PRESENTED TO: The Manitowoc Pastoral Conference

ASSEMBLED AT: St. John Ev. Lutheran Church, Two Rivers, Wisconsin

ON: January 30, 1978

BY: Pastor Harmon C. Krause

THEME: THE FORMULA OF CONCORD: How It Developed

OUTLINE:

I. THE YEARS OF FRUITLESS STRUGGLE FOR UNION (1553-1566)

II. THE YEARS WHEN UNION IS REALIZED (1567-1580)

INTRODUCTION:

1. TWO APPROACHES TO UNITY

"Two patterns or approaches in the search for unity developed during the 1550's. The first depended to a great extent on the initiative and power of the princes and was supported by the Philippist Party. The princes sought accord among their churches through meeting of the representatives of the Evangelical estates; often the princes themselves participated. At these meetings they usually tried to formulate a brief, concise, but seldom specific solution to the most pressing doctrinal issues under debate. The Philippist called for amnesty among Lutheran theologians so that old quarrels might be put away and forgotten. The second approach to Lutheran unity was that of the Gnesio-Lutherans. Flacius and his comrades called for a conference of theologians, a synod or a colloquy, at which the various issues could be resolved. Such a synod would not grant amnesty for those in error; instead, it would condemn errors and those who propagated them, and it would call for those in error to repent publicly."[1]

Actually, union was achieved by a combination of the above two approaches to union, that is, through meetings of the representatives of the Evangelical estates and through condemnation of specific errors in Christian doctrine. Very wisely, Andreae discouraged the calling of a synod meeting.

FR 515

2. NEED FOR UNITY

Pope Paul III issued a bull on July 4, 1546 which stated his intention, with the assistance of the Roman Emperor, Charles, of rooting out the godless doctrines which had been sown throughout Germany by heretics. "Elector John Frederick of Saxony and Landgrave Philip of Hesse were placed under the imperial ban. Catholic forces marched on Germany, and one by one the cities fell. Maurice of Ducal Saxony defected to the imperial side in the expectation of becoming an elector. John Frederick was defeated and captured at Muehlberg in 1547. Philip surrendered and was imprisoned by the emperor's troops. Wittenberg surrendered to Charles in order to save John Frederick's life. Military resistance to the imperial-papal coalition had been ineffective and was at an end."[2]

3. AUGSBURG INTERIM

The defeat by the Evangelicals in the Smalcaldic War placed the Evangelicals in a most difficult position. This defeat was followed on May 15, 1548 by the infamous Augsburg Interim which demanded among other things -- 1. the reinstatement of Catholic ceremonies; 2. reinstatement of the seven sacraments; 3. acceptance of decrees of Council of Trent when it had adjourned; 4. recognizing divine supremacy of pope and bishops. Melanchthon opposed the Augsburg Interim and attacked it in print.

4. LEIPZIG INTERIM

Moritz, duke of Saxony, feared an imperial invasion of Saxony and also desired to keep the emperor's favor, therefore, he tried to please the emperor and preserve the chief part of Lutheran doctrine. Moritz used his secular advisors to pressure his theologians into creating and agreeing to a compromise settlement. "The basic principle of the

Leipzig Interim was concession on indifferent matters and retention of the Evangelical understanding of justification. The Leipzig Interim was viewed by its authors as a document of compromise chiefly in its concessions in what they considered adiaphora. The Interim accepted confirmation (holding out hope it could be transformed from a spectacle into an examination of faith), private confession before Communion, and extreme unction practiced according to apostolic usage. It restored much of the Latin rite of the Roman Mass as well as the traditional vestments, bells, lamps, vessels -- the ceremonial of the old worship service. Moritz's theologians also conceded the restoration of the canonical hours and services in memory of the dead. They planned for the reintroduction of many of the old festival celebrations including Corpus Christi and Marian holidays. According to this second Interim, meat would not be eaten on Fridays and Saturdays in Saxony, in obedience to the civil ordinances of the empire. Perhaps the most difficult part of the new formula to compose and to sell to the estates was that which dealt with the right of the bishops to ordain."[3]

Robert Kolb characterizes the forgers of the Leipzig Interim "men of good will and genuine concern, but they were men of a different spirit and perhaps of less common sense than those who quickly rose up to oppose them."[4] I cannot feel as sympathetic as Robert Kolb appears to feel anymore than the Gnesiõ-Lutherans could who "replied to the electoral Saxon theologians that the average parishioner saw as much as he heard in worship. If he saw the surplice and the candle, he would believe that the Wittenbergers who had reintroduced these papalistic practices had returned to the message of the old days as well. He would not hear the Gospel because the reminders of Rome would seem to indicate that Luther's successors had forgotten it. The

exiled pastors at Magdeburg had lived their ministries among people for whom words were less important than symbols."[5]

Though Melanchthon had bravely resisted the Augsburg Interim, he became involved in the Leipzig Interim. Later on Melanchthon admitted that he had sinned, "in a qualified way",[6] but he was too proud to confess his sin without qualification and publicly as Flacius demanded. Melanchthon excused himself by reminding his attackers that for thirty years he had carried heavy burdens for the Christian church and now deserved mercy from those who were attacking him. No wonder his followers learned to be so evasive in their doctrinal statements.

5. PASSAU PACT - 1552

"The political and military teeth of the Interims were drawn when Maurice of Saxony determined to present a united front with his Lutheran brethren against the imperial forces. Charles was caught without an army at Innsbruck, was nearly captured, and agreed to a truce which effectively ended the Smalcald War."[7]

6. CHILDREN OF SAME FATHER

It is interesting that of the people involved in the various controversies between the Phillipists and the Gnesio-Lutherans, many on both sides had studied under Melanchthon, respected him and looked to him to carry on after Luther's death. In fact, three of the four main architects of the Formula of Concord, Chemnitz, Chytraeus, and Selneker had had extremely close ties with Melanchthon. The only exception of those four architects would be Andreae. Chemnitz boarded at Melanchthon's house, was his student, and lectured on Melanchthon's Loci communes. Chytraeus boarded with Melanchthon for more than five years and was one of his favorite pupils. Selnecker followed Chytraeus as a boarder at Melanchthon's house.

Of those four theologians, Chemnitz was not only the most brilliant, perceptive, and stable, but also he was the one least sensitive to or offended by criticism. Of course, to be fair to Andreae it should be stated that the nature of his calling in the Lutheran struggle for unity was ideally suited to attract very unfair criticism and suspicion more than the calling of the other three men. Also, Selnecker was always in poor health throughout his professional life -- no wonder he was moody. Chytraeus, too, suffered from poor health, for the last 20 years of his life he often couldn't perform his administrative duties at the University, before that he was often bed-ridden. That Selnecker and Chytraeus were a little thin-skinned sometimes isn't surprising. What is surprising is how much they were able to accomplish -- because Christ's grace was sufficient unto them inspite of their heavy afflictions. May Christ grant us that same grace whenever needed!

I. THE YEARS OF FRUITLESS STRUGGLE (1553-1566 - 13 years)

A. 1553-1556 - Flacius vs Melanchthon

Already in 1553 Flacius and Gallus requested that ten or twenty capable men, who hadn't participated in the public Adiaphoristic Controversy be appointed to resolve matters between them and the people who had participated in the Leipzig compromise. However, Melanchthon and the Wittenberg Theologians didn't cooperate in this effort at union. In April 1556 Praetorius, who was rector of the school in Magdeburg wrote a letter to Melanchthon on behalf of Flacius' desire to gain peace between himself and Melanchthon. Not only did Melanchthon not respond to that letter but he even insinuated that Flacius' only desire was to arouse hatred. Melanchthon appears to have had a special insight regarding who were hypocrites, or else, though a very intelligent educator, he used the word hypocrite very loosely and unlovingly, or else, he was defending a guilty conscience.

In May 1556, Flacius, continuing his peace efforts, forwarded to Paul Eber his 'Mild Proposals' ---. According to these Proposals, Flacius demanded that, in a publication signed by the theologians of both parties, the pope be denounced as the true Antichrist, the Augsburg Interim be rejected, the proposition: 'Good works are necessary to salvation,' be condemned, also the errors of Zwingli and Osiander. 'The good Lord knows,' said Flacius, 'that every day and hour I consider and plan earnestly how the affair of the Adiophorists might be settled in a Christian manner.' But he added that he could not be satisfied until by repentance, they wipe out their sin, denial, apostasy, and persecution, instead of increasing ~~than~~ them by their excuses.' But Flacius received an answer neither from Eber nor from Melanchthon. Instead, the Wittenbergers, with the silent consent of Melanchthon, circulated a caricature in which Flacius was accorded the role of a braying ass being crowned by other asses with a soiled crown."[8]

Such response must have dampened the peace-making desire even of an Albanian Christian like Flacius. However, Flacius, on September 1, 1556, wrote a letter to Melanchthon and again tried to be reconciled with him. Other details of this effort of Christian unity belong to the Adiophoristic Controversy. Suffice it to say that Flacius and Melanchthon were not reconciled during their lifetime.

B. 1557 -- COLLOQUY AT WORMS

On account of imperial pressure the Catholics met with the Evangelicals at Worms in August 1557. However, the Evangelical representatives were not united, there were the Philippists and there were the Gnesio-Lutherans. The Roman Catholics caused the colloquy to disband because they argued that they couldn't tell who were the true adherents to the Augsburg Confession. Andreae began to realize that unity could not be restored among Lutherans by so evasively expressing

the difference between Lutherans and Calvinists regarding such doctrines as the Lord's Supper that no one was offended. He began to understand that both agreements and differences must be expressed in doctrinal statements.

C. 1558 FRANKFURT RECESS

In March of 1558 the Evangelical princes met at Frankfurt am Main to forge a basis for reconciliation of the two groups of Evangelicals. Melanchthon was requested to draw up a document for their subscription. Melanchthon's document contained articles on justification, good works, adiophora, and the Lord's Supper. The three Evangelical electors together with some of the Evangelical princes subscribed to that union-document. However, its language was so ambiguous and evasive that even Calvin claimed he could agree with it. The Gnesio-Lutherans loudly protested that Melanchthon's document was entirely inadequate for genuine Christian unity efforts.

"When the Frankfort Recess was submitted for subscription to the estates who had not been present at Frankfort, it failed to receive the expected approval. It was criticized by the theologians of Anhalt, Henneberg, Mecklenburg, Pomerania, the Lower Saxon Cities, and Regensburg. The strongest opposition, however, came from Ducal Saxony, where Flacius attacked the Recess in two books. The first was entitled: 'Refutation Of The Samaritan Interim, In Which the True Religion Is Criminally and Perniciously CONFOUNDED By The Sects.' The other: 'Reason And Cause Why The Frankfort Interim Must Not Be Adopted.' The chief objections of Flacius were: 1. The Smalcald Articles should have been included in the confessions subscribed to; 2. The differences within the Lutheran Church should not have been treated as questions of minor import; 3. Major's statement should have been rejected as simply false, and not merely when falsely interpreted; 4. The

statements concerning the Lord's Supper are 'dark, general, and ambiguous,' hence, Crypto-Calvinistic; 5. The article on the adiaphora is ambiguous and altogether unsatisfactory; 6. The measures adopted to suppress theological discussions and controversies would lead to suppression of the truth ('binding the mouth of the Holy Ghost') and tyrannizing of the churches by pastors. In his attitude Flacius was supported by his colleagues in Jena and by Duke John Frederick."[9]

D. 1559 MAGDEBURG INVITATION

Following the failure of the Frankfort Recess, Duke John Frederick the Middler of Saxony invited a synod of theologians to assemble at Magdeburg. However, his intentions were frustrated by the pressure which the other Evangelical princes exerted upon the city council. Nevertheless, John Frederick went ahead and directed his theologians to produce a 'Book of Confutation', which would define and refute the false teachings of the sectarians and also indentify by names the men who advocated those false teachings. Flacius wished to use the 'Book of Confutations' as a basis for further unity-discussions with other Lutherans. But this book only angered the Philipists. Around this same time, the Gnesio-Lutherans "presented a 'Supplication' to the Evangelical princes and estates. This petition called for a synod which would define and refute error and thus establish genuine Evangelical unity. The 51 theologians who signed the 'Supplication' came mostly from central and northern Germany, and many had not been closely associated with the Flacian party. However, the 'Supplication' was Gnesio-Lutheran in tone and in approach. The princes did not respond positively to its suggestion."[10]

E. 1561 -- NAUMBURG

On January 21, 1561 the Evangelical princes assembled at

Naumburg at the invitation of Elector August of Saxony. Their purpose for meeting was to strive for union on the basis of the Augsburg Confession. However, some of the Evangelical representatives maintained that the unity-document must not be the Augustana of 1530 but the Variata of 1540. "At last the laymen did what one must admire them, or at least cannot blame them, for doing. They determined to resolve matters without the theologians."[11]

Though the assembly at Naumburg was compelled to adjourn without having achieved unity after holding twenty-one sessions, there were three important results of that meeting. First of all it caused Chytraeus to have the opportunity to confess his faith more boldly than heretofore. He had been selected as the representative of the theological faculty at Rostock to attend that meeting. At the request of Duke Johann Albrecht for an evaluation by his theologians of the Naumburg Recess, Chytraeus, representing Rostock's faculty, composed an uncompromising evaluation and attacked Crypto-Calvinism. "And if further evidence is needed to demonstrate the increasing commitment on the part of Chytraeus to an unequivocal Lutheran position, one need only contemplate the following statement of his guiding principle:

> 'It is God's immutable will and command that all novice preachers and ministers of Christ not only diligently preach the true doctrine as with one mind, correctly and unadulterated, but also that they should refute and reject false and erring doctrines and warn their listeners regarding those who are false teachers and seducers and point the finger at and name the wolf who is sneaking about in their midst in sheep's clothing, in order that the lambs might be able to protect themselves from him and make their escape. It is impossible that simple souls defend themselves against

false teachers who employ such beautiful, sweet talk, unless one designates them by name. Since now the errors of the Anabaptists, the Sacramentarians, the Schwenkfeldians, Osiandrians, Stancarians, and others contradict the Word of God, it is accordingly proper that faithful preachers not be dumb dogs but should joyfully and confidently rebuke by name false teachers and their doctrine, refute and condemn such doctrine, and point the finger at and explicitly name the wolf who is sneaking into their midst dressed in sheep's clothing.'"[12]

Secondly, Chemnitz's coadjutor at Brunswick, Moerlin, composed his "Lueneburg Articles" which pointed out that the confession of the princes at Naumburg was inadequate because it did not condemn specific doctrinal errors which were distressing the Lutherans. Chemnitz restrained his good friend Moerlin by reminding him that there is a difference between controversies which are essential for doctrinal purity and controversies which stem from a party-spirit. Thirdly, two Lutheran princes had the opportunity to publicly confess their commitment to a genuine union-document which didn't avoid, but which resolved the issues which were being contested. John Frederick the Middler and Duke Ulrich of Mecklenburg walked out of the Naumburg Conference in protest before it formally adjourned.

One important issue was resolved before Elector August invited the Lutheran princes to the Naumburg Conference, that was the death of Melanchthon on April 19, 1560. Melanchthon appears to have been one of the major obstacles to true union among the Lutherans and also a master at producing evasive and ambiguous statements. It is of note that after his death, his Crypto-Calvinistic fellow-theologians were either far less cautious in revealing their doctrinal position than they had been during his lifetime, or else they were more determined

to spread their heresies.

F. 1563 - STRASSBURG

In 1563 Andreae was sent by Duke Christoph to referee a controversy between two professors, Johann Marbach, who was a faithful Lutheran and Hieronymus Zanchi, who had strong Calvinistic learnings. Marbach accused Zanchi of false teaching regarding the Lord's Supper and predestination. At this time yet Andreae was either optimistic enough or naive enough to accept a very weak statement from Zanchi and to hope that Zanchi's understanding would improve. Zanchi would only agree that in the Sacrament Christ was received in a spiritual fashion and that the Christians who were weak in the faith received Christ's presence, but not that the hypocrites, who attended the Lord's Supper received Christ's real presence. Adreae's approach to union in the Zanchi matter didn't cause the Gnesio-Lutherans to trust him as much as he later showed that he deserved to be trusted in his desire for genuine union between the Evangelicals.

G. 1564 MAULBRONN

In April 10, 1564 Andreae headed a delegation of theologians, whom Duke Christoph had sent to Maulbronn to point out the inadequacies and the weaknesses of the Heidelberg Catechism. The goal of Duke Christoph and of his theologians was to restore Lutheranism in the Palatinate. After the Naumburg Conference the Palatinate had revealed its Calvinism and false teachings regarding Jesus' human nature. Some historians feel that Andreae's involvement in this struggle between Tuebingen and Heidelberg resulted in his even greater "appreciation for the purely human, historical figure of Christ. This could, if it were true, be characterized as an advance beyond the Christology of Brenz."[13] The goal of regaining the Palatinate for Lutheranism, however, was never realized.

H. 1566 DIET OF AUGSBURG

If David Chytraeus was excited by the Naumburg Conference 1561, he was even more excited and saddened by the open display of the Crypto-Calvinism of the so-called "new Wittenbergers" at the Diet of Augsburg in 1566, to which he had accompanied Duke Ulrich. "To his friend Marbach he wrote: 'The Sacramentarians have erected the citadel of their false doctrine in the very heart of Germany, and already one hears the public applause at the courts and from the intellectuals at the schools.'"[14]

II. THE YEARS WHEN UNION IS REALIZED (1567-1580 - 13 years)

A. 1567-1568 ANDREAE'S FIVE ARTICLES - BRUNSWICK

In 1567 Andreae composed five articles which dealt with: 1. justification by faith alone; 2. good works; 3. free will; 4. adiaphora; and 5. the Lord's Supper. Andreae's document was entitled: "Confession And Brief Explanation Of Certain Disputed Articles, Through Which Christian Unity May Be Reached In The Churches Subscribing To The Augsburg Confession, and Scandalous, Wearisome Division May Be Set Aside."

In 1568 Andreae went to Braunschweig-Wolfenbuettel to reorganize, together with the help of Chemnitz, the church along Evangelical lines. The previous ruler of Brunswick, Duke Heinrich, had been an ardent supporter of the papacy and an implacable opponent of the Lutheran Reformation. But when Heinrich died, his son, Duke ~~Christoph~~ Julius, determined to reform the churches of his domain and to this end he requested help from Duke Christoph. Andreae convinced Duke Julius that his "Five Articles" were a useful tool for this purpose. Duke Christoph not only sent Andreae to help reform the churches of Duke Julius, but he also authorized him to strive to effect a union between the Saxon theologians and the other Evangelicals.

Andreae's union-document was criticized by the Gnesio-Lutherans because it didn't contain antitheses, which rejected the false teachings of the Crypto-Calvinists teachings regarding the above-mentioned five Christian doctrines. Bitter experience would teach Andreae that the "New Wittenbergers" would confess one thing to him in private and quite another thing in public.

Also, of interest is the fact that when Andreae arrived in Wolfenbuettel in the late summer of 1568, he found that Chemnitz had arrived two weeks earlier and had used that time to compose a document which included both theses and antithesis. This document of Chemnitz's was to interpret his corpus doctrinae for the reformation of the churches of Wolfenbuettel. When Chemnitz submitted this document to Andreae, Andreae readily approved of it. We see that the two main architechts of the Formula of Concord were already organizing and developing their final union-document for the Evangelicals.

When Andreae and Chemnitz visited Duke Julius' schools, churches, and monasteries, they found conditions so deplorable that they administered the strong medicine of insisting that "every pastor or teacher who was unwilling to subscribe to the Augsburg Confession or who was simply incompetent in office be forced to resign."[15] For the normally conciliatory and optimistic Andreae this was a new approach to church union. Also, for the patient, gentle, and moderate Chemnitz this was an unusual action. However, both of these men were not humanists but were Christ-centered men and as such took the actions necessary for the spiritual welfare of the souls for whom they were responsible.

B. 1569 - CHYTRAEUS - AUSTRIA

Austria wasn't blessed with Evangelical pastors as Germany was for it had no University of Wittenber or Jena or Tuebingen either for that matter. The pastors serving its Evangelical Christians were

mostly misfits, incompetents or rejects from other Evangelical countries. Therefore Emperor Maximilian asked Chytraeus to prepare a church order for the reformation of the Evangelical Austrians. The church order was to be in harmony with the Augsburg Confession and was to imitate the pattern of church orders which were being used in Saxony and Brandenburg-Nuerenberg. Maximilian desired to effect a reunification of the churches not as a result of the leadership of the pope, theologians or princes, but of the emperor.

Chytraeus worked as faithfully as was his custom and in two months he had completed a draft of the agenda having been helped by a local friend named Reiter who knew by experience exactly what the problems of the Austrian Evangelicals were. When Emperor Maximilian received the first draft, he told Chytraeus he had authorized him to write an agenda not a dogmatics textbook. But Chytreus wouldn't settle for union at any price, doctrinal purity meant far too much to him for that. Chytraeus finished his church order by the end of March 1569 and discussed it with the emperor and with the Austrian estates. Two matters attracted much discussion, the ceremonials and episcopal jurisdiction. The Evangelical leaders would not give into the Emperor's desire regarding vestments, candles, and the elevation of the host. However, they were willing to make many concessions regarding the ordination of Evangelical pastors by Catholic bishops as long as no sinful obligations became involved with the ordination. Thus, Chytraeus too learned how to compose Evangelical Lutheran union-documents which protected the true Christian doctrines.

At the end of 1569, after Chytraeus had returned to Rostock from his Austrian mission, he was visited by Andreae who desired his cooperation in achieving union in the Evangelical church by means of a union-document such as his "Five Articles". Chytraeus found no fault with either the content or the format of Andreae's "Five Articles,"

but he couldn't see any necessity for a new confession. Secondly, he wasn't confident that submitting a document, which had been privately authored, to the churches for their subscription was the best or even a possible way of achieving the desired union. "Against this presumption Chytraeus wrote in a document containing a confession of his own faculty relative to the subjects dealt with by Andreae in his 'Articles':

> 'We hereby emphatically declare that we have composed this our confession for ourselves alone and in it have prescribed nothing for anyone else, far less desired to commend it or inflict it upon others as a formula concordiae. For we recognize ourselves to be far too inadequate and lacking in wisdom to be able to advise or do anything fruitful or beneficial relative to so many highly important matters and in a situation involving such bitter feelings not only between high estates, feelings which have been stirred up in a variety of ways and as a result of their authors' own numerous calumnies... If a Christian and salutary concordia is to be established, it must, as does the Augsburg Confession not only set down the truth affirmatively but also reject falsehoods by name. May the almighty and eternal God graciously direct this highly important and doubtless well- and honestly-intentioned project, and insofar as we for our own persons are able to help in effecting a Christian, brotherly, and salutary union, we have, without boasting, conducted ourselves until now as godly, peace-loving, and faithful servants over against all alike.'

It is highly unlikely that Chytraeus intended these last words to be an encouragement to Andreae to try again, but Andreae chose to be a literalist and assumed that God was answering Chytraeus' prayer by

prompting him to publish his 'Six Sermons,' seasoned to order with the condemnation of false doctrines together with their authors."[16]

It is because of this charge made by friend and foe that the "Formula of Concord" was a new confession of the Lutheran Church that you will notice a repeated insistence in the Formula itself and in the "Book of Concord" that it is not a new confession or a confession which differs in any way from previous Lutheran confessions; for example, page 845 of the Triglotta states, "Thorough, Pure, Correct, and Final (Solid, Plain, and Clear) REPETITION AND DECLARATION of Some Articles of the Augsburg Confession concerning which, for Some Time, there has been controversy among Some Theologians who Subscribe Thereto, Decided and Settled according to the Analogy of God's Word and the Summary Contents of Our Christian Doctrine."

C. 1570 - ZERBST

TWO APPROACHES TO UNION

Chemnitz and Andreae entertained different goals regarding how to effect Evangelical church union. Chemnitz hoped that as individual churches gradually accepted the same confession that an association or synod of churches would more or less automatically develop. Whereas, Andreae more realistically sought a kind of state church which would be created as soon as the individual churches would subscribe to a confession, which had been drawn up without their participation and required only their endorsement. To Andreae's approach Chemnitz was not attracted at all, in fact, he went so far "as to write a pastor in reference to Andreae's confession: 'Supposedly a new apostle has arisen, who desires to prescribe new articles of faith.' To his friend Moerlin Chemnitz wrote in the spring of 1570: 'There is an attempt being made to put down the controversies with the fist, i.e. by force. They want to quarter the Flacians, and then do the same to their adherents.

Thereupon we are to enjoy peace and tranquility. This is proclaimed not only in threatening and harsh words, but I fear something is being attempted here which our dear God will condemn."[17] These words reflect an unusual attitude on the part of the mild, even-tempered Chemnitz. If the approach to union could fill his mind with such concern and anxiety what must it have done to Lutherans who didn't possess his unusual self-control and patience? First, Andreae is accused of being too soft, then of being too firm in his union methods. One has to feel sympathy toward him.

The Gnesio-Lutherans claimed that Andreae's fifth article, which was about the Lord's Supper, could be interpreted to please the Zwinglians. Therefore, Andreae added a lengthy appendix in which he censured a symbolic interpretation of the words regarding Christ's body and blood. The theologians of the university attacked Andreae in a published work. Those theologians were Hesshus, Wigand, Kirchener, and Coelestinus. The court preacher of Weimar, Christoph Irenaeus, attacked Andreae from the pulpit, so did Hesshus. Finally, Andreae wrote to Duke John William of Saxony and complained about this slander. Adreae wrote that the Weimar theologians "had not only lost the Holy Spirit <u>but their reason and common sense as well</u>."[18] Some of the Evangelical princes understood Hesshus' remarks as a personal attack upon their persons and they weren't smiling about the matter.

In an effort to stop these kinds of suicidal Evangelical attacks in early April 1570 Dukes William and Julius invited the Evangelical princes to send representatives to a conference at Zerbst. The representatives met at Zerbst May 7, 1570. The Lutheran princes and their theologians accepted as their confessions the Ecumenical Creeds, the Augsburg Confession, the Apology of the Augsburg Confession the, Catechism of Luther, and the Smalcald Articles. They rejected Melanchthon's Corpus Doctrinae. The Wittenbergers said that no new confessional

document was needed therefore they wouldn't sign one. Andreae claimed that such a confessional document was necessary because both the Philipists and the Gnesio-Lutherans were using the Augsburg Confession against each other in their disputes. It reminds one of how ready Missouri's theologians were to quote the Lutheran Confessions in the 1950's and early 60's - quote, that is in part.

D. 1573-74 - SWABIAN CONCORDIA

In 1573 Andreae published his "Six Christians Sermons" which in some ways "resemble 33 sermons which he had actually preached in Esslingen in 1567, when the Tuebingen faculty held classes in that city during an outbreak of the plague in Tuebingen. In these 'Thirty-three Sermons On The Most Important Divisions In The Christian Religion, Which Exist Between Papists, Lutherans, Zwinglians, Schwenckfelders, and Anabaptists, Andreae outlined for his hearers the differences between the teachings of Scripture and what he viewed as its misinterpretation by those groups."[19]

While it is true that his "Six Sermons" are descended from Andreae's "Five Articles," it also appears true that his "Five Articles" utilize many of the same thoughts as did his 33 Sermons of about the same time-period. However, Andreae employed two new methods in his "Six Sermons": He condemned both false doctrines and teachers by name, also he used the Catechism's teachings to illustrate who was the wrong party in the doctrinal controversy. It is true that Andreae didn't specifically name the false teachers in the text of his sermons except in the sixth sermon, where he named the new Wittenbergers, but in the margin he wrote the names of the people who supported the correct and supported the false views of the doctrine under consideration.

"Martin Chemnitz and David Chytraeus and Duke Julius of Brunswick advised him to recast these sermons in the form of theses and then issue

them through his Tuebingen faculty. This he did and the result was the Swabian Concord, in eleven articles. This was really the 'first draft' of the Thorough Declaration as we know it."[20]

E. 1574 - EXEGESIS PERSPICUA

A number of things which were very significant for Lutheran union took place in 1574. One of them was that the Philipists published a document entitled "Exegesis Perspicua" which revealed much more than any previous publication had done their Calvinistic inclinations. This document caused Elector August to realize that he had been defending and giving sanctuary to Crypto-Calvinists. Immediately, he labored to correct the damage which had been done because the Philipists had succeeded in deceiving him.

Secondly, Selneker was one of the first Lutherans to attack this Exegesis Perspicua and to show that it was not in agreement with Luther or the Unaltered Augsburg Confession. Thirdly, Selnecker realized that the Torgau Confession of 1574 was inadequate because it still labored under the false assumption that Melanchthon was in agreement with Luther's teaching of God's Word.

F. 1575 - JANUARY 19, 1576 - MAULBRONN FORMULA

The enlightened prince regarding the Crypto-Calvinists, Elector August directed Lucas Osiander (Wuerttemberg court preacher) and Balthasar Bidembach (Stuttgart provost) to prepare a document which would unequivocably outline the Lutheran belief and which could be used to test all departures from that belief. This document was called the "Maulbronn Formula" and was very useful for Andreae later at Torgau.

"No individuals were to be named as errorists, Latin and technical terminology were to be avoided, and there were to be no quotations from Melanchthon. The last-mentioned sage stipulation was intended to

prevent anyone from concluding that Melanchthon was a teacher whose judgments may serve as a court of last appeal. Nine articles were drawn and the document was presented at the cloister of Maulbronn. It was examined, amended, approved, and sent to Elector August. The electoral court had received the Swabian-Saxon Concord just three weeks before, and it was decided to refer both formulae to Andrea. Andreae advised that from the two formulae a single new formula be prepared."[21]

G. 1576 - MAY - TORGAU BOOK

From May through June 7, 1556, 17 Lutheran theologians met at Torgau to combine the "Swabian Concord" and the "Maulbronn Formula" into one confession. Included in those 17 theologians were Selnecker, Chemnitz, Chytraeus, Musculus, Koerner, and Andreae. In this effort to combine those two confessional documents the "Swabian Concordia" gained prominence over the "Maulbronn Formula," perhaps this was thought out and refined over a much longer period of time and had benefited from many constructive comments of other theologians. It was to "this early 'unexpurgated' edition of the Formula of Concord to which Chytraeus really felt attached. After it had been replaced by the 'Bergic Book', Chytraeus wrote to a friend:

> 'If only the 'Torgau Book,' the form of the confession which had originally been subscribed and sent to the churches of the Augsburg Confession for approval, had also later been adhered to! However, the 'Big Three,' who were directing the project, had in my absence introduced at Bergen on the basis of the evaluation submitted by the churches, as they said, numerous expressions of Luther, particularly in reference to the bodily presence of Christ, which now alone are almost entirely responsible for the criticism being hurled at the confession, I confess also that I, when finally after several months was called

in for consultation, subscribed the 'Bergic Book'; however, not that Samaritan idol but only that doctrine which both before and after the Augsburg Confession has been commonly taught in our churches.'

It would seem from the above that Chytraeus understood his subscription to the 'Bergic Book' in the form of a quatenus approval, i.e. insofar as it agreed with the Augsburg Confession. He also seemed to feel that when the invitation did finally come for him to participate at the second meeting at Bergen Abbey, it was not his theological insights that were being solicited but only the church-political support which his participation would supposedly bring with it."[22] By the "Big Three", Chytraeus refers to Andreae, Chemnitz, and Selnecker.

H. 1577 - BERGIC BOOK

In May 1577 a committee of six met at Bergen Abbey to revise the "Torgau Book" in view of written constructive suggestions which had been offered. The six theologians were Andreae (Wuertemberg), Chemnitz (Brunswick), Selnecker (Saxony), Chytraeus (Mecklenburg), Musculus and Koerner (Brandenburg).

Chemnitz finally realized that there was something to Andreae's plan for Evangelical union. "In a letter to Duke William at Celle: 'Finally there must be a limit set to this theological one-upmanship, if we don't in the end wish to lose the entire substance.' It was becoming clear to Chemnitz that there was a limit to the success one could expect in establishing a unanimous confession through a process of 'participatory democracy.' There came a time when he felt responsible leadership simply had to call for obedience. Thus we find evidence that not only had Chemnitz succeeded in modifying Andreae's notions of how to achieve unity, but that the reverse was also probably true."[23]

At this meeting at Bergin, Andreae abbreviated the articles

regarding "Free Will" and the "Lord's Supper." Also, Andreae wrote the Epitome to serve as a brief summary of the entire confessional document. This summary was not to replace but to precede the confessional document.

I. 1580 - FINAL REVISION OF PREFACE

In February of 1580 Andreae and Chemnitz met at Bergin Abbey to forge a final revision of the Preface to the Formula of Concord.

J. 1581 - APOLOGY OF FORMULA OF CONCORD

In 1581 Selnecker, Chemnitz, and Kirchner met at Erfurt to produce what is know as the "Erfurt Apology of the Formula of Concord," which was published in 1582.

K. 1582 - IMPROVED TRANSLATION

"In 1582 Selnecker finished an improved Latin translation of the Formula of Concord and of the Smalcald Articles."[24]

L. 1584 - NEW EDITION OF BOOK OF CONCORD

In 1584 Selnecker produced a new edition of the "Book of Concord with an improved text of the Unaltered Augsburg Confession."[25]

CONCLUSION

The more than 20-year struggle for Christian unity following the death of Dr. Luther and the defeat of the leaders of the Smalcaldic League show us first of all how great was the cost which other Christians were willing to pay for their Savior so that you and I may today enjoy a Christ-given and Holy Spirit created union and peace within our WELS which is a rare gift in this world of thorns and tears. Secondly, it shows us how real is our grief and how great is our loss when we lose Christians fathers such as Dr. Luther. We children of Christian fathers can be sometimes easily deceived by evasive, dishonest, proud, gifted

men who assume the place of such fathers as Dr. Luther occupied.

Thirdly, those Gnesio-Lutherans really cherished the pure Gospel because they had only recently escaped from the bondage and from the oppression of the papacy. Many Lutherans today are so far away from that bondage both in time and in actual experience of fathers or of selves that union at any price is palatable to them and is viewed as a gift of God rather than as a delusion of Satan and a partial return to spiritual bondage and oppression. Christian consciences can't really be half-free and half-slave.

Fourthly, there is no reasonable or possible way in which to ever effect union with Christians who are held captive in error and who are too proud to admit their error, but will defend it with ambiguous and evasive words. Indeed, disagreement regarding Adiaphora is possible, so is misunderstanding regarding semantics. Our ability to accurately communicate our thoughts to our fellow sinners and our ability to correctly perceive what they intend to communicate to us have been so damaged by sin that we freely and frequently confess that we make many mistakes in both speaking and hearing. Mistakes, misunderstandings are one matter, but false teaching which is defended and which is covered by former service in the Lord's Vineyard, or by connection with former, genuine orthodox Christians as Melanchthon's was is quite another.

Fifthly, some historians tend to readily label Evangelical Christians such as Andreae as being the Supplanter or political opportunist or prince-pleaser and Nikolous Selnecker as being the weather vane. I believe that it is extremely not only uncharitable but also unwise to judge either Evangelical princes or theologians as if they had the freedom or the opportunity to do things in the same way that you or I can do them in the 20th century U.S.A. By that I don't mean that our faith is in any way superior to that of the men who labored for Evangelical unity after Luther's death, nor is our knowledge in any way

superior to their knowledge, nor is our culture any improvement upon their culture for our morality or ethics. Rather, I mean that different responsibilities rested upon the shoulders of an Evangelical prince and theologian in the 16th century than rest upon similar shoulders of Evangelicals in the 20th century -- even as the responsibilities and opportunities of a Christian in the 20th century are quite different if he is living in the U.S.A. or if he is living in East Berlin. The way that those sincere Evangelical Lutheran princes prayed on their knees while union efforts were going on between their theologians, the way that one had his wife on ~~his~~ her knees praying beside him for the same result, the way that some theologians were exiled a half a dozen times for the pure faith doesn't impress me that those Evangelicals where opportunists, but that they were very Christ-centered. Some of them indeed had clay feet, so what does that prove? It proves that none of them were Christ, but you and I didn't really expect that they would be, did we?

God grant us such undeserved genuine union of heart in WELS for many years yet in the future!

END NOTES

1. Quoted from R. Kolb, Andreae and the Formula of Concord, p. 39 (1977 Concordia)
2. Quoted from R. Balge, The Continuing Relevance Of The Formula Of Concord, Southeastern Wisconsin District - WELS Pastor-Teacher Conference, June 14, 15, 1977 - p. 4
3. Quoted from R. Kolb, "Andreae And The Formula Of Concord, p. 22
4. Quoted from R. Kolb, Andreae And The Formula Of Concord, p. 22,23
5. Quoted from R. Kolb, Andreae And The Formula Of Concord, p. 25
6. Quoted from Concordia Triglotta - p. 236
7. Quoted from R. Balge, p. 6
8. Quoted from Concordia Triglotta - p. 236
9. Quoted from Concordia Triglotta - p. 240a
10. Quoted from R. Kolb, Andreae and The Formula Of Concord, p. 41,42
11. Quoted from R. Balge, p. 15
12. Quoted from T. Jungkuntz, Formulation Of The Formula Of Concord, p. 75 (1977 Concordia)
13. Quoted from T. Jungkuntz, p. 33
14. Quoted from T. Jungkuntz, p. 76
15. Quoted from T. Jungkuntz, p. 59
16. Quoted from T. Jungkuntz, p. 81,82
17. Quoted from T. Kungkuntz, p. 61
18. Quoted from T. Jungkuntz, p. 44
19. Quoted from R. Kolb, p. 48
20. Quoted from R. Balge, p. 18
21. Quoted from R. Balge, p. 19
22. Quoted from T. Jungkuntz, p. 83
23. Quoted from T. Jungkuntz, p. 63
24. Quoted from T. Jungkuntz, p. 103
25. Quoted from T. Jungkuntz, p. 103