

## *Preaching the Christian Life: Ethical Instruction in the Postils of Martin Chemnitz*

by ROBERT KOLB

CARTER LINDBERG asked an old question in 1999: “Do Lutherans Shout ‘Justification’ But Whisper ‘Sanctification?’”<sup>1</sup> Questions regarding the sanctified Christian life have produced much controversy and not always the clearest answers in the history of Lutheran theology. Twentieth-century views of humanity, inside and outside the church, have imposed anew on Lutheran theologians the challenges of addressing problems relating to ethical motivation, the “third use” of the Law, and instruction in moral living,<sup>2</sup> and the resulting conflicts represent no new development within the Lutheran discussion of the impact of the biblical message on believers’ daily lives. How to integrate motivation for Christian living through the gospel with the information needed for making ethical decisions has challenged followers of Luther and Melancthon since the 1520s, even if this particular expression of the question bares clear traces of modern modes of thinking. The preaching of Martin Chemnitz, one of Melancthon’s prize students, a leading interpreter of the Wittenberger legacy in the 1560s–1580s, provides one perspective on the historical development of the Lutheran understanding of the sanctified life. His sermons reveal something of how he practiced motivating and instructing his hearers in Christian living.

### *Law, Gospel, and the Christian Life in Sixteenth-Century Lutheran Theology*

By 1554, when Chemnitz left Wittenberg for his first (and only) pastorate, in Braunschweig, the issue of how justification related to sanctification—how God’s law relates to the person saved by faith—had long aroused controversy within the Wittenberg circle. The problem arose from Luther’s forthright address of the biblical

tension between the concept of a Creator God totally responsible for all in his creation and the concept of a human creature totally responsible for a specific realm of life, for his or her own actions. Within this paradox of dual responsibilities it is clear that God is responsible for the existence and identity of individual human creatures and that he holds them responsible for meeting his expectations that flow from the identity he gives them as his children. The biblical insistence on the total responsibility of the Creator God for his creation produced Luther's understanding of God's providence and above all of God's unconditional grace toward his elect children, whom he recreates out of their sinfulness into people who live by faith in him on the basis of Christ's death and resurrection. This message Luther labeled gospel. He assumed that God's Word, as it conveys this message of forgiveness and life, actually accomplishes what it promises. From this gift of life flow certain expectations, Luther believed. These expectations place a burden of responsibility upon human creatures, designed to meet and fulfill God's expectations. With the aid of Christ, under the working of the Holy Spirit, these burdens are light. When human beings remain in sinful revolt against God, these expectations accuse and crush. This message Luther labeled law. He believed it incapable of bestowing life; it could only evaluate—and condemn—human creatures that fail to live out their God-given identity. Although Luther did not specifically designate this enigma of dual responsibility as a "paradox," he wrestled with its paradoxical implications for anthropology in his distinction between two kinds of righteousness and with its implications for God's dealing with his human creatures in the distinction between law and gospel.

Also determinative of Luther's understanding of Christian living in the world, alongside this paradox of responsibilities, is the mystery of the continuance of evil in believers' lives. After God's grace has transformed the identity of sinners, making them members of his family through the baptismal form of his re-creating Word, they continually fall back into sin. The struggle between "flesh" and "spirit" described by Paul in Romans 7 was a significant aspect of Luther's experience as a believer, and the life of repentance it necessitated became a major preoccupation for Wittenberg theology. Luther and his followers continually tried to aid believers in the

struggle to practice the life in Christ to which God had called and empowered them in their new baptismal identity as God's child. Wittenberg teaching viewed the believer's whole life as a life of repentance,<sup>3</sup> that is, of the daily repetition of God's killing the sinful self and his restoring the faithful child of God through the action of law and gospel. For that sinful self, with its sins and evil desires, must daily be drowned and die through remorse and repentance, according to Luther's Small Catechism. Each day the new person must be raised to live in righteousness and purity in God's presence forever.<sup>4</sup> The mystery of the persistence of evil and the paradox of human responsibility to live according to God's plan in conjunction with God's total responsibility for the creation, redemption, and sanctified living of human creatures provide the background and basis for much of the conflict among the students of Luther and Melancthon to define their mentors' legacy.

From the late 1520s on, disagreements regarding the use of the law in the Christian life rocked Lutheran circles. In 1527–1528 Luther and Melancthon headed a visitation of electoral Saxon congregations. Scholars have given insufficient attention to the caesura their experiences in the villages generated in their conception of how to give the life of parish and people concrete form. Their encounters with peasant life caused Luther to write in the introduction to his Small Catechism,

the deplorable, wretched depravation that I recently encountered while I was a visitor has constrained and compelled me to prepare this Catechism, or Christian instruction, . . . Dear God, what misery I beheld! The ordinary person especially in the villages knows absolutely nothing about the Christian faith . . . They live like simple cattle or irrational pigs, and, despite the fact that the gospel has returned, have mastered the fine art of misusing all their freedom.<sup>5</sup>

Luther reacted to these conditions in part with an increasing emphasis on God's law in his preaching, particularly in its "second"—accusatory or crushing use—and with ever more explicit ethical direction of the type in his Large Catechism (combining of both positive and negative instruction).<sup>6</sup>

Melancthon's reaction to the squalid conditions of faith and life in the Saxon villages took as radical a turn even if his indignation and fear of moral disorder were expressed in another theo-

logical form. The visitation and Johann Agricola's criticism of his and Luther's emphasis on preaching the law to the secure formed one basis for Melancthon's concept of the third use of the law.<sup>7</sup> In the Apology of the Augsburg Confession Melancthon continued to use the language of the righteousness of faith and the righteousness of the law<sup>8</sup> (which he had adopted at least six years earlier) to express Luther's distinction between two "kinds of human righteousness" (passive and active),<sup>9</sup> critical for the Wittenberg shift in the paradigm for biblical interpretation. By 1534 Roman Catholic accusations of antinomianism and lingering concerns about Agricola's evisceration of true repentance caused Melancthon to sharpen the focus of his explanation of both justification and sanctification. He defined the righteousness of faith more precisely by emphasizing that sinners become right in God's sight only by the re-creating power of his merciful word of forgiveness ("forensic justification"). He intensified his efforts to cultivate the Christian life through his extending of the uses of the law to a third, its function to aid believers "in the practice of obedience," as a guide to ethical decision-making in daily life.<sup>10</sup>

Yet this deep concern for moral living and public order did not overpower the fundamental Wittenberg commitment to bringing peace to terrified consciences, brought to confront their guilt before God by the accusation of the law. Thus, much of Wittenberg ethical deliberation addressed the reality of the believer's struggle with the abiding presence of the sin and inclination to transgress God's law. In this struggle, the power of the gospel alone could produce the proper disposition of mind and heart, the trust that places God at the center of life. Apart from that motivation no human performance could please God, all Lutherans believed. God's children live by faith alone. Some Wittenberg students believed that the law guided Christian decision-making only by functioning as a threat and curb against sinful inclinations; others thought the law's content could be used by those whom the gospel was moving to perform God's will when they sought to identify what moral choices that will commanded. However Luther's and Melancthon's disciples viewed the process of ascertaining God's will, at the heart of their efforts to indigenize the Wittenberg Ref-

ormation among the German populace were attempts to practice the tension between the gospel of forgiveness, which bestows a new identity as child of God upon sinners, and the law, which states the Creator's expectations for his restored creatures.

Melanchthon's concept of the third use of the law forms part of the background for the dispute over grace and good works provoked by his colleague, Georg Major, when he argued that "good works are necessary for salvation" and "no one can be saved without good works." In the wake of that controversy, the second generation of the Wittenberg circle divided over whether the law must be used to guide and instruct Christians. In 1556, in the midst of the Majoristic dispute, some "Gnesio-Lutheran" students of Luther and Melanchthon around Matthias Flacius defended the proposition that good works are theoretically necessary for salvation in the doctrine of the law, a position rejected by his mentor Nikolaus von Amsdorff and a group of younger disciples of Luther, Andreas Poach, Anton Otto, and Andreas Fabricius.<sup>11</sup> Among Flacius' supporters was the ecclesiastical superintendent of Braunschweig, Joachim Mörlin. His colleague and comrade, Martin Chemnitz, was inevitably drawn into this argument regarding the law within the Wittenberg circle.<sup>12</sup>

A parallel dispute arose between two instructors at the University of Frankfurt an der Oder who had studied under Luther and Melanchthon, Andreas Musculus and Abdias Praetorius. Musculus insisted that believers perform good works "spontaneously," not out of necessity. His sharp proclamation of the accusatory use of the law indicates that he was not "antinomian," as is sometimes suggested; he recognized the necessity of continually calling his parishioners in Frankfurt to repentance, and his sermons reveal his concern to develop the practice of Christian virtues in their lives. He presumed, however, it seems from his treatises on public vices, that the condemnation of such vices would suffice to give Christians all the information they needed on the opposite virtues they were to practice.<sup>13</sup> He dismissed any positive use of the law in the Christian life, including, apparently, that of giving information regarding godly callings or virtues, because he believed that Christians produce good works "out of a free and merry spirit," not out

of necessity of any kind. Praetorius defended Major's position on the necessity of good works, asserting that God's demand for obedience from faithful believers constitutes a necessity for that obedience.<sup>14</sup> Their sharp polemical exchange ignored the fact that they were addressing two different agendas. It attracted the attention of others, including Jacob Andreae. In his second attempt at drafting a formula for concord among the Lutherans, he rejected Musculus' position explicitly.<sup>15</sup>

When the committee that composed the Formula of Concord met in 1576, Andreae was confronted by a representative sent to that committee by the elector of Brandenburg, Andreas Musculus. Therefore the statement in the Formula of Concord regarding the "The Third Use of the Law" (article VI) reveals an attempt to react to Musculus' concern about works-righteousness creeping back into Evangelical preaching and at the same time to meet the concern shared by Andreae and his fellow formulators David Chytraeus, Nikolaus Selnecker, and Martin Chemnitz, that Christians not believe they can freely dispense with God's will in their lives or avoid a daily struggle against the sinful desires that remain in their hearts.<sup>16</sup> This article proposes a use of the law in the Christian life that parallels its use in the lives of those outside the Christian faith, as a curb upon open sinning and an accusing, crushing judgment against sin, for its authors were all concerned about the continuing struggle against sin in the believer's life. It also posits that the law helps the faithful children of God learn what God's will is—a matter of information—after faith in Christ has motivated them to new obedience. This article does not clearly distinguish the categories of motivation and information in the discussion of good works, and it alludes to the mystery of the struggle between "flesh" and "spirit" in the Christian's life without analyzing how best to address it with law and gospel.

The controversies of the time gave the Concordists no reason to examine how biblical information on God's will for daily life be conveyed, and they did not explicitly attempt this task. They had nothing similar to modern psychological categories regarding motivation of human action. Luther, Melancthon, and their students addressed people who wanted to live by faith, and that was moti-

vation enough. They tried to convey information about God's will for daily life to the common people with the law they knew would crush and accuse tender consciences and rein in rebellious tendencies at the same time it informed pious believers about what was right and wrong. To convey this curbing, crushing, and informing message the Wittenberg theologians used both the structure of vocation set forth in Luther's concept of the Christian's callings and the discussion of good and evil works or actions that he modeled in the Large Catechism's exposition of the Decalogue.<sup>17</sup> Luther himself had provided a model for bringing vocation together with virtues and vices in his 1531 addition to the Small Catechism, the instruction for confession and absolution. It enjoins sinners to think of their sins by considering their situation or callings in life in the light of the Ten Commandments, that is, the virtues and vices explicit and implicit in the Decalogue.<sup>18</sup> Some in the Wittenberg circle used both vocation and virtue (some with, some without this terminology), while others employed largely the latter, either in positive admonition or in negative warnings (or both), as they attempted to cultivate the fruits of faith in their people.<sup>19</sup>

#### *Chemnitz's Teaching on the Sanctified Life*

As the theological leader within the group responsible for the Formula of Concord and one of the most influential of all the second generation interpreters of the Wittenberg legacy, Chemnitz played a significant role in formulating the Lutheran understanding of the interaction of the gospel and the law in the life of believers. Although Chemnitz's alterations to Andreae's "Swabian Concord" contributed to the final form of several articles in the Formula, his pen did not play a part in refining Andreae's text of article VI. Nonetheless, its content corresponded to what he attempted to teach young pastors regarding the proper use of the law for the people of their congregations.

As is the case with almost all members of the Gnesio-Lutheran party, he had deep respect for his mentor, Philip Melanchthon, and shared Melanchthon's view of the third use of the law. In his *Loci*

*Theologici*, a commentary on Melanchthon's *Loci Communes* developed out of his continuing education program for his colleagues in Braunschweig (edited posthumously by Polycarp Leyser),<sup>20</sup> he represented his preceptor's concerns. In addition, in his handbook for theological candidates as they prepared for their examinations, first published in 1569,<sup>21</sup> he also gave them instruction on how to preach and teach, supporting his conclusions with cornucopias of Bible passages, so that their people would know how to live out the Christian life. The treatments of the motivation which creates the Christian life and the information which God provides for making ethical decisions are not identical in the two works at every point but often run parallel even when the former work does not reproduce the latter's language or argument precisely. For instance, the *Enchiridion* does not present extensive positive moral instruction or guidance for those candidates preparing for examination for the office of pastor whereas in the exposition of the Decalogue in the *Loci communes* suggestions for teaching Christian virtues is to be found alongside warning against ungodly vices.

In this *Enchiridion* Chemnitz followed the "law/gospel" structure that had informed Lutheran doctrinal instruction since Melanchthon first formulated such a program in his *Loci communes* of 1521. Chemnitz, however, did not spell out three uses of the law, as had Melanchthon in his *Loci*<sup>22</sup>—or as Chemnitz did in his commentary on it.<sup>23</sup> Readers of the *Enchiridion* learned two uses of the law—in fact, equivalent to his and Melanchthon's second and third uses elsewhere: that believers might learn "to acknowledge both their manifold sins and the judgment of God against sins," and that the reborn might have "a sure norm and rule, showing which works God has prepared, in which he wants the reborn to walk and serve him."<sup>24</sup>

Having learned of the law, Chemnitz's candidates for the ministry moved theologically along the paths set in the Augsburg Confession, from "justification" and "faith" to "new obedience."<sup>25</sup> The bridge was constructed by the question, "Now then, with sin forgiven us, does God want us thus to persevere and continue in sin without renewal?" Chemnitz's answer: "By no means. On the contrary . . . ." The Holy Spirit transforms and renews those

whom God has justified by faith and purifies for himself a particular people that performs good works and serves God in holiness and righteousness. Chemnitz defined renewal with reference to the continued killing power of the law, “mortifying the passions or works of the flesh” and the life that is lived by doing good, walking in the Holy Spirit, and living unto righteousness. The two sides of the struggle described by Paul in Romans 7—and the need daily to kill the “flesh” and to revive the “spirit”—formed a central motif of Chemnitz’s exposition of Christian living in new obedience.

Chemnitz addressed the question of ethical motivation by explaining that while “good works are necessary” because they are commanded by God, they are not performed because of coercion or constraint. “For God requires the obedience that is rendered from the mind or heart,” from the “free and merry spirit” of which Musculus wrote, even though, Chemnitz conceded, the believer who is both righteous and sinful<sup>26</sup> at the same time in the midst of the struggle with the sinful self will not achieve perfect motivation. Chemnitz led his readers through a distinction of the law and gospel by emphasizing first that good works contribute nothing to the believer’s righteousness in God’s sight, which consists only in the obedience, passion, and death of Christ, . . . apprehended and applied to us by faith alone and thus consist[ing] only in free reconciliation and remission of sins.” The next question poses, however, a call to repentance to the believer, for it assures Christians that they dare not indulge in corrupt lusts against conscience and fail to produce the fruits of faith.<sup>27</sup>

Chemnitz explored in some detail the motivation for Christian living by examining its “causes.” In view of the constant attack of the devil, the world, and the sinful flesh, good works are possible only because of faith in Christ and because the Holy Spirit purifies and renews hearts, kindles new affections that submit the believer’s life to God’s law and obedience to him, both in mortifying the works of the flesh and in exercising faith through good works.<sup>28</sup> Believers perform such good works for a number of reasons, Chemnitz instructed. First, he cited Urbanus Rhegius, the venerable authority for the churches in the several principalities of

Braunschweig because of his leadership of the churches in Braunschweig-Lüneburg, 1530–1541. What Rhegius had called the “*officia*”—functions—of good works, Chemnitz labeled “*ursachen*” in German, in Latin in his *Loci* “*causae impulsae & finales*”—the factors that cause them and their goals. Rhegius taught that the motivation for good works flows from the desire (1) to give due obedience to the Creator and to express thankfulness for his favor and love; (2) to glorify the heavenly Father, (3) to exercise faith that it may grow, (4) to edify the neighbor, (5) to confirm the believers’ calling and give testimony to their faith, and (6) to receive the promise of life even though salvation is not dependent on these good works.<sup>29</sup> In addition, the disciple repeated his preceptor’s list of reasons for doing good works, citing Melanchthon’s *Loci*: (1) to obey God’s command, (2) to preserve faith and avoid driving out the Holy Spirit, (3) to avoid punishment, (4) to give God pleasing—though non meritorious!—sacrifices, and (5) to receive the promises attached to godliness. Melanchthon did not shy away from using arguments that laid down the threat of the law to move believers to keep God’s command. Chemnitz did not shy away from repeating Melanchthon’s list, but he focused more on response to God’s love in Christ, adding his own summary of Luther’s motivational proclamation, in three categories, from the standpoint of God, self, and neighbor. Believers perform good works because God is their loving and gracious father, to whom they owe obedience and thanks, above all for salvation in Christ. They also do God’s will because they recognize that they are dead to sin and live to righteousness, and so they wish to give testimony to their faith and not drive the Holy Spirit away by doing evil works. Third, they obey God’s commands for the sake of the neighbor, to assist others and to draw them to the gospel and to godliness by example.<sup>30</sup> This material is found in only slightly altered form in Chemnitz’s *Loci communes*.<sup>31</sup>

Chemnitz did not provide questions and answers regarding the content of positive moral instruction in his *Enchiridion*. But his commentary on Melanchthon’s discussion of the Decalogue in the *Loci* provided not only the warnings of the second use of the law in its accusing and crushing function. After an extensive rehearsal

of the ways in which human beings transgress and offend each of the commandments, Chemnitz explained to his readers that the listing of the sins stipulated by the negative expression of the commandment leads to conclusions about the opposite, the virtues which God wants his people to perform. This in turn provokes the recognition of other sins, for the exposition of virtue also opens the eyes to seeing how sinners offend God. Chemnitz saw that any engagement with the law directs sinners' attention back to their tendency to stray from faith and obedience.<sup>32</sup>

Nonetheless, he was determined to offer positive instruction in moral living. The exposition of the seventh commandment in the *Loci communes* provides an example. First, the commentary lays out a list of vices which included two general categories, theft—taking property for the sake of making money by stealth—and stealing or robbery—taking property openly, by force—to which he added embezzlement, sacrilege (taking that which belongs to ministers of the gospel or the poor), use of debased money, unfair prices, false measure or weight, dishonesty in wording, refusal to take time for acts of charity, etc. The good works, which God here commands, are classified as internal and external. Internal obedience to this commandment begins with the conscience that, reconciled with God through faith in Christ, desires to please God by fulfilling his commands. Believers then live as content and satisfied people who trust in God. This leads to external works which use and care for the material blessings of life in godly fashion. That includes the just exchange of property, industriousness in performing the callings of life, paying all that is owed (including taxes), thrift and proper use of goods and money that does not squander them, generosity, repayment of that which has been defrauded or stolen. Chemnitz pointed his readers to the order of good works relating to the seventh commandment: “Some apply to the acquisition of wealth, some to the way an individual spends it, some to the sharing and giving of it which takes place either in our normal civil life (as in the payment of debts, contracts and loans) or in generous giving.”<sup>33</sup>

In addressing the heart of his faith—the forgiveness of sins, or the justification of the sinner by faith in Christ's atoning work—

Chemnitz was led, by the logic of his theology, to treat what this restoration of the relationship between God and the human creature meant for the relationship among human creatures. He believed that good works are the result of the Holy Spirit's activity and produced by faith in Christ's atoning and restoring death and resurrection. He also believed that God had set a pattern for all of human life in his plan for the human creature, and that the law of God had been given to evaluate whether human creatures were living the life God designed them to live. That law accused and crushed the disobedient, but it also could provide moral instruction to those moved by their love for and trust in God to seek guidance in making ethical decisions. These activities of both law and gospel take place in the Christian life within the struggle encompassed by daily repentance, the dying anew to sin and rising to new life in Christ summarized in the fourth question on baptism in Luther's Small Catechism.<sup>34</sup>

#### *Chemnitz's Preaching of Sanctified Life*

How did Chemnitz translate theory into practice? The sermons in his posthumously published postil offer a glimpse of how he attempted to provide ethical instruction for the people of Braunschweig from his pulpit. His homiletical use of the law appears in his sermon for the Fourth Sunday after Trinity. The Gospel reading for the day, Luke 6:35b-42, with its commands to be merciful and forgiving, not to judge or condemn, gave opportunity for moral instruction.

Chemnitz felt compelled to make clear the proper distinction between law and gospel at the beginning of the sermon to give the hearer or reader the proper orientation. Law must cause sinners to recognize the need for Christ, the Redeemer and Savior. But the gospel dare not be misunderstood as if it permitted believers to avoid doing good. Instruction in the God-pleasing life was also necessary for the congregation.<sup>35</sup> The mention of God's loving-kindness at the beginning of the pericope reminds hearers and readers that eternal joy and salvation come alone from Christ, but

God's acceptance of sinners for Christ's sake brings them to "serve him, as our Catechism says, in holiness and righteousness, which pleases him, for that is the reason we were redeemed by Christ."<sup>36</sup> Chemnitz assured hearers that good works have no merit that could win favor in God's sight.<sup>37</sup> He carefully distinguished between the passive righteousness of the human being that God's unconditioned mercy and favor created and the active righteousness of serving the neighbor in love. This text enabled him to treat the practice of the faith in daily life with special reference to the fifth, seventh, and eighth commandments. For the fruits of faith reveals its presence. The law permits neither a reliance on one's own works for salvation nor a licentiousness that believes Christ's death means freedom for disobedience.<sup>38</sup>

Always concerned about a return to medieval trust in works for winning merit in God's sight, Chemnitz never tired of repeating that God gives his favor and love to his chosen people out of pure mercy. Nonetheless, he also balanced this emphasis on the gospel with the law's reminder that true faith produces the correct fruits. Preaching on Matthew 18:21–35, he simply said,

If you still want to fool yourself that you can treat your neighbor cruelly and still be saved, you are engaging in unprofitable words and vain thoughts. It is not going to help if you want to say, "Sure I believe." For where faith is true, fruits such as being kind to your fellow servants and forgiving them from the heart are going to follow. But if these fruits are not being produced, and you are sallying ahead secure in your sins, ask your own heart if you have faith and if it is the nature of faith to pile up sins.<sup>39</sup>

A call for repentance followed this admonition. As Chemnitz reiterated this point in the sermon on Luke 6, he joined to the gospel an insistence that God saved his people in order that they might perform the works he had prepared for human creatures to do (Eph. 2:8–10). To accomplish this, God has sent his Holy Spirit to renew hearts through the Word. With a strong emphasis on the means of grace in both preaching and the sacraments, Chemnitz urged readers and hearers to respond to God's love and mercy with love and mercy toward their neighbors. That pleases God because he looks at the works of believers through Christ. He ignores the

weakness and imperfection of their good deeds because he has accepted them as his children for Christ's sake. Although human works earn nothing from the merciful God, he chooses to reward them with the delight and favor of a father.<sup>40</sup> Later in the sermon, the preacher elaborated on why Christians do good works without mention of reward. They love because they have experienced God's mercy and love in salvation through Christ and in the daily experiences of his loving-kindness. God exhibited this love by creating us in his image, redeeming us through his Son, electing us in Christ to be his children, giving his saving Word, providing for every need of daily life, turning away the punishment we deserve, and sending blessings on evildoers as well as the upright.<sup>41</sup>

On the basis of this motivation from the revelation of God's goodness, both as creator or provider and as savior and sanctifier, believers do good works. Distinguishing between internal and external obedience to God's commands, Chemnitz first explored the inner disposition of the faithful mind and heart as believers respond to Jesus' commands, "Be merciful! Do not judge! Do not condemn! Forgive! Pray!" The inward predilection of the believer seeks to avoid anger, hatred, and bitterness, judgment, and condemnation and wants to show mercy, forgive, and meet the needs of the neighbor. Chemnitz warned against hearing God's Word, receiving the sacraments, praying, and practicing other pious exercises while at the same time thinking that outward works of mercy are not important. No, the demonstration of kindness, of giving and forgiving, must also be in evidence in the Christian life.<sup>42</sup> External performance also came under the preacher's scrutiny; the text focused the sermon on the eighth commandment and then on the fifth and seventh. Specific commands against judging and condemning brought a general warning against the joy of hearing evil reports about others and of spreading stories of their failures, joy produced by envy and hatred. This general warning opened the way to condemn those who take delight in criticizing and judging their pastors and governmental authorities. Indeed, those who delight in criticism will receive God's judgment through the similar condemnations of their own actions by others. Chemnitz paraphrased Augustine's observation that whatever we see hap-

pening to our neighbor could happen to us if God withdraws his hand.<sup>43</sup>

Alongside the accusing finger of the law this genre contains positive instruction in Christian living. Believers cannot see others in need or danger without having concern and sympathy for them. They assist others in finding relief. Parents, for instance, rush to rescue a child who has fallen into a well or a fire, risking drowning and death themselves. When a house burns in the night and parents flee, they often return to save the child who remains in the flames.<sup>44</sup> Opportunities of this sort give occasion for demonstrating God's love in daily life, especially when the neighbor suffers under the assaults and tribulations of various crosses.<sup>45</sup>

Such positive instruction also included assistance in the struggle against the voice within, the "Old Adam," that continues to provide reasons for not following the command of Christ to love the neighbor. For instance, it is sometimes difficult to forgive those who wrong someone. The person who has sinned against us has acted too vilely, or has assaulted us too harshly, or has demonstrated wanton disregard toward us too often, we wish to say. But God has had cause to regard us in such a way and has graciously forgiven us. Therefore, he turns our hearts to forgiveness, and we thus fulfill his will as he expressed it in the fifth commandment. Similarly, believers perform the task of the Seventh Commandment when they share their earthly goods with others. The "Old Adam" argues that those to whom we give just waste what they have, or that the other is tramp and scalawag, or that Paul himself said that those who do not work should not eat. Against such arguments and temptations to avoid doing good, Chemnitz advised, believers must remind themselves of God's generosity and ever-giving love. That generosity also undercuts the argument that we cannot give because of our responsibilities to our own household. Trust in God creates generosity in the Christian heart and generates sharing the things of this life with the neighbor, Chemnitz demonstrated with a bouquet of Bible passages. God's goodness also refutes the argument that the divine order makes some rich and some poor, so that none need feel obligated to interfere with that order. Chemnitz condemned those who use every situation to their own eco-

conomic advantage. It encouraged mutual support and assistance within the Christian community by citing specific examples of how artisans and merchants come to the aid of one another in time of hardship.<sup>46</sup>

It was necessary, Chemnitz believed, to differentiate the judgment against others formally pronounced by governmental officials or pastors from the judgment rejected by Jesus in the pericope. Those who had official assignments to judge as a part of their calling within the structure designed to keep order in society, acted in God's behalf for the welfare of the whole community when they condemned transgressors of public standards or laws.<sup>47</sup>

Chemnitz not only counseled proper behavior toward people but also toward property. His sermons warn against making an idol out of the things of this world or of offending God through ingratitude for temporal blessings. He also warned against the dangers of harming other people because of greed and admonished thankfulness toward God and kindness and support for neighbors as the proper ways of using what God has given for earthly life.<sup>48</sup>

Although much of the instruction for daily life in the *Postilla* focuses on ways in which hearers treated each other and discharged daily responsibilities, Chemnitz also strove to foster their pious practices. He frequently preached on prayer<sup>49</sup> and on the use of the means of grace.<sup>50</sup> The sermon for the Fifth Sunday after Trinity illustrates Chemnitz's treatment of this topic and also his use of both Christ and the disciples as examples of carrying out the callings of their respective responsibilities in the church, as preacher and hearer.<sup>51</sup>

Although the sermon on Luke 6 offered instruction chiefly by presenting virtues and counseling the avoidance of vices, it made reference to the social theory which divided human life into three situations or walks of life, *ecclesia*, *politia*, and *oeconomia*. Chemnitz was among those disciples of Luther and Melancthon who admonished hearers to good works through the practice of their callings in each of these situations. He thereby embraced all of life as medieval society conceived it. Oft tinged with polemic against the false piety of papal monasticism, as in the sermon for the First

Sunday after Epiphany (Luke 2: 41–52), these sermons emphasized the holiness of the faith-driven, faith-filled, and faithful exercise of the responsibilities of family life or other situations or walks of life. Here, parents are urged to follow the example of Mary and Joseph in bringing up their children in the fear and admonition of the Lord, holding them in obedience, cultivating good habits and manners, prohibiting and preventing moody, rebellious, or lazy behavior. This would, as Luther often repeated, provide the world with people well trained for the situations of ecclesiastical, political, and domestic life. Pastorally sensitive, Chemnitz also proclaimed comfort for those who had failed to be good parents in spite of their best efforts, reminding them that even the patriarchs had sometimes failed at the parental task.<sup>52</sup> Luke 5:1–11, the Gospel for the Fifth Sunday after Trinity, revealed Peter at work as a housefather providing food for his family and gave Chemnitz the opportunity to treat “God’s will that all people be in a certain calling, in which they serve God and do what is appropriate for their situation and responsibility, as is laid out in the Household Chart [of Christian callings] and prescribed for all Christians.” He continued with observations about the callings of princes, mayors, fathers, and artisans.<sup>53</sup> In depicting the Last Judgment Chemnitz returned to the vocational framework to place the standards of God’s judgment before his hearers:

Listen, you pastors and curates of souls! Give an account. How did you conduct yourself in your office? How did you instruct your hearers and care for them with God’s Word? How did you admonish them to repentance and improvement of their lives? How did you rebuke the bullheaded and headstrong? How did you comfort the troubled, visit the suffering, speak peace to them? You, emperor, king, prince, count, nobleman, mayor, commissioner! How did you govern your poor subjects and administer the courts and justice? Did you protect the upright and punish the evildoers? Give account of your management of your responsibilities. You can no longer be manager.

What kind of tree are you in the luxurious garden of God? What kind of fruit did you bear? How have you demonstrated your faith? How did you regard the ministry of the Word, the church and the schools? Did you console widows and orphans and promote the welfare of the suffering? You subjects! How obedient

were you to the governmental authorities? Have you always prayed diligently for them?<sup>54</sup>

The sermon continues with similar questions for parents and children and servants, artisans, workers, and day laborers, merchants and the rich.<sup>55</sup> For the most part the questions were stated positively, but of course, in this context the implicit judgment on failure to meet God's standards for human living lurked behind the divine query. Instruction in the virtues of each vocation and the call for repentance for failing to produce the fruits of faith sounded together in the hearers' ears.

All of Chemnitz's preaching on new obedience addressed the struggle going on between "flesh" and "spirit" in every hearer's life. He used both the warning of the law and the consolation and strength of the gospel to reinforce both faith and new obedience. The Word provides weapons against the devil's plagues as they descended upon people in every calling, and the preacher did battle against Satan's tempting power in a number of sermons.<sup>56</sup> Chemnitz provided a catalog of thirty psalms that brought consolation in the midst of these temptations and other crosses for life for his hearers on *Reminiscere*.<sup>57</sup>

In this postil Chemnitz's address to the daily lives of the people of Saint Martin's parish in Braunschweig provided a model for preaching far beyond its borders. His sermons reflect the dogmatic concerns that drove his expression of Christian teaching in the larger arena of controversy over the interpretation of biblical thought, refracted through Luther's teaching. He sharply distinguished what constitutes the Christian's righteousness in God's sight—God's favor and mercy, bestowed through Christ's passion, death, and resurrection, received by the faith that gives the believer identity as God's child—from the righteousness of the behavior or performance which flows from that new identity. Chemnitz sought to foster that behavior or performance through the motivating power of the gospel although he sometimes used elements of God's law in such a way that also could move believers to pious action, warning against disobedience and the practice of specific sins, instructing and guiding decisions motivated by the gospel.

*Sanctification in the Preaching of Chemnitz's Contemporaries*

Chemnitz's postil was one of more than thirty published in German Lutheran lands within seventy years of the appearance of Luther's (1522–1527). Luther's homiletical models remained the most popular at these preaching helps among sixteenth-century Lutheran pastors,<sup>58</sup> but comparison with others of this genre offers a fuller picture of how the Wittenberg message was conveyed to hearers in the late Reformation. A glance of treatments of Luke 6:35b–42 in representative postils of the period suggests that Chemnitz's preaching on the sanctified life of believers reflected a broader homiletical approach.

Luther's own sermon on this text had offered ethical instruction, in line with the style of preaching reworked for his Large Catechism. The reformer first countered any implication that might be read out of the text suggesting that the believer's acts of mercy earn salvation. Then he turned to admonition of the life that faith produces and a discussion of faith's fruits. The reformer proclaimed that Christ invites us to do good works and threatens us with judgment if we do not.<sup>59</sup> Gospel motivation and the accusation of the law go hand-in-hand in his preaching. This sermon gives life-specific instruction through examples from Scripture and from church history—for example, Augustine's mother Monica—which provided models and warnings to direct Christian living.

Similar concerns emerge in the sermons of Chemnitz's contemporaries, such as the Johannes Brenz (1499–1570)<sup>60</sup> and Johannes Spangenberg (1484–1550),<sup>61</sup> both of whom had not studied in Wittenberg, and of Wittenberg students Georg Major (1502–1574),<sup>62</sup> Christoph Fischer (1520–ca. 1599),<sup>63</sup> Tileman Heßhus (1527–1588),<sup>64</sup> Joachim Mörlin (1514–1571),<sup>65</sup> and Simon Musaeus (1521–1576).<sup>66</sup> Major's Latin postil provided dogmatic studies for interpreting the text, emphasizing the use of the law in the Christian life, and exegetical helps in commentary style. Spangenberg's Latin postil posed questions for his secondary-school pupils regarding each pericope. The rest offered readers homiletical exposition of the pericope, that is, a treatment of the text in sermon

style, or, in Mörlin's case, notes his son assembled from several sermons on each pericope.

In their model sermons on Luke 6:35b-42 several of these preachers insisted, like Chemnitz, on keeping crystal clear the distinction between the righteousness bestowed by God's grace through the faith in Christ and the righteousness of love for neighbor that flows from that new identity.<sup>67</sup> Major differentiated justification, the remission of sins and reconciliation by faith, from regeneration, living as the temple of God.<sup>68</sup> Musaeus applied Luther's terminology, speaking of the passive mercy received from God and the active mercy shown to others, as he set down the presupposition for treating the latter.<sup>69</sup> Lutheran preachers in the late Reformation never ignored the specter of works-righteousness.

They all were oblivious to modern categories such as motivation and information. They dealt with the person of faith, forgiven and claimed by God, who lived by faith. Such persons of faith were addressed with the presupposition that they lived by God's grace but in a battle against Satan, world, and their own sinful desires. Therefore, they needed to mortify the flesh with the law's curbing and its crushing power, and they needed to perceive how they should act upon their reborn desires to serve their Creator, through a discussion of virtues and vices, both of which could cause guilt or give direction for God-pleasing actions. Mörlin moved his hearers with an appeal to God's unfathomable mercy, as presented in the three articles of the Creed, creation, redemption, and sanctification. Children of God are "saved" [*selig*], and the saved produce good fruit, like a good tree.<sup>70</sup> God's example of treating those who slander his name with temporal blessings should move his children to show mercy and abstain from judging others, according to Spangenberg. His positive appeal for showing mercy quickly turned, however, to warning against hatred and condemnation of others.<sup>71</sup>

Major affirmed that Christ and the Holy Spirit move the reborn to perform good works and described the motivation of the gospel of God's free forgiveness of sins as it moves the liberated will. But he then focused on the human advantage gained by obedience to God's will as he repeated Melanchthon's "causes why good works

are to be done,” necessity, worthiness, and rewards. He emphasized that good works are necessary because good trees produce good fruits, because God has commanded them and human beings are obligated to do them, because their absence drives out the Holy Spirit, because their presence prevents eternal and temporal punishments.<sup>72</sup> Such threat of the law’s condemnation does not intrude upon Fischer’s reminder to readers that Christ is the true prince of peace and the inexhaustible fountain of all mercy, not as a sacrifice but aroused by desire and delight [*lust vnd liebe*]. Christians are courtiers in the kingdom of Christ, and “the color of his court is brotherly love,” he commented, as he turned to instruction in specific virtues, discussing, on the other hand, also the colors of Satan’s court—hatred, envy, and resentment.<sup>73</sup>

Fischer and all his contemporaries also shared Luther’s and Chemnitz’s propensity to warn against specific sins, placing emphasis on the “second,” accusing or crushing, use of the law to call those engaged in specific sins back to the gospel. Brenz concentrated his first sermon on Christ’s *officium* as *pedagogus*, which he exercised by condemning vices, for instance, slander and cheating in commercial dealings; Brenz also condemned those who tell the truth about a criminal when they have no call to issue a judgment over that person by condemning such rumor-mongering to a vigilante execution of a thief caught stealing in the market. He also urged the practice of “virtues” or “good works.”<sup>74</sup> Brenz’s second sermon on the text focused on defining the neighbor—the term includes enemies—and what love for the neighbor meant in concrete instances. That love is performed because God expects those whom he forgives to live according to his law.<sup>75</sup> Fischer, Heßhus, and Musaeus, anticipated Chemnitz’s use of the framework of commandments five and eight to accuse and warn as well as to admonish, advise, and inform how mercy might be practiced.<sup>76</sup>

Instruction for moral disposition and moral living came to Musaeus’s readers from Bible passages and from illustrations from daily life, focusing on mercy through the heart, the mouth, and the hand. Negative warnings and positive admonitions lie alongside each other, but Musaeus used both to cultivate an understanding of virtue as well as discourage vice.<sup>77</sup> Heßhus discussed the virtues

set forth in the text within the context of Luther's vocational structure, presenting what pastors and parents are called to do to combat vices in those for whom God had given them responsibility.<sup>78</sup> Chemnitz's contemporaries reflect the same theological palette from which all Wittenberg students drew the materials for their compositions, however different the shadings and accents may have been.

### *Conclusion*

A survey of Chemnitz's postil and those of selected late Reformation contemporaries demonstrates that Luther's and Melancthon's followers were deeply concerned about Christian living, confirming Lindberg's observation that Lutherans reject any concept of sanctification apart from justification, but also revealing that they have always rejected a concept of justification that did not lead to sanctification. How they have tried to cultivate the sanctified life is another question. Chemnitz and contemporaries believed that faith in Christ changes the believer's fundamental identity, and that in faith believers want to produce good fruit. Faith motivates performance, but from a modern perspective these preachers also seem to motivate pious behavior with the law. Clearly, they rely on the law for the information that guides the decisions that are moved by the gospel. This lack of clarity arises from their conviction that the sanctified life is a life of struggle against temptation to live apart from God, to refashion life according to the sinner's will rather than God's: the Christian life is a life of continuing repentance. The rhythm of law and gospel, of daily dying to sin and rising to new life in Christ must continue.

Lindberg quotes Gerhard Forde, "If justification is unconditional and total, it explodes into love and good works."<sup>79</sup> The way in which Chemnitz and his contemporaries proclaimed law and gospel may not always have conveyed the unconditional nature of the gospel so clearly, but their use of the law, whether condemning vices or picturing virtues, whether rebuking failures to carry out callings or urging proper exercise of vocational responsibility, was

always delivered in an effort to effect repentance. Thus, their proclamation reflects the dynamic of Luther's ethic, working itself out between the poles of law and gospel, and it reveals these theologians' struggle to practice the virtues of the calling of preacher as faithful children of God.

#### NOTES

1. Carter Lindberg, "Do Lutherans Shout Justification But Whisper Sanctification?" *Lutheran Quarterly* 13 (1999): 1–20.
  2. Lindberg's article offers a brief survey of current discussions; cf. Gerhard O. Forde, *The Law- Gospel Debate. An Interpretation of its Historical Development* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1969).
  3. The first of the Ninety-Five Theses, *D. Martin Luthers Werke* (Weimar: Böhlau, 1883–1993) 1:233,10–11; *Luther's Works* (Saint Louis/Philadelphia: Concordia/Fortress, 1958–1986) 31:25.
  4. *The Book of Concord, The Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church*, ed. Robert Kolb and Timothy J. Wengert (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2000), 360; henceforth BC. *Die Bekenntnisschriften der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche* (11. ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992), 516–517; henceforth BSLK.
  5. BC, 347–348; BSLK, 502–503.
  6. BC, 392–431; BSLK, 572–639 (on commandments two through ten). On Luther's preaching of the law in his later years, see James M. McCue, "Luther and the Problem of Popular Preaching," *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 16 (1985): 33–43.
  7. Timothy J. Wengert, *Law and Gospel, Philip Melancthon's Debate with John Agricola of Eisleben over Poenitentia* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1997), 77–210, esp. 200–206.
  8. Charles P. Arand, "Two Kinds of Righteousness as a Framework for Law and Gospel in the Apology," *Lutheran Quarterly* 15 (2001): 417–439.
  9. 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.
  10. Wengert, *Law and Gospel*, 177–210. In fact, in the third edition of his *Loci communes*, Melancthon described four functions of the law: to describe the dignity and purity in which God created the human creature, to describe the wretched state of fallen humankind, to describe God's wrath and impress it upon sinners, and "by implication quietly [to] instruct us concerning the restoration of the human race . . . [and to] point out to what greater excellence we are recalled," *Corpus Reformatorum. Opera quae supersunt omnia*, ed. C. G. Bretschneider and H. E. Bindweil (Halle and Braunschweig: Schwetschke, 1834–1860) 21:717–719 (3. ed.), *Loci Communes 1543: Philip Melancthon*, trans. J. A. O. Preus (Saint Louis: Concordia, 1992), 58–59. See also Matthias Richter, *Gesetz und Heil. Eine Untersuchung zur Vorgeschichte und zum Verlauf des sogenannten Zweiten Antinomistischen Streits* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996), 370–380.
- Wengert, p. 191, discusses Luther's introduction of the concept of uses (*usus, Gebrauch*) and functions (*officium, Amt*) of the law in the Christian life. Though not consistently so

used in this period, the former generally refers to what the preacher or teacher intends the law to do in the hearer's life, the latter to what effects the law actually brings about in the hearer.

11. Richter, *Gesetz und Heil*, 132–196, 251–329.

12. Richter, *Gesetz und Heil*, 196–202, 258, 266–267, 275–276. That Chemnitz was involved in this dispute is clear from a letter to him from Anton Otto, of August 1566, in Philipp Julius Rehtmeyer, *Historiae ecclesiasticae inclytæ urbis Brunsvigæ Pars V . . .* (Braunschweig: Ludolph Schröder, 1720), Supplementa 99–102; see further Richter, *Gesetz und Heil*, 258, 266–267.

13. See Robert Kolb, “The Devil & the Well-Born. Proclamation of the Law to the Privileged in the Late Reformation,” in *Let Christ Be Christ, Theology, Ethics & World Religions in the Two Kingdoms, Essays in Honor of . . . Charles L. Manske*, ed. Daniel N. Harmelink (Huntington Beach, CA: Tentatio, 1999), 161–171.

14. Richter, *Gesetz und Heil*, 208–250.

15. *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), 65–71; in translation, see Robert Kolb, *Andreae and the Formula of Concord, Six Christian Sermons on the Way to Lutheran Unity* (St. Louis: Concordia, 1978), 103–104. On Chemnitz's position in this dispute, see his 1561 appraisal of contemporary controversies, *De controversiis quibusdam, quæ superiori tempore, circa quosdam Augustanæ Confessionis Articulos motæ & agitatae sunt: Iudicium . . .* (Wittenberg, 1594); he addressed the questions of whether good works are done out of necessity or spontaneously by Christians at this point with reference to the continuing struggle between the old creature and the new creature, arguing that the old creature has to be coerced but the new creature acts spontaneously, 141; see Richter, *Gesetz und Heil*, 105–106.

16. SD VI:15–17 address Musculus' concern. Preceding and following paragraphs deal with the concerns of others for the responsible exercise of new obedience and for public order; BSLK, 967–968, *Book of Concord*, 587–591. Polycarp Leyser, editor of Chemnitz's *Loci theologici Reverendi et clarissimi Viri, D. Martini Chemnitii . . .* (3 vols.; Frankfurt am Main: Johannes Spies, 1591), informed readers that Chemnitz had opposed Musculus's opinion in the 1560s and that Musculus rejected his own position by accepting the Formula of Concord, see *Tertia Pars locorum theologorum*, 33b.

17. BC, 386–431; BSLK, 560–645.

18. BC, 360; BSLK, 517, §19–20.

19. See Robert Kolb, “Festivals of the Saints in Late Reformation Lutheran Preaching,” *The Historian* 53 (1990):622–625 [reprinted as article IX in idem, *Luther's Heirs Define His Legacy, Studies on Lutheran Confessionalization* (Aldershot, Hampshire: Variorum, 1996)] on the categories of virtue and vice. Cf. also the approaches of Andreas Musculus, who relied on a presentation of vices and virtues (largely the former), and Cyriacus Spangenberg, who combined appeals for rejecting vices and practicing virtues with the framework of vocational responsibilities, in Kolb, “The Devil and the Well-Born.”

20. See note 15 above.

21. *Handtbuf[e]hlein Der Fu[e]rnehmsten Hauptstu[e]ck der Christlichen Lehre/ Durch Frag vnd Antwort aus Gottes Worte einfeltig vnd gru[e]ndlich erkleret. . . .* (2. eds, Heinrichstadt: n.p., 1574); *Ministry, Word, and Sacraments, An Enchiridion*, trans. Luther Poellot (Saint Louis: Concordia, 1981), henceforth *Ministry*.

22. CR 21: 713–719.

23. Chemnitz, *Secunda Pars locorum theologorum*, 118b-121a; *Loci Theologici*, trans. J. A. O. Preus (2 vols. Saint Louis: Concordia, 1989), II:439-441; Chemnitz defines the third use of the law as that for the regenerate: 1) that they may “know, as they perform their worship, what kind of works are pleasing to God, so that they do not devise new forms of worship without the Word and may learn that it is the will of God that they make a beginning in obeying the commandments of the Decalog,” 2) that they may be shown their continuing sinfulness, and 3) that they may “contend against and coerce” the sinful flesh. This definition of the use of the law in the Christian life parallels Andreae’s in FC, SD VI:4-14, BC, 587-589, BSLK, 963-966.

24. *Handtbu[e]chlein*, 77-80 [= 78]; *Ministry*, 56.

25. BC, 38-41; BSLK, 56, 60.

26. Chemnitz did not use Luther’s *simul justus et peccator* terminology but treated the problem which Luther addressed with it in a similar manner.

27. *Handtbu[e]chlein*, 191-193; *Ministry*, 97-98.

28. *Handtbu[e]chlein*, 206-208; *Ministry*, 101.

29. *Handtbu[e]chlein*, 197; *Ministry*, 98. Cf. Rhegius, *Formulae quaedam cave et citra Scandalum loquendi de praecipuis Christianae doctrinae locis, pro iunioribus Verbi Ministris in Ducatu Luneburgensi*. (Wittenberg: Johannes Lufft, 1535), B7a-B8a. Chemnitz repeated the list in *Tertia pars locorum theologorum*, 27a-b.

30. *Handtbu[e]chlein*, 197-200; *Ministry*, 98-99.

31. *Tertia pars locorum theologorum* 27a-28b.

32. E.g., his treatment of the seventh commandment, *Secunda pars locorum theologorum*, 95a-96a; *Loci communes*, II:420.

33. *Secunda pars locorum theologorum*, 96b-98a ; *Loci communes*, II:420-421.

34. BC, 360; BSLK, 516-517.

35. *Postilla Oder Auflegung der Euangelien / welche auff die Sontage / vnd fu[e]nemste Feste / durchs gantze Jahr in der gemeine Gottes erklaret werden . . .*, ed. Melchior Neukirch (Magdeburg: Johann Franck, 1594), 281. Neukirch (ca. 1540-1597), son of a Braunschweig pastor, studied at Rostock and returned to Braunschweig as rector and then pastor of the Petrikirche. According to Neukirch, Chemnitz’s widow and children had entrusted his literary remains to his successor, Polycarp Leyser, who commissioned Neukirch to edit the postil. Whether Chemnitz had already selected sermons for it or whether the editor chose selections from a larger collection of manuscripts is unclear, see *Postilla I*:( ) ( 3a.

36. *Postilla II*:282; cf. Luther’s Small Catechism, explanation of the second article, BC, 355; BSLK, 511.

37. *Postilla II*: 283.

38. *Postilla II*: 283-284.

39. *Postilla II*:505. Similar passages can be found in many sermons, e.g. that for the eighth Sunday after Trinity, on Matthew 7:15-27 and parallel, *Postilla II*: 327-328, or for the eighteenth Sunday after Trinity, on Matthew 22: 34-46 and parallels, *Postilla II*: 461-468.

40. *Postilla II*:285-286.

41. *Postilla II*:288-289.

42. *Postilla II*:287.

43. *Postilla II*:289-292. Cf. rather detailed instructions on how to reconcile with a neighbor through forgiveness in the sermon for the twenty-second Sunday after Trinity, II:506-508. The instruction in virtue through warning against vice is well illustrated in

many sermons, e.g. that for the second Sunday in Advent, on Matthew 24:29–51 and parallels, *Postilla I*:38–50.

44. *Postilla II*:287–288.

45. *Postilla II*:380–382, sermon for the twelfth Sunday after Trinity on Matthew 15:29–31a and parallel. Chemnitz proclaimed, “Listen! If here or there some are sick, poor, or in some other misfortune, if you are a true member of the body of Christ, you will be ready to have deep-felt sympathy with them, carry them to Christ in prayer, and search for help, all the while reminding yourself of your own need for health and well-being. If you do not have the habit of acting in this way, you are not a member of Christ.”

46. *Postilla II*:292–295.

47. *Postilla II*:291–292. Almost all the postils considered later in this essay strove to make the same point lest they undercut social order and authority.

48. E.g., in sermons for the seventh Sunday after Trinity, on Matthew 15:32–39a, *Postilla II*:317–321, or for the fifteenth Sunday after Trinity, on Matthew 6:19–34, *Postilla II*:415–431.

49. E.g., in the sermon for Rogate on John 16:23–33, *Postilla II*:151–166, for Pentecost on John 14:23–31a, *Postilla II*:209–211, and for the eleventh Sunday after Trinity, on Luke 18:9–14, *Postilla II*:379–380.

50. E.g., the sermon for the fifth Sunday after Trinity, on Luke 5:1–11, *Postilla II*:298–304.

51. *Ibid.*

52. *Postilla I*:246–253. Cf. the sermon for the second Sunday after Epiphany, on John 2:1–11, with its comments on marriage and family life, *Postilla I*:270–284. Chemnitz took the occasion of the Gospel for the sixteenth Sunday after Trinity, Luke 7:11–17, to treat the “situation” or “walk of life” of widowhood, *Postilla II*:433–442.

53. *Postilla II*:300.

54. *Postilla II*:541–542, in the sermon for the twenty-sixth Sunday after Trinity, Matthew 25:31–46 and parallels.

55. *Postilla II*:542.

56. E.g., that for Reminiscere, on Matthew 15:21–28 and parallel, *Postilla I*:472, or that for Oculi, on Matthew 12:22–50 and parallels, *Postilla I*:500–505.

57. See the sermon for Reminiscere Sunday, *Postilla I*:470–494. Similar comfort under crosses of various kinds can be found in many sermons, among them those for Easter Monday, on Luke 24:13–35, *Postilla II*: 37–55, for Jubilate, on John 16:16–23, *Postilla II*:121–138, for the fourteenth Sunday after Trinity, on Luke 17:11–19, *Postilla II*:392–415.

58. See Robert Kolb, *Martin Luther as Prophet, Teacher, and Hero. Images of the Reformer, 1520–1620* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1999), 156–157.

59. WA 10:I,2:313–324; *Sermons of Martin Luther*, trans. John Nicholas Lenker, *Volume 4, Sermons on Gospel Texts for the 1st to 12th Sundays After Trinity* (1904; rpt. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1983), 117.

60. *Pericopae Euangeliorum quae singulis diebus Dominicis publicè in Ecclesia recitari solent, expositae* (Frankfurt/Main: Peter Brubach, 1556).

61. *Postilla Latina, Pro Christiana Iuuentute, per Quaestiones explicata* (Frankfurt/Main: Christoph Egenolph, 1544).

62. *Tertius Tomus operum . . . D. Georgii Maioris: continens homelias in evangelia Dominicalia & dies Festos . . .* (Wittenberg: Johannes Lufft, 1570).

63. *Außlegung der Euangelien/ so man auff die Sontage in der Christlichen Kirchen zu handeln pflaget . . . .* (1574).
64. *Postilla. Das ist/ Außlegung Der Sontaglichen Euangelien* (Eisleben: Urban Gaubisch, 1586).
65. *Postilla: Oder Summarische Erinnerung bey den Sonteglichen Jahrs Euangelien vnd Catechismi* (Erfurt: Isaiah Mechler, 1587).
66. *Postilla Das ist: Außlegung der Episteln vnnnd Euangelien/ welche durch das gantze Jahr . . . vblich vnd brafe]uchlich sind . . . herfu[e]r gebracht/ Geprediget . . .* (Frankfurt/Main: Bassaeus, 1583).
67. In their sermons on Luke 6:35b-42 this was not a concern of Brenz, Spangenberg, or Mörlin.
68. Major, 414a-b.
69. Musaeus, II:86. Cf. Fischer, II:n3a-b, Heßhus, III:25a-b.
70. Mörlin, 555-556, cf. 558.
71. Spangenberg, II:150b-151b. Cf. Brenz, with a similar comparison, 677-678; he, too, coupled the admonition to love as the Father has loved us with a warning against cutting oneself off from the family of God through sinning.
72. Major, 415a-416b.
73. Fischer, II:n4a. Heßhus had the bifurcated emphasis also, e.g. III:25b-26a in comments on the practice of mercy.
74. Brenz, 674-682.
75. Brenz, 682-691.
76. Fischer, II:n4b; Musaeus, II:87a-89a; Heßhus, III:28b-30a, used the sixth and seventh as well.
77. Musaeus, II:87a-89b. Cf. similar devices used by Fischer, II:n5a-01b.
78. Heßhus, III:26b.
79. Lindberg, 15, citing Forde, "Justification and Sanctification," in Carl Braaten and Robert Jenson, eds., *Christian Dogmatics 2* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984): 434.