen Gregoriano Calendro an den Marckgrafen und Hertzog in Preussen ("An Account of the New Papalist Gregorian Calendar to the Margrave and Duke in Prussia"),¹⁰ he counsels adoption of the new calendar, although he also urges that it be undertaken in such a way that the pope be not given an oblique precedent for intervening in the affairs of the Lutheran community. Similarly, in 1583 he drafted a reply (published in 1585), written in the name of the imperial estates which had accepted the Book of Concord, to the proposal of the then Reformed King Henry of Navarre (d. 1610) for a comprehensive alliance of Lutheran and Reformed communities against the aggressive designs of the pope. In this document Chemnitz insisted that a "compression of opinions that is called a syncretism," in which each party continues to affirm its distinctive position at home while simulating agreement in public, is neither pleasing to God nor beneficial to the church; instead, Chemnitz urged, let Henry accept the Book of Concord.¹¹ (Henry did not adopt this well-meant counsel; instead he converted to the Roman Catholic Church to become Henry IV of France!)

Chemnitz' health failed rapidly after 1582, and on April 8, 1586, he died quietly. His last recorded words, spoken two days before his end, after he had made his confession and had received holy absolution, were: "Lord, do with me according to Your will and command that my spirit may be received in peace, for it is much better for me to die than to live."

centuria (Frankfurt-am-Main: Martinus Hallervordus [Johannes Andreae], 1685), pp. 1050 to 1051. On the positive contributions to science of these Lutheran astrologer-astronomers, see John Warwick Montgomery, "Cross, Constellation, and Crucible: Lutheran Astrology and Alchemy in the Age of the Reformation," *Ambix*, XI (1963), 65—86.

¹⁰ Printed out in full Rehtmeyer, Appendix to Part III, 359—362.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 367—388.

THE CONTROVERSY WITH THE JESUITS

On the Feast of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary, 1534, Ignatius of Loyola (1491—1556) with six companions had founded in Paris what was to become the Society of Jesus. In 1540 Pope Paul III (1468—1549) had confirmed the foundation of the society with his bull *Regimini militantis ecclesiae*. Alphonse Salmeron (1515—1585) and Peter Canisius (1521—1597) came to the University of Ingolstadt in 1549. The Collegium Germanicum came into being at Rome in 1552 to prepare young Germans for the task of leading their homeland back to union with the Roman see. In 1554 Ignatius of Loyola drafted a master plan for the destruction of the Reformation in Germany. Two years later the Society established itself at the languishing University of Cologne and soon proceeded to dominate the theological faculty. The Cologne Jesuits received their first great opportunity to test their theological mettle in 1560.

John Monhemius (1509?—1564) was the brilliant and influential headmaster of the academy at Düsseldorf. He had demonstrated his Erasmian leanings in three catechisms which he had edited in 1547 and 1551. In 1560 he showed himself a full-blown, even though cautious, Calvinist, in his *Catechismus in quo christianae religionis elementa . . . explicantur* ("A Catechism in Which the Elements of the Christian Religion . . . Are Unfolded"). Designed for students in the fourth and fifth forms, it consists of 11 dialogues between a father and his son.¹²

The Jesuits at Cologne, as part of their program to save the lower Rhine terri-

tories for the papacy, responded with their *Censura et docta explicatio errorum catechismi Johannis Monhemii, grammatici Duesseldorpensis, in qua tum s(acrae) scripturae atq(ue) vestustiss(imorum) patrum testimoniis, tum evidentiss(imis) rationibus veritas catholicae religionis defenditur, per deputatos a sacra theologica facultate universitatis Coloniensis* ("An Evaluation and Learned Unfolding of the Errors of the Catechism of John Monhemius, Grammarian at Düsseldorf, in Which the Truth of the Catholic Religion Is Defended Both with the Testimonies of the Sacred Scriptures and of the Most Ancient Fathers and with the Most Evident Reasons, by Persons Which the Faculty of Sacred Theology at the University of Cologne Has Charged with This Responsibility").¹³ The work bears marks of having been put together rather hastily by a number of authors. Nevertheless, it is in general a competently written attack on Monhemius' work, on the reading of the Sacred Scriptures by laymen, and on the individual's certainty of salvation. It follows the pattern of medieval theology in its uneasy synthesis of works-righteousness and righteousness by grace. It demands a subjection of the secular power to the church. It devotes 22 pages to a defense of the communion of the congregation under the appearance of the consecrated bread alone. The authors are well acquainted with the positions of the Reformers; they quote both the fathers (notably the writings of St. Augustine and

¹² Mumm, pp. 18—21.

¹³ The publisher is Maternus Cholinus of Cologne, the date 1560. The book runs to 354 pages, plus an index. The library of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, has a microfilm copy of the original in the Universitätsbibliothek, Munich. A second edition came out in Cologne in 1582.

Tertullian's *De praescriptione*) and the medieval scholastics. They quote the Bible in the original, although their interpretations involve "unscrupulous eisegesis."¹⁴ What makes this work significant for the prehistory of Chemnitz' *Examen* is that their clinching argument is often a decree of the Council of Trent!

Monhemius' prince, Duke William V (1516—1592) of Jülich, forbade Monhemius to reply, in the hope that he could thereby placate the Roman Catholic party and also evade the necessity of banishing his brilliant headmaster. The task of replying in the name of the Düsseldorf academy thus fell upon the otherwise unknown Henry Artopoeus (Becker), who produced a lively rejoinder, cannily published outside the country in September 1561,¹⁵ which paid the Jesuits off in their own coin. The *Censura* drew at least two other replies. The more important of the two, which concerned itself with the church-and-state issue raised by the *Censura*, was the critical *Responsio duodecimi articuli in censura theologorum Coloniensium de catechismo M. Johannis Monhemii* ("A Reply to the Twelfth Article of the Evaluation of the Catechism of John Monhemius, M. A., by the Theologians at Cologne") by Henry Hamelmann (1525—1595) of Lemgo, an Osnabrück-born Roman Catholic priest who had converted to the Lutheran church in 1550 and was a close

friend of Chemnitz. This work, also published in 1561, saw a second printing the same year, edited by Chemnitz' Brunswick colleague, John Neukirchen (Neophanius).

His interest aroused by these developments, Chemnitz now entered the lists in 1562 with his *Theologiae Jesuitarum praecipua capita ex quadam ipsorum censura, annotata* ("The Chief Chapters of the Theology of the Jesuits, Taken from an Evaluation of Theirs and Annotated").¹⁶ The dedicatory epistle, dated Jan. 27, 1562, is addressed to Elector Joachim II (1505 to 1571) of Brandenburg, and contains this statement: "So that these messengers of the bishop of Rome [i.e., the Jesuits] may be more fully exposed and so that they might become known in our churches (for the ruination of which their idol called them into being) not only by name, but particularly in terms of the criminal shamelessness of what they teach, I felt that it would be worth my while to assemble from that *Censura* of theirs the chief chapters of Jesuit theology, so that,

¹⁶ This work is available to the present writer in two editions: (1) *Theologiae Jesuitarum brevis ac nervosa descriptio et delineatio, ex praecipuis capitibus censura ipsorum, quae anno MDLX Coloniae edita est* ("Brief and Vigorous Description and Portrayal of the Theology of the Jesuits, Taken from the Chief Chapters of Their Evaluation, Which Was Published at Cologne in the Year 1560") (Frankfurt and Wittenberg: Haeredes Tobiae Maevii et Elerdus Schumacherus, 1653), where the text occupies 41 folio pages appended to the 1653 edition of Chemnitz' *Loci theologici*; (2) Martinus Kemnecius, "De origine Jesuitarum et quo consilio secta illa recens constituta sit," in Conradus Deckehrus (editor), *Tractatus de proprietatibus Jesuitarum* (Oppenheim: Hieronymus Gallerus, 1611), pp. 1—150.

¹⁴ Mumm, pp. 22—25.

¹⁵ Henricus Artopoeus, *Ad theologastorum Coloniensium censura . . . responsio, pro defensione catechismi Joannis Monhemii, praeceptoris sui, conscripta* ("A Reply to the Evaluation of the Theologasters of Cologne, Written in Defense of the Catechism of John Monhemius, His Teacher") (Grenoble: Petrus Cephalius Duro-montanus, 1561).

sketched as it were in brief tabular form and set forth for the world to see, they could be recognized by all men and might be appreciated for what they really are. If this kind of thing represents the first-fruits of their preliminary exercises, let the kind reader determine for himself what Germany can await from this sect in the future if it should acquire great strength."

The sharp, sometimes witty, sometimes heavily ironic, but consistently hard-hitting attack on the Neopelagianism and the indefensible hermeneutics of the *Censura* takes the position that the Jesuit doctrine represents a new development within the papalist community which deserves a specific refutation.

A Joachim Loneman of Salzwedel contributes an uncomplimentary 72-line "hendecasyllable" on the Jesuits. An introductory chapter discusses the origin of the Society. In the course of this chapter Chemnitz quotes some speculations on the origin and meaning of the name Jesuit, but soberly insists that he is merely "reviewing various opinions and then allowing the reader to make his own decision." Some Roman emperors were called Africanus, Germanicus, and Asiaticus, not because they were the friends but the conquerors of the people whose name they took; this would make the Jesuits the sworn enemies of the Lord Jesus. Some looked for similar-sounding names in the Old Testament and thought that "Jesuit" might be a kind of paranomasia for Esauites¹⁷ or Jebusites. Working from the

Latin, one could resolve *Jesuita* into *Jesum vita* ("Avoid Jesus"). In Low German *Jesu witt* means "far from Jesus." In High German *Jesu wider* means "against Jesus"; the shift from "t" to "d" presents no problem, since a *Thumbherr* (modern, *Domherr*, canon in a cathedral chapter or a collegiate church) rates as a *dummer Herr* ("a stupid mister"). Some hold that *Jesu wider* is an inadvertent but idiomatic German rendering of "Antichrist." Some etymologists regard the initial syllable of a word as a superfluous addition, hence for *Jesuitae* read *Suitae*, the name Horace applies to "a hog of the sect of Epicurus."

Chemnitz follows the introductory chapter with 15 doctrinal chapters — on the Sacred Scriptures, sin, free will, the Law, the Gospel, justification, faith, good works, the Holy Communion, the invocation of the saints, penance, confirmation, extreme unction, images and celibacy. A final chapter discusses "certain Jesuit axioms scattered here and there" in the work. When the Jesuits find that some point of theirs cannot be proved from the Sacred Scriptures, they have found it safer to say in essence: (1) It is a tradition, and when even this cannot be proved, the bare assertion suffices; (2) the church, that is, the bishop of Rome and his supporters, have so ruled, and such a ruling deserves no less respect than an explicit word of God; (3) nonecclesiastics ought not to ask if the things proposed to them are right or otherwise, but ought humbly kiss the hinder parts of the chapter in canon law which begins *Si Papa*,¹⁸ (4) if the learned con-

¹⁷ This pun occurs at least as early as 1560, for example in James Andreae's *Bericht von der Einigkeit und Uneinigkeit der christlichen Augspurgischen Confessions verwandten Theologen* (Tübingen: N. p., 1560).

¹⁸ *Decreti Magistri Gratiani*, prima pars, distinctio XL, caput VI. Aemilius Friedberg (editor), *Corpus juris canonici* (Graz: Akademische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt, 1955), col.

tradict, let them at once be got rid of with sword or flame.

There are a few references to the Council of Trent, for instance, to the decree on the Vulgate;¹⁹ to the "blasphemous" decree which anathematizes those who say that the satisfaction of penitents is nothing else than faith which trusts that Christ made satisfaction for them;²⁰ and to the experience of the bishop of Chioggia, whom the papal legates expelled from the

146: Dampnatur Apostolicus qui suae et fraternae salutis est negligens. Item ex gestis Bonifacii Martiris. III. Pars. Si Papa suae et fraternae salutis negligens reprehenditur inutilis et remissus in operibus suis et insuper a bono taciturnus, quod magis offitit sibi et omnibus, nichilominus innumerabiles populos catervatim secum ducit, primo mancipio gehennae cum ipso plagis multis in eternum vapulaturus. Huius culpas istic redarguere praesumit mortaliū nullus, quia cunctos ipse iudicaturus a nemine est iudicandus, nisi deprehendatur a fide devius; pro cuius perpetuo statu universitas fidelium tanto instantius orat, quanto suam salutem post Deum ex illius incolumitate animadvertunt propensius pendere. ("The pope is condemned who is unconcerned about his own and his brothers' salvation. Item: From the Deeds of St. Boniface the Martyr [680?—754]. Part Three [i. e., of the *Distinctio*]. If a pope, unconcerned about his own and his brothers' salvation, is found to be useless and remiss in his deeds and beyond that silent over against that which is good, which is the more harmful to him and to everyone, even though he leads countless people by whole troops with him, he shall by himself be flogged forever with many stripes at hell's first taking over of him. No mortal man presumes to admonish the faults of this man here below, because he who has to judge all men ought to be judged by no one, unless he be caught wandering away from the faith. The whole number of the faithful prays so much the more instantly for his continual good estate as they consider that their salvation under God depends the more readily from his preservation.")

¹⁹ Ch. X, Sec. xi.

²⁰ Ch. XII, Sec. iii.

Council of Trent when he expressed displeasure at the decree which declared that traditions ought to be received and kept with the same dutiful affection and reverence as the written Gospel; as well as the effort of Stanislaus Hosius (1504—1579) to support the council's position on tradition with a quotation from Plato.²¹

Chemnitz' faithful friend and colleague John Zanger, an Innsbruck-born convert to the Lutheran Church, translated the work into German before the year was out under the title *Vom neuen Orden der Jesuwider, was ihr Glaube sei und wie sie wider Jesum und sein heiliges Evangelium streiten* ("Of the New Order of Opponents of Jesus, What They Believe and How They Make War on Jesus and His Holy Gospel"). Both in Latin and German the work received instant and widespread recognition.

Even apart from its irony and sarcasm, there are other defects in the work, some of which Mumm points out. At one point Chemnitz attributes to the Jesuits the hoary comparison of the Sacred Scriptures to a "wax nose,"²² although the *Censura* cites this not as a Jesuit principle but as a vulgar axiom. Again, the unqualified charge that the Jesuits teach that the church has power to alter institutions and prescriptions of the Sacred Scriptures²³ has not taken cognizance of the parenthetic illustration of the *Censura* — "as Acts 15

²¹ Ch. XVII, under Axiom 1. The "bishop of Chioggia" referred to was James Nacchianti (1500?—1569); see Hubert Jedin, *A History of the Council of Trent*, trans. Ernest Graf, II (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., c. 1961), 64 to 65 (esp. n. 2), 86—87, 92—93.

²² Ch. II, Sec. ii.

²³ Ch. XVII, under Axiom 2.

makes clear in connection with things strangled and blood and the keeping of the Sabbath that the Sacred Scriptures command." ²⁴

The counterfire began promptly. An otherwise unknown John Albrecht (Albertus),²⁵ lay professor of oratory at the University of Ingolstadt — where Jesuits had been teaching since 1549 — wrote a plaintive and rambling German defense of the Society,²⁶ designed primarily, it would seem, to counter the effect of Zan-

²⁴ Mumm, pp. 44—45. Mumm also states that he could not locate two passages which imply moral relativism on the part of the Jesuits and which Chemnitz quotes in chapter V, section iv, either on the leaf which Chemnitz cites or anywhere else in the *Censura*.

²⁵ The forms Alberus and Allerus seem to be mistakes.

²⁶ The full title reads: *Von der Gesellschaft Jesu wahrhafter und wolgegründter Bericht, mit Widerlegung des uppigen lästerlichen Schreibens, so bayde Martin Kemnitz und Johann Zanger, die Diener zu Braunschweyge, haben newlich wider das Cölnisch Buch, Censuram etc., lassen aussgeben, durch Ioannem Albertum Wimpinensem, Professorem zu Ingolstadt* ([Ingolstadt:] N. p., MDLXIII; 13 unnumbered pages, 120 numbered leaves; 10 by 15 cm.) The work is dedicated to Paul Smayner, Benedictine Abbot of Niederalten (i. e., Niederaltaich, currently one of the centers of German Roman Catholic ecumenical activity). The dedicatory epistle is dated August 10, 1563. The library of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, has an electrostatic reproduction from a microfilm kindly supplied by the Universitätsbibliothek, Munich.

Von der Gesellschaft Jesu reveals that Albert was a master of arts and a lay ("a simple common layman," p. a vi recto) professor of oratory at the University of Ingolstadt. The agnomen Wimpinensis (alias Wimpinaeus) identifies his birthplace as Wimpfen, Kreis Heilbronn. For additional information about him, Oberbibliotheksrat Dr. phil. Ladislaus Buzás of the Universitätsbibliothek in Munich has thoroughly examined the sources available to him and has kindly communicated his findings to me in a letter dated February 25, 1964. The items which he

ger's German translation of Chemnitz' work. Chemnitz regarded the work as so inept as to be almost beneath contempt. In the preface to the *Examen* he notes that

has assembled are not wholly consistent; one or the other of the older historians may have erred in transcribing his sources, or the data collected by Dr. Buzás may not all refer to the same John Albert.

The *Matrikel der Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität Ingolstadt-Landsbut-München*, I (1937), 36, reports a "Johannes Albertus Wimpinensis dioecesis Wormatiensis" as having been matriculated as a *studiosus artium* on January 21, 1561. (It is difficult to imagine that in a matter of barely two years he could have completed his university career and have been made a professor.) Johannes Nepomucenus Mederer, *Annales Ingolstadiensis academiae*, I (1782), 267, reports that 19 days earlier, on January 2, 1561, a John Albert became *magister artium*. (If the persons are the same, one of the entries is wrong; Dr. Buzás believes that Mederer has committed "an obvious error.") Carl Prantl, *Geschichte der Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität Ingolstadt-Landsbut-München*, I (1872), 229, 238, reports that Albert became professor of rhetoric in 1563 (the year in which he wrote *Von der Gesellschaft Jesu*), and that in 1564 the Jesuits at the university tried to have him admitted to the liberal arts faculty, but that the faculty refused to receive him. (The latter statement presents patent difficulties, since as professor of rhetoric he was a member of the liberal arts faculty.) Prantl's statement that Albert was a Jesuit is refuted by Franz Sales Romstöck, *Die Jesuitennullen Prantl's an der Universität Ingolstadt* (1898), p. vii.

Finally, we have the article on a John Albert in Anton Maria Kobolt, *Baierisches Gelehrtenlexikon*, I (1795), 755—757. It reports that he lived at the end of the 16th and the beginning of the 17th century, that he was well-versed in philosophy and theology and that he was an excellent speaker. It further describes him as a physician by profession and (although the dukes of Bavaria did not achieve the electoral dignity until 1623) Electoral Court Physician in Munich. His medical colleagues attacked him for his refusal to submit blindly to the dicta of the traditional medical authorities, for his critical comparison of these authorities with one another, and for his insistence that physicians

no member of the Society of Jesus had undertaken to reply to his work. "Nevertheless, so that they would not be altogether silent, which might have been interpreted as a fault, they pushed forth a kind of hired messenger, an exceedingly wretched little far-shooting Apollo, John Alber[t]us of the University of Ingolstadt, who put on his mask and as if it were on a stage acted out that play written in German in such a laughable fashion, that he had hardly begun the introduction (*protasis*) when he saw from afar the development of the drama's action (*epitasis*), threw off his mask, and dashed out of the theater, but not before he had given the spectators hope that soon another comic actor would follow him who would complete the rest of the drama if not more happily, at least more nobly."²⁷

should study nature for added insight. Kobolt does not list *Von der Gesellschaft Jesu* among this John Albert's works, although he does catalog five medical works published at Ingolstadt and three other medical titles that came from Albert's pen but may not have been published.

²⁷ Martinus Chemicius, *Examen Concilii Tridentini*, ed. Ed[uardus] Preuss (Berlin: Gustav Schlawitz, 1861), Part One, praefatio, par. 1, p. 1A. Hereafter page references in the *Examen* are to this edition, the letters A and B representing the left-hand and right-hand columns respectively. Chemnitz presumably has in mind the statement which Albertus makes almost exactly halfway through his book: "Inasmuch as we have received certain information that a highly learned and able theologian has already begun a comprehensive confutation and apology and has progressed very far in his work, I have regarded it as unnecessary to follow my original undertaking and to provide a lengthier refutation and thus to infringe upon someone else's labors, especially since the other work is so arranged and so solidly founded that thereby Kemnitz and his translator will receive more than enough" (fol. 57).

D'ANDRADA'S *Orthodoxae Explicationes*

Meanwhile another defender of the Jesuits was entering the lists. James Payva d'Andrada (1528—1576?) was a secular priest and a missionary-minded professor of theology at the Portuguese University of Coimbra. The young Jesuit-educated King Sebastian I of Portugal (1554 to 1578) had sent d'Andrada to the Council of Trent as a member of a 4-man team of theologians. At the Council his homiletic abilities, his learned orations, his more than rudimentary acquaintance with the published works of the Reformers, and a brilliant paper on the authority of the pope soon secured for him an impressive reputation. At Trent he seems to have chanced on Chemnitz' *Theologiae Jesuitarum praecipua capita* by himself.²⁸ One of those who strongly urged d'Andrada to prepare a reply was King Sebastian's orator at Trent, Ferdinand Martinez of Mascarenhas, who had been informed by "many" in conversation that Chemnitz' work was being received among the Lutherans and the Reformed with great enthusiasm.²⁹ The nature of the debate at Trent at the mo-

²⁸ Didacus Payva Andradius, *Orthodoxarum explicationum libri decem* (Venice: Jordanus Zilettus, 1564), Epistola nuncupatoria, fol. *3 verso: "Incidi in libellum quendam Martini Kemnicii."

²⁹ "Accessit summa Ferdinandi Martinez Mazcarenii . . . auctoritas qui cum multorum sermone intellexisset, hos commentarios magno cum haereticorum omnium applausu et gratulatione exceptos fuisse, vehementer me incitavit" (ibid., fol. [*4] recto). Among the *multi* we can well include three of the leading Jesuits attending the Council: James Lainez (1512 to 1565), the second general of the Society; Salmeron, who had attended the crucial imperial diet of Augsburg in 1555; and Canisius, first provincial of the Society's German province.

ment gave d'Andrada the necessary leisure. The work came out in Venice in 1564.³⁰ A few months later in the same year, the printer to the University of Cologne, Martenus Cholinus, who had published the *Censura* (as he reminds the "candid reader" in his brief address following the title page), reproduced the Venice edition in Germany.³¹

D'Andrada dedicates the 10-book work to his monarch. The first book begins with a slashing attack on the "impious, crafty, passionate, Satanic" catechism of Monhemius. Chemnitz, whom he calls — somewhat proleptically — a Brunswick doctor, is a pseudoprophet whom Satan has incited. Next d'Andrada gives a life of Ignatius of Loyola and a somewhat dithyrambic description of the progress of the Society. This first book was published separately as well.³²

³⁰ The title of the "extremely rare" (so Toussaint) Venice edition reads: *Orthodoxarum explicationum libri decem, in quibus omnia fere de religione capita, quae his temporibus ab haereticis in controversiam vocantur, aperte et dilucide explicantur, praesertim contra Martini Kemnicii petulantem audaciam, qui Coloniensem censuram, quam a viris Societatis Jesu compositam esse ait, una cum eiusdem sanctissimae societatis vitae ratione, temere calumniandam suscepit* ("The Ten Books of the Orthodox Interpretations, in Which Almost All the Chapters About Religion That in These Times Have Been Called into Controversy by the Heretics Are Frankly and Clearly Unfolded, Especially Against the Wanton Impudence of Martin Kemnitz, Who Rashly Undertook to Misrepresent the Cologne Evaluation, Which He Says Was Put Together by Men of the Society of Jesus, Along with an Account of the Life of the Same Most Holy Society").

³¹ Except for the place of publication and the publisher's name, the Cologne title is all but identical with that of the Venice edition. The library of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis has a microfilm copy of each edition, made from originals in the Universitätsbibliothek, Munich.

³² As an appendix to J. Rut, ed., *Epistolae Indicae* (Louvain, 1566), under the title *De*

The remaining nine books discuss the questions that Chemnitz had raised in his attack on the Jesuits — the sacred Scriptures, sin, free will, the Law and the Gospel, justification and faith, the Holy Communion, penance, confirmation and extreme unction, the veneration of the saints and images, and celibacy. The viewpoint is the rigidly authoritarian one which the Iberian bishops represented at Trent.

THE *Examen Concilii Tridentini*

Chemnitz gladly picked up the gage of battle that d'Andrada had thrown at his feet. Obviously the 10 books of the Coimbra professor's ambitious effort demanded a similarly extensive reply. The course of events seemed to Chemnitz to dictate the form that his reply must take.

For one thing, the *Censura* had repeatedly clinched its points by quoting a Tridentine decree. For another, d'Andrada, himself a participant in the Council, had written his attack on Chemnitz at Trent. If Chemnitz concluded that d'Andrada had written his book by direction of the Council itself,³³ he cannot be blamed too much.

Societatis Jesu origine libellus, authore D. Jacobo Payva . . . contra Kemnicii cujusdam petulantem audaciam. A copy is in the British Museum. Johannes Georgius Walchius, *Bibliotheca theologica selecta*, II (Jena: Vidua Croeckeriana, 1758), 290, lists a Cologne 1564 edition as well.

³³ *Examen Concilii Tridentini*, Part One, locus VI, sectio i, par. 2, p. 123B. — The first complete edition of the canons and decrees of Trent came off the press in Rome shortly after Pius IV confirmed them in 1564. The amplest collection of supplementary materials is the Görres-Gesellschaft's *Concilium Tridentinum: Diariorum, actorum, epistolarum, tractatum nova collectio*, 13 vol. (Freiburg-im-Breisgau: Herder, 1901–1961). H. J. Schroeder, *Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent: Original Text with English Translation* (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1941), draws on the Görres-Gesellschaft text.

Finally, the fact that d'Andrada's book arrived in Brunswick almost simultaneously with the last decrees of Trent decided Chemnitz' course for him: He would analyze the doctrinal decrees of Trent at the hand of the commentary with which he saw d'Andrada's book providing him.

This decision, natural for a person of Chemnitz' mind-set, had two consequences.

By concentrating almost exclusively on the dogmatic decrees Chemnitz spared himself the added effort of a full-dress discussion of the Council's decisions in the area of reform. Yet these reform decrees were not uninfluenced by doctrinal considerations, nor were they without doctrinal implications; except by an intolerably narrow definition of "doctrine," many of the reform decrees were really doctrinal too. The fact that Chemnitz deliberately ignored them almost altogether tended to render incomplete, at least to some extent, the picture of Trent which the *Examen* gave to the non-Roman-Catholic reader whose chief source of information about Trent would be this volume.

Similarly, by letting d'Andrada's work serve as a commentary on the Tridentine decrees, Chemnitz canonized for his readers as the authentic understanding of the Tridentine position the partisan interpretation of the Latin theologians of the extreme right. Thus Chemnitz introduced into the Lutheran interpretation of Trent a hermeneutical skew which largely foreclosed the possibility of a more moderate and a more "evangelical" interpretation.³⁴

³⁴ This observation is particularly true with reference to at least some aspects of the doctrines of justification and of the sources of revelation. As Werner Elert, *Morphologie des Luthertums*, 2d ed., I (Munich: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1952), 65, points out, Chemnitz sees the chasm between the Lutheran

Indeed, one of the first major Roman Catholic attempts at refuting the *Examen*, that of Jodoc Ravesteyn, strongly criticizes

and the Roman Catholic position on justification as unbridgeable. Yet such inquiries as Hanns Rückert, *Die Rechtfertigungslehre auf dem Tridentinischen Konzil* (Bonn: A. Marcus und E. Weber's Verlag, 1925), and Hans Küng, *Rechtfertigung: Die Lehre Karl Barths und eine katholische Besinnung* (Einsiedeln: Johannes Verlag, c. 1957), translated by Thomas Collins, Edmund E. Tolk, and David Granskou as *Justification: The Doctrine of Karl Barth and a Catholic Reflection* (New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, c. 1964), indicate that the Tridentine fathers were far from unanimous in their doctrine of justification and that some of this diversity finds expression in the language of Trent. Similar differences in opinion are alleged in the case of the relation of Scripture and tradition; see Gabriel Moran, *Scripture and Tradition: A Survey of the Controversy* (New York: Herder and Herder, 1963), and Georges Tavad, "The Problem of Tradition Today," in Gregory Baum, ed., *Ecumenical Theology Today* (Glen Rock, N. J.: Paulist Press, 1964), pp. 18 to 27. At the same time, Pelikan's observations are apposite in this connection: "Revisionists have attempted to show that on the doctrine of justification and on the authority of Scripture the formulations of Trent are actually a compromise between the Reformation extreme and the opposite extreme of certain fifteenth century theologians. Only when they are read in the light of both extremes, rather than merely in the light of the reformers, are these formulations said to come into proper perspective. There is undoubtedly something to be said for this interpretation, and it deserves more careful attention than Protestant theologians have been willing to give it. But it does not appear to have demonstrated its fundamental contention; for the explicit target of Trent's anathema is consistently the Reformation position — or 'extreme' — while some fairly subtle and sophisticated historical scholarship is often necessary to unearth the opposite 'extreme' also included in the condemnations." (Jaroslav Jan Pelikan, *The Riddle of Roman Catholicism* [New York: Abingdon Press, c. 1959], pp. 52—53.) D'Andrada's work has never been officially disavowed. Chemnitz unquestionably intended to reply to the interpretation of the Tridentine decrees that appeared to him to square with the intentions of the council fathers.

Chemnitz for having at times confused the opinion of the theologians of d'Andrada's type with the real content of the decrees.

The preparation of the *Examen* absorbed Chemnitz' leisure for the next nine years. By the end of March 1565 he had worked out the first part sufficiently to send it to a colleague in Frankfurt-am-Main, Matthias Ritter (1526—1588), with the request that he try to find a publisher. On Christmas Eve of that year Chemnitz was still reading proof and finding "manifold and most horrible errors" (*multiplicia et foedissima errata*).³⁵ The following spring the first part came out, dedicated to Duke Albert Frederick (1553—1618), the youthful son of Duke Albert the Elder. The second part followed in the same year, dedicated to Margrave John of Brandenburg-Cüstrin, after Chemnitz' friend, Duke Julius of Brunswick-Wolfenbüttel, had refused the honor because of the militant commitment of his father, the still reigning Duke Henry, to the Roman Catholic party. In 1573 both the third part, dedicated to Elector John George (1525 to 1598) of Brandenburg, and the fourth and final part, dedicated to Duke Henry Julius (1554—1613) of Brandenburg-Wolfenbüttel, the son of Duke Julius, who now reigned as a Lutheran in his deceased father's domains, came out.

Part One is prefaced with a *Narratio de Synodo Nicena versibus exposita* ("Narrative Account of the Council of Nicaea Set Forth in Verses"), four solid double-spaced pages of hexameters in the Preuss edition, composed by Matthias Berg, M. A. (1536

to 1592), headmaster of St. Catharine's School in Brunswick.³⁶ The first part discusses the teaching about traditions, original sin, concupiscence, the word "sin," the conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary, the works of unbelievers, free will, justification, faith, and good works. The second part discusses the sacraments in general, Baptism, confirmation, the sacrament of the Eucharist, Communion under both appearances, the mass, penance, contrition, confession, satisfactions, extreme unction, the sacrament of orders, and matrimony. The third part covers the issues of virginity, priestly celibacy, purgatory, and the invocation of the saints. The fourth part continues the third, with sections on the relics of the saints, images, indulgences, fasting, the distinction of foods, and the feasts of the calendar.

Since the first edition, there has never

³⁶ In 1578 Berg subscribed the Formula of Concord, but soon began to have doubts about the correctness of some of its definitions. He corresponded with Reformed theologians like Theodore de Bèze (1519—1605) in Geneva and with Mark Menning (d. 1584) in Bremen, and in 1580 he formally withdrew his subscription to the Formula in a "Protestation" to the Brunswick ministerium. In this document he took issue with the Formula on predestination and free will, on the hypostatic union and the exchange of qualities of our Lord's two natures, on our Lord's ascension and session, and on the Holy Communion. Cited to answer before the ministerium, Berg was charged by Chemnitz with Calvinism. Berg thereupon changed his mind again, and the city council and the ministerium commanded him to do public penance in St. Ulric's Church: He was to kneel throughout the sermon at vespers on Trinity XI and thereupon formally to recall his errors. This he did, but in 1582 he relapsed into Calvinistic ways of thought again, and the city council gave him eight days in which to go into exile. Berg spent the rest of his life as a professor at the University of Altdorf. (Rehtmeyer, III, 500 to 503; appendix, 347—359.)

³⁵ Preuss, "Historia libri impressi," in his edition of the *Examen*, pp. 959—964. The frequent dating of the printing of the first part in 1565 is accordingly wrong.

been a century in which the *Examen* was not republished. Twenty subsequent editions came out in Frankfurt-am-Main (two in 1574, one each in 1576, 1577, 1578, 1585, 1588, and 1590, two in 1596, one each in 1599, 1605, 1606, and 1609, two in 1615, one each in 1619, 1642, 1690, and 1707), plus five in Geneva (1614, 1634, 1641, 1667, and 1668), and one each in Wittenberg (1598), Berlin (1861), and Leipzig (1915).³⁷

³⁷ The information contained in this paragraph is based on Preuss, pp. 961—962; Mumm, pp. 90—91; Gottfried Noth, *Grundlinien der Theologie des Martin Chemnitz*, 1930, an unpublished holographic copy of a University of Erlangen doctoral dissertation (available to this writer in a microfilm copy of the original in the Universitätsbibliothek, Erlangen), p. ii; a careful review of the holdings of the library of Concordia Seminary in St. Louis; an examination of the Library of Congress Union Catalog in Washington, D. C., and of the catalogs of the libraries of the British Museum in London, the University of Erlangen, the University of Marburg, the University of Kiel, the University of Bern, Luther Theological Seminary in St. Paul, the Theological Seminary of Capital University in Columbus, Wartburg Theological Seminary in Dubuque, the Rock Island (Illinois) Campus of the Lutheran School of Theology, Northwestern Lutheran Theological Seminary in Minneapolis, the Geistliches Ministerium in Greifswald, and the Société des Pasteurs et Ministres in Neuchâtel, and of the catalogs of the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris, the Deutsche Staatsbibliothek in East Berlin, the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek in Munich, the Herzog-August-Bibliothek in Wolfenbüttel, the Bibliothek der Hansestadt Lübeck, the Bibliothèque Publique et Universitaire of Geneva, and the Stadtbibliothek of Zurich. — The edition of 1576 (so the colophon; the title page gives the date as 1577), not otherwise recorded, is represented by a copy of Part One in the Universitätsbibliothek Erlangen; the publisher is Paul Reffeler (data confirmed in a letter from *Bibliotheksrat* Dr. Frankenberger, dated Feb. 5, 1964). The edition of 1577 (so both title-page and colophon), not otherwise recorded, is represented by a copy of Part One in the Library of Concordia Seminary,

TRANSLATIONS OF THE *Examen*

From a note that may have been written as early as 1571, it appears that John Zanger translated at least a part of the *Examen* into German; if the work was ever printed, no copies have survived. All four parts are included in the stout folio German translation by George Nigrinus, published in 1576/1577.³⁸ Abridged translations into German came out in this country in 1875,³⁹ and in Germany in 1884.⁴⁰

St. Louis; the publisher is again Paul(us) Raffeler(us), the page size 9.7 by 15.5 cm. It is quite possible that both of these editions may have been reprints of the first part only, occasioned by an increase in the print runs of Parts Two through Four in the course of the printing of the octavo edition of 1574.

³⁸ *Examen, das ist, Erörterung dess Tridentinischen Concilii in Latein beschrieben und in vier Theil verfasst, darinn eine starcke vollkommene Widerlegung der fürnemmen Hauptpuncten der gantzen papistischen Lehre, auss dem Grundt der H. Schrift und dem Consens der rechtlebrenden Väter zusammen getragen und in ein Buch verfasst ist, auss dem Latein vertetschet durch Georgium Nigrinum* (Frankfurt-am-Main: [Georg Raben], 1576 [colophon date: 1577]). This writer has been given generous access to the copy of the Reverend Robert Wilken of the Gettysburg (Penn.) Theological Seminary faculty.

³⁹ *Examen Concilii Tridentini, d. h. Prüfung des Concils von Trient, worin die Hauptlehren des ganzen Papstthums sowohl aus den Quellen heiliger Schrift als auch dem Consens der rechtgläubigen Väter gründlich und vollständig widerlegt werden, aus dem Lateinischen aufs neue ins Deutsche übertragen von etlichen lutherischen Pastoren* (St. Louis: L. Volkening, 1875; xx, 256 pp.). The translator of the first part, all that was ever actually published, was Carl Adolf Frank (1846—1922).

⁴⁰ *Examen Concilii Tridentini, das ist, Beleuchtung und Widerlegung der Beschlüsse des tridentinischen Konzils, deutsch bearbeitet von R. Bendixen in Verbindung mit Chr(istoph) E(rnst) Luthardt* [1823—1902] (Leipzig: Dörfeling und Franke, 1884; xvi, 487 pp.).

In 1582 an English translation of the section on traditions was published in London by Thomas Purfoot and William Pounsonbie under the title *A Discoverie and Batterie of the Great Fort of Unwritten Traditions: Otherwise, An Examination of the Counsell of Trent Touching the Decree of Traditions, done by Martinus Chemnitius in Latine and translated into Englishe*. The translation is dedicated to Sir James Altham (died 1617), whom Francis Bacon called "one of the gravest and most reverend judges of this kingdom."⁴¹ On page 85 the translator, identified only by the initials R. V., promises: "The discourse of the Scripture is placed before this of traditions, which, if God will, shall one day be translated also."⁴²

⁴¹ On Altham see the article in *The Dictionary of National Biography*, I (1885), 348.

⁴² The library of Concordia Seminary in St. Louis has an electrostatic copy of this 85-page book. The translator has not been identified. For a number of reasons, this writer would suggest further inquiry into the possibility that the translator may have been the Richard Vennar(d), or Venner, whose career is sketched in *The Dictionary of National Biography*, XX (1899), 210—212. (1) For quite a period before and after 1582, Vennar is apparently the only British author known to have published under the initials R. V. (2) Just prior to June 10, 1581, when he was admitted to Lincoln's Inn, Vennar had returned to England from a long visit to the Continent, including Germany. (3) Both Altham, to whom *A Discoverie* is dedicated, and Vennar were lawyers. (4) The subsequent course of Vennar's life would account for his failure to complete, or at least to publish, the promised section of the *Examen* on the Sacred Scriptures. (5) Vennar is known to have been anti-Roman-Catholic and to have had, among other interests, a lively interest in religion. In 1601 Thomas Este of London published Vennar's *The Right Way to Heaven and the True Testimonie of a Faithfull and Loyall Subject*. The first part of this work was reprinted in 1602 under the title *The Right*

In 1963 the Reverend Frederick H. S. Has-sold, D.D., a retired Lutheran pastor of Glenside, Australia, brought to a conclusion his typewritten 2,505-folio translation of the *Examen* into English.⁴³ An abridged English translation, which will reproduce in their entirety Sections I and VIII of the commonplace on Sacred Scriptures and the whole of the commonplaces on traditions, free will, justification, the sacrament of the Eucharist, the mass, purgatory, and indulgences, with the balance of the *Examen* summarized, is in preparation under the aegis of the Committee on Scholarly Research of The Lutheran Church — Missouri Synod.

In 1588 the then 30-year-old Hungarian Lutheran Baron Gergely Horváth of Felső-Eőr published a faithful sentence-by-sentence Magyar translation of paragraphs 9 through 11 of Part Four, locus III, section iii of the *Examen*, a discussion of the legitimacy of images.⁴⁴

Way to Heaven and A Good Presedent for Lawyers and All Other Good Christians, the latter part in 1605, dedicated to James I, as *The True Testimonie of a Faithful Subject, Contain-ing . . . a Thanksgiving to God for the Happie Deliverie of the House of Parliament from the Late Horrible Treason* (that is, the Gunpowder Plot).

⁴³ The typescript of this translation, complete except for some of the prayers in Part Three, locus IV, sectio ii, has been acquired by the Committee on Scholarly Research of The Lutheran Church — Missouri Synod. It has been microfilmed and xeroxed and copies are available for sale to libraries of universities and theological seminaries.

⁴⁴ Ed. Preuss, pp. 771—772. The Magyar title reads: *Az kepekről való tudomány, mely Chemnitz Márton írásából, kit déákul ki boczátot, minden embernek járúara, magyar nyelvre fordítatot Stansit Horvát(h) Gergely által* (Bartfa: N. p., 1588; 8 unnumbered pages; 21 cm). Each page of the text contains 29 lines.

The statement is frequently made that the *Examen* was translated into French. Actually, this is true only of part of Part Four. In 1599 the first commonplace of this part, on the relics of the saints, was published in a French translation as an appendix to an edition of John Calvin's *Traitté des reliques*,⁴⁵ while another vol-

The printer, although not named on the title page, is certain to have been David Gutgesel, a devoted Lutheran whose press issued other orthodox Lutheran publications and of whom the chronicle of the city of Bartfa affirms that "he published neither Sacramentarian nor Arian nor Anabaptist books nor any other heretical writings."

In his 16th year Baron Horváth had begun a tour that kept him from his homeland for seven years and that took him to Germany (where he attended the Lutheran universities of Wittenberg and Strasbourg), Holland, Switzerland (where he studied at the University of Basel and the Academy of Geneva) and Italy. Back in Felső-Eör, he set up an academy in one of his castles, established generous scholarships for poor students, and himself joined the teaching staff as teacher of dialectics, ethics, and rhetoric. At this particular time the number of Roman Catholics in Hungary had declined to a point where they no longer constituted a threat to the Lutheran movement. More dangerous was the rising tide of Reformed influence, and Baron Horváth did what he could to stem it. Among his polemical works is a multivolume Latin polemic against the Reformed preacher Sebastian (Ambrose) Lám of Késmark. The anti-iconoclastic purpose behind Baron Horváth's publication of the Chemnitz excerpt contributed to the charge of being an image-worshiper that the Reformed party brought against him. (The present writer owes this information to the kindness of the Reverend Jenő Virág, librarian at the Lutheran Theological Academy in Budapest, who in turn states that he derived it from an article by Miklós Vértessy in a professional librarians' journal. Pastor Virág states that he has personally examined a surviving copy of Baron Horváth's little translation.)

⁴⁵ Jean Calvin, *Traitté des reliques, ou, Advvertissement tresutile du grand profit qui revient à la Chrestienté, s'il se faisoit inventaire de*

ume offered a translation into French of the third commonplace, on indulgences.⁴⁶

Besides these editions and translations, the *Examen* received additional attention. Solomon Gesner (1559—1605) made it the subject of 18 disputations over which he presided at the University of Wittenberg; they were published in 1602.⁴⁷ In 1701 Samuel Benedict Carpzov (1647 to 1707) published the *Disputationes isagogicae in Chemnitium systematicae et anti-papisticae* ("An Introduction to Chemnitz in the Form of Systematic and Antipapistic Disputations") of John Benedict Carpzov the Elder (1607—1657). In 1736 Theodor Reimbold published his *Historiae examinis concilii Tridentini specimen* ("A Sample of a History of the *Examen Concilii Tridentini*").

THE THEOLOGY OF THE *Examen*

The theology which underlies the *Examen* is that of a second-generation Reformation theologian who is both a disciple

tous les corps saints et reliques . . . autre traité de reliques contre le décret du Concile de Trente, traduit du Latin de M. Chemnicus . . . Geneva, P. de la Roviére, 1599). The volume also included French translations of an anonymous inventory of the relics of Rome (from the Italian) and of a similarly anonymous reply to Bellarmine's assertions in favor of relics. The translator is not identified. A second edition of the work came out in 1863.

⁴⁶ *Traitté des indulgences contre le décret du Concile de Trente; briefve considération sur l'an du Jubilé; le vrai et grand pardon général de pleniére rémission des péchés. Traduit du Latin de M. Chemnitz avec une préface* (Geneva: I. Choüet, 1599; 239 pp.). The translator is not identified.

⁴⁷ The proponent in the fifth disputation was Count Axel Gustafsson Oxenstjerna (1583 to 1654), who became the chancellor of Sweden a decade later.

of Luther and a disciple of Melanchthon. Put differently, Chemnitz reproduces the theological concerns of Luther with the careful precision that the Brunswick superintendent had learned from his mentor Melanchthon, for whom he always maintained a dutiful respect, even when circumstances required him to dissent from some of Melanchthon's positions.⁴⁸

One can differentiate three types of "Melanchthonianism" in the disciples of the *Praeceptor Germaniae*. One type we can call "Cryptocalvinist." It is the position that some of Melanchthon's more extreme disciples in Wittenberg and elsewhere took when they exaggerated and absolutized incidental elements of Melanchthon's theology. After the victory of the Formula of Concord forced the representatives of this school in many Lutheran territories out of the Lutheran Church and into the Reformed camp, this theological emphasis helped to give German Reformed Orthodoxy some of the characteristic features — notably a stress upon the universality of grace — that differentiate it from the more uncompromisingly predestinarian Reformed Orthodoxy of Switzerland and

pre-Arminian Holland.⁴⁹ With this aberration Chemnitz had no sympathy.

The second type of Melanchthonian inheritance we can call "Calixtine." It is the moderate, humanistic approach that combined an open commitment to the Lutheran position with a greater degree of tolerance and of concern for the unity of the empirical church than many of the representatives of classic Lutheran Orthodoxy commonly displayed. This type of Melanchthonianism, although it both antedated and survived the great Helmstedt theologian, found expression in the movement associated with the name of George Calixtus.⁵⁰

The third type we can call "Chemnitarian." On issues where Lutheran and Reformed theology take different positions — even where Reformed theology appeals to a real or fancied agreement with Melanchthon for support — Chemnitz takes the Lutheran view on principle, but

⁴⁹ The relationship of Melanchthonianism to German Reformed theology is complex and must not be oversimplified, as Heinrich Heppe (1820—1879) did in his day. Concerning him Karl Barth observes: "According to him it was strangely not Calvin but the later Melanchthon who, taken strictly, would have to have been the father of Reformed theology" (Barth's introduction to Heinrich Heppe, *Die Dogmatik der evangelisch-reformierten Kirche*, ed. Ernst Bizer, 2d ed. [Neukirchen Kreis Moers: Neukirchener Verlag, 1958], p. ix; see Bizer's historical introduction to this work passim pp. xxxiv—lvi, especially p. xli).

⁵⁰ See, for instance, Friedrich Wilhelm Kantzenbach, *Das Ringen um die Einheit der Kirche im Jahrhundert der Reformation* (Stuttgart: Evangelisches Verlagswerk, 1957), especially Chs. III (Melanchthon) and VII (Calixtus). The most recent discussion of the role of Calixtus is Hermann Schüssler, *Georg Calixt: Theologie und Kirchenpolitik — eine Studie zur Ökumenizität des Luthertums* (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1961).

⁴⁸ Gottfried Noth explores the tension between the Lutheran and the Melanchthonian elements in the theology of Chemnitz in his *Grundzüge der Theologie des Martin Chemnitz* (see n. 37). The three major sections discuss Chemnitz' views of Scripture and tradition (for which Noth draws heavily on the *Examen* for documentation), his soteriology, and his sacramental doctrine in relation to his Christology. Noth examines the same tension in a narrower segment of Chemnitz' theology in his article, "Pecata contra conscientiam," in Friedrich Hübner, Wilhelm Maurer, and Ernst Kinder, ed., *Gedenkschrift für D. Werner Elert: Beiträge zur historischen und systematischen Theologie* (Berlin: Lutherisches Verlagshaus, 1955), pp. 211 to 219.

without the bitter anti-"Philippist" polemics of the "Gnesio-Lutherans." Among the major representatives of this type of Melancthonism are Chemnitz himself and his two fellow protégés of Melancthon among the coauthors of the Formula of Concord, Nicholas Selnecker and David Chytraeus.

The "Lutheran" emphases that one would expect to find in Chemnitz are not missing. We shall take our examples exclusively from Part One of the *Examen*.

In his teaching on Sacred Scripture, Chemnitz may stand as an epitome of the historic tension in Lutheran theology between a defensible Biblicism which insists that the Sacred Scriptures are the sole rule and norm of all articles of faith on the one hand and a profound concern for every insight that the tradition of the church can provide for the proper understanding of the divine oracles on the other. Chemnitz manages to maintain both emphases in a proper balance. Thus against the charge that the Lutheran position in the matter of relics of the saints is a novelty, he declares defiantly: "Our antiquity is Christ and the Sacred Scriptures."⁵¹ But with equal energy he rejects the charge that Lutherans "across the board attribute no value to the witness of antiquity, count the authority of the Fathers as without weight, and weaken the approval, the faith, and the majesty of the church," and he counters with the declaration: "We give

the writings of the fathers the place that they ought to have — and it is one that does them honor — as those that have unfolded the meaning of many passages of Scripture most clearly, that have defended the ancient dogmas of the church out of the Scriptures against the novel corruptions of the heretics, that have rightly explained many passages of doctrine, that have recorded many items out of the history of the early church, and in a useful fashion have given us many additional instructions. . . . It is our conviction that in religious controversies the judge is the Word of God and that afterward there is added the confession of the true church."⁵²

Original sin is "in the will a turning away from God and enmity against God, in the heart a stubbornness of the dispositions, and in all of a human being's powers a horrifying disorder and debasement as far as divine or spiritual matters are concerned."⁵³ The unrebored human being has "wholly lost the power, the strength, and the efficacy or faculty with which to begin and carry out spiritual actions as he should."⁵⁴

The doctrine of the divine forgiveness of sins by grace for Christ's sake through faith — what Lutheran theology technically describes as "justification" — is central for Chemnitz. ("The sum total and, as it were, the scope of all of the Sacred Scriptures is the remission of sins," he observes.)⁵⁵ Justification is "the chief article

⁵¹ "Respondemus primo nostram antiquitatem esse Christum et sacram scripturam" (Part Four, locus I, sectio iii, par. 15, p. 759A). See also Part One, locus I, sectio viii, par. 2, p. 66A. The issue of Scripture-and-tradition receives a careful treatment in Arthur L. Olson, "Martin Chemnitz and the Council of Trent," *Dialog*, II (1963), 60—67.

⁵² Part One, locus II, sectio vi, pars. 1—2, p. 81A.

⁵³ Part One, locus III, sectio ii, par. 2, p. 103B.

⁵⁴ Part One, locus VII, sectio iii, par. 1, p. 136B.

⁵⁵ Part Four, locus III, sectio i, capus ii, par. 1, p. 799A.

of Christian doctrine."⁵⁶ Justifying faith is "that instrument or organ through which we seek, lay hold of, accept, and apply to ourselves the mercy of God in the word of the Gospel — of a God who takes away sins and receives us to eternal life on account of His Son, our Mediator."⁵⁷ We "ought not to attribute to the merits of our own works the expiation of our sins or the offering of a propitiation for our sins, for this belongs to an office which is exclusively that of Christ, the Mediator. Hence the remission of sins, reconciliation with God, adoption, salvation, and life eternal do not depend on our merits, but they are given gratuitously on account of the merit and the obedience of the Son of God, and they are received through faith. But once we have been reconciled, good works thereupon please God through faith on account of the Mediator, and so they have spiritual and bodily rewards both in and after this life."⁵⁸

Chemnitz has a high view of the sacred ministry. In connection with his discussion of holy absolution, he says: "Even though the keys are given to the church herself, as the ancients rightly report, nevertheless

we in no way believe that any Christian, without distinction and without a legitimate vocation, ought or can arrogate to himself or exercise the ministry of the Word and of the sacraments. But just as in a case of necessity the ancients say that any Christian layman can administer the sacrament of baptism, so Luther said the same thing with reference to absolution in a case of necessity where a priest is not to be had, and he said nothing more than what Peter Lombard . . . and Gratian . . . say about a case of necessity on the basis of the opinions of the ancients."⁵⁹ A little later on he asserts in the same vein: "God, who alone takes away sins, does not do this without means but through the ministry of the Word and of the sacraments."⁶⁰ The fact of baptism does not dispense Christian lay people from the due reverence to and recognition of the authority of the sacred ministry, any more than it dispenses them from their due obedience to the political authorities.⁶¹

Chemnitz sees values in ascetic disciplines. He agrees that there is a right kind of fasting, which believers can offer as a voluntary sacrifice in their worship of God.⁶²

⁵⁶ Part One, locus VIII, examen, par. 1, p. 146A. At the same time Chemnitz refuses to make of this doctrine what a later age of comparative theologians would call a "material principle." While he recognizes the relatedness of all revelation, he also accepts the multiplicity and the variety of the self-disclosure of God's being and purposes.

⁵⁷ Part One, locus IX, sectio ii, par. 1, p. 182A.

⁵⁸ Part One, locus X, quaestio iv, par. 1, p. 212B. See also *Apology of the Augsburg Confession*, IV, 348—372. (So that the reader can satisfy himself of the congruence of Chemnitz' position with the Lutheran symbolical books, cross references to the latter are offered in this and the following footnotes.)

⁵⁹ Part Two, locus X, examen, par. 1, p. 453B. See also *Treatise on the Authority and Primacy of the Pope*, 67.

⁶⁰ Part Two, locus X, sectio i, par. 5, p. 454B. See also *Augsburg Confession*, V, 1—2; XIV; XXVIII, 5—9; *Apology*, XIII, 7—13; XXVIII, 12—13.

⁶¹ Part Two, locus II, sectio vi, par. 3, p. 275A. See also *Large Catechism*, Fourth Commandment, 158—166.

⁶² Part Four, locus IV, sectio i, caput iii, pp. 845—849. The final sentence reads: "Si fines [jejunii] recte indicentur et explicantur, tunc apud pios talia exercitia sponte sequuntur, et tunc etiam fiunt cultus, si ex fide propter veros

He recognizes that celibacy is something which individuals with the necessary gift for it can intentionally undertake and sets up six rules to guide such persons,⁶³ and he endorses in all its terms the confession of the fourth-century Council of Gangra: "The holy church of God with humility admires and glorifies virginity, praises widowhood, and honors and supports the chaste bond of marriage."⁶⁴

Pious and good, he says, and neither to be rejected nor condemned, is the thought that the blessed saints in light, even though they do not know the particular circumstances of individual persons on earth, nevertheless pray for the good estate of Christ's church militant on earth, that they are concerned about the faithful upon earth, and that they ask of Christ on behalf of the faithful on earth everything good and a final transition for them to their company in the heavenly fatherland.⁶⁵

Chemnitz yields not an inch in insisting on the dynamic character of the Sacrament of the Altar and in rejecting "two major columns supporting the papalist dominion, namely, (1) that once the words of institution have been recited over the bread even outside the use divinely ordained and commanded in our Lord's institution, Christ, God and man, enters into an enduring conjunction with the bread and remains therein in the very same way

according to which He is there in a right use of the Sacrament, and (2) that it is licit to employ the Eucharist in another way and for another use beyond and outside the one which has the endorsement and command of Christ's institution, as, for example, that of sacrificing it or reserving it or carrying it about or exposing it for adoration or for related activities."⁶⁶ At the same time he takes the terms *usus* and *actio* broadly enough to include the primitive practice of having the deacons take the body and blood of Christ to the absent members of the community and the practice of some early bishops of Rome of sending part of the Eucharist from their own celebrations as a symbol of intercommunion to the places in the city where bishops and priests from Asia and elsewhere were celebrating the Sacrament of the Altar.⁶⁷ Even with reference to the ancient practice which had communicants take with them from the celebration of the Eucharist some of the consecrated species for private communion at home (attested as late as Saint Augustine) and the primitive custom of reserving the Sacrament for possible administration to the dying, Chemnitz asserts (although withholding his approval): "We do not condemn those ancients who observed this custom, for they had weighty grounds for doing so by reason of their times."⁶⁸

finis sint voluntaria sacrificia." See also Augsburg Confession, XXVI, 33—39; Apology, XV, 46—47.

⁶³ Part Three, locus I, sectio ii, caput v, pp. 541—544. See also Apology, XXIII, 36—40. 55. 67—69; XXVII, 21 and 27.

⁶⁴ Part Three, locus I, sectio ii, p. 523B.

⁶⁵ Part Three, locus IV, sectio i, par. 19, p. 660A. See also Apology, XXI, 9 and 27; Smalcald Articles, Part Two, II, 26.

⁶⁶ Part Two, locus IV, section iii, par. 12, p. 310A.

⁶⁷ Ibid., par. 14, p. 310B; sectio vii, par. 12, p. 329. Par. 14, p. 330A: "In hisce exemplis omnibus servatur adhuc usus sive actio a Christo instituta."

⁶⁸ Ibid., par. 19, p. 331B. John Gerhard devotes a large part of Chapter XVII, "De repositione sacramentali," *Loci theologici*, V, locus XXI, pars. 191—198, ed. Preuss pp. 180—195,

We encounter in Chemnitz a profound Eucharistic piety. Typical is this assertion: "In the Eucharist we receive a most certain and excellent pledge of our reconciliation with God, the forgiveness of sins, immortality, and future glorification. And indeed in this sacrament Christ pours out generously the wealth of His divine love toward men. For that body which He gave into death He gives to us in His Supper as food, so that from it, as from a solid, divine, and life-giving food we may live, be nourished, grow, be comforted, and be ultimately changed into Him, never to be separated from Him, as St. Augustine says rightly, in Christ's person: 'You will not change Me into yourself, but you will be changed into Me.' And: '[O] holy banquet, in which Christ is received, the memory of His Passion is recalled, the soul is filled with grace, and a pledge of glory to come is given to us.'⁶⁹ And the statement of St. Ignatius in his Letter to the Ephesians is beautifully put, where he calls the Eucharist 'a medicine of immortality, an antidote so that we shall not die but live in God through Jesus Christ, and a purgative that drives away evils.'" Chemnitz continues with additional quotations from SS. Bernard, Cyprian, John Chrysostom, and Ambrose.⁷⁰

He approves the adoration of Christ, God and man, who is present in the Holy

Communion with a peculiar kind of presence and grace so that here He truly and substantially conveys to all the communicants His body and His blood, although of course Chemnitz rejects an adoration of the bread and wine as such.⁷¹ He lists seven ways in which the mass can rightly be called a sacrifice: (1) Because in the mass the death of Christ is proclaimed in the reading and explication of the prophetic and apostolic Scriptures and a consideration of the causes and benefits of the Passion of Christ is set forth out of the Word of God (Rom. 15:16; Phil. 2:17; 1 Peter 2:5); (2) in the celebration of the Holy Communion the praises of God are spoken and sung (Heb. 13:15; Ps. 50:14); (3) the liturgical action includes public prayers and common acts of thanksgiving; (4) since the celebration is the occasion for offering alms for the relief of the poor, the whole action can be called a sacrifice; (5) in the mass we consecrate our whole selves to God, so that we may cleave to God in a holy association, we engage in exercises of repentance and faith, and our love for God and the neighbor is kindled; (6) the Eucharistic blessing or consecration, inasmuch as it is part of the Gospel ministry, can be called a sacrifice (Rom. 15:16); (7) the distribution of and participation in the Holy Communion can be called a sacrifice because it takes place as a memorial of the unique sacrifice of Christ and because the same Victim who was once offered for our sins on the cross is there distributed and received.⁷²

to a defense of Chemnitz against Robert Cardinal Bellarmine (1542—1621). — On the practices themselves, see Archdale A. King, *Eucharistic Reservation in the Western Church* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1965), Part one.

⁶⁹ The antiphon upon Magnificat at the Second Vespers of the Feast of Corpus Christi, presumably from the pen of St. Thomas Aquinas (1225?—1274).

⁷⁰ Part Two, locus IV, sectio ii, examen, par. 3, pp. 303—304.

⁷¹ Part Two, locus IV, sectio v, par. 1, p. 320B.

⁷² Part Two, locus VI, sectio i, articulus ii, pp. 383—384. See also Apology, XXIV, 16 to 40.

In the realm of ceremonial, he regards the dilution of the wine in the Holy Communion with a little water as an indifferent matter, concedes that our Lord probably mixed water with the wine at the first Eucharist, and notes that the custom was general (although probably not universal) in the ancient church.⁷³

He accepts (*recte definit; non male definit*) the definition of catholicity given in his *Commonitory* by St. Vincent of Lerinum (died before 450) — *quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est* — and uses it against his opponents a number of times, for instance, in connection with the reservation of the Holy Eucharist and the invocation of the saints.⁷⁴

THE METHOD OF THE *Examen*

Methodologically, Chemnitz follows a general pattern, modified to meet the exigencies of the particular issue. He quotes in full the Tridentine statement under discussion. Next he points out the errors that he finds expressed or latent in it. He examines these on the basis of the Sacred Scriptures. Thereupon he considers the papalist rebuttals of his evidence, refutes the objections, fortifies the Lutheran position with appropriate Biblical arguments, and replies to objections based on an appeal to tradition by providing a genetic account of the doctrine or practice at issue.

Chemnitz emerges from the *Examen*, as from his other works, as a Biblical theologian who is, unlike the Lutheran Ortho-

dox theologians of the next century, "rather suspicious of scholastic philosophy."⁷⁵

His real target is the dogmatic system emerging at Trent, as he sees it through d'Andrada's eyes. The Society of Jesus is no longer the novel peril that it appears to be on the pages of the *Theologiae Jesuitarum praecipua capita*. Even d'Andrada recedes into the background after Part One. Altogether Chemnitz cites an astonishingly small number of Roman Catholic theologians by name. In the dogmatic system that his adversaries are developing he senses the striving of the papacy for supremacy that he unhesitatingly calls "Antichristian" and that since the Gallican movement has been called "ultramontane." "Ultimately," he says in one of the bitterest passages of the *Examen*, "it is all the same [to the papalists] whatever religion anybody embraces, whether it be that of the philosophers or even that of the Turks, as long as the state of their dominion remains unaffected."⁷⁶

Chemnitz understands that, as d'Andrada interprets them for him, Trent's doctrinal decrees are simply the extension and the systematization of a very late medieval scholasticism, just as he points out fre-

⁷⁵ Jaroslav Jan Pelikan, *From Luther to Kierkegaard*, 2d ed. (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1963), p. 54. See the dedicatory epistle of Part One: "Consuta [sunt] Tridentina decreta hoc consilio et hoc fine ut usitatas adulationes quas ex philosophia male et infeliciter cum theologia dilutas monachi in ecclesiam invexerunt . . . retinere . . . possint" (ed. Preuss, p. xi, lines 26—29).

⁷⁶ Part One, locus VI, sectio i, par. 5, p. 124A: "Idem enim [Pontificiis] est, quamcumque quis religionem amplectatur, sive sit philosophica, sive forsitan Turcica: modo ipsis status regni sui salvus maneat."

⁷³ Part Two, locus VI, sectio vi, pp. 420 to 421.

⁷⁴ Part Two, locus IV, sectio vii, par. 6, p. 327B; Part Three, locus IV, sectio v, caput iii, par. 21, p. 721B.

quently that the antithesis which Trent anathematizes is a distorted caricature of the reformers' real position.

His concern is with the issues before him. His style makes no pretense at literary artistry. He has his own vocabulary, which needs to be mastered. He is often diffuse and from commonplace to commonplace he is frequently redundant and repetitious; this may reflect merely a reluctance to wield a blue pencil, but it may also indicate an awareness that his readers are likely to consult his book on an *ad hoc* basis rather than to read it through. There are more than a few asides that are something less than fully germane to his argument.

He takes his weapons where he finds them. In his masterful use of patristic evidence in support of his polemics he stands squarely in the Lutheran tradition of the 16th and 17th centuries exemplified before him by his mentor Melancthon and by Matthias Vlačić (Flacius) (1520—1575) and by John Gerhard and George Calixtus and Abraham Calovius after him. Lutherans for whom the appeal to Christian antiquity seems a betrayal of their *nuda Scriptura* principle have sometimes stressed that Chemnitz is merely catering for the willingness of both theologians and the common folk to be impressed by the witness of the church fathers. They have also urged that Chemnitz is merely using a gambit designed to demoralize his opponents by turning against them the charge with which they sought to write off the Reformation, namely that the reformers were innovating. It must be noted, however, that Chemnitz's honest concern to be standing in the continuity of the church is

at least as potent a factor as either of the other two motives mentioned.⁷⁷

Chemnitz' impressive scholarship reflects the best learning of the times, and he prides himself on the fact that he used original sources which he himself verified and did not — as his opponents at times were wont to do — acquire his wisdom only from commentaries and florilegia.⁷⁸ Yet his learning was that of his times and must be gauged by that criterion. (By the same token, in spite of the stimulation that his compendious work gave to theological inquiry — notably in the fields of systematic, polemic, and historical theology — it cannot simply be invoked in the 20th century in the way it could be in the 16th.)⁷⁹

It does no discredit to Chemnitz to concede that he was too close to the event of Trent to be able to have a wholly balanced view of the council, its proceedings, and its historical significance. The addi-

⁷⁷ Toward the fathers of the primitive church he exhibits a charitable and dutiful piety that he expresses in the principle voiced in connection with a "rash assertion" of St. Epiphanius: "Pudenda patrum praestat tegere quam denudare nisi adversariorum impudentia veritatem inde oppugnantium aliud cogat" (Part Three, locus II, caput iv, par. 25, p. 578A).

⁷⁸ Part One, locus I, sectio iv, articulus i, par. 18, p. 25A (replying to the charge that "like a debauchee [Chemnitz] operates with mutilated and abbreviated statements of the holy [fathers], to defraud the inexperienced multitude"): "Nos vero Dei beneficio et possumus et solemus autorum loca inspicere, nec ex solis commentariis sapere."

⁷⁹ For example, neither Chemnitz' concern for truth nor his erudition always preserved him from exaggerating the congruity of the Lutheran position and that of certain of the fathers whom he adduces or of minimizing the differences between them. On p. 39, n. 4, Mumm catalogs a few examples.

tional material that four centuries have made available enable us to correct many details, and the scholarly researches into the progress of the debates give us a better understanding of the process by which the council arrived at its formulations. Chemnitz might divine but he could not foresee the course of four centuries of Roman Catholic Church history, and the theological developments implied by the condemnations of Bajus and Jansenism, by the dogmatic definitions of 1854, 1870, and 1950, or by the contemporary impact of the Biblical, liturgical, and ecumenical movements that have produced the thrust toward modernization of which Vatican II is the monument.

Chemnitz' references to his adversaries sometimes sound unduly harsh and uncharitable to the ears of our ecumenically conditioned age. It is, however, if anything somewhat more restrained than the run-of-the-mine polemic diction of the period. The pejorative opinions that he expresses about his opponents, their "lies," and their "deceptions" is compounded in equal parts of the conventional language of polemical rhetoric and of the passionate certitude of the rectitude of his own position.⁸⁰

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC REACTION

The Roman Catholic response to the *Examen* was not slow in coming.

⁸⁰ "With the rigidity of men who knew before they started just where their analysis would lead them, the defenders of the faith demolished their opponents without ever meeting them or their arguments. But as it was carried on by men like Martin Chemnitz . . . the polemical theology of these centuries did voice a testimony that was always firm and sometimes even gentle." (Pelikan, *The Riddle of Roman Catholicism*, p. 218.)

It was with reference to the *Examen* that the papal nuncio Count Bartholomew de Portia called Chemnitz "the most impious of Lutherans (*sceleratissimus Lutheranus*)."⁸¹ Through 1717, Mumm records eleven Roman Catholic replies to Chemnitz' work.⁸²

In 1568 the Louvain professor Jodocus Ravesteyn (1506?—1570) published the first part of his *Apology*; the second part came out in the year of his death.⁸³ In 1575 William Damasus van der Linde (1525—1588), successively Bishop of Roermond and of Ghent, came out with the first of two broadsides against the *Examen*.⁸⁴ The second came out in 1577.⁸⁵

⁸¹ Karl Schellhass, ed., "Die süddeutsche Nuntiatur des Grafen Bartholomäus von Portia," in *Nuntiaturberichte aus Deutschland*, III/3 (Berlin: A. Bath, 1896), 217; in Elert, *Morphologie*, I, 251.

⁸² Mumm, pp. 92—94.

⁸³ Jodocus Ravesteyn, *Apologiae seu defensionis decretorum concilii Tridentini, quae quidem ad religionem et doctrinam Christianam pertinent, adversus censuras et examen Martini Kemnitii pars prima [-altera]* (Louvain: Petrus Zangrius, 1568—1570) (Schottenloher 43218). Another edition came out in Cologne in 1608. A projected third part was never published.

⁸⁴ Wilhelmus Damasus Lindanus, *Stromatum libri tres pro variis sacrosancti concilii Tridentini decretis ac potissimum de suscipiendis una cum divina scriptura etiam apostolicis traditionibus et pro panopliae suae evangelicae atque apologetici defensione contra Martinum Chemnitium et alios Momos* (Cologne: Maternus Cholinus, 1575; 71 pp. in folio) (Schottenloher 43218d). A second edition from the same press, dated 1577, has 264 pages in small-octavo format.

⁸⁵ Lindanus, *De apostolico virginitatis voto atque evangelico sacerdotum coelibatu pro defensione s[ancti] concilii Tridentini libri V, contra Martini Chemnitii Lutherani superintendentis calumnias* (Cologne: Maternus Cholinus, 1577; 24, 259 pp.). A second edition came out at Antwerp in 1579.

The most ambitious reply was that of d'Andrada himself, under the title *Defensio Tridentinae fidei* ("Defense of the Tridentine Faith").⁸⁶ His death kept him from discussing more than the first five sessions. His two brothers edited the work posthumously, and the second volume promised in the *Ad lectorem* never appeared. The introduction ends with a somewhat condescending disavowal of Chemnitz' suggestion that d'Andrada had written his *Orthodoxae explicationes* at the behest of the Tridentine fathers.⁸⁷

⁸⁶ Didacus Payva Andradius, *Defensio Tridentinae fidei catholicae et integerrimae quinque libris comprehensa adversus haeticorum detestabiles calumnias et praesertim Martini Chemnitii Germani* ([Lisbon: N. p., 1578]). The library of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, has an electrostatic copy of an undated but clearly a very early edition made from the copy in the library of the theological seminary of the Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod in Mequon, Wisconsin, with the kind permission of the librarian at the latter school. The imprimatur (*censeo recudi posse*) of Gregory de Valentia, S. J., dean of the theological faculty at the University of Ingolstadt, points to that city as the place of publication, but the title page lacks the addition *nunc primum in Germania multo quam antea emendatius impressa* ("now printed in Germany for the first time in a better form than before") which appears on the title page of the edition that David Sartorius printed at Ingolstadt in 1580 (16, 500, 12 leaves) (Schottenloher 43219a). In 1580, according to Mumm, Maternus Cholinus of Cologne also printed an edition, and in 1582 another was put out in Venice. Jacobus Wilhelmus Feuerlin, *Bibliotheca symbolica evangelica lutherana*, ed. Johannes Bartholomaeus Riederer (Nuremberg: Wolfgangus Schwartzkopf, 1768), II, 157 (No. 2078) lists a 1590 Cologne edition.

⁸⁷ Sed ne mihi eas laudes videar silentio arrogare quas in me falso Kemnitius confert tacere non potui, haud, quidem mihi fuisse a sanctissima synodo munus aliquod scribendi injunctum, ut ille putavit, sed hominum gravissimorum et cum quibus maxime mihi necessitudo intercedebat hortatu decem illos de orthodoxis explicationibus libros, dum concilium agigaretur, com-

The nihil obstat (*typis mandavi posse et legi debere censeo*) of Bartholomew Ferreira in the name of Henry, Cardinal of Portugal, the supreme inquisitor, which sees Chemnitz and his fellow heretics "clinging to the remnant of their master, Satan, who in tempting our Savior Christ in the desert perversely cited passages of the most sacred Scriptures," is dated May 8, 1575. The author dedicated the work to Gregory XIII (1502—1585). Jerome Osorio (1506—1580), Bishop of Silves in Algarve,⁸⁸ wrote a commendatory letter as a preface.

An essay on the authority of general councils is followed by treatises on the authority of the Sacred Scriptures and of tradition, on the canonical books, on the authority of the Vulgate, and on original sin and the remnants of original sin or the concupiscence which is left in the soul after Holy Baptism. Four poems by Brother Cosmas of the Presentation, O. S. A., in tribute to d'Andrada, introduce the book. The fourth, a decastich addressed to Chemnitz, begins:

Bis, Martine, paras bello certare nefando;
Bis victus, Payva bis superante cadis.

("Martin, twice you prepare to engage in your criminal warfare,

Twice defeated you fall while d'Andrada twice knows success.")

It is d'Andrada's "best work,"⁸⁹ both solider and tighter than the *Orthodoxae*

posuisse; tum quia neque synodi summam auctoritatem decebat Kemnitii vel nomen curare vel ineptiis respondere, tum vero quia si id e sua esse dignitate arbitraretur, viris abundabat omni eruditionis genere clarissimis qui munus illud possent pro dignitate explere.

⁸⁸ The seat of the bishop was transferred to Faro in 1577.

⁸⁹ So Arthur J. McCaffray in *Catholic Encyclopedia*, I (1907), 469.

explicationes,⁹⁰ and quite understandably it won for him the thanks of the pope. Roman Catholic writers of the present like to point out that the work "forced even Chemnitz to proclaim the knowledge and the alluring eloquence of his adversary."⁹¹

Others who wrote against the *Examen* were the ex-Lutheran Caspar Franck (1543—1584);⁹² Robert Cardinal Bellarmine (1542—1621), who regards Chemnitz as one of his major adversaries;⁹³

Gregory de Valentia (1551—1603),⁹⁴ and the energetic Jesuit proselytizer John Kraus (1649—1732).⁹⁵

Of interest chiefly because Mumm, mistaking the date, lists it as the first Roman Catholic reply to the *Examen*, is the clandestinely published mid-17th-century work of an otherwise unknown Martin Gärtner, presumed to have been a Roman Catholic priest, against Chemnitz' treatment of the Eucharist.⁹⁶

⁹⁰ So C. Toussaint in *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, I (1909), 1179, who notes that Book 5 is of special interest for the large number of savants' opinions on the Immaculate Conception of the B. V. M. which it assembles. Of d'Andrada's remaining works a treatise *De conciliorum potestate* and seven volumes of Portuguese sermons were published, but his reputation derives from the *Orthodoxae explicationes* and the *Defensio* (Cesare Bertola, in *Enciclopedia cattolica*, I [1948], 1181).

⁹¹ So, for instance, Toussaint, loc. cit., and L. Loevenbruck, in *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, II (1905), 2357.

⁹² Caspar Franck, *Rettung und Erklärung dess heyligen allgemeinen Tridentinischen Concilii: I. Von den canonischen Büchern dess alten und neuen Testaments; II. Wie auch dieselbige eigentlich sollen verstanden und ausgelegt werden, sampt Erörterung vil anderer notwendigen jetziger Zeit strittigen Articuli, wider Martin Chemnitz ungegründtes Schreiben und intituirtes Examen der Decret des Tridentinischen Concilii, so von Georg Nigrino verteutscht* (Ingolstadt: Wolfgang Eder, 1583; 12 leaves, 216 pp.) (Schottenloher 43219c). Following H. Hurter, *Nomenclator literarius*, I/2 (Innsbruck, 1892), 69, Mumm lists a Cologne edition of 1582. Feuerlin, II, 153 (No. 2033) knows an *Oratio apologetica pro professione fidei juxta concilium Tridentinum adversus Chemnitium* by Franck, published at Ingolstadt in 1581.

⁹³ Robertus Bellarminus, "Disputationum . . . de controversis christianae fidei adversus hujus temporis haeticis tomus primus [quartus]," in *Opera omnia*, I—IV (Naples: Josephus Giuliano, 1856—1858). The first volume of the *Disputationes* came out in 1581.

⁹⁴ Gregorius de Valentia, *De rebus fidei hoc tempore controversis libri qui hactenus extant omnes, cum nonnullis aliis nondum antea editis* (Leyden: Haeredes Gulielmi Rovilii [Petrus Rolandus], 1591), passim. This collection includes two works which name Chemnitz on their title pages: *Disputatio theologica de vera et falsa differentia veteris et novae legis* and *De sacrosancto missae sacrificio*, both of 1580. See De Backer-Sommervogel, *Bibliothèque de la Compagnie de Jésus*, VIII (1898), 388—400 (Nos. 10, 11, 36).

⁹⁵ Johannes Kraus, *Der abgewiesene Krausoldus, oder Antwort auf den General- und Specialbericht des sogenannten lutherischen Baalitenstellers M. Valentini Krausoldi* (Prague: Wolfgang Wickhart, 1717). His immediate target was Krausold's *Hinckender Baalit wider das Löschbörnle* (Dresden: Zimmer, 1717), which Krausold had written in defense of Valentin Ernst Löscher's *Der abgewiesene Demas*. See De Backer-Sommervogel, IV (1893), 1226 to 1227. — An 18-book refutation of the *Examen* which the unfortunate Julius Caesar Vanini (1579?—1619) allegedly wrote in Paris, *Apologia concilii Tridentini contra Chemnitium*, appears never to have been printed.

⁹⁶ Martinus Gärtner, *Chemnitius reformatus circa venerabile sacramentum eucharistiae, hoc est, discussio et profligatio errorum quibus Mart. Chemnitius in examine concilii Tridentini deformavit orthodoxam doctrinam sacramenti eucharistiae* (N. p.: N. p., 1666). Mumm, p. 92, citing as his authority Christian August Salig (1692—1735), *Vollständige Historie des Tridentinischen Conciliums*, III (Halle, 1745), 283, gives the date as 1566. This is obviously wrong, since the dedicatory letter of Part Two of the *Examen*, which contains the common-

Some Roman Catholic readers, however, appear to have found the *Examen* persuasive. Among them was a Jesuit-trained Austrian canon at Sechow in Styria, Francis Leopold von Reissing, who had received permission to read canonically prohibited books. The *Examen* planted the first seeds of doubt in his mind. They grew until he finally determined to convert to the Lutheran Church. After two years' imprisonment in Rome, the Inquisition sentenced him to lifelong retirement in the Collegio Santa Maria de Pace. He escaped to Genoa and fled on foot via Switzerland to Jena. Here he was received into the Lutheran Church. He later became a Lutheran clergyman, first in Slesvig, then in Blankenburg in the Duchy of Oldenburg. After 1715 he drops out of sight. After his conversion to the Lutheran religion he declared: "What shall I write about Martin Chemnitz, to whom, after God, I owe my conversion, and whose really unanswerable *Examen Concilii Tridentini* puts all papalist libraries to shame? . . . I confess, to the highest comfort of my soul, that I was converted wholly and entirely through the reading of the divine Word and of the incomparable *Examen Concilii Tridentini* — which the papacy has never altogether succeeded in refuting — by the highly enlightened and celebrated Dr. Martin Chemnitz of blessed memory."⁹⁷

place on the Eucharist, is dated Dec. 18, 1566. Jöcher-Adelung, *Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexicon*, Fortsetzung, II (1787), 1310, gives the date of Gärtner's work correctly as 1666.

⁹⁷ Georgius Henricus Goetzius, *De conversis pontificiis ex ectione librorum Lutheri Lutheranorumque doctorum ad veritatem evangelico-lutheranam perductis schediasma historico-theologica* (Leipzig: Christian Emmerich [Literae Fuldianae], 1705), pp. 46—47; Jöcher-Adelung-

John Olearius (1611—1684), writing in 1661, reports that a few years before a learned man, whom he identifies merely by the initials J.R.W., and whom he describes as "having been educated by the Jesuits from his youth and well practiced in the controversies [between the two confessions], was brought by God's help to a recognition of the truth of the Gospel through the diligent reading of Dr. Martin Chemnitz' *Examen Concilii Tridentini*."⁹⁸ "J.R.W." is clearly John Roger Weir (Weyer), who describes himself (on the title page of a dissuasive from conversion to Roman Catholicism which he delivered at the University of Wittenberg in 1653) as *Equitum magister* and whom the Rector

Rotermund, *Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexicon*, VI (1819), 1747—1748 (wrong, however, in stating that Reissing entered the Jesuit order); Franciscus Leopoldus à Reissing, "Brevis relatio de horrendo inquisitionis processu," in *Fortgesetzte Sammlung von alten und neuen theologischen Sachen . . . auf das Jahr 1723* (Leipzig: Joh. Friedr. Brauns Erben [Jacob Andreas Bock], [1723]), 27—43. — Lutherans deplore the fact that in 1871—1872 Dr. Eduard Preuss, the distinguished 19th-century editor of the *Examen*, of John Gerhard's *Loci*, and of John William Baier's *Compendium theologiae positivae*, while a member of the faculty of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, made the opposite transition, from the Lutheran religion to Roman Catholicism. See Ludwig Fuerbringer, *80 Eventful Years* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1944), chapter 26; Preuss' own anonymous *Zum Lobe der unbefleckten Empfängnis der allerseligsten Jungfrau* (Freiburg-im-Breisgau: Herdersche Verlagshandlung, 1879), pp. 181—227; [Carl Ferdinand Wilhelm] W[alther], "Ein Abfall," *Der Lutheraner*, XXVIII, 10 (Feb. 15, 1872), 73—75.

⁹⁸ Johannes Olearius, *Die wunderliche Güte des Allerhöchsten, welche Er denen, so Ihm kindlich vertrauen, väterlich erweist* (Leipzig: Joh. Wittigauens Wittve und Friederich Knochen, 1679), p. 770. The dedicatory epistle is dated 1661.

Magnificus, Geoffrey Schwab (Suevus) (d. 1659), in inviting the Wittenberg students to the lecture described as an expapalist and a *praefectus turmae* in the imperial army.⁹⁹ He was the brother-in-law of the Lutheran educator, historian, and doctor of medicine Sylvester Kundtmann (1595—1656), who recommended to him the reading of the Sacred Scriptures and of Chemnitz' *Examen*. In the revocatory address which he delivered in 1651, Weir himself relates that the first time he read the *Examen* though he was still so thoroughly under Jesuit influence that he "refused to let himself be drawn into the net of the Lord Christ." It was only after a period of agnosticism and during a crisis in his life brought on by his experiences in the Thirty Years' War that the works which his brother-in-law had recommended to him exerted a decisive effect.¹⁰⁰

⁹⁹ Johannes Rogerius Weir, *De non imitando ad vomitum redeunte cane, hoc est, de vitando ad Papismum relapsu oratio* (Leipzig: Praelum Ritschianum [1653]), title page and folio I-3 verso. On p. 13 Weir refers to the *Examen* of Chemnitz, "the one who overturned the Tridentine conventicle."

¹⁰⁰ Goetzius, pp. 11—12, 47. Martin Lipe-nius, *Bibliotheca realis theologica* (Frankfurt-am-Main: Johannes Friderici, 1685), p. 673, who consistently misspells Weir's name "Weikers," lists, in addition to *De non imitando*, Weir's Latin *Dissertatio revocatoria* (Leipzig, 1651), the same work in German (Leipzig, n. d.), *Des H. Römischen Reichs Gefahr* (Leipzig, n. d.), and *Ursachen, das Pabstthum zu verlassen* (Leipzig, n. d.). The second last title is either identical with or a translation of *De perenni periculo S{ancti} Rom{ani} Imperii* (Leipzig, 1652), listed by Johann Heinrich Zedler, *Grosses vollständiges Universal-Lexicon*, LIV (1747), 1043. *Ursachen, das Pabstthum zu verlassen* may be a German version of *De non imitando*, since Zeidler gives what is apparently a fuller title, *Ursachen, das Pabstthum zu fliehen und zu meiden* (Leipzig, 1653). Zedler also lists a polemic by Weir against Jodoc Kedd, S. J. (1597—1657):

EVALUATIONS OF THE *Examen*

Quite understandably, one's denomination has through the centuries tended to determine the stance one takes toward Chemnitz' *Examen*.

After reading the second part of the *Examen* in manuscript, Lord Andrew von Meyendorff zu Ummendorff (d. 1583), no mean lay theologian in the opinion of many of his ordained contemporaries, congratulated Chemnitz in a letter dated Jan. 22, 1566: "I do not doubt that your work will be most useful to the church. For even though Bl. [Martin] Luther overthrew the papacy, it is always bent on rising again."¹⁰¹

Andrew Tricesius of Cracow (b. 1520), a Polish poet, hailed the *Examen* with a quatrain preserved in John Gasmer's *Oratio de vita, studiis et obitu Martini Chemnitii*:

Chemnitii, Latii pestis saevissima papae,
Vive diu et magni exemplo felicibus ausis,
Alcide, Satanae exitiabile confice mon-
strum;

Sic tibi laus surget quae nullo desinet
aevo.

("Long may you live, O Chemnitz, the
fiercest plague of Rome's pontiff;

Let this great work be the pattern of dar-
ing deeds no less happy,

Through which, Alcides [that is, Hercules],
you slay the dreadful monster of Satan.

So will well forth to you praise that never
shall know any ceasing.")¹⁰²

Ungeultiges Schreyen und erbärmliches Wehklagen Jobst. Keddens in etwas gestillet (Leipzig, 1654), not recorded in de Backer-Sommer-vogel.

¹⁰¹ Rehtmeyer, V, Supplementa, 108.

¹⁰² Preuss, "Vita Martini Chemnitii," p. 930. The Latin of the second line is not wholly transparent and admits of various interpreta-tions.

The dean and the professors of the theological faculty of the University of Rostock in the *Programma sive testimonium promotionis Martini Chemnitii in doctorem* ("Diploma or Certificate of the Promotion of Martin Chemnitz to the Doctorate"), on the Feast of the Visitation, 1568, called the then half-published *Examen* "an integrated body of true doctrine, to which he has added in connection with each article an insightful and energetic refutation of errors that militate against that truth, partly in the form of most clear and absolutely certain evidences from the divine Word and partly from the opinions of the entire ancient church and the old fathers. With singular diligence, faithfulness, and judgment he inquired into and brought together testimonies and decisions in the matter of doctrine from every period, and he read through all the ancient ecclesiastical writers in order to search out the opinion of Christ's Catholic Church for the vitally necessary and welcome resolution of the most serious controversies of our times and to oppose those who were camouflaging manifest errors with the name of the fathers and of the Catholic Church."¹⁰³

Nathan Chytraeus (1543—1598), widely traveled headmaster of the Bremen academy and a poet of renown, paid Chemnitz this tribute:

Hactenus invicta et nulli vincenda deinceps
Papicolae, ima ipsi rumpantur ut ilia
papae.

("Never vanquished to date, nor destined to yield to a papist,

Whose lower parts are torn open like the
Pontiff's own entrails.")¹⁰⁴

¹⁰³ Rehtmeyer, III, Beylagen, pp. 140—141.

¹⁰⁴ Preuss, *ibid.*

John Francis Buddeus (1667—1729) stated that among Lutheran polemical writings against Roman Catholic error, Chemnitz is as important as all the rest put together.¹⁰⁵

John George Walch (1693—1775), Luther's editor, asserted that Chemnitz' *Examen* reflects special honor upon our church, since it is incontrovertibly to be regarded as the chiefest work against the papists.¹⁰⁶ Elsewhere he observes that "it is praised as excellent but not diligently read."¹⁰⁷

Frederick Eberhard Rambach (1708 to 1775), in his German version of Sarpi's *Istoria* insists: "To the present hour the wound which [the *Examen*] administered to the papacy through its attack on the Tridentine Council has not been healed. The replies of d'Andrada, Ravenstein, van der Linde, Franck, and Gärtner are so shallow and pitiful that they have not been able in even the slightest degree to detract from the esteem in which it is held."¹⁰⁸

Henry Schmid (1811—1885) called it "the ablest defence of [the Lutheran position] ever published."¹⁰⁹

¹⁰⁵ Johannes Franciscus Buddeus, *Isagoge historico-theologica ad theologiam universam singulasque partes* (Leipzig: Thomas Fritsch, 1727), I, 498: "De ipso autem hocce opere egregio prorsus nihil dici potest tam praeclare quin multis modis illud superest; estque in hocce genere *Chemnitius* instar omnium."

¹⁰⁶ Johann Georg Walch, *Einleitung in die Religions-Streitigkeiten, welche sonderlich ausser der lutherischen Kirche entstanden*, II (Jena: Johann Meyers Wittwe, 1734), 813.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 795.

¹⁰⁸ Friedrich Eberhard Rambach, ed., *Paul Sarpius Historie des Tridentinischen Concilii*, V (Halle: Gebauer und Stettinsche Buchhandlung, 1765), 473, note x.

¹⁰⁹ Heinrich Schmid, *Doctrinal Theology of the Evangelical Lutheran Church*, translated by

Mumm, no uncritical admirer, calls Chemnitz "the most influential of all of Luther's disciples."¹¹⁰ The popular adage, *Si Martinus non fuisset, Martinus vix stetit*, endorses this judgment — "if Martin [Chemnitz] had not come along, Martin [Luther] would hardly have survived."¹¹¹

Otto Ritschl (1860—1944) refers to "the elenctic that the great denominational polemicists carried on with holy earnestness from the second half of the 16th century on" and credits the *Examen* with "laying the foundation for an eminently moderate style that moves along on the rails of serene objectivity."¹¹²

Although Wilhelm Pauck knows the *Examen* only on the basis of the abridged Bendixen-Luthardt translation, he declares that "with great thoroughness and without any of the passionate hatred and intemperance that had characterized the polemics of the Reformation age, [Chemnitz] endeavored to prove that the Roman Catholic doctrine was against Scripture and the ancient fathers."¹¹³

J. L. Neve and O. W. Heick refer to Chemnitz' "brilliant" criticism of Trent.¹¹⁴

Ernst Wolf avers that in the *Examen* Chemnitz "in the role of theological con-

troversialist has expounded the theology of the Reformation in a comprehensive analysis over against Tridentine Roman Catholicism after a fashion that through the centuries has never again been either repeated or achieved."¹¹⁵

Jaroslav Jan Pelikan observes that "Chemnitz' critique of the Council of Trent was based on a depth of patristic scholarship difficult to match. He went through the patristic evidence with care and discrimination, sorting out the relevant from the irrelevant and demonstrating that Trent had done violence to the tradition, while the Reformation had been faithful to the best in the tradition by being faithful to the Scriptures."¹¹⁶

Franz Lau sees the *Examen* as "a worthy and knowledgeable presentation and critique of the Tridentine decrees, in which above all else the evangelical Scriptural principle is clearly worked out."¹¹⁷

Arthur L. Olson describes Chemnitz as "an important defender of the Reformation against the revived energy of Roman Catholicism manifested in the Counter-Reformation" and the *Examen* as a major work whose "many editions attest to its influential role as a classic . . . criticism of the Council of Trent."¹¹⁸

Bengt Häggglund refers to the *Examen*

Charles A. Hay and Henry E. Jacobs, 3d ed. (1899) (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1961), p. 666.

¹¹⁰ Mumm, p. 77.

¹¹¹ *Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche*, 3d ed., III (1897), 803.

¹¹² Otto Ritschl, *Dogmengeschichte des Protestantismus*, IV (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1927), 236.

¹¹³ Wilhelm Pauck, *The Heritage of the Reformation*, rev. ed. (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1961), pp. 161 and 389, n. 29.

¹¹⁴ J. L. Neve and O. W. Heick, *A History of Christian Thought*, I (Philadelphia: The Muhlenberg Press, c. 1946), 332.

¹¹⁵ Ernst Wolf, in *Neue deutsche Biographie*, III (1957), 201.

¹¹⁶ Jaroslav Jan Pelikan, *Luther the Expositor: Introduction to the Reformer's Exegetical Writings* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, c. 1959), p. 82. See also his *From Luther to Kierkegaard*, p. 53, and his *The Riddle of Roman Catholicism*, p. 52.

¹¹⁷ Franz Lau, in *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, 3d ed., I (1957), 1647.

¹¹⁸ Arthur L. Olson, "Martin Chemnitz," in Herman A. Preus and Edmund Smits, eds., *The*

as "exemplary" as far as interconfessional polemics is concerned and as one of Chemnitz' "great contributions."¹¹⁹

A 20th-century European Roman Catholic appraisal calls the *Examen* "actually a course in theology as practiced by the Lutheran churches. It was so highly regarded that it put its author into the front rank among the evangelical theologians of the 16th century. Reinforced on a big scale with arguments taken from Biblical in-

terpretation, history and dogmatics, it endeavors to oppose each of the decrees of the Council of Trent."¹²⁰ A German Roman Catholic church historian acknowledges that "through his famed polemical work against Trent, Chemnitz exerted a century-spanning influence . . . on evangelical controversial theology as it confronted the Roman Catholic Church at the same time that he set forth positively the evangelical understanding of the faith."¹²¹

St. Louis, Mo.

Doctrine of Man in Classical Lutheran Theology (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, c. 1962), pp. 226—227.

¹¹⁹ Bengt Hägglund, *Theologins historia: En dogmhistorisk översikt*, 2d ed. (Lund: CWK Gleerups Förlag, 1963), p. 248.

¹²⁰ L. Loevenbruck, in *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, II (1905), 2356.

¹²¹ E. W. Zeeden, in *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*, 2d ed., II (1958), 1044.