

The German Lutheran Reaction to the Third Period of the Council of Trent*

By Robert Kolb

Recent discussion of the reaction of continental Protestants to the Council of Trent have focused chiefly on four themes: 1) initial responses to Pope Paul III's call to council in the 1530s; 2) the critique of the decision reached during its first period (1545-1547) – above all by John Calvin; 3) the presentations and the confessions prepared for presentation by representatives of the churches of electoral Saxony and Württemberg, in cooperation with Strassburg and other South German cities, during Trent's second period (1551-1552); and 4) the massive examination of the council's doctrinal decisions by Martin Chemnitz.¹

* An earlier version of this paper was delivered at the spring meeting of the American Society for Reformation Research, Kalamazoo, Michigan, May 4, 1979. Work on this study began at the Folger Shakespeare Library in Washington, continued with the aid of the Center for Reformation Research, St. Louis, and was completed at the Herzog August Bibliothek in Wolfenbüttel. I am deeply grateful to the staffs of these libraries for assistance (especially for that of Dr. Oliver K. Olson of the Herzog August Bibliothek) and also for financial support for my research from the Aid Association for Lutherans of Appleton, Wisconsin, and the Herzog August Bibliothek.

Abkürzungen

Admonitio Matthias FLACIUS: *Pia et necessaria admonitio* ... (cf. note 26)

Canon VON DEM CONCILIO ZU TRIENT (cf. note 25)

Norma Nicolaus GALLUS: *Norma simul ex praxis constitvendae religionis ac ecclesiae*, ... (cf. note 25)

Protestatio [Matthias FLACIUS; Nicolaus GALLUS]: *Protestatio* ... (cf. note 14)

Trent CANONS AND DECREES OF THE COUNCIL OF TRENT (cf. note 34)

- 1 On the *Protestant reaction to the Council in the 1530s*, see Hubert JEDIN: *A history of the Council of Trent*/ trans. by Ernest Graf. Vol. 1. StL 1957, 319-321. 335f; Robert STUPPERICH: *Die Reformation und das Tridentinum*. ARG 47 (1956), 20-63; Robert E. McNALLY: *The Council of Trent and the German Protestants*. Theological studies 25 (Baltimore, Md. 1964), 1-22; Wilhelm PAUCK: *Protestant reactions to the Council of Trent*. In: Wilhelm Pauck: *The heritage of the Reformation*. 2nd ed. Glencoe, Ill. 1961, 145-161; H[ans] VIRCK: *Zu den Beratungen der Protestanten über die Konzilsbulle vom 4. Juni 1536*. ZKG 13 (1892), 487-512; Ernst BIZER: *Die Wittenberger Theologen und das Konzil 1537: ein ungedrucktes Gutachten*.

Almost no attention has been focused on those critiques of the council and its decisions composed by German Lutherans during the third period of the council's meeting at Trent (1562-1563).

It has been suggested that after the Religious Peace of Augsburg of 1555 German Evangelicals had little reason to be interested in the council's decisions since the Peace quite safely secured them beyond the grasp of the papal politics which had attempted to bring them into submission through force of arms during the first period of the council, in the Smalcald War of 1546-1547.² This

ARG 47 (1956), 77-101; Eike WOLGAST: Das Konzil in den Erörterungen der kursächsischen Theologen und Politiker 1533-1537. ARG 73 (1982), 122-152; Walter DELIUS: Kurfürst Joachim II. von Brandenburg und das Konzil von Trient. In: Reformation und Humanismus: Robert Stupperich zum 65. Geburtstag/ ed. by Martin Greschat and J. F. G. Goeters. Witten 1969, 192-203; see also the discussion of one tract published in the Lutheran critique of the council aimed at the popular mind, Robert KOLB: A conversation between Pasquil and German: theological mood and method, 1537. Concordia theological monthly 41 (StL 1970), 131-145. On Calvin's reaction to Trent, see Robert M. KINGDON: Some French reactions to the Council of Trent. ChH 33 (1964), 149-156, and Theodore W. CASTEEL: Calvin and Trent: Calvin's reaction to the Council of Trent in the context of his conciliar thought. HThR 63 (1970), 91-117. On the Protestant attendance at Trent during the council's second period, see the text of the CONFESSIO VIRTEMBERGICA/ ed. by Ernst Bizer. S 1952; Helmut MEYER: Die deutschen Protestanten an der zweiten Tagungsperiode des Konzils von Trient 1551/52. ARG 56 (1965), 166-209; Peter MEINHOLD: Die Protestanten am Konzil zu Trient. In: Il Concilio di Trento e la Riforma Tridentina/ Vol. I. Roma 1965, 277-315; Martin BRECHT: Abgrenzung oder Verständigung: Was wollten die Protestanten in Trient? BLWKG 70 (1970), 148-175; Delius, 203-207; Walter FRIEDENSBURG: Zur Konzilspolitik der Stadt Straßburg 1551. In: Festschrift für Georg Wolfram = Elsaß-Lothringisches Jahrbuch 8 (1929), 192-210. Later Lutherans all looked to Martin Chemnitz for the authoritative critique of the Council of Trent: Martin CHEMNITZ: Examen Concilii Tridentini. F 1578/ ed. by Eduard Preuß. B 1861, translated by Fred Kramer as Martin CHEMNITZ: Examination of the Council of Trent. 2 vols. StL 1971, 1979. Already by the early seventeenth century this work attracted the focus of theological study to itself, e.g. in DISPUTATIO I. PRO EXAMINE CONCILII TRIDENTINI CONSCRIPTO A ... MARTINO CHEMNICO ... sub praesidio Salominis Gesneri. Wittenberg 1602, and a series of thirty-eight additional disputations under Gesner's direction published over the subsequent two years. See the more recent studies of Reinhold MUMM: Die Polemik des Martin Chemnitz gegen das Konzil von Trient. L 1905; Arthur L. OLSEN: Martin Chemnitz and the Council of Trent. Dialog 2 (MP 1963), 60-67; and OLSEN: Scripture and tradition in the theology of Martin Chemnitz. Cambridge, Mass. 1966 – Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University, Ph. D. diss., 1966; Fred KRAMER: Chemnitz on the authority of the Sacred Scripture: an examination of the Council of Trent. The Springfielder 37 (Springfield, Ill. 1973), 2-13.

² Pauck, 150; McNally, 21.

judgment fails to take into account evidence from a large number of authors of the period. It overlooks the fear that imperial and papal forces would break that peace, a besetting fear among Protestants especially in the 1560s and 1570s. Further, it ignores the concern for the doctrinal issues which divided Roman Catholic from Evangelical; these issues were being intensely debated by the theologians of the two sides on Lutheran missionary frontiers and in established centers of learning as the council held the sessions of its final, third period, coincident with Jesuit initiatives toward Counter-Reformation in western and southern Germany. It is interesting to note that already in the mid 1550s the decrees of Trent's earlier sessions had begun to provide German Evangelicals a focus for those debates, for they were already then regarding Trent's decrees as a most significant summary of the papal doctrine which they rejected and condemned. In 1557, under the auspices of Duke Johann Albrecht of Mecklenburg, the duke's theological counselors drew up a confession designed to heal the rifts which had developed over the previous decade within the Wittenberg movement. That document affirmed that the confession of the truth of the gospel involved rejection of the »decrees of the council of Trent and all corruptions of doctrine and idolatrous worship practices which the pope or Roman Antichrist holds«. Significantly, the Mecklenburgers proceeded immediately to link Trent's doctrines with the recatholicizing Augsburg Interim, which Emperor Charles V had attempted to impose upon the Evangelical estates of Germany in 1548.³

The developments surrounding the Augsburg Interim had contributed a great deal to the creation of parties within the Saxon Reformation in the years immediately following Luther's death in 1546. In turn, these divisions influenced the form of the critiques of Trent composed by German Lutherans as they publicly discussed the council during its second and third periods, in 1551-1552

3 *Narratio pacificationis inter Adiaphoristas et Magdeburgen. per legatos Mecklenburg 1557. in Febr. tractatae* (Herzog August Bibliothek, Wolfenbüttel; Cod. Guelph. 79 Helmst.), 263^v-264^r. Later sixteenth century German Evangelical literature frequently viewed the decisions of the Council of Trent as the summary of the papal doctrine which they were opposing, e.g. a declaration issued by Lutheran pastors in Austria (*FORMULA VERITATIS*. [n.p.] 1582, A4-B). Allusions to the political as well as the religious tensions between Roman Catholics and Evangelicals in this period are made by Lewis W. SPITZ: *Imperialism, particularism, and toleration in the Holy Roman Empire*. In: *The Massacre of St. Bartholomew*/ ed. by Alfred Soman. The Hague 1974, esp. 76f.

and 1562-1563. Among the Wittenberg graduates who filled pulpits throughout Saxony and other parts of Germany, a conservative party, which modern scholars have labeled »Philippist« because of its members' devotion to Philip Melanchthon, disputed against a more radical set of Luther's and Melanchthon's students, the so-called »Gnesio-Lutherans«. The third major Evangelical party, the Swabians, stood somewhat apart from the center of these disputes; its members were primarily connected with the court of Duke Christoph of Württemberg and stood under the theological influence of Johann Brenz.⁴

1 Earlier Reactions to Trent

The parties took different approaches to the Council of Trent already in 1551, in reaction to the invitation issued by Pope Julius III to the Protestants to attend the sessions of the council's second period. The governments of Württemberg and Saxony instructed their theologians, led by Brenz and Melanchthon respectively, to compose confessions for presentation at the council. Brenz favored attendance at the council, among other reasons, because the emperor had commanded it; in general, Brenz believed strongly in strict obedience to the higher powers.⁵ So did Melanchthon, who also had long favored and had engaged in negotiations to attempt the reconciliation of Rome and Wittenberg.⁶ Several German Evangelical governments did in fact dispatch delegations to Trent to

4 On these party divisions see Robert KOLB: Dynamics of party conflict in the Saxon late Reformation, Gnesio-Lutherans vs. Philippists. *The journal of modern history* 49 (Chicago, Ill. 1977), D 1289-1305.

5 So argues Meinhold, 292; on Brenz's attitude toward government, see also James M. ESTES: Church order and the Christian magistrate according to Johannes Brenz. *ARG* 59 (1968), 5-24; ESTES: Christian magistrate and state church: the reforming career of Johannes Brenz. Toronto 1982.

6 On the Regensburg colloquy of 1541, the climax of Melanchthon's efforts at resolving Roman Catholic-Evangelical differences, see Peter MATHESON: Cardinal Contarini at Regensburg. Oxford 1972. It is true that when his own prince had been in revolt against the emperor, Melanchthon and his Philippist colleagues supported that action; once Moritz became his overlord, he changed that stance and remained faithful to his former position on obedience to the immediate overlord; see Luther D. PETERSON: The Philippist theologians and the Interims of 1548: soteriological, ecclesiastical, and liturgical compromises and controversies within German Lutheranism. Madison, Wis. 1974, 447-490 – Madison, Wis., Univ. of Wisconsin, Ph. Diss., 1974.

participate in the council, among them Elector Joachim II of Brandenburg. Representatives of Württemberg and of Strassburg attended sessions in early 1552, presented their confession, and then left the city as the council was breaking up; it adjourned in part because of fear that Melanchthon's prince, Elector Moritz of Saxony, would descend upon the city with his troops. Moritz had dispatched secular counselors to Trent and had sent Melanchthon and other theologians on their way as well, but the theologians were recalled when Moritz's military designs against the Hapsburgs progressed rapidly in early 1552.

The confessions and stance of these two parties have been treated in recent scholarship, as noted above; the stance of the third party within German Lutheranism at this time toward the council at Trent has not received such treatment. The Gnesio-Lutherans steadfastly opposed any involvement with the papal council at Trent. None of them served major princes at court in 1551, so they felt little political pressure to become so involved. Furthermore, this party had boldly opposed and sharply criticized the attempt of Emperor Charles V to resolve the »Lutheran question« through his »Augsburg Interim« of April 1548, and they had also strongly repudiated the attempt of Elector Moritz to appear to be complying with the imperial religious settlement of the »Augsburg Interim« by having his theologians compose the »Leipzig Interim« of December 1548. Under siege by Moritz's imperially commissioned troops in the city of Magdeburg, a number of pastors exiled by the enforcement of the Interims, the core of the incipient Gnesio-Lutheran party, issued the Magdeburg »Confession« in April 1550. This document rejected the validity of imperial authority exercised against their faith, and by 1551 and 1552 the Gnesio-Lutherans were certainly not yet prepared to attend a papal council merely because the emperor had commanded it. Furthermore, the Gnesio-Lutherans rejected more decisively than the Philippists the external ecclesiastical usages of the medieval church, and they separated themselves further and more firmly from the papal party than did the Philippists.⁷ Thus, quite typically, Nikolaus von Amsdorf rejected

7 Kolb: Dynamics of party conflict, D 1297-1302; cf. Peterson, 113-214 on the Leipzig Interim, and 312-446 on the subsequent »adiaphoristic controversy« on the Interim, as well as Robert Kolb: Nikolaus von Amsdorf (1483-1565): popular polemics in the preservation of Luther's legacy. Nieuwkoop 1978, 69-122, on one Gnesio-Lutheran's opposing stance. On the Magdeburg Confession, see Oliver K. Olson: Theology of revolution: Magdeburg, 1550-1551. SCJ 3 (1972) 1, 56-79.

the urging of those who wanted Lutherans to pray for the council in 1551. Locked in battle with his former friends in the Philippist camp over their compromises with medieval forms of church life and teaching in the »Leipzig Interim«, von Amsdorf regreted that the Council of Trent was restoring power and respectability to the pope. However, it must be noted that he did not regard the council as so dangerous a threat to the gospel as the Philippists were – since the council was openly identified with the Antichrist while the conservative Lutherans of the »Leipzig Interim« advanced the Antichrist's cause while masquerading as Evangelicals, in von Amsdorf's opinion. That opinion reflected the bitterness of his sense of betrayal at the hands of friends.⁸

Von Amsdorf had resided at Magdeburg with a number of younger colleagues, among them his friends, Matthias Flacius and Nikolaus Gallus. They, too, challenged the council at Trent in 1551. Flacius had first attacked the papal council and had called for a free council in 1549, when he issued three pseudonymous tracts, the chief purpose of which was to oppose the »Augsburg Interim«.⁹ Together he and Gallus reissued a rejection of the council which had been first published in 1546 in the name of all the estates of the »Augsburg Confession«. Because they could not undermine divine truth by recognizing papal authority or supremacy, this document had stated, these estates were appealing to a »universal, free, Christian council outside the control of a single party« for an examination of their cause. This document outlined seven reasons why the

8 Nikolaus von AMSDORF: Das itzund die rechte zeit sey Christum vnd sein Wort zu bekennen vnd auff keine andere zu warten sey ... Magdeburg 1551, B. Bij, cf. also in Nikolaus von AMSDORFF: *Ausgewählte Schriften*/ ed. by Otto Lerche. GÜ 1938, 30-31. 34. 48, comments from his: *Antwort, Glaub vnd Bekenntnis auff das schoene vnd liebliche INTERIM*. Magdeburg 1548, and similar comments from his: *Eine erinnerung an die Deutschen das die einfeltigen jhre Sunde so sie diese funff jar her gethan haben erkennen vnd bekennen sollen sich bekeren vnd bessern* ... Magdeburg [1550?], 56f. Von Amsdorf also prepared a critique of Trent's decree on justification which remained in manuscript form: *Propositiones de Justificatione ad Conciliabulum Tridentinum A. 1551* (Nationale Forschungs- und Gedenkstätten der klassischen deutschen Literatur in Weimar, Goethe-Schiller-Archiv, Ehemalige Thüringische Landesbibliothek: Band 40, 374'-377'. Von AMSDORF had earlier set down basic principles regarding Evangelical reaction to a papal council in his: *Cogitationes Nicolae Amsdorfii de concilio nunquam futuro si per papa liceat*. Magdeburg 1535.

9 Johann WAREMUND [= Flacius]: *Ein gemeine protestation vnd Klagschrifft aller frommen Christen wieder das Interim vnnd andere geschwinde anschlege vnnd grausame verfolgung der widersacher des Euangelij* ... [n.p.] 1549, B^o-Bij^r on the tyranny of the recent council, and Bij^r on the need for a free council.

adherents of the »Augsburg Confession« felt compelled to reject the call to council at Trent. The pope had no right to call a council; in the Old Testament and in the early church political leaders had convened councils. Papal legates had promised the imperial diets that a free council would be held in Germany, but Trent could not qualify as a German city. Nor was it safe there for Protestants since the pope had placed them under his ban. The council was not universal because Roman sympathizers controlled it tightly and because the laity was excluded, in violation of New Testament and patristic practice. Trent was not a free council because the Evangelicals had already been condemned by those who dominated its decisions. It was not a Christian council because it would not listen to the Word of Christ. Although Christians were in attendance at the council, the pope and his followers represented the devil, not God, as could be seen from the pope's doctrinal errors and his moral turpitude. Finally, the pope could not be the final judge in a matter to which he was party, and yet his legates completely controlled the actions of the council. The thrust of this appeal, issued in 1546, echoed earlier memoranda written in anticipation of the papal council during the 1530s, and it would find echoes in the critiques of the council issued by German Lutherans in the early 1560s.¹⁰

In 1551 Flacius and Gallus added their own comments to this »Re-

10 RECUSATIONSSCHRIFT DER CHRISTLICHEN AUGSPURGISCHEN CONFESSIONSVERWANDTEN STENDE WIDDER DAS VERMEINT VON BAPST PAULO DEM DRITTEN, WEILANDT ZU TRIENT INDICIRT VND ANGEFANGEN CONCILIUM, SAMPT EINER GEBERLICHEN PROVOCATION VND ERBIETUNG, AUFF EIN ALLGEMEIN ODER NATIONAL, FREY, CHRISTLICH VND VNPARTEISCH CONCILIUM INN DEUDTSCHEN LANDEN/ mit einer Vorrede Matth. Fla. Illyr. vnd Nicolai Galli. Magdeburg 1551 reprints the text of RECUSATIONSSCHRIFT IN WELCHER ALLE PROTESTIERENDE RELIGIONS VND EYNUNGS VERWANDTE STENDE RECHTMESSIGE VND ERGRUNDT VRSACH ANZEIGEN, WARUMB JRE CHUR VND F. G. VND SIE DAS VERMEINT VON BAPST PAULO DEM DRITTEN ZU TRIENT ANGESETZT CONCILIUM ZUBESUCHEN NIT SCHULDIG NOCH AUCH DASSELBE DEM BAPST DES ORTS VBER DIE AUFFGERICHTE REICHSABSCHIED VNND BESCHEHENEN VERTROSTUNGEN ANZUSTELLEN GEBURT HABE. Nuremberg 1546. Christian August SALIG: Vollstaendige Historie Des Tridentischen Conciliums. Vol. 1. Halle 1741, 420-434, labeled this the second »Recusationsschrift«, the first he identified with the document issued at Smalcald by the Smalcald League in 1537 (I, 126). This document, issued in 1546, echoes the themes set, e.g., in the memorandum edited by Bizer: Die Wittenberger Theologen . . . , 47. Flacius also issued about 1551 EINE PROPHETISCHE ABCONTERFEIHUNG DES TRIDENTISCHEN CONCILIABULI, DURCH D. MARTINUM LUTHERUM/ mit einer erklerung M. Fl. Illyr. Magdeburg [n.d.], in which he attacked »Interimists« and »Adiaphorists« (i.e., the Philippists) who want to set the Roman »Beerwolff« against the church and the »third Elijah« (Luther).

cusationschrift«, which had been composed five years earlier. They charged that the pope, whom they labeled the Antichrist, was threatening to destroy the gospel with deceit and brute force. He had used deceit in calling a council and then postponing its opening and switching its locale until he could mount an armed attack upon the Evangelicals. Then »with murder and arson« the pope dispatched Evangelical leaders of church and state to the grave or to prison through the Smalcald War, and he imposed the »Augsburg Interim« upon the Evangelical churches, reducing the number of their adherents from a great multitude to a small remnant.

Flacius and Gallus exaggerated Evangelical losses, but these bitter words reflect their deep frustration and resentment against the Roman party as a result of the war and the Interim. They were convinced that Emperor Charles V and Pope Paul III had carefully coordinated a conspiracy which employed the council and the war to coerce the Evangelicals to return to the Roman obedience. Such careful coordination did not in fact take place between an emperor and a pope whose relationships were somewhat strained during this period. But there was sufficient reason in the appearance and course of events for Flacius and Gallus to suspect collusion. Gallus had been forced to flee Regensburg because of the enforcement of the »Augsburg Interim« imposed by imperial forces upon the city, and Flacius, whose uncle had been jailed and done to death by church officials in Venice, had left his position in Wittenberg because of tensions growing out of the imposition of the »Augsburg Interim« and his differences with Melanchthon over the proper Evangelical reaction to it.¹¹ Both men were partisans of Elector John Frederick of Saxony, who had lost his title, much of his lands, and his personal freedom as a result of his defeat in the Smalcald War; in 1551 he remained yet a prisoner after four years in Charles V's custody.

The reconconvocation of the council in 1551 simply meant, as far as Flacius and Gallus were concerned, that after four years the pope was reviving the council to mount once again a campaign to eradicate the gospel. Against the decision of Melanchthon and Brenz and their colleagues in electoral Saxony and Württemberg to attend the council, Flacius and Gallus urged from embattled Magdeburg

11 On Gallus, see Hartmut VOIT: Nikolaus Gallus: ein Beitrag zur Reformationsgeschichte der nachlutherischen Zeit. Neustadt a. d. Aisch 1977, 62-107; on Flacius, Wilhelm PRAGER: Matthias Flacius Illyricus. Vol. 1. Erlangen 1859 (rpt., Nieuwkoop and Hildesheim, 1964), 13-75.

that Christ's example before the high priest set the course for the adherents of the Augsburg Confession. As Christ had stood silent before his accusers, so the Evangelicals should stay away from the council, following the practice of the ancient Fathers of the church, who had absented themselves from councils of which they were suspicious. Flacius and Gallus feared that Evangelical attendance at Trent would only help bestow a legitimacy upon the council which they believed it did not have, and that would only frustrate the course of the gospel by ending all hope for a free, Christian council in Germany. Following their preface Flacius and Gallus cited an attack on the papal council from Luther's preface to his 1545 tract, »Against the papacy at Rome, founded by the Devil«. To it they appended a sarcastic blast at their Philippist foes and the new confession which had been prepared for presentation at Trent: the Philippists were able to do better than the stubborn Luther; they had written a better confession than the »Augustana«. For Flacius and Gallus their battle against the Philippists and their battle against the papacy were one battle, and Melancthon's plans to attend Trent offered confirmation of that conviction.¹²

The frustration and disgust of the Gnesio-Lutherans over their former colleagues' actions in the Interims period led Flacius to issue a collection of documents relating to the council sometime between 1554 and 1561. His »Certain documents of pope and monarchies on the Council of Trent« contained correspondence and memoranda from the papal, imperial, and French courts written between 1547 and 1551, relating to Charles V's and Henry II's complaints regarding the location and conduct of the council. The preface sets forth Flacius' three reasons for publishing the book. First, it should call to repentance »all men of our doctrine« who had taken part in the war against Elector John Frederick of Saxony and against the Magdeburgers, for the documents revealed, Flacius was certain, that the Smalcald War had indeed been waged for the purpose of suppressing Evangelical doctrine. Secondly, Flacius and his colleagues had been mocked because of their fears that attendance at the council in 1551 would betray the Evangelical cause for no good reason at all;

12. *Recusationschrift* ... 1551, A^v-Aiiij^v; Luther's preface is found on Aiiij^v-Aiiij^v; from *Wider das Papsttum zu Rom, vom Teufel gestiftet*, 1545 (WA 54, 206, 17–207, 30). Anonymous tracts on the Council of Trent appeared during this period, e.g. the dialog piece *WAS VOM DEM IETZT AUSGESCHRIEBENEN TRIDENTISCHEN CONCILIO ZU HALTEN SEY, DREY GESPRECH*. [n.p.] 1551, which would seem to come from the Magdeburg circle. Dr. Luther D. Peterson called it to my attention.

these documents demonstrated, he believed, how the pope had deceived monarchs and mocked the Württemberg-Strassburg delegation which did go to Trent. Finally, the documents showed that the council was neither universal nor free nor Christian nor legitimate. The preface closed with a bitter reference which reminded the reader of the coincidence of the convocation of the council and the war against the Evangelicals.¹³

II Reactions to the Third Period of Trent

The Smalcald War and the subsequent battle with the Philippists did not command all their attention in 1563 as Flacius and Gallus once again turned their attention to Trent. By 1563 their works were also pointing forward to a new age of inter-confessional polemic. Nonetheless, their treatments of the council published that year did contain occasional – but forceful – allusions to the persecutions of 1547 and 1548. More importantly, still in 1563 what they wrote about the council was framed by their conviction that the council, the war, and the »Augsburg Interim« were part of one conspiracy against the gospel – and the council was being convened once again. The Smalcald War and the Interims had marked these men for life.¹⁴

Robert Stupperich has credited Flacius with being »the only energetic spokesman on the Protestant side regarding the council« at the time of its conclusion.¹⁵ Yet it is not quite correct to infer that only the Gnesio-Lutheran party

13 SCRIPTA QUAEDAM PAPAE ET MONARCHARUM, DE CONCILIO TRIDENTINO, AD COGNOSCENDAM UERITATEM ADMODUM LECTU UTILIA NUNC PRIMUM IN PUBLICUM EDITA/ cum praefatione Mathiae Flacij Illyrici. Basel [n.d.]. There is no mention of a reconocation of the council, so the work must have been composed before 1560; it labels Elector John Frederick »of pious memory« and thus must postdate 1554 (further, it quotes Pietro Paulo VERGERIO: Concilium non modo Tridentinum sed omne papisticum perpetuo fugiendum esse omnibus piis. [n.p.] 1553.

14 [Matthias Flacius; Nicolaus Gallus]: PROTESTATIO CONCIONATORVM ALIQVOT AVGVSTANAE CONFESSIONIS, ADVERSUS CONVENTUM TRIDENTINUM, PERNICIEM UERAЕ RELIGIONI & ECCLESIAE MOLIENTEM: & ADVERSUS EIUS CONVENTUS AUTOREM ANTICHRISTUM ROMANUM... [n.p.] 1563, 32. 43. 76f. 92; [Matthias Flacius]: TREWE WARNUNG, FÜR DEM HOCHSCHEDLICHEN BETRUG DES BAPSTS VNND SEINES CONCILIJ, DAMIT SIE VNDTER EINEM SCHEIN DES NACHGEBENS ETLICHER GERINGER ARTICKEL DIE EINFELTIGEN CHRISTEN ZU ALLEN JREN GREWELN ZWINGEN, VND AUFFS HOCHSTE VERBINDEN WOLLEN. [n.p.] 1563.

15 Stupperich, 61f; on the brief against Trent published by Charles Dumoulin in 1564, see Kingdon, 151-153.

raised a voice against council during its third period. It is significant to note, however, that it was Gnesio-Lutheran theologians who placed their critique of the council before the German-reading public in 1563 while it was still in session.

1 The Official Reaction by the Evangelical Estates (1561-1564)

In contrast, the combined Evangelical estates of Germany, under the leadership of Württemberg, Saxony, and Hesse, placed their objections to the council in memorandum form before a much more restricted audience, the emperor and other European monarchs. They permitted only a very brief Latin rejoinder to the papal invitation to be published immediately (if indeed that undated »Succinct response« did appear in 1561). The official memoranda of the Evangelical estates composed in opposition to the reconvened council were kept from publication for more than two years.

Pope Pius IV published his intent to reconvene the council in 1560, and two papal legates, Zacharias Delphino and Giovanni Francesco Commendo, delivered a papal invitation to attend the council to the German Evangelical princes at the diet which they were holding at Naumburg in January 1561. The diet had been called to resolve the doctrinal divisions afflicting the German Evangelical movement. It failed to do so, in part because of the protest of the duke of Saxony, John Frederick the Middler, who had long inclined toward the Gnesio-Lutherans and who stood yet at this point under the influence of Flacius' thinking (though he was moving toward a final rift with his leading theologian during 1561). The princes also failed to resolve the problem of how to respond to the papal invitation to council although they did reject it in the form delivered. This rejection appeared in print, a brief, four-leaf tract in Latin, not designed for popular consumption.¹⁶ The princes at Naumburg referred the question of attendance at the council to a special committee of counselors, which met at Erfurt in April 1561 and reviewed several memoranda prepared for discussion.

¹⁶ POSTULATA PII QUARTI PONTIFICIS ROMANI NOMINE, IN CONSESSU PRINCIPUM GERMANORUM, NAUMBURGI CONGREGATORUM, PROPOSITA, NON. FEBR. ANNO M.D.LXI. ITEM SUCCINCTA PRINCIPUM AD EADEM ILLA POSTULATA RESPONSIO. ANNO M.D. LXI. [n.p.: n.d.]. Undoubtedly, theologians throughout Evangelical Germany were consulted by their governments and produced memoranda with similar points of view, as did the superintendent of the churches of Ulm, Ludwig Rabus, in a memorandum composed in 1562, Stadtarchiv Ulm 9059 (formerly X.52.2), 98f. Rabus urged the council to ask the emperor to institute a new, truly Christian council.

Among them was an explanation setting forth reasons why the Evangelical princes would not send delegations to Trent, directed to Emperor Ferdinand II; in addition, the committee considered at least two memoranda which rejected the council's legitimacy and criticized key articles of Roman Catholic doctrine. One of these memoranda came from the electoral Saxon Court; another was drafted in its final form by a secular counselor from Strassburg, Dr. Ludwig Grempp, a former professor of law at the University of Tübingen, whom Duke Christoph of Württemberg had commissioned for this task. The Erfurt documents were reviewed and revised once again by another committee which met at Fulda in September 1561, and the address to the emperor and the electoral Saxon version of the rejection of the council were chosen as the documents which would register the Evangelical estates' formal protest against Trent. They were presented to Ferdinand a year later at the imperial diet at Frankfurt am Main. The electoral Saxon critique, along with the estates' letter to the emperor and their reply to the papal legates at Naumburg, was published in 1564. The Evangelical governments also resolved to have the Grempp critique published anonymously. It appeared first in 1564 also and was translated into Latin for publication the following year by one of Grempp's lawyer colleagues in Strassburg, Lorenz Tuppe.¹⁷

17 Grempp's career is briefly outlined in ALLGEMEINE DEUTSCHE BIOGRAPHIE. Vol. 9. L 1879, 687f. On the Naumburg diet's dealings with the papal legates, see Robert CALINICH: Der Naumburger Fürstentag, 1561. Gotha 1870, 188-208; Heinrich HEPPE: Geschichte des deutschen Protestantismus in den Jahren 1555-1581. Vol. 1. Marburg 1852, 395-401; on the Erfurt meeting, Calinich, 340-377; Heppé 1, 421-429; on the Fulda meeting and the presentation of the documents to the emperor, Calinich, 377-382; Heppé 1, 485-488. Heppé reprinted the statement addressed to the emperor, 1 (Beilage 41), 149-155. In February 1561 the papal legate Commendo had also met with Elector Joachim II of Brandenburg in an attempt to induce him to send a delegation to Trent again, Delius, 209-211.

The letter to the emperor, the electoral Saxon document, and the response given at Naumburg to the papal legates were printed under the title CAUSAE CUR ELECTORES, PRINCIPES ALIQUE AUGUSTANAE CONFESSIONIS CONIUNCTI STATUS AD IMPIMUM CONCILIUM A PONTIFICE PIO IV. TRIDENTI INDICTUM NON ACCEDANT. Wittenberg 1564. A German translation, »Gründlicher Bericht vnd warhafftig Erklerung Deren Vrsachen / warumb die Durchleuchtigen Chur vnd Fuersten / vnd sunst die Stende der Augspurgischen Confession zugethan / das verdecktig / vermaint vom Bapst Pio Quarto verkuendigt Tridentisch Concilium nicht haben besuchen wollen / An die Roem. Kay. May. geschrieben«, appeared in Melchior von HAIMINSSFELD: Reichshandlung und andere dess H. Roemischen Reichs Acta ... Von Macht und Gewalt dess Keyserns und Bapsts ... Hanau 1609, 194-215. The Grempp memorandum was published under

The letter of the estates to the emperor and the official memorandum accompanying it repeated themes from the »Recusationsschrift« of 1546 (and thus from the Evangelical deliberations on the papal call to council of the 1530s) and appealed to the case made earlier against a council conducted under papal auspices. Not only had the papal council not been free, universal, and Christian; many of the decrees of its earlier sittings contradicted God's Word. Without going into detail the memorandum called attention to Trent's errors on tradition, original sin, and justification, for example. The Evangelical estates both expressed fear that the pope was massing forces in the spirit of the Antichrist so that he might eradicate the Evangelicals and, at the same time, these estates called for the repudiation of Trent's earlier decrees and the convening of a free, ecumenical council at which Scripture, not the traditions of the Roman party, would be the norm.

Grempp began his critique by outlining twelve reasons why Evangelicals were compelled to reject the council. It was illegitimate because the pope, not a secular official, had convened it; convocation by a temporal leader had been the practice of God's people in the Old Testament and in the early church. The council did not offer safety for Evangelical participants. It was not a truly ecumenical, free, or Christian council which had convened at Trent. The popes who had called it were guilty of many crimes; above all, Grempp stressed those connected with finances, such as simony. The Roman party was in serious doctrinal error on twenty-four specific articles of faith,¹⁸ and it cultivated superstition in its cultic life. The papacy was further guilty of tyranny over the

the title *STÄTTLICHE AUSSFÜHRUNG DER VRSACHEN DARUMBEN DIE CHUR VVND FÜRSTEN AUCH ANDERE STENDE DER AUGSPURGISCHEN CONFESSION DES BAPST PII III. AUSSGESCHRIEBEN VERMEYNT CONCILIIUM, SO ER GEGEN TRIENT ANGESETZT NIT BESUCHEN KHUNDEN . . .* [n.p.] 1564; Strassburg 1566, trans. by Tuppe under the title *ADVERSUS SYNODI TRIDENTINAE RESTITUTIONEM SEU CONTINUATIONEM A PIO IIII, PONTIFICE INDICTAM, OPPOSITA GRAUAMINA . . .* Strassburg: Emmel, 1565; second edition printed by Gabriel Carterius, 1597. See Salig 2, 518-528.

- ¹⁸ Grempp (*Stättliche Aussführung . . .*, 135-244) sets forth a critique of Roman Catholic teaching on the invocation of the saints, statues and images, mediation between God and man, Christ's merits and human works, the Lord's Supper, original sin, freedom of the will, justification, faith and assurance, the distinction of law and gospel, the perfect keeping of the law, Christ's passion and death, the state of the dead and purgatory, reconciliation and divine grace, the number of sacraments, baptism, the gifts of the Holy Spirit, repentance, the mode of expiating sin, communion in both kinds, the ministry of the gospel, marriage, extreme unction, and papal traditions.

church; in sharp, well-ordered but brief sections Grempp attacked papal claims to secular power and to primacy within the church. Furthermore, Trent's earlier decrees had been impious; Grempp examined a number to illustrate their errors, including those on the Apocrypha, the traditions of the church, concupiscence, justification, the assurance of faith, purgatory, the number of sacraments, and the *ex opere operato* nature of the sacraments. Papal councils have caused more discord than they have abated, Grempp asserted. Papal arrogance, contempt for secular rulers, and abuse of the ban demonstrated for him the basic nature of the papacy. Finally, Trent had to be rejected because acceptance of the council would mean rejection of the truth and would thus damage the Christian conscience. Throughout this critique Grempp cited Scripture as well as patristic, medieval, and contemporary authorities at length. The work concludes with a list of ten conditions which the Evangelical estates stipulated as necessary conditions for their participation in a council: that it be convoked by the emperor, on German soil, with all interested parties – who were genuinely concerned for the truth, and were enemies of sophism, spiritual, learned, holy in life, zealous in piety, and God-fearing – in attendance; with laity – both princes and men of lower estate – playing a role in its decisions; with representatives from all parts of the universal church; without control by papal bishops and clerics; without submission to Trent's prior decrees; under the leadership of a Christian judge; with Scripture alone as the norm; and with the authority of the Fathers and councils subject to Scriptural authority.¹⁹

Like the official Evangelical memorandum of 1561, this document reflects the same concerns and takes the same positions toward the council which the Evangelicals had taken in their earliest responses to Pope Paul III's call for a council to assemble at Mantua a quarter century earlier. It built upon the »Recusationschrift« of the Evangelical estates published first in 1546. But it appeared in Latin and after the conclusion of the council as part of a well-ordered, governmental offensive against the Counter-Reformation, an offensive which centered around diplomatic efforts within the imperial diet, not around a popular publicity campaign.

19 Ibid., on Trent's earlier decrees, 393-465; on the condition for Evangelical participation in a council, 490-578.

2 *The Critiques of Trent by Flacius and Gallus (1563)*

In contrast, the Gnesio-Lutherans – although they also appealed to the emperor's son and issued Latin critiques of the council for the educated to digest – addressed the threat which they perceived in the Council of Trent with longer and shorter pieces in German, designed to sound the warning against papal tyranny among nobles and townsmen who would read their publications. In 1562 Cyriakus Spangenberg, who had studied with Flacius and Gallus at Wittenberg in the early 1540s and joined them in a number of common polemical causes in the 1550s and 1560s, included a very brief and superficial critique of the papal council in an attack against seven recent Roman Catholic publications, among them Pope Pius IV's bull of 1560 reconvening the council.²⁰

A much more sophisticated series of critiques of Trent came from the city of Regensburg, where Flacius had recently joined Gallus, superintendent of the city's churches since 1553. They published two works in one large volume in 1563. The first of these was a »Declaration of a number of preachers of the Augsburg Confession against the Council of Trent, which strives for the destruction of true religion and the true church, and against the originator of this assembly, the Roman Antichrist«. ²¹ Although Flacius was moving toward a

20 Cyriakus SPANGENBERG: *Wider die böse Sieben ins Teufels Karnöffelspiel*. [n.p.] 1562, iij. A-Diij. The Gnesio-Lutheran authors of the *MAGDEBURG CENTURIES* did not develop their treatment of the Council of Trent so far as we can tell. In the unpublished manuscript fragments relating to the sixteenth century are to be found two overviews of the Tridentine sessions from 1546 to December 1563. But no critical evaluation is present in these manuscripts, at the Herzog August Bibliothek, Wolfenbüttel, Cod. Guelph. 11.20 Aug fol, 173-217, and Cod. Guelph. 6.5 Aug fol, 800-819^f; the former appears to be an expansion of the latter. See the observations of Heinz SCHEIBLE: *Der Plan der Magdeburger Zenturien und ihre ungedruckte Reformationsgeschichte*. HD 1960, 195 f. – HD, Univ., Th. Diss., 1960.

21 See note 14. No indication of authorship is given, but since both Flacius and Gallus seem to have worked on the second half of this volume, see note 25, it seems safe to assume that the two of them worked together on this major summary of their position. Among the most prominent of those who subscribed the *Protestatio* were Simon Musaeus, Tilemann Hesshus, Georg and Johann Friedrich Coelestin, Johann Wigand, Matthaeus Judex, Joachim Westphal, Anton Otto, Andreas Poach, and Joachim Magdeburg.

In the Herzog August Bibliothek, Cod. Guelph. 75 Helmst, 6-12 and 26-31 are two manuscripts, respectively entitled »*Causae cur non sit Naumburgensi Formulae Suscribendum Et Cur Tridentinum Conciliabulum sit modis omnibus recusandum ac devitandum 1561*«, and »*Causae cur Tridentinum concilium aliaque ei similia pijs recusanda ac detestanda sint*«, without date. These rough draft position papers are in a hand frequently identified as that of

disastrous break with Duke John Frederick the Middler during 1561 – the result of which was his exile from the University of Jena and the duke's lands at the end of the year –, it is entirely likely that the duke still would have reviewed the Erfurt and Fulda documents with his leading theology professor when ducal Saxony's representatives returned with them.²² So it is quite possible that Flacius would have had copies of Grempp's memorandum in his possession when he arrived at Gallus' home in Regensburg early in 1562. It is also therefore possible that he referred to the Grempp document as he and Gallus prepared their own critiques of the papal council, which were published the next year. However, the Grempp piece and the works by Flacius and Gallus, while very occasionally extremely similar in detail, in general bear no more resemblance to each other than might be expected in two independently composed documents which proceed from a common written heritage of protest.²³

The Declaration was subscribed by thirty-four Lutheran theologians, including the most prominent members of the Gnesio-Lutheran party. No Swabian or Philippist theologians had signed the document. The ministerium of Lübeck, which stood apart from the intra-Lutheran party strife of the period, agreed to attach the names of its members to the Declaration if Flacius and Gallus would permit them their own formula for subscription; the ministerium formula does not appear in the Declaration although the name of one pastor from Lübeck, Peter Trimersheim, does appear among the other subscribers. David Chytraeus, leader of the church of Mecklenburg, who also stood between the Philippist and Gnesio-Lutheran parties, wrote Flacius and Gallus a cordial reply to their invitation to him and his colleagues to join in subscribing the Declaration. In this letter Chytraeus also declined to subscribe. He preferred that the Evangelical rejoinder against Trent be confined to the official channels which the

Flacius; if it is not, it is likely that of one of his amanuenses. These two drafts may represent Flacius' initial attempts at formulating his critique of the council as it was called into session once again in the 1560s.

22 On the deterioration of Flacius' relationship with John Frederick the Middler, see Preger 2 (1861), 113-180.

23 At points in the general structure of their outline, Grempp and the *Protestatio* appeared much the same, e.g., while arguing that the convocation was illegitimate, not ecumenical, free, or Christian, not safe for the Evangelicals. Arguments developed in both the *Stattliche Ausführung* . . . , 28-33, and the *Protestatio*, 7-20, on the illegitimate nature of the convocation of the council are very similar, but such similarities in detail are not found in any appreciable number of instances.

Evangelical estates had established at Erfurt and Fulda. Chytraeus expressed his general agreement with Flacius' and Gallus' Declaration but deemed it improper since it was the work of a self-appointed band of theologians rather than of the official representatives of the Evangelical estates and lands.²⁴ Flacius, Gallus, and the thirty-two who joined them in subscribing the Declaration obviously had a different view of the prophetic calling of the individual pastor.

The second document included in Flacius' and Gallus' larger volume was also issued separately, both in Latin and in German translation. It was called »The standard and the process accepted and used by pope and council for establishing religion and the church and for concluding controversies«. The volume which contained this work and the Declaration was sent by Flacius and Gallus to the emperor's son, King Maximilian II, in August 1563.²⁵ In addition, during 1563 Flacius himself published »A pious and necessary admonition on the decrees and canons of the Council of Trent« and a short tract, »A true warning on the very harmful deceit of the pope and his council«.²⁶ The latter was a popular appeal to rally those who might be taken in by minimal symbolic concessions against such potential trickery. The former was a long Latin treatise, 160 quarto pages, with the most detailed and careful reasoning and argumentation of the

24 The Lübeck letter, dated February 13, 1563, is found in the Herzog August Bibliothek, Wolfenbüttel, Cod. Guelph. 74 Helmst, 352; Chytraeus' letter was co-signed by his colleagues at the University of Rostock in the Rostock ministerium, one of whom, Georg Reich, did have his name attached to the Declaration. This letter was dated February 18, 1563, and is found in Cod. Guelph. 74 Helmst, 346-351^r. Preger 2, 275, cites the summary of this letter in Otto Friedrich SCHÜTZ: *De vita Davidij Chytraej*. Vol. 1. HH 1720, 242-244; this summary does not reflect the tone of the letter quite accurately.

25 Nicolaus GALLUS: *Norma simvl ex praxis constitvndae religionis ac ecclesiae, dirimendarvm-que controversiarvm, iam pontifici et synodo recepta ac visitata/ mit einer Vorrede von Matthias Flacius*. Regensburg 1563, translated as Nicolaus GALLUS; Matthias FLACIUS: *Von dem Concilio zu Trient: Canon, Regel vnd Process, Wie der Bapst mit seinen Geistlichen, in dem selben vnd andern seinen Concilien, Kirchen vnd Religion sachen pflege zu handeln ...* Regensburg 1563. Only Gallus' name appears on the title page of the Latin though Flacius' appears at the end of the preface; both names appear on the title page of the German. On sending the entire volume, this work and the *Protestatio*, to King Maximilian, see Preger 2, 275.

26 Matthias FLACIUS: *Pia et necessaria admonitio de decretis et canonibus concilii Tridentini*, Sub Pio quarto Rom. Pontif. Anno etc. 62. et 63. celebrati. Scripta in gratiam piorum hominum, qui emendationem Doctrinae & Caerimoniarum in Ecclesia per Concilia faciendum expectant. F 1563; cf. Trewe *Warnung*, ...

four, dedicated to the analysis of specific decrees of the council which had been issued between January 1562 and March 1563.

These four works represent the climax of almost thirty years of criticism of the papal council from the Wittenberg movement. Flacius' and Gallus' works set the foundations from which new kinds of anti-Tridentine polemic would proceed. Flacius' own »Key to the Sacred Scriptures« of 1567 is one such work. More than a half century ago Wilhelm Diltthey noted that Flacius' »Clavis Scripturae« had grown out of his opposition to Anabaptist and Roman Catholic claims regarding the obscurity of Scripture. Diltthey stated that the »Clavis Scripturae« was composed against the background of the Council of Trent specifically as an attack on its view of ecclesiastical tradition. One section of the »Clavis Scripturae« simply reproduces portions of the »Standard and process«.²⁷ Another example of the new kind of work which emerged after the council's conclusion but out of the context created in part by Flacius' and Gallus' work is Martin Chemnitz' »Examination . . .«. The doctrinal analysis of his work is certainly more rigorous and detailed than that of his predecessors, of course.²⁸

Flacius and Gallus attempted to do three things in their four publications. First, they repeated the objections to a papal council which Evangelical theologians and estates had raised since the 1530s. Second, they examined some of the decisions which the council had already reached. Third, they condemned the Roman party's attitude toward and use of Scripture while affirming its absolute authority, setting in place the Lutheran side of a debate which dominated Roman Catholic-Evangelical exchanges in the Orthodox period and beyond.

It is in the Declaration that the quarter-century old list of objections to the papal council, refined on the basis of actual experience, was presented. That document was indeed intended to be a political document, for it places its confession before God, the church, the empire, and all temporal lords. Furthermore, in it Flacius and Gallus reviewed in some detail all the troubles which

27 Wilhelm DILTHEY: *Gesammelte Schriften*. Vol. 5. L 1924, 324f. This essay, on »The rise of hermeneutics«, is translated by Fredric Jameson in *New literary history* 3 (Charlottesville, Va. 1972), 229-244. The last tractate of the second part of Matthias FLACIUS: *Clavis Scripturae, seu de sermone sacrarum literarum, plurimas generales Regulas continens* (Vol. 2. Basil 1609, 695-772), »Norma seu regula coelestis veritatis, Tractatus VII«, reproduces 715-754 the »Norma simul et praxis«, as found in the *Protestatio*, 101-176.

28 See note 1 for the title of Chemnitz's work.

Emperor Charles V and King Henry II of France had had with the popes and their council. In the »Pious and necessary admonition ...« Flacius called upon the princes, whom God had appointed as wet-nurses of the church (Isa. 49:23), to purge Christian ceremonies of superstition and to protect the teaching of the gospel from all error and from papal tyranny.²⁹

After pledging their adherence to the gospel and their submission to the Word of God, the signers of the Declaration promised to reject sects which held contrary doctrine. They called for a free council, as Luther had, and therefore repudiated the Council of Trent and rejected the jurisdiction of any council which they could not recognize as legitimate and Christian. With some touches of their own Gallus and Flacius repeated the standard Evangelical attack on the legitimacy of the council. From Moses through Constantine, Theodosius, Martian, and Justinian, to the emperors Charlemagne, the Ottos, and the Henrys of the tenth and eleventh centuries, secular leaders had convened councils for the people of God, they argued with support from Nicolaus of Cusa, and they quoted Pope Pius II in support of their contention that the pope does not have to convene a council.³⁰ Furthermore, the emperor should preside at a legitimate council. Thirdly, legitimate Christian councils are held in the area in which the issues to be treated were originally raised; a series of imperial diets had called for the council to meet in Germany. The popes had defied this call by holding their council in Trent, an Italian town seven days journey from Germany. Not only was Trent remote; prices were high, the weather was bad, and the place was generally inhospitable. Flacius and Gallus rejected the reasoning of the Roman party that Trent was a suitable site for reviewing the Lutheran problem since it was located within the Empire.

Next, the Declaration argued that the council was not free, for all bishops attending had to swear an oath of loyalty to the pope. Gallus and Flacius also

29 *Protestatio*, 5, places the document before the empire and its temporal lords; materials relating to papal relations with European rulers are found on 23-35, including citations from Johann SLEIDAN: *De statu religionis et reipublicae, Carolo Quinto Caesare, Commentarii*. Basel 1562, 292. 294 (on 25 f of the *Protestatio*). *Admonitio*, 159f.

30 *Protestatio*, 5-13; on 9f the document reproduces a section from chapter 13 of book 3 of Nicolaus DE CUSA: *De concordantia catholica* (de Cusa: *Opera omnia*/ ed. by Gerhard Kallen. Vol. 14. HH 1964, 377) and a section from Aeneas Sylvius PICCOLOMINI: *De gestis concilii Basiliensis commentariorum libri II*/ ed. and trans. by Denys Hay and W. K. Smith. Oxford 1967, 80. 82.

printed a bull of Pope Julius III forbidding the reading of Protestant books as further proof of their claim, and they cited support also from the protests of Charles V and Henry II. Nor could the council claim to be truly universal since its participants were mostly Italian. Few Germans and Frenchmen, and no Poles, Swedes, Danes, or Englishmen, were in attendance. Greece, Africa, and Asia were not at all represented. The laity was excluded altogether, against the custom of the early church and the objections of more recent commentators – although some of their citations from late medieval figures do not address the precise issue of the presence of the laity at council, which Flacius and Gallus were raising. Finally, the Declaration rejected Trent because it was not a Christian council; it was not, the document argued at length, because it did not accept the Holy Scriptures as the sole guide in its decision-making. In sum, the council breathed the very spirit of Antichrist, the Declaration asserted, because its procedures and practices revealed papal duplicity, tyranny, and blasphemy.³¹

The Gnesio-Lutherans set down their own prescriptions for the proper form of a council. They suggested that the bishops and clergy of the church could convoke a council if necessity demanded it. This divergence from the principle that emperor should call the council, mentioned above, not only reflects the Gnesio-Lutheran disillusionment with Charles V. It also coincides with the principles which guided their own search for the solution of intra-Lutheran disputes; they wanted a synod of clergy to resolve those problems while the Philippists and Swabians promoted a meeting of the Evangelical estates as the agency for the creation of Lutheran concord.³² Based on principles outlined by Nicolaus of Cusa, four other guidelines were set down: the council should base its deliberations on the gospel, on Christ and his promises as presented in the Holy Scriptures; the council should discuss the matters before it in accurate focus, reviewing the positions of both parties fairly and with the proper understanding of each side's arguments; the council should examine all the issues

31 *Protestatio*, 13-15. 69-70 (on the issue of the presiding officer and papal control of the council); 15-20. 75 (on the unsuitability of Trent as the place of the council); 20-35 (on papal tyranny over the council and its lack of freedom); 35-45 (on its lack of universal representation); 45-65 (on its non-Christian character); 86 (summary).

32 Hans-Werner GENSICHEN: *We condemn: how Luther and 16th-century Lutheranism condemned false doctrine*/ trans. by Herbert J. A. Bouman. StL 1967, 123-152, treats the Gnesio-Lutheran approach to the resolution of intra-Lutheran disputes.

each side raises; the council should make its judgments according to the Scripture, not according to human imagination.³³

Flacius and Gallus not only criticized the conduct of the council. They also began the task of examining its dogmatic decisions, a task which would be completed in greater analytical detail by Martin Chemnitz. In their »Standard and process« the two Gnesio-Lutheran theologians chose a number of issues on which Trent had already issued decrees, which the Evangelicals found troubling. They began with one of their chief doctrinal concerns, the sacrifice of the mass, addressing first the »decree concerning the manner of living during the council« of January 7, 1546, which had instructed the clergy participating in the council to »celebrate in accordance with their duty the sacrifice of the mass at least every Sunday«. Flacius and Gallus rejected the sacrifice of the mass as a denial of the once-for-all character of Christ's sacrifice on the cross, for Christ was the only priest who could offer the perfect sacrifice for sin. Thus, at its inception the council had committed itself to that abuse of the Lord's Supper which turned it from sacrament to sacrifice.³⁴ The half page devoted to this statement briefly summarized the Lutheran position; at almost no point in this critique of Trent did Flacius and Gallus introduce new elaborations or even an extensive development of the Evangelical position vis-a-vis Roman Catholic teaching.

Without any detailed critique the »Standard and process« proceeded to reject the decrees of Trent's fourth session (April 8, 1546) regarding Scripture. As noted above, this treatment of Trent's teaching on Scripture and Tradition provided an early formulation of the approaches and ideas which Flacius was to use in his great hermeneutical treatise, the »Key to the Sacred Scriptures«. Flacius and Gallus had elsewhere presented detailed argument against the idea that only the church, which they interpreted simply to mean the pope, could interpret Scripture, so they gave no attention to the question of tradition, which occupied Flacius' and Chemnitz's attention at length, in their subsequent works. The anathema which condemned those who did not accept the Apocrypha condemned thousands of Christians in the early church, including Christ

33 *Protestatio*, 65-68; cf. the citation from *De concordantia catholica* 2, 6 (de Cusa: *Opera omnia* 14, 112-114).

34 *Norma*, *Eiv*^v; *Canon*, *Fiv*^v; cf. *CANONS AND DECREES OF THE COUNCIL OF TRENT*/ ed. by H. J. Schroeder. StL 1941, 12. 291.

and the apostles, for they did not count those books among the books of the Old Testament. Against the Tridentine decree concerning the Vulgate, the »Standard and process« ridiculed the idea that a translation could in any way be more authoritative than the original and asserted that the Vulgate's errors and divergences from the Hebrew and Greek texts of the Bible twist the true and natural understanding of God's Word.³⁵

In examining the decree on original sin Flacius and Gallus argued briefly against the ideas that original sin is completely removed by baptism rather than forgiven and that concupiscence in the saints is not truly sin. Aside from quoting John, »he who thinks he has no sin deceives himself« (1 John 1: 8), and Paul, »with my flesh I serve the law of sin« (Romans 7: 25), the »Standard and process« did little to counter the second point from the Tridentine decree. Actually, Flacius and Gallus ignored elements in the decree with which they must have agreed, for example on the origin of original sin, and they did not analyze the intention or argumentation of the decree or its basis in the medieval theology from which it sprang. Their purpose in this tract was clearly not to present simply a learned theological examination of the council, and so they were content with a more superficial address to central ideas, which Martin Chemnitz would analyze in greater detail.³⁶

Following a brief reference to the decree which defined regular preaching as the chief duty of the episcopal office – a reference which pointed out that bishops had long failed to preach the gospel –, the subject of the freedom of the will was mentioned as the first of a series of topics treated by Trent's decree of justification. The Gnesio-Lutheran authors rejected the decree's definition of the free will after the fall as only weakened but by no means extinguished (chapter I of the decree), and they cited Romans, 3, 4, and 5 in support of their definition of justification, which excluded the sanctification and renewal which Trent had included in its definition (chapter VII). Contrary to the Tridentine decree (chapter VI), love is not a preparatory cause of justification, according to Flacius and Gallus, and they suggested that the council contradicted itself by immediately defining love as a result of justification (chapter VII). In a series of

35 Norma, Eiv^v-F2ⁱ; Canon, Fiv^v-Hij^v; Admonitio, 25-27; Trent, 17-20. 296. Cf. Chemnitz: Examen ..., 69-99 (Examination ... I, 217-307), on tradition.

36 Norma, F2; Canon, Hij^v-Hijjⁱ; Admonitio, 27; Trent, 21-23. 300-302. Cf. Chemnitz: Examen ..., 99-106 (Examination ... I, 309-332).

rhetorical questions designed to demonstrate the pastoral consequences of Trent's rejection of the »vain confidence of the heretics« (chapter IX), Flacius and Gallus affirmed against the council that the Christian can trust completely that God's grace in Christ will remain secure for him and that he can be assured of salvation on the basis of God's faithfulness to the promises which he offers in the Scripture. Flacius and Gallus might have set their critique of Trent's position in the context of their principle of the distinction of law and gospel, a fundamental principle for their theology. But such a lengthy, analytical review of the council apparently diverged from their purpose for this piece of polemical propaganda. They concluded their judgment on Trent's decree on justification with succinct repudiations of its condemnations of those who teach that the law cannot be kept (chapter XI), that the Christian's good works are still imperfect (chapter XVI), and that Christ did come as a lawgiver (canon 21).³⁷ Once again, detailed analysis is not offered.

As the council's first period at Trent was coming to a close, in May 1547, it issued a decree concerning the sacraments, in which those who denied that there are seven sacraments (canon 1) and that the sacraments confer grace *ex opere operato* (canon 8) are condemned. The »Standard and process« rejects these condemnations with brief summaries of the Evangelical position on each issue. The book then proceeds to treat certain decrees of the »present pope, Impius IV« from the past year, 1562. In its fifth session of the third period, on July 16, the distribution of the Lord's Supper in both kinds had been treated, and the right of the church to dispense the sacrament in only one kind affirmed (chapters I and II). The »Standard and process«, the »Pious and necessary admonition ...«, and Flacius' »True warning ...« made much of this issue, a favorite among Evangelicals from the early days of the Reformation. The »Pious and necessary admonition ...« used an extensive citation from Johannes Gerson as the occasion of its sharp critique. Flacius and Gallus discussed communion in both kinds in this situation not so much because of the appeal of this issue to the laity as because they believed that it offered a clear demonstration of the nature of papal tyranny exercised both against the lay person, who could not receive the cup, and against God, whose Word was being subjected to human whim. In the

37 Norma, F2^v-F3^r, cf. K4^v-L^r; Canon, Fiv^v-Hijj^v, cf. O^v; Trent, 26. 305 (on episcopal preaching). Norma, F2^v; Canon, Hiiij^v-Hiv^r; Admonitio, 27f; Trent, 29f. 308f (free will). Norma, F3^r-F4^v; Canon, Hiv^r-Jij^r; Admonitio, 28-35; Trent, 32-42. 311-323 (justification).

»Pious and necessary admonition . . .« Flacius charged specifically that distribution in only one kind provided the means by which Christians had been forced into every form of pontifical idolatry. This issue of papal tyranny obviously had lain close to the heart of these Gnesio-Lutherans' central concern since the Smalcald War and the enforcement of the »Augsburg Interim« by Spanish occupation forces a decade and a half earlier. Here they joined it with the issue of Scriptural authority and with a medieval worship practice which had touched the lives of all and had become a point of friction. On communion in both kinds the »Standard and process« repeats basic Evangelical arguments with occasional touches of rhetorical flourish but with more extensive detail and analysis than it had given previously discussed issues. Flacius and Gallus linked the decree concerning the sacrifice of the mass, from the previous September, with that concerning communion in both kinds in order to highlight several concerns. The papal Antichrist had arrogated to himself the power to change God's Word, they charged. The council had claimed scriptural support for its doctrine of the mass but then could not prove it from Scripture, as they endeavored to show at some length.³⁸

In the »Pious and necessary admonition . . .« Flacius examined the recent statement of the council regarding the mass in much greater detail: more than a quarter of that 160 page volume is dedicated to that decree and to popular medieval conceptions relating to the mass. This reflects Flacius' sensitivity to the role of that central act of medieval worship for the sixteenth century lay person. Flacius recorded his regret that the council had not carried out its pledge to restore the primitive use of the Lord's Supper but instead had continued to view it as a propitiatory sacrifice. First, he rejected several arguments advanced in behalf of the sacrifice of the mass. While it is true, he conceded, that the Levitical sacrifice was incomplete, it was completed by Christ's sacrifice on the cross, not by the mass, as he argued from Hebrews 7: 18-28 and 10: 3-14. While Christ's priesthood continues, he again agreed, it continues not in a continuing sacrifice which takes place in the mass but rather in his continuing instruction of believers and intercession for them, for intercession and instruction also

38 Norma, F4^v; Canon, Iij^r; Trent, 51f. 329f (on the sacraments in general). Norma, F4^v-K^r; Canon, Iij^v-N^r; Admonitio, 99-138, esp. 131, the citation on 109-112 from »Contra haeresim de communicatione Laicorum sub utraque specie« (Johannes GERSON: Prima pars operum. Nuremberg 1489, y2^v and y3^v); Trent, 132-134. 144-148. 406-408. 417-421 (on communion in both kinds and the mass).

belong to the duties of the priest. Flacius ridiculed the logic of other arguments for the mass being a propitiatory sacrifice. Just because Christ is a priest after the order of Melchizedek and Melchizedek sacrificed bread and wine, the mass is not a sacrifice for the living and the dead, Flacius protested. Nor does it make sense, he insisted, that just because the Old Testament paschal lamb was not eaten but sacrificed that the body of Christ in the sacrament must be sacrificed: Flacius affirmed that Christ's body had been sacrificed on the cross as the paschal lamb for his people (1 Cor. 5: 7). Flacius was willing to concede that according to Malachi 1: 11 God's people must continue to perform sacrifices, but he cited Saint Jerome to support his contention that Malachi called for a sacrifice of praise, not of Christ in the mass.³⁹ Finally, Flacius would not grant the parallel asserted in the argument that since Paul forbade partaking of the Lord's table and the devil's table, and the devil's table consisted of sacrifices to idols, therefore Paul taught that the table of the Lord is a sacrifice.⁴⁰

Flacius treated briefly a number of elements of the doctrine and practice of the mass. Against the teaching of Trent that hearing and seeing the mass conveys the benefits of Christ's sacrifice to participants in the service, Flacius asserted that those benefits are conveyed to those who partake in faith, according to the Scripture. He attacked the celebration of the mass for the dead and ridiculed its celebration to honor saints since Christ had instituted it in his own memory, not that of the saints.

The council had asserted that the canon of the mass is free from error; Flacius took particular exception to that. He listed six errors which he found in its text. The canon's statement that the mass is being offered for the redemption of souls Flacius rejected as a diminution of the sole sacrifice of Christ on the cross. The canon errs when it states that participants in the mass are aided by the merits of the saints and by their prayers, Flacius wrote, affirming that Christ's merits and intercession provide for all the needs of the believer. It is wrong to attempt to propitiate God through the mass, Flacius reasserted, asking whether the canon's prayer that the elements be acceptable to God as a sacrifice should be understood as a prayer that God no longer be angry with his Son's body and blood –

39 Admonitio, 78; cf. Jerome's »Commentariorum in Malachiam Prophetam ad Mineruium et Alexandrum, liber unus« (S. Hieronymus Presbyter: Opera. Pars 1, 6. Turnholt 1970, 911). On Flacius' critique of the mass, see Oliver K. Olson: *The Missa Illyrica and the liturgical thought of Flacius*. HH 1966, 64-94. 106-112. – HH, Univ., Th. Diss., 1966.

40 Admonitio, 70-78; Trent, 144-148. 417-421.

which, Flacius observed, is foolishness. In addition, the canon errs, according to Flacius, because it confirms the doctrine of purgatory and the practice of prayers for the dead. He continued by taking issue with the Tridentine decree which confirmed the private mass. The celebration of the private mass is contrary to the practice of Christ and the apostles, Flacius argued, and he expressed his disgust at Biel's argument that the priest in the private mass receives for all believers as the mouth receives for the whole body.⁴¹ A comparison of Flacius' most detailed examination of the Tridentine treatment of a single issue with Chemnitz's parallel Examination reveals that Chemnitz's analysis was more exhaustive also in dealing with the mass. Flacius intended even his most analytic attack on Trent not to say the last and most carefully developed word on the council. Rather, he wanted to set the issues before the Evangelical estates and people of Germany that they might react to the council in an informed way – that is, in a way informed by Flacius' understanding of the critical nature of the juncture of the history of the church which the reconconvocation of the papal council at Trent had brought about.

In the »Standard and process« Flacius' discussion of papal abuse of the Lord's Supper had led into an extensive treatment of the ways in which »the Antichrist has perverted Christ's kingdom, Word, religion, and church and trampled them underfoot«. ⁴² This section of the work gives the negative side, directed against Rome, of a somewhat more positive discussion found in the Declaration, which laid out the standards for a Christian council in terms of its faithfulness to proper scriptural interpretation (a discussion which did include, of course, much negative criticism of Roman Catholic treatment of Scripture). In so doing these works only set forth a line of argumentation fundamental to the radical Lutheran critique of Rome for several decades. Indeed, Flacius' Philippist opponent Georg Major had foreshadowed this approach in his »On the origin and authority of the Word of God« of 1550. There he had employed a somewhat similar critique of the Roman position, though one much more primitively formulated than Flacius'; he did not, however, attack Trent directly in his examination of the Roman Catholic treatment of Scripture, for such an attack might still have been unwise in the electoral Saxony of Moritz at that time.

41 Admonitio, 81-97; cf. Gabriel BIEL: *Canonis misse expositio*/ ed. by Heiko A. Oberman, William J. Courtenay and Daniel E. Zerfoss. Vol. 4. Wiesbaden 1967, 32 f.

42 Norma, K¹; Canon, N¹.

Flacius and Gallus, on the other hand, were developing in their works a position which foreshadows and lays the groundwork for Flacius' massive »Key to the Sacred Scriptures« and thus point to the increasing importance of this debate for Roman Catholic-Protestant relationships in later centuries.⁴³

Flacius and Gallus insisted that Scripture alone has authority to decide disputes among Christians. The authority of Scripture is supported and confirmed, according to the Declaration, by the testimony, martyrdoms, and miracles of the prophets, Christ, the apostles, and the fathers of the early church. But above all, Scripture can function as judge for Christians because it is God's Word, given by him for this purpose to the church. Since the Scripture is God's Word, and God is wise, truthful, and good, scriptural authority is sure. Men's words cannot be authoritative because men are liars, foolish, and evil, but the Holy Spirit, who has spoken through the mouths of prophets and apostles and has co-authored (*conscriptum*) through their hands, reveals their teaching both wise and salutary. Against this authority of the Scripture the papacy had placed its own authority and that of the councils, Fathers, and canon law, Flacius and Gallus charged, labeling this blasphemous. Christ had criticized the Pharisees for doing the same thing, teaching the commandments of men in a vain effort to worship Christ. The Gnesio-Lutherans indignantly rejected the claims that Scripture was the source of heresy and that it was the basis from which controversy sprang – rather than the judge of controversy. Furthermore, the human words of papal, conciliar, and patristic authorities could not be trusted because the Fathers contradicted each other. Only God's Word in Scripture is sure, Flacius and Gallus confessed.⁴⁴

At some length the Declaration comments on the use or purpose of Scripture, which is to make people wise to salvation in Christ Jesus so that the man of God may be prepared for every good work (1 Timothy 3: 15-16). The Scriptures were written to console us and to instruct us that we might have the certain hope of

43 Günter MOLDAENKE: *Schriftverständnis und Schriftdeutung im Zeitalter der Reformation*. Teil 1: Matthias Flacius Illyricus. S 1936, traces the development of Flacius' understanding of Scripture. Georg MAJOR's work was entitled: *De origine et auctoritate verbi Dei, & quae Pontificum Patrum & Conciliorum sit auctoritas, admonitio hoc tempore, quo de Concilio congregando agitur, ualde necessaria* (Wittenberg 1550).

44 Norma, K^v-K^{2v}. K4. L; Canon, N^v-N^{iiij}. Niv^v. Oij^v; Protestatio, 51-53. 57f. 61; cf. Admonitio, 14-16, where Flacius complained that the Colloquy of Worms of 1557 had been doomed by the failure of the papal party to bind itself to the Scriptures.

life (Romans 15: 4), to provide all that is needed for true faith and eternal salvation (John 20: 31). Flacius and Gallus insisted on the sufficiency of Scripture to supply Christians with all God wants them to know; they rejected the suggestion that the Scripture needs expansion and clarification from popes and councils, from human traditions. They affirmed the clarity of Scripture and rejected their opponents' claims that Scripture is ambiguous and in need of definitive interpretation by learned doctors. This had led to the false concept of implicit faith, in which the laity were instructed to believe simply what the church had taught; such a concept, parallel to thinking that the sacraments are effective *ex opere operato*, led to errors of all sorts, a list of which is provided to the readers of the Declaration.⁴⁵

Instead, Flacius and Gallus demanded further, the laity should be acquainted with the Bible. Under the papacy many did not even know that the Bible existed, they claimed. The Scriptures should be available to all in their native tongue; it would be wrong to think that the laity will have contempt for God's Word if it is placed before them in the language they understand.⁴⁶

Finally, Flacius and Gallus took issue with the way in which the followers of the pope had been interpreting the Scriptures. The most fundamental problem was the simple ignorance of the Scripture, which according to Flacius and Gallus could be found even in the writings of the popes. Even many of the Fathers but also contemporary papal interpreters of the Scriptures could not read the languages in which the Bible was written. The papal interpreters had even attacked those scholars, such as Reuchlin, Erasmus, Budé, Vives, and others who had promoted linguistic studies. The Gnesio-Lutherans were not in the habit of defending Luther's opponent in the controversy over the boundness of the will, but they did recognize his contributions in Biblical studies. Further, they objected to allegorical interpretation, to the method of Origen, which, they charged, imported Platonic ideas foreign to the Biblical message into Christian doctrine. Philosophy in general, and specifically the systems of Thomas Aquinas and Duns Scotus, had warped Biblical interpretation, but worse yet, Flacius and Gallus asserted, were those postils of the monks which merely indulged in fables and superstitions. Papal interpreters ignore the context of their citations. Finally, they misrepresent the intention of the Biblical writers,

45 Norma, K^v-K₂^r; Canon, N^v-Nij. Nij^v; Protestatio, 5of. 59-61.

46 Norma, K₂^v-K₃^r; Canon, Jij^v-Niv^r.

for instance by turning into mere counsels what Christ had given as commands.⁴⁷ Once again, though Flacius and Gallus went to great length to enumerate points of differentiation between Evangelical and Roman Catholic attitudes toward Scriptural authority, between their treatment of the Bible and their respective interpretive principles, they spent relatively little time developing each point in detail or criticizing the Roman position analytically. Though hardly developing a new Evangelical point of criticism in their use of the issue of Scriptural authority, Flacius and Gallus, by emphasizing this issue so strongly, did indicate how one key issue dividing Evangelicals and Roman Catholics would be addressed during the coming Orthodox period, beginning with Flacius' own »Key to the Sacred Scriptures«. Flacius and Gallus, in their works against Trent, did not do that on any other issue, for they treated none other in comparable detail, apart from the mass.

They had not, quite obviously, set out to produce an examination of Tridentine decrees of the type which Martin Chemnitz would begin constructing a short time later. They were writing rather to set the Council of Trent in proper focus for their Evangelical fellow-believers – not just the Gnesio-Lutherans but also those of other parties, and above all for the common people of no party. Flacius affirmed toward the beginning of the »Pious and necessary admonition ...« that the laity does not need the decisions of councils but can decide what is true and false on the basis of the catechism. He was most strenuously concerned to warn against papal tyranny, the clerical yoke which Trent was trying to impose once again upon the Evangelical estates.⁴⁸

Two tracts composed by Flacius in 1563 reveal something more of the mindset behind his and Gallus' longer works against Trent than these works themselves reveal. The first is Flacius' »True warning on the very harmful deceit of the pope and his council«; the second is his »Proof that according to the Passau Treaty and the Edict of the Augsburg Diet of 1555 the papist governments do not have the authority to persecute their subjects on account of the Augsburg Confession, much less to drive them out of their lands and force them

47 Norma, K3^v-L2^r; Canon, N4^v-Oii^r; Protestatio, 51. 53. 55 f. 64.

48 Admonitio, 13 f on the laity, 151-160 on papal tyranny. On similar uses of the catechism as a standard by which lay people can judge theological controversies, see Robert Kolb: »The layman's Bible; the use of Luther's Catechism in the German late Reformation. In: Luther's Catechisms – 450 years/ ed. by David P. Scaer and Robert D. Preus. Fort Wayne, Ind. 1979, 22-25.

to sell their possessions, accurately taken from the text of these documents«. The title of the latter summarizes its argument. In a brief conclusion after the citations of the relevant texts, Flacius recalled Luther's prophecy of persecution. He expressed his own belief that out of the »Sodomite false council« of the Roman Antichrist would come a »civil war and blood bath« which would bring atrocities upon the German Evangelicals »as he [the Antichrist] has often done before«, a reference to the Smalcald War and the time of the Augsburg Interim and the first session of Trent in all likelihood.⁴⁹

The »True warning ...« also reveals that Flacius and Gallus viewed the opening of the third period of the council as a critical juncture in the war between the papacy and the Evangelical movement. They did not trust agreements made by followers of the pope in the Religious Peace of Augsburg. They feared that the new sessions of the council would lead, as had its first sessions, to a period of critical conflict, and potentially, of betrayal by other Evangelicals, matching the earlier betrayal which Gallus and Flacius believed had so seriously damaged the Evangelical cause when the Philippists had forged the compromise with the papacy in the »Leipzig Interim«. Thus, in this tract Flacius compared the situation of the Evangelical movement in 1563 to that of the church at the time the papacy suppressed the Council of Basel and at the time of the »Augsburg Interim«. He warned against any attempt to compromise through a series of theses which declare that the articles of faith are inseparable and that abandoning one article of the faith not only insults God but also leads to abandoning other articles of the faith. This tract was written in response to a request from Lutheran nobles in Bavaria. There Duke Albrecht V, a loyal supporter of Rome, was trying to counteract the growing Lutheran movement by granting concessions regarding communion in both kinds and clerical celibacy (both concessions offered in 1548 by the »Augsburg Interim« to the Evangelicals) as well as fasting. Leaders of the Lutheran nobility in Bavaria requested that Flacius and Gallus formulate a reaction to the ducal program for them, and the »True warning ...« was the result. Joined to its warning that compromise on

49 BEWEISUNG DAS VERMOEGE DES PASSAWISCHEN VERTRAGS VND ABSCHIEDS DES AUGSPURGISCHEN REICHSTAGS ANNO M. D. LV. DIE PAPISTISCHE OBERKEIT NICHT MACHT HABE DIE VNTERTHANEN DER AUGSPURGISCHEN CONFESSIO HALBEN, YRGEND AUFF EIN WEISE ZUUERFOLGEN, VIL WENIGER DIE SELBIGEN AUS DEN LÄNDEN ZUUERTREIBEN, VNND JHRE GUETER ZUUERKAUFFEN ZWINGEN, AUS DEM TEXT SOLCHER SCHRIFFTEN TREWLICH GENOMMEN. n.p. 1563. Flacius' comments are found on Biiij^v.

some issues of doctrinal dispute would undermine the whole faith is Flacius' rejection specifically of the three leading concessions in Albrecht's program. Flacius must have made his point effectively, for Friedrich Staphylus, a lay advisor of Albrecht's who had converted from his Lutheran faith to Roman Catholicism, issued a rejoinder to it.⁵⁰ In exile in Regensburg Flacius could not know that both the Religious Peace of Augsburg and the loyalty of other German Lutherans would survive Trent's third period intact. On the basis of his own experience over a decade and a half, he had reason to fear. That fear, coupled with his zest for Luther's gospel, made him, with Gallus at his side, at least »the most energetic spokesman on the Protestant side regarding the council« at the time of its conclusion.

But he was not the only such spokesman. Each party within the German Lutheran movement had reason to take public exception to the council in one form or another. The reactions of the German Evangelicals to the convocation of the Council of Trent in the early 1560s took form in occasional writings, works which addressed the situation of the moment as it was perceived at the time. Before the conclusion of the council, of course, no Evangelical was able to approach the kind of analysis which Martin Chemnitz could undertake a short time later.⁵¹ The Lutheran critiques which were composed in 1561-1563 were

50 Trewe Warnung, ..., A2^r-A4^r. Two Bavarian noblemen, Joachim von Ortenburg and Pankraz von Freiburg, requested Flacius' and Gallus' help in preparing a critique of Albrecht's program, in instructions to Joseph Fröschl, July 3, 1563; see BEITRÄGE ZUR GESCHICHTE HERZOG ALBRECHTS V. UND DER SOG. ADELVERSCHWÖRUNG VON 1563/ ed. by Walter Goetz and Leonhard Theobald. L 1913, 62-65; see also Alois KNÖPFLER: Die Kelchbewegung in Bayern unter Herzog Albrecht V. M 1891, for details on Duke Albrecht's program. On Flacius' and Gallus' reaction to the program, see also Karl SCHOTTENLOHER: Das Regensburger Buchgewerbe im 15. und 16. Jahrhundert. MZ 1920, 38-43. That there was some possibility that the Council of Trent might indeed grant the concessions about which Flacius was concerned is shown in Knöpfler, 96-106, and by Paula Sutter FICHTNER: The disobedience of the obedient: Ferdinand I and the papacy, 1555-1564. SCJ 11 (1980) 2, 25-34. Friedrich STAPHYLUS' rebuke was entitled: Trewe warnung, An alle fromme guthertzige Christen, wie sie sich zu yetzigen verfuerrischen zeytten, vor Irrthumb, vnd dem, an yetz ausgebreytten falschen schwermerischen rhat vnd der vngetrewen warnung . . . huetten moegen. [n.p.] 1563.

51 Chemnitz's massive critique (see note 1) did not end the smaller, less definitive Evangelical reactions; see, e.g., the tract published under the name Theophilus BALDANUS: Warhafftige vnd in Goettlicher Schrifft gegruendte aussfuerung Das das Concilium zu Triendt hat wider Gott

functional pieces, designed as much for a political public as for a theological audience.

The Evangelical estates did what politically responsible officials had to do. Their overlord, Emperor Ferdinand, had granted the »Augsburg Confession« legal status in 1555, but he had not abandoned either the hope for or his own efforts towards the reconciliation of the two legal confessions within his empire. The Evangelical princes believed that they owed the emperor an explanation of their rejection of the papal invitation to Trent. It comes as little surprise that they reiterated the same basic argument which the Evangelical estates had forged a quarter century earlier. The Evangelical princes did not publish their critiques immediately; their political sensitivity kept them from publicly objecting to the council until it concluded its sessions. Then they shared with the public their reasons for not going to Trent.

For the Gnesio-Lutherans the reconconvocation of the council produced immediate associations with that complex of events in 1545-1548 which they believed had seriously threatened the very existence and survival of the Lutheran movement. For them Trent was inextricably bound to the Smalcald War and the »Augsburg Interim«, both coercive and violent attempts to eradicate the teachings of the »Augsburg Confession«. The »Augsburg Interim« had attempted to seduce Evangelicals with the minimal concessions of the cup for the laity and marriage for priests, just as some delegates at Trent and the government of Duke Albrecht of Bavaria were promoting such concessions in the early 1560s. So Flacius and Gallus felt compelled to attack the council as an immediate threat to the safety of their faith, and there was one forum which they viewed as the most effective setting for their ideas: the forum of printed words which would reach both the Latin-reading and the German-reading public. Flacius and Gallus responded to the council and its menace with traditional arguments against its legitimacy and with traditional arguments against doctrines to which they had long objected and which they had learned Trent was codifying. Finally, they attacked the concept of papal authority with an extensive argument which opposed to the authority of the pope that of Scripture.

vnd sein heiliges Wort falsche vnchristliche vnnd Gottslesterliche Canones vnd Satzungen gemacht ... Lauingen 1569; Nuremberg 1570. This work is listed as pseudonymous, but without identification of its author, in Emil WELLER: *Lexicon pseudonymorum*. Regensburg 1886, 58. Very likely, this work also came from the Flacian circle.

The worst fears of Flacius, Gallus and other German Lutherans in regard to the Council of Trent were not realized, and the occasional pieces published in 1563 and 1564 by German Lutherans disappeared largely from view. However, at least one Roman Catholic, the French Franciscan Joannes Porthaesus, thought Flacius' critique of the mass in the »Pious and necessary admonition ...« important enough to demand an answer. Porthaesus was engaged in Counter-Reformation activities in the Low Countries in 1566, at the same time at which Flacius was serving the Lutheran church in Antwerp. His rejection of the Flacius critique of the Roman Catholic doctrine of the mass appeared in 1567 and was republished twice, in 1585 and in 1586.⁵² Indeed, the Lutheran critique of Trent during its third period did make some impact on the form and agenda of the continuing debates between Roman Catholics and Lutherans.

If there ever had been a time in which reconciliation of Rome and Wittenberg had been possible, it had certainly past by 1562. When the final sessions of the Council of Trent were being held, there was fundamentally only one stance which the German Evangelicals could take. Divided into parties as their movement was, their responses differed in specific motivation and mode, but they shared a common stance toward the Council: they rejected the power of the men who had gathered at Trent to repudiate and repulse the German Evangelical movement, and they rejected the validity of the ideas which those men advanced to counter and condemn Luther's understanding of the gospel.

52 JOANNES PORTHAESIUS: *De Verbis Domini Hoc Facite pro oecumenico concilio tridentino adversus Sophisticas nebulas Matthiae Flaccii Illyrici Concilium Catholicum Tridenti Habitum*. Antwerp 1567.