

# LUTHERAN ORTHODOXY UNDER FIRE: AN EXPLORATORY STUDY OF THE SYNCRETISTIC CONTROVERSY AND THE *CONSENSUS REPETITUS FIDEI VERE LUTHERANAE*<sup>1</sup>

Timothy R. Schmeling

It is fairly safe to assume that Abraham Calov(ius) (1612-1686), the *Consensus Repetitus Fidei Vere Lutheranae* (hereafter CRFVL), and Georg Calixt(us) (1586-1656) are not household vocabulary in much of contemporary Lutheranism. Yet, all played a prominent and important role in the 17<sup>th</sup> century syncretist controversy. History has hardly been kind to Abraham Calov, the chief orthodox opponent of syncretism. Speaking of Calov, Gotthold Lessing (1729-1781) remarks that many people want to be Christians, but "*Freilich nicht wittenbergisch-lutherische Christen: freilich nicht Christen von Calovs Gnaden.*"<sup>2</sup> His nineteenth century biographer, August Tholuck (1799-1877), marshaled forth a chain of less than savory names to describe the Lutheran dogmatician such as "*lutherischen Archi-Theolog,*" "*heißblütigen Zionswächter,*" "*lutherischen Torquemada,*" "*Großinquisitor,*" and "*Mann von Strahl und Eisen.*"<sup>3</sup> The reputation of the CRFVL has not fared much better than Calov. Referring to the CRFVL as "An Abortive Symbol against Syncretism, 1655," Philip Schaff writes, "This new symbol goes far beyond the Formula of Concord, and would have so contracted Lutheranism as to exclude from it all independent thought and theological progress."<sup>4</sup> With the exception of Theodor Wotschke's work, it is not surprising that Abraham Calov and his CRFVL have not been the main focus of scholarly study in the same way that Georg Calixtus has been until rather recently.<sup>5</sup> In contrast, a two volume nineteenth century biography of Georg Calixtus, a number of scholarly studies, and a modern edition of his selected works have been published.<sup>6</sup> The reason for the greater interest in Georg

---

<sup>1</sup> Reprinted from, *Lutheran Synod Quarterly*, 47:4 (December 2007).

<sup>2</sup> Gotthold Ephraim Lessing, *Gesammelte Werke*, ed. Raul Rilla, vol. 8 (Berlin, 1956), 170, quoted in Johannes Wallmann, "Abraham Calov - theologischer Widerpart der Religionspolitik des Großen Kurfürsten," in *700 Jahre Wittenberg Stadt Universität Reformation*, ed. Stefan Oehmig (Weimar: Verlag Hermann Böhlhaus Nachfolger, 1995), 303.

<sup>3</sup> August Tholuck, *Der Geist der lutherischen Theologen Wittenbergs im Verlaufe des 17. Jahrhunderts* (Hamburg und Gotha: Friedrich und Andreas Perthes, 1852), 189, 202, 209, 229; August Tholuck, *Das akademischen Leben des siebzehnten Jahrhunderts, mit besonderer Beziehung auf protestantische-theologischen Facultäten Deutschlands* (Halle, 1853), 143.

<sup>4</sup> Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom with a History and Critical Notes*, 4<sup>th</sup> ed., vol. 1 (New York and London: Harper & Brothers, Publishing, 1919), 349, 352.

<sup>5</sup> Theodor Wotschke, "Calovs Historia syncretistica," *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 36 (1916): 425-458; Theodor Wotschke, "Aus Abraham Calovs Briefwechsel mit Niedersachsen," *Zeitschrift der Gesellschaft für niedersächsische Kirchengeschichte* 24 (1919):1-57; Theodor Wotschke, "Brandenburgische Brief an Hülsemann and Calov," *Jahrbuch für brandenburgische Kirchengeschichte* 17 (1919):48-80; Theodor Wotschke, "Kaspar Hermann Sandhagens Briefe an Abraham Calov," *Zeitschrift der Gesellschaft für niedersächsische Kirchengeschichte* 42 (1937): 306-313; Jörg Baur, "Die Pflicht geschichtlichen Gedenkens. Anlässlich Geburtstages von Abraham Calov," *LM* (1962): 230-232; Heinz Staemmler, *Die Auseinandersetzung der kursächsischen Theologen mit dem Helmstedter Syncretismus. Eine Studie zum "Consensus Repetitus fidei vere Lutheranae" (1655). Texte und Studien zum Protestantismus des 16. bis 18. Jahrhunderts* no. 4 (Waltrop: Hartmut Spenner, 2005); Wallmann, "Abraham Calov - theologischer Widerpart," 303-311; Kenneth Appold, *Abraham Calov's Doctrine of Vocatio in Its Systematic Context* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998); Volker Jung, *Das Ganze der Heiligen Schrift: Hermeneutik und Schriftauslegung bei Abraham Calov* (Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1999); Kenneth G. Appold, "Abraham Calovs Auseinandersetzung mit der tridentischen Rechtfertigungslehre," in *Zur Rechtfertigungslehre in der Lutherischen Orthodoxie*, ed. Udo Sträter (Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2003), 71-80.

<sup>6</sup> Heinrich Schmid, *Geschichte der synkretistischen Streitigkeiten in der Zeit des Georg Calixt* (Erlangen, 1846); Wilhelm Gass, *Georg Calixtus und der Syncretismus* (Breslau, 1846); E.L.T. Henke, *Georg Calixtus und seine Zeit*, vol. 1-2

Calixtus, the originator and intellectual leader of syncretism, is because his irenicism has won the attention of 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> century unionists and ecumenists.

The purpose of this present endeavor is to make a minor English contribution to the study of Lutheran Orthodoxy by examining the syncretist controversy and the CRFVL. First, this paper will define the term *syncretism* and explain why it was applied to Calixtus. Second, Calixtus' career prior to the controversy will be examined to illustrate factors that led him to advocate his union theology. Third, an overview of the syncretist controversy will be given to contextualize the CRFVL. Fourth, this essay will examine the structure of the CRFVL. Fifth, the content of this confession will be presented. Sixth, this essay will analyze how the polemic functions in the CRFVL. The thesis of this essay is that the union theology of Calixtus was made possible by his upbringing, education, and travels. This instilled in him an intellectual openness and a love for the ideal of antiquity. His union theology was prompted by the Thirty Years' War, but ultimately influenced and based upon the thought of Cassander and de Dominis. This paper further argues that the content, structure, and polemic of the CRFVL were designed with a threefold objective, i.e., to demonstrate the theological chasm between the syncretists and orthodox; to prove that the syncretist had abandoned the symbols to which they were bound; and to show the syncretists had departed from the Augsburg Confession (hereafter CA) and therefore should be excluded from Lutheranism.

It is only proper to introduce this paper with a definition of *syncretism* and the evolution of the term.

Syncretism, from συγκρητίζειν (not from συγκεραυνύναι). An explanation is given by Plutarch in a small work on brotherly love ("Opera Moralia", ed. Reiske VII, 910). He there tells how the Cretans were often engaged in quarrels among themselves, but became immediately reconciled when an external enemy approached. "And that is their so-called Syncretism." In the sixteenth century the term became known through the "Adagia" of Erasmus, and came into use to designate the coherence of dissenters in spite of their difference of opinions, especially with reference to theological divisions. Later, when the term came to be referred to συγκεραυνύναι, it was inaccurately employed to designate the mixture of dissimilar or incompatible things or ideas.<sup>7</sup>

This later use or misuse of the term *syncretism* was the way it was applied to Calixtus and his

---

(Halle, 1853-1860); C. Dowding, *German Theology during the Thirty Years' War: The Life and Correspondence of George Calixtus* (1863); Friedrich Hans, *Georg Calixtus, der Unionsmann des 17. Jhs. Inwiefern sind seine Bestrebungen berechtigt?* (Anklam, 1891); Franz Jacobi, "Das liebevolle Religionsgespräch zu Thorn 1645," *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 15 (1895): 345ff. and 465ff.; Friedrich Uhlhorn, "Die Bedeutung Georg Calixts für die lutherische Kirche der welfischen Lande," *Zeitschrift der Geschichte für Niedersächsische Kirchengeschichte* 33 (1928): 201ff.; M.J. Husung, "Georg Calixtus zu Helmstedt, ein gelehrter Drucker des 17. Jhs.," *Gutenberg-Jahrbuch* 14 (1939): 293ff.; Inge Mager, *Georg Calixts theologische Ethik und ihre Nachwirkung* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969); Friedrich Wilhelm Kantzenbach, *Das Ringen um Einheit der Kirchen im Jahrhundert der Reformation* (Stuttgart, 1957); Hermann Schüssler, *Georg Calixt: Theologie und Kirchenpolitik eine Studie zur Ökumenizität des Luthertums* (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag GMBH, 1961); Johannes Wallmann, *Der Theologiebegriff bei Johann Gerhard und Georg Calixt* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1961); P. Engel, *Die eine Wahrheit in der gespaltenen Christenheit: Untersuchung zur Theologie Georg Calixts* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1976); Johannes Wallmann, "Zwischen Reformation und Humanismus. Eigenart und Wirkungen Helmstedter Theologie unter Berücksichtigung Georg Calixts," in *Theologie und Frömmigkeit im Zeitalter des Barock: Gesammelte Aufsätze* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1995), 61-86; Jörg Baur, "Die Helmstedter Lesart des Rechtfertigungsartikels und deren rechthgläubige Kritiker," in *Zur Rechtfertigungslehre in der Lutherischen Orthodoxie*, ed. Udo Sträter (Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2003), 81-136; Georg Calixt, *Werke in Auswahl*, ed. Inge Mager, vol. 1-8 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978-1982).

<sup>7</sup> Klemens Löffler, "Syncretism," in *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, ed. Charles G. Herbermann et. al., vol. 14 (New York: Robert Appleton Company, 1912), 383.

adherents. Properly speaking, the syncretist controversy originates in the theology of Georg Calixtus. He was by no means the first to push for toleration or even intercommunion among the confessions of Christendom. Desiderius Erasmus (1469-1536) had been a proponent of mutual toleration between Roman Catholics and Protestants for the benefit of the external unity of the church as is evident in his *On Restoring Concord in the Church* (1533).<sup>8</sup> This spirit continued in many of his followers particularly George Cassander (1513-1566). Eventually a similar movement arose among the Reformed for inner-Protestant reconciliation best represented by Francis Junius (1545-1602) and David Pareus (1548-1622) called Reformed Irenicism.<sup>9</sup> Even the most staunchly orthodox Lutherans, in truth, desired a reunion of Christendom as long as it was on the basis of complete doctrinal agreement. But Calixtus is unique in that he was a Protestant seeking the reunion of all of Christendom even Catholics. Yet, he was very Lutheran in that he was convinced the Lutheran church (of Braunschweig) was the purest of the various confessions (albeit not totally pure) and that any union had to be based on doctrinal agreement.<sup>10</sup> Unlike other Lutherans, he did not feel the Book of Concord or even the CA should be the basis of such a union. He was dubbed a syncretist by the orthodox Lutherans because he maintained that the Apostles' Creed contained all fundamental doctrine, i.e., doctrines necessary for salvation, and that it should serve as the sole doctrinal norm for reconciliation. He further advocated his *consensus antiquitatis*, i.e., consensus of the fathers and councils of the first five centuries as the proper explication of the Apostles' Creed.<sup>11</sup> This consensus was intended for the clergy as a means of inculcating the timeless apostolic faith, as a means of opposing heresy, and as a common basis for the mutual toleration and the future reconciliation of the various confessions.<sup>12</sup> These ideas are the key to Calixtus' union theology and the focus of the CRFVL's polemic against him. Many Lutherans objected to this because he had appeared to dismiss the Lutheran symbols and placed tradition over the Bible not to mention the fact that the creed did not contain all fundamental doctrines such as justification.<sup>13</sup> Lutherans did not believe all the doctrine of the Book of Concord or even of the CA was fundamental, but they did believe that even the non-fundamental doctrine of the symbols was essential for church union. For instance, the CRFVL does not condemn all non-Lutherans, but

---

<sup>8</sup> Ruth Rouse and Stephan Charles Neill, *A History of the Ecumenical Movement 1517-1948*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (London: S.P.C.K., 1967), 35-36.

<sup>9</sup> Theologically, Reformed Irenicism believed it was in fundamental agreement with Lutheranism, but that the Lutheran Reformation was incomplete and considerably too papist. Politically, the Reformed's legal status under the 1555 Peace of Augsburg was tenuous at best and Calvinism was under siege in Western Europe. Thus, Reformed Irenicism was politically and theologically motivated to seek mutual toleration with Lutheranism against Roman Catholicism if the Calvinization Lutheranism was not viable.

<sup>10</sup> *Consilia Theologica Witebergensia, Das ist/Wittenbergische Geistliche Rathschläge Deß theuren Mannes GOTTES/ D. Martini Lutheri, seiner Collegen, und treuen nachfolger/ von dem heiligen Reformation – Anfang/ biß auff jetzige Zeit/ in dem Namen der gesampten Theologischen Facultät außgestellte Urteil/ Bedenken/ und öffentliche Schriften*, part 1 (Frankfurt am Mäyn: Balthasar Christoph Wusts, 1664), 928, 930.

<sup>11</sup> Wallmann, "Zwischen Reformation und Humanismus," 75; Note J. Dorsch first coined the term *consensus quinquesaecularis*.

<sup>12</sup> Schmid, *Geschichte*, 147-148, 160, 200; Gaß, *Georg*, 63; Calixt believed all fundamentals were contained in their final form, for all time, and without further need of explication regardless of new heresies in the Apostles' Creed. Heresies were only cognizant denials of creedal articles. Calixt sought mutual toleration between the confessions with the ultimate hope of the reconciliation of Christendom, which he did not yet deem viable.

<sup>13</sup> For a thorough understanding of Lutheran Orthodoxy's conception of the distinction between fundamental and non-fundamental doctrine cf. Nicolaus Hunnius, *Diaskepsis Theologica: A Theological Examination of the Fundamental Difference between Evangelical Lutheran Doctrine and Calvinist or Reformed Teaching* (Malone, TX: Repristination Press, 1999).

only false teachers and false doctrine.<sup>14</sup> In contrast to Calixtus who maintained all who confessed the Apostles' Creed were church, the Electoral Saxon Lutherans argued the Lutheran church alone is true church although Catholics and Reformed can be Christians and saved by believing in true fundamental doctrine.<sup>15</sup> In a nutshell, Calixtus' ecclesiology limited the doctrine necessary for salvation to the creed and made the adherence to creed's explication in the *consensus antiquitatis* the mark of true church and sole basis of church fellowship.

Since Georg Calixtus was the intellectual leader and origin of the syncretist movement, his career prior to the controversy will be examined to illustrate factors that led him to advocate his union theology. Calixtus was born December 14, 1596 in Medelby in Schleswig. His father, Johannes Calixtus, was a pastor known also to be an *Erasmophilus* and *Melanchthonicola*. Instilling in him a love of antiquity, Johannes taught his son at home until the age of twelve to shelter him from Gnesio-Lutheranism and the Formula of Concord particularly the teaching of ubiquity.<sup>16</sup> After four years at the humanist orientated Flensburg Latin school, his father sent him in 1603 to the University of Helmstedt. Its faculty was free of the Formula of Concord and fostered a Philippist as well as humanist tradition. In point of fact, the *Corpus doctrinae Juliam* only demanded subscription to the ecumenical creeds, CA, Apology, Smalcald Articles, Catechisms, *Kurze Bericht*, and *De formulis caute et citra scandalum loquendi de praecipuis christianae doctrinae locis* of Urbanus Rhegius (1489-1541).<sup>17</sup> When Duke Heinrich Julius (d. 1613) assumed power in 1589, subscription to its *corpus doctrinae* was not enforced.<sup>18</sup> Here Calixtus also came under the influence of Johann Caselius (1533-1613), the so-called last German humanist, and Cornelius Martini (1568-1621), who revived Aristotelian metaphysics in German Lutheranism. This atmosphere promoted a sense of history and a deeper love for the ideal of antiquity in Calixtus.<sup>19</sup> Against both Daniel Hoffmann (c. 1538-1611) who opposed Aristotelianism in favor of Ramism and Balthasar Meisner (1587-1626) who argued logic was not necessary in theology, Calixtus supported Martini becoming a capable Aristotelian himself. He had learned theology from Martini who deviated from the norm of early Lutheran Orthodoxy particularly in Christology. Hence Calixtus was later called an *ἀυτοδίδακτος* that had never heard orthodox theology.<sup>20</sup> In addition to philosophy and theology, he dedicated himself to church history and the fathers, which was vital to his later project. From 1609-1613, he made two important trips. On his travels, he encountered the Jesuit Becanus as well as the Reformed Irenicists Pareus and Casaubonus (1559-1614). The later's stress on antiquity made a real impression on him.<sup>21</sup> His 1614 dispute with the Jesuit Turrianus (1566-1644) gained him the attention of Duke Friedrich Ulrich (1591-1634) who appointed him as a professor at Helmstedt in that year.

The new professor was immediately deemed suspect by some in Braunschweig. His

---

<sup>14</sup>*Consilia Theologica Witebergensia*, 1:928-929.

<sup>15</sup> Schüssler, *Georg Calixt*, 144; *Consilia Theologica Witebergensia*, 1:928.

<sup>16</sup> Johannes Wallmann, "Georg Calixt (1586-1656)," in *Theologische Realenzyklopädie*, vol. 7 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1981), 552; Schüssler, *Georg Calixt*, 2.

<sup>17</sup> Emil Sehling, *Die evangelischen Kirchenordnungen des XVI. Jahrhunderts*, vol. 6/1 (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1955), 91-93; Cf. also Wallmann, "Zwischen Reformation und Humanismus," 64. Here Wallmann suggests the criticisms Duke Julius received for permitting his son to be ordained in the Roman manner were not the primary motive for withholding support of the Formula of Concord. Rather the Dresden court's assumption of the leading role of the Formula of Concord project caused rivalry between Julius and August, which contributed to Julius' withdrawal of support.

<sup>18</sup> Wallmann, "Zwischen Reformation und Humanismus," 66.

<sup>19</sup> Kantzenbach, *Das Ringen*, 235.

<sup>20</sup> Wallmann, "Georg Calixt," 7:552; Schüssler, *Georg Calixt*, 3-4.

<sup>21</sup> Kantzenbach, *Das Ringen*, 235.

1616 dissertation was forwarded to Balthasar Mentzer (1565-1627), who considered it too philosophical and historical as well as lacking biblical proof.<sup>22</sup> The anthropology and presentation of justification found in Calixtus' *Epitome theologiae* (1619) was considered "papist" by Mentzer in 1620.<sup>23</sup> There was even an attempted refutation of Calixtus at Jena in 1625.<sup>24</sup> This suspicion of him at home and abroad seems to explain why he published few works as a professor until his *Apparatus theologicus* (1628). A notable exception was his *Epitome theologiae* published by his students. Eventually, he drew a sympathetic circle around himself composed of Conrad Horneius (1590-1649), Herman Conring (1606-1681), Gerard Titius (1620-1681), and Justus Gesenius (1601-1673). In any case, he was still convinced that Catholics and the Reformed are guilty of fundamental error and that church reunion is only possible via conversion to Lutheranism until his union theology really develops in the 1620s.<sup>25</sup> Thus, the Melancthonian humanist tradition, love of antiquity, and the intellectual openness that he was exposed to at this juncture did not lead Calixtus to his union theology though it created a disposition that made the development of such a theology possible.

The Thirty Years' War (1618-1648) played a vital role in promoting the ideas of irenicism and church union in Germany. Prompted by the Hapsburg and Valois persecutions of the Calvinists and being assured by Lutherans that they were not protected by the Peace of Augsburg (1555), Calvinists such as the Brandenburg court preacher Peter Bergius (1587-1658) sought harmony among Protestants to present a united front against Catholicism. The closest that this idea came to being realized was when Peter Bergius convinced the Saxon theologians to dialogue at the Leipzig Colloquy (1631) resulting in a momentary shift away from Saxony's pro-imperial policy.<sup>26</sup> The amount of agreement achieved at this rather cordial colloquy only occurred because Ferdinand II's (1619-1637) edict of restitution caused the Saxon Lutherans to really question for the first time the stability of their status in the empire. The colloquy yielded the Leipzig Manifesto (1631), which made a united Lutheran and Reformed political front against the Hapsburgs possible. But as soon as the Lutherans gained an upper hand over the Catholics, they resumed their anti-Reformed policy. Seeing the devastation all around him and now convinced the divisions between the churches were the chief cause of this war, Calixtus was prompted to rethink the notion of fundamental doctrine and the unity of the church.<sup>27</sup>

In midst of the Thirty Years' War, but prior to the Leipzig Colloquy, Calixtus republished Augustine's *De doctrina Christiana* and Vincent of Lerins' *Commonitorium* (1629) with a single preface that first expresses his notion of the *consensus antiquitatis*.<sup>28</sup> In 1633, Duke Ernst of Gotha invited him to help reorganize the duchy of Franconia. Here Calixtus first uses his *consensus antiquitatis* for irenic purposes and calls for tolerance of Catholics as true Christians.<sup>29</sup> Not long after he called all Catholic universities to religious discussions. He once

---

<sup>22</sup> Wallmann, "Georg Calixt," 7:553.

<sup>23</sup> Baur, "Die Helmstedter Lesart," 82.

<sup>24</sup> Ernst Koch, *Das konfessionelle Zeitalter – Katholizismus, Luthertum, Calvinismus (1563-1675)* (Leipzig: Verlagsanstalt, 2000), 304.

<sup>25</sup> Schüssler, *Georg Calixt*, 44-45, 51-52.

<sup>26</sup> Bodo Nischan, "Reformed Irencism and the Leipzig Colloquy," in *Lutherans and Calvinist in the Age of Confessionalism* (Alderhot: Ashgate, 1999), XIII:1-26.

<sup>27</sup> Schüssler, *Georg Calixt*, 45; Cf. also Johannes Wallmann, *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands seit der Reformation*, 5<sup>th</sup> ed. (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 2000), 99; Wallmann, "Zwischen Reformation und Humanismus," 74.

<sup>28</sup> Wallmann, "Georg Calixt," 7:553-754. Note Johann Dorsch first coined the term *consensus quinqueseacularis* not Calixtus.

<sup>29</sup> Wallmann, "Georg Calixt," 7:554.

again advocated religious discussions in 1642 via a work of and about George Cassander, which he sent to Mainz and Köln. When the response was unfavorable, he wrote his *Responsum maledicis theologorum Moguntinorum* (1644/45) presenting his plan for church union.<sup>30</sup> The first public attack on Calixtus and his *consensus antiquitatis* was made by Statius Büscher in his *Cryptopapism novae Theologiae Helmstadiensis* (1640), which accused him of abandoning the *Corpus Doctrinae Julium*.

The following observations are now in order: First, Calixtus' upbringing, freedom from confessional subscription, and humanist education gave him a great deal of latitude, a certain historical outlook, and tools that were necessary for the development of his union theology. Second his travels gave him a friendlier disposition to the Reformed and Catholics than was typical among Lutherans. Still, these aforementioned factors did not bring about his union theology, although they facilitated it. Third, the Thirty Years' War played a vital role in fostering irenicism and first prompted Calixtus to rethink his ideas about fundamental doctrine and the unity of the church. What ultimately influenced his particular union theology? The answer is Cassander and de Dominis. Hermann Schüssler has shown that the union theology that Calixtus developed was not influenced by the Lutheran confessional tradition nor Reformed Irenicism, but by the old catholic church idea, which he drew from the union theology of Cassander and Marcus Antonius de Dominis.<sup>31</sup> In point of fact, Cassander believed that the creed contained the fundamentals and that Scripture and the tradition of the early church should solve theological controversies.<sup>32</sup> De Dominis organized and developed these ideas by suggesting the church of the first five centuries is the true form of the catholic church and by providing a program for union arguing the best way to achieve church union was via adherence to the fundamentals contained in the creed. Even Abraham Calov recognized the connection between Calixtus' union theology and Cassander and de Dominis in the preface to the 1666 CRFVL.<sup>33</sup> How did Calixtus encounter these ideas? Schüssler explains:

*In Auseinandersetzung mit Ideen von Cassander und de Dominis hat Calixt in den zwanziger Jahren des 17. Jahrhunderts dann die Gedanken entwickelt, die zu seiner neuen Sicht der Trennung und der Einheit geführt haben. Bereits 1617 kennt er den ersten Teil der Respublica Ecclesiastica, der in diesem Jahr erschien. 1622 kommt der dritte Teil mit dem VII. Buch heraus, das die Ausführungen über die Kircheneinheit enthält. In seinen nächsten größeren Schriften hat Calixt das Werk benutzt. Gelegentlich läßt sich sogar bis in formale Einzelheiten hinein eine Abhängigkeit nachweisen. Vor allem zeigt er aber in seiner neuen Konzeption von der kirchlichen Einheit eine deutliche inhaltliche Beeinflussung durch de Dominis. Falls er vorher mit Cassanders Ideen noch nicht bekannt geworden war, wurde er durch de Dominis jetzt darauf aufmerksam.<sup>34</sup>*

The syncretistic controversy itself has been divided into three phases: The first phase occurred from 1645-1656 or the period between the Colloquy of Thorn and death of Calixtus. The second phase occurred from 1661-1669 or from the time from the colloquies of Hesse-Kassel

---

<sup>30</sup> Wallmann, "Georg Calixt," 7:555.

<sup>31</sup> Schüssler, *Georg Calixt*, 49.

<sup>32</sup> Rouse, *A History of the Ecumenical Movement 1517-1948*, 38.

<sup>33</sup> *Consensus Repetitus Fidei Vere Lutheranae in illis Doctrinae capitibus quae Contra puram & invariatae Augustanam Confessionem, aliosque libros Symbolicos in Formulae Concordiae comprehensos, scriptis publicis hodieque impugnant. D. Georgius Calixtus, Professor Helmstadiensis, eiusdemque complices. In gratiam Eorum, qui distantiam D. Calixti, Rintelensium, & aliorum Novatorum a fide Lutheranae in Synopsi intueri discipiunt, Ob Praesentem Ecclesiae necessitatem seorsim editus* (Wittebergae: Typis Johannis Borckardi, 1666), 2.

<sup>34</sup> Schüssler, *Georg Calixt*, 51-52; Calixtus, *Werke in Auswahl*, 1:284-285; Cf. endnotes 95-96 for Calixtus' pertinent references to de Dominis not found in the *Werke in Auswahl*.

and Berlin until the Great Elector Frederick William (1620-1688) banned polemics. The third phase occurred from 1675-1686 or from the period when Calov renewed the controversy until the death of Calov.<sup>35</sup> During this last period, Calov sought wider acceptance of the CRFVL and began his polemics against Johann Musaeus (1613-1681) at Jena.

The *Colloquium caritativum* or Colloquy of Thorn (August 28 - November 21, 1645) was called by King Ladislaus IV of Poland with the ultimate hope of drawing the Protestants back into the Catholic fold.<sup>36</sup> When Calixtus heard of the colloquy, he quickly praised the venture and sought appointment. This action first gained him the animosity of Coelestin Myslenta (1588-1653) and Abraham Calov who were actively resisting the Great Elector's attempts to promote Calvinism in Prussia.<sup>37</sup> The Danzig city council, as part of Poland, considered sending Calixtus, but Calov, currently a Danzig pastor and rector of its school, prevented it. The Polish Lutherans chose Johann Hülsemann (1602-1661) of Wittenberg as one of their representatives, who along with Calov, would become the real leaders of the Lutheran party at Thorn. The Elector of Brandenburg was invited to send theologians because the Great Elector as Duke of Prussia was a vassal of the Polish king. Despite accepting Johann Bergius' proposed policy of toleration towards Lutherans, the Hollenzollerns still sought to undermine orthodox Lutheranism in their lands.<sup>38</sup> It is not surprising that the Great Elector would come to see an ally in Calixtus and the more moderate Lutherans already at this juncture. The Great Elector invited Calixtus, upon the recommendation of Bergius and in place of Coelestin Myslenta (1588-1653), hoping Calixtus could undermine the orthodox Lutherans.<sup>39</sup> He selected Levin Pouchen, Michael Behm, and Christian Dreier to represent the Lutheran University of Königsberg.<sup>40</sup> In addition, Friedrich Reichel and Bergius were sent as the Great Elector's Reformed envoys. There Calixtus worked for his union idea, but Calov and Hülsemann immediately took issue with Calixtus refusing to recognize him as a Lutheran. Calixtus ultimately sat with the Reformed and helped them produce their *Declaratio Thoruniensis*, which Calov felt was so influenced by him that he called it the "*Calixtinische Professio*."<sup>41</sup> The Lutheran statement, in contrast, was not allowed to be read. The Lutherans even refused to pray with the Catholics, Reformed, and Herrnhuters at Thorn.<sup>42</sup> In the end, the colloquy achieved little other than to set the stage for the orthodox polemic against Calixtus.

The orthodox Lutheran attack on Calixtus and his school began in 1646 at Königsberg with the Johann Latermann affair. The Great Elector had appointed Latermann, a student of Calixtus who accompanied him to Thorn, as a professor of theology. His March 1646 *Habilitationsschrift, De aeterna Dei Praedestinatione*, divided the faculty and prompted *Gutachten* from other Lutheran universities because it sought to facilitate doctrinal agreement with the Reformed and argued no confession was free of error.<sup>43</sup> Dreier, Pouchen, and Behm supported

---

<sup>35</sup> Paul Tschackert, "Syncretism, Syncretistic Controversies," in *The New Schaff-Herzog Religious Encyclopedia*, ed. Samuel Macauley Jackson, vol. 11 (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1949-1950), 219.

<sup>36</sup> Schüssler, *Georg Calixt*, 122.

<sup>37</sup> Tschackert, "Syncretism," 219.

<sup>38</sup> Bodo Nischan, "John Bergius: Irenicism and the Beginnings of Official Religious Toleration in Brandenburg Prussia," in *Lutherans and Calvinist in the Age of Confessionalism* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1999), XII:402-4.

<sup>39</sup> Koch, *Das konfessionelle Zeitalter*, 305.

<sup>40</sup> Schüssler, *Georg Calixt*, 124.

<sup>41</sup> Schüssler, *Georg Calixt*, 128-129; W. Gaß, *Geschichte der Protestantischen Dogmatik in ihrem Zusammenhange mit der Theologie überhaupt*, vol. 2 (Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1857), 161; Wallmann, *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands*, 99.

<sup>42</sup> "Zur kirchlichen Chronik," *Der Lutheraner* 64 (April 7, 1908): 111.

<sup>43</sup> Schüssler, *Georg Calixt*, 135.

him. But Coelestin Myslenta would accuse Latermann of ten errors: deviations on original sin, synergism, a Calvinist explanation of election, denial of the main proofs of the Trinity, overestimation of works, and acceptance of tradition over Scripture.<sup>44</sup> In 1648, Myslenta issued the *Censurae theologorum orthodoxorum*, which was rebutted by Horneius of Helmstedt.

In December 29, 1646, the faculties of Wittenberg, Leipzig, and Jena issued an *Admonitio* to the University of Helmstedt intended to call Helmstedt back to an orthodox position on works as well as reassert the unity and purity of the Lutheran church.<sup>45</sup> It was prompted by Elector Johann Georg I (1585-1656) of Saxony when he was informed by Jakob Weller (1602-1664) that Horneius defended the necessity of works for salvation in a disputation.<sup>46</sup> Calixtus responded in February of 1647 with a sharp letter to Johann Hülsemann refuting the charges made against Helmstedt and reminding him that the Formula of Concord was not binding in Braunschweig. Made well aware of the issues, the Elector instructed his theologians to write up a refutation of Helmstedt's errors "article by article" already in January of 1648.<sup>47</sup> By June 16, 1649, Johann Georg I took it upon himself to issue an address to the three Braunschweig dukes who operated the University of Helmstedt. Herein he accused Calixtus of manifold errors and schisms, asked that the Helmstedt theologians be barred from polemics, and "invited the dukes to a proposed alliance of Evangelical states for restrictive measures, under threat of assuming protection against schism."<sup>48</sup> Conversely, the Braunschweig dukes had Conrad Horneius with the assistance of Calixtus write an apology against the Königsberg *Censurae theologorum orthodoxorum* treating subjects such as authority of the ancient church, good works, Trinity, and the charge of syncretism.<sup>49</sup> The following was the reaction to Johann Georg I:

Now, he [Calixtus] furnished an apology against Johann Georg's address, and the dukes of Brunswick in joint reply to the latter (1650) offered to acquiesce in the suppression of the polemical writings of their theologians, provisionally, if he would take the same steps, and proposed a convention to devise counsels against schisms in behalf of peace, but intimated resistance to the threatened directorate, if the same implied the assertion of superiority by force.<sup>50</sup>

Johann Georg I retorted by calling Abraham Calov to Wittenberg in 1650 who had already written his *Institutionum theologiarum ta. prolegomena cum examine novae theologiae Calixtinae* (1649) and *Consideratio novae theologiae Helmstadioregiomontanorum syncretistarum* (1649). This move only suggested an increase in polemics was imminent.

Calixtus himself would not take part in the controversy after he wrote his *Widerlegung Wellers* in 1651. By 1650 the elector instructed his theologians to call for a conference of theologians to discuss the Helmstedt matter and in 1652 ninety-four errors of Helmstedt were collected for such a purpose.<sup>51</sup> This ultimately failed because the dukes of Saxony and theologians of Jena, who did not want this schism to grow wider, realized the electoral Saxons desired the exclusion of Braunschweig from Lutheranism.<sup>52</sup> The electoral Saxons would not be stifled. In 1655, the Dresden high consistory requested a new confession against the syncretists.

---

<sup>44</sup> Gaß, *Geschichte*, 2:163.

<sup>45</sup> Koch, *Das konfessionelle Zeitalter*, 304.

<sup>46</sup> Schüssler, *Georg Calixt*, 136.

<sup>47</sup> Schüssler, *Georg Calixt*, 140.

<sup>48</sup> Tschackert, "Syncretism," 11:220.

<sup>49</sup> Tschackert, "Syncretism," 11:220.

<sup>50</sup> Tschackert, "Syncretism," 11:220.

<sup>51</sup> Schüssler, *Georg Calixt*, 147.

<sup>52</sup> Tschackert, "Syncretism," 11:220.



Between February and March, Wittenberg and Leipzig each wrote a draft out of which the CRFVL arose.<sup>53</sup> It is almost certain that Abraham Calov wrote the CRFVL.<sup>54</sup> It in turn was signed by the theologians of the Universities of Wittenberg and Leipzig on March 14, 1655. Since the CRFVL never acquired any further signatures due in large part to Jena's mediating position between Helmstedt and the electoral Saxons, it was never incorporated into the Book of Concord.<sup>55</sup> It was also not printed until 1664 because of the ducal Saxons as well as the death of both Georg Calixtus and Johann Georg I in 1656.<sup>56</sup>

The second phase of the controversy opened with the colloquies of Hesse-Kassel and Berlin. With the Peace of Westphalia, the Lutheran University of Rinteln fell under the Reformed rule of William VI, the Great Elector's brother-in-law. To promote union and good will within his lands, he held the *Colloquium irenicum* at the Kassel (June 1-9, 1661) between the Reformed faculty of the University of Marburg (reopened in 1653) and the Lutheran faculty of the University of Rinteln.<sup>57</sup> Sebastian Curtius and Johannes Heinius were the spokesman for the Reformed. Johannes Heinichen and Peter Musaeus (1620-1674), the brother of Johann Musaeus, represented the Lutherans. The topics under discussion were Baptism, the Lord's Supper, the person of Christ, and election. The Wittenberg faculty sharply criticized this colloquy, when it learned of it, in a work titled *Epicrisis Theol. Fac. Witeberg. De colloquio Casselano Rintelino-Marpurgensium* (1662). This polemical treatise was followed up by a number of others. From September 8, 1662 to June 29, 1663, the Great Elector, Friedrich William of Brandenburg, called a colloquy in Berlin in which Paul Gerhardt (1607-1676) took part. But this colloquy produced little results. The Great Elector issued a new edict on September 16, 1664 that prohibited polemics on pain of removal from office.<sup>58</sup> Many Lutheran pastors such as Paul Gerhardt (1607-1676) disobeyed and were dismissed from office.

At the same time, the electoral Saxons published the 1664 *Consilia theologica Witebergensia* in Frankfurt am Main, a collection of theological opinions from the Wittenberg faculty demonstrating its orthodoxy all the way back to Luther. The 1655 CRFVL, promulgated earlier, was first published in this tome.<sup>59</sup> Ernst Henke states that there are three printed editions of the CRFVL.<sup>60</sup> The first edition appeared in Latin and German in the 1664 *Consilia theologica Witebergensia* mentioned above. Herein the German text is an elaboration or even explanation of the more cursory Latin text and was intended for the laity. Hereafter the CRFVL is published by itself. The 1666 second edition was issued by Abraham Calov and was printed at Wittenberg. It omits the German text and makes certain changes in the Latin text such as typographical and grammatical corrections. The 1666 edition expands the title, includes a table of contents, and

---

<sup>53</sup> Schüssler, *Georg Calixt*, 147-8.

<sup>54</sup> When authorship is attributed to the CRFVL by scholars, it is generally attributed to Abraham Calov, the most unrelenting opponent of Lutheranism Syncretism. This may be because Helmstedt and Jena criticisms of the CRFVL often want to dismiss the document as product of a mere zealot and not as product of all Lutheranism or even of all Electoral Saxons. However, Heinz Staemmler has done an excellent job arguing Johann Hülsemann should be seen as the CRFVL's main author. Cf. Schaff, *Creeks of Christendom*, 1:351; Calixt, *Werke in Auswahl*, 1:32; Staemmler, *Die Auseinandersetzung*, 89, 93-96, 113.

<sup>55</sup> Koch, *Das konfessionelle Zeitalter*, 306; Wallmann, *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands*, 100.

<sup>56</sup> Koch, *Das konfessionelle Zeitalter*, 304.

<sup>57</sup> Gaß, *Geschichte*, 2:171.

<sup>58</sup> Tschackert, "Syncretism," 11:221.

<sup>59</sup> Schaff, *Creeks of Christendom*, 1:351; Koch, *Das konfessionelle Zeitalter*, 304; Wallmann, "Abraham Calov," 7:566.

<sup>60</sup> E.L.T. Henke. *Inest theologorum Saxoniorum consensus repetitus fidei vere lutheranae* (Marburgi: Typis Elwertii Academicus, 1846), v-vi.

adds a preface accusing the University of Rinteln of syncretism. This prompted Friedrich Ulrich Calixtus (1622-1701), the son of Georg Calixtus, to defend his father and refute the CRFVL. In response, Aegidius Strauch, student of Calov, and Deutschmann (1625-1706), a son-in-law of Calov, began their polemics against syncretism. This same Strauch would publish what Henke calls the 1668 third edition of the CRFVL at Wittenberg against Friedrich Ulrich Calixtus. This edition expands the title yet again and made some alterations to the text. It should also be noted that Ernst Henke published an edition at Marburg in 1846 under the title *Inest theologorum Saxoniorum consensus repetitus fidei vere lutheranae*.

Despite the polemics of Friedrich Ulrich Calixtus, the most capable and productive defense of Helmstedt was made by Hermann Conring in his *Pietas academiae Juliae*. It pointed out that the CRFVL could undermine Braunschweig's protected status under the Peace of Westphalia (1648).<sup>61</sup> To put an end to the schism, Friedrich Wilhelm of Saxon-Altenburg (d. 1602) convinced Johann Georg II (1613-1680) of electoral Saxony to speak with his theologians. They responded with a report on April 22, 1669.<sup>62</sup> Though the report continued the schism, a refrain from polemics was decreed. Not long after Ernst the Pious encouraged by Spener (1635-1705) also sought to resolve the strife, but distrust prevented any real healing of the breach.<sup>63</sup>

Abraham Calov inaugurated the third phase of the syncretistic controversy in 1675 with his *E diaboli excrementa Calixtinas sordes exquirere*. The Great Elector's capture and three year imprisonment of Aegidius Strauch, now a Danzig pastor, as he was sailing towards Hamburg off the coast of Pomerania no doubt only added fuel to the fire.<sup>64</sup> Since the Elector of Saxony barred polemics without permission, Calov now began to use pseudonyms. Yet, Abraham Calov still managed to make new enemies. He came into conflict with Johannes Meisner (1615-1684) his colleague at Wittenberg. But it was Johannes Musaeus, professor at the University of Jena, who received the brunt of his wrath for suggesting the issues with the syncretists are now negated. In fact, Calov compelled the Jena faculty to condemn syncretism.<sup>65</sup> On January 12, 1680, Johann Georg II (1647-1691) prohibited polemics once again and punished the printers that issued Calov's *De Syncretismo Musaei*.<sup>66</sup> Calov's situation worsened as the new Elector Johann Georg III (1647-1691) of Saxony allied himself with the Great Elector. With great difficulty, Calov was still able to get his *Historia syncretistica* (1682), a virtual goldmine of information on the controversy, published in Frankfurt am Main. The elector soon confiscated it. Thus, a second edition was printed in 1685. Calov's death in 1686 marked the end of the final phase of syncretism.

In sum, syncretist controversy was the most important and enduring controversy in the Age of Orthodoxy. The controversy had both religious and political implications. Theologically, orthodox Lutheranism felt threatened. Politically, Hohenzollern politics became intertwined with syncretism, the Saxon houses were unable to achieve a unified stance towards syncretism, and the controversy caused divisions within Lutheranism that could have undermined the legal status of Braunschweig if not Lutheranism in general. It should also be noted that the CRFVL ultimately failed to be accepted beyond electoral Saxony because of the mediating position that the University of Jena took with respect to it.

---

<sup>61</sup> Tschackert, "Syncretism," 11:222.

<sup>62</sup> Tschackert, "Syncretism," 11:222.

<sup>63</sup> Tschackert, "Syncretism," 11:222.

<sup>64</sup> Wallmann, "Abraham Calov – theologischer Widerpart," 311.

<sup>65</sup> Tschackert, "Syncretism," 11:223.

<sup>66</sup> Tschackert, "Syncretism," 11:223.

This paper will now examine the CRFVL itself providing first an examination of its structure. The 1664 CRFVL is composed of two preliminary articles, thirteen articles or topics, and a conclusion. In 1666, Abraham Calov would add a preface and table of contents. These articles are subdivided into eighty-eight points that delineate the subject matter of each article, however, at each article the count starts over again. The 1846 edition numbers its points consecutively, but this is not the case in the 1664 or 1666 editions. Such a feature makes the text more user-friendly. It also undermines the intended structure of the confession.

It is quite clear that the structure of the CRFVL down to the construction of its very articles is intentionally modeled after the CA. In point of fact, a horizontal line introduces each new CRFVL article, which is listed as a CA article even retaining the numbering of the CA. For instance, the heading of the article on free will reads: "*Articulus XVIII. Augustanae Confessionis de Libero Arbitrio.*"<sup>67</sup> Since the CRFVL lists its articles in this manner and because there is no standard method of referring to its articles, this paper has chosen simply to refer to each of its articles or topics with the CRFVL abbreviation instead of referring to them as CA articles of the CRFVL. In this way, any confusion with the CA can be avoided. Consequently, the previous italics reference to the article on free will shall now be abbreviated CRFVL XVIII. This will be the procedure for the rest of the paper.

There are four major differences from the CA's structure. First, the CRFVL has nonconsecutive numbering of its articles, despite generally retaining the CA's ordering of its topics. The reason for this will become clearer in the following points. Second, the CRFVL has two preliminary articles not treated in the CA. Third, the articles of the CA not in dispute with the syncretists are omitted in the topics or the articles of the CRFVL. Fourth, when possible, articles that come later in the CA, which can be assumed under earlier articles, are combined with those earlier articles in the CRFVL. A similar practice is already evident in the Apology to the Augsburg Confession. In other words, the CRFVL articles follow the topical arrangement of the CA more rigidly at the beginning than at the end because it combines later articles with earlier articles. For instance, the *Index Caputum* from the 1666 edition lists the "*Articulus XII. De Poenitentia, punct. III. p. 101*" immediately ahead of "*Articulus XVI. De Magistratu Politico, punct. II. p. 103.*"<sup>68</sup> This is because CA XIII was combined with CA IX in the CRFVL and there was no dispute with the syncretists over the content of CA XIV or XV. In another example, the *Index Caputum* from the 1666 edition lists its second non-preliminary topic as follows: "*Articulus II. & XIX. De peccator, eiusdemque causa, & que ei fuit opposita, imagine divina, habet XIII. puncta, p. 22.*"<sup>69</sup> Since more than one CA article is often assumed in one CRFVL article, it should come as no surprise to see the CRFVL heading for the article on the Lord's Supper reads: "*Articulus X. XXII. & XXIV. Augustanae Confessionis de Coena Domini et Abusu circa eandem scil. Missa Papistica.*"<sup>70</sup>

To further support the contention that the structure the CRFVL was intentionally modeled after the CA, though with some deviations, one need only see the actual topical order of the CRFVL keeping in mind that the numbering of its articles corresponds with the CA. The following is the actual topical order of the CRFVL with the CA articles combined in the CRFVL articles in parentheses: a preliminary article containing the basis of the whole discussion; a preliminary article on Scripture; God (I); sin and its cause as well as the image of God (II, XIX); Christ (III); justification and good works (IV, VI, XX); the Word of God and law and gospel (V);

---

<sup>67</sup> *Consilia Theologica Witebergensia*, 1:989.

<sup>68</sup> *Consensus Repetitus*, Index Caputum.

<sup>69</sup> *Consensus Repetitus*, Index Caputum.

<sup>70</sup> *Consilia Theologica Witebergensia*, 1:976.

the church (VII, VIII, XXVIII); the sacraments in general and particularly Baptism (IX, XIII); the Lord's Supper and its abuses particularly the papal mass (X, XIII, XXIV); repentance (XII); the political magistrate (XVI); the last judgment (XVII); free will (XVIII); and the cult of saints (XXI).

Every point under each article of the CRFVL has a definite structure similar to some of the articles of the CA, but still all its own. For instance, the CA article on God presents first a positive statement affirming true doctrine and then a condemnation of heretics and false teachings introduced with a *damnant*.<sup>71</sup> The CRFVL takes a similar approach, but the pattern for each of its points hardly ever varies and it consistently adds a third part. This third part lists the name or names of the individuals being refuted and proves their culpability from extensive citations from their writings along with references. CRFVL I:1 on God illustrates this standard pattern by beginning with "*profitemur & docemus*," which precedes a positive statement of doctrine. Then, comes "*rejecimus eos, qui docent*" followed by the false doctrine in question. The point concludes with "*ita docet D. Georgius Calixtus*," preceding in this case a citation from Calixtus' 1634 *Epitome Theologiae* found on pages 69-70 and from Horneius' *Dissertat. Theolog. III* held at Helmstedt on May 30, 1637.<sup>72</sup>

The last structural item worth noting is the marginal references to the Lutheran Confessions beginning with the 1664 Latin and German edition. The first point of the first preliminary article lists the following on its margin: "*Liber Concord, pag. 633. Edit. Lat. Lips. In 8vo publicatae Anno 1612. 1626. & Jenae 1645. Edit Germanae in folio Dresdae 1580. pag 256. August. Conf. art. 7. pag. 12. Edit Lips.*"<sup>73</sup> These marginal references not only point the reader to the ecumenical creeds, CA, Apology, Smalcald Articles, and Catechism, but also to the Formula of Concord and Catalogue of Testimonies.<sup>74</sup> The editions of the Book of Concord cited were ones available in that day. In some cases, the marginal references draw the reader's attention to other items such as the Calixtus' *Epitome Theologia*, Council of Antioch, and the Council of Ephesus.<sup>75</sup>

The following observation may now be made: First, the structure of the CRFVL intentionally reflects the CA. Its purpose was to cover the articles of the CA in order to bolster the claim that Georg Calixtus and his adherents are in conflict with the Augsburg Confession. Second, the structure of the CRFVL's points is unique in that it not only rejects false doctrines, but that it names false teachers and cites these teachers extensively. With this approach, the CRFVL went beyond the Formula of Concord which did not name names or cite from its opponents on each article. The marginal references were intended to show that the syncretists had departed from the CA and had abandoned other Lutheran symbols to which they were bound. In addition, references to the Formula of Concord only helped illustrate the theological chasm between subscribers of the Book of Concord and the syncretists. Fourth, the structure of the CRFVL demonstrates the Lutheran Confessions were very much a part of the thought process and polemical theology of the Silver Age of Lutheran Orthodoxy.

This paper will now shift to an examination of the CRFVL's content. Given the sheer length of the document, its complete contents cannot be presented. Instead, this paper will first introduce each CRFVL article or topic. The paper will then indicate in a series the specific condemnation for each point distinguishing the substance of each point with a semicolon. For

---

<sup>71</sup> *Die Bekenntnisschriften der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche*, 11<sup>th</sup> ed. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992), 51.

<sup>72</sup> *Consilia Theologica Witebergensia*, 1:936-937.

<sup>73</sup> *Consilia Theologica Witebergensia*, 1:928.

<sup>74</sup> *Consilia Theologica Witebergensia*, 1:936, 938, 940, 948, 951, 952.

<sup>75</sup> *Consilia Theologica Witebergensia*, 1:938, 950, 955.

the benefit of reader, the consecutive numbering of the points from the more accessible 1846 CRFVL is given in parentheses after the discussion of each article for the sake of reference. In the four points of the first preliminary article, the CRFVL defines the *totius negotii fundamentum* or the underlying presuppositions of the entire confession and root of the contention with the syncretists.<sup>76</sup> First, the CRFVL asserts that the Lutheran church is the *vera dei ecclesia* wherein the gospel is rightly taught and the sacraments are rightly administered. Thus, those who teach that the Lutheran church is only slightly less polluted with errors than the Catholics and Calvinists are to be rejected. Second, only false doctrines and false teachers are condemned. The *rejecimus* of this confession are not intended against whole churches or people that err out of simplicity and do not blaspheme the truth of the Word of God. Third, neither all that is necessary to know and believe for salvation can be found in the Apostles' Creed, nor should those who only believe its articles be deemed brothers and heirs of heaven. Fourth, not all heresies are defined by the Apostles' Creed and therefore other confessions are necessary (1-4).<sup>77</sup> The second preliminary article treats Scripture. It rejects that the witness of the church is necessary to recognize Scripture; that not everything contained in Scripture is divine revelation; that a clearer church tradition is given in addition to Scripture; that Scripture requires interpretation according to the norm of the catholic church (i.e. *consensus antiquitatis*); and that tradition serves as a secondary principle to Scripture (5-9).<sup>78</sup> CRFVL I begins the regular topics by addressing the subject of God. It rejects that the existence of God and His attributes are not an article of faith; that it is enough to believe there is one God in three persons though unnecessary to believe in the *notions divinae proprietates & relations*; that the mystery of the Trinity was only made known to the patriarchs and prophets via a special revelation from God; that the Old Testament is unclear about the doctrine of the Trinity; that only the gifts of God as opposed to His essence exist in the believer; that the deity of Christ and Spirit is unable to be proved from passages that say God appears as an angel in the Old Testament; and that the Jew and the Turk are not guilty of idolatry (10-16).<sup>79</sup> CRFVL II & XIX examines original sin, its cause, and the image of God. Herein the CRFVL rejects that the image of God does not belongs to the natural state of man; that *iustitia originalis* of our first parents is supernatural not innate; that human nature was created rebellious; that the body of our first parents was only made incapable of dying via a supernatural gift; that God is the indirect cause of sin; that souls arise not from propagation, but *ex nihilo tunc primum creari* (creationism); that one should not seek the cause of original sin, but attribute it to a *causa moralis*; that original sin in infants is merely a *cauentia iustitiae*; that original sin is a mere privation or lack; that original sin means after the fall the natural powers remain uncorrupted so that only supernatural powers are lost; that concupiscence is not sin; that it is sufficient to know for salvation that original sin means man was born excluded from heaven and subject to eternal damnation; and that original sin does not bring death unless actual sins are committed (17-29).<sup>80</sup> Christ is the focus of CRFVL III. It rejects that Old Testament believers neither had to know or believe the doctrine of Christ and His work as the God-man to be saved; that Old Testament believers did not have to believe in His divinity to be saved and were unsure if the messiah would be God, an angel, or man; that Christ never appeared in His own person before His incarnation and is only called an angel in two places

---

<sup>76</sup> *Consilia Theologica Witebergensia*, 1:928.

<sup>77</sup> *Consilia Theologica Witebergensia*, 1:928-931.

<sup>78</sup> *Consilia Theologica Witebergensia*, 1:932-936.

<sup>79</sup> *Consilia Theologica Witebergensia*, 1:936-938.

<sup>80</sup> *Consilia Theologica Witebergensia*, 1:938-948.

(Isaiah 9:6 and Malachi 3:1); that the Son born *ex Maria pura santa semper virgine* subordinated Himself to sickness, suffering, and death by becoming man; that there is no communication of omnipresence to the human nature of Christ, that the human nature of Christ does not dwell in the believer; that the power to raise the dead with one word does not occur through the human nature, but only through the divine nature; that work of salvation only occurs through the divine nature; that divine attributes are not communicated to the human nature of Christ; that divine attributes are not communicated to the human nature through the personal union, but are only united with the person so that Christ human nature is not present on this earth after the ascension; that the universal merits of Christ are not the first and principle article of the faith; and that Christ did not descend into hell with His body (23-41).<sup>81</sup> CRFVL IV, VI, & XX discusses justification and good works. The CRFVL rejects that controversies concerning salvation between Lutherans and Catholics can be easily distinguished and settled; that *justificari* is not used in a forensic sense in I Corinthians 6:11 (1666 Edition has 7:11 and Henke has 6:2) and Titus 3:7 but in a moral sense; that confession of sins and praying for forgiveness belongs to justification itself; that good works, the intention to avoid sin, and obedience to the commandments are necessary to receive justification; that only works done before justification are excluded from one's justification; that faith is necessary for justification insofar as it is active; that justification consist of the remission of sins and sanctification of the Spirit; that attending to righteousness and love for ones brother are necessary to be a saved child of God; that the cause of election is not only the mercy of God and merits of Christ but also something in man; that the active love of God, love of neighbor, and the obedience to the commandments are the *causa sine qua non* for receiving the inheritance of eternal salvation; that there are not three grades of faith; that via devoting oneself to sanctification one acquires the right of eternal life; that man must doubt his steadfastness in the faith until the end; that the intention of loving God and obeying the commandment is required for justification; that one can trust in God's mercy as well as the merits of Christ and can still live against conscience in unrighteousness; and that Lutheran doctrine prohibits good works and opens the door to impiety if it says: good works and the practice of piety are not necessity for justification or salvation (42-57).<sup>82</sup> CRFVL V focuses on the Word of God, law, and gospel. In this article, any mixing of the law and gospel is opposed (58).<sup>83</sup> CRFVL VII, VIII, & XXVIII pursues the topic of the church. The confession rejects that not only Lutherans and Greeks, but also Catholics and Reformed belong to the Christian church so that what Lutherans, Greeks, Catholics, and Reformed do not agree upon ought to be abandoned; that catholic is what all Christians everywhere can agree upon; and that several articles of Trent that conflict with the Lutheran symbols can be tolerated, softened, or excused (59-61).<sup>84</sup> The sacraments in general and Baptism in particular are considered in CRFVL IX & XIII. It rejects that Scripture is unclear about the number of the sacraments; that sacraments justify *ex opera operato*; that the forgiveness bestowed in baptism happens merely by the will of God and in no way via water and the word (i.e. baptism is a mere confirmation of the forgiveness of sins); that infants have no faith of their own; and that Calvinists teach nothing that deviates from the CA on Baptism (62-66).<sup>85</sup> CRFVL X, XXII, & XXIV treats the Lord's Supper and its abuse, namely, the papal mass. It rejects that John 6 applies to the Lord's Supper;

---

<sup>81</sup> *Consilia Theologica Witebergensia*, 1:948-956.

<sup>82</sup> *Consilia Theologica Witebergensia*, 1:956-967.

<sup>83</sup> *Consilia Theologica Witebergensia*, 1:967-968.

<sup>84</sup> *Consilia Theologica Witebergensia*, 1:968-972.

<sup>85</sup> *Consilia Theologica Witebergensia*, 1:972-976.

that Lutherans, Catholics, and Calvinists agree that the *verum ac reale* body of Christ *vere & realiter exhibeatur* so that the disagreement between them is only over the mode of presence; that one can receive the Lord's Supper in the Roman manner if among Catholics or in the Calvinist manner if among the Calvinists; that the *dogma de ubiuitate carnis Christi* is more absurd than the Catholic and Reformed teachings; that the body of Christ is present in the Lord's Supper via a particular divine power, but not through the power Christ received according to the His human nature through the personal union; that the *factio panis* and pouring out of the wine into the mouth of the believer were intended by Christ as signs of His passion; that the Lord's Supper is *sacrificium memorativum*; that Catholics hold to the fundamentals of salvation, are members of Christ, and have become citizens of the kingdom of heaven although they have many errors particularly on the mass (67-74).<sup>86</sup> Repentance is the subject of CRFVL XII. It rejects those who do not speak properly of the two parts of repentance, i.e., *contritio et fides*; that man who is not yet converted should cooperate in his conversion from the beginning of his conversion if he is to be converted; and that those who say that the regenerate cannot fall away are members of Christ and citizens of the kingdom of heaven (75-77).<sup>87</sup> CRFVL XVI talks about political magistrates. The CRFVL rejects that categorical subscription to the symbols, required by a magistrate, can be transformed into a hypothetical or *quatenus* subscription or that authors of the Lutheran Confessions make things necessary for salvation which God Himself has never proposed as necessary for salvation (78-79).<sup>88</sup> CRFVL XVII presents the last judgment. The confession rejects that none receive beatitude or damnation before the last day; that unbaptized infants who have died suffer only the lack of the beatific vision; and that eternal life and grades of glory or rewards are not distinct (80-82).<sup>89</sup> CRFVL XVIII speaks about free will. It rejects that there is synergy from the beginning of conversion and that the Reformers defended divine grace over against free will too vehemently (conversely, it affirms only two causes of conversion); that natural man has natural capabilities in some things to raise and save himself; that man does more in a negative way to inhibit his conversion than actively resisting conversion; and that one can only do morally good works on the basis of natural powers alone and that all works of the heathen are generally not to be equated with sin (83-86).<sup>90</sup> Finally, the cult of saints is addressed in CRFVL XXI. It rejects that if the dead saints understand ones invocation as the living do, then one may invoke them to pray for us or that the Catholics ought to be deemed children of God for they are far from idolaters (87-88).<sup>91</sup> Though Philip Schaff's assessment of this confession is far from kind, he offers a generally sound and succinct overview of the previous content:

The first fundamental section anathematizes the Calixtine concession of the imperfection of the Lutheran church, the relative recognition of Catholics and Calvinists as Christian brethren and the assertion of the necessity of Christian tradition alongside of the Scriptures. The following doctrines are rejected not simply as doubtful, erroneous, or dangerous opinions (which some of them are), but as a downright heresies: That the article of the Holy Trinity is not clearly revealed in the Old Testament; the Holy Spirit dwells in believers as a gift not as an essence; that theology need not prove the existence of God, since it is already certain from philosophy; that Jews and Mohammedans are not idolaters; that original sin is simply a *caerentia iustitiae*; that souls are created

---

<sup>86</sup> *Consilia Theologica Witebergensia*, 1:976-983.

<sup>87</sup> *Consilia Theologica Witebergensia*, 1:984-985.

<sup>88</sup> *Consilia Theologica Witebergensia*, 1:985-987.

<sup>89</sup> *Consilia Theologica Witebergensia*, 1:987-989.

<sup>90</sup> *Consilia Theologica Witebergensia*, 1:989-992.

<sup>91</sup> *Consilia Theologica Witebergensia*, 1:992-994.

by God (creationism); that Christ's body is not omnipresent; that sanctification entered in any way into the idea of justification; that the true church embraces also Calvinists, Papists, and Greeks; that infants have no faith; that John vi. treats the Lord's Supper; that man is active in his conversion; that symbolical books are to be only conditionally subscribed *quatenus Scripturae S. consentiunt*; that symbols contain many things as necessary to salvation, which God has not fixed as such; that unbaptized infants are only negatively punished; that good works are necessary to obtain eternal life. A prayer that God may avert all innovations and corruptions from the Orthodox Church, and preserve it in this repeated consensus, forms the conclusion.<sup>92</sup>

The following conclusions can be made: First, the CRFVL's articles do not correspond with all the topics of the CA. Articles XI, XIV, XV, XXII, XXIII, XXV, XXVI, and XXVII are omitted. The reason for this omission appears to be that these topics were not in contention or at least were not crucial to the argument being posed against Calixtus and his adherents. Second, the CRFVL presents a comprehensive refutation of the perceived deviations of Calixtus and his adherents from the Book of Concord and more importantly the CA. This is assuming the CRFVL has an accurate grasp of their theology on each point of controversy. Unfortunately, this paper was unable to confirm the CRFVL's accuracy. In addition, the CRFVL has stressed that there is no fundamental agreement between Lutherans, Catholic, and Reformed on which to base a union. Third, the confession is remarkable in that it recognizes the underlying conflict of presuppositions between the syncretists and orthodox. Fourth, the confession condemns only false doctrines and false teachers. At other times, the confession seems to suggest Catholics and Reformed are not saved children of God, but such passages must be understood in light of its first preliminary article. Fifth, the articles that receive the most attention are justification and good works with 15 points, original sin with 13 points, Christ with 12 points, and the Lord's Supper with 8 points. Perhaps, it is somewhat surprising the soteriology and more particularly justification would need a thorough defense in the so-called Age of Lutheran Orthodoxy. The fact that CRFVL was trying to safeguard justification should temper remarks about dead or rigid orthodoxy and should indicate that not only the CA, but even the heart of the Lutheran faith itself was under fire. This may also explain some of the vehemence of Calov's own polemical writing. Sixth, the content of the CRFVL exceeds the express mention of the CA and even in a few instances the Formula of Concord. The Lutheran Confessions do not have specific articles on Scripture and confessional subscription. Nevertheless, the CRFVL neither really exceeds the thought expressed in the Formula of Concord's *summarischen Begriff* regarding Scripture nor the intention of the formulators regarding subscription.<sup>93</sup> The Book of Concord does not bind the Christian to maintain that Old Testament believers expressly believed in the Trinity or the deity of Christ for salvation. Still, such ideas were not innovated by the CRFVL. Luther argued the Trinity was clearly taught in Old Testament and that the patriarchs and prophets understood these articles though many Jews rejected them.<sup>94</sup> Similarly, Johann Gerhard teaches that it was necessary for salvation in the Old Testament to believe in the Trinity.<sup>95</sup> The Lutheran Confessions also do not expressly teach the separation of the body and soul at death followed by the immediate beatitude or damnation before judgment day. This teaching is hardly a novelty among Lutherans.<sup>96</sup> Two instances where the CRFVL may exceed

---

<sup>92</sup> Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom*, 1:352.

<sup>93</sup> *Die Bekenntnisschriften*, 767-769.

<sup>94</sup> Martin Luther, *Dr. Martin Luthers Sämmtliche Schriften*, vol. 1 (St. Louis: Lutherischer Concordia-Verlag, 1881), 708; Hereafter W2; Luther, W2, 13:2687; Luther; W2, 2:940; Luther; W2, 3:1891.

<sup>95</sup> Johann Gerhard, *Loci Theologici*, ed. Ed. Preuss, vol. 1 (Berlin: Gust. Schlawitz, 1863), 373.

<sup>96</sup> Gerhard, *Loci Theologici*, 8: 95-96.



the norms of Lutheranism is the repudiation of creationism and its stress on ubiquity without any mention of the multivoli-presence. Many Lutherans did not want to be overly dogmatic about the origin of the soul and only a select few were open to creationism. In spite of this, the language of the Formula of Concord regarding the transmission of original sin via carnal propagation appears very similar to CRFVL and could be understood as binding one to a sort of transducianism.<sup>97</sup> At any rate, the marginal references to the Smalcald Articles and Formula of Concord suggests the CRFVL believed its position was confessional or at least logical deductions from the Lutheran Confessions. Both the Swabian ubiquity and the Lower Saxon multivoli-presence were accepted in the Formula of Concord. The CRFVL might be read as placing far more stress on ubiquity to the detriment of the multivoli-presence. It is unclear if this is the case.

The function of the CRFVL's polemic will now be examined. The purpose of the CRFVL was really threefold: It sought to demonstrate that the syncretists were in disharmony with the Book of Concord to illustrate the theological chasm between the syncretists and orthodox. The confession intended to prove the syncretists had contradicted the symbols to which they were bound. Its primary objective was to show that the syncretists had departed from the CA and therefore should be excluded from Lutheranism.<sup>98</sup> This aim is confirmed in the full title of 1664 edition of the CRFVL:

*Consensus Repetitus Fidei Vere Lutheranae in illis Doctrinae capitibus quae Contra puram & invariatae Augustanam Confessionem, aliosque libros Symbolicos in Formulae Concordiae comprehensos, scriptis publicis hodieque impugnant. D. Georgius Calixtus, Professor Helmstadiensis, eiusdemque complices.<sup>99</sup>*

The terms *consensus repetitus* echoes the Formula of Concord and suggest that the CRFVL is not so much a new confession as an explanation or commentary on the CA and other Lutheran symbols. In this way, it could be argued by the orthodox that the CRFVL was not imposing a new confession at all. There seems to be a potential political element to the CRFVL. If Calixtus and his adherents were proved to be in disharmony with the CA, then they were no longer Lutheran and needed to be excluded from Lutheranism. In other words, if the church of Braunschweig for instance was not adhering to the CA and had not become Reformed or Roman Catholic, then it was not officially protected by the Peace of Westphalia (1648).<sup>100</sup> Whether or not this really mattered after the Thirty Years' War may be debatable. At any rate, subscription to the CRFVL was promulgated by Wittenberg and Leipzig as the mark of an authentic Lutheran.

The target of the 1664 CRFVL is the syncretists, i.e., first and foremost Georg Calixtus as well as his adherents: Conrad Horneius, Christian Dreier, Johannes Latermann, and Friedrich Ulrich Calixtus, all of whom are specially named in the CRFVL.<sup>101</sup> Particular doctrines of the Catholics and the Reformed are also under fire because the syncretists claimed they adhered to fundamental doctrine. In the expanded title and preface of the 1666 edition, the Lutheran University of Rinteln is included among the condemned syncretists. Friedrich Ulrich Calixtus receives further attention in the 1668 CRFVL whose expanded title now includes his name.

---

<sup>97</sup> *Die Bekenntnisschriften*, 847, 853-854.

<sup>98</sup> Johann Georg Walch, *Historische und Theologische Einleitung in die Religions-Streitigkeiten Der Evangelisch-Lutherischen Kirchen, Von der Reformation an bis auf ietzige Zeiten*, vol. 1 (Jena: Johann Meyers Witwe, 1730), 304; *Consensus Repetitus*, preface; Schüssler, *Georg Calixt*, 148.

<sup>99</sup> *Consilia Theologica Witebergensia*, 1:928.

<sup>100</sup> Tschackert, "Syncretism," 11:222.

<sup>101</sup> *Consilia Theologica Witebergensia*, 1:928, 229, 931, 935, 938.

The design of the CRFVL's polemic is multifaceted and well conceived. Before the CRFVL even begins its refutation in its main articles, it set forth two preliminary articles that are intended to attack the presuppositions undergirding the syncretists' platform as conceived by Georg Calixtus. First, it argues the Lutheran church is the *vera dei ecclesia* and not all that is necessary for salvation is taught in the Apostles' Creed such as justification by faith alone.<sup>102</sup> Second, the confession reasserts the inspiration, sufficiency, and clarity of Sacred Scripture over against the need for the interpretation of Scripture via catholic tradition or the legitimacy of the reunion of Christendom on the basis of tradition. Granted the Formula of Concord's *status controversiae* generally present the real question at issue for each of its topics, but the CRFVL is distinct in that it recognizes and lists in its preliminary articles the central presuppositions underling the syncretists' entire deviations from the Augustana. In fact, the title of the first preliminary article demonstrated the CRFVL's recognition of the central issues at hand: "*Articulus, Prooemialis Prior, continens Totius negotii fundamentum.*"<sup>103</sup> In this way, the CRFVL is unique among Lutheran symbols.

So far this paper has explained how the structure, content, and preliminary articles of the CRFVL are designed to prove the syncretists' deviations from the CA. The best way to fully illustrate how the polemic works is to sample one of its points and then supplement this with other examples of how the polemic functions in this confession. The point under discussion will be *Punctum V* from *Articulus IV. VI. & XX. Augustanae Confessionis, De Justificatione & Bonis Operibus* or CRFVL IV, VI, & XX. The marginal references for this point are: "*Aug. Conf. art. 4. p. 11. Apologia p. 184. & Epitome Concordiae. art. 3. p. 584. nec non Declaratio ejusdem p. 690. Teut. fol. 481. 276.*" The following is the articles as it appear in the text:

*Profitemur & docemus, hoc ipsam nostram esse coram Deo justitiam, quod Dominus nobis peccata remittit ex mera gratia, absque ullo respectu praecedentium, praesentium aut consequentium nostrorum operum, dignitatis et meriti. Ille enim donat atque imputat nobis iustitiam obedientiae Christi. Propter eam justitiam a Deo in gratiam recipimur, & iusti reputamur, non propter opera, etiamsi sint hominum regentorum ac justificatorum, nec ex solis viribus humanis profecta. Quare etsi conversi & in Christum credentes habent inchoatam in se renovationem, sanctificationem, dilectionem, virtutes et bona opera: tamen haec omnia nequaquam possunt aut debent immisceri articulo Justificationis coram Deo, ut Redemptori honor illibatus maneat: et cum nostra nova obedientia imperfecta & impura sit, perturbatae conscientiae certa et firma consolatione sese sustentare valeant.*

*Rejicimus eos, qui docent, ea opera hic tantum esse excludenda, quae ante justificationem homo fecerit.*

*Ita docet D. Conradus Hornejus in Iterata assertione §. 37. Verba sunt haec: Verum etiam est, evidenter scriptum esse, hominem justificari absque operibus, ut Rom. III. 28. Arbitramur hominem justificari fide absq; operibus, nempe quae ante fecerit. Idem etiam Paulus ad Gal. II, 16. inculcat: Ex operibus legis non justificabitur ulla caro. Ita quoq; limitat §. 51. 53. 69. 110. & Repetit. p. 36. Dreier. Erörterer p. 545.<sup>104</sup>*

Based on this article the following conclusions about how the polemic work can be made: First, the title of the article references CA IV, VI, & XX, which suggests that what is condemned in this article conflicts with these articles of the CA. Second, the point confesses and teaches that our righteousness is from God and that God forgives sins out of pure grace without any preceding, present, or consequential works, merit, or worthiness. It further asserts that God gives and imputes to us righteousness because of the merits of Christ. Although the believer has

---

<sup>102</sup> *Consilia Theologica Witebergensia*, 1:929-930.

<sup>103</sup> *Consilia Theologica Witebergensia*, 1:929.

<sup>104</sup> *Consilia Theologica Witebergensia*, 1:959.

sanctification, love, virtues, and good works; all these things ought not to be mixed into the article of justification. Note that the *profitemur & docemus* is modeled after the Formula of Concord's *credimus, docemus et confitemur*. Why the CRFVL did not strictly retain this pattern is unclear. Third, the point rejects those who teach only the works preceding justification are excluded from justification. Note that *rejecimus* does not reject the simple or whole church bodies, but only false doctrine and false teachers as the first preliminary article states in its second point. This point is typical of the polemic of the CRFVL with one exception that occurs in CRFVL X, XIII, & XXIV:2. Herein an *improbamus* and a *damnamus* are added in addition to the *rejecimus*.<sup>105</sup> Fourth, the marginal references provide the relevant passages in the Book of Concord that proves to the reader that what is rejected by the CRFVL is also condemned by the Book of Concord. In this case, the issue in question conflicts with the CA, Apology, and the Formula of Concord. In point of fact, the CA states: "*Item docent, quod homines non possint iustificari coram Deo propriis viribus, meritis, aut operibus sed gratis iustificentur propter Christum per fidem.*"<sup>106</sup> Granted this citation makes no distinction between works before justification and after justification. In truth, the CA does not distinguish between such works because *viribus, meritis aut operibus* are simply intended to exclude any work from justification regardless of how one wants to distinguish between them. Thus, the reference to the CA demonstrates that the syncretists had abandoned the Augustana, forfeiting the name Lutheran. The reference to the Apology shows Helmstedt was not in sync with its own confessions. The reference to the Formula of Concord further proves to the reader the disparity between the orthodox and syncretists. If the polemic went no further, it would conclusively prove that adherents of the doctrine condemned have departed from the Lutheran symbols. But there is more to the CRFVL's polemic. Fifth, the CRFVL goes on to name the transgressor and prove his culpability from his own writings so that the condemnation does not remain unsubstantiated. In this instance, Conrad Horneius and Christian Dreier are specifically named. The damning citation comes from Horneius' *Iterata assertion de necessitate fidei per caritatem operantis* § 37: "*Verum etiam est, evidenter scriptum esse, hominem justificari absque operibus, ut Rom. III. 28. Arbitramur hominem justificari fide absq; operibus, nempe quae ante fecerit. Idem etiam Paulus ad Gal. II, 16. inculcat: Ex operibus legis non justificabitur ulla caro,*" i.e., "It is true and clearly found in Scripture that man is justified without works as Romans 3:28 says. We hold that man is justified by faith without works, i.e., which he has done beforehand. This Paul also teaches in Gal. 2:6: *Out of the works of the law no flesh is justified.*" The CRFVL further acknowledges that Horneius limited this proof in § 51. 53. 69. 110 and in his *Repetitio doctrinae verae de necessitate bonorum operum* p. 36. *Gründlicher Erörterung* p. 545 of Dreier is cited as an additional reference. It is possible that this citation of Horneius was taken out of context by the CRFVL because this paper was unable to confirm the citation. Regardless, the polemic of the CRFVL is unique among Lutheran symbols in that it names names and cites often extensively from the offender to prove their culpability.

The polemic of the CRFVL occurs in other ways not illustrated by the previously cited point. First, it generally makes use of Scripture to affirm its positions though in a few instances it lists Scripture passage in its condemnations. Scriptural citations seem more frequent in the CRFVL than the CA. The cited passages generally originate from the New Testament. The CRFVL probably references more Old Testament passages than any other Lutheran symbol. This is not that surprising given the fact that this confession treats the Trinity and deity of Christ in the Old Testament as well as the fact that Abraham Calov was an Old Testament

---

<sup>105</sup> *Consilia Theologica Witebergensia*, 1:977-978.

<sup>106</sup> *Die Bekenntnisschriften*, 56.

professor. Its Old Testament citations are also not limited to the discussion of the Trinity and deity of Christ in the Old Testament. Genesis, Psalms, and Isaiah occur most frequently, but Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, II Samuel, Job, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, Hosea, and Micah are all represented. Second, the polemic employs the Lutheran Confessions in the text of the articles themselves. In the text, the CRFVL references the Athanasian Creed, CA, Apology, Catechisms, and the Smalcald Articles.<sup>107</sup> These confessions were selected because Helmstedt was technically bound to them confirming their deviations from their own official symbols. Third, the confession cites positively Luther, Melanchthon, Augustine, Jerome, Ambrose, and Justin in support of itself.<sup>108</sup> It condemns Vincent of Lerins as a pelagian heretic to undermine Calixtus' *consensus antiquitatis*, which is ultimately grounded in Vincent's definition of catholicity.<sup>109</sup> It even references the Heidelberg Catechism to show Lutherans and the Reformed are not in agreement over Baptism.<sup>110</sup>

In conclusion, this essay has shown that the union theology of Calixtus was made possible by his upbringing, education, and travels. This instilled in him an intellectual openness and a love for the ideal of antiquity. It was prompted by the Thirty Years' War, but ultimately influenced and based upon the thought of Cassander and de Dominis. This paper has further demonstrated that the content, structure, and polemic of the CRFVL were designed with a threefold objective, i.e., to demonstrate the theological chasm between the syncretists and orthodox; to prove that the syncretists had abandoned the symbols of which they were bound; and to show the syncretists had departed from the CA and therefore should be excluded from Lutheranism. What was the impact of the syncretistic controversy and the CRFVL? The answer to this question is far beyond the scope of this paper. Nevertheless, Valentine Ernst Loescher may shed some light on this issue when he writes, "In *Timotheus Verinus*, Part One I noted that one of the seeds of pietism was a lack of concern for the syncretistic ways of Calixtus. I lamented the fact that Dr. Glassius and Dr. Musaeus made light of Calixtus errors."<sup>111</sup> This thesis certainly may account for one factor in the rise of pietism and explain some of the impact of the syncretistic controversy. But above all, this passage shows that there is still much research to be done on the Age of Lutheran Orthodoxy and the syncretistic controversy.

---

<sup>107</sup> *Consilia Theologica Witebergensia*, 1:937, 940, 960, 961, 965, 970, 972, 976..

<sup>108</sup> *Consilia Theologica Witebergensia*, 1:951, 965, 969, 985.

<sup>109</sup> *Consilia Theologica Witebergensia*, 1:935.

<sup>110</sup> *Consilia Theologica Witebergensia*, 1:976.

<sup>111</sup> Valentin Ernst Loescher, *The Complete Timotheus Verinus*, trans. James L. Langebartels and Robert J. Koester, vol. 2. (Milwaukee: Northwestern Publishing House, 1998), 39.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Appold, Kenneth. "Abraham Calovs Auseinandersetzung mit der tridentischen Rechtfertigungslehre." In *Zur Rechtfertigungslehre in der Lutherischen Orthodoxie*, ed. Udo Sträter, 71-80. Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2003.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Abraham Calov's Doctrine of Vocatio in Its Systematic Context*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998.
- Baur, Jörg. "Die Helmstedter Lesart des Rechtfertigungsartikels und deren rechtgläubige Kritiker." In *Zur Rechtfertigungslehre in der Lutherischen Orthodoxie*, ed. Udo Sträter, 81-136. Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2003.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Die Pflicht geschichtlichen Gedenkens. Anlässlich Geburtstages von Abraham Calov." *LM* (1962): 230-232.
- Die Bekenntnisschriften der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche*. 11<sup>th</sup> ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992.
- Calixt, Georg. *Werke in Auswahl*. 8 vols. ed. Inge Mager. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970ff.
- Consensus Repetitus Fidei Vere Lutheranae in illis Doctrinae capitibus quae Contra puram & invariatae Augustanam Confessionem, aliosque libros Symbolicos in Formulae Concordiae comprehensos, scriptis publicis hodieque impugnant. D. Georgius Calixtus, Professor Helmstadiensis, eiusdemque complices. In gratiam Eorum, qui distantiam D. Calixti, Rintelensium, & aliorum Novatorum a fide Lutheranae in Synopsi intueri discipiunt, Ob Praesentem Ecclesiae necessitatem seorsim editus*. Wittebergae: Typis Johannis Borckardi, 1666.
- Consilia Theologica Witebergensia, Das ist/ Wittenbergische Geistliche Rathschläge Deß theuren Mannes Gottes/ D. Martini Lutheri, seiner Collegen, und treuen nachfolger/ von dem heiligen Reformation – Anfang/ biß auff jetzige Zeit/ in dem Namen der gesampten Theologischen Facultät außgestellte Urteil/ Bedenken/ und öffentliche Schriften*. 4 parts. Frankfurt am Mäyn: Balthasar Christoph Wusts, 1664.
- Dowding, C. *German Theology during the Thirty Years' War: The Life and Correspondence of George Calixtus*. Oxford: J. Henry and J. Parker, 1863.
- Engel, P. *Die eine Wahrheit in der gespaltenen Christenheit: Untersuchung zur Theologie Georg Calixts*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1976.
- Gaß, Wilhelm. *Georg Calixtus und der Syncretismus*. Breslau, 1846.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Geschichte der Protestantischen Dogmatik in ihrem Zusammenhange mit der Theologie überhaupt*. 4 vols. Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1854-67.
- Gerhard, Johann. *Loci Theologici*. ed. Ed. Preuss. 9 vols. Berlin: Gust. Schlawitz, 1863ff.
- Hans, Friedrich. *Georg Calixtus, der Unionsmann des 17. Jhs. Inwiefern sind seine Bestrebungen berechtigt?* Anklam, 1891.
- Henke, E.L.T. *Georg Calixtus und seine Zeit*. 2 vols. Halle, 1853-1860.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Inest theologorum Saxoniorum consensus repetitus fidei vere Lutheranae*. Marburgi: Typis Elwertii Academicus, 1846.
- Hunnus, Nicolaus. *Diaskepsis Theologica: A Theological Examination of the Fundamental Difference between Evangelical Lutheran Doctrine and Calvinist or Reformed Teaching*. Malone, TX: Repristination Press, 1999.
- Husung, M.J. "Georg Calixtus zu Helmstedt, ein gelehrter Drucker des 17. Jhs." *Gutenberg-Jahrbuch* 14 (1939): 293ff.
- Jacobi, Franz. "Das liebevolle Religionsgespräch zu Thorn 1645." *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 15 (1895): 345ff. and 465ff.

- Jung, Volker. *Das Ganze der Heiligen Schrift: Hermeneutik und Schriftauslegung bei Abraham Calov*. Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1999.
- Kantzenbach, Friedrich Wilhelm. *Das Ringen um Einheit der Kirchen im Jahrhundert der Reformation*. Stuttgart, 1957.
- Koch, Ernst. *Das konfessionelle Zeitalter – Katholizismus, Luthertum, Calvinismus (1563-1675)*. (Leipzig: Verlagsanstalt, 2000.
- Lessing, Gotthold Ephraim. *Gesammelte Werke*. ed. Raul Rilla, 10 vols. Berlin, 1954-1958.
- Loescher, Valentin Ernst. *The Complete Timotheus Verinus*. Trans. James L. Langebartels and Robert J. Koester. 2 vols. Milwaukee: Northwestern Publishing House, 1998.
- Löffler, Klemens. "Syncretism." In *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, ed. Charles G. Herbermann et. al., vol. 14, 383-384. New York: Robert Appleton Company, 1912.
- Luther, Martin. *Dr. Martin Luthers Sämtliche Schriften*. 23 vols. St. Louis: Lutherischer Concordia-Verlag, 1881-1910.
- Mager, Inge. *Georg Calixts theologische Ethik und ihre Nachwirkung*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969.
- Nischan, Bodo. "John Bergius: Irenicism and the Beginnings of Official Religious Toleration in Brandenburg Prussia." In *Lutherans and Calvinist in the Age of Confessionalism*, XII:389-404. Alderhot: Ashgate, 1999.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Reformed Irenicism and the Leipzig Colloquy." In *Lutherans and Calvinist in the Age of Confessionalism*, XIII:3-26. Alderhot: Ashgate, 1999.
- Rouse, Ruth, and Stephan Charles Neill. *A History of the Ecumenical Movement 1517-1948*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. London: S.P.C.K., 1967.
- Schaff, Philip. *The Creeds of Christendom with a History and Critical Notes*. 4<sup>th</sup> ed. 3 vols. New York and London: Harper & Brothers, Publishing, 1919.
- Schmid, Heinrich. *Geschichte der synkretistischen Streitigkeiten in der Zeit des Georg Calixt*. Erlangen, 1846.
- Schüssler, Hermann. *Georg Calixt: Theologie und Kirchenpolitik eine Studie zur Ökumenizität des Luthertums*. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag GMBH, 1961.
- Sehling, Emil. *Die evangelischen Kirchenordnungen des XVI. Jahrhunderts*. 1ff. vols. Leipzig: Reisland, 1902ff.
- Staemmler, Heinz. *Die Auseinandersetzung der kursächsischen Theologen mit dem Helmstedter Syncretismus. Eine Studie zum "Consensus Repetitus fidei vere Lutheranae" (1655)*. Texte und Studien zum Protestantismus des 16. bis 18. Jahrhunderts no. 4 Waltrop: Hartmut Spenner, 2005.
- Tholuck, August. *Das akademischen Leben des siebzehnten Jahrhunderts, mit besonderer Beziehung auf protestantische-theologische Facultäten Deutschlands*. Halle, 1853.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Der Geist der lutherischen Theologen Wittenbergs im Verlaufe des 17. Jahrhunderts*. Hamburg und Gotha: Friedrich und Andreas Perthes, 1852.
- Tschackert, Paul. "Syncretism, Syncretistic Controversies." In *The New Schaff-Herzog Religious Encyclopedia*, ed. Samuel Macauley Jackson, vol. 11, 219-223. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1949-1950.
- Uhlhorn, Friedrich. "Die Bedeutung Georg Calixts für die lutherische Kirche der welfischen Lande." *Zeitschrift der Geschichte für Niedersächsische Kirchengeschichte* 33 (1928): 201ff.

Walch, Johann Georg. *Historische und Theologische Einleitung in die Religions-Streitigkeiten Der Evangelisch-Lutherischen Kirchen, Von der Reformation an bis auf ietzige Zeiten*. 5 vols. Jena: Johann Meyers Witwe, 1730-1736.

Wallmann, Johannes. "Abraham Calov (1612-1686)." In *Theologische Realenzyklopädie*, vol. 7, 563-558. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1981.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Abraham Calov - theologischer Widerpart der Religionspolitik des Großen Kurfürsten." In *700 Jahre Wittenberg Stadt Universität Reformation*, ed. Stefan Oehmig, 303-311. Weimar: Verlag Hermann Böhlhaus Nachfolger, 1995.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Georg Calixt (1586-1656)." In *Theologische Realenzyklopädie*, vol. 7, 552-559. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1981.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Der Theologiebegriff bei Johann Gerhard und Georg Calixt*. Tübingen: Mohr, 1961.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Zwischen Reformation und Humanismus. Eigenart und Wirkungen Helmstedter Theologie unter Berücksichtigung Georg Calixts." In *Theologie und Frömmigkeit im Zeitalter des Barock: Gesammelte Aufsätze*, 61-86. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1995.

Wotschke, Theodor. "Aus Abraham Calovs Briefwechsel mit Niedersachsen." *Zeitschrift der Gesellschaft für niedersächsische Kirchengeschichte* 24 (1919): 1-57.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Brandenburgische Brief an Hülsemann and Calov." *Jahrbuch für brandenburgische Kirchengeschichte* 17 (1919): 48-80.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Calovs Historia syncretistica." *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 36 (1916): 425-458.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Kaspar Hermann Sandhagens Briefe an Abraham Calov." *Zeitschrift der Gesellschaft für niedersächsische Kirchengeschichte* 42 (1937): 306-313.

"Zur kirchlichen Chronik." *Der Lutheraner* 64 (April 7, 1908): 111-113.