

STRENUUS CHRISTI ATHLETA
ABRAHAM CALOV (1612-1686):
SAINTED DOCTOR AND DEFENDER OF THE CHURCH¹

Timothy R. Schmeling

It has been said that Johann Gerhard (1582-1637) was third in the series of Lutheranism's most preeminent theologians and after him there was no fourth (Fischer. *The Life of Johann Gerhard*. 98-99). First and second place naturally belong to Martin Luther (1483-1546) and Martin Chemnitz (1522-1586) respectively. If one were to speak of a fourth in this distinguished list, the position would no doubt have been assigned to Abraham Calov.

Abraham Calov ranks not only as one of the greatest theologians in Lutheranism, but also as one of the greatest teachers in Christendom. He was a man of exceptional learning and scholastic tendencies. At the same time, he was a man of deep piety and practicality. Very few were impartial in their assessment of Abraham Calov. He was a very polarizing individual. His opponents feared him, but his adherents loved him.

The legacy of Abraham Calov has been tarnished over time. Prior to the recent renaissance, sparked by the rediscovery of missing portions of the *Codex Epistolarum theologiarum* (his collected letters), Calov research had depicted him as the prototype of a controversialist and a preacher of an unattainable doctrinal orthodoxy. This questionable caricature can be explained by a number of factors. First of all there has been a strong bias against Lutheran Orthodoxy even within Lutheranism. Gotthold Lessing (1729-1781) writes, "Many people want to be Christians, but certainly not Wittenberg Lutheran Christians; certainly not Christians of Calov's grace" (Lessing. *Gesammelte Werke*. 170). In his revisionist *History of Lutheranism*, Eric Gritsch denounces the doctrines of verbal inspiration and fellowship as taught by Calov and finally writes him off as Ultraconservative (Gritsch. *A History of Lutheranism*. 135). Second, the chief nineteenth century biographer of Abraham Calov was a mediating theologian named August Tholuck (1799-1877). This Prussian Union historian had more in common with Calov's syncretistic arch-nemesis than with Calov. Third, there is very little primary source material available on Calov and much of it may not have survived the war or is possibly buried somewhere in the *Bibliotheca Gdanska PAN* (formerly *Stadtsbibliothek Danzig*). Finally Calov's research is a difficult task due to the linguistic, cultural, and intellectual barriers that divide us from this critical juncture in Lutheran history. In spite of these facts, it is the purpose of this paper to help familiarize Lutheranism with one of its lost teachers.

I. The Life of Abraham Calov

The Early Years

Abraham Calov(ius) was born on April 16, 1612 in Mohrunen, East Prussia – present day Morag, Poland. (Calovius is a latinization of his surname that was originally written Kalau). His father, Peter Calov, was the treasurer or steward of Electoral Brandenburg. His mother was Katharina nee Speiß, the daughter of the mayor of Mohrunen. Both Peter and Katharina were pious Lutherans who provided a Christian environment for their children. In his youth Abraham had a speech impediment that he overcame with great perseverance. Together with his older brother Fabian, he enrolled at the elementary school in Mohrunen and the Gymnasium in Thorn –

¹ Reprinted from *Lutheran Synod Quarterly*, 44:4 (December 2004).

modern day Torun, Poland – and Königsberg – present day Kaliningrad, Russia. Before long, war and plague forced him to leave and continue his education in Mohrungen under his father (Preus. *The Theology of Post-Reformation Lutheranism*. 1:59; Hereafter TPRL). He felt particularly indebted to the Rector of the School in Mohrungen, Daniel Ulrich from Chemnitz; Rector Graser in Thorn; and the Rector Petrus Mauritius in Königsberg for his early education.

Master of the Arts

On February 10, 1626, at the age of fourteen, he matriculated at the University of Königsberg (*Theologische Realenzyklopedia*. 7:563; hereafter TRE). Supported by a stipend, he would attend this university for six years. There he busied himself with philosophy, philology, mathematics, botany, and theology. His interest in mathematics is not surprising when one takes into consideration the fact that Copernicus along with a number of other great mathematicians came from Prussia. Abraham became very interested in oriental languages and grew very proficient in them. At the age of only seventeen he was permitted to deliver his first sermon. Two of his more notable professors during this period were Johannes Behm (1578-1648) and Cölestin Myslenta (1588-1653) who were both known for their orthodoxy. Myslenta, who is remembered for his polemics against the Reformed, helped stimulate Calov's interest in oriental languages and philology.

In 1632, at the age of twenty, Abraham received his Master of Arts. He then joined the philosophical faculty at the University of Königsberg and continued his studies in theology. At this time he devoted himself to the study of Johann Gerhard's *Loci Theologici* and organized a number of disputations on this pivotal work. A controversy regarding the nature of the real presence came to his attention. Johann Bergius (1587-1658), the court preacher of the Elector of Brandenburg, Georg William (1595-1640), had anonymously begun writing against the Lutheran view of the sacrament in 1624. Around the time Abraham Calov joined the faculty, Bergius publicly renewed the debate concerning the sacrament with Professor Johann Himmel of the University of Jena. This provoked Abraham Calov to author his first theological work titled *Daß die Worte Christi noch feststehen* defending the Lutheran doctrine of the real presence. It was so well received that it was quickly translated into Latin and published under the title *Stereoma testamenti Christi*. This treatise gained Calov friends among the nobility who disliked their Calvinist Elector Georg William. These same nobles ultimately provided him with funding so that he could complete his doctoral studies at the University of Rostock.

Doctor of Theology

In 1634 he began his studies at the University of Rostock and earned his doctorate in 1637. While attending the university, he had stayed for three years at the house of Johann Quistorp, Sr. (1584-1648). The two became very close friends and allies throughout their lives. While teaching at the University of Königsberg, Abraham began to produce and publish some of his philosophical *corpus*. The majority of these materials were written and published in Rostock. Eventually these philosophical works were collected and published in two volumes known as the *Scripta philosophica* (Rostock 1650-1). These writings dealt primarily with methodology, metaphysics, and epistemology (Wundt. *Die deutsche Schulmetaphysik des 17. Jahrhunderts*. 133-136, 257-260; hereafter *Schulmetaphysik*). Some of his insights from these works would assure him a place in the annals of philosophy.

Professor of Theology at Königsberg

One of Abraham Calov's most earnest desires was to study at the University of Jena under the arch-theologian Johann Gerhard or even at the University of Wittenberg (Tholuck. *Der Geist der lutherischen Theologen*. 186; hereafter *Geist*). This was not possible because of the Thirty Years' War.

Therefore, he supplemented his study at Greifswald and Copenhagen before joining the theological faculty at Königsberg in 1637. There he taught dogmatics and polemics. After two years he was promoted. In 1638 the University of Rostock extended him a call, but he declined it.

His influence as a professor should not be underestimated. Students from Scandinavia, Northern Germany, the Siebenbürgen (Transylvania), Kurland, and Latvia attended his lectures. The rise in enrollment was due in part to the Thirty Years' War and in part to his growing prestige. Eventually the Elector of Brandenburg, a Calvinist, began to prohibit young men of Brandenburg from attending the University of Königsberg because of its strong Lutheran stance. In 1641, Abraham Calov became Königsberg's superintendent of schools and churches. He was appointed visitor of the Samland that same year.

Pastorate in Danzig and Rector of the Gymnasium

Abraham Calov received a call in 1643 to become the pastor at the *Trinitatiskirche* (Holy Trinity Church) and rector of the Gymnasium or *Academicum* in Danzig—modern day Gdansk, Poland. Since this Hanseatic city was bound to no confession, the task at hand would prove to be quite difficult. The Syncretists, Calvinists, Roman Catholics, and Socinians had overrun Danzig. The Gymnasium had a strong Reformed influence due to Bartholomaeus Keckermann (1571-1609), a very learned German Reformed theologian and philosopher. This was also the same Keckermann who supposedly taught double truth (reason can conflict with theology) and that the Holy Trinity can be discovered by reason alone. Abraham even had to share the *Trinitatiskirche* (the building, not divine services) with a Calvinist. It was a challenge, but one that he was ready to assume.

The Colloquy of Thorn

While serving as pastor in Danzig, he was invited to the *Colloquium charitativum*, i.e., Colloquy of Thorn (August 28 - November 21, 1645) as representative of Danzig and as member of the Lutheran delegation. Wittenberg Professor of Theology Johann Hülsemann (1602-1661) was the leader of the Lutheran delegation. This same Hülsemann later became superintendent and professor in Leipzig. He would remain a close associate of Abraham Calov throughout his life. The Colloquy in Thorn was called by King Wladislaus IV of Poland with the hope that a union between Catholics, Lutherans, and Reformed could be reached. Prussia and Brandenburg were also invited to take part in the colloquy. The elector sent his court preacher, Johann Bergius, whom Calov refuted in his *Stereoma testamenti Christi*. In addition the elector asked the Duke of Braunschweig to send the infamous Helmstedt theologian, Georg Calixtus (1586-1656), to the colloquy.

The meeting was doomed from the beginning when Calixtus, a supposed Lutheran representative, took the side of the Reformed. This infuriated Calov and Hülsemann. Instead of improving relations, the colloquy only intensified the divisions between the churches. The one positive outcome of this incident was that the unit concept of fellowship taught in Scripture was confirmed by the practice of Calov and Hülsemann. They refused to pray with the other parties at the colloquy. This action demonstrates that the unit concept of fellowship is by no means a modern innovation (cf. *Der Lutheraner*. 1908 p. 111; Gaylin Schmeling. "The Theology of Church Fellowship". *Lutheran Synod Quarterly*, Vol. XXXIII, No. 2, p. 44).

Georg Calixtus and Syncretism

One needs to become more acquainted with Georg Calixtus to gain a better picture of Abraham Calov. Calixtus was a professor at the University of Helmstedt and the leader of the Syncretistic movement in Lutheranism (cf. Henke. *Georg Calixt und seine Zeit*. Vol. I-II). He sought to unite all Christians into one church by playing down or disregarding doctrinal divisions. The chief impetus of Syncretism, besides unionism, was the Thirty Years' War (1618-1648). This war, waged

primarily because of religious divisions, so devastated Europe that many longed for the peace that a reunited church hopefully would restore. The end of the horrors of war, tolerance, and religious reunion were leitmotifs of Syncretism. In order to facilitate this agenda Georg Calixtus developed the concept of the *Consensus quinquesaecularis*. This was supposed to be the doctrinal consensus of Christendom based on the writings of the first five centuries. In other words only teachings evident in the first five centuries were to be doctrinally binding. This movement came to be known as Syncretism and was the original ecumenical movement.

Abraham Calov had no disdain for the theologians of the first five ecumenical councils. He cherished the writings of the early church fathers and was an accomplished patristic scholar himself. Calov opposed Syncretism because he knew it would sacrifice doctrinal agreement for the sake of a false harmony. Rather than pursuing a fabricated union, Calov taught that union could only occur where there was true doctrinal agreement. For this reason Calov was bound by Holy Scripture (Romans 16:17) to reject the unionism expressed at the Colloquy of Thorn and in the works of Georg Calixtus. As the modern church has been nearly consumed by the errors of unionism, so it was necessary for Abraham Calov to dedicate a great deal of time and energy to this critical issue in his day. It should not be a surprise that Syncretism would come to dominate much of his polemics. Nevertheless Hermann Sasse observes an important distinction that Calov makes in his *Historia Syncretistica* (1682). On the basis of the condemnation found in the preface to the *Book of Concord* (*Bekennnisschriften der Evangelisch Lutherischen Kirche*. 11), Calov proves St. Paul condemned only false apostles, but not their misguided congregations (Sasse. *Here We Stand*. 177). In other words, anathemas are made against only heretics who consciously teach contrary to Scripture – not their misguided followers.

To better understand Syncretism one needs to understand the pivotal role of the University of Helmstedt in Lutheran history. Many years earlier Martin Chemnitz had admonished Duke Julius of Braunschweig for having three of his sons ordained as Catholic priests in order to acquire the bishopric of Halberstadt for Braunschweig. This caused the Duke to relinquish his support of the *Formula of Concord* (Koelpin. *No Other Gospel*. 52). The result of this was that the church of Braunschweig, which included the University of Helmstedt, never subscribed to the *Formula of Concord*. In fact when the Gnesio-Lutheran, Tilemann Heßhusius (1527-1588), needed a place to flee, Duke Julius had him called to the University of Helmstedt. In gratitude for this appointment, Heßhusius gave the duke some legitimacy by condemning the doctrine of ubiquity as taught by the *Formula of Concord*. Ironically Martin Chemnitz and David Chytraeus (1531-1600) were still permitted to appoint much of the faculty of the University of Helmstedt, particularly the philosophical faculty. Since the *Formula of Concord* was not binding upon the theologians of Braunschweig, Calixtus was able to accomplish much of his syncretistic agenda. His lack of regard for the *Formula of Concord* is evident in the following citation written against Jakob Weller (1602-1664), a professor at Wittenberg:

I was born and raised till my 16th year in a territory where the *Formula of Concord* was never accepted or loved... I willingly confess that from childhood on it was repugnant to me, and probably no one could have persuaded me to accept and approve it (cited in Koelpin *No Other Gospel*. 53).

Syncretism was not strictly a German movement. Hugo Grotius, the Dutch Covenant theologian whom Calov refuted in his *Biblia illustrata*, also tried to reunite the Arminians and Calvinists into one church. Grotius did not have as wide a vision as Calixtus. He was not willing to dialogue with the Roman Catholics. Georg Calixtus, on the other hand, worked with all European

Christians. He even tried to draw the Greek Orthodox into this union during the time of Cyril Lucaris, via Metrophanes Critopoulos (Maloney. *A History of Orthodox Theology Since 1453* 138). Cyril Lucarius was the Greek Patriarch of Constantinople and a sympathizer of Calvinism.

The First Phase of the Syncretistic Controversy (1645-1656)

The Syncretistic Controversy officially began at the Colloquy of Thorn and can be divided into three phases: The first phase occurred from 1645-1656. The second phase occurred from 1661-1669. The third phase occurred from 1675-1686. In addition to Georg Calixtus, Michael Behm (1612-1650), Christian Dreier (1610-1688), Johann Lautermann (1620-1682), and Friedrich Ulrich Calixtus (the son of Georg Calixtus) became advocates of Syncretism.

Immediately after the Colloquy of Thorn, Calov began to address this great calamity in the church. His industry is shown by his *Institutiones theologicae cum examine novae theologiae Calixtinae* (1649) that appeared the year after the Colloquy of Thorn. Calov would continue to write a number of tomes against Syncretism, but these were produced in Wittenberg. All the while Calov wrote, Calixtus never responded to him. He chose to deal with Jakob Weller, a more prestigious adversary from the University of Wittenberg. Friedrich Ulrich Calixtus, the son of Georg Calixtus, would raise his pen against Calov. This phase of the Syncretism lasted until the death of Georg Calixtus in 1656. It was followed by a short-lived truce.

Syncretism was strongly supported by Fredrich William the Great Elector of Brandenburg (1620-1688). He sought a united Protestant religious front against Roman Catholicism. He also had an ulterior motive. After the conversion of Johann Sigismund (1572-1619) to Calvinism a year after the birth of Abraham Calov, the Electors of Brandenburg had longed to spread the Reformed confession throughout their lands. But their subjects remained stubbornly Lutheran. In spite of the failure of the Thorn Colloquy, the Great Elector doubled his efforts to extend the Reformed confession in Prussia. In order to facilitate this agenda, he obtained the allegiance of the University of Helmstedt and called Johann Lauterman, a zealous student of Calixtus, to the Königsberg faculty. Calov was infuriated. His beloved home was being overrun by Calvinism. He felt it was his lifelong duty to protect Lutheran Prussia.

Abraham Calov did not spend all of his time brooding over the Syncretists. He dedicated himself to the service of his flock in Danzig and teaching at the Gymnasium. The pastoral works he authored in this period are an indication of his labor. One of the gems of his Danzig pastorate was the *Danziger Katechismus* printed under his direction in 1648. This catechism was a splendid manual of instruction and work of Christian piety. The following axiom printed on the catechism bears evidence of his concern for Christian education of all ages: *Was Prediger in der Kirche sind, das sollen Eltern und Hausväter bei ihren Hausgenossen und ihren Hauskirchen sein*, i.e., "As preachers are in the church so should parents and fathers be for the members of their household and their house churches."

Professor and Superintendent in Wittenberg:

In 1650 Elector Johann Georg I of Saxony, prompted by his court preacher Jakob Weller, called Abraham Calov to the University of Wittenberg as theological professor. Following the death of Paul Röber (1587-1651), he was named second theological professor. Not long after this a call was extended to him to serve as pastor of the *Stadtkirche* (City Church or St. Mary's Church). His reputation increased, he became a member of the consistorial court, and was appointed general superintendent by the elector in 1652. With the death of Johannes Scharf (1595-1660), he assumed Scharf's position as *professor primarius*. Due to the attraction of Calov's lectures, the university grew extensively. While the University of Jena decreased in prestige under Johann Musäus, the University of Wittenberg increased in prestige under Abraham Calov. Up to 500 students at one

time attended his lectures. He was so highly respected that it was said that he taught from Luther's chair (*cathedra Lutheri*). But the increase in students dropped off when the Reformed Great Elector of Brandenburg, Friedrich William, barred his subjects from attending Calov's lectures on philosophy or theology. *Principia Caloviana* were too hostile to the Reformed.

Abraham busied himself with many different activities in Wittenberg. He held public and private lectures. Several times a week he led disputations. Every week he held catechism classes. He produced many edifying funeral sermons, led the consistorial business, presided over senate meetings and deans meetings, and almost weekly prepared faculty and private *Gutachten* (Uhlhorn. *Geschichte der deutsch-lutherischen Kirche*. 214). What's more he was a faithful servant to Johann Georg II (1613-1680), the successor of Johann Georg I (1585-1656), who diligently read Calov's *Biblischer Kalender* (Meusel. *Kirchliches Handlexicon*. 1:638).

In 1655 the one-hundredth anniversary of the Peace of Augsburg was celebrated in Saxony. For this occasion he ascended the pulpit of the *Pfarrkirche* on September 25th and preached on Psalm 125. The theme was: *Wie wir dieses Fest als ein Dank- und Bet-Fest, Gott zu lobe und uns zu Troste halten sollen*, i.e., "How we should regard this festival as a thanksgiving and prayer festival to praise God and to comfort us." It was printed in Wittenberg (1656) by Johann Borckardten (Meusel. *Kirchliches Handlexicon*. 1:638).

The Second Phase of the Syncretistic Controversy (1661-1669)

During his Wittenberg days, Calov had continued his critique of the Syncretists. The following tomes testify to his efforts: *Syncretismus Calxtinus* (1653) and *Harmonia Calixtino-haeretica* (1655). In 1656 Georg Calixtus, the archenemy of Abraham Calov, died. Syncretism did not expire with him. Theological faculties of Helmstedt and Wittenberg declared a peace that lasted for a couple of years. But the Conference of Kassel brought about the second phase of the Syncretistic Controversy (1661-1669). The Conference of Kassel occurred on July 1-9, 1661. The conference was called by William IV of Hessen, the brother-in-law of the Great Elector Friedrich William of Brandenburg. It was a meeting between the Reformed faculty of the University of Marburg and the Lutheran faculty of the University of Rinteln. Sebastian Curtius and Johannes Reinius were the spokesman for the Reformed. Johannes Heinichen and Peter Musäus (1620-1674), the brother of Johann Musäus, represented the Lutherans (cf. Hermelink. *Die Universität Marburg von 1527-1645*). Interesting enough Peter Musäus would join the faculty of Helmstedt two years later and was suspected of Syncretism. The topics under discussion were Baptism, the Lord's Supper, the person of Christ, and election. Both parties felt the meeting was productive. The Wittenberg Faculty sharply criticized this conference in a work titled *Epicrisis Theol. Fac. Witeberg. De colloquio Casselano Rintelino-Marpurgensium* (1662).

From September 8, 1662, to June 29, 1663, the Great Elector, Friedrich William of Brandenburg, called the Berlin Discussions of Religion in which Paul Gerhardt (1607-1676) of the *Nikolaikirche* took part. At the same time he banned his people from studying philosophy and theology at the University of Wittenberg because of its strict orthodoxy. Calov's response was a collection of various *Gutachten* or theological opinions from the orthodox faculty of Wittenberg dating as far back as Luther's time. These *Gutachten*, bound as the *Consilia theologica Witebergensia*, showed that the Wittenberg position was the biblical and historical viewpoint of Lutheranism. The *Consensus repetitus fidei verae Lutheranae* or Saxon Consensus was first published in this collection. In 1669 Friedrich William declared a refrain from religious polemics. Many Lutheran pastors disobeyed this truce and were dismissed from office. Paul Gerhardt (1607-1676), the famous hymn writer, was one of those dismissed. It is somewhat ironic that both Gerhardt and Calov shared the same Lutheran conviction and piety, but are remembered quite differently in history. The elector's

peace lasted until the death of Duke Ernst the Pius when Abraham Calov initiated the third phase of the Syncretistic Controversy (1675-1686). This final phase lasted until his death in 1686.

The *Consensus repetitus fidei verae Lutheranae*

Consensus repetitus fidei verae Lutheranae in illis doctrinae capitibus, quae... scriptis publicis hodieque impugnant D. Georgius Calixtus... ejusdemque complices, i.e., the Saxon Consensus (1655; first printed in 1664 in the *Consilia theologica Witebergensia*, a Latin-German edition was printed in 1666) was an abortive attempt to add to the *Formula of Concord* (cf. Henke, Ernst. *Inest theologorum Saxonorum consensus repetitus fidei vere lutheranae*). It was originally published anonymously and was intended to be a confession against the errors of Georg Calixtus. In spite of support from Wittenberg and Leipzig, Helmstedt as well as Jena rejected it.

German Lutheranism was divided into at least three major camps at this point in time. The orthodox camp included the University of Wittenberg and the University of Leipzig. It was led by Abraham Calov and Johann Hülsemann. The moderates occupied the University of Jena, which had previously been the citadel of orthodoxy under Johann Gerhard. They were led by Johann Musäus (1613-1681), the future father-in-law of Johann William Baier ([1647-1695] cf. Heussi. *Geschichte der theologischen Fakultät zu Jena*). The Syncretist-Lutherans were found at the University of Helmstedt and the University of Altdorf, both of which were not bound to the *Formula of Concord* (Baur, Jörg. *Die Vernunft zwischen Ontologie und Evangelium eine Untersuchung zur Theologie Johann Andreas Quenstedt*. 18). Georg Calixtus led this faction.

Helmstedt rejected the consensus because it was targeted against Georg Calixtus. The primary reason the moderates at Jena opposed the *Saxon Consensus* was to preserve the peace and keep German Lutheranism from splintering. The second reason was that they felt nothing should be added to the *Formula of Concord*. While certain Lutheran provinces had provincial confessions that were binding only in that particular province, there seemed to be an aversion to adding to the *Book of Concord*. Whether this aversion was merely to making an addendum to the *Formula of Concord* or to authoring a new universal Lutheran Confession is unclear. Still many provinces attached provincial confessions to their editions of the *Book of Concord*. Two examples of this would be the *Confessio Virtembergica* (1551) of Johannes Brenz (1499-1570) attached to Tübingen editions of the *Book of Concord* and *Christliche Visitationsartikel* (1592) of Aegidius Hunnius (1550-1603) attached in the *Triglotta* published by the Saxons of the Missouri Synod. Even though Helmstedt and Jena opposed the *Saxon Consensus*, the theological faculties of Leipzig and Wittenberg subscribed to it (Schaff. *The Creeds of Christendom*. 1:352).

The content of the *Consensus* was interesting. It very sharply refuted the theology of Calixtus. In particular it rejected his teaching that knowledge of and belief in the teachings of the Apostolic Symbol are all that is necessary for a Christian. The *Saxon Consensus* condemned those who claimed the doctrine of the Trinity is not taught in the Old Testament. It further maintained that the Old Testament faithful had to believe in the Trinity to be saved. The *Consensus repetitus fidei verae Lutheranae* rejected the teaching that God was the indirect cause of the fall. It upheld the doctrine of verbal inspiration. It confirmed the biblical teachings of original sin, the image of God, the person of Christ, the church, the sacraments, repentance, government, and the last judgment. It corrected the abuses of the Roman Mass and the Roman cult of saints. Finally the *Saxon Consensus* condemned sixteen errors of Calixtus on the doctrine of justification and good works. A major objective of the *Saxon Consensus* was to make clear that a *quia* subscription to the Lutheran Confessions required acceptance of the doctrine of verbal inspiration (Pelikan. *The Christian Tradition: Reformation of the Church and Dogma* [1300-1700] 4:347).

The Third Phase of the Syncretistic Controversy (1675-1686)

The third phase of the Syncretistic Controversy was partially provoked by the capture of Ägidius Strauch, a Danzig preacher and faithful student of Calov, off the coast of Pommern as he was sailing towards Hamburg. Great Elector had orchestrated this crass expression of Ceasaropapism and held Strauch captive for three years. Johannes Musäus, professor at the University of Jena, and Johannes Meisner (1615-1684), a professor at the University of Wittenberg, were also responsible for this third phase of Syncretism. Following the rejection of the *Consensus repetitus fidei verae Lutheranae*, Johannes Musäus and Calov saw eye to eye on very little. Musäus had now claimed that God's work of redemption could be perceived in the creation and not exclusively by divine revelation in Sacred Scripture (Gritsch, Eric. *A History of Lutheranism*. 119). Along with this error in natural theology, Musäus had been accused of Syncretism. Even though Musäus had publicly disavowed any sympathy for Syncretism, Calov continued to consider him suspect.

Meisner, on the other hand, was Calov's colleague. He had been on the faculty of Wittenberg a year longer than Calov. Perhaps jealousy was part of the problem. Calov's career had advanced faster than that of Meisner. Moreover, he was not particularly fond of Calov's personality. In any case, Meisner became sympathetic to Calixtus' cause. Subsequently Meisner made an improper use of the distinction between fundamental and non-fundamental doctrine that created a rift in the faculty. While Johann Quenstedt (1617-1688) and Johann Deutschmann (1625-1706) continued to remain loyal to Calov, Calov and Meisner were no longer on speaking terms after 1675. Regrettably this conflict became very personal.

Abraham Calov continued his protest against Syncretism under pseudonyms and by republishing the works of the Gnesio-Lutherans such as the *De Amnestia* of Johann Wigand (1523-1587). With great difficulty he was even able to get his *Historia syncretistica* (1682) published in Frankfurt am Main. The elector soon confiscated it. Thus a second edition (1685) was printed in Ratzeburg. The final phase of Syncretism concluded with the death of Calov in 1686.

Additional Polemics

The Syncretists were not the only ones to taste his polemics. Calov produced polemical materials in reaction to the Roman Catholics, Reformed, Socinians, Jean de Labadie, Jakob Böhme, etc. From 1655-58 Abraham wrote his chief work against the Reformed titled: *Discussio controversiarum hodierno tempore inter ecclesias orthodoxas et reformatos coetus agitatarum*. Following this, he wrote a critique of the Remonstrance in his *Consideratio Arminianismi*. Concerning the Papists, he wrote *Mataeologia papistica*. One of the goals of this work was to prove that Elector Johann the Constant had not passed away professing Roman doctrine. Even the Socinians felt Calov's polemical prowess with *Scripta antisociniana* (1684), a book filling two folio volumes. Still no other group received as much attention as Calixtus and the Syncretists. The purpose of all of his polemics was not to pick fights, but to protect the faithful and show the recipients of his critique the error of their ways so that they would be restored to the flock of God. His writings against the Syncretists and Socinians confirmed the fact that Abraham Calov was also the great champion of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity in Lutheran Orthodoxy. This is why he was dubbed the Lutheran Athanasius.

Major Works

From 1655 to 1682 Abraham produced a proliferation of material on various subjects. Due to the sheer magnitude of his writings, some 500 titles in all, only his major works will be given attention. His chief systematic work, the *Systema Locorum theologicorum*, was written in two phases

(Tomes. I-IV, 1655-1661; V-XII, 1677) and was published in 12 volumes. The purpose of the *Systema Locorum theologicorum* was to place the Bible into systematic form. The first tomes I-IV were prepared very thoroughly; however, the latter part, V-XII appears to be rushed (Preus. *TPRL*. 61). This systematics was really the only one to rival Gerhard's *Loci Theologici* in all of Lutheranism. The *Theologia Didactico-Polemica sive Systema Theologiae* of Johann Quenstedt (1617-1688), the librarian of Wittenberg, was far more exhaustive. Nevertheless it did not reach the depth of Calov's *Systema Locorum theologicorum* (at least with respect to the first four tomes). Quenstedt's work appears to have been more popular, for many copies of it still exist. Copies of Calov's *Systema Locorum theologicorum* are extremely rare. He also authored two dogmatic compendia: *Theologia Positiva* (1682) which was printed by Calov and *Apodixis articulorum fidei* (1684) which was printed by his students. Both of these works were highly regarded.

His chief exegetical work and certainly his *magnum opus* was the *Biblia Illustrata*, a commentary on the entire Bible including the Apocrypha (1672-76). This work was printed in Frankfurt am Main in four large folio volumes to counter Hugo Grotius' *Biblia annotata*. It is a virtual gold mine of theology and attests to Calov's exegetical abilities. The *Biblia Illustrata* was so popular that it retained its prestige well into the nineteenth century, when most scholarly commentaries still made frequent reference to this classic work. The prominence of the doctrine of inerrancy saturates each page. Apart from the *Biblia Illustrata*, he compiled commentaries on Genesis, Romans, and Hebrews. It is worth noting that he had a particularly high regard for the book of Hebrews. His chief isagogics book, *Criticus sacer biblicus*, was written in 1673 and still proves to be fruitful reading.

Calov as Shepherd

The name Calov customarily conjures up images of an exegete or systematician. However, devotional literature was never far from his heart. His pastoral heart is evident in his own works and in his high regard for other Lutheran devotional material. Even more than his hymnals, catechisms, and *Biblischer Kalender*, his *Die deutsche Bibel* or Calov Bible (1682) merits recognition as a superb contribution to the devotional genera. This Bible along with the *Systema* and *Biblia Illustrata* are Calov's greatest legacy. *Die deutsche Bibel* should not be confused with the *Biblia Illustrata*. *Die deutsche Bibel* or Calov Bible is Luther's translation of the Holy Scriptures with a running commentary selected from the writings of Martin Luther. Where Luther offered no comment, Calov provides a gloss of his own (Leaver. *J.S. Bach and Scripture*. 23). It was anything but dry and academic. It breathes a warm devotional spirit (Leaver *J.S. Bach and Scripture*. 23). This Bible was highly treasured by the laity. Johann Sebastian Bach considered it one of his prized possessions. In fact J.S. Bach's own copy of the Calov Bible is well worn, including extensive notes and underlining by Bach himself. Bach's copy of the Calov Bible now rests at Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, Missouri.

Abraham Calov recognized his few works would by no means satisfy the spiritual needs of the people. For this reason he directed them to Johann Arndt's *Wahres Christentum* (*The Encyclopedia of the Lutheran Church*. 1:353; hereafter *ELC*). He also had a high respect for the early work of Philipp Jakob Spener (1635-1705) particularly his *Pia Desideria*, which he publicly recommended. The following letter to Spener dated October 11, 1674 express his own pious desires:

Eure desideria, für deren Mitteilung ich bestens danke, sind auch die meinigen. Und da Eure Kirche von den Übungen der Frömmigkeit eine solche Frucht hat, wie der Ruf berichtet, so nehme ich keinen Anstand, solche examina pietatis auch andern zu empfehlen; wie ich denn noch kürzlich mit Anführung des Beispiels und Erfolgs Eurer Kirche im öffentlichen Gottesdienst die Patrone der Kirche zu ihrer

Nachahmung ermahnt habe, mit dem Wunsch, daß sie mit Nutzen fortgesetzt und die hier und da per accidens (zufälliger-, nicht notwendigerweise) sich anschließenden Mißbräuche abgestellt werden. (Your desires, for whose distribution I am most grateful, are also my desires. Since your church has [gleaned] such fruit from the exercises of piety as your communication reports, I do not hesitate to recommend such *examina pietatis* to others. I have rather recently advised the patrons of the church with quotations of the example and success of your church to imitate them in public worship with the desire that they will continue with their use and do away with the following misuses [that occur] here and there *per accidens* (accidentally, not necessarily). (Krauß. *Lebensbilder aus der Geschichte der christlichen Kirche*. 600)

Why would Calov have such high regard for Philipp Spener, the father of Pietism? Many of Spener's concerns had always been the concerns of Lutheranism (e.g., Luther, Gerhard, Dannhauer, etc.). Spener longed to be a true servant to his flock, something Calov highly respected. Likewise Spener's early work was not as radical as his later writings. In the long run Spener appears to have lost control of his movement and to have begun to tolerate or accept the errors of his followers. Had Calov seen the result of pietism particularly under August Hermann Franke (1663-1727), he surely would have been more critical of the movement.

Personality, Family, and Death

Abraham Calov was a very healthy and an industrious individual. He possessed all the qualities of the churchmen of his time: an encyclopedic memory, an indeflatable industry, linguistic skills, effective administration, and an inflexible zeal for pure doctrine (Gritsch, Eric. *A History of Lutheranism*. 120). He was loved by his adherents who considered him to be a new Athanasius. He was hated by his enemies who regarded him to be a new Torquemada. Calov's uncompromising character did overstep the rules of legitimate polemics at times. Yet he never placed his doctrine in opposition to his piety. Setting his positive attributes and foibles aside, one must concede that Calov's quest for pure doctrine and piety was firmly grounded in Holy Scripture and the prize that awaited him in heaven. He was indeed the *strenuus Christi athleta*, i.e., vigorous athlete of Christ, which he dubbed himself.

Calov was a very family oriented individual. He survived five wives and all thirteen of his children. At the age of seventy-two he took his sixth wife, Dorothea Quenstedt, the daughter of his younger colleague Johann Quenstedt. In addition to Quenstedt, Hülsemann and Heiland (the son-in-law of Polykarp Leyser) were some of his more famous fathers-in-law (Tholuck. *Geist*. 192-3). When his third wife, the daughter of Hülsemann, neared death he was comforted by the fact that she lived to receive the Eucharist on her deathbed (Tholuck. *Geist*. 192-193). When she received the *viaticum*, Calov rejoiced and sang loudly Philipp Nicolai's (1556-1608) chorale, *Wie schön leuchtet der Morgenstern*, particularly the last verse (Tholuck. *Geist*. 193).

Wie bin ich doch so herzlich froh,
Daß mein Schatz ist das A und O
Der Anfang und das Ende:
Er wird mich noch zu seinem Preis
Aufnehmen in das Paradeis
Des klopfe ich in die Hände:
Amen, Amen,
Komm du schöne Freudenkrone,

Bleib nicht langen,
Deiner wart'ich will mit Verlangen

Oh, joy to know that Thou, my Friend
Art Lord, Beginning without end,
The First and Last, Eternal!
And Thou at length – O glorious grace!
Wilt take me to that holy place,
The home of joys supernal.
Amen. Amen!
Come and meet me! Quickly greet me!
With deep yearning,
Lord, I look for Thy returning.

Not all of his children died young. Three of his daughters married, and his two sons, both named Abraham, died as young adults. The preface of his *Dreißig Leichenpredigten*, dedicated to his colleague Johann Deutschmann (1625-1706) and jurist Wilhelm Leyser, conveys his grief at this time of his life (Meusel. *Kirchliches Handlexicon*. 1:638). Moreover his final wife bore him no children. This was especially difficult for him because his children had been his major source of comfort (Meusel. *Kirchliches Handlexicon*. 1:638).

On February 25, 1686, Abraham Calov was taken from this vale of tears to his eternal home. He died in complete control of all of his faculties. He was seventy-four. The funeral sermon was preached by Johann Fredrich Mayer (1615-1712). In this sermon he tried to soften the polemical caricature of Calov. In place of it, Mayer presents Calov as a theologian completely devoted to Holy Scripture. He particular praised his intensive biblical studies. Abraham Calov was succeeded at the University of Wittenberg by Balthasar Bebel from Straßburg. There has been some debate regarding the date of Calov's death. February 21, 25, and 27 are all listed as possibilities. The confusion lies in the various dates recorded for Calov's death in the funeral sermon given by Johann Fredrich Mayer (1615-1712). February 25 is generally accepted.

II. The Theology and Philosophy of Abraham Calov

Catholicity

Dr. Abraham Calov was dedicated to the concept of catholicity. This means that Lutheranism is not some innovation of the sixteenth century. Rather Lutheran theology is the continuum of the one holy catholic and apostolic church confessed by the ecumenical creeds in opposition to Rome that has departed from the true path. Catholicity has always played a prominent role in Lutheranism. It is quite strong in the theology of Luther, Chemnitz, Gerhard, and Calov, etc. (cf. Hägglund. *History of Theology*. 303). Calov did not adhere to an uncritical catholicity, but a catholicity grounded in Sacred Scripture. This is clear from Martin Chemnitz' alteration of Vincent of Lerin's definition of catholicity, "Which has been received consistently from Scripture, always, everywhere, and by all believers" (cf. Chemnitz. *Examination of the Council of Trent*. 3:466; Elert. *Structure of Lutheranism*. 288).

In order to express this catholicity Abraham Calov frequently cited the early and even medieval church fathers to prove that Lutheranism was not practicing innovative exegesis. Rather it upheld the pure biblical theology of the church in every age. By doing this Calov made it clear that the fathers agreed far more with Lutheran doctrine than Roman or Reformed doctrine. Thus the fathers rightfully belonged to Lutheranism.

The catholicity of Abraham Calov's theology has often been overlooked. The main reason for this omission is attributed to Georg Calixtus. In ecumenical circles Calixtus is praised as the father of the modern ecumenical movement and the true advocate of catholicity. Calov is characterized as an intolerant bully and founder of a sectarian form of Lutheranism known as Confessional Lutheranism. In truth the romantic notions of Calixtus are far from authentic catholicity. The church has always been evangelical and charitable, but it never sought catholicity through tolerance of error in doctrine or practice. The following example will illustrate the difference between these two men: Calixtus, as the present day ecumenical movement, saw the Holy Eucharist as a mean to achieving some quasi unity rather than as the expression of unity achieved by obedience to Christ. Calov revealed his catholicity by adhering to the practice of the church partaking of the Eucharist only with those who are in full agreement with the teachings of Christ (cf. Elert. *Eucharist and Church Fellowship in the First Four Centuries*). In the theology of Calov the Eucharist is the expression of the unity or catholicity achieved by obedience to Christ, not an attempt to achieve tolerance by circumventing Christ.

Martin Luther

Throughout his life Abraham Calov considered himself a faithful disciple of Dr. Martin Luther. He ardently read his beloved teacher daily and meditated upon his writings. *Die Deutsche Bibel* is a clear witness to this fact. *Die Deutsche Bibel* was running commentary on each verse of Holy Scripture drawn from the writings of Martin Luther. Only where there were no remarks of Luther to be found would Calov submit his own gloss. Calov took no credit for this work. In fact he was very pleased to see that it was regarded as one of Luther's works and not his own.

Furthermore *Die Deutsche Bibel* should be recognized as one of the many attempts to systematize Martin Luther. Martin Luther was an existentialistic and practical theologian. He was certainly not an existentialist in the sense of Søren Kierkegaard or Martin Heidegger. Rather his theology was a living, vivid, and vibrant thing. It was concerned with soteriology, the issues at hand, and had little time for speculative questions. While the *opera* of Luther were for the most part unsystematic, they were not confused and flawed. On the contrary, the systemization of Luther was meant to organize, summarize, and help one navigate his massive *corpus*. This systemization helped distinguish the mature Luther from the early Luther and limited the abuse of Luther's writings by non-Lutherans. Some of the most noteworthy systemizations of Luther are: *Loci Communes Lutheri* by Johannes Corvinus, *Thesaurus explicationem omnium articulorum* by Timotheus Kirchner, *Loci Communes Lutheri* by Theodosius Frabricius, and *Pastorale Lutheri* of Conrad Porta (Cf. Kolb. *Martin Luther as Prophet, Teacher, and Hero*). One edition of Luther's works even provided an index of his work based upon the *Loci Theologici* of Johann Gerhard.

Lutheran Confessions

Some scholars have assumed that there was a rapid decline in the use of the Lutheran Confessions in Lutheran Orthodoxy after the time of Leonhard Hutter (1563-1616) and then an incline during the life of Abraham Calov and Johann Dannhauer (1603-1666). A strong argument for this position is the general lack of citations from the Lutheran Confessions in the *Loci Theologici* of Johann Gerhard. This perceived decline is not entirely accurate. First of all, Lutheran universities always required a knowledge and subscription to the Lutheran Confessions. Second, the Lutheran Confessions were typically cited in inter-Lutheran controversies and as a prerequisite for non-Lutherans seeking fellowship. Since internal Lutheran conflict at the time of Gerhard was less than that at the time of Calov, mass citations from the Confessions were not as necessary. Third, the great dogmatic works of Lutheranism were meant to prove the Scriptural teaching and catholicity of Lutheranism particularly to those outside of Lutheranism. In contrast to the *compendia* that were

printed as manuals of instruction for future pastors, the *Loci Theologici* of Johann Gerhard was generally treated as a reference work or theological encyclopedia. Finally the many works of Gerhard's period, including the *Loci Theologici*, contain citations from the confessions, albeit not as many as can be found in Calov's day. In any case Abraham Calov's use and advocacy of the confessions is clear in the Syncretistic Controversy.

Theology

Abraham Calov defines theology with the following citation from the *Systema*:

Theologia est Habitus Practicus cognitionis e revelatione divina haustae, de vere Religione qua homo post lapsum per fidem ad salutem aeternam perducendus (Systema 1:1) i.e. Theology is a practical habit of cognition drawn from divine revelation, concerning true religion, by which man after the fall is to be led, through faith, to eternal salvation) (Appold. Abraham Calov's Doctrine of Vocatio in Its Systematic Context. 46).

This citation is often abbreviated: *Theologia est habitus practicus* i.e. theology is practical aptitude. This famous axiom is the overarching theme of his theology. In contrast to certain scholastics, Calov taught theology was practical rather than theoretical and an aptitude or disposition rather than a science. It was not a science because its first principles transcend rational explanation. Practically this meant that theology is driven by soteriology. The focus of Scripture is salvation and the beatific vision.

While he emphasized soteriology, this does not mean that he denigrated the doctrine of the Trinity or the person of Christ. In reality he spent an extensive amount of time on these subjects because they are intimately linked to our salvation. Regrettably this axiom has often been misunderstood to mean that only what one subjectively deems practical or what itching ears desire is authentic theology. It is chiefly in the *Systema locorum theologicorum* under the section titled *usus practicus* (practical use), where the *habitus practicus* principle is demonstrated. In these edifying sections similar to the ones found in the *Loci Theologici* of Johann Gerhard, Calov reveals the practical application of each and every dogma of the Christian faith. Thus doctrine, faith, and piety were inseparable.

Holy Scripture

Abraham Calov is primarily known as a dogmatician and philosopher. However, he was a far greater exegete and would be better envisioned as a biblical theologian. His entire theology was intended to be a summary of the Holy Scripture – nothing more nothing less. His devotion to the Holy Scripture was unparalleled and few could challenge him on a point of exegesis. He is often remembered in history as the greatest advocate of verbal inspiration. He attempted to reiterate, clarify, and make binding the Lutheran Confession's existing position of verbal inspiration by appending the *Consensus repetitus fidei verae Lutheranae* to them.

In his *Systema locorum theologicorum* an entire chapter was devoted to the efficacy of Holy Scripture. This chapter was directed against Herrmann Rahtmann (1585-1628) who orchestrated the second major attack upon the Scriptures at the time of Lutheran Orthodoxy. Herrmann Rahtmann taught that Scripture was not a means of grace, but a dead letter. The Holy Spirit was not bound to the dead letter. In contradistinction Lutheranism taught that the Scriptures could not be separated from the Holy Spirit. For this reason they said that Holy Scriptures were efficacious even outside the use. Calov reiterates this point with one of his favorite expressions, namely, *verbum efficax*. This emphasis on the effect or power of the Word was belittled by Karl Heim (1874-1958) as nothing more than a "word fetish." At the same time, however, Heim's critique hints at the fact that Calov's

concept of verbal inspiration was not some dead letter, but a living, vibrant, powerful, and active means of grace.

An oddity of this period, at least to the modern ear, was the controversy over the Hebrew vowel marks. Essentially certain Lutherans from the time of Flacius had fought for the authenticity of the vowel marks, going as far as claiming they could be found in the *Urtext*. Already by the time of Elijah Levita (1468-1549), a famous Hebrew scholar and friend of Johann Reuchlin (1455-1522), it had been proved convincingly that the vowels were not Mosaic or even from the time of Ezra, but from the post-Talmudic period (Preus. *TPRL*. 307-8). Even Martin Luther held to this position. In spite of this fact, men like Calov insisted on this point. It has often been suggested the Calov pressed this matter to support a radical concept of verbal inspiration. The reality is far different. The first reason he held this view was the necessity of reacting to the Roman Catholics who were raising doubts about the reliability of the Masoretic text in order to exalt the Vulgate. The second reason was that the Jesuits' argument for a late introduction of vowel marks implied that Lutherans were every bit as dependent on tradition as Rome (Preus. *TPRL*. 308).

The hermeneutics of Abraham Calov exhibits his complete loyalty to Scripture alone. He was a strong advocate of the historical-grammatical method and the study of the original languages. Contextual exegesis was of paramount importance, but when necessary he would employ the *regula fidei*, i.e., analogy of faith. Even when hermeneutics developed into a virtual science among the dogmaticians, Calov stressed Luther's spiritual aids in the interpretation of Scripture: *oratio*, *meditatio*, and *tentatio* (cf. Calov. *Paedia Theologica*. Jung, Voelker. *Das Ganze der Heiligen Schrift. Hermeneutik und Schriftauslegung bei Abraham Calov*. 12-14). Abraham Calov and the dogmaticians stressed the *sensus literalis* throughout their study of Holy Scripture. The *sensus literalis* did not necessarily mean the literal-grammatical sense of the modern day, but the original meaning intended by the Holy Spirit (Hägglund. *History of Theology*. 307).

In contrast to a radical Antiochian interpretation of Scripture, Calov acknowledged a *sensus mysticus*, i.e., mystical sense. *Sensus mystica* was seen as an application of the text that did not destroy the one spirit-intended meaning of the text. In point of fact Johann Gerhard and his handpicked successor at Jena, Solomon Glassius, would speak of the *sensus duplexus* that is a literal and mystical sense (Glassius. *Philologia Sacra*. 2.1.1.1) This was in no way a denial of the one spirit-intended meaning (in contradistinction to the one literal sense), but a division of the one spirit-intended meaning into its applications or accommodations (*accommodationes*) and sub-applications (Gerhard. *Disputatum Theologicarum*. I, 68ff). For example Lutherans often divided the literal into the proper and the figurative or trope (metaphor). They divided the mystical sense into the allegorical, typological, and parabolic (Glassius. *Philologia Sacra*. 2.1.2.2; Hollaz. *Examen*. Proleg. 3:18). Conversely, Lutherans like the Pomeranian David Hollaz criticized the medieval fathers for merely dividing the mystical sense into the allegorical, the tropological, and analogical, since these were really uses of the allegorical sense according to Lutheran hermeneutics (Hollaz. *Examen*. Proleg. 3:18).

Some have suggested that Abraham Calov and the dogmaticians were ignorant of exegesis and that they dogmatized Scripture. This unsubstantiated view has begun to decline due to modern research. It is certainly true that there have been advances in biblical archeology, biblical history, biblical anthropology, lower textual criticism, etc., since the days of the dogmaticians. This should be expected. Their high regard for the perspicuity of Scripture may help explain some exegetical omission. Still the pioneering work of Flacius, Gerhard, Calov, Glassius, Dannhauer, Schmidt, and Pfeiffer cannot be overlooked. Modern exegesis would not be where it is today without their contributions.

Mystical Union

The *unio mystica* or mystical union is one subject where the name Calov appears again and again. Johann Arndt (1555-1621) is accused of innovating the concept of the *unio mystica* in Lutheranism and Calov is charged with its introduction to dogmatics. In reality this biblical doctrine is found in Martin Luther, Johannes Brenz, Martin Chemnitz, Johann Gerhard, etc. Some have credited Calov, and to a certain degree Hülsemann, with being the first to assign the mystical union its own locus in dogmatics (Neve. *A History of Christian Thought*. 325). The locus *Von der Vereinigung mit Christo* is already present in *Epitome Credendorum* of Nicholaus Hunnius (1585-1643). The reason the mystical union was not given its own *locus* until this time was a shift from the synthetic to the analytical method in dogmatic methodology. Furthermore Calov has been accused of pantheism and taking the *unio mystica* to limits that Luther would not have dreamed. This is based on the use of the terms *conjunctio* and περιχωρήσις, i.e., perichorsis in his description of the union.

The form (of the mystical union) is a joining together (*conjunctio*) with God, not relatively, but truly; not purely extrinsic but intrinsic, not through a bare positioning but through an intimate emanation, not only the operation of grace but at the same time the approach of the divine substance to believers with the mystical περιχωρήσει; nevertheless short of a commixture or transforming of the essence of man (Calov. *Theologia Positiva*. Cap. VIII. Thes. III. 503).

Calov certainly stresses the intimate nature of the mystical union with these terms. He considered the union to be an *unio substantiarum*. His rejection of μεταουσία, i.e., a *transsubstantiatio*: a union of two substances which changes the one into the other or συνουσία, i.e., a *consubstantiation* a union of two substances that results in a third new substance clearly absolves him of any charge of pantheism (cf. Calov. *Biblia Illustrata*. NT 2:1536).

Philosophy

To understand Calov, the philosopher, a bit of history is required. Luther's own philosophical persuasion is a complicated question. He was not as opposed to philosophy as some think and yet he was by no means a philosopher either. He borrowed from the *via antiqua*, nominalism (esp. William Ockham and Gregory of Rimini), and the various strands of renaissance humanism. At best he is an eclectic that employed philosophy only to advance the Gospel. Philipp Melanchthon (1497-1560) was far more of a humanist and a philosopher. He too was quite eclectic, but eclectic in the sense that the Renaissance Humanism was a sampling of the classical world. In early days of the Reformation both Martin and Phillip had nearly abandoned most of the disciplines of philosophy for the study of philology. Following the peasants' revolt, Melanchthon with Luther's blessing revived a number of the philosophical disciplines in Wittenberg. Metaphysics would not be revived until the period of Lutheran Orthodoxy. Melanchthon's purpose in reintroducing philosophy and education was to curb the Anabaptist barbarism found among the laity (Kusukawa. *The Transformation of Natural Philosophy*). Thus Melanchthonian eclecticism with notable exceptions dominated Lutheran circles until the early Golden Age of Orthodoxy. One of the significant exceptions was the University of Tübingen where Jakob Schegk (1511-1587) professed a strict form of Aristotelianism and waged war on Ramism (cf. *Philosophy in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries: Conversations with Aristotle*. 169-187).

In the middle and toward the end of the 16th century other philosophical movements arose. The most significant were Neo-Aristotelianism, Ramism, Neo-Stoicism, and Cartesianism. Lutheran Orthodoxy and Reformed Orthodoxy would generally adhere to Neo-Aristotelianism. This was not a Medieval Aristotelianism. It was a hybrid that studied Aristotle in a humanistic fashion. Some

Gnesio-Lutherans and the German Reformed at the University of Herborn became advocates of Ramism. Ramism was founded by Peter Ramus (1515-1572), a Calvinist, who tried to simplify and streamline Aristotle (cf. Ong, *Ramus Method and the Decay of Dialogue*). The sole Lutheran Neo-Stoic was Justus Lipsius. He was a short-time convert to Lutheranism and the pioneer of Neo-Stoicism. Cartesianism was generally embraced only by Dutch Calvinists.

The origins of the revival of Aristotelianism particularly in Lutheran circles is a study in itself (cf. Scharlemann, *Aquinas and Gerhard*, 13-22). It seems to have a variety of origins. First of all Renaissance Humanism never really destroyed the study of Aristotle. The schools of the scholastics continued to study Aristotle with ever improving texts (esp. Thomas de Vio). In Italy, particularly Padua and Bologna (esp. Pietro Pomponazzi, Giacomo [Jacopo] Zabarella), a strict form of Aristotelianism influenced by the ancient commentators and Ibn Rushd (better known as Averroes) was thriving (cf. Iorio, *The Aristotelians of Renaissance Italy*). Dominicans and Jesuits (esp. Francisco Suarez) joined humanism and Aristotelianism to produce their synthesis. The centers of this study were the Spanish University of Salamanca and the Portuguese University of Coimbra. The University of Tübingen, the University of Altdorf, and the University of Helmstedt also played a significant roll. Their influence requires further study. All of these traditions helped initiate the revival of Aristotelianism in Lutheranism.

As was stated earlier, the Aristotelianism of Lutheran Orthodoxy was not a lapse into the Middle Ages. Rather it was a philosophy aided by the knowledge and tools of the Renaissance. Lutheran Philosophy would not rigidly adhere to Aristotle, but taught the subject of philosophy was *ad res ipsas*, i.e., to the things themselves. Conversely, just as certain elements of Thomism have some influence on the theology of Lutheran Orthodoxy, Thomism is also evident in its philosophy. Michael Wolf (1584-1623), a colleague of Johann Gerhard, used Thomas' *De ente et essentia* in his lectures on metaphysics. The true father of Lutheran Aristotelianism was Jakob Schegk. There are some other Lutherans that deserve to be mentioned. Philipp Scherb, founder and professor of the University of Altdorf in Nürnberg, acquired his knowledge of Aristotle in Italy. The Italian Julius Pacius had some impact. Owen Günther (1532-1615) taught at the University of Jena before teaching at Helmstedt. Finally there was Cornelius Martini (1568-1621) of the University of Helmstedt who was a friend of David Chytraeus (1531-1600), (Wundt, *Schulmetaphysik*, 49-50).

Before one begins the history of the revival of metaphysics in Lutheranism, metaphysics needs to be defined. Metaphysics is the study of *ens qua ens*, i.e., being insofar as being. It was considered the queen of the sciences and is a branch of philosophy. The revival of metaphysics in Lutheranism was more independent than the revival of Aristotelianism, albeit the *Metaphysicae disputationes* of Francisco Suarez would have some impact after the revival. The revival of metaphysics begins with Daniel Cramer (1568-1637), professor at the Gymnasium and pastor of Stettin, Pommern. His lectures titled *Isagoge in Metaphysicam Aristotelis* were published in 1594. Cramer was also known for his uncompleted *Pommersche Kirchenchronik*. Zacharias Sommer of the University of Wittenberg published his *Questiones in primam Aristotelis philosophiam* in 1594. In contrast to Cramer he saw only the theological value of metaphysics. Solomon Gesner (1559-1605), a colleague of Sommer, used metaphysics exclusively to refute the Reformed. This would essentially be the approach of Jakob Martini (1570-1649) and Balthazar Meissner (1587-1626). At the University of Altdorf, Nikolaus Taurellus (1547-1606), Ernst Soner, and Michael Piccart continued the legacy of Scherb. The very independent minded Taurellus tried to develop a Christian philosophy as Piccart published his *Isagoge in lectionem Aristotlis* in 1605. In Strasburg, Johann Ludwig Hawenreuter, philosopher and physician, published his metaphysics in 1596. The text that set the standard for Lutheranism was the *Compendium metaphysicum* of Cornelius Martini (1568-1621) of the University of Helmstedt. After it was revised, Johann Gerhard used it in his lectures on metaphysics at the University of Jena (Wundt, *Schulmetaphysik*, 51-68).

The Hoffmann Controversy at the University of Helmstedt sealed the revival of metaphysics in Lutheran circles. At Helmstedt a Gnesio-Lutheran by the name of Daniel Hoffmann (1538-1611) had taught double truth, i.e., reason can contradict theology. This was the same Hoffmann that had opposed the *Formula of Concord* and attacked Martin Chemnitz. Hoffmann felt his position was that of Luther and the Scriptures. He also advocated Ramism which was now under attack. Cornelius Martini (1568-1621), who had helped revive metaphysics, opposed him (cf. Thomasius, Gottfried. *De Controversia Hofmanniana.*). Martini taught that such things as the Holy Trinity are beyond reason, but that they cannot contradict reason. The “reason” of which Martini speaks is pre-fall or regenerate reason. His argument is the following: If pure reason contradicts theology, then God would be a liar and the origin of evil. Pre-fall or regenerate reason cannot contradict theology, because its origin is from God and He is unable to do evil. Still pre-fall or regenerate reason is not able to comprehend the Holy Trinity even in the beatific vision. Since man will never be omniscient, certain things will always be beyond reason, but they will not contradict reason. This was the position that won the day.

Aristotelianism and particularly metaphysics came to play a very important roll in High Orthodoxy. For example the *Loci Theologici* of Johann Gerhard employed Aristotelian methodology, logic, and metaphysics to advance the Gospel. The *Philosophia sobria* of Balthasar Meisner (1587-1626) made abundant use of metaphysics to demonstrate the superiority of Lutheranism to Calvinism. While there was little advancement among Lutherans in theory at this time, two different approaches to philosophy were beginning to take shape. One part of Lutheranism understood philosophy as an *ancilla*, i.e., a handmaiden to theology. The other part did philosophy for philosophy’s sake. Generally speaking, those who used philosophy for philosophy’s sake did not always maintain their orthodoxy.

The high point of Lutheran Aristotelianism was Abraham Calov. This is true because of his contribution to ontology, i.e., the study of being and his distinction between *gnostologia* and *noologia*. Calov produced his philosophical *corpus* in his younger years at the Universities of Königsberg and Rostock. The following are a list and description of these works. *Tractatus de methodo discendi et disputandi* (1632) was manual for disputations. *Gnostologia* (1633) was the study of *omne scibile qua tale*, i.e., all things cognizable as such. Calov further defines *cognoscibile*, i.e., cognizable with *intelligibile*, i.e., intelligible and states, “*intelligibile est omne, quod est*, i.e., intelligible is everything that exists” (Wundt. *Schulmetaphysik*. 257). *De directione... intellectus...disputatio* (1636) dealt with the intellect. *Metaphysica Divina* (1636) was a metaphysical text that presupposed both Scripture and reason as a basis for knowledge. *Noologia* (1650) dealt with intelligence or the *habitus primorum principiorum*, i.e., the habit or disposition of the first principles. Its object is the *affinitas rerum*, i.e., relationship of things compared with one another. Thus the first principles are derived from the observation of the neither the complete dissimilarities or complete similarities of these compared things. (Wundt. *Schulmetaphysik*. 259). The philosophical works of Abraham Calov were collected and published in two volumes know as the *Scripta philosophica* (1650-1). A year later his *Encyclopedia disciplinarum realium ideae* was published in 1652. These works dealt primarily with methodology, metaphysics, and epistemology. Some of these works were intended to show that even sound philosophy demonstrated the validity of Lutheranism in contrast to the errors of the Reformed and Roman Catholics. In this manner Calov followed in the footsteps of Balthazar Meissner’s (1587-1626) *Philosophia sobria*.

The contributions of Calov to epistemology and ontology are his real claim to fame. Drawing from the works of Wittenberg professors Georg Gutke (1589-1634) and Valentin Fromme (1601-1675), he anticipated some of the epistemological insights of Immanuel Kant (1724-1804) in his works on *Gnostologia* and *Noologia* (Wundt. *Schulmetaphysik*.. 134, 259). Nevertheless he is fundamentally Aristotelian in his epistemology and did not advocate the transcendental idealism of

Kant, i.e., the distinction between phenomena and noumena. Abraham Calov is also credited with coining the word “ontology,” i.e., the study of being. This is only partially true. Rudolf Goclenius had already introduced the term in his 1613 *Lexicon philosophicum*. Still Abraham Calov was the first to use the term “ontology” in its proper sense. This he did in his *Metaphysica Divina* (1636).

So often the work of the seventeenth century Lutheran, Catholic, and Reformed philosophers has been overlooked. In fact, most histories of philosophy leap from the Middle Ages to Descartes and Kant. Had there not been a Neo-Aristotelian revival, there would never have been a Leibnitz, Wolff, or Kant. Just as St. Augustine should not be equated with Plotinus, so, too, Lutheran Neo-Aristotelianism should not be equated with the rationalism of Leibnitz, Wolff, or Kant. Lutheran Orthodoxy did not use reason magisterially as the theologians of the Enlightenment. Moreover, Lutheran Orthodoxy did not cause Rationalism. To imply this is no different than saying lower textual criticism leads to higher criticism. In any case contribution of Lutheran Orthodoxy should not be underestimated in the history of philosophy.

Approach to Dogmatics

One of the recognized characteristics of Lutheran Orthodoxy was the writing of dogmatics or systematics. Writing a systematic text was orthodoxy's claim to fame much like writing a sermon book on the historic pericopes was for the Synodical Conference theologians. In order to write a dogmatics book one had to begin with an outline or roadmap. This road map was typically determined by Aristotelian methodology. The first method for doing dogmatics was the *ordo locorum* or the *loci* method popularized by Philipp Melanchthon (1497-1560) and the humanists. This method grew out of the *Topics* of Aristotle and the works of Cicero. The *loci* method makes use of the *habitus practicus* method, but was by no means a *summa* or a *corpus* of theology. For example, the *Loci Communes* (1521) of Melanchthon grew out of his commentary on Romans and only treated certain major points of doctrine.

When the *De natura logicae* of Giacomo Zabarella (1533-1589), the celebrated logician from Padua, was studied, the *Loci* method was abandoned. This work was part of a collection of logical works known as *Opera Logica*. Out of this study grew two ways of approaching systematics. In reality this distinction in methodology did not originate in Zabarella, but was derived from the writing of Galen the Physician, a famous Aristotelian commentator (cf. Edwards. *The Logic of Iacopo Zabarella (1533-1589)*). The first approach was the *ordo compositivus*, i.e., synthetic method, which proceeds from principles to conclusions. The second was the *ordo resolutivus*, i.e., analytical method, which begins with the goal in view and then sets forth ways to reach this goal. These two approaches became necessary to systemize the massive amount of dogmatic material accumulated by Luther, Melanchthon, Chemnitz, Hunnius, and others.

Johann Gerhard followed the *ordo locorum* or *loci* method of Melanchthon, but also made use of a loose adaptation of the *ordo compositivus*. This is exhibited by Gerhard's treatment of theology's principles, specifically the *principium cognoscendi*. In the same year Gerhard's *Loci Theologici* was printed, Balthazar Mentzer, Gerhard's teacher, adopted the second approach, the *ordo resolutivus*, in his *Synopsis theologiae analytico ordine comprehensa*. About the same time or earlier Bartholomaeus Keckermann, a Reformed theologian from Danzig implemented the analytical method. The analytical method better suited Lutheran theology than Reformed theology. Lutheranism had a soteriological emphasis, which became the *finis* or end goal of Lutheran dogmatics, as opposed to the theocentric viewpoint of the Reformed (Appold. *Abraham Calov's Doctrine of Vocatio in Its Systematic Context*. 29).

The analytical method, particularly in the *Systema Locorum Theologicorum* of Calov, helped facilitate the *habitus practicus* principle. The purpose of this method was to systematize all theology under the single point of view: How will man reach his highest goal, eternal blessedness? It began

with the belief that God is the eternal goal, and then proceeded to deal with the doctrine of man, the subject of theology, and finally with the means whereby man can attain eternal blessedness. Prior to Calov there was no uniformity in dogmatic method. There was also no theological purpose in choosing one methodology over another. After Calov made use of the analytical method specifically because of its soteriological aim, no noteworthy Lutheran would deviate from it. Thus the *Systema Locorum Theologicorum* set the precedence for all future Lutheran dogmatics even though it was not the first to employ the analytical method.

Order of Salvation

Early Lutheran dogmatic works did not treat the entire *ordo salutis* (order of salvation) in a systematic way. However, they did deal with most of the *ordo* under one or more *loci*. When the *ordo compositivus* (synthetic method) was popularized by Johann Gerhard, the *ordo salutis* was still in its early stages. Yet it should be noted that Johann Gerhard would later advocate the *ordo resolutivus* in his *prooemium* (par. 28) because it treated theology as a *habitus practicus* (as opposed to a theoretical science). Since he had finished his *Loci Theologici* and could no longer restructure it (Vaahantoranta, Martti. *Restauratio Imaginis Divinae*. 22). Nicolaus Hunnius was one of the earliest to develop the *ordo salutis* in his *Epitome Credendorum* along with Balthazar Mentzer (1565-1627). (A sort of *ordo salutis* can also be found in the *Wahres Christentum* of Johann Arndt). But the *ordo salutis* would not take its final shape until after Calixtus, the arch-heretic from Helmstedt. Abraham Calov is said to be the true founder of the modern Lutheran *ordo salutis* even though he was not the first to develop it. A comprehensive study of the *ordo salutis* can be a tremendous aid to maintaining a proper distinction between justification and sanctification. Many errors have arisen as a result of a misunderstanding of the *ordo salutis*.

Although there are minor differences among Lutheran theologians as to the exact structure of the *ordo salutis*, there is clearly agreement on its main components. Abraham Calov's *ordo salutis* consists of the following: vocation, illumination, regeneration, conversion, justification, penitence, mystical union, sanctification, and glorification (Calov. *Systema*. 10). This is the most common schema for constructing the *ordo*. The purpose of the *ordo salutis* is merely to systematize what takes place in a believer in a cause and effect relationship. The *ordo* dare not be turned into a temporal relationship or into something caused by man since this would be unbiblical. Furthermore the entire *ordo salutis* occurs simultaneously. The negative of developing such an *ordo salutis* via the analytical method, as C.F.W. Walther (1811-1887) once remarked, is that one could force Scripture into an airtight system whereby doctrine is not based upon *locus classicus*, but rather logical deductions (Suelflow. *Servant of the Word*. 106). Moreover the Reformed have often attacked the Lutheran *ordo salutis* claiming it was synergistic, since regeneration and faith precede justification. Biblically speaking, faith precedes subjective justification since man is justified by faith (Galatians 3:28, Romans 8:30). Moreover faith is also caused by the Holy Spirit and therefore is not a work of man (Romans 8:30). Clearly the Reformed charge is unwarranted and clouded by their misunderstanding of election.

III. Abraham Calov's Influence

Abraham Calov was a man of exceptional learning and pastoral concern. He was truly a *strenuus Christi athleta*, i.e., vigorous athlete of Christ. His supporters admired him as the Lutheran Athanasius, while his opponents abhorred him as the Lutheran Torquemada, the Hot-blooded Watchman of Zion, and the Grand Inquisitor (Tholuck. *Geist*. 202, 209, 229). His influence is evident in Hülsemann, Quenstedt, Scherzer, Kromayer, and later Lutheran Orthodoxy. At times his polemics went too far, still they were rather typical for the day. His zeal was primarily driven by a pastoral concern to protect the flock.

Abraham Calov had a profound influence on Johann Sebastian Bach. This is largely attributed to *Die deutsche Bibel*. J.S. Bach also acquired Calov's personal copy of the Altenberg edition of Luther's works—full of his personal underlining and notes. This was the edition that Abraham Calov had used to produce *Die deutsche Bibel*. J.S. Bach obtained it via the auction of Andreas Winkler's library (Leaver, *J.S. Bach and Scripture*. 25). All of these books were treasured by him as can be seen from the following: Although Bach consulted the Calov Bible extensively, its present condition indicates that he must have taken meticulous care of it. *Die deutsche Bibel* was catalogued first among the theological books that Bach owned in a list written in 1750, indicating its importance in Bach's library. The Altenberg edition of Luther's works and the Calov Bible were set in a place of prominence in J.S. Bach's library. When Bach died all his books were distributed among his family except for *Die deutsche Bibel* and the Altenberg edition of Luther's works, which were assigned to his widow, Anna Magdalena, because she knew how much her husband regarded these books (Leaver *J.S. Bach and Scripture*. 24-25). These books took precedence over Martin Chemnitz's *Examen* and Johannes Müller's *Lutherus Defensus*.

Abraham Calov left his mark on the Synodical Conference Lutheranism as well. C.F.W. Walther frequently quotes Calov in his writings and appears to have had a high regard for him. Adolph Hönecke (1835-1908) had a profound respect for Calov and probably used him more than any other American Lutheran (Preus, *TPRL*. 61). Robert Preus adds that Franz Pieper (1852-1931) more often cites Quenstedt while Hönecke uses Calov (Preus, *TPRL*. 22). What is far more intriguing is that Calov's greatest Synodical Conference disciple, Adolph Hönecke, was converted by August Tholuck, the contentious Prussian union biographer of Calov. Even celebrated exegetes like Georg Stöckhardt (1842-1913) and Heinrich Meyer (1800-1873) frequently cite the *Biblia Illustrata* in their commentaries.

In conclusion, Abraham Calov was indeed one of the greatest theologians in Lutheranism and all of Christendom. Thus it is the hope of this author that he not be forgotten, but diligently read and studied. His theology is just as vital to the present as it was to his own time. May the advice of C.F.W. Walther be heeded!

Do not despise the writings of the old faithful church fathers, the writings of a Luther, Chemnitz, Quenstedt, Gerhard, H. Müller, etc. Otherwise you disobey the Holy Spirit, who commanded you: "Do not despise prophecy" [that is, exposition of Scripture; I Thess. 5:20].

C.F.W. Walther

1884 Synodical Conference convention essay

Bibliography

- Appold, Kenneth G. *Abraham Calov's Doctrine of Vocatio in Its Systematic Context*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1998.
- Baur, Jörg. "Die Pflicht geschichtlichen Gedenkens. Anlässlich Geburtstages von Abraham Calov." *LM*. (1962):230-232.
- Baur, Jörg. *Die Vernunft zwischen Ontologie und Evangelium Eine Untersuchung zur Theologie Johann Andreas Quenstedt*. Guetersloh: Gueterslohe Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1962.
- Die Bekenntnisschriften der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche*. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1992.
- Bodensieck, J. *The Encyclopedia of the Lutheran Church*. Vol. I-III. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1965.
- Calov, Abraham. *Systema Locorum Theologicorum*. Wittenberg, 1655/77.
- Chemnitz, Martin. *Examination of the Council of Trent*. I-IV St. Louis: CPH. 1971.
- Edwards, William F. *The Logic of Iacopo Zabarella (1533-1589)*. Columbia University, Ph.D., 1960.
- Elert, Werner. *Eucharist and Church Fellowship in the First Four Centuries*. St. Louis. CPH, 1966.
- Elert, Werner. *The Structure of Lutheranism*. St. Louis: CPH, 1962.
- Fischer, Erdmann Rudolph. *The Life of John Gerhard*. Malone: Repristination Press, 2000.
- Friedensburg, Walter. *Geschichte der Universität Wittenberg*. Halle, 1917.
- Friedensburg, Walter. "Kurfürst Fredrich Wilhelm von Brandenburg und die Wittenberger Theologen." Found in *Festschrift Karl Müller*. Tübingen 1922: 228-253.
- Gensichen, Hans-Werner. *Die Wittenberger antisozinianische Polemik*. Diss. theol. Göttingen, 1942.
- Glassius, Salmon. *Philologia Sacra*. Lipsiae: Apud Jo. Frider. Gleditschium, 1785.
- Gritsch, Eric. *A History of Lutheranism*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002.
- Hägglund, Brengt. *History of Theology*. St. Louis: CPH, 1968.
- Henke, Ernst. Ludwig Theodor. *Georg Calixt und seine Zeit*. Vol. I-II. Halle, 1853-1860.
- Henke, Ernst. *Inest theologorum Saxoniorum consensus repetitus fidei vere lutheranae*. Marburgi: Typis Elwertii Academicus, 1846.
- Heussi, Karl. *Geschichte der theologischen Fakultät zu Jena*. Weimar, 1954.

- Hermelink, Heinrich. *Die Universität Marburg von 1527-1645*. Marburg, 1927.
- Hoffmann, Georg. "Lutherische Schriftauslegung im 17. Jahrhunderts, dargestellt am Beispiel Abraham Calovs." Found in Balz, Horst. *Das Wort und die Wörter. Festschriften Gerhard Friedrich*. Stuttgart, 1973: 127-142.
- Holzhey, Helmut and Schmidt-Biggemann. *Die Philosophie des 17. Jahrhunderts. Das Heilige Römische Reich Deutscher Nation. Nord- und Ostmittel Europa*. Vol. 4. Basel: Schwabe & Co., 2001.
- Iorio, Dominick. *The Aristotelians of Renaissance Italy*. Lewiston: The Edwin Mellon Press, 1991.
- Jung, Voelker. *Das Ganze der Heiligen Schrift. Hermeneutik und Schriftauslegung bei Abraham Calov*. Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1999.
- Kasukawa, Sachiko. *The Transformation of Natural Philosophy: The Case of Philipp Melanchthon*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995
- Kaufmann, Thomas. "Königsberger Theologieprofessoren im 17. Jahrhunderts." Found in Rauschnig, Dietrich. *Die Albertus-Universität zu Königsberg und ihre Professoren. Aus Anlaß der Gründung der Die Albertus-Universität vor 450 Jahren. Jahrbuch der Albertus-Universität*. 29. Berlin, 1995: 45-86.
- Koch, Ernst and Wallmann, Johannes. *Ernst Salomon Cyprian. (1673-1745) zwischen Orthodoxie, Pietismus und Frühaufklärung*. Veröffentlichungen der Forschungs-und Landsbibliothek Gotha 34. Gotha, 1996.
- Koelpin, Arnold. *No Other Gospel*. Milwaukee: Northwestern Publishing House, 1980.
- Kolb, Robert. *Martin Luther as Prophet, Teacher, and Hero*. Grand Rapids: Paternoster/Baker Books, 1999.
- Krauß, E.A. Wilh. *Lebensbilder aus der Geschichte der christlichen Kirche*. St. Louis: CPH 1911.
- Kurtz. *Kurtz's Church History*. Vol. III. New York: Funk and Wagnalls Company.
- Leaver, Robin. *J.S. Bach and Scripture*. St. Louis: CPH, 1973.
- Lessing, Gotthold. *Gesammelte Werke*. Berlin: Verlag v. Paul Rilla, 1956.
- Mager, Inge. "Brüderlichkeit und Einheit: Georg Calixt und das Thorner Religionsgespräch 1645." found in Jähniß, Bernhart and Letkemann, Peter. *Beiträge zur Geschichte Westpreussens*. 7 Göttingen, 1981:197-208.
- Maloney, George A. *A History of Orthodox Theology Since 1453*. Boston: Nordland Publishing Company, 1976.
- Mayer, Johann Fredrich. *Der biß in seinen Todt Gott fürchtende Abraham/ Unserer Zeit/ Der Magnificus*.

Hochwürdige/WohlEdle und Hochgelahrte Herr D. Abraham Calovius. [mit Curriculum Vitae Abraham Calovii, 75-107]. Wittenberg 1691.

Meusel, Carl. *Kirchliches Handlexicon*. Leipzig: Verlag von Justus Naumann, 1887.

Nagel, William. "D. Johann Friedrich Mayer. Prof. Prim. Der Theologie, Prokanzler der Universität Greifswald etc. (1701-1712)." Found in *Festschrift de 500-Jahrfeier der Universität Greifswald 17.10.1956*. Vol. 2. Greifswald, 1956: 34-47.

Neve, J.L. *A History of Christian Thought*. Philadelphia: The Muhlenberg Press, 1946.

Ong, Walter. *Ramus Method and the Decay of Dialogue*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1983.

Pelikan, Jaroslav. *The Christian Tradition: Reformation of the Church and Dogma (1300-1700)*. Vol. IV. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1984.

Philosophy in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries: Conversations with Aristotle. Edited by Constance Blackwell and Sachiko Kusukawa. Aldershot: Ashgate, 1999.

Preus, Robert. *The Theology of Post-Reformation Lutheranism*. Vol. I St. Louis: CPH, 1970.

Ritschl, Otto. *Dogmengeschichte des Protestantismus*. Vol. I-IV. Göttingen, 1927.

Sasse, Hermann. *Here We Stand*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1938.

Schaff, Philip. *The Creeds of Christendom*. Vol. I. New York: Harper and Brother, 1919.

Scharlemann, Robert. *Thomas Aquinas and John Gerhard*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1964.

Schlee, Ernst. *Der Streit des Daniel Hoffmann über das Verhältnis der Philosophie zur Theologie*. Marburg, 1862.

Schmeling, Gaylin. "The Theology of Church Fellowship". *Lutheran Synod Quarterly*, Vol. XXXIII, No. 2, June 1993.

Sparn, Walter. *Wiederkehr der Metaphysik. Die ontologische Frage in der lutherischen Theologie des frühen 17. Jahrhunderts*. Stuttgart: Calwer theologische Monografien, 1976.

Spener, Philip Jacob. *Pia Desideria*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1964.

Symposium on Seventeenth Century Lutheranism. St. Louis: Symposium on Seventeenth Century Lutheranism, 1962.

Tholuck, A. *Der Geist der lutherischen Theologen Wittenbergs im Verlaufe des 17. Jahrhunderts*. Hamburg und Gotha: Friedrich und Andreas Perthes, 1852.

Thomasius, Gottfried. *De Controversia Hofmanniana*. Erlangen 1844;

Trautmann, Christoph. "Calovii Schrifften. 3 Bände aus Johann Sebastian Bachs Nachlaß und ihre Bedeutung für das Bild des lutherischen Kantors Bach" *Musik und Kirche*. 39 (1969):145-160.

Uhlhorn, Friedrich. *Geschichte der deutsch - lutherischen Kirche*. Leipzig: Verlag von Dörffling und Franke, 1911.

Wallmann, Johannes. "Abraham Calov theologischer Widerpart der Religionspolitik des Großen Kurfürsten." found in Oehmig, Stefan. *700 Jahre Wittenberg Stadt Universität Reformation*. Weimar, 1995: 303-311.

Weber, Hans Emil. *Reformation, Orthodoxie und Rationalismus*. Band I-II. Guetersloh: Guetersloher Verlaghaus Gerd Mohn, 1951.

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

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

Wotschke, Theodor. "Kaspar Hermann Sandhagens Briefe an Abraham Calov." *Zeitschrift der Gesellschaft für niedersächsische kirchengeschichte*. 42 (1937):306-313.

Wundt, Max. *Die deutsche Schulmetaphysik des 17. Jahrhunderts*. Heidesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 1992.

Wundt, Max. *Die Philosophie an der Universität Jena*. Jena, 1932.