

The Formula of Concord and Contemporary Anabaptists, Spiritualists, and Anti-trinitarians

by ROBERT KOLB

In his monumental study, *The Radical Reformation* (1960), George Hunston Williams grouped together three disparate kinds of “outsiders” from the Reformation era; he labeled them Anabaptists, Spiritualists, and Anti-Trinitarians.¹ Interestingly, and probably coincidentally, descendants of these ways of thought—or more recently arisen parallel religious phenomena—have become prominent in twentieth-century Anglo-American religion although these three dissimilar groups commanded relatively little popular support in the sixteenth century. Indeed, they did elicit a good deal of negative reaction from the reformers, more than appropriate for their numbers, because they called into question fundamental elements of the catholic tradition and Reformation theology. At two points one of these theological systems or another had rejected the central legal definition of Christian orthodoxy as legislated in the Justinian Code (529), belief in the Trinity and in infant baptism.²

In re-introducing his comprehensive overview of these dissident traditions to the public in its third edition in 1992, Williams observed that in “our own times,” with the disestablishment of European “state churches,” the reorganization of North American churches, and the challenge to Asian and African Christianity by renascent ethnic religions and Marxism, “Christians of many denominations are finding themselves constitutionally and in certain other ways closer to the descendants of the despised sectaries of the Reformation Era than to the classical defenders of a reformed *corpus christianum*.”³ With this assessment, Williams challenges Lutherans to re-examine why the confessors at Augsburg in 1530 and the Concordists of the 1570s distinguished their own faith and teaching so sharply from that of the Anabaptists, Spiritualists, and Anti-Trinitarians. In the 1570s those seeking a resolution of the issues dividing the Lutheran churches believed it important also to reassert the difference between their teaching and that of these

three groups. Therefore, they included a very brief summary of the Lutheran objections to the key doctrines of these “sects” in their Formula of Concord. Although scholars have largely overlooked Article XII of the Formula,⁴ it does provide important assistance in clarifying a vital part of the Lutheran contribution to ecumenical conversation at the beginning of the twenty-first century in North American society.

The Wittenberg Reformation and Old-Style Reform

In fact, these three dissident traditions were not so radical and innovative at all. The Anti-Trinitarians only repeated ancient arguments that had been examined and rejected by the early church; their *restitutio* was no more than a *restitutio haereticorum et haereseos*.⁵ The Anabaptists and Spiritualists reflected a tradition of protest that had existed for at least half a millennium in western Christendom. Although people with these ideas had founded no lasting institutions, small bands of biblicistic, moralistic, anti-clerical, anti-sacramental, millennialistic believers had grown up from time to time across the religious landscape of western catholic Christianity following the turn of the first millennium, to raise their voices against some elements of the religious establishment or folk piety.⁶ They were also associated in the popular mind with disrespect for civil order, with rebellion and social chaos.

For many early sixteenth-century Christians this way of thinking provided the only, or at least the most prominent, alternative to the established form of ecclesiastical life. In 1524 Ulrich Zwingli confronted one of the first such groups to organize itself after the beginning of the Reformation.⁷ In south Germany one group identified itself through the Schleithem Articles of 1527.⁸ Jakob Hutter and Menno Simons founded Anabaptist churches that have continued to this day.⁹

Not only Ulrich Zwingli was directly confronted by this traditional form of reform. Martin Luther encountered it in his own backyard. His colleague at Wittenberg, Andreas Bodenstein von Karlstadt, caught Luther's enthusiasm for reformation but reverted to the older

medieval pattern of bringing change to the church. In the early 1520s Luther rejected Karlstadt's moralism, his deprecation of the pastoral office, and his dismissal of the sacraments as God's instrument for working his saving will.¹⁰ In the 1520s and 1530s Luther and his colleagues responded to attacks from their former student, Thomas Müntzer,¹¹ and a Silesian nobleman, Caspar Schwenkfeld, whose spiritualizing tendencies led them both to dispute Wittenberg theology.¹² They both dismissed the outer forms of God's word—oral, written, and sacramental—and, in an attempt to safeguard Christ's divinity, Schwenkfeld diminished the importance of the incarnation with his doctrine of the celestial flesh of Christ.

In the late 1520s Philip Melanchthon, Luther, and others in the Wittenberg circle, such as Justus Menius, began to repudiate a number of Anabaptist teachings and practices.¹³ In the 1530s, the denial of the doctrine of the Trinity by Michael Servetus attracted the attention of the Wittenberg theologians, especially Melanchthon.¹⁴ Lutheran criticism of these groups included not only a theological critique but also a rejection of tendencies among some of them to dismiss key elements of the social order as ungodly. Because they regarded such sects as a threat to societal stability, the Wittenberg theologians could take exception to their general principle that heretics should not be executed for their beliefs. Melanchthon, for instance, could support the use of capital punishment against them for seditious activities.¹⁵

Early on, the Wittenbergers were forced to recognize the necessity of distinguishing their own views and those of these dissidents operating with another pattern for reform, since Roman Catholic theologians did not always recognize the distinction. The Roman polemic deliberately associated the Lutherans with these heretical groups. When John Eck prepared theses designed to call the wrath of Emperor Charles V down upon the Lutherans, his *Four Hundred Four Articles* of 1530, he lumped together with the Lutheran teachers not only Swiss "sacramentarians" but also Anabaptists such as Balthasar Hubmaier, Oswald Glaidt, and Hans Denck, and others.¹⁶ Melanchthon repudiated this association as he rejected ancient heresies regarding the Trinity in Article I of the Augsburg Confession and also the views being revived by Anabap-

tists concerning the office of public ministry, the church, baptism, the possibility of perfection in the Christian life, and secular government, in articles V, VIII, IX, XII, and XVI.¹⁷

As Lutheran princes and theologians continued the formal definition of their public teaching in the 1550s, they repeated the Augsburg Confession's rejection of such groups. In 1559 the Saxon *Book of Confutation* and the Mansfeld *Confession* explicitly rejected false teaching within the Lutheran churches and condemned Anabaptists, Schwenkfeld, and Anti-Trinitarians as well.¹⁸

Jacob Andreae's "Thirty-Three Sermons"

Jacob Andreae reflected these same concerns when, in 1566, he preached thirty-three sermons in the city of Esslingen to instruct parishioners on the difference between Lutheran teaching and Roman Catholic, Zwinglian, Anabaptist, and Schwenkfeldian error.¹⁹ Andreae had repeatedly demarcated the Church of the Augsburg Confession from such opponents and critics of Lutheran theology. He himself had engaged in dialog and disputation with Anabaptists in 1557 at Pfeddersheim in the Palatinate, representing Elector Ottheinrich, regarding infant baptism, the believer's relationship to secular government, oaths, the Lord's Supper, and prohibitions of attendance at Evangelical worship services.²⁰ From his own experience with such groups Andreae knew why he objected to their theologies.

Andreae's critiques were not unique. The outline of the 1566 sermons on Anabaptist thought reflects an older Lutheran tradition. Most of the dozen topics in these sermons are on a list of questions posed by Philip Melancthon, Caspar Cruciger, and Anton Musa to Anabaptists in Jena in 1535: the Trinity, righteousness in God's sight, communal property, governmental authority, baptismal regeneration and infant baptism, the swearing of oaths, and the propriety of divorce from those not sharing the faith.²¹ Andreae's understanding of Anabaptist thinking came from general knowledge and personal experience; he almost always summarized what he had heard or read from Anabaptists without citation, but on two occasions he gave a bibliographical reference. He quoted the Hutterite leader Peter Riedemann's "*Rechenschafft des Glaubens*," as Andreae entitled it, which had

been republished in 1565, as he discussed the Anabaptist charge that Lutheran worship was a “mob of whoremongers, adulterers and all other kinds of impure spirits whom God hates”²² In fact, Riedemann treated almost all the issues addressed by Andreae in his critique of the Anabaptists. His work may have provided the preacher in Esslingen with his fundamental text of Anabaptist errors.

The Esslingen sermons reiterated Andreae’s frequent argument that the teachers of the Augsburg Confession had a unity of faith that excluded the ideas propagated by these “sects.” Andreae believed that it was necessary to make clear the difference between their proclamation and Lutheran teaching. Nonetheless, he wanted so to educate his lay hearers that they would be able to win some from these groups to the truth. In his introduction to these sermons Andreae explained, “I hope to Almighty God not only that through this witness the clamor of these opponents will be put to rest, but even more that it will bring about a reduction in the divisions and through God’s grace an effort in behalf of Christian, God-pleasing unity.” He intended that the opponents would see their positions fairly represented in his assessment and would therefore be able to appraise their own ideas according to the plumbline of the Christian faith as he had presented it.²³

Framed in simple terms that lay people could use in such encounters, Andreae’s sermons were designed to assist his audience in giving the account of their faith, as, he insisted, God expects all believers to do. All Christians have received this responsibility to offer their confession with “gentleness and reverence” (1 Pet. 3:16). Those who can read the Bible have been given a gift that enables them to use it in discussions of the faith. Even though the vast majority of people could not read Scripture themselves, they were nonetheless bound to give witness to its content, Andreae contended. He provided the outline of the six chief parts of Luther’s catechism and explained to his hearers and readers how they could use the catechism’s texts to guide their testimony.²⁴ No one dare say that he or she believes simply what the church believes. All are called by God to know his Word and to be able to share it with others and defend it.²⁵

In pursuit of his goal of enabling such witness, Andreae used one basic form of presentation. After a few exegetical comments on the pericope, he presented one or more specific errors propa-

gated by his opponents. In the first sermon of each series he gave a brief explanation of the origins and fundamental orientation of those whose teachings he was appraising. Specific analysis of critical issues began with a review of the opponents' position, including a careful recitation of their interpretation of the Bible passages on which they based their doctrine. The second part of Andreae's analysis consisted of a careful assessment and rebuttal of that interpretation, leading to the third part, a proclamation of the Lutheran teaching which the opponents' position contradicted. He supported his biblical analysis with occasional patristic citations, chiefly to Augustine,²⁶ and with illustrations or stories.

This method, repeated in each sermon, may be assessed in his treatment of the Anabaptist denial of infant baptism. He began by listing eight reasons why the Anabaptists reject the baptism of infants. 1) Scripture does not say a single word about it. 2) The practice is totally contrary to Christ's command to baptize in Matthew 28 because there teaching precedes baptism.²⁷ 3) Children have no sin. 4) The early church baptized only those who had confessed their sins and their faith. 5) The apostles did not baptize children; 6) the papacy introduced the custom. 7) Baptism is the covenant of a good conscience (1 Pet. 3:21), and children have no conscience. The testament of grace is a testament of the knowledge and understanding of God, and children know neither good nor evil. 8) It does no good to put a seal on a letter with nothing written on the paper, but that is what happens when a promise is given to children, who cannot have faith.²⁸

After this recitation of the Anabaptist argument Andreae turned to refutation. He admitted that the words, "you are to baptize children," do not occur in Scripture, but neither does a command to commune women, who were not present at the institution of the Lord's Supper. Christ's command that his disciples baptize commissions them to baptize all people. God's command to Abraham to keep his covenant and to circumcise did not require that children be taught before they be made children of that covenant (Gen. 17:9–14). God's promise delivered in baptism extends to children just as did his promise through circumcision to his Old Testament people. Against the contention that children do not sin, Andreae cited Psalm

5:1;5, “in sin did my mother conceive me,” and Ephesians 2:1–3, “we were dead in trespasses and sins, by nature the children of wrath.” Leviticus 26 and Deuteronomy 28 concluded all Israelites, adults and children, under God’s judgment. In John 3:5 Jesus told Nicodemus that no one, not even children, can enter God’s kingdom apart from new birth. To the Anabaptist objection that this refers to older people, not children, Andreae replied that all that are born of flesh are flesh, sinful, impure, condemned (John 3:6).

Against the fourth argument of the Anabaptists Andreae submitted that the apostolic church did baptize children, for they must have been included in Stephanas’ household (1 Cor. 1:16). Christ himself summoned the children to himself and stated that the kingdom of God can be entered only by those who come in the manner of the children (Mark 10:14; Matt. 18:3). Anabaptists’ concerns about the lack of faith of children, if consistently applied, would prevent baptism of adults as well, for no one can judge whether the adult’s confession of sins and confession of faith is sincere; that of Simon Magus was not, according to Andreae’s (perhaps dubious) interpretation of the report in Acts 8:9–14. It is much more certain to place a child into the confession of Christ, who is the eternal truth and utterly reliable (John 14:6), also when he says that he brings children into the kingdom of God. Andreae concluded that there is no more certain baptism than that of a child, for whom Christ gives witness that he accepts this one who is baptized. Furthermore, infant baptism cannot be an invention of the pope since Cyprian and Augustine testified to the baptism of infants long before the papacy arose.

Andreae’s exegesis of 1 Peter 3:21 focused on the nature of the biblical covenant. In the Old Testament the covenantal relationship was simply a gift from God, bestowed, through circumcision, on eight-day-old children. Children are not silent in their baptisms; Christ speaks for them in establishing the covenant with the Father. They are able to react to God’s Word through God’s working in them, just as John the Baptist did in his mother’s womb (Luke 1:41). But, protest the Anabaptists, you can see what baptism—and God through baptism—accomplishes in children: as soon as they begin to talk and walk, they exhibit every form of mischievousness and disobedience, a sign that they were not truly born again. Andreae

responded: indeed baptism covers sin; it is no longer imputed as damnable. But it does not disappear, as Paul commented regarding his own life (Rom. 7:14–25; Gal. 5:16–6:1; Rom. 6:12–23). Just as circumcision had served as a seal of the righteousness of faith, so baptism does, according to Paul in Colossians 2:11–13.²⁹

Following this extensive examination of the Anabaptist position, Andreae turned to the positive presentation of his own teaching. He defined baptism as a covenantal sign of the new testament which belongs to all who are comprehended within this covenant. Children need this washing of rebirth and renewal in the Holy Spirit (Titus 3:5), for this new birth through water and Spirit is the only entry into God's kingdom prescribed by Christ himself (John 3:5). Christ cleanses his church through this washing of water by the Word (Eph. 5:26). Andreae concluded his treatment of infant baptism by leading readers and hearers through a way to introduce this way of thinking to Anabaptists.³⁰

Throughout Andreae's sermons the constant coupling and coordination of dogmatic concerns and pastoral care, one of the distinctive marks of sixteenth-century Lutheran public teaching and church life, is evident. For instance, alongside their doctrinal errors the Schwenkfelders were guilty of diverting people from hearing the Word of God and receiving the sacraments; such calculated neglect of God's people drove Andreae to preach against them.³¹ In countering the Anabaptist blurring of the distinction between the gift of righteousness in God's sight and the practice of righteous love for the neighbor, Andreae referred to the troubles and terrors visited upon consciences by such confusion of God's favor with human efforts. Andreae affirmed the necessity of the works of love which the Anabaptists called for and insisted on new obedience as the fruit of faith, a product of the Gospel. He also sharply criticized the Anabaptist teaching on justification because its lack of clarity led to despair in those who were struggling against sinful weakness. He reported on a person whom he knew, who had been deceived by Anabaptists into thinking that he would be able to keep God's commandments "with his whole heart and strength" because he had been born anew and redeemed from his sin by the indwelling of Christ. The more this man tried to practice his piety, the more

despairing he became. He found “no joy in the Holy Spirit,” but instead only “shivering and shuddering” [*zittern vnd zagen*] because he could not draw the distinction between two distinct works of Christ: his work of redeeming sinners through his own obedience to the Father and his work of leading his people into their own life of obedience, which remains imperfect in this life. This “new monkery” robbed Christians of the peace of conscience Christ died to give them. Particularly the appearance of piety which the Anabaptists claimed made them dangerous: it tempted unsuspecting believers to agree with them.³²

Andreae’s critique of his opponents took their biblical interpretation seriously enough to assess it, to offer his own contrasting interpretation, and to answer it with biblical exposition from other passages. His polemic was clear and sharp, but attempted to be fair. He reminded readers that not all Anabaptists taught the same thing.³³ At the same time he warned against Satanic temptation in the form of outward holiness and pious-sounding words that praised external performance of what is right but robbed believers of their confidence in Christ’s work.³⁴

From the “Thirty-Three Sermons” to the “Formula of Concord”

Andreae composed his *Thirty-Three Sermons* to assert the identity and doctrinal integrity of the Lutheran confession of the faith in the confusing situation of the 1560s. However, this work did more than that. With its simple biblical and catechetical argument and its focus on the critical questions which differentiated his position from those of his opponents, these *Sermons* provided the methodological pattern for Andreae’s attempt to bring harmony to the divided Lutheran churches six years later, his *Six Christian Sermons on the Divisions within the Churches of the Augsburg Confession*.³⁵ In addition, the sections of the *Thirty-Three Sermons* which treat the Schwenkfelders and the Anabaptists laid the foundation for article XII of the Formula of Concord.

In the initial draft of his program for concord, the *Six Christian Sermons*, Andreae did not treat any groups outside the Lutheran

churches. However, when he made the second step toward the formulation of what would become the Solid Declaration of the Formula of Concord, the “Swabian Concord” of 1574,³⁶ he added a brief appendix to his treatment of the intra-Lutheran disputes, on the errors of Anabaptists, Schwenckfelders and Anti-Trinitarians. In this document he abandoned the specific mention of false teachers and focused only on false teachings as he treated divergent Lutheran positions, and he addressed the errors of the three “sects” in this way also, without naming the names of their leaders but only refuting their false teachings. It is quite clear that the first two sections of this appendix in the “Swabian Concord” reproduce the positions outlined in those sermons preached at Esslingen which had addressed the theologies of Anabaptists and Schwenckfelders. The material remained in subsequent drafts leading to the Formula of Concord, with only minor revisions from Martin Chemnitz’s pen (SD XII:16, 17) and from the committee assembled at Bergen (SD XII:13).

Throughout, the Formula follows the guidelines laid down in its introduction: the truth God reveals to his people is found in “the prophetic and apostolic writings of the Old and New Testaments, as [in] the pure, clear fountain of Israel, which alone is the one true guiding principle, according to which all teachers and teaching are to be judged and evaluated” (SD, Concerning the Binding Summary, 3). Nonetheless, the Concordists also honored and treasured the witness of the ancient church (SD, Concerning the Binding Summary, 1–2). In article XII Andreae followed the example of Melancthon at Augsburg and reaffirmed the Trinitarian faith of the church, the catholic tradition of baptizing infants (SD XII:11–13), and the rejection of a Donatist view of the office of the public ministry³⁷ (SD XII:34). In rejecting Anabaptist, Spiritualist, and Anti-Trinitarian errors, the Lutheran churches wished to follow the model of the Augsburg Confession by confessing the biblical message delivering anew the tradition of the church.

After repeating Andreae’s observation in Esslingen that the Anabaptists were divided into many factions, the Formula rejects their heretical teachings because their false doctrines undermined biblical teaching in each of the three walks of life that framed medieval social

theory. In the realm of the church the Formula condemns the Anabaptist (1) views that the believer's righteousness before God depends upon "our renewal and on the godliness of our own way of life before God" as well as Christ's merit (SD XII:10); (2) rejection of infant baptism (SD XII:11-13); (3) perfectionistic view of the church (SD XII:14-16); (4) doctrine that Christ's flesh is "celestial" flesh, not normal human flesh, and of others who believed that Christ is not truly divine (SD XII:25, 26). In the realm of political life the Formula's condemnation fell upon the Anabaptist (1) rejection of government service as displeasing to God (SD XII:17); (2) view that Christians may not exercise offices in the government, may not appeal to its power, and may swear no oaths (SD XII:18-20); and (3) repudiation of capital punishment (SD XII:21). The Concordists further condemned the Anabaptists' opinions regarding the domestic realm of human life when some of them taught (1) that private property is wrong (SD XII:22); (2) that the callings of innkeeper, merchant, or weapons-maker are antithetical to the faith (SD XII:23); (3) that married believers may divorce unbelieving partners (SD XII:24).³⁸ The nine sermons of the fourth part of the Esslingen sermons, those dedicated to the Anabaptists, had treated (1) the righteousness of believers in God's sight, (2) infant baptism, (3, 4) the church and its ministers, (5, 6) the nature of governmental authority, (7) oaths and capital punishment, (8) communal sharing of material goods, and (9) marriage.³⁹ Andreae repeated his critique of 1566/1567 in the Formula's text, albeit in a very brief summary.

The spiritualizing Schwenckfelders were condemned in the Formula for their (1) Christological heresies, including a Monophysite denial of Christ's creatureliness (SD XII:29); (2) denial of the effectiveness of the means of grace (SD XII:30-32); (3) perfectionistic view of the Christian life (SD XII:33); (4) insistence that regular practice of excommunication is necessary for a true Christian congregation (SD XII:34); and (5) contention that only truly renewed ministers can effectively teach and distribute the sacraments (SD XII:35).⁴⁰ At Esslingen Andreae had preached four sermons against the Schwenckfelders: (1) on Christ, (2) on the ministry and the proper understanding and use of the sacra-

ments, (3) on Christian perfection and the fulfilling of the law in this life, and (4) on the true Christian church and its ministers.⁴¹ Also in this section of Article XII Andreae was following the agenda of analysis he had set forth in the *Thirty-Three Sermons* of 1567.

*The Concerns of Article XII and Contemporary
North American Religion*

Each of the issues addressed by the twelve articles of the Formula of Concord are issues of some significance at the beginning of the twenty-first century even if the questions are not always posed in the same way. (For instance, the nature of original sin in the half century after the Soviet and Nazi holocausts is of deeper importance than ever, but how to define it in Aristotelian categories need no longer claim a place in theological discussion.) The prominence of certain ideas of the Anabaptists in the church worldwide, the revival of Spiritualism in the New Age movement inside and outside the church, and continuing challenges to God's Trinitarian revelation of himself demand that the twelfth article of the Formula not be ignored.

The entire range of issues in its twenty-seven articles of rejection—some of them more immediately relevant in our time than others—revolve around two fundamental axioms of Lutheran teaching.

The first concerns the definition of *what it means to be human*, that is, what humanity is according to God's design and what has happened to humanity through the fall into sin.

The second concerns the conviction that *God's created order is good*, with the implications of this simple claim for (a) God's choice of human flesh as his vehicle for revealing himself and for rescuing fallen human creatures from their sin and death, (b) his use of selected elements of his good creation to deliver this salvation worked through his Word made flesh, and (c) the Christian's enjoyment of and service in daily life within the structures God created for human living in this world.

1) *Two Kinds of Righteousness and Two Kinds of Sinfulness*

At the heart of Luther's shift in the paradigm of understanding the biblical message stands his distinction between two kinds of righteousness.⁴² His revision of the fundamental defining presupposition of the theological enterprise rested upon his conviction that sinners cannot be saved by producing the righteousness demanded in each of the Ten Commandments through human performance. Luther believed that human creatures never were (before the fall), never are (through grace in this life), and never will be (in the Eschaton) righteous, or truly human, in God's sight because of human performance of the works set forth as the pattern for human life in God's law. The reformer affirmed the righteousness of human works, but he recognized that we are human because of our good, God-pleasing performance only within the horizontal relationships among human creatures. In God's sight, within the vertical relationship with our Creator, human beings before the Fall pleased him only because he had already made them as his beloved children. Sinners brought to righteousness, returned to their true humanity, are truly human in his sight once again only because his love and mercy regard them as human since they have died and been raised with Christ. That regard is not merely a divine observation or opinion. That regard rests upon his Word of forgiveness and life which changes the reality of our humanity when it says, "your sins are forgiven you." In life eternal God's delight in his chosen and saved people rests in no way upon their performance but rather simply on his wanting to take delight in them.

Vital for Christian confession and for the peace of conscience that God wants to place at the center of our perception of ourselves and of him is this understanding that human righteousness consists in nothing more or less than "fearing, loving, and trusting in God above all things" because he is the loving Creator and Father who made us and who has remade us, who has brought us out of Egypt (Ex. 20:2) and who has taken his place at the center of the believer's daily life.

Much of contemporary American religion embraces a view that human worth and identity are established by human performance. Adherents of such an understanding of humanness hold that the

accomplishment of our works cannot be distinguished from our identity. This blurring of true human identity as a child of God, which God gives as an unconditioned, undeserved gift, with our own performance forces us to come to terms with ourselves on the basis of a very shallow definition of what it means to be a good human being. We force ourselves to be satisfied with conformity to a version of God's expectations that focuses on external successes in moral performance, successes in works flashy enough to convince ourselves of our goodness. This moralism sometimes even takes form in perfectionism. Perfectionism is possible for those with still less sense of what it really means to be human. It reduces life to a striving to keep conscience and confidence in a balance that too easily eludes sinners when they look a bit more deeply inside themselves or look more sharply at the evils around them.

The reverse side of this moralism is a shallow view of sinfulness and evil. Such a shallow view of what goes wrong with life defines sin in a way that makes my own failures something less than the crimes that qualify as "real sin," according to such a conceptualization of evil. It disarms the concept of evil in a period in world history when technology harnessed to lust, fear, and greed makes evil's manifestations more horrible than ever before. Lutherans understand the critical distinction between sinful actions and what we call the original sin, or the root sin, which is the disruption of our identity through the broken relationship with God. Sin is at its root not merely a matter of bad behavior. Behavior is too often a matter of chance and luck in a sinful world. What is wrong with our lives at their root is the loss of the stability and harmony which trusting in our Creator bestows.

Failure to perform what we want to do, and to accomplish what we ought to accomplish, is only the result of that lack of trust in our God which gives daily living its life. Lutherans witness to the mystery of God's re-creation through his Word and his letting sin and evil continue until the Eschaton. We confess that individual Christians and the church itself are both righteous and sinful at the same time. As Andreae repeatedly noted in Esslingen, perfectionism is a denial of the mystery of the continuation of evil in a world redeemed by Christ. This denial is deadly because it blunts the proper use of God's Word for individuals and for congregations. It deludes them into

taking sin less seriously than they ought and prevents them from seeing the full glory of God's grace in the midst of a sinful world. For this reason Andreae rejected certain moralistic or perfectionistic beliefs held by his Anabaptist and Spiritualist contemporaries.

Anabaptists had frequently reproached Lutherans because the lives of too many members of their congregations were marked by sin. Andreae conceded that bad behavior continued to be a problem in parishes just as it had been before the Reformation. He also acknowledged that the Anabaptists believed that believers are saved by God's grace. But he expressed concern that they failed to understand the depth of sin and the totality of human dependence upon God's favor. The Anabaptists argued that the righteousness of Christians had to be better than that of the scribes and Pharisees (Matt. 5:20), that God demands obedience of the heart, not just of external works, and that Christ is our righteousness. Andreae stated his full agreement with each of these points but regretted the Anabaptist failure to distinguish two works which Christ accomplishes for believers: their redemption from sin, through his own obedience to the Father's plan for salvation, and their sanctification, through his dwelling in their hearts through faith.⁴³ Andreae employed Luther's distinction between passive righteousness before God and active righteousness in relationship to neighbors. The latter remains "imperfect, not because of the Lord Christ—it is not a failure of his power or desire—but [because of] our corrupted nature, which does not submit to the Spirit of the Lord Christ with complete obedience but strives against him" (Rom. 7:14–25, 2 Cor. 12:7–9).⁴⁴

Andreae distinguished submission to sin that masters the unrepentant from the struggle against sin which all believers experience, just as Paul did. All believers must pray with the psalmist that their sins not be imputed to them but be covered by the blood of Christ (Ps. 31:1–2). The Holy Spirit leads Christ's followers to act against their sinful lusts, as Christ told Peter he would be taken where he did not wish to go (John 21:18). His spirit was willing, but his flesh resisted (Matt. 26:41), and he remained its prisoner until the Holy Spirit freed him. The failure of Anabaptists to recognize the brokenness of the life of believers drove many to despair, Andreae

believed. He strove to make it clear to his hearers and readers that the struggle against disobedience in the Christian life does not alter God's commitment, made in Christ on the basis of unconditioned grace, to save those who trust in him (Rom. 5:12–21; Rom. 4:4; 1 John 1:7; Isa. 53:5; 1 Pet. 1:18–19).⁴⁵

Andreae treated another indication of what Lutherans think is a superficiality in understanding how the spiritual struggle against evil must be conducted. It surfaced in the belief of some Anabaptists that it was sinful and dangerous for true believers to visit "houses of worship in which papistic masses were previously recited" or to have any contact with ministers of the Augsburg Confession, even as employees (SD XII: 15,16). Anabaptists argued that God has created his own temple in his people and does not seek to be worshipped wherever human beings fashion some kind of worship of their own. The churches of Germany had been built as people were forced at sword's point to become Christian; the pagan temples had simply been transferred to the church while maintaining the worship that the devil had set up. So, as in the Old Testament, every remnant of pagan worship should be rooted out (Ex. 34:13, Num 33:50–56, Deut. 7:5, 12:2–3). This belief in an irradicable demonic nature of a place or building projected a mirror image to the pagan understanding of sacred places and things represented in the veneration of relics and the pilgrimage practices of popular medieval religion, which indeed did contain such pagan elements. This Anabaptist revulsion could indicate a tactical prohibition of contact with the inadequately reformed Lutheran way of doing things, but it could also be based on the belief that the devil is so strong that he can permanently pervert some places, activities, and things.

Andreae believed that God's Word trumps demonic perversion of places and practices. When the Holy Spirit is present in Word and sacrament, times, places, and persons fall under his lordship and are placed under the rubric of Christian freedom. Christ builds his house wherever his Word is preached and gathers the faithful. Paul could claim the altar to the unknown God in Athens for the service of his proclamation (Acts 17:22–31), for, as he himself stated, "we know that no idol really exists" (1 Cor. 8:4). God's

command to Israel to eliminate pagan temples was appropriate and designed for the situation at that time, but this rule is not universally applicable any more than is the command to eliminate entire populations (Deut. 7:2, 20:17). Lutheran churches had been purged of the idolatrous mass. To worship in them is no different than what Josiah (2 Kings 22:3–23:25), Ezekiel (chs. 40–44), and Christ himself (Luke 19:45–47) did when they worshipped in temples that had been cleansed of their corruption.⁴⁶ Andreae believed that God's Word asserts itself over all the powers of evil, and that with the sword of the Spirit in hand, which is the Word of God, Christians can reclaim all of life, even in the midst of its brokenness under evil's weight, for the service of God and his gospel, for the service of one another.

If Christians fail to recognize how deeply ingrained the power of sin has become in human life and fail to define sin as every aspect of the brokenness of our relationship with God, then they can easily believe that “our renewal and . . . the godliness of our own way of life before God” (SD XII:10) contribute to the believer's righteousness in God's sight. Then they can believe that “unbaptized children are not sinners in God's sight but instead are righteous and innocent and therefore in their innocence are saved without baptism, which they do not need” (SD XII:11, also 12 and 13). Then they may be deceived into thinking that “a Christian, who is truly reborn through the Holy Spirit, can keep and fulfill the law of God perfectly in this life” (SD XII: 33). Then they can regard as unchristian those congregations “in which sinners are still found” (SD XII:14) and in which excommunication is not regularly practiced and ministers are “not personally truly renewed, righteous, and godly” (SD XII:34).

On days overshadowed by a security which ignores the depth of sinfulness or in hours blessed by the joys of relatively successful obedience to God's command, the Lutheran understanding of the situation of the believer as both righteous and sinful may not seem so critical. But in those dark days of uncertainty—when storms of one kind or another raise questions about our relationship to God—understanding the depth of our sinfulness, the persistence of our struggle against it, and the totally unconditioned love of our

God make the difference between life and death. In times like ours, confessing the faith of the Concordists as expressed in Formula of Concord Article XII is a crucial ecumenical task for the people of the Lutheran confession.

2) *The Goodness of the Created, Material Order*

Second, Andreae and the Formula of Concord reaffirmed Luther's understanding of the goodness of the created order and its relationship to God and to his way of working in his world. An underlying, to a certain extent unarticulated, hermeneutic of the Creator held by Andreae and his fellow Concordists reaffirmed Luther's doctrine of creation and captured its significance for a range of issues. This hermeneutic can be summarized in three theses.

a) *The Word became Flesh and dwelt among us.* For a worldview which connects abstract Spirit with the Good and finds the material world inferior if not downright evil, the coming of God, the Good, into human flesh and bones is at least impossible and perhaps blasphemy of the worst sort. For this reason spiritualizing Christians of every age have striven with imagination and verve to squeeze the biblical message into the shapes prescribed by Plato or other spiritualizers. But, as John tells us, "By this you know the Spirit of God: every spirit that confesses that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh is from God, and every spirit that does not confess Jesus is not from God" (1 John 4:2). Therefore, the Concordists simply rejected and condemned those who were resurrecting the old christological heresies, teaching "that Christ is not true, essential God by nature, of one eternal divine essence with God the Father, but that he is merely adorned with divine majesty under and alongside God the Father" and that Christ is not true God in his essence but merely has more and higher gifts and glory than other people, "that only the Father is really true God," (SD XII:36, 26, 38). They rejected ancient modalism, which tried to solve the problem of the Trinity by abolishing the distinction of the persons, and they rejected a new kind of tritheism advanced by a few Anti-Trinitarians in Hungary⁴⁷ (SD XII:37).

Andreae and his colleagues also rejected another kind of attempt to come to terms with the problem of bringing divine Spirit together with material creation. Some Anabaptists, like Clement Ziegler, Melchior Hoffmann, and Menno Simons,⁴⁸ had taught that “Christ did not receive his flesh and blood from the Virgin Mary but brought it with him from heaven” (SD XII:25). Caspar Schwenckfeld had also struggled with the definition of Christ according to his human nature as creature.⁴⁹ His views elicited the Concordists’ condemnation. They repudiated his teaching that “all those who believe that Christ according to the flesh or his assumed humanity is a creature have no correct knowledge of Christ, the reigning king of heaven, and that through the exaltation, Christ’s flesh assumed all divine attributes in such a way that in power, might, majesty, and glory he is equal in every way to the Father and the eternal Word in status and essential dignity, so that the two natures in Christ share one essence, one set of characteristics, one will, and the same glory, and so that the flesh of Christ participates in the essence of the Holy Trinity” (SD XII:29). Behind the Concordists’ sharp rejection of such ideas stand the intense struggles over Christology, specifically over the sharing of the characteristics of the divine and human natures of Christ within his person, that had led to the eighth article of the Formula of Concord. For Andreae’s and Chemnitz’s crypto-philippist opponents had lumped them both together with Schwenckfeld under the label “Eutychian.”⁵⁰

In the *Thirty-Three Sermons* Andreae had dealt with christological heresy chiefly in addressing Schwenckfeld’s denial that Christ is a creature according to his human nature. Andreae excused Schwenckfeld in part, judging that, although he was a sharp thinker, he had not studied theology and had never learned how to use theological language and distinctions properly. Andreae explained that the controverted word “creature” is not good German but a “broken Latin word.” Thus, Andreae could say that at least in part this dispute was a matter of terminology.⁵¹ Nonetheless, Andreae, himself under attack for Eutychianism because of his so-called “ubiquitarian” Christology,⁵² took Schwenckfeld’s monophysite definition of the relationship of the divine and human

natures seriously. Andreae affirmed that Jesus received a true human nature through the Virgin Mary as he was conceived by the Holy Spirit (Luke 1:35). Andreae rejected the teaching that the human nature had been divinized but recognized Schwenkfeld's desire to avoid teaching that Christ held a subsidiary position in relationship to God the Father. Andreae insisted that Lutheran teaching preserved the biblical definition of the majesty of the human nature of Christ, given within the personal union with the divine nature. In discussion with Schwenkfeld's followers, Lutheran lay people were instructed to pose four questions: Did Christ have a true body and a true soul, like other human creatures, distinguished from them only by the absence of sin in him? Did Christ bring his human nature from heaven or did he receive it in Mary's womb, from her flesh and blood? Did the human nature exist eternally? Is Christ still truly human, with body and soul, flesh and bones? These questions should lead Schwenkfeld's disciples to confess the true humanity of Christ. In defending his view of Christ's humanity, Andreae expressly called upon Luther's authority.⁵³

As in every age God's revelation of himself in the incarnation, in the cross, in the re-claiming of life through Christ's resurrection is a stumbling block for those whom the Holy Spirit does not bring to faith (1 Cor. 1:18–2:16). With the Concordists contemporary Americans are called to proclaim the Word that brings life because it conveys the gifts of salvation and reconciliation effected by the Word made flesh. God has come to engage his human creatures in conversation, and by speaking to them through his re-creative Word, he gives them new life, makes new creatures out of sinners, whose lives had been governed by their doubt of his Word. This Word of life must be proclaimed against every spiritualizing attempt to banish God's creative and loving activity to the forces of some nether world deep in the human soul or beyond the stretches of the universe. God is at work in the means of grace, addressing and re-creating human creatures here and now.

b) *God works his saving will through selected elements of the created order, what Luther called "the means of grace."* Not only God's commandeering of human flesh and blood in the person of

Jesus of Nazareth causes those estranged from God to stumble. So does his placing of life-restoring power in human language that conveys the gospel of Christ and in sacramental elements that—in conjunction with the Word in language form—convey forgiveness of sins, life, and salvation. Spiritualizing believers of the sixteenth century and like-minded Christians in subsequent centuries have missed out to some extent on the comfort and assurance that God's Word bestows because they have failed to realize that God's Word in oral, written, and sacramental forms is his power to save (Rom. 1:16; cf. 2 Tim. 3:15). This insight which arose out of Luther's doctrine of creation and his convictions regarding the nature of God's Word formed the Concordists' treatment of the Lord's Supper in Article VII and found expression in their rejection of the Anabaptists' rejection of infant baptism (SD XII:11–13) and of Schwenckfeld's deprecation of the ministry of the Word and of the sacraments (SD XII:30–32).

Against Schwenckfeld Andreae led his Concordist colleagues in affirming that the church's ministry, the Word as it is proclaimed and heard, is a means through which God the Holy Spirit teaches human beings the saving knowledge of Christ and effects conversion, repentance, faith, and new obedience in them. They further attested that the water of baptism is a means through which the Lord God seals the adoption of his children and effects new birth and that the bread and wine in the Holy Supper are means through which Christ distributes his body and blood (SD XII:30–32). Andreae noted in the *Thirty-Three Sermons* that the point at issue was not whether preaching and the administration of the sacraments should be conducted; Schwenckfeld himself had preached. The critical question was whether the various forms of the Word (namely, oral, written, and sacramental), were means and instruments of God through which sins are forgiven and eternal life is given. Against Schwenckfeld's contention that Jesus Christ alone is God's means of grace and salvation, Andreae set down as his presupposition the difference between the eternally self-subsistent Word which became flesh and his word written and proclaimed. The latter is not the essence or power of God but the servant or instrument of God's essence and power. The sacramental elements

had no saving power apart from the Word that makes them instruments of the Holy Spirit. Christ had commissioned the use of Word and sacrament in the church to accomplish his saving will (John 17:8, 17; Matt. 28:18–20; Mark 16:15–16). Schwenkfeld's problem, Andreae recognized, was that he could not believe that the spiritual or heavenly could be given through the corporeal or earthly.⁵⁴

Also in the case of the biblical teaching regarding what Lutherans call the means of grace, when life is going well for believers, it may not seem to make much difference whether they understand how God actually conveys forgiveness of sins, life, and salvation to them. But in the turmoils and tragedies of life it is vital to be able to cling to the assurance and comfort rendered by knowing that what God says he not only means but actually effects as he delivers his Word through his people. To understand how to serve the Holy Spirit's purpose in bringing the life-renewing gospel of Christ to others, it is important to perceive that God's Word effects what it announces. This is the original form of performative speech; it is recreating speech. The gift of this insight is also one that Lutherans are called to share with the whole household of faith.

c) God is to be served and praised in all walks of life. Not only secularized, materialistic thinking within North American society today tends to separate religious commitment from daily life. Certain streams of "spirituality" do the same, for a variety of reasons. Not only New Age fascination with the inner "spirit" or "spiritual forces" that flow through individuals and unite them with a greater, impersonal spirit undermines biblical thinking. Some Christians are seeking to protect the faith and the faithful by circling the wagons and withdrawing from the culture into which God has called them merely because the culture is more hostile than it was previously. Biblical thinking approaches human life and its relationship to God in a totally different way. Luther insisted on distinguishing the realm of our trust in God from the realm of our love for neighbor, but the two can never be separated in Lutheran theology. What God says in his revelation in Scripture has significance for governing society, family life, and occupational life, as well as the teaching and practice of the church. Andreae used this

principle to shape his critique of the Anabaptists; medieval social structure provided him his outline.⁵⁵ He believed that God's Word accompanies believers into the whole of God's creation and enables them to make sanctified use of all his created gifts. Such a conviction led the Concordists to affirm the propriety of governmental participation and service in secular government (SD XII:17–21) and of service to God and neighbor within the structures of family and economy (SD XII:22–24).

Anabaptists objected to Christian participation in government because the scepter of earthly rule was to depart from God's people when Christ came (Gen. 49:10), in accord with a hermeneutical principle that sets aside Old Testament regulations, a principle outlined in the work *Heute vnnnd Gestern*. Andreae pointed out that the Ten Commandments remain valid for all time, and so does God's establishment of civil government as his tool for keeping order and promoting the good (Rom. 13:1–7). He thus rejected the interpretation of Genesis 49 as a failure to distinguish God's spiritual rule from his temporal rule. For the same reason Andreae dismissed the Anabaptist argument that once Christ came to rule from Zion (Ps. 2:6), the temporal sword was no longer to be found in the hands of his own people, a view confirmed by Sirach's observation that other peoples had secular government, but Israel had only the Lord (17:14–15). Christ's sword is his Word, and it has different functions than the temporal sword, Andreae insisted; the two can co-exist. Historically, pagan emperors and kings never abandoned their responsibilities as rulers when they became Christian but exercised them as believers following conversion, just as those soldiers who came to John the Baptist were not advised to give up their calling but to practice it responsibly (Luke 3:14). When the Lord complained to Samuel about the Israelites wanting a king (1 Sam. 8:4–9), he was not indicating displeasure with temporal government—that remained with Israel's judges—but with the people's desire to abandon the order he had given them for such government. God's favor in fact has always fallen upon faithful kings. When Anabaptists used Christ's words to Peter, "put up your sword" (Matt. 26:52) as a reason for believing that Christians may not participate in secular governing, Andreae advised brandishing

Luther's understanding of the Christian's calling, pointing out that God had given Peter the responsibility to preach the Word, not exercise temporal rule.⁵⁶ That did not exclude other believers from fulfilling callings within secular government.

When the Formula of Concord teaches that governmental service is a God-pleasing walk of life in the New Testament, that Christians can hold governmental offices with a good, clear conscience, may exercise that office against the wicked in appropriate situations, may appeal to the government for aid, may swear an oath in court, pay homage to rulers, and execute criminals if it is their responsibility (SD XII:17–21), it is not simply submitting to the early modern state on its way to absolutism, as is sometimes asserted. Luther and his followers perceived that God works in the institutions and walks of life which he has established as Lord and creator, through those whom he calls to exercise responsibility in the realm of this world for the common good.

Andreae made similar points as he commented on the (relatively seldom advanced) Anabaptist contention that a “true believer” could divorce an unbelieving spouse and marry another “true believer” and on the Anabaptist prohibition against the occupations of innkeeper, merchant, and weapons-maker. In defense of the second proposition they cited Sirach 26:28–27:3, which warns of the ease with which merchants fall into sin. Andreae rejected this condemnation of an entire walk of life because of the temptations associated with it. Without those engaged in trade, life cannot proceed; this is the way God had constructed human living. The same is true of innkeepers; weapons-makers are a necessary part of the exercise of political power, Andreae contended.⁵⁷ Likewise, he rejected the call for community of goods, as voiced by some Anabaptists, with reference to the absence of divine commands to hold all in common, to God's command not to steal—a protection of private property—and to Paul's acceptance of riches held by Christians (1 Tim. 4:4 ; 2 Thes. 4:10; Eph. 4:28; 2 Tim. 6:17–19).⁵⁸ Andreae affirmed the validity of marriage as a part of God's order for creation that embraces people and determines the shape of their lives, whether they are believers or not, once again repeating Lu-

ther's understanding of the natural goodness of life in its bodily and earthly dimensions as God created it.⁵⁹

The Lutheran confession of the faith was conceived within the university, and its adherents recognize that God also gives gifts of learning for the preservation and enjoyment of his world. This appreciation of intellectual and cultural gifts from God surfaced in Andreae's reply to the Anabaptist critique of the Lutheran public ministry. Anabaptist abhorrence of Lutheran pastors was grounded in part on doctrinal objections to the content of their message⁶⁰ and their conduct,⁶¹ but some also criticized the "book-learning" of university trained pastors, who had studied "books of pagan myths" [Heidnische Fabelbücher]. Andreae pointed out that the Anabaptists' own elders were supposed to know more than other members of the congregation. These elders boasted that they had learned the faith from a peasant, and so Andreae pointed out that they were not "taught by God" directly either. At the university pastors studied the languages of Holy Scripture and "the art of speaking about each article of teaching in an orderly manner, so that they might exhort their people and give answer to those who contradict their teaching."⁶² Not every field hand [Drescher] should be entrusted with the office of the public ministry (1 Tim. 3:1-7, 5:17, 2 Tim. 2:15, Titus 1:6-9), for if an elder knows only Luther's German translation or the Zurich translation, he cannot meet the challenge of those who claim that a passage is falsely translated. The devil, not God, is an enemy of the university, Andreae concluded.⁶³ Also in this instance Luther's hearty and healthy appreciation for the blessings of the material creation is reflected in Andreae's affirmation of the believer's ability and call to take the good gifts of learning in hand for the service of both God and his people.

Lutherans recognize that the cultures and societies in which God calls them to serve suffer corruption from a wide variety of evils that sin has loosed in God's world. But they reject a spiritualizing flight from the goodness of God's creation, even in broken form. Precisely because of its broken form we are called to plunge into the activities of daily life. For if Christians do not exercise respon-

sibility in a way that reflects God's plan for human life in their God-forsaking societies, who will? Faith clings to Christ in the midst of corruption of all kinds, and God's Word aids believers in reclaiming God's gifts for the service of humanity. In so doing they reclaim them also for his praise.

Called to Repeat the Confession

Not only can the faith not be separated from daily life. It also cannot be separated from the faithful of past generations. That is clear from the Concordists' recall to the catholic tradition, both in repetition of the life-giving Word of Scripture and in the recollection of what the church has taught in the past. In a New Age, in a Christendom that often claims to be creedless, the repetition of the ancient faith held by the community of believers in all times and places must constantly be asserted. The confession that Jesus of Nazareth is the second person of the Trinity come into human flesh stands at the heart of the biblical message. The confession that the Holy Spirit works through the means of grace to effect life and salvation stands at the heart of pastoral care and consolation. The confession that God's creation is good and that believers are called to serve in the midst of life stands at the heart of the cultivation of proper discipleship.

Twenty-first century Lutherans are called to continue and repeat the pastorally oriented confession of the faith which had become the habit of mind for sixteenth-century followers of Martin Luther. The need of the world around us demands it, and it is the desire of God to speak to all people his re-creating Word of life. With such a confession, repeating the insights of the last article of the Formula of Concord, we bring the comfort of the cross and the resurrection to the troubled. We bring clarity to the confused and lift the burdens of those crushed under the evils of this world. We affirm God's rule and providing love that express themselves in our service to the neighbor. Formula of Concord Article XII reminds us of one significant part of Lutheran ecumenical responsibility in this place and time.

NOTES

1. George Hunston Williams, *The Radical Reformation* (3. ed., Kirksville: The Sixteenth Century Journal, 1992), hereafter cited as Williams, *The Radical Reformation*, with page numbers from the third edition. Because Williams offers extensive bibliographical references, the following essay directs readers to his review of the literature on specific figures and topics.

2. Werner Elert, "Die Bedeutung der Augsbургischen Konfession im theologischen Denken und in der geistesgeschichtlichen Entwicklung," in *Ein Lehrer der Kirche, Kirchlich-theologische Aufsätze und Vorträge von Werner Elert*, ed. Max Keller-Hirschmenger (Berlin: Lutherisches Verlagshaus, 1967), 97–99.

3. Williams, *The Radical Reformation*, xxxvi.

4. See F. H. R. Frank, *Die Theologie der Concordienformel IV* (Erlangen: Blaesing, 1865): 345–373; and Gunther Wenz, *Theologie der Bekenntnisschriften der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche 2* (Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 1998): 747–749.

5. See Jerome Friedman, *Michael Servetus, a Case Study in Total Heresy* (Geneva: Droz, 1978) on the ancient roots of the anti-trinitarian thought of Servetus.

6. Norman Cohen, *The Pursuit of the Millennium: Revolutionary Millenarians and Mystical Anarchists in the Middle Ages* (3. ed., London: Paladin, 1984).

7. Williams, *Radical Reformation*, 179–193.

8. In a bid for ecumenical respectability these articles were re-christened the Schleithem Confession in contemporary American Anabaptist historiography, see John C. Wengert, "The Schleithem Confession of Faith," *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 19 (1945): 243–254. See also Williams, *Radical Reformation*, 280–294.

9. Williams, *Radical Reformation*, on Hutter, 637–657, on Menno, 585–600, 731–753.

10. Williams, *Radical Reformation*, 110–120, 155–161.

11. Williams, *Radical Reformation*, 120–136, 161–165.

12. Williams, *Radical Reformation*, 199–211, 383–387, 472–477.

13. Justus Menius, *Der Widdertauffer lere vnd geheimnis/ aus heiliger schriftt widderlegt* (Wittenberg: Nickel Schirlentz, 1530). See John Oyer, *Lutheran Reformers against Anabaptists: Luther, Melancthon, and Menius and the Anabaptists of Central Germany* (The Hague: Nijhoff, 1964), 179–210.

14. As Servetus (see note 5) first attacked the doctrine of the Trinity, in *De erroribus Trinitatis* (1531) and *Dialogorum de Trinitate* (1532), Melancthon wrote against his views to Joachim Camerarius (*Corpus Reformatorum. Philippi Melanthonis Opera quae supersunt omnia*, ed. C. G. Bretschneider and H. E. Bindweil [Halle and Braunschweig: Schwetschke, 1834–1860; henceforth CR] 2:630, 640, #1094 and 1099, *Melancthons Briefwechsel*, ed. Heinz Scheible [Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: fromann-holzboog, 1977–1998; henceforth MBW] #1305 and #1311) and Johannes Brenz (CR 2: 660–661, #1123, MBW #1351). In his *Loci communes theologici* (1535, cf. the 1543 edition, in *Melancthons Werke in Auswahl*, ed. Robert Stupperich [Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1951–1975; henceforth StA] 2:1 182, 189–190), in his *De ecclesia et de autoritate verbi Dei* (1539, StA 1:327), and in his *Responsiones . . . ad impios articulos Bavaricae inquisitionis* (1558, StA 6:365–377) he criticized Servetus in print. Melancthon also approved of Servetus' execution in Geneva (1553) in a memorandum of April 10, 1557 (CR 9:133, MBW #8185).

15. See the discussion of the Wittenberg positions by Gottfried Seebaß, "Luthers Stellung zur Verfolgung der Täufer und ihre Bedeutung für den deutschen Protestantis-

mus,” in: *Die Reformation und ihre Außenseiter, Gesammelte Aufsätze und Vorträge*, ed. Irene Dingel (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1997), 272, 278–282.

16. Wilhelm Gussmann, ed., *D. Johann Ecks Vierhundertundvier Artikel zum Reichstag von Augsburg 1530* (Kassel: Pillardy, 1930): citations from Hubmaier in articles 178, 226, 245, 321, 353, 394; Glaidt in articles 125, 179, 213, 227, 245, 321, 392, 393; Denck in article 394. Anabaptists as a group were referred to in article 404 and the Spiritualist Zwickau Prophets in article 111. See the translation of this work in *Sources and Contexts of the Book of Concord*, ed. Robert Kolb and James A. Nestingen (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001).

17. *The Book of Concord, The Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church*, Eds. Robert Kolb and Timothy J. Wengert (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2000), 36/37, 40/41, 42/43, 44/45, 48/49–50/51 [hereafter cited as BC]; *Die Bekenntnisschriften der evangelischen-lutherischen Kirche* 11th ed. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992), 51, 58, 62, 63, 67, 70–71 [hereafter cited as BSLK]; *The Book of Concord: The Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church*. Ed. and trans. Theodore G. Tappert (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1959), 27/28, 31–33, 36–40 [hereafter cited as BC-T].

18. *Des Durchleuchtigen . . . Herrn Johans Friderichen des Mittlern . . . in Gottes wort/ Prophetischer vnd Apostolischer schrift/ gegru[e]ndete Confutations/ Widerlegungen vnd verdammung etlicher . . . Corruptelen/ Secten vnd Irrthumen . . .* (Jena: Thomas Rebart, 1559): on Servetus, B1a–C1a (1a–5a), on the Schwenkfelder, C1a–E4a (5a–16a), on the Anabaptists, G1a–H1a (20a–25a); *Illustrissimi principis . . . Iohannis Friderici secundi . . . sumpta confutatio & condemnatio praecipuanum Corruptelarum, Sectanum, & errorum . . .* (Jena: Thomas Rebart, 1559): on Servetus A1a–A3a (1a–3a), on the Schwenkfelder, A3a–C2b (3a–10b), on the Anabaptists, D2b–E1b (14b–17b); *Bekendnis der Prediger in der Graffschafft Mansfelt/ vnter den jungen Herren gesessen. Wider alle Secten/ Rotten/ vnd falsche Leren/ wider Gottes wort/ die reine Lere Luthers seligen/ vnd der Augspurgischen Confession/ an etlichen o[e]rten eingeschlichen/ mit notwendigen widerlegunge derselbigen* (1. ed., Eisleben 1559, dated August 20, 1559; I have used the 2. ed.: Eisleben: Urban Gaubisch, 1560), on the Anabaptists, B2a–H1a (1a–24a), on Servetus, H1b–N4a (24b–48a), on the Schwenkfelder, g1b–x4b (113b–172b).

19. *Drey vnd dreissig Predigten von den fu[e]rnehmsten Spaltungen in der christlichen Religion/ so sich zwischen den Ba[e]pstischen/ Lutherischen/ Zwinglischen/ Schwenckfeldern/ vnd Widerteuffern halten . . .* (Tübingen: Morhart, 1568). I have used the Tübingen 1580 edition, hereafter cited as *Drey vnd dreissig Predigten*.

20. The protocols of this disputation were discovered, edited, and translated by John S. Oyer, see “The Pfeddershiem Disputation, 1557,” *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 60 (1986): 304–351.

21. See reports to Elector Johann Friedrich from early December 1535, CR 2:997–1004, #1369 and #1370, MBW #1671 and #1674.

22. *Drey vnd dreissig Predigten, Der vierde Theil*, Llll1b [= p. 64]. Cf. Riedemann’s *Rechenschafft vnsrer religion/ leer vnd glauben/ von den bru[e]dern, so man die Hutterischen nennt außgangen* (Brünn: P. Vollandt, 1565), translated as *Peter Riedemann’s Hutterite Confession of Faith*, trans. and ed. John J. Friesen (Waterloo: Herald Press, 1999), 124. On this work, see Werner Packull, “The Origins of Peter Riedemann’s *Account of our Faith*,” *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 30 (1999): 61–69. In fact, Andreae cited specifically only one other Anabaptist work, *Heut vnnnd Gestern*; see *Drey vnd dreissig Predigten, Der vierde Theil*, Pppp4b [= p.102].

23. *Drey vnd dreissig Predigten*, A4b.
24. *Drey vnd dreissig Predigten, Der vierde Theil*, Ccccc2a-Dddd1a [= pp. 195 {= 185}-201 {= 191}], Eeeee1a-Eeeee2b [pp. 209 {= 199}-212 {= 202}]; cf Andreae's admonition to give witness to Schwenkfeld's followers as well, Dddd4a-Eeeee1b [= pp. 207-209]. Andreae's frequent use of the catechism as an organizing principle for teaching theology to the laity is discussed in Robert Kolb, "Jakob Andreae's Concern for the Laity," *Concordia Journal* 4 (1978): 58-67.
25. *Drey vnd dreissig Predigten, Der vierde Theil*, Cccc1a [= p. 1], Bbbb3a-Ccccc1a [= p. 189 {= 179}-193 {= 183}].
26. E.g., *Drey vnd dreissig Predigten, Der dritte Theil*, Ppp2a [= p. 17]; Sss1b [= p. 40], Aaaa1b [= p. 88]; *Der vierde Theil*, Hhhh1b-Hhhh2a [pp. 40-41].
27. In fact, the proper translation, with "make disciples" as the main verb of the command and "baptizing" and "teaching" as participles explaining the main verb, would have strengthened Andreae's argument immensely, but he followed Luther's translation and the Vulgate.
28. *Drey vnd dreissig Predigten, Der vierde Theil*, Ffff3b-Ffff4b [= pp. 28-30].
29. *Ibid.*, Ffff3b-Hhhh4a [= pp. 28-45].
30. *Ibid.*, Hhhh4b-Jiii1b [= pp. 46-48].
31. *Drey vnd dreissig Predigten, Der dritte Theil*, Nnn4b [= p. 6].
32. *Drey vnd dreissig Predigten, Der vierde Theil*, Eeee3b-Ffff2b [= pp. 20-25]. Andreae laid a similar charge at the feet of the Schwenckfelders, *ibid.*, *Der dritte Theil*, Yyy2b [= p. 74].
33. *Drey vnd dreissig Predigten, Der vierde Theil*, Cccc1a-Cccc3 [= pp. 1-6].
34. *Drey vnd dreissig Predigten, Der vierde Theil*, Cccc1a [= p. 1], Dddd1b-Dddd2a [= p. 8-9], Ffff1b-Ffff2a [pp. 24-25].
35. *Sechs Christlicher Predig Von den Spaltungen so sich zwischen den Theologen Augspurgischer Confession von Anno 1548. biss auff diss 1573. Jar nach vnnd nach erhaben. . .* (Tübingen: Gruppenbach, 1573), translated in Robert Kolb, *Andreae and the Formula of Concord, Six Sermons on the Way to Lutheran Unity* (Saint Louis: Concordia, 1977), 61-120.
36. H. Hachfeld, "Die schwäbische Confession (liber Tubingensis)," *Zeitschrift für historische Theologie* 36 (1866): 297-301.
37. Cf. *Drey vnd dreissig Predigten, Der dritte Theil*, Aaaa4a-Bbbb2b [= pp. 93-98].
38. BC, 657-658; BSLK, 1093-1096; BC-T, 633-635.
39. *Drey vnd dreissig Predigten, Der vierde Theil*, Cccc1a-Eeeee1b [= p. 1-212].
40. BC, 658-659; BSLK, 1096-1098; BC-T, 635-636.
41. *Drey vnd dreissig Predigten Der dritte Theil*, Nnn1a [= p. 1]-Bbbb4b [= p. 101].
42. Robert Kolb, "Luther on the Two Kinds of Righteousness. Reflections on His Two-Dimensional Definition of Humanity at the Heart of His Theology," *Lutheran Quarterly* 13 (1999): 449-466.
43. *Drey vnd dreissig Predigten, Der vierde Theil*, Dddd2a-Dddd4b [= pp. 9-14].
44. *Ibid.*, Dddd4b [= p. 14].
45. *Ibid.*, Eeee1a-Eeee4b [= pp. 15-22]. Andreae returned to the topic of Anabaptist contempt for Lutheran congregations, Llll1a-Mmmm1a [= pp. 63-72]. He had also engaged Schwenkfeld's perfectionist views of the life of individual Christians in the third sermon against his views, *Der dritte Theil*, Vuu3b-Yyy3b [= pp. 60-76] and of the Christian congregation, *Der dritte Theil*, Yyy4a-Bbbb4a [pp. 77-101].

46. *Drey vnd dreissig Predigten, Der vierde Theil*, llll3a-Llll1a [= pp. 51–63].
47. On one Lutheran reaction to these developments, see Robert Kolb, “Das Erbe Melanchthons im Bekenntnis der ungarischen Bursa an der Universität Wittenberg (1568),” in *Melanchthon und Europa, 1. Teilband: Skandinavien und Mitteleuropa*, ed. Günter Frank and Martin Treu (Stuttgart: Thorbecke, 2001), 223–239.
48. Williams, *Radical Reformation*, on Ziegler and Hoffmann, 492–496, on Menno, 597–598.
49. Williams, *Radical Reformation*, 495–499.
50. Robert Kolb, “Altering the Agenda, Shifting the Strategy: The Grundfest of 1571 as Philippist Program for Lutheran Concord,” *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 30 (1999): 705–726.
51. *Drey vnd dreissig Predigten, Der dritte Theil*, Ooo4b-Ppp1b [= p. 14–16], Ooo1a [= p. 8]. Others did not judge Schwenckfeld as charitably, including Luther (see his “Disputatio de divinitate et humanitate Christi,” *Dr. Martin Luthers Werke* [Weimar: Böhlau, 1883–], 39, II: 92–121) and Matthias Flacius (see Rudolf Keller, *Der Schlüssel zur Schrift, Die Lehre vom Wort Gottes bei Matthias Flacius Illyricus* [Hannover: Lutherisches Verlagshaus, 1984]).
52. Ernst Bizer, *Studien zur Geschichte des Abendmahlstreits im 16. Jahrhundert* (Gütersloh: Mohn, 1940), 335–362.
53. *Drey vnd dreissig Predigten, Der dritte Theil*, Ooo1a-Qqq1a [= pp. 7–24].
54. *Ibid.*, Qqq3b-Vuu1b [= pp. 28–56].
55. *Drey vnd dreissig Predigten Der vierde Theil*, Cccc1a [= p. 1]—Cccc2b [= p. 4].
56. *Ibid.*, Ppp4a-Ssss2a [= pp. 101–121]. This summarizes only the first of three sermons Andreae devoted to participation in the responsibilities of the political realm; the second dealt with the Christian’s right to call upon government officials: *Drey vnd dreissig Predigten, Der vierde Theil*, Ssss2b-Vvvv3a [= pp. 122–139], the third with the swearing of oaths in civil courts and capital punishment: *Drey vnd dreissig Predigten, Der vierde Theil*, Vvvv3b-Yyyy2b [= pp. 140–154]. The exegetical examination of Anabaptist argumentation differed, but the theological structure of his counter-argument remained the same. Cf. *Hutterite Confession*, 130–137.
57. *Drey und dreissig Predigten, Der vierde Theil*, Yyyy4a-Zzzz1b [= pp. 157–170{= 160}]. Cf. *Hutterite Confession*, 137, 149–150.
58. *Drey und dreissig Predigten, Der vierde Theil*, Zzzz1b-Aaaa2a [= pp. 170{= 160}–179 {= 169}]. Cf. *Hutterite Confession*, 119–122.
59. *Drey vnd dreissig Predigten, Der vierde Theil*, Aaaa2a-Aaaa3a [= pp. 179{= 169}–181 {= 171}]. Cf. *Hutterite Confession*, 127–129.
60. *Drey vnd dreissig Predigten, Der vierde Theil*, Mmmm3a-Nnnn2a [= pp. 75–81].
61. *Ibid.*, Oooo1b-Pppp1a [= pp. 88–96]. Cf. *Hutterite Confession*, 122–126.
62. *Drey vnd dreissig Predigten, Der vierde Theil*, Nnnn2b-Nnnn3b [= pp. 82–84].
63. *Ibid.*, Nnnn4a-Oooo1a [= pp. 85–87].