

Catechism and *Querelle des Femmes* (1556–1689):

Lutheran *Haustafel* Sermons as Contributions to the Debate about Women¹

By Austra Reinis

Many have [...] wanted to be noticed, have wished to be praised, for speaking and writing disgracefully and mockingly about married women. One, for example, says: Wives are a necessary evil. [...] Another [says]: A husband has only two happy days: One when he goes with his wife to the wedding, the other when he accompanies her to her grave. Just recently an evil knave came out with a despicable writing about the origin of women, for which both the author and the printer would have deserved to be taken to task by Master Peter.²

With these words, Sebastian Artomedes (b. 1544), cathedral preacher in Königsberg in the Duchy of Prussia from 1579 to 1602, in a *Haustafel* sermon on marriage, attacks writers – both ancient and contemporary – whom he considers to be enemies of this divinely ordained estate. Although Artomedes does not cite the title of the »recently« published

1 An earlier form of this essay was presented at a fellows colloquium at the Forschungszentrum Gotha in Gotha, Germany, on November 3, 2010. I am grateful to Missouri State University for sabbatical funding as well to the Herzog August Bibliothek in Wolfenbüttel and the Forschungsbibliothek Gotha for grants which made research and writing of this essay possible.

2 »Viel haben [...] damit wollen gesehen sein / habens wo(e)llen ruhm haben / daß sie schimpfflich vnd spo(e)ttisch von Ehlichen Weibern geredet vnd geschrieben / als da einer sagt: Mulieres esse necessarium malum. [...] Ein ander: Ein Ehemann hab nur zween fro(e)liche Tage: Einen / wenn er mit seinem Weib zur trawung; Den andern / wenn er mit jhr zum Grab gehet. Wie denn auch newlich ein bo(e)ser Bub ein abschewliche Lesterschrifft vom herkommen der Weiber hat ausgesprenget / da beydes der Tichter vnd der Drucker werth gewesen weren / daß man Meister Petern hette mit jhnen gut scharff disputiren lassen.« S. ARTOMEDES, Kurtze vnd einfeltige / jedoch // richtige vnd reine Erklerung // des Heiligen // Catechismi / // sampt der Christlichen Haus= / // tafel [...], part 2, 1605, 123f.

»despicable writing,« or the name of the »knave« who is its author, it is likely that he is referring to the anonymous *New disputation against women, by which it is proven they are not human* (1595). Within just a few weeks, this booklet had already provoked published condemnations from the theological faculties of the Universities of Wittenberg and Leipzig.³

I Introduction

This essay explores a source largely neglected in the past – the Lutheran homiletical genre known as the *Haustafel* sermon – in particular, the sermons on the respective duties of husbands and wives. Building on recent research on the debate about women (*querelle des femmes* or *Frauenstreit*) in Germany, it argues that these sermons on the duties of spouses represent a heretofore unrecognized, relatively unified Lutheran contribution to this debate, which was carried on in Europe from the Middle Ages through the Early Modern Era. The Lutheran preachers were well-aware of the issues involved in it. They staked out their position by defending the honor and dignity of women as Christians and co-heirs of Christ, while at the same time justifying the subordination of wives to husbands as necessary for peace and harmony in the household. To support their views, these preachers appealed to Scripture and to a long tradition of scriptural interpretation. In particular, with only very few exceptions, they explicitly endorsed the traditional Christian anthropology, which viewed women as physically, intellectually, and sometimes morally, inferior to men.

Taking into account both the context of the debate about women and traditional Christian anthropology contributes to resolving what Susan Karant-Nunn once identified as a »curious inconsistency« in the wedding sermons of Johannes Mathesius between the »high praise of the marital condition with the depiction of the very defective nature of women.« It

3 For the Latin text of the *New Disputation*, as well as a translation into German, see V. ACIDALIUS, *Disputatio nova contra mulieres, qua probatur eas homines non esse*, trans. G. BURKARD, 2006. The controversy around the writing is explored by M. DREXL, *Weiberfeinde – Weiberfreunde? Die Querelle des femmes im Kontext konfessioneller Konflikte um 1600*, 2006.

questions her hypothesis that »it is possible that marriage was now more actively praised and promoted in part because women were perceived to be worse than before and more in need of the male discipline that the nuptial bond imposed on them.«⁴ Instead, this essay argues that the *Haustafel* preachers genuinely believed themselves to be defenders of women, even as, for the most part, they perpetuated ancient Christian ideas about women's inferiority. Karant-Nunn's »inconsistency« thus becomes an »inconsistency« only in the eyes of the modern beholder. At the same time, this study cautions against optimistic older views, such as those of Robert Stupperich, who asserted that the Reformation led to »a change in traditional views of women« in that the woman was no longer »held in contempt or feared« as a »temptress or even the embodiment of evil« but rather honored as a »creature of God«.⁵

II *Haustafel Sermons and Catechetical Preaching*

The *Haustafel* was an integral part of the *Small Catechism* that Martin Luther published in 1529. It consisted of biblical texts which outlined the duties of the members of the three estates: 1. Bishops, pastors, and preachers; 2. Governing authorities; 3. Husbands; 4. Wives; 5. Parents; 6. Children; 7. Male and female servants; 8. Masters and mistresses; 9. Young people in general; 10. Widows; 11. All in the community. In later editions of the *Small Catechism*, the respective duties of parishioners (beginning in 1540) and of subjects (beginning in 1542) were added to this list.⁶

4 S. KARANT-NUNN, *Kinder, Küche, Kirche*. Social ideology in the Sermons of Johannes Mathesius (in: *Germania Illustrata*. Essays on Early Modern Germany. Presented to Gerald Strauss, ed. A. C. FIX and S. C. KARANT-NUNN, 1992, 136).

5 R. STUPPERICH, *Die Frau in der Publizistik der Reformation* (AKuG 37, 1955, 204. 206). Although S. Ozment strives for a balanced treatment of the views of Lutheran reformers on women and marriage, he fails to note that the reformers for the most part perpetuated the medieval and renaissance depiction of women as »the physical and mental inferiors of men«; see S. OZMENT, *When Fathers Ruled. Family Life in Reformation Europe*, 1983, 9.99.

6 An English translation of Luther's *Haustafel* can be found in *The Book of Concord. The Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church*, eds. R. KOLB and T. J. WENGERT, 2000, 365–367; for references to the scripture texts spelling out the duties of parishioners and

Before publishing the *Small Catechism*, Luther had already preached on the Ten Commandments in 1516/17; later, in 1519, 1522, and 1523, he had expanded his series of sermons to include the Lord's Prayer and the Creed. The first generation of Lutheran pastors followed his example. Later Lutheran preachers, however, beginning with Cyriacus Spangenberg (1528–1604) in Eisleben in 1556, and ending with Philipp Jacob Spener (1635–1705) in 1689, went on to preach and publish sermons on the *Haustafel* as well.⁷ The *Haustafel* sermon or sermon on the Household Table of Duties thus can be regarded as a sub-genre of the catechism sermon.⁸

The Lutheran church orders of the second half of the sixteenth century reveal that catechism preaching generally became a weekly practice in German towns. A catechism sermon was often, but not always, preached at the vespers service on Sunday. The vespers catechism service was the custom in Marburg, where Aegidius Hunnius served as court and city preacher.⁹ Although the church orders make few references to *Haustafel* sermons in particular, it appears that these sermons normally were preached following a series of sermons on the first five parts of the catechism. This was the case in the Duchy of Prussia, where the 1568 church order specifies that at the Cathedral in Kneiphof Königsberg, where Sebas-

subjects, see 365, nn. 114f. The German and Latin versions of the *Haustafel*, including the Scripture passages relating to parishioners and subjects, are provided in BSLK, ¹⁰1986, 522–527.

7 For a bibliography of thirteen of these collections of *Haustafel* sermons, see J. HOFFMANN, Die »Hausväterliteratur« und die »Predigten über den christlichen Hausstand«. Lehre vom Hause und Bildung für das häusliche Leben im 16., 17. und 18. Jahrhundert, 1959, 50–56. I have been able to identify the following additional works (the date of the first edition of each appears in parentheses): A. HUNNIUS, Catechismus / // Oder // Kinderlehr [...], 1596 (1586); L. OSIANDER, Die Christliche Hauß= // tafel [...], 1601; F. FISCHER, Paedagogia Chri= // stiana. // Dje Christliche // Hausztaffel [...], 1617 (1613).

8 On the catechism sermon and its subgenres see W. JETTER, Art. Katechismuspredigt (TRE 17, 1988, 744–786).

9 Agenda / Das ist: / Kirchenor- / dnung wie es im Für- / stenthumb Hessen mit verku(e)ndigung / Go(e)ttliches worts, reichung der heiligen Sacra- / menten vnd andern Christlichen handlung- / gen vnd Ceremonien gehalten / werden soll (in: Die evangelischen Kirchenordnungen des XVI. Jahrhunderts, ed. E. SEHLING, vol. 8, 1965, 415).

tian Artomedes served as preacher, such sermons were to take place at the early service on Sunday mornings:

At the beginning of each sermon, the chaplain shall very slowly and understandably recite one after another the five articles of the catechism. After that, he is to begin with the Ten Commandments, explain one commandment each Sunday, and finish by illustrating it with examples from Scripture [...]. When the first five articles of the catechism are done, lessons from the *Haustafel* are to follow, one after the other. When those, too, are finished, then the catechism is to begin all over again, so that it is continuously practiced.¹⁰

The only extensive study to date of *Haustafel* sermons as a genre is Julius Hoffmann's *Die »Hausväterliteratur« und die »Predigten über den christlichen Hausstand«* (1959).¹¹ Hoffmann explains that Luther believed God to have structured society into three different estates or regiments: the church estate (*status ecclesiasticus*), the political estate (*status politicus*), and the domestic estate or estate of marriage (*status oeconomicus*, *Hausstand* or *Ehestand*). Each person was a member of all three estates and was called by God to to serve his or her neighbor in his or her position in the three estates.¹² In their sermons on the *Haustafel*, Lutheran pastors offered ethi-

¹⁰ »Der [caplan] soll ordelichen die fünf stück des catechismi fein langsam und verstendlich recitiren zum anfang einer jedern predig, darauf von den zehen geboten anfahren und je einen sonntag ein gebot auslegen, dasselbige fein zum beschluss mit exempeln der schrift verklaren [...]. Wenn die fünf stück des catechismi aus sind, soll in der haustafel folgen eine lection nach der andern; wenn die auch herümmer, soll der catechismus vornen wiederum angefangen werden und derselbig immer in ubung bleiben.« Kirchenordnung und ceremonien, wie es in ubung gottes worts und reichung der hochwirdigen sacrament in den kirchen des herzogthums Preussen sol gehalten werden (SEHLING [s. n. 9], vol. 4, 1911, 79).

¹¹ W. BEHRENDT, Lutherisch-orthodoxe Ehelehre in der Haustafelliteratur des 16. Jahrhunderts (in: Text und Geschlecht. Mann und Frau in Eheschriften der frühen Neuzeit, ed. R. SCHNELL, 1997, 214–229), offers a brief analysis of Lutheran teaching on marriage based on Aegidius Hunnius's *Haustafel* sermon on marriage and on two didactic dramas on the *Haustafel*. I have not been able to find other studies of *Haustafel* sermons.

¹² HOFFMANN (s. n. 7), 34–37. On Luther's doctrine of the three estates, see also W. MAURER, Luthers Lehre von den drei Hierarchien und ihr mittelalterlicher Hintergrund, 1970, 18–34; R. SCHWARZ, Luthers Lehre von den drei Ständen und die drei Dimensionen der Ethik (Lu) 45, 1978, 15–34; J. KÜPPERS, Luthers Dreihierarchienlehre als Kritik an der mittelal-

cal instruction to parishioners by explaining the duties of the members of each estate. Hoffmann provides a summary of the preachers' teaching, but not an analysis of individual sermons. With respect to the estate of marriage, Hoffmann explains that the preachers' principal concern was peace and harmony within the household. This peace, to their mind, was possible only in the context of a loving but hierarchical relationship in which the wife submitted her will to her husband and the husband governed, supported, and cared for his wife.¹³ With reference to the *Haustafel* sermons of several preachers, Hoffmann notes that, according to these preachers, wives had to submit to their husbands on account of their (the wives') weakness of will, body, and intellect.¹⁴

In terms of subject matter, the *Haustafel* sermons on the duties of husbands and wives overlap with contemporary wedding sermons (*Hochzeitspredigten*) and tracts on the estate of marriage (*Ehebücher*); these writings have received extensive consideration by social historians interested in issues such as family, gender, and power. The authors have reached similar conclusions to those of Hoffmann with respect to the hierarchical structure of the relationship between the spouses.¹⁵ This essay provides a closer textual analysis of selected *Haustafel* sermons than does Hoffmann's book. It highlights the traditional Christian anthropology conveyed in these sermons and focuses on their contribution to the *querelle des femmes*. It argues that focusing on these two aspects provides a clearer understanding of early Lutheran views on women and helps resolve what to the modern reader may appear to be contradictions in sixteenth-century assessments of the female sex.

terlichen Gesellschaftsauffassung (EvTh 19 [14, Neue Folge], 1959, 361–374); and O. BAYER, Freiheit als Antwort. Zur theologischen Ethik, 1995, 116–146.

¹³ HOFFMANN (s. n. 7), 130f.

¹⁴ Loc. cit. 115f.

¹⁵ For the most recent overview of scholarship on gender and the Reformation, see M. WIESNER, Gender and the Reformation (ARG 100, 2009, 350–365). A discussion of methodological questions to consider in studying gender in the Early Modern Period is provided by R. SCHNELL, Geschlechterbeziehungen und Textfunktionen. Probleme und Perspektiven eines Forschungsansatzes (in: Geschlechterbeziehungen und Textfunktionen. Studien zu Eheschriften der Frühen Neuzeit, ed. R. SCHNELL, 1998, 1–58).

III *The Querelle des Femmes and Christian Anthropology*

The *querelle des femmes* was a discussion about the relationship between the sexes which was carried on in Europe from the Middle Ages through the Early Modern period; both male and female writers contributed to it. In terms of subject matter the *querelle* was primarily »a debate about the anthropology of the female sex, about its ethical, rational, and practical powers, about its position in human society in general and relative to the male as father and husband in particular.«¹⁶

The *querelle* is generally said to have begun with misogynist writings that circulated in France beginning as early as the thirteenth century; Christine de Pisan famously reacted to these with three books, among them her *Book of the City of Ladies* (1404/05). The end of the *querelle* has been dated with the French Revolution. At this time the European discussion about the sexes shifted from the social sphere to the political arena, thereby fundamentally changing the nature of the debate about women.¹⁷

While considerable research exists on the *querelle* as it manifested itself in France, Spain, and Italy, less has been written about the course of the debate about women in Germany.¹⁸ Gisela Bock, however, has suggested that the Reformation debates about marriage are also to be seen within this context, beginning with Martin Luther's *The Estate of Marriage* (1522) and his *Reason and Answer, Why Virgins May Leave the Cloister* (1523). The writings of women who, like Charitas Pirckheimer, defended the monastic life, and Katharina Zell, who defended her marriage to Matthias Zell, a former priest, also belong to this debate.¹⁹ A somewhat

16 C. PLUME, *Heroinnen in der Geschlechterordnung. Weiblichkeitsprojektionen bei Daniel Casper von Lohenstein und die Querelle des Femmes*, 1996, 15.

17 G. BOCK, *Die Querelle des Femmes in Europa. Eine begriffs- und forschungsgeschichtliche Einführung* (in: *Querelles. Jahrbuch für Frauenforschung* 2 [eds. G. BOCK and M. ZIMMERMANN], 1997, 16–18.20–22).

18 For an introduction to the scholarship on the *querelle des femmes*, see BOCK (s. n. 17), 9–38; G. ENGEL et al., eds., *Geschlechterstreit am Beginn der europäischen Moderne. Die Querelle des Femmes*, 2004; and F. HASSAUER, ed., *Heißer Streit und kalte Ordnung. Epochen der »Querelle des femmes« zwischen Mittelalter und Gegenwart*, 2008. For an older, English-language study see I. MCLEAN, *The Renaissance Notion of Woman*, 1980.

19 BOCK (s. n. 17), 16f.20f.

later German contribution to the *querelle* is the *Dialogus dem Ehestand zu Ehren* (1545) of Lutheran pastor Johann Freder, teacher and pastor in Hamburg at the time of the publication of his pamphlet. Freder's work was a reaction to a collection of proverbs on a variety of topics published by Sebastian Franck. Freder took offense at certain proverbs he considered to be defamatory of women and marriage. Although he remained traditional in his endorsement of separate domains and different work for men and women, he did advocate what Scott Hendrix terms »a limited equality of women and men.«²⁰ Concerning women's moral capacities, Freder argued that, in God's eyes, men and women were all alike because they were all sinners; he also considered Eve to be no guiltier than Adam in the Fall.²¹ With respect to women's intellectual capacities, he wrote that women were endowed with the same noble and rational soul as men.²² He also cited a proverb attributed to Socrates »that women's minds in all things are no less capable and clever than are the minds of men.«²³

Fifty years later, at the end of the sixteenth century, a new controversy over the nature and capabilities of women erupted in the German Lutheran territories with the publication of the anonymous *New disputation against women, by which it is proven that they are not human* in January 1595. Magdalena Drexel, who has studied this controversy at length, explains that the *New disputation* was widely attributed to the German

20 S. HENDRIX, Christianizing Domestic Relations. Women and Marriage in Johann Freder's *Dialogus dem Ehestand zu Ehren* (SCJ 23, no. 2, 1992), 251.58. For a study of Freder's *Dialogus* in its theological, literary, and legal context, see M. BAUSEN, Lob und Unschuld der Ehefrauen. Analytische Betrachtungen zu Leben und Werk des Johannes Freder. Ein Beitrag zur *Querelle des Femmes* des 16. Jahrhunderts, 2002. For a modern edition of Franck's proverbs, see S. FRANCK, Sämtliche Werke. Kritische Ausgabe mit Kommentar, ed. P. K. KNAUER, vol. 11, 1993.

21 »Für Gott sind beide Menner und Weiber gleich / da ist ein Mensch wie der ander / nemlich / allzumal Sunder / Wie Paulus sagt Ro. 3[,10]. Es ist keiner der guts thut / auch nicht einer [...].« J. FREDER, Ein Dialogus dem Ehestand zu ehren geschrieben. Durch M. Johan Freder [...]. Mit einer Vorrede D. Mart. Luth., 1545, Hr, cited in HENDRIX (s. n. 20), 259.

22 »Denn es hat Gott den Weibern je so wol eine edle vnd vernunfttge Seele gegeben als den Mennern.« FREDER, Jijv cited in HENDRIX (s. n. 20), 260.

23 »Das der Weiber verstand zu allen dingen / nicht weniger tüchtig und geschickt sey / denn der Menner verstand.« FREDER, Kivr, cited in Hendrix (s. n. 20), 260.

humanist Valens Acidalius (1567–1595), although the latter persistently denied that he had written it. The author of the *New Disputation* argued that women were not human, contending that he was able to do so with the same exegetical means by which the Anabaptists argued that Christ was not divine. In effect, according to Drexel, the *New disputation* was less an attack on women or Anabaptists than it was an attack on the kind of literal exegesis of the Bible that was practiced by the major confessional groups of the time, including not only Anabaptists, but also Lutherans and Calvinists.²⁴

Within days of the publication of the *New Disputation*, on January 12, 1595, the dean (most likely Aegidius Hunnius) and professors of the Theological Faculty at the University of Wittenberg published an official reply.²⁵ Their nine-page response did not consist of a point-by-point refutation of the theses of the *New Disputation*; rather, it made three main points. First, it warned students of the Theological Faculty against joking and frivolous exegesis of Scripture; Scripture was to be interpreted in the correct, that is, Lutheran, manner. Second, it sought to convince students who held anti-trinitarian views to abandon these. Third, it argued that the doctrines of the Trinity and of salvation were to be upheld as applying to both men and women.²⁶

24 DREXL (s. n. 3), 94. Drexel notes that the author of the *Disputatio nova* does not differentiate between Anabaptist and antitrinitarian groups.

25 Loc. cit. 127. The title reads: *Admonitio theologiae Facultatis in Acad. Witeb. ad scholasticam juventutem de libello famoso [...] recens sparso, cui titulus est: Disputatio nova contra mulieres*, 1565. It is almost certain that the dean of the Wittenberg Theological Faculty at the time was Aegidius Hunnius. The first of two entries for 1595 in the minutes of the Senate of the Theological Faculty reads: »Anno 1595 die [dies deest] pro licentia in S. Theologia responderunt Decano D. *Aegidio Hunnio* et Praeside D. *Salomone Gesnero* datis dandis: M. *Iohannes Georgius Volcmarus* Löbensteinensis Variscus, Historiarum Professor. M. *Daniel Cramerus*, Organi Aristotelici extraordinarius professor.« The previous entry, July 4, 1594, lists Salomon Gesner as dean; the subsequent entry, October 21, 1595, lists David Rungius; see »Senatus de collegio theologie studij albiori-« (in: *Liber Decanorum Facultatis Theologiae Academiae Vitebergensis*, ed. C. E. FOERSTERMANN, 1838, 87f).

26 DREXL (s. n. 3), 133–135. The reply of the Leipzig professors bore the title: *Refutatio Opposita [...] auctoris thesibus, quibus humanam naturam foeminei sexus impugnatur*, 1595.

A week later, on January 19, 1595, the dean and professors of the Theological Faculty in Leipzig published their reply. The Leipzig theologians were less concerned with the denial of the humanity of women in the *New Disputation* than they were with what they perceived to be its attacks on the true, Lutheran, faith. They argued that the author of the *New Disputation* denied the resurrection of women only to call into question the doctrine of the resurrection as a whole. Having defended this doctrine, the Leipzigers argued that they had reestablished the dignity of the female sex and had dispelled doubts that the *New Disputation* might have given women about the certainty of their salvation.²⁷

The views about women's nature and capacities reflected and debated in the writings of the abovementioned Lutheran theologians can be traced back to the Bible and to the biblical exegesis of Augustine and Thomas Aquinas. According to Augustine, woman was created solely to be the »helpmate« of man in procreation. She was created subordinate to man; as a result of the fall, her husband was also given the right to rule over her. In another writing, Augustine teaches that as »homo interior« woman was man's equal at creation, because both had an asexual soul, but as »homo exterior« woman was inferior in the patriarchal social order.²⁸ Woman's intellectual capabilities were inferior to those of man, and this inferiority further justified her subordination.²⁹ The anthropology of Thomas Aquinas does not deviate significantly in these points from that of Augustine. Aquinas agrees with his predecessor that woman was created solely to be man's helpmate in procreation. Both man and woman were created in the image of God as rational human beings.³⁰ However, even before the fall, woman was inferior to man both intellectually and ethically.³¹

27 DREXL (s. n. 3), 140–143.

28 L. SEELBACH, »Das weibliche Geschlecht ist ja kein Gebrechen....«. Die Frau und ihre Gottebenbildlichkeit bei Augustin, 2002, 178.180.198.

29 M. LEISCH-KIESL, Eva als Andere. Eine exemplarische Untersuchung zu Frühchristentum und Mittelalter, 1992, 84.

30 Loc. cit. 137.141.

31 K. FIETZE, Spiegel der Vernunft. Theorien zum Menschsein der Frau in der Anthropologie des 15. Jahrhunderts, 1991, 68f.

Martin Luther's anthropology, and that of the Lutheran preachers whose *Haustafel* sermons are analyzed in this essay, is to be seen in this context. While Luther himself did not preach a series of *Haustafel* sermons, he did preach and publish a series of sermons on 1 Peter in 1523, six years before he published his *Haustafel*. The sermons on 1 Peter dealing with husbands and wives warrant closer consideration here because the principal texts adduced for wives and husbands in Luther's *Haustafel* are 1 Pet 3:1,6 and 1 Pet 3:7, and it is likely that Luther's followers consulted these sermons in themselves preparing to preach on the duties of spouses.³²

In explaining 1 Peter 3:1–6, Luther identifies, in essence, a single duty for wives: that they be subject to their husbands. For Luther, this subjection is in accordance with the Word of God: »For this is the order established by God when He says to the woman in Gen. 3(: 16): ›Your desire shall be for your husband, and he shall be your lord.« It is the direct result of the fall into sin: »This is also one of the penalties God imposed on women.«³³ Luther does, however, qualify the subjection of the wife to her husband: »But such conduct, (I say), is external; it pertains to the body, not to the spirit.«³⁴ In the sermon on husbands which follows, Luther identifies two more duties of wives: »Woman is also God's armament or instrument (he [St. Peter] says); for God uses her to conceive, bear, feed and look after children, and to govern the household.«³⁵

32 The *Sermons on the First Epistle of St. Peter* were incorporated into a number of editions of Luther's works, among them the Jena edition, thus making them available to later generations of Lutheran preachers; see P. PIETSCH, Introduction to Epistel S. Petri gepredigt und ausgelegt. Erste Bearbeitung 1523, WA 12; 249.

33 LW 30,88. Citations from the LW are adapted when a more literal rendition reveals a nuance obscured by the translation. »Denn also hat es Gott geordnet Gene: 3. da er zum weyb spricht: ›Du sollt dich ducken fur deynem man und er soll deyn herr sein‹, Wilchs auch der straff eyne ist, die er den weybern auff gelegt hat« (WA 12; 342,14–19).

34 LW 30,88. »Solchs ist aber (sag ich) der eusserlich wandel, gehoe|rt den leyb an, nicht den geyst« (WA 12; 342,19f).

35 LW 30,91. »Das weyb ist auch Gottis rusttzeug odder wercktzeug (sagt er). Denn Gott braucht seyn datzu, das sie kinder trage, gepere, ernere und wartte, und das haws regire« (WA 12; 346,1–3).

Concerning the duties of husbands, Luther states that a husband is to govern his wife (»regieren«), but also to see to it »that he treats her in a considerate manner and reasonably, that he spares her and gives her honor as God's weakest instrument.«³⁶ Second, a husband is to understand that his wife is »weaker physically and also weaker and more fearful of heart.«³⁷ On account of the weaknesses of his wife, the husband is not to use his power over her arbitrarily, but rather to help, preserve, and protect (»helffest, enthaltest und schu(e)ttest«) her. Third, he is to support (»ernennen«) her. Fourth, he is to be patient with her and treat her reasonably.³⁸ Luther acknowledges that scholars before him have differed in their interpretations of what it means to »honor« one's wife, and then concludes: »In my opinion, it means what I have said, namely, that a husband must bear in mind that his wife is a Christian too and is God's instrument or armament.«³⁹ Alluding to Galatians 3:28, Luther further explains that even though a wife may be »weak and frail« (»schwach und gebrechlich«), nevertheless »she is also baptized and has exactly what he has, namely, all blessings from Christ. For inwardly we are all alike; there is no difference between a man and a woman. Externally, however, God wants the husband to rule and the wife to be submissive to him.«⁴⁰

In the *Sermons on the First Epistle of St. Peter*, there is no mention of women's ethical inferiority; both husbands and wives have their respective moral weaknesses. Luther condemns both disobedience on the part of wives and physical abuse on the part of husbands, saying to husbands: »For

36 LW 30,91. »wie er sewberlich und mit vernunft mit yhr umbgehe, das er yhr schone und yhr eehr gebe, als dem schwachsten werckzeuge Gottis« (WA 12; 346,9f).

37 LW 30,91f. »schwecher von leyb, und auch am mu(o)tt blo(e)der und vertzagter« (WA 12; 346,12).

38 LW 30,92 [=WA 12; 346,18–28.]

39 LW 30,92. »Jch halt, es sey das die meynung, wie ich gesagt hab, das der man das weyb also ansehen soll, das sie auch eyn Christen sey und Gottis werck odder rustzeug« (WA 12; 346,31–33).

40 LW 30,93. »sie auch getaufft ist, und eben das hatt, das er hatt, nemlich alle gu(e)ttter von Christo. Denn ynnertlich sind wyr alle gleych und ist keyn unterscheid unter man und weyb. Aber euserlich will Gott haben, das der man regire, und das weyb yhm unterthan sey« (WA 12; 347,8–12).

you will accomplish nothing with blows; they will not make a woman pious and submissive. If you beat one devil out of her, you will beat two into her, as the saying goes.«⁴¹

From Luther's exposition of 1 Peter, it is tempting to conclude that Luther had a higher view of women's intellectual and moral capacities than did Augustine or Aquinas. A look at his later *Lectures on Genesis* (1535), however, demonstrates that this is not the case. In his exegesis of Genesis 1:27, »Male and female He created them,« Luther writes that the woman has »different members and a much weaker nature (*ingenium*)«.⁴² Because »ingenium« can also refer to intellect or rational capacity, it seems that Luther, too, had his doubts about women's intellectual capacities.⁴³ The same seems to be the case with Luther's assessment of women's moral capacities. Commenting on Genesis 3:1, »Who said to the woman: Did God really command you not to eat from every tree of Paradise?«, Luther writes:

Satan's cleverness is perceived also in this, that he attacks the weak part of the human nature, Eve the woman, not Adam the man. Although both were created equally righteous, nevertheless Adam had some advantage over Eve. Just as in all the rest of nature the strength of the male surpasses that of the other sex, so also in the perfect nature the male somewhat excelled the female.⁴⁴

41 LW 30,88. »Denn mit schlagen wirstu nichts ausrichten, das du eyn weyb frum und bendig machst, schlechstu eyn teuffel heraus, so schlechstu yhr zween hyneyn (wie man sagt)« (WA 12; 342,32–343,2). Cf. K. F. W. WANDER, ed., *Deutsches Sprichwörter-Lexikon*, vol. 5, 1880, 35, nr. 787.

42 LW 1,69. »et membra habet dissimilia et ingenium longe infirmius« (WA 42; 51,36). Cf. I. LUDOLPHY, *Die Frau in der Sicht Martin Luthers* (in: *Vierhundertfünfzig Jahre lutherische Reformation 1517–1967. Festschrift für Franz Lau zum 60. Geburtstag*, ed. H. JUNGANS, 1967, 204–221).

43 K. E. GEORGES, *Art. ingenium* (*Ausführliches Lateinisch-Deutsches Handwörterbuch*, vol. 2, 11962, 261f).

44 LW 1,151. »Deinde deprehenditur astucia etiam in eo, quod Satan invadit infirmam partem humanae naturae, Heuam foeminam et non Adam masculum. Quanquam enim ambo aequaliter iusti creati sunt, tamen Adam Heuae praestitit. Sicut enim in tota reliqua natura mascula virtus excedit alterum sexum: Ita etiam in integra natura masculus praestitit nonnihil foemellae« (WA 42; 114,1–5).

Luther goes on to speculate that, had the serpent attacked Adam, Adam would not have given in to the temptation. Thus Luther appears to agree with his predecessors that Eve was created not only physically weaker, but also intellectually and ethically inferior, to Adam. This same conviction about the intellectual and moral inferiority of women was almost invariably used by Luther's successors in their *Haustafel* sermons to justify the social subordination of women to men.

IV *The Haustafel Sermons of Luther's Successors on the Duties of Husbands and Wives*

In what follows, the *Haustafel* sermons of four preachers are examined to highlight their contribution to the *querelle des femmes*; particular attention is paid to the preachers' defense of the dignity of women as baptized Christians along with their insistence on women's inferiority to men. Two of the four authors can be directly linked to the *querelle*: Aegidius Hunnius and Sebastian Artomedes. The other two, Cyriakus Spangenberg and Philipp Jacob Spener, represent chronologically the first and last contributors to the genre of *Haustafel* sermons. Additionally, the four authors represent four distinct German territories and cities: Hunnius was city and court preacher in Marburg in Hesse, Artomedes served as cathedral preacher in Königsberg in Prussia, Spangenberg preached in Eisleben, and Spener in the imperial city of Frankfurt.

The earliest printed collection of *Haustafel* sermons to have survived is that of Cyriacus Spangenberg, who at the time was serving as court and city preacher for the counts of Mansfeld.⁴⁵ It was published in Wittenberg in 1556 under the title *Die Geistliche Haustafel*.⁴⁶ At the beginning of his

45 On the life and work of Cyriakus Spangenberg, see B. FEICKE, Art. Spangenberg, Cyriakus (BBKL, online edition, <http://www.bautz.de>, accessed November 10, 2010). For a recent collection of articles on Cyriacus Spangenberg and the Reformation in the Mansfeld territories see S. RHEIN and G. WARTENBERG, eds., *Reformatoren im Mansfelder Land*. Erasmus Sarcerius and Cyriakus Spangenberg, 2006.

46 C. SPANGENBERG, *Die Geistliche* // HAVSTA= // FEL / Wie sich ein jgliche Gott= // selig Mensch in seinem Stande // vnd beruff nach Gottes wil= // len rechtschaffen halten // solle [...], 1556. The *Haustafel* sermons were subsequently merged with Spangenberg's

sermon on the duties of husbands, Spangenberg states the »rule« that a husband is to »love, care for, and faithfully govern« his wife; in the course of the sermon he adduces specific Scripture passages.⁴⁷ Spangenberg teaches, first, that husbands are to love their wives, and supports this teaching with the argument that God »took her not from Adam's feet, so that he should hold her in contempt [...] rather, he took her and created her from a rib, which he took from Adam's side, next to the heart, where by nature love dwells, in order to show that a husband should love his wife like his own heart.«⁴⁸ A further reason for husbands to love their wives is their co-redemption in Christ: A husband is to love his wife »for the sake of the promise of God, who has made the wife, too, a co-heir of grace and eternal life. Therefore one is properly not to hold a co-heir in contempt, but rather honor and love her.«⁴⁹ The second duty of husbands, that of supporting their wives, Spangenberg, following Luther, derives from Genesis 3:19a: »This is required by God's commandment and as penance imposed by him, because God said to Abraham, ›By the sweat of your face you shall eat your bread.««⁵⁰ The third duty of husbands is derived from the creation

Catechism sermons under the title *Catechismus // Die Fünff Haupt= // stu(e)cke der Christlichen // Lere / Sampt der Haustafel*; this work was published in at least six more editions between 1565 and 1580; see VD16/17, online edition, http://gateway-bayern.bib-bvb.de/aleph-cgi/bvb_suche?sid=VD16, accessed December 1, 2010.

- 47 »lieben / jrer pflegen vnd getrewlich fu(e)rstehn.« C. SPANGENBERG, *Catechismus // Die Fünff Haupt= // stu(e)cke der Christlichen // Lere / Sampt der Haustafel / // vnd dem Morgen vnd Abend Gebete // Benedicite vnd Gratias / etc [...]*, 1580, [Dddiv]v.
- 48 »nicht von Adams Fu(e)ssen genomen / das der Mann sein Weib verachten solle / [...] / Sondern hat Euam genomen vnd gemacht / aus einer Rieben / die er nam aus Adams Seiten / neben dem Herten / da von Natur die Liebe wonet / Anzuzeigen / Das der Mann sein Weib lieben solle / wie sein eigen Hertz.« SPANGENBERG (s. n. 47), Eeer. S. KARANT-NUNN notes that this argument has been attributed to Peter Lombard; see her *The Transmission of Luther's Teachings on Women and Matrimony. The Case of Zwickau* (ARG 77, 1986, 33).
- 49 »Vmb Gottes Beruffs willen / der das Weib auch zum Miterben der Gnaden / vnd des ewigen Lebens gemacht hat / Darumb man Christi Miterben billich nicht verachten / sondern ehren vnd lieben sol.« SPANGENBERG (s. n. 47), Eeev.
- 50 »So erfordert solches auch Gottes Befehl vnd aufgelegte Busse / Denn zu Adam sagte Gott / Im Schweis deines Angesichts soltu dein Brod essen.« SPANGENBERG (s. n. 47), Eeeijv. Scripture passages are translated as the sixteenth-century writers cite them, in consultation with the New Revised Standard Version (NRSV).

account and from 1 Corinthians 11:3–12: »A husband is to govern his wife, that is, he is to be lord in the house and his wife is to be obedient and submissive, for God first created the man, and then the woman, and he is also the head of the woman, therefore he is to have the governance, not the woman.«⁵¹ Although, following Augustine, Aquinas and Luther, Spangenberg considers women to be less intelligent than men, he nevertheless advises men to give ear to the counsel of their wives:

Here husbands are to take note, that even though by nature they are more reasonable and wiser than their wives, nevertheless they are not to hold their [wives'] advice in contempt, but rather listen to what God through his dear gift wishes to say, and to consider well whether to heed it or not, because the advice of righteous Christian wives is not always to be held in contempt.⁵²

This admonition to listen to wives is backed up with references to Scripture:

Had Abraham not heeded the advice of his old housewife Sarah, he may have lost control over the young lord Ishmael or Ishmael may have harmed Isaac, so that things would have become overly difficult for them [Gen 21:9–14]. Pilate's wife advised her lord that he should have nothing to do with the innocent Christ [Mt 27:19]. Surely Pilate would now give a pretty penny to have heeded her advice!⁵³

Finally, Spangenberg, like Luther, condemns wife-beating.⁵⁴

51 »Sol ein Ehemann sein Ehefrau auch regieren / Das ist / Er sol Herr im Hause sein / vnd die Frau sol gehorsam vnd vnterthan sein / Denn Gott hat zum ersten den Mann geschaffen / darnach das Weib / vnd ist auch der Mann des Weibes Heupt / darumb sol er das Regiment haben / vnd nicht das Weib.« SPANGENBERG (s. n. 47), Eeeiijv.

52 »Hie sollen aber die Ehemänner das auch mercken / Ob sie wol von Natur / vernu(e)nfftiger vnd weiser sind den(n) die Weiber / So sollen sie doch derselben Raht nicht gar verachten / sondern anho(e)ren / was Gott durch seine liebe Gabe rahten wo(e)lle / vnd solches wol erwegen / Ob demselben zu folgen oder nicht / Denn fromer / Christlicher Ehefrauen Raht / ist nicht allzeit zuuerachten.« SPANGENBERG, Catechismus, [Eiv]r-v.

53 »Hette Abraham nicht dem Raht seiner alten Hausmutter Sara gefolget / es solte jm der Juncker Jsmael / wol vber den Hals gewachsen sein / oder dem Jsac einen Schaden zugefu(e)gt haben / das es jnen allzu schwer were worden. Pilatus Weib gab jrem Herrn den Raht / Er solte nichts zu schaffen haben mit dem vnschu(e)ldigen Christo. Da gebe jetzt Pilatus wol etwas grosses vmb / das er diesem Raht gefolget hette.« SPANGENBERG (s. n. 47), [Eiv]v.

54 SPANGENBERG (s. n. 47), [Eeeiv]v-Fffr.

Spangenberg's advice to wives is organized under three headings: How a wife is to behave toward 1. her husband, 2. other people, and 3. her children. According to Spangenberg's rule, a wife is to »show reverent fear toward her husband, be obedient and faithful to him, have a gentle and quiet spirit toward everyone, not quarrel or insist on the last word, [and] raise and govern children and servants in fear and love of God.«⁵⁵ The duty of obedience Spangenberg bases on 1 Peter 3:1,6: »Let wives be subject to their husbands as to the LORD, as ›Sarah obeyed Abraham and called him lord. And you have become her daughters, when you do what is good.«⁵⁶ Second, with respect to »other people,« Spangenberg observes that a woman's place is in the home and that she should not go out without good reason. He acknowledges, however, that sometimes women's work in their husband's business requires them to go to market or other places, and does not discourage or condemn their activity.⁵⁷ Third, women are to raise their children to fear God.⁵⁸

Aegidius Hunnius (1550–1603), who published his *Christliche Haußtafel* in 1586 in Frankfurt, was serving at the time as city and court preacher of the Lutheran Landgrave Ludwig IV of Hesse-Marburg.⁵⁹ Hunnius summarizes his teaching on husbands and wives in a single sermon, selecting Ephesians 5:25–29 and 5:22–24 as his Scripture texts. With St. Paul's words, »Husbands, love your wives, just as Christ loved the church and gave himself up for her« (Eph 5:25), Hunnius sounds the principal theme of his advice to husbands.⁶⁰ Although he does not mention the

55 »sich in Ehrwürdiger Furcht / gegen jren Ehemann beweisen / jm gehorsam vnd treu sein / eines sanfften vnd stillen Geistes gegen jederman / Nicht zanken / vnd das letzte Wort behalten / Kinder vnd Gesinde auffziehen vnd regieren / in Gottes Furcht vnd Liebe.« SPANGENBERG (s. n. 47), Fffv.

56 »Die Weiber sollen vnterthan sein jren Männern / als dem HERRN / wie Sara dem Abraham gehorsam war / vnd hies in jren Herrn / welcher To(e)chter jr worden seid / so jr wolthut.« SPANGENBERG (s. n. 47), Fff iijr. NRSV, adapted.

57 SPANGENBERG (s. n. 47), [Fff iv]r-v.

58 SPANGENBERG (s. n. 47), [Fff iv]v-Gggr.

59 M. MATTHIAS, *Theologie und Konfession. Der Beitrag von Ägidius Hunnius (1550–1603) zur Entstehung einer lutherischen Religionskultur*, 2004, is the most recent and significant biographical and theological study of Hunnius to date.

60 A. HUNNIUS, *Catechismus* / // Oder // Kinderlehr [...] // Sampt anhangender Christ= //

honor that husbands owe their wives as co-heirs of Christ, he does teach that husbands are to love them as Christ loved the church (cf. Eph 5:25); such love, he says, is »not limited, not cold or lukewarm [...] but entirely ardent, sincere, and true.«⁶¹ Referring to 1 Peter 3:7, Hunnius warns that anger and violence toward one's wife is not compatible with either love or faith: Men »are to lift pure hands up in prayer, without anger or doubt. With these words he [St. Peter] wishes to teach that when they do not love their wives, but are angry, bitter, and evil toward them, then they cannot pray, their prayer will be in vain and will not bear fruit.«⁶² Unlike Spangenberg, however, Hunnius does not teach that there are times when husbands are to listen to and consider the advice their wives give.

Just as love is the principal emotion that is to characterize the relationship of husbands toward their wives, obedience is the main attitude that wives are to display toward their husbands. Hunnius cites the words of Paul: »Wives, be subject to your husbands as you are to the Lord (Eph 5:22),« and explains: »Thus subjection and obedience is required of them.«⁶³ Important to note, however, is that he sets limits on the obedience of wives – it is only to be rendered in »all proper, honorable, and godly matters.«⁶⁴ This limitation implies that Hunnius believes women to have the moral capacity to distinguish between »honorable« and dishonorable

licher Haußtafel nu(e)tzlicher Er= // kla(e)rung [...], 1596, 770. Cf. the analysis of this sermon in BEHRENDT (s. n. 11), 223–225. The *Christliche Haußtafel* was remarkably successful; it was published separately in at least four more editions by J. SPIES in Frankfurt am Main in 1588, 1591, 1593, and 1594, respectively. After that, in 1596, 1597, 1598, and 1604, it was published as part of HUNNIUS (s. n. 60); see the bibliographies in MATTHIAS (s. n. 59), 341 and 353. The VD 16/17 identifies an additional edition of the *Christliche Haußtafel* published in Leipzig, also by Johann Spies, in 1593; see http://gateway-bayern.bib-bvb.de/aleph/cgi/bvb_suche?sid=VD16, accessed April 6, 2011.

61 »nicht gering / nicht kalt oder lohe [...] / sondern gantz innbru(e)nstig / hertzlich vnd warhafftig.« HUNNIUS (s. n. 60), 771f.

62 »sollen im Betten reine Ha(e)nde auffheben / ohne Zorn vnnd ohne Zweifel. Wil mit diesen Worten lehren / wann sie jhre Weiber nicht lieben / sondern zornig / bitter vnnd bo(e)ß gegen sie seyn / so ko(e)nnen sie nicht betten / jhr Gebett sey vergebens / vnd gehe ohne alle Frucht ab.« Loc. cit. 772f.

63 »Wirdt also Vntertha(e)nigkeit vnnd Gehorsam von jhnen erfordert.« Loc. cit. 775.

64 »allen billichen / ehrbarn / Go(e)ttlichen Sachen.« Loc. cit. 777.

matters. With respect to the intellectual capacities of women, however, Hunnius appears to have his doubts. He disciplines uppity wives with the harshest of words:

Therefore, if you are a wife, and the thought comes to you that you should not defer to your husband, because you are of equally high standing as he is, equally wealthy, equally wise and understanding (»kluge vnnd versta(e)ndig«) – then ask yourself: From whom does such a thought come? Immediately your conscience will be able to tell you that it comes not from the good and Holy Spirit (for he wills obedience on the part of wives toward their husbands). Rather, it comes from the despicable devil, who gladly would overturn the order of GOD, so that wives would not be obedient, but rather rebellious toward their husbands.⁶⁵

Sebastian Artomedes (b. 1544), an almost exact contemporary of Hunnius, appears to have valued the intellectual capacities of women more highly than his colleague did. Artomedes served as cathedral preacher in Kneiphof Königsberg from 1589 until his death in 1602.⁶⁶ His *Haustafel* sermons were published posthumously in Leipzig in 1605 together with his catechism sermons under the title *Kurtze vnd einfeltige / jedoch richtige vnd reine Erklerung des Heiligen Catechismi / sampt der Christlichen Haustafel*; three of them are dedicated to the estate of marriage.⁶⁷ In the first Artomedes condemns the already mentioned »despicable writing about the origin of women«; to speak »disgracefully and mockingly« (»schimpfflich vnd

65 »Darumb wenn du ein Weib bist / vnnd es wil dir ein solcher Gedanck eynfallen / daß du deinem Man(n) nichts bevor geben sollest / du seyest von so gutem Geschlecht / als er / so reich als er / so klug vnnd versta(e)ndig als er: So dencke also baldt zu ru(e)ck / von wem wol solcher Gedanck herkommen mo(e)ge? Wirt dir so baldt dein Gewissen sagen ko(e)nnen / er komme nicht her von dem guten vnd heyiligen Geist (dann der wil den Gehorsam von Weibern gegen jhre Ehema(e)nner haben) Sonder von dem leydigen Teufel / der die Ordnung GOTtes gern vmbwenden wolt / daß das Weib dem Mann nicht gehorsam / sondern widerspa(e)nstig soll seyn.« Loc. cit. 778f.

66 The available biographical information on Artomedes is scanty; see F. W. BAUTZ, Art. Artomedes, Sebastian (BBKL, <http://www.bautz.de>, accessed April 6, 2011), and F. MOELLER, *Altpreußisches evangelisches Pfarrerbuch von der Reformation bis zur Vertreibung im Jahre 1945*. Biographischer Teil, Erste Lieferung, 1977, 44f.

67 The composite volume was printed at least three more times, in 1609, 1614, and 1621, respectively, and in 1609 the *Haustafel* sermons also appeared as a separate volume; see VD 16/17, http://gateway-bayern.bib-bvb.de/aleph-cgi/bvb_suche?sid=VD16, accessed June 22, 2010.

spo(e)ttisch«) about married women is unacceptable to him. He goes on, however, to present a traditional view of the duties of husbands and wives. Like Hunnius, he bases his instruction on Eph 5:25–29. He identifies five duties of husbands: They are to »love and honor« (»lieben vnd ehren«) their wives, to support them, to be patient with them, and to »govern« (»regieren«) them. Like Luther and Spangenberg before him, he considers the duty to support the wife to be a result of the fall into sin. Concerning the duty to govern the wife, he writes that a husband is »not to be a Doctor Sieman [lit., ›she-man‹], but rather the lord in his house.«⁶⁸ He is »not to misuse his superiority and lordship« (»seiner Superioritet vnd Herrschafft nicht mißbrauchen«), however, but rather to remember the familiar saying that the woman was taken not from the feet, but the rib of the man, near his heart. Even more fervently than Spangenberg, Artomedes exhorts husbands not to underestimate their wives' intelligence:

And because God in administering and distributing his gifts has not bypassed or forgotten the female sex – there are some women superior in intelligence and skill (»verstand vnd geschickligkeit«) to men, and two eyes see more than one, four eyes see more than two, two people who seriously consider a matter think of more things than one person does: For this reason, a Christian husband shall not disregard the advice and opinion of his wife, who is his closest, dearest, best, most loyal friend. Rather, when at times difficult, unpleasant, dangerous, far-reaching, and dubious matters come up, in which he might, on account of a small mistake, cause himself and his own great harm, then he is to gladly listen to his dear wife, as well as to seek her counsel.⁶⁹

68 »daß er nicht sol ein D. Sieman / sondern Herr in seinem Hauß sein.« ARTOMEDES (s. n. 2), 142.

69 »Vnd weil Gott in ausspendung vnd außtheilung seiner gaben das Weibliche Geschlecht nicht gar verbeygangen oder vergessen / es thuts manches Weib mit verstand vnd geschickligkeit auch wol Ma(e)nnern bevor / Et oculi plus vident, quàm oculus, Vier augen sehen mehr / als zwey / vnd zweyen / die ein ding mit ernst nachdencken / fellet mehr zu als einem: So sol ein Christlicher Ehman seines Weibs / als seines nechsten / liebsten / besten / getrewesten freundes rath vnd wolmeinung nicht in wind schlagen / sondern wenn jhm bißweilen schwere / wu(e)nderliche / gefehrliche / weitsehende / zweiffeliche ha(e)ndel fu(e)rkommen / da er etwas / durch ein kleines versehen / jm vnd den seinen grossen schaden thun ko(e)ndte: Da sol er sein liebes Weib auch gern ho(e)ren / sie auch lassen mit einrathen / [...].« Loc. cit. 143.

Thus, in contrast to his predecessors, Artomedes believes that at least »some women« are more intelligent than their husbands. To support this assertion, Artomedes points out that the biblical women Sarah, Rebekah, and Esther gave good advice to their husbands, Abraham, Isaac, and Ahasuerus (Gen 21: 9–14; Gen 27: 46–28: 2; Esther 5: 1–5). Nabal should have, but did not, listen to the advice of his wife Abigail (1 Sam 25: 2–38). And Pilate would not have fallen into such misery and distress (»solch jammer vnd noth«) had he listened to his wife (Mt 27: 19).⁷⁰

In the list of reasons that Artomedes gives for husbands to obey the rules he has spelled out, familiar themes surface. One reason is reminiscent of Luther: »Even though she [the wife] is a weaker instrument, nevertheless she is a co-heir of grace and life.«⁷¹ A second was previously brought up by Hunnius: A husband should live reasonably (»mit vernunfft«) with his wife, in order that his prayers may not be hindered.⁷²

In his instructions to wives Artomedes also is quite traditional. A wife is to love her husband, be obedient and faithful to him, and to fear God. Artomedes follows Luther in pointing out that the subjection of wives is due to the fall of Eve; before the fall, Eve was equal to her husband.⁷³ In apparent contradiction to his earlier statement that wives sometimes are more intelligent and clever than their husbands, Artomedes seems to echo Hunnius when he says: »And when a wife seeks to dominate her husband, considers herself more clever, more insightful, more intelligent than her husband, [...] then she acts against God's order and she dare not believe that he will leave her unpunished.«⁷⁴ He does not, however, in any way appear to question the moral capabilities of women.

⁷⁰ Loc. cit. 143.

⁷¹ »Ob gleich sie [die Frau] ein schwacher werckzeug ist / so ist sie doch ein Miterbe der Gnaden vnd des Lebens.« Loc. cit. 144.

⁷² Loc. cit. 146.

⁷³ Loc. cit. 148.

⁷⁴ »Vnd wenn das Weib dem Mann will zun ha(e)upten wachsen / lesst sich bedu(e)ncken sie sey geschickter / anschlegiger / verstendiger / als der Mann / [...] / da handelt sie wider Gottes Ordnung / vnd darffs jhr nicht in sinn nemen / das er sie werd vngestraft lassen.« Loc. cit. 148.

Philipp Jacob Spener is the author of what appears to be the last volume of *Haustafel* sermons published by Lutheran preachers: *Kurtze Catechismus Predigten* (1689). Spener preached on the catechism and *Haustafel* during his tenure in Frankfurt am Main; by the time of the publication of the sermons, however, he had already become court preacher in Dresden. Spener does not preface his sermons with a specific sermon text or a rule. He largely repeats the traditional advice on husbands and wives given by his Lutheran forebears. Although his teaching is thoroughly conventional, it is possible to regard Spener as emphasizing the spiritual equality of wives, indeed, on occasion the spiritual superiority of a wife over her husband. He begins his sermon on husbands by stating that their duties are to love their wives, to support them, to govern them, and to be patient with them.⁷⁵ With respect to the husband's duty to govern his wife, Spener emphasizes that this governance, first and foremost, is spiritual in nature: He is to »keep and urge her to godliness.«⁷⁶ Although in the household he is to leave women's matters and the supervision of the servants to his wife, nevertheless he is to maintain overall governance (»das oberregiment«). This is because »the rule of women without male supervision is thoughtless and commonly unsuccessful.«⁷⁷ Nevertheless, a husband is to live reasonably (»mit vernunft«) with his wife; this means that he should consult her in certain things and »not hold in contempt her advice or always reject it.«⁷⁸ Finally, a husband should be patient with his wife. Here Spener explicitly condemns men who abuse their wives, »who want to cor-

75 P. J. SPENER, D. Philipp Jacob Speners // Kurtze // Catechismus= // Predigten // Darinnen // Die fu(e)nf Haupt=Stu(e)ck / auß dem Catechismo / vnd // die Hauß=Tafel / samt den Fest=Materien // einfa(e)ltig erkl(a)ret werden [...], 1711, 613. In addition to this and the original 1689 edition, Spener's volume was published at least two more times, in 1697 and 1727, respectively; see VD 16/17, http://gateway-bayern.bib-bvb.de/aleph/cgi/bvb_suche?sid=VD16, and Karlsruhe Virtueller Katalog, <http://www.ubka.uni-karlsruhe.de/kvk.html>, both accessed December 1, 2010. For biographical information on Spener, see J. WALLMANN, Philipp Jakob Spener und die Anfänge des Pietismus (BHTh 42), ²1985.

76 »zur gottseligkeit halte und antreibe.« SPENER (s. n. 75), 614.

77 »wie dann weiber=regiment ohne ma(e)nnliche aufsicht / wie unbesonnen / also gemeinlich auch unglu(e)cklich ist.« Loc. cit. 614.

78 »derselben erinnerungen nicht eben verachte oder allezeit außschlage.« Loc. cit. 615.

rect [their] faults [...] with scolding, cursing, beating, and the like.«⁷⁹ The sermon on husbands concludes with three by now familiar reasons why husbands are to be considerate of their wives. Wives are the »weakest instrument,« which means that »[t]hey are not only weaker of body [...] but also more likely to be wrong, or to make a mistake.«⁸⁰ Clearly, Spener considers wives intellectually, perhaps also morally, inferior to their husbands. A wife is also a co-heir of eternal life. In elaborating this point, Spener extols the spiritual virtues of some women. Explicitly citing Galatians 3:28, he emphasizes that Christ has bestowed equal spiritual benefits on both sexes, »so that we [men] have not the least advantage over them, because ›in Christ there is no male or female.‹«⁸¹ This means, he says, that women are of equal honor before God and that husbands must grant their wives this honor of being »sisters and co-heirs who are equal to us. Indeed,« he says, »the occasional [woman] has a great advantage over her husband before God on account of her godliness.«⁸² Thirdly, wives are to be treated well so that the husbands' prayers are not hindered.

The spiritual superiority of the occasional woman does not exempt her in particular or women in general, from the divinely-ordained gender hierarchy. In his sermon on wives, Spener follows his Lutheran forebears in teaching that wives are to love and be faithful to their husbands, to honor them in acknowledging their God-given right to rule over their wives, to be submissive and obedient, and to do good, that is, to fear God, dress humbly, be frugal, and be conscientious in raising children and patient in child-bearing.⁸³ Like Hunnius, Spener limits the obedience wives are to render to »matters that are not against God« (»sachen, die nicht wider Gott

79 »die des weibes gebrechen mit schelten / fluchen / schla(e)gen und dergleichen weise zu recht bringen wollen.« Ibid.

80 »Sie seynd nicht nur an leib schwa(e)cher / [...] / sondern mo(e)gen auch eher fehlen / und von einem fehl u(e)bereilet werden.« Loc. cit. 616.

81 »ohne daß wir in allem diesen den geringsten vorzug ha(e)ttten: dann da ist in Christo kein mann und weib / Gal. 3 / 28.« Ibid.

82 »schwestern und mit=erben / die uns gleich sind / ja manche bey ihrem GOTT ihrer gottseligkeit wegen vor ihrem mann grossen vorzug hat.« Ibid.

83 Loc. cit. 618–622.

sind«). He reminds wives that their submission to their husbands originated with the punishment God imposed on Eve after the fall.⁸⁴

The content of this sermon is consistent with Spener's tract, *The Spiritual Priesthood* (1677), published twelve years earlier, in which he had taught that both men and women were members of the spiritual priesthood and were to use the spiritual gifts given to them. With reference to Galatians 3:28, he had written:

And thus in Christ the difference between man and woman, with respect to spiritual matters, is eliminated. Because God also endows believing women with his spiritual gifts, their orderly exercise of these gifts may not be forbidden.⁸⁵

Women were not to teach publicly in the congregation, but they could hold small meetings to review the pastor's sermons and to read and discuss the Bible.⁸⁶ In other words, they could – indeed had an obligation to – exercise their spiritual gifts, but only within the boundaries (»in [...] Schrancken«) the church had set for them.⁸⁷

⁸⁴ Loc. cit. 621.

⁸⁵ »Und ist also in Christo der Unterscheid unter Mann und Weib, was das geistliche anlangt, aufgehoben; Weil dann GOtt auch gla(e)ubige Weibes=Personen seiner geistlichen Gaben wu(e)rdiget, also mag deren Gebrauch in ihrer Ordnung ihnen nicht gewehret werden.« P. J. SPENER, *Das Geistliche Priesterthum*, aus Göttlichem Wort ku(e)rtzlich beschrieben [...] (in: Philipp Jakob Spener, *Kleine Geistliche Schriften*, ed. J. A. STEINMETZ, 2000, 676). Cf. R. ALBRECHT, *Art. C. Frauen* (in: H. LEHMANN, ed., *Glaubenswelt und Lebenswelten*, vol. 4 of *Geschichte des Pietismus*, ed. M. BRECHT et al., 2000, 524–526). On the basis of writings by both men and women Pietists, and both advocates and critics of Pietism, C. NIEKUS MOORE observes that while male Pietist leaders did not acknowledge any potential contradiction between their calls for reform and the traditional roles of women, this tension was evident to women Pietists and to critics of the movement; see her 'Obschon das Schwächste Werkzeug.' *Die Darstellung der Frau im deutschen Pietismus* (in: *Interdisziplinäre Pietismusforschungen. Beiträge zum Ersten Internationalen Kongress für Pietismusforschung*, ed. U. STRÄTER, 2005, 38).

⁸⁶ SPENER (s. n. 85), 677.

⁸⁷ Loc. cit. 678.

V Conclusion:

Haustafel Sermons and the Querelle des Femmes

The seemingly contradictory »high praise of the marital condition« and »depiction of the very defective nature of women« that Susan Karant-Nunn observed in her study of the wedding sermons of Johannes Matheius is found also in Lutheran *Haustafel* sermons on husbands and wives; moreover it persists over the century that passes between the publication of the sermons of Cyriacus Spangenberg in 1556 and Philipp Jacob Spener in 1689. The disparity between these respective assessments of marriage and women, was not, however, an inconsistency in the eyes of Martin Luther, who composed the *Haustafel*, or his followers, who preached on it. From their point of view, women's physical, intellectual, and moral inferiority was an indisputable fact, grounded in Scripture, Christian tradition, and experience. Thus, even though in his *Sermons on the First Epistle of Peter* (1523) Luther asserted that »inwardly we [both genders] are all alike,« in his later *Lectures on Genesis* (1535) he taught that even before the fall, woman was both intellectually and morally inferior to man. Hunnius clearly stated women to be intellectually inferior. Spener agreed, but considered some women superior with respect to spiritual matters. Artomedes was the only one to concede that at least some women were more intelligent and clever than their husbands; this made his estimation of women's intelligence, along with that of Johann Freder a half-century earlier, notable exceptions to the rule. With respect to the moral capacities of women, the comments of Spener on the weaker nature of women suggest that he agreed with Luther that women were morally weaker than men. At the same time, Spener, along with Hunnius, explicitly limited the obedience women owed their husbands to matters that were in line with God's commandments, thereby suggesting that women did have the moral capacity to make this distinction. The putative intellectual, moral, and physical inferiority of women, upheld by a long tradition of biblical exegesis, justified their subordinate social status; their subjection to male rule in turn was considered necessary for the harmony and stability of not only the household, but also the entire social order of the three estates. In view of this, Freder's and Artomedes's willingness to assert the intellectual equality of at least some women is all the more remarkable.

To consider the female sex inferior and in need of male governance was not, however, as far as the preachers were concerned, equivalent to disparaging women. They seriously believed they were defending women's honor and dignity when they praised marriage as a divinely ordained estate, insisted on the spiritual equality of wives as Christians and co-heirs of eternal life with Christ, urged husbands to love their wives and consider their advice, and explicitly condemned violence against women. The intention of the Lutheran preachers to defend women is all the more clearly visible when the *Haustafel* sermons are viewed within the context of the *querelle des femmes*. Aegidius Hunnius almost certainly was dean of the Theological Faculty of the University of Wittenberg in January 1595, when the Faculty published its refutation of the *New disputation against women, by which it is proven they are not human*. Sebastian Artomedes explicitly condemned a »knave« who wrote a »despicable and blasphemous writing about the origin of women«; this likely was the author of the *New disputation*.

Generally speaking, both the low estimation Lutheran preachers had of women's intellectual and moral capacities, and their insistence on marriage as a divinely-ordained estate, remained consistent with medieval teaching, with one significant exception: Whereas medieval preachers had praised the celibate, spiritual estate as more pleasing to God than the married estate, Lutherans rejected celibacy and insisted that the married estate was the *only* estate pleasing to God.⁸⁸ In their eyes, this teaching represented an elevation of both the status of marriage and the status of women, because it upheld the worth of women as fellow human beings redeemed by Christ, highlighted the value of the companionship that wives offered their husbands, and affirmed the significance of the work they did in their husband's home (and sometimes also workshop).

Lutheran views regarding the intellectual and moral capabilities of women were also in line with humanist ideas. While Desiderius Erasmus (1466–1536) and Juan Luis Vives (1492–1540) encouraged husbands to educate their wives in the classical languages and literature, Erasmus never-

88 On both the divine institution of the married estate and the superiority of virginity in late-medieval teaching, see A. VON EYB, *Spiegel der Sitten*, ed. G. KLECHA, 1989, 433.

theless held that women were »weaker in body and mind« than men and Vives cautioned that the choice of reading material should not be left to a girl herself, lest »she take false for true, harmful for salutary, foolish and senseless for serious and commendable.«⁸⁹

A profoundly different assessment of female intellectual and moral capacities could be found earlier in the writings of the female humanists Christine de Pisan (1364–1431) and Isotta Nogarola (1418–1466). Pisan, in her *Book of the City of Ladies* (1405), appealed to reason (»Raison«), righteousness (»Droiture«), and divine justice (»Justice«) as her standards. After examining the historical record of women, she concluded that women could and did possess intelligence and virtue equal to that of men.⁹⁰ Nogarola, in her dialogue entitled *Concerning the Equal or Unequal Sin of Eve and Adam* (1451), demonstrated the incompatibility of the idea of women's inferior intellectual and moral capacities with Augustine's teaching that Eve sinned more gravely than Adam did.⁹¹

Lutheran pastors, however, and not female humanists, remained the dominant voice on the nature of women and the relationship between the sexes throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries in the German Lutheran territories. Their access to pulpit and printing press enabled them to perpetuate an entrenched anthropology which considered women intellectually and morally inferior while at the same time promoting a theology which accorded them spiritual equality before God and therefore dignity, honor, and respect in the household.

89 ERASMUS, *The Institution of Christian Matrimony*, trans. M. J. HEATH (in: *Collected Works of Erasmus*, vol. 69, *Spiritualia and Pastoralia*, ed. J. W. O'MALLEY and L. A. PERAUD, 1999, 373.404); and J. L. VIVES, *De institutione feminae christianae. Liber primus*, ed. C. FANTAZZI and C. MATHEEUSEN, vol. 6 of *Selected Works of J. L. Vives*, ed. C. MATHEEUSEN, 1996, 31.51.

90 FIETZE (s. n. 31), 97.102.104.

91 For a comprehensive analysis of Nogarola's dialogue, see loc. cit. 115–134.