
Georg Calixtus and the Humanist Tradition

Christian Thorsten Callisen

Diploma of Financial Services (Financial Planning) *Finsia*

Postgraduate Certificate in Business *USQ*

Research Students Centre

Division of Research & Commercialisation

Queensland University of Technology

Thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts (Research)

2010

Keywords

Georg Calixtus (1586–1656); Isaac Casaubon (1559–1614); humanism; ars historica; consensus antiquitatis; calixtine theology; irenicism; Renaissance; history of ideas; early modern Europe

Abstract

Georg Calixtus (1586–1656) was a Lutheran theologian, prominent in the German lands during the first half of the seventeenth century. Existing research focuses on Calixtus' contributions to religious and theological debates, particularly in regard to his role in the Syncretistic Controversy of the latter half of the seventeenth century, and in regard to his unique position as a Lutheran who aspired to reunion between the different Christian confessions. This thesis problematises this focus on Calixtus by theologians and ecclesiastical historians, and argues that the genesis and transmission of his ideas cannot be fully appreciated without considering his relationship with the broader intellectual milieu of early modern Europe. It does this by exploring Calixtus' interaction with the humanist tradition, in particular by reconsidering his relationship with Isaac Casaubon (1559–1614), and by exploring his work in light of intellectual movements that were taking place outside the Christian church. In so doing, this thesis argues that Calixtus made contributions to early modern thought that have been overlooked in the existing literature. It also becomes apparent that much research remains to be done to gain a more accurate picture of his place in the early modern intellectual landscape, and of his legacy to later generations of scholars.

Table of Contents

Keywords	i
Abstract.....	ii
Table of Contents	iii
List of Abbreviations	iv
Statement of Original Authorship	v
Acknowledgements.....	vi
1. Introduction	1
1.1. Impetus / Research Question	5
1.2. A Note on Sources, Catholicity, and Creeds	8
1.3. Summary—Introduction.....	14
2. Context—Background and Biography	16
2.1. The Confessionalization Thesis.....	17
2.2. The Early Years / University	21
2.3. The Scholars	27
2.3.1. Jan Gruter	27
2.3.2. Cornelius Martini	28
2.3.3. Philipp Melanchthon	29
2.3.4. Balthasar Mentzer	31
2.3.5. David Pareus	33
2.3.6. Summary—The Scholars	35
2.4. The Controversies.....	36
2.5. The Calixtine Legacy to Lower Saxony	43
2.6. Summary—Background and Biography	45
3. Calixtus and Humanism: A Partial View?.....	47
3.1. The Genesis of a Calixtine <i>consensus antiquitatis</i>	48
3.2. Humanism, Calixtus, and History	52
3.2.1. Merkt and Schüssler	55
3.3. Summary—Calixtus and Humanism.....	59
4. Isaac Casaubon and the Consensus of Antiquity	61
4.1. The <i>consensus antiquitatis</i> of Cassander, Dominis, and Calixtus.....	62
4.2. Isaac Casaubon	68
4.3. Casaubon in Calixtus.....	73
4.4. Summary—Isaac Casaubon and the Consensus of Antiquity	81
5. On the Study of History	83
5.1. The <i>ars historica</i>	83
5.2. “De studio historiarum oratio”	87
5.3. Summary—On the Study of History	97
6. Conclusion.....	101
Bibliography	105
1. Primary Sources	105
2. Secondary Sources	109

List of Abbreviations

ADB = *Allgemeine deutsche Biographie*, 55 vols. Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot, 1875–1912, <http://www.deutsche-biographie.de> (accessed March 23, 2009).

“De historia” = Calixtus, Georg. “De studio historiarum oratio: 1629.” In *Werke*, 1:419–33.

HAB = Herzog August Bibliothek, Wolfenbüttel.

NDB = *Neue deutsche Biographie*, 23 vols to date. Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1953–, <http://www.deutsche-biographie.de> (accessed March 23, 2009).

Werke = Calixtus, Georg. *Werke in Auswahl*, 4 vols. Edited by Inge Mager. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970–82.

Statement of Original Authorship

The work contained in this thesis has not been previously submitted to meet requirements for an award at this or any other higher education institution. To the best of my knowledge and belief, the thesis contains no material previously published or written by another person except where due reference is made.

Christian Thorsten Callisen

/ /2010

Acknowledgements

The seeds for this thesis were sown in 2008, when my grandma sent me an email telling me that one of my ancestors had been friends with Philipp Melanchthon and Martin Luther. Although the material facts turned out to be a little different, her email piqued my interest, and my tenth great-uncle remains the subject of this study. Without that message from my grandma, Rosemarie Callisen, this thesis would not exist, and it is to her that it is dedicated.

Of course, over the last year and a half many debts have been incurred, and I cannot acknowledge them all here. However, there are several individuals whom I would like to make note of. First, I would like to thank my family—Mum, Thorkil, Caroline, and Nicholas—and my dearest friends, Bob and Andrew, for standing by me, even if they watched with incredulity as I made the leap from bank manager to intellectual historian. I would also like to thank my partner's family, especially Graham, Cheryl, Chris, and Auntie Bev, for welcoming me with open arms and for helping to make the transition in my private life over the last couple of years even easier than the transition in my professional life.

To my supervisors, Associate Professor Gary Ianziti and Professor Gavin Kendall, I would like to express my sincere thanks and admiration. Gary's keen eye and firm editorial hand, and Gavin's incisive questioning, have helped to shape this thesis from the beginning, and their enthusiasm and support have made the whole journey entirely enjoyable. My thanks are also due various other scholars who took the time to answer questions and offer useful advice to an anonymous student from the other side of the world: Professor Dr Christoph Böttigheimer, Dr William Kelly, Rev. Dr Benjamin Mayes, and Rev. Dr Quentin Stewart; and especially Professor Constantin Fasolt, Professor Dr Inge Mager, and Dr Dirk van Miert for suggesting sources that I might otherwise have overlooked. I must also offer my gratitude for the incisive and constructive criticism of two anonymous reviewers from the *Journal of the History of Ideas*, whose feedback has helped to make chapter four much stronger than it might otherwise be.

Others have contributed to this project in ways they may not even realise. My fellow research students in the former Humanities Program at QUT, particularly Gerri, Jean-Paul, Lanka, Lena/Theresa, Meg, and Nick, have been a source of great support, humour, conversation, and coffee over the last eighteen months, and the

tireless efforts of Melody McIntosh continue to make the research journey infinitely easier for all of us. To the Document Delivery team at the QUT Library I am enormously indebted, as this project simply could not have been completed without their efforts. I am grateful also to Dr Enrique Callisen Descals for generously lending me his copy of Halling's *Beiträge zur Familiengeschichte des Geschlechtes Callisen*.

Finally, I would like to thank my beautiful partner, Matthew. His sense of humour, critical mind, and generous heart have supported me both personally and intellectually during the last two and a half years. In my last year as a bank manager he learned (or at least heard) more about banking and management than he probably ever wanted to, and since then has listened patiently as I spoke incessantly about early modern history, the Republic of Letters, and myriad other subjects that he could happily have remained ignorant of. Throughout all of this he has helped me to think differently about things that I once took for granted, and has loved me unconditionally. Without him neither I, nor the modest volume you are currently reading, would exist as we are today.

1. Introduction

The last several decades have seen a growing interest in the early modern period of European history, particularly in regard to the movement of Renaissance humanism and its influence.¹ The goal of this thesis is to contribute to this body of knowledge by introducing a relatively little-known figure to anglophone historians. This study will explore some of the work of Georg Calixtus (1586–1656), a Lutheran theologian at the University of Helmstedt in Brunswick, Germany, and its relation to the evolving tradition of Renaissance humanism.

The term “humanism,” when applied to the early modern period, has, since the 1960s, typically referred to a movement that originated in Italy with the work of Petrarch (1304–1374), and which spread throughout Western and Central Europe via university and court systems, through the correspondence of Italian humanists (whether scholars, princes, popes, or courtiers) with friends and acquaintances in other countries, and by the dissemination of printed books and pamphlets following the invention of the printing press in the fifteenth century.² Around that time Angelo Poliziano (1454–1494) introduced new standards for both the presentation and evaluation of philological material,³ and in the second half of the sixteenth century scholars like Joseph Scaliger (1540–1609) refined the critical philological methods that would persist until the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.⁴ The movement was characterised by the rediscovery and reconsideration of ancient texts—Latin, Greek, and Hebrew—within which was sought “the answer to all social, political, artistic, and ethical problems.”⁵ Its proponents tended to view the medieval period as a dark

¹ See, for example, *The Cambridge Companion to Renaissance Humanism*, ed. Jill Kraye (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996); *Interpretations of Renaissance Humanism*, ed. Angelo Mazzocco (Leiden: Brill, 2006); S. Harris Thomson, *Europe in Renaissance and Reformation* (London: Rupert Hart-Davis, 1963), chs 4, 12, 23; Charles Trinkaus, *The Scope of Renaissance Humanism* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1983); Ronald G. Witt, *In the Footsteps of the Ancients: The Origins of Humanism from Lovato to Bruni* (Boston: Brill, 2003); and the various publications of other scholars such as Anthony Grafton, Paul Oskar Kristeller and Donald R. Kelley.

² This is neatly reviewed in Paul Oskar Kristeller, *Renaissance Thought and the Arts* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980), ch. 3. See also Marc Fumaroli, “The Republic of Letters,” trans. R. Scott Walker, *Diogenes* 143 (1988): 129–52. On Kristeller’s influence on humanist scholarship, see Witt, *In the Footsteps*, 1–5. Cf. the collected essays in *Interpretations*.

³ Anthony Grafton, *Joseph Scaliger: A Study in the History of Classical Scholarship*, 2 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983–93), 1:21–44.

⁴ See Grafton, *Joseph Scaliger*.

⁵ Thomson, *Europe*, 328.

age, and believed that the best way to address the difficulties of their own time was to seek to restore the purity of antiquity. However, despite the work of the Polizianos and Scaligers of the age, by the beginning of the seventeenth century, the humanist movement was on the decline, and the lessons of the past were no longer seen as the ultimate antidote for contemporary ills. These themes were generally accepted until the 1990s.⁶ At that time, new research began to show that icons such as Joseph Scaliger and Angelo Poliziano could no longer be seen as typical of all humanists,⁷ and that the humanist movement itself spanned a much greater time period than had previously been considered. Ronald Witt, for example, sees its genesis in a conscious assertion of Italian independence in the work of Lovato dei Lovati (1240/41–1309) in response to a French cultural influence that had been growing in Italy around 1200.⁸ For Witt, Petrarch, previously seen as the “father” of Renaissance humanism, was in fact a third-generation humanist—a revolutionary within an already established movement.

At the other end of the scale, a growing body of work makes it clear that Renaissance humanism did not reach its end-date at the turn of the seventeenth century. Scholars such as Paula Findlen, Ingrid Rowland, and Nicholas Wickenden, among others, have shown us that the humanists of the seventeenth century were as active as ever. They continued to use their vast stores of knowledge in an effort to revitalise the wisdom of the ancients, to expose forgers, and to advise princes and kings on matters of diplomacy and war. People like Isaac Casaubon (1559–1614),

⁶ See, for example, Fumaroli, “Republic”; Kristeller, *Renaissance Thought*, ch. 1; Charles G. Nauert, *Humanism and the Culture of Renaissance Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995); Thomson, *Europe*, 673–702; Trinkaus, *Scope*, 11–25.

⁷ Grafton, *Defenders of the Text: The Traditions of Scholarship in an Age of Science, 1450–1800* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1991), 27. For examples of such explorations, see also Brian Curran and Grafton, “A Fifteenth-Century Site Report on the Vatican Obelisk,” *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 58 (1995): 234–48; Grafton, *Bring Out Your Dead: The Past as Revelation* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001); *What Was History? The Art of History in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007); *Worlds Made By Words: Scholarship and Community in the Modern West* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2009), chs 1–6, 8; *Historia: Empiricism and Erudition in Early Modern Europe*, ed. Gianna Pomata and Nancy G. Siraisi (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2005); Gary Ianziti, “Between Livy and Polybius: Leonardo Bruni on the First Punic War,” *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome* 51/52 (2006/07): 173–97; “Bruni on Writing History,” *Renaissance Quarterly* 51, no. 2 (1998): 367–91; Christopher R. Ligota, “Annius of Viterbo and Historical Method,” *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 50 (1987): 44–56; Mark Milne, “Two Humanistic Translations of Polybius,” *Res Publica Litterarum* 12 (1989): 123–29; Nicholas Wickenden, *G. J. Vossius and the Humanist Concept of History* (Assen: van Gorcum, 1993).

⁸ Witt, *In the Footsteps*.

Curzio Inghirami (1614–1655), Athanasius Kircher (1602–1680), Gerhard Vossius (1577–1649) and, as this thesis will argue, Georg Calixtus, continued to draw on the humanist tradition and make their own contributions to the debates that it had begun.⁹

Calixtus is an attractive subject for this study for two particular reasons. First, although the debt he owed sixteenth-century humanists such as Philipp Melanchthon (1497–1560) and Johannes Caselius (1533–1613) is widely acknowledged, his interaction with later generations of humanists has received virtually no attention. Second, the focus on his work by theologians and ecclesiastical scholars has resulted in a rather narrow understanding of the contributions that he made to the intellectual milieu of early modern Europe. So caught up have scholars been with the idea that Calixtus was a theologian in the modern sense that evidence of his influence in spheres such as historical criticism, chronology, and legal theory appear to have gone unnoticed. Those that do acknowledge his place in the tradition of Renaissance humanism tend to cast him as a consumer, rather than a producer, of humanist ideals, thus limiting their consideration of how his work related to that of other early modern scholars.¹⁰

One must remember that the epistemology of the seventeenth-century European was very different to that which modern Western society enjoys. For an early modern scholar, there existed no such thing as a discrete theological discipline, or a discrete medical discipline; although universities certainly granted degrees in different fields (law, medicine, philosophy, and theology), these fields were not considered unrelated to each other.¹¹ As such, to view Calixtus as a theologian in the

⁹ On Casaubon, Inghirami, Kircher, and Vossius see respectively, for example, Anthony David Nuttall, *Dead from the Waist Down: Scholars and Scholarship in Literature and the Popular Imagination* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003), ch. 3; Ingrid Rowland, *The Scarith of Scornello: A Tale of Renaissance Forgery* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004); Athanasius Kircher: *The Last Man Who Knew Everything*, ed. Paula Findlen (New York: Routledge, 2004); Wickenden, *G. J. Vossius*.

¹⁰ This dichotomy between consumption and production will be unpacked in our discussion of the current body of research in chapter three.

¹¹ See Michel Foucault, *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences* (New York: Random House, Vintage Books, 1994), 17–30; Grafton, *Worlds*, 9–14; Jan C. Westerhoff, “Polyhistor and Poeta Doctus: Notes on the Baroque Conception of Signs and Signification,” *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft* 10 (2000): 91–130; “A World of Signs: Baroque Pansemioticism, the Polyhistor and the Early Modern Wunderkammer,” *Journal of the History of Ideas* 62, no. 4 (2001): 633–50. Cf. Adina Miriam Yoffie, “Biblical Literalism and Scholarship in Protestant Northern Europe, 1630–1700,” (PhD diss., Harvard University, 2009), 89–91.

modern sense of the term is to anachronistically foist the limits of a modern discipline onto a practitioner of early modern polymathy. Of course, we must not discount the question of genre when considering Calixtus' works—he was after all a professor of theology, and the vast majority of his works bear theological concerns—however, if we are to fully understand the genesis and development of his ideas, we must also be conscious of his relationship with the broader world of humanist scholarship which was prevalent at the time.

In order to position Calixtus in relation to the humanist tradition, we must first refine what is meant by the term “humanist.” To this end, the present study will borrow from the work of Anthony Grafton, who summarises the activities of the humanists as follows:

[They] studied a vast range of texts, issues, and problems. They forged many of the technical methods still applied by the supposedly revolutionary German philology of the late eighteenth century. But they also found practical lessons in the classics—lessons applicable to warfare and administration as well as oratory and epic poetry. And they continued to find formal Latin eloquence a supple and expressive tool for both technical and literary purposes.¹²

Thus, one can expect to find in the work of a Renaissance humanist a concern with a wide range of problems, whether philological, political, historical, or religious. One can also expect to find criticism of sources, the practical application of knowledge gained from these sources, and a strong command of the Latin language. Enveloping all these hallmarks one can, of course, expect to find a concern and familiarity with classical Greek and Latin texts.

This thesis will bear these points in mind as it considers Calixtus' engagement with the intellectual environment of seventeenth-century Europe. Although existing literature certainly acknowledges the influence of Renaissance humanism on Calixtus' work, Grafton's definition of a humanist will allow the present study to adopt a more nuanced approach. It will be able to consider not only what Calixtus drew from the humanist tradition, but also how he interacted with and

¹² Grafton, *Defenders*, 4.

contributed to it. With this in mind, the following discussion will introduce three pieces of evidence that point to Calixtus' contributions to this erudite world, and will define the research question and method underpinning the ensuing investigation.

1.1. Impetus / Research Question

There are several pieces of evidence to suggest that Calixtus warrants attention as an active participant in the humanist tradition. Initial investigations revealed myriad references to him in English literature concerning the period, yet these proved to be little more than incidental remarks. While Calixtus has been described by leading scholars as, for example, one of the two “most important thinker[s] at Helmstedt in the seventeenth century,”¹³ or as “perhaps the most remarkable Lutheran theologian of the period,”¹⁴ further investigation of his work is rarely undertaken.¹⁵ One cannot help but wonder why so many talented, reputable scholars seem to hold Calixtus in such high regard, yet pay so little attention to him. The ambit of English scholarship seems simply not to have accommodated a deeper consideration of Calixtus' contributions to early modern thought. As we shall see in chapter three, the German literature has also failed to consider Calixtus' work in relation to the broader intellectual debates of the time in any real depth. As in the English literature, there are suggestions that some greater contribution lurks beneath the surface of his works, yet there is little further investigation. Michael Stolleis, for example, points out that

¹³ Constantin Fasolt, *The Limits of History* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004), 56.

¹⁴ Howard Hotson, “Irenicism in the Confessional Age: The Holy Roman Empire, 1563–1648,” in *Conciliation and Confession: The Struggle for Unity in the Age of Reform, 1415–1648*, ed. Howard P. Louthan and Randall C. Zachman (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2004), 229.

¹⁵ Other plaudits include “German Lutheranism’s most important representative of the humanistic tendency in Melancthon’s thought,” “the most independent and influential representative of the Melancthonian school in the Lutheran Church of his times,” “Helmstedt’s famous Georg Calixtus,” “one of Helmstedt’s greatest ornaments,” and “the great Calixtus.” See, respectively, Robert Merrihew Adams, “Leibniz’s *Examination of the Christian Religion*,” *Faith and Philosophy* 11, no. 4 (1994): 521; C. George Fry, “Three Lutheran Fathers of the 17th Century: The Search for Identity,” *Concordia Journal* 5, no. 4 (1979): 135; Thomas Albert Howard, *Protestant Theology and the Making of the Modern German University* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 107; William Ashford Kelly, *The Theological Faculty at Helmstedt: An Outline of its Intellectual Development as Mirrored in its Dissertations and Programmata* (East Linton: Cat’s Whiskers Press, 1996), 8 [= “The Theological Faculty at Helmstedt: An Outline of its Intellectual Development, as Mirrored in its Dissertations, Together with a Chronological Catalogue” (PhD diss., University of Strathclyde, 1991), 107]; Samuel J. T. Miller, “Molanus, Lutheran Irenicist (1633–1722),” *Church History* 22, no. 3 (1953): 199.

Calixtus held that the “Lotharian legend,” a myth popularised in the sixteenth century that purported to explain the presence of Roman law in the Holy Roman Empire, was false.¹⁶ For someone interested in the history of ideas, this is an important piece of evidence that hints at Calixtus’ interaction with the critical traditions of Renaissance humanism. Unfortunately, this is not relevant to Stolleis’ essay, and one is left wondering how Calixtus’ critique may fit into the intellectual landscape of the time. The passage in question is treated more fully by Inge Mager, though the scope of her discussion still means that Calixtus’ application of historical criticism to the problem of the Lotharian legend receives little attention.¹⁷ A closer look at Calixtus’ *Epitomes theologiae moralis* (Summary of Moral Theology) of 1634 reveals an interesting examination of the legend, entirely consistent with the techniques employed by contemporary humanist scholars to question previously unchallenged authoritative documents and intellectual mores.¹⁸

This oversight of Calixtus’ critique of the Lotharian legend is a typical example of the manner in which modern scholarship has avoided engagement with Calixtus’ work outside the confines of modern theological disciplines. By considering Calixtus’ work in relation to the intellectual environment of his age—that of Renaissance humanism—this thesis will begin to fill the gap that this lack of engagement has created.

The key here is to what extent Calixtus engaged with the humanist tradition. Was he, as existing research suggests, merely a consumer of humanist ideals, using the values and techniques put forth by earlier humanists to shape his own work? Or did he make an active contribution to the humanist tradition, developing and refining these techniques in order that those who followed might be able to engage more effectively with the world they lived in? That is: *What exactly was Calixtus’*

¹⁶ Michael Stolleis, “Hermann Conring und die Begründung der deutschen Rechtsgeschichte,” in Hermann Conring, *Der Ursprung des deutschen Rechts*, ed. Stolleis, trans. Ilse Hoffmann-Meckenstock (Frankfurt: Insel, 1994), 260–61. I am grateful to Constantin Fasolt for this reference. See also Stolleis, “Zur Bedeutung der Juristischen Fakultät und insbesondere Hermann Conrings für die Universität Helmstedt,” in *Das Athen der Welfen: Die Reformuniversität Helmstedt 1576–1810*, ed. Jens Bruning and Ulrike Gleixner (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2010), 193; Erik Wolf, *Grosse Rechtsdenker der Deutschen Geistesgeschichte* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1963), 233.

¹⁷ Inge Mager, *Georg Calixts theologische Ethik und ihre Nachwirkungen* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969), 129–34.

¹⁸ See Georg Calixtus, “Epitomes theologiae moralis pars prima: 1634,” in *Werke*, 3:116–42; *Epitomes theologiae moralis pars prima, vna cum digressione de Arte nova, ad omnes Germaniae academias Romano pontifici deditas et subditas, inprimis Coloniensem: cujus digressionis ergo, haec epitomes par seorsim nunc editur* (Helmstedt: Typographeo Calixtino, 1634), 99–122, 123–24.

relationship to Renaissance humanism? While the abovementioned critique of the Lotharian legend promises to provide fodder for a future study, this thesis will focus on two more pieces of evidence for Calixtus' active engagement with the humanist tradition.

The first of these pieces of evidence provides the basis for chapter four, which will explore the relationship between Georg Calixtus and Isaac Casaubon. It is the fact that Casaubon's model for an ideal Christian church, as described in William Patterson's 1997 monograph on King James I of England, bears remarkable similarities to Calixtus'.¹⁹ This thesis will build on this evidence by exploring these similarities in more depth, drawing on Calixtus' and Casaubon's published works, testimony from contemporaries, and observations from modern scholars, to consider not only the similarities in the theology of these two men, but also the connections between them. The fact that Calixtus and Casaubon met in 1612 is well known in the German literature, yet the remarks concerning their relationship, like the English remarks regarding Calixtus in general, are by and large incidental.²⁰ Chapter four will argue that this meeting was much more important for Calixtus' intellectual development than has previously been acknowledged, and in so doing will illuminate a previously little-considered aspect of Calixtus' relationship with the intellectual world of Renaissance humanism.

The second piece of evidence which prompted further investigation, and which will be explored in chapter five, is Calixtus' fascination with history. As Andreas Merkt and Hermann Schüssler have shown, Calixtus' concern with history

¹⁹ William Brown Patterson, *King James VI and I and the Reunion of Christendom* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 133–36. Cf. Patterson, "Foreign Visitors to the Jacobean Church of England" (paper presented at the 154th annual meeting of the American Society for Church History, Williamsburg, VA, April 1–4, 1993), 4–5, 6–7.

²⁰ See, for example, Christoph Böttigheimer, *Zwischen Polemik und Irenik: Die Theologie der einen Kirche bei Georg Calixt* (Münster: Lit, 1996), 190n445, 217; Friedrich Wilhelm Kantzenbach, *Das Ringen um die Einheit der Kirche im Jahrhundert der Reformation: Vertreter, Quellen und Motive des "ökumenischen" Gedankens von Erasmus von Rotterdam bis Georg Calixt* (Stuttgart: Evangelisches Verlagswerk, 1957), 235; Andreas Merkt, *Das patristische Prinzip: Eine Studie zur theologischen Bedeutung der Kirchenväter* (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 22–23, 35–36, 68; Otto Ritschl, *Dogmengeschichte des Protestantismus*, vol. 4, *Das orthodoxe Luthertum im Gegensatz zu der reformierten Theologie und in der Auseinandersetzung mit dem Synkretismus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1927), 398n21; Hermann Schüssler, *Georg Calixt, Theologie und Kirchenpolitik: Eine Studie zur Ökumenizität des Luthertums* (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1961), 67, 88, 199n76, 201n12; Erich Seeberg, *Gottfried Arnold: Die Wissenschaft und Mystik seiner Zeit* (Meerane: 1923; reprinted Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1964), 475n1.

was so strong that it had a significant impact on his theology.²¹ In the context of Anthony Grafton's 2007 monograph on the genre of the *ars historica* (art of history) in early modern Europe,²² one wonders if, given Calixtus' high view of history, he made any contributions to this genre himself. The speech he delivered upon the conclusion of his first term as pro-rector of the University of Helmstedt in 1629 proves to be just such a contribution, and chapter five considers it in this light. It argues that the "De studio historiarum oratio" (Speech on the Study of Histories) engaged with the same arguments that other *artes historicae* did, showing that Calixtus was not only an inheritor of the Renaissance humanist tradition, but a practitioner of it. He engaged in debates about history, about source criticism, and about chronology; he drew on an enormous array of sources, both sacred and secular; and he established connections between these sources and contemporary debates to develop practical approaches to the problems that faced the world in which he lived.

This introduction has so far discussed four things: the tradition of Renaissance humanism and the activities of Renaissance humanists; the anachronism that has resulted in an unnecessarily narrow view of Calixtus' interaction with this tradition; this thesis' research question; and the approach that will be taken to address this question. The following section will clarify four pertinent matters before turning to chapter two, which will serve to introduce Calixtus in greater depth. These four matters concern the biographical sources that are available for Calixtus, the term "catholicity," the Apostles' Creed, and the Vincentian Canon. A note concerning biographical sources is warranted because of the impact that these sources have had on existing views of Calixtus' life and works, while catholicity, the Apostles' Creed, and the Vincentian Canon have implications for later discussions of Calixtus' relationship with Isaac Casaubon.

1.2. A Note on Sources, Catholicity, and Creeds

There is really only one useful published source for Calixtus' biographical details, which was written by Ernst Henke and published in two volumes between 1853 and

²¹ See below, § 3.2.1.

²² Grafton, *What Was History?*

1860.²³ There is an English biography available, written by William Dowding and published in 1863, but it is overtly biased and reliant almost solely on Henke's work.²⁴ While Henke also exhibits an ecumenical bias, his work nevertheless offers a much more thorough treatment of Calixtus' life and works, and thus has been cited by almost every author since.²⁵ For example, Henke's stories of Calixtus being taught by his father, a student of Philipp Melanchthon (1497–1560), and of Calixtus' two academic tours through Europe in the early 1600s, are widely related in order to establish the origins of Calixtus' irenic disposition.²⁶

Despite the widespread citation of Henke's work, it does have some limitations. First, the facts that Calixtus' father was taught by Melanchthon, and that Calixtus lived through the Thirty Years War, are not enough to explain the genesis of his theology. Thousands of other people were also influenced by Melanchthon's

²³ Ernst Ludwig Theodor Henke, *Georg Calixtus und seine Zeit*, 2 vols (Halle: Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses, 1853–60).

²⁴ William Charles Dowding, *The Life and Correspondence of George Calixtus, Lutheran Abbot of Königsutter, and Professor Primarius at the University of Helmstadt* (Oxford: J. H. & J. Parker, 1863). Although this thesis will provide references to Dowding's biography where applicable, it will do so only in order to provide a point of reference for readers without a knowledge of German.

²⁵ See, for example, Peter Engel, *Die eine Wahrheit in der gespaltenen Christenheit: Untersuchungen zur Theologie Georg Calixts* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1976), 156; Max Joseph Husung, "Georg Calixtus zu Helmstedt, ein gelehrter Drucker des 17. Jahrhunderts." *Gutenberg-Jahrbuch* 14 (1939): 283–90; Mager, *Georg Calixts theologische Ethik*, 12; "Brüderlichkeit und Einheit: Georg Calixt und das Thorner Religionsgespräch 1645," in *Thorn: Königin der Weichsel, 1231–1981*, ed. Bernart Jähnig and Peter Letkemann (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981), 212; Anselm Schubert, "Die Diskussion um die Calixtinische Anthropologie," in *Das Ende der Sünde: Anthropologie und Erbsünde zwischen Reformation und Aufklärung* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2002), 59; Schüssler, *Georg Calixt*; Friedrich Uhlhorn, "Die Bedeutung Georg Calixts für die lutherische Kirche der welfischen Lande," *Zeitschrift der Gesellschaft für Niedersächsische Kirchengeschichte* 33 (1928): 209; Johannes Wallmann, "Union, Reunion, Toleranz: Georg Calixts Einigungsbestrebungen und ihre Rezeption in der katholischen und protestantischen Theologie des 17. Jahrhunderts," in *Union, Konversion, Toleranz: Dimensionen der Annäherung zwischen christlichen Konfessionen im 17. Und 18. Jahrhundert*, ed. Heinz Durchhardt and Gerhard May (Mainz: Von Zabern, 2000), 25; "Zwischen Reformation und Humanismus: Eigenart und Wirkungen Helmstedter Theologie unter besonderer Berücksichtigung Georg Calixts," in *Theologie und Frömmigkeit im Zeitalter des Barock: Gesammelte Aufsätze* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1995), 64.

²⁶ See, for example, Fry, "Three Lutheran Fathers," 134–35; Husung, "Georg Calixtus," 283–84; Timothy R. Schmeling, "Lutheran Orthodoxy Under Fire: An Exploratory Study of the Syncretistic Controversy and the *Consensus repetitus fidei vere Lutheranae*," *Lutheran Synod Quarterly* 47, no. 1 (2007): 319–20; Schüssler, *Georg Calixt*, 1–5. The details of these tours are also available in Johannes Moller's earlier account, though Henke embellishes his version by including extra details about the individuals involved, contemporary political intrigues, et cetera. See Johannes Moller, "Georgius Calixtus," in *Cimbria literata sive scriptorum ducatus utriusque Slesvicensis et Holsatici quibus et alii vicini quidam accensentur historia literaria tripartita*, vol. 3, *Quadraginta sex insignium scriptorum, partim indigenarum, partim adoptivorum historias longiores exhibens* (Copenhagen: Typis Orphanotrophii Regii, 1744), 122–23.

teachings, and millions lived through the Thirty Years War, but none of them developed an irenic theology as controversial or as influential as Calixtus'.²⁷ Second, although certainly interested in the personal details of Calixtus' life, Henke was more motivated to promote Calixtus' theology, and his book included additional information only to provide historical context around its discussion. Because of this, Henke overlooks other aspects that might be of interest to his reader. For example, he briefly discusses the witch hunts that were prevalent in the Holy Roman Empire during Calixtus' lifetime, yet does not discuss Calixtus' attitude toward them, nor whether or not Calixtus was affected by them.²⁸ Someone interested in this naturally has their appetite whetted by Henke's account, yet it remains unsated as he moves on to a discussion of religious alliances in the Thirty Years War. Of course, Calixtus did have an opinion on the witch hunts that were taking place around him, but one must look elsewhere to find out what it was.²⁹

This focus means that throughout Henke's work it is Calixtus' religious concerns, as outlined in his various publications and exemplified in the controversies that he was embroiled in, that receive the majority of Henke's attention. Henke's use of sources also suggests that there may be other aspects of Calixtus' life that have not been considered. Having spent many years in the archives at Herzog August Bibliothek, Wolfenbüttel, Henke compiled and published three collections of Calixtus' correspondence, and drew heavily on these when he wrote his biography of Calixtus.³⁰ Of course, as Henke himself acknowledged, for these collections he

²⁷ My thanks are due an anonymous reviewer from the *Journal of the History of Ideas* for their succinct expression of this point. I have taken the liberty of paraphrasing their words here.

²⁸ Henke, *Georg Calixtus*, 2.1:6–8.

²⁹ Calixtus does not appear to have written a treatise specifically on witchcraft; however, he did treat the matter briefly in some of his discussions concerning angels and demons. Claudia Kauertz finds that Calixtus held a rather mild view of witchcraft, arguing that the devil could only imitate the miracles of God rather than creating miracles in his own right, that the devil often needed the help of people to create these illusions, and that none of these things occurred without God's permission. Calixtus also wrote against the use of trial by water to determine the guilt or innocence of witches, in variance to other humanists such as Jean Bodin (1530–1596) or Calixtus' student Hermann Conring (1606–1681). Claudia Kauertz, *Wissenschaft und Hexenglaube: Die Diskussion des Zauber- und Hexenwesens an der Universität Helmstedt (1576–1626)* (Bielefeld: Verlag für Regionalgeschichte, 2001), 72, 78–80. Cf., Jonathan L. Pearl, "Humanism and Satanism: Jean Bodin's Contribution to the Witchcraft Crisis," *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 19, no. 4 (1982): 541–48; Gerhild Scholz Williams, *Ways of Knowing in Early Modern Germany: Johannes Praetorius as a Witness to His Time* (Hants: Ashgate, 2006), 93.

³⁰ Calixtus, *Georg Calixtus' Briefwechsel*, ed. Henke (Halle: Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses, 1833); Calixtus, *Ad Augustum ducem Brunsvicensis epistolae XII*, ed. Henke (Jena: Typis Schlotteri, 1835); Calixtus, "Commercii literarii Calixtini fasciculus tertius," in Henke, *Viro summe venerabili*

selected that correspondence which seemed of greatest interest to Calixtus' story.³¹ Writing with a particular interest in ecclesiastical history and theology, it is quite understandable that Henke may have overlooked aspects of Calixtus' work that might have been of interest to scholars working in different areas.³²

Calixtus' biography, then, is ripe for reconsideration. Although this is not an undertaking that can be adequately contemplated by this thesis, the refinement of some aspects of the narrative, such as Calixtus' relationship with Isaac Casaubon and Calixtus' engagement with the intellectual debates of his time, at least begins this project. To aid in this refinement, the term "catholicity" must be clarified, as must the nature of the Apostles' Creed and the Vincentian Canon, as they each play an integral role in the analysis to be undertaken in chapter four. These three matters are the focus of the final parts of this introduction.

In using the term "catholic," this thesis slightly refines Quentin Stewart's definition, understanding "[c]atholicity . . . as a sense of universality, continuity with the past, and general agreement with the doctrinal and exegetical tradition of the ancient . . . church expressed by its foremost interpreters and doctors."³³ In its unadulterated form, Stewart's definition also provides scope for the traditions of the medieval church, but Calixtus' understanding of catholicity did not extend this far. For him, it was the first five hundred years of Christianity that were representative of the true catholic church. The church after this time had fallen into such a state of corruption and superstition that it could not be recognised as that given to the apostles by Christ.³⁴ This thesis uses the term "catholic" to refer to what may be

perillustri amplissimo Carolo Guilielmo Justi (Marburg: Typis Elwertii Academicis, 1840), 1–58. Henke also drew on Moller, "Georgius Calixtus," for Calixtus' basic biographical details.

³¹ Calixtus, *Georg Calixtus' Briefwechsel*, xv.

³² Henke was professor of theology at the Collegium Carolinum in Brunswick (now Technische Universität Braunschweig), and later professor of church history at Marburg. He had a particular interest in the pro-union aspect of Calixtine theology. See Friedrich Wiegand, "Henke: Ernst Ludwig Theodor," in *ADB*, 50:185–87. Matthew Harrison, Benjamin Mayes, and Timothy Schmeling have all noted an ecumenical bias in the nineteenth-century scholarship regarding Calixtus. Matthew C. Harrison, "Abraham Calov on Eastern Orthodoxy," *Logia* 9, no. 4 (2000): 13n11; Benjamin T. G. Mayes, e-mail message to author, August 25, 2008; Schmeling, "Lutheran Orthodoxy," 316. Cf. Mager, "Einführung," in *Werke*, 1:9–28.

³³ Quentin Stewart, "Catholicity or Consensus? The Role of the Consensus Patrum and the Vincentian Canon in Lutheran Orthodoxy: From Chemnitz to Quenstedt" (PhD diss., Concordia Seminary, 2006), 8.

³⁴ This is discussed further in chapters two and four, below.

understood as the “pure” church of Christ, and “Roman Catholic” when discussing that branch of Christianity that functions under the auspices of the Pope.³⁵

Chapter four discusses the origins of one of Calixtus’ key theological concepts—his understanding, and application of, the *consensus antiquitatis* (consensus of antiquity), in light of existing opinions and of his relationship with Isaac Casaubon. Key to this discussion are the Apostles’ Creed and the Vincentian Canon, as they formed the foundation for both these men’s understanding of the primitive church which, for Calixtus, was defined by the *consensus antiquitatis*. As such, it is important to understand exactly what the Apostles’ Creed and the Vincentian Canon are, and what significance they have for Christian theology in general.

Though the exact origins of the Apostles’ Creed are unknown, it is generally acknowledged that it does originate from the time of the apostles, even if it was not composed by the apostles themselves.³⁶ The current version has a direct connection to the Old Roman Creed, which itself dates from the third or fourth century and has philological links to the New Testament.³⁷ As Wolfram Kinzig and Markus Vinzent describe it, a creed is “a formal pledge of allegiance to a set of doctrinal statements concerning God and his relationship to his creation in general and to mankind in particular.”³⁸ As such, it is seen as fundamental to the expression of one’s belief, and the Apostles’ Creed is to this day a statement of Christian doctrine that is common to both Protestant and Roman Catholic confessions. Where individual people and confessions differ is in the relative weight they apply to the Creed as opposed to other documents. Orthodox Lutheranism, for example, abides by the Creed, but only in conjunction with various other creedal formations, and only insofar as these

³⁵ Of course, the religious divisions in early modern Europe were not as simple as Protestant (Lutheran and Reformed) and Roman Catholic; however, a more detailed discussion is beyond the scope of the present study. Cf. Kenneth Austin and Wendy Anderson, “Faith, Friendship and Learning: Intercultural Communication in the Republic of Letters,” *Language and Intercultural Communication* 10, no. 1 (2010): 23–24.

³⁶ *The Book of Concord*, ed. Theodore G. Tappert (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1959), 17; Wickenden, *G. J. Vossius*, 116.

³⁷ A good summary of the history of the Apostles’ Creed can be found in Wolfram Kinzig and Markus Vinzent, “Recent Research on the Origin of the Creed,” *Journal of Theological Studies* 50, no. 2 (1999): 535–59.

³⁸ Kinzig and Vinzent, “Recent Research,” 540.

concur with Scripture.³⁹ Roman Catholicism, on the other hand, sees the Creed as defining particular criteria that define the true church, and lays claim to this church through apostolic succession—a continuous link between the Pope and Saint Peter.⁴⁰ This link is embodied in tradition, and through this doctrine can develop, or progress, over time. The absolute emphasis in Lutheranism is on Scripture, in Roman Catholicism on tradition.

The Vincentian Canon is embodied in Saint Vincent of Lérins' *Commonitorium* (A Reminder), written around 434. Vincent (d. ca. 445) was present at the Council of Ephesus in 431 and, despite the controversies of the time, believed that he could identify a continuity with the church that had gone before. He believed that Christians had two resources to which they could turn to identify the true, catholic church: Scripture and tradition. He believed that, in order to refute heretics, Scripture must be interpreted through tradition, which he defined as “that which has been believed *everywhere, always, and by all.*”⁴¹ These three criteria—universality, antiquity, and consensus—have since become synonymous with claims for inheritance of, or affinity with, the apostolic church, and the Canon was often presented as a basis for dialogue between Protestants and Roman Catholics in the early modern period.⁴² This theme of continuity is important: Howard Louthan and Randall Zachman remind us that early reformers such as Melancthon and, of course, Martin Luther (1483–1546), did not see themselves as “Protestant.” They were rather continuing the *true* catholic tradition and rescuing the church from the abuses of the papacy.⁴³

However, the Vincentian Canon also includes a second principle, one that permits doctrinal development (progress), albeit with certain restrictions:

³⁹ The confessional statements of Lutheranism are the Apostles', Nicene, and Athanasian Creeds; the Augsburg Confession; the Apology of the Augsburg Confession; the Schmalkaldic Articles; Philipp Melancthon's “Treatise on the Power and Primacy of the Pope”; Martin Luther's Small and Large Catechisms; and the Formula of Concord. These are collectively known as the *Book of Concord*. See also Yoffie, “Biblical Literalism,” 98, and references there cited.

⁴⁰ Vatican II Council, *Lumen gentium, Dogmatic Constitution on the Church*, (Vatican: The Holy See, 1965), 1.8.

⁴¹ Saint Vincent of Lérins *Commonitorium* 1.2, quoted in Calixtus, “Prooemium ad Augustini ‘De doctrina Christiana’ et Vincentii Lerinensis ‘Commonitorium’ (Auswahl): 1629,” in *Werke*, 1:382: “Teneamus quod UBIQUE, quod SEMPER, quod AB OMNIBUS creditum fuit” (emphasis in original). I follow the accepted translation as quoted in Stewart, “Catholicity or Consensus?,” 22–23.

⁴² Stewart, “Catholicity or Consensus?,” 25.

⁴³ Louthan and Zachman, “Introduction,” in *Conciliation and Confession*, 3.

[I]t is characteristic of progress that a thing grows while remaining the same thing. . . . Therefore intelligence, knowledge and wisdom grow and increase considerably both of the individual as of all, of the single man as well as of the entire church, according to ages and times. The particular nature of each is to be respected, however; that is, it remains exactly the same dogma, has the same meaning and expresses the same thought.⁴⁴

Two possible interpretations of this passage are reflected in standard Protestant and Roman Catholic lore. From the Protestant point of view, “it remains exactly the same dogma” seems to hold sway, while for Roman Catholic, we find the emphasis on “the same meaning and . . . the same thought.” As such, Roman Catholic tradition allows for much more development of doctrine (or progress), while Protestantism sees such development as novelty.⁴⁵ It will be useful to keep these differences in mind as one considers Calixtus’ relationships with other religious figures in chapter two, and as one considers his notion of the *consensus antiquitatis* in chapter four.

1.3. Summary—Introduction

Rather than impose the limits of a modern Western epistemology on the life and work of a person that lived in an age with very different understandings of the world and of knowledge, this thesis will explore Calixtus’ relationship to Renaissance humanism by reconsidering his work in light of the intellectual climate of his times. By examining the importance of Calixtus’ interaction with Isaac Casaubon for the formation of one of Calixtus’ key theological concepts, and Calixtus’ contribution to the genre of the *ars historica*, it will argue that we cannot fully understand his work

⁴⁴ Vincent of Lérins *Commonitorium* ch. 23, quoted in Stewart, “Catholicity or Consensus?,” 23.

⁴⁵ See, for example, “The Augsburg Confession,” in *Book of Concord*, 95: “it is manifest and evident . . . that we have diligently and with God’s help prevented any new and godless teaching from creeping into our churches.” Cf. *The Canons and Decrees of the Sacred and Oecumenical Council of Trent*, ed. and trans. J. Waterworth (London: Dolman, 1848), wherein are decreed myriad “new laws.” The Roman Catholic approach to doctrinal development can also be seen in early approaches to the Reformation. For example, in some quarters it was argued that the Lutheran doctrine of justification by faith might be accommodated within Roman Catholicism, as “the medieval church . . . had not [yet] undertaken any really rigid definition of doctrine [in this regard].” Stephen J. Lee, *Aspects of European History 1494–1789*, 2nd edn (London: Methuen & Co., 1984; reprinted London: Routledge, University Paperbacks, 1990), 43.

without considering it in this manner. This study also provides the basis for future considerations of Calixtus' life and work that are more refined, and prompts us to think differently about the contributions of other figures of the period—people like Abraham Calov (1612–1686) and Berthold Nihus (1590–1657), two of Calixtus' opponents who have traditionally been looked at as theologians, but who also produced historical and legal commentaries.⁴⁶

Given the dearth of knowledge concerning Calixtus in English-language scholarship, the following chapter will serve to introduce him through a discussion of his early life and university years. This will ensure that the reader has at least a passing familiarity with Georg Calixtus and his historical significance before we begin to re-evaluate it. Chapter three will explore the current body of knowledge regarding Calixtus. In particular, it will describe existing viewpoints on the genesis of his understanding of the *consensus antiquitatis*, and will explore to what extent the literature considers Calixtus' work in relation to the tradition of Renaissance humanism. Chapter four will comprise the first of the above-mentioned case studies, which considers the relationship between Casaubon and Calixtus, and the genesis of one of Calixtus' most important ideas. The second case study—a discussion of Calixtus' "De studio historiarum oratio" as an *ars historica*—will be addressed in chapter five. These analyses will allow us to better consider the question of Calixtus' relationship to the humanist tradition. Although this thesis can only begin to answer this question, in doing so it will offer a novel interpretation of some of Calixtus' works, and will provide a solid foundation upon which to base future research.

⁴⁶ For example, Abraham Calov, *Historia Syncretistica, das ist: Christliches wolgegründetes Bedencken über den Lieben Kirchen-Frieden und Christliche Einigkeit In der heilsamen Lehre der Himmlischen Wahrheit* (1685); Berthold Nihus, *Irnerius seu quaestiones de jurisconsulto illo historicae a juris Pontificii et caesari collegiis Bononiensibus excussae 1641* (Cologne, 1642). It appears that Nihus also had philological interests. See John E. Fletcher, "A Brief Survey of the Unpublished Correspondence of Athanasius Kircher, S.J. (1602–1680)," *Manuscripta* 13, no. 3 (1969): 158. Calixtus' relations with Calov and Nihus are considered further in § 2.4, below.

2. Context—Background and Biography

This chapter serves two purposes. First, it introduces Georg Calixtus as the subject of the subsequent analyses, outlining some of the key stages and figures in his intellectual development, with particular regard to the tradition of Renaissance humanism. Second, it introduces him as a little-known figure to anglophone historians. As such, it will also explore other aspects of his life that are perhaps not entirely germane to the argument of this thesis, but which have previously been sparsely considered in English literature, and which suggest opportunities for further research—some of the religious controversies that he was involved in, and his role in the emergence of the early modern state in his local region. Before embarking on this discussion, it is pertinent to explore the social context in which these events took place. Calixtus was born in Medelby on 14 December 1586, at a time when the German lands were relatively peaceful compared to the rest of Europe. Despite this, the region of Schleswig-Holstein (in which Medelby is located) was affected by the confessional movement as much as the rest of the Holy Roman Empire, and in particular the struggles within the Lutheran church regarding the definition of Lutheran orthodoxy.¹ The Formula of Concord (to this day a key statement of Lutheran confession) had been drafted in 1577, though regions such as Schleswig-Holstein had failed to adopt it. Over time this led to the emergence of a “post-orthodox [Lutheran] theology,” and a split between its proponents and orthodox Lutherans.²

This split was the result of a process that Heinz Schilling and Wolfgang Reinhard have termed “confessionalization.”³ After Luther’s instigation of the Reformation in the first half of the sixteenth century, the Holy Roman Empire was

¹ Schüssler, *Georg Calixt*, 1. On these struggles, see Theodore Tappert’s helpful notes to the “Preface to the Book of Concord,” in *Book of Concord*, 3–16. See also Manfred Roensch, “Die Konkordienformel in der Geschichte des deutschen Luthertums,” *Lutherische Theologie und Kirche* 2/79 (1979): 37–52.

² Heinz Schilling, “Confessionalization in the Empire: Religious and Societal Change in Germany between 1555 and 1620,” in *Religion, Political Culture and the Emergence of Early Modern Society: Essays in German and Dutch History* (Leiden: Brill, 1992), 238.

³ There is a growing body of literature that makes this work available to an English-language audience. See, for example, *Confessionalization in Europe, 1555–1700: Essays in Honor and Memory of Bodo Nischan*, ed. John M. Headley, Hans J. Hillerbrand & Anthony J. Papalas (Hants: Ashgate, 2004); Ronnie Po-chia Hsia, *Social Discipline in the Reformation: Central Europe 1550–1750* (London: Routledge, 1989).

faced with a hitherto-unknown problem: how to ensure the peaceful coexistence of two distinct and mutually-antagonistic branches of Christianity. The Peasants' War of 1524–25 and the Schmalkaldic Wars of 1546–47 had shown that without an appropriate solution, such peaceful coexistence would continue to remain elusive. A resolution was sought in the Peace of Augsburg of 1555, which provided legal recognition for both Lutheran and Roman Catholic churches, and which gave territorial counts and princes (*Landesherrren*) the authority to dictate religion in their lands.⁴ This new-found episcopal authority was embodied in the maxim *cuius regio, eius religio* (whose land, his religion), and resulted in a situation in which the church could be seen not as a challenge to power, but as a tool with which a ruler could reinforce their own dominance.⁵ The emergence of Calvinism in the Empire in 1559, and post-Tridentine Catholicism after 1563, introduced new dimensions to the political landscape and set the stage for a politics fuelled by “religious fervor and dynastic rivalries.”⁶ Schilling argues that the resulting “confessionalization” of the Holy Roman Empire, and ultimately of Europe, facilitated a shift in societal structure from the medieval system of political lordship and local autonomy to an early modern state under absolute sovereignty.⁷ A discussion of this process will aid in contextualising the events of Calixtus' life, and its features warrant consideration as we navigate his experiences and those of his contemporaries.

2.1. The Confessionalization Thesis

As noted above, the “confessionalization thesis” was born of the work of two German scholars in the 1970s and 1980s. Schilling, in his analysis of the relationship between the Calvinist Count of Lippe, Simon VI (1554–1613), and the Lutheran populace of his subject town of Lemgo, saw a process of state building, religious

⁴ Ian Hunter, *The Secularisation of the Confessional State: The Political Thought of Christian Thomasius* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 122–23; Benjamin Kaplan, *Divided by Faith: Religious Conflict and the Practice of Toleration in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2007), 103–4.

⁵ Schilling, “Between the Territorial State and Urban Liberty: Lutheranism and Calvinism in the County of Lippe,” trans. Thomas A. Brady Jr, in *The German People and the Reformation*, ed. Hsia (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1988), 266. See also Hunter, *Secularisation*, 116–21.

⁶ Joel F. Harrington and Helmut Walser Smith, “Confessionalization, Community, and State Building in Germany, 1555–1870,” *Journal of Modern History* 69, no. 1 (1997): 85.

⁷ Schilling, “Between the Territorial State and Urban Liberty,” 276. On the lead-up to, or “first phase” of, confessionalization, see Schilling “Confessionalization in the Empire,” 217–22.

renewal (confessional formation, or *konfessionsbildung*⁸), and social disciplining that enabled the integration of previously autonomous cities into a territorial state.⁹ Schilling's thesis was supported by the early modern maxim *religio vinculum societatis* (religion is the bond of society). This meant that, although secular and sacred existed separately, they were inextricably linked, both in the public eye and in practice. Thus, religious change was, by necessity, social change.¹⁰

Wolfgang Reinhard took a slightly different approach to his study of confessionalization, uncovering a "confessionalization of the churches" as opposed to Schilling's "confessionalization of society."¹¹ That is, he saw the process of confessionalization as a consolidation of territories by churches rather than by (though in many cases, with) the *Landesherrn*.¹² These processes of confessionalization, though appearing on the surface to be exclusive, occurred simultaneously and often conjunctively, and the results were the same: in both, the three foci of state building, confessional formation, and social disciplining were apparent, and the final outcome was the emergence of the early modern absolute state. These parallels are evident in the seven conditions that Reinhard identified for successful confessionalization:¹³

1. Embodiment of doctrine in a confession of faith (the Confession of Augsburg [1530] and the *Book of Concord* [1580] for Lutheranism; the Helvetic

⁸ Schilling, "Confessionalization in the Empire," 207.

⁹ Brady Jr, "Confessionalization: The Career of a Concept," in *Confessionalization in Europe*, 4; Schilling, "Between the Territorial State and Urban Liberty," 276. On Simon VI see August Falkmann, "Simon VI," in *ADB*, 34:362–67.

¹⁰ Schilling, "Confessionalization: Historical and scholarly perspectives of a comparative and interdisciplinary paradigm," in *Confessionalization in Europe*, 27–28; "Confessionalization in the Empire," 208; Yoffie, "Biblical Literalism," 96–97.

¹¹ Schilling, "Die Konfessionalisierung von Kirche, Staat und Gesellschaft—Profil, Leistung, Defizite und Perspektiven eines geschichtswissenschaftlichen Paradigmas," in *Die katholische Konfessionalisierung: Akten eines von Corpus Catholicorum und Verein für Reformationsgeschichte veranstalteten Symposions, Augsburg, 1993*, eds. Schilling and Wolfgang Reinhard (Münster: Gütersloh, 1995), 3–4, quoted and trans. in Brady Jr, "Confessionalization," 8.

¹² See Reinhard, "Reformation, Counter-Reformation, and the Early Modern State: A Reassessment," *Catholic Historical Review* 75, no. 3 (1989): 386–98.

¹³ See Reinhard, "Pressures Towards Confessionalization? Prolegomena to a Theory of the Confessional Age," in *The German Reformation: The Essential Readings*, ed. C. Scott Dixon (Oxford: Blackwell, 1999), 177–82; "Reformation," 391–95. These points are also summarised from several of Reinhard's articles in Ute Lotz-Heumann and Matthias Pohlig, "Confessionalization and Literature in the Empire, 1555–1700," *Central European History* 40, no. 1 (2007): 39–40. Cf. Hunter, *Secularisation*, 25–32.

Confessions [1536, 1566], Zurich Consensus [1549], and the canons of Dordrecht [1619] for Calvinism; the Council of Trent's doctrinal canons and certain papal statements for post-Tridentine Catholicism)¹⁴;

2. The enforcement of the confession via the prudent appointment and monitoring of public officials;
3. Censorship of publications and control of propaganda;
4. Normalisation of the confession through education;
5. Disciplining of the populace via means such as visitations;
6. The establishment and enforcement of rites such as the practice of the sacraments;
7. Regulation of language. For example, the use of saints' names for Roman Catholic children and Old Testament names for Calvinist children.

These indicators illustrate the visible (and physical) impact of social disciplining and confessional formation in the period, consistent with the sweeping social changes identified by Schilling. The *Landesherrn*, in order to successfully exercise their right to confessionalize under the Peace of Augsburg, were generally left with little choice but to establish autocratic governments in order to do so. In Schilling's example of the county of Lippe, this meant that those who supported the model of an absolute state had few alternatives but to convert to Calvinism, reinforcing Simon VI's attempts at state building and aiding the process of confessional formation. In contrast, those who fought to preserve the late-medieval status quo by retaining their local loyalties, feudal relationships, and urban autonomy held onto their Lutheran confession.¹⁵ It must be noted here that this does not mean that Calvinism was inherently progressive and Lutheranism inherently conservative. Other examples of confessionalization in the Empire show that in certain instances Lutheranism or Roman Catholicism were confessed by the *Landesherr* and enabled the consolidation of an autocratic state.¹⁶ In the case of Helmstedt, as has been

¹⁴ Schilling, "Confessional Europe," trans. Brady Jr, in *Handbook of European History 1400–1600: Late Middle Ages, Renaissance, and Reformation*, vol. 2, *Visions, Programs, and Outcomes*, ed. Brady Jr, Heiko A. Oberman and James D. Tracy (Leiden: Brill, 1995), 641.

¹⁵ Schilling, "Between the Territorial State and Urban Liberty," 271–72.

¹⁶ See Marc Forster, "Catholic Confessionalism in Germany after 1650," in *Confessionalization in Europe*, 227–42; Hsia, *Social Discipline*, ch. 5; Schilling, "Calvinism and Civic Liberties: Political and Theological Pamphlets of the 'Patriots' in Emden and Groningen and the Political Culture of Germany and the Netherlands," in *Civic Calvinism in Northwestern Germany and the Netherlands*,

alluded to above, a “post-orthodox” Lutheranism fulfilled this role in opposition to orthodox Lutheranism.¹⁷

Of course alliance to one confession or another was not always motivated by political concerns. The very nature of religious confessions provided scope for individuals with genuine spiritual convictions to change confessions on that basis. However, even in these instances, the ultimate effect was the consolidation of political interests along confessional lines, as it was the ruler’s confession that had legal standing. These alliances did not follow the traditional split of ruler versus ruled. Rather, the nature of confessions meant that they were “vertically not horizontally structured.”¹⁸ This meant that a cross-section of society, from noble, to preacher, baker, or carpenter could subscribe to a confession. This ensured that any “popular” movement could be driven by nobles as well as burghers. It also meant that, with appropriate financial backing, a city could compete on equal footing with its *Landesherr*.¹⁹ Schilling also notes that this vertical structure of confessions resulted in what he terms a “differentiation of elites,” that is, a noble stratum that was split (differentiated) along confessional lines.²⁰ Therefore, rather than a conflict between ruler and ruled, the process of confessionalization resulted in a conflict between those vying for an early modern state, and those fighting to preserve urban autonomy, regardless of one’s social status. Over time, the legal status of the ruler, established by the Peace of Augsburg and reinforced by the Peace of Westphalia in 1648,²¹ meant that the early modern absolute state eventually won.²² Through the process of state building, confessionalization therefore served not only to strengthen the governments of individual territories, but also to set them apart from, and hence against, each other on religious grounds.²³

Sixteenth to Nineteenth Centuries (Kirksville: Sixteenth Century Journal Publishers, 1991): 69–104; “Confessionalization in the Empire,” 226–29. Cf. Randolph C. Head, “Catholics and Protestants in Graubünden: Confessional Discipline and Confessional Identities without an Early Modern State?,” *German History* 17, no. 3 (1999): 321–45.

¹⁷ Luise Schorn-Schütte, “Lutherische Konfessionalisierung? Das Beispiel Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel (1589–1613),” in *Die lutherische Konfessionalisierung in Deutschland*, ed. Hans-Christoph Rublack (Gütersloh: G. Mohn, 1992), 163–98. See also below, § 2.5, and references there cited.

¹⁸ Schilling, “Between the Territorial State and Urban Liberty,” 278.

¹⁹ See, for example, Schilling, “Between the Territorial State and Urban Liberty,” 273.

²⁰ Schilling, “Between the Territorial State and Urban Liberty,” 278–79.

²¹ Harrington and Smith, “Confessionalization,” 77; Hunter, “Secularisation,” 31–32.

²² Schilling, “Between the Territorial State and Urban Liberty,” 279, 282.

²³ Reinhard, “Reformation,” 390.

This consolidation of states under different religious confessions resulted in religious and dynastic conflicts that ultimately culminated in the Thirty Years War (1618–1648).²⁴ This war eventually involved countries throughout Europe (including Spain, France, Denmark, Sweden, and of course the Holy Roman Empire), and reduced the Empire’s population by up to a third.²⁵ On a more local level, these conflicts were reflected in the irenic exercises of some and, more commonly, the polemic exercises of others. The key thing to take from this discussion is the physical effect that confessionalization had on the populace. It not only had consequences for how the *Landesherrn* were to relate to their subjects, but also resulted in the physical dislocation of many individuals, with subsequent repercussions for these individuals’ approaches to the conflicts they faced in their own lives. These social dynamics are quite evident in the following section, which concerns itself with some of the key biographical details of Calixtus’ life, as well as five significant figures that influenced him around the turn of the seventeenth century. Many of Calixtus’ contemporaries were forced to move because of their religious beliefs, and Calixtus also found himself embroiled in many controversies, particularly in his later years.

2.2. The Early Years / University

Georg’s father, Johann Calixtus (Kallisøn/Callisen, 1539–1618), played a key role in Georg’s early academic formation. Johann was the son of a cobbler in Aabenraa (Åbenrå, in modern Denmark), but early spurned his father’s profession for a life of piety and scholarship, studying under Philipp Melanchthon at the University of Wittenberg, and under David Chyträus (1530–1600) at Rostock, ultimately turning to the pulpit and spending the better part of his life as a priest in Medelby.²⁶ Having

²⁴ Harrington and Smith, “Confessionalization,” 85; Schilling, “Confessionalization in the Empire,” 235. Cf. Lee, *Aspects*, 107–8.

²⁵ On the Thirty Years War see, for example, Lee, *Aspects*, chs 14–15; Cicely Veronica Wedgwood, *The Thirty Years War* (London: J. Cape, 1938; reprinted New York: New York Review of Books, 2005).

²⁶ Dowding, *Life and Correspondence*, 16–17; Adolph Halling, *Stammtafel der familie Callisen*, (Glückstadt: J. J. Augustin, 1907); Henke, *Georg Calixtus*, 1:81. On the Callisen genealogy, see Halling, *Stammtafel*, and on Johann Calixtus, Halling, *Beiträge zur Familiengeschichte des Geschlechtes Callisen* (Glückstadt: J. J. Augustin, 1898), 4–8. There is a suggestion that Johann spent some time in Scotland as a secretary to James VI’s queen consort, Anna of Denmark, but I have not been able to substantiate this. Maureen M. Meikle, “A Meddlesome Princess: Anna of Denmark and

studied under Melanchthon and proving himself an ardent admirer of both his famous teacher and the latter's Dutch contemporary Desiderius Erasmus (ca. 1466–1536),²⁷ Johann provided for his young son a “spiritual world . . . characterised by a moderate melanchthonian Lutheranism.”²⁸ In this environment Georg Calixtus learned to revere above all the moderate, humanist tendencies of Melanchthon, and to reject those of “ultraconservative ‘genuine Lutherans’”²⁹ like Matthias Flacius (Flacius Illyricus, 1520–1575).³⁰ Georg was accepted into the Flensburg Grammar School at the age of twelve, and it is quite clear why Johann Calixtus chose this particular school for his son. The teachings of Melanchthon received pride of place, just as they had in the private tutelage Georg had received at home.³¹ The school's library also contained a wide range of classical, patristic, and humanist texts,³² fostering the historical bent that would prove so prominent in Calixtus' later work.

The next step in Calixtus' intellectual development would take him to university. The University of Helmstedt had been established in 1576 and had quickly developed a reputation as one of the most progressive universities in the Holy Roman Empire. Over the coming years it would come to be recognised as “an oasis of humanist sensibilities in a neoscholastic age.”³³ Calixtus was admitted to Helmstedt as a student at the age of sixteen, and spent the rest of his life in its service. As might be expected in the polymathic environment of early modern scholarship, his interests were initially wide-ranging, and he studied philosophy, ancient languages, mathematics, and medicine, before ultimately setting his heart on

Scottish Court Politics, 1589–1603,” in *The Reign of James VI*, ed. Julian Goodacre and Michael Lynch (Edinburgh: Birlinn, John Donald, 2008), 129.

²⁷ Georg's student Gerard Titius would later characterise Johann Calixtus as an “Erasmophile and Melanchthonite.” Gerard Titius, *Laudatio funebris memoriae svmmi et incomparabilis viri Georgii Calixti ss. theol. doct. et primarii professoris in Academia Iulia, abbatis regio Lothariensis &c.* (Helmstedt: Henning Muller, 1656), sig. A3[i]v: “Erasmophilum & Melanchtonicolam”

²⁸ Schüssler, *Georg Calixt*, 1: “Die geistige Welt . . . war durch ein gemäßigtes Luthertum melanchthonischer.”

²⁹ Bodo Nischan, “Reformed Irenicism and the Leipzig Colloquy of 1631,” *Central European History* 9 (1976): 4.

³⁰ Dowding, *Life and Correspondence*, 18–19; Henke, *Georg Calixtus*, 1:83.

³¹ Schüssler, *Georg Calixt*, 2.

³² See the library catalogue in Olaus Heinrich Moller, *Erneuertes Andenken der milden Stiftungen, durch welche sich der vor 200 Jahren verstorbene Stifter der lateinischen Schule, Ludolphus Naamani, und dessen gottselige Eltern um die Stadt Flensburg rühmlichst verdient gemacht haben* (Flensburg: Serringhausen, 1774), 45–50.

³³ Howard, *Protestant Theology*, 79.

theology.³⁴ His two most influential teachers were Johannes Caselius and Cornelius Martini (1568–1621), each one a reputable scholar in his own right.³⁵ Caselius, like Calixtus' father, had studied under Melanchthon,³⁶ and has been described as “the last great humanist in Germany.”³⁷ Martini had studied under Caselius at Rostock and they had moved to Helmstedt together in 1591. With the humanist predilection instilled by his father and fostered under Caselius' tutelage, Calixtus found in Martini's teachings a historical approach that appealed to his sensibilities. Martini revered ancient philosophers over and above those more recent, and Calixtus utilised this same approach in his study of theology.³⁸ Calixtus also studied Aristotelian metaphysics under Martini, and this too played a key part in the shaping of his theology in later years, a fact that is widely recognised in the literature. For Christoph Böttigheimer, Aristotelian philosophy provided Calixtus with the “tools” to engage effectively with Scripture;³⁹ for William Kelly, it provided the foundation for Calixtus' understanding of the *consensus antiquitatis*, as it recognised that all Christians were “bound by one and the same intellectual inheritance”;⁴⁰ and for Johannes Wallmann and Peter Engel, Aristotelianism allowed the evolution of theology into a scholarly form.⁴¹ After receiving his Master's degree in 1605, at the

³⁴ Dowding, *Life and Correspondence*, 33–34, 38; Henke, *Georg Calixtus*, 1:107–12.

³⁵ Calixtus acknowledged his debt to Caselius and Martini in his own work. See, for example, Calixtus, “Apparatus sive introductio in studium et disciplinam sanctae theologiae: 1628–1656,” in *Werke*, 1:117.

³⁶ Richard Newald, “Caselius (Kessel, Chesselius, Bracht, Bractus), Johannes,” in *NDB*, 3:164.

³⁷ Wallmann, “Zwischen Reformation und Humanismus,” 66: “der letzte große Humanist Deutschlands.” This appears to be a moderated version of the same plaudit in Wallmann's earlier work, in which he describes Caselius as the “last great humanist of the 16th century.” Wallmann, *Der Theologiebegriff bei Johann Gerhard und Georg Calixt* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1961), 86: “letzter großer Humanist des 16. Jahrhunderts [*sic*].”

³⁸ Dowding, *Life and Correspondence*, 39; Henke, *Georg Calixtus*, 1:113–14. See also Titius, *Laudatio funebris*, sigs B^r–B2^r.

³⁹ Christoph Böttigheimer, “Auf der Suche nach der ewig gültigen Lehre: Theologische Grundlagenreflexion im Dienste der Irenik bei Georg Calixt,” *Kerygma und Dogma* 44, no. 3 (1998): 221. A Melanchthonian influence can also be detected in this aspect of Calixtine theology. See below, § 2.3.3.

⁴⁰ Kelly, *Theological Faculty*, 8; “Theological Faculty,” 109. As Kelly's 1996 publication is a reproduction of a chapter in his PhD dissertation, this thesis will from now on only cite the former where information is duplicated.

⁴¹ Wallmann, *Der Theologiebegriff*, 25–26, quoted in Engel, *Die eine Wahrheit*, 19. For Horst Reller, there was a direct connection between Protestant Aristotelianism and the emergence of the absolute state. Horst Reller, “Die Auswirkungen der Universität Helmstedt auf Pfarrer und Gemeinden in Niedersachsen,” *Jahrbuch der Gesellschaft für Niedersächsische Kirchengeschichte* 74 (1976): 40–41.

age of eighteen, Calixtus continued to pursue theology under Martini before embarking on the first of two academic tours around Europe.

The first of these tours was limited to German universities. During 1609 and 1610, Calixtus travelled throughout the Holy Roman Empire, visiting many prominent universities including those at Jena, Giessen, Tübingen, Mainz, Heidelberg, and Frankfurt.⁴² At these universities he met with several eminent scholars, including both Roman Catholic and Protestant theologians such as the “mad Jesuit”⁴³ Martin Becanus (1563–1624), the Reformed (German Calvinist) irenicist David Pareus (1548–1622), and the Lutheran professor Balthasar Mentzer (1565–1627).⁴⁴ In Jena Calixtus chaired a disputation on the nature of logic and philosophy,⁴⁵ and in Mainz he debated the sacraments with Becanus, discussing how they might be treated so as to mitigate dissension between the confessions.⁴⁶ Henke provides little additional information regarding this first tour, yet it is already apparent that Calixtus was willing to converse with parties on all sides of the confessional debate. Although considering himself a Lutheran, he was more than happy to engage with adherents of other confessions in order to further his own education.⁴⁷

The second tour would prove extremely valuable for Calixtus’ intellectual development. From 1611 to 1613, he travelled across Western Europe, visiting universities and libraries and engaging with some of the better-known scholars of the

⁴² Adolph Halling also mentions Augsburg, Dillingen, Durlach, Hanau, Lauingen, Marburg, Oppenheim, Pforzheim, Speyer, Ulm, and Worms. Halling, *Beiträge*, 14. Cf. Moller, “Georgius Calixtus,” 122–23.

⁴³ Titius, *Laudatio funebris*, sig. B2^v: “rabioso Iesuita.”

⁴⁴ Dowding, *Life and Correspondence*, ch. 7; Henke, *Georg Calixtus*, 1:118–26; Titius, *Laudatio funebris*, sigs B3^f–B3^v. Other scholars that Calixtus met on this tour included Jakob Christmann (1554–1613), Jan Gruter (1560–1627), Matthias Hafenreffer (1561–1619), Christoph Helwig (1581–1617), Johannes Major (1564–1654), Lucas Osiander (1571–1638), and Johannes Winckelmann (1551–1626). On Gruter, Mentzer, and Pareus, see below, §§ 2.3.1, 2.3.4–5. On Becanus, Christmann, Hafenreffer, Helwig, Major, Osiander and Winckelmann, see the relevant entries in the general (*allgemeine*) and new (*neue*) German biographies by Kratz, Cantor, Fausel, Kämmel, Pünjer, Schott, and Pistor, respectively. For complete bibliographical details, below, pp. 111–24.

⁴⁵ Dowding, *Life and Correspondence*, 46–47; Henke, *Georg Calixtus*, 1:119.

⁴⁶ Calixtus, *Responsum moguntis theologis*, 156, quoted in both Dowding, *Life and Correspondence*, 50, and Henke, *Georg Calixtus*, 1:124n2.

⁴⁷ Calixtus would also work closely with the future patriarch of the Greek Orthodox Church in later years, accommodating him in his home for eight months. See Colin Davey, *Pioneer for Unity: Metrophanes Kritopoulos (1589–1639) and Relations Between the Orthodox, Roman Catholic and Reformed Churches* (London: British Council of Churches, 1987), 149–58; Schüssler, *Georg Calixt*, 99–101.

time. He used this tour to deepen his understanding of both Roman Catholic and Protestant doctrines, visiting Cologne (“the German Rome”⁴⁸), Leiden, The Hague, Amsterdam, Rotterdam, London, and Paris. Although Calixtus was willing to engage in dialogue with Roman Catholics, he was never shy about his opinions regarding church doctrine. He was in Cologne for several months and used the time to write an attack on the Roman Catholic mass.⁴⁹ It might be observed at this point that this tract was less an attack on the Roman Catholic church, and more a historical critique of the mass itself. Here one sees the historical inclination that began at the Flensburg Grammar School and which developed under Caselius and Martini’s tutelage: by reference to the works of the church fathers, Calixtus could show that the mass was a later introduction, a “superstitious and absurd” rite that had not been practised in the primitive church.⁵⁰ From Cologne, Calixtus travelled to the Netherlands and, despite visiting several major seats of learning, did not stay there long—his political opinions seem to have clashed with the ideology of the emerging Dutch republic, and he missed out on the opportunity to acquaint himself with the scholars he would have liked to meet. Joseph Scaliger had died three years earlier, and Calixtus as yet had no personal connections to others, such as Hugo Grotius (1583–1645) and Gerhard Vossius.⁵¹

From the Netherlands, Calixtus travelled to London for the most significant encounter of his early years. It was here that he met Isaac Casaubon, the famed classical scholar and philologist, from whom he would gain one of the most important concepts of his life: his understanding of what he saw as the pure form of the Christian church, and its decline from the sixth century onwards.⁵² Existing scholarship would suggest that Calixtus found this inspiration in the works of other theologians, such as Georg Cassander (1513–1566) and Marco Antonio de Dominis (1566–1624);⁵³ however, this thesis will show that Casaubon is a much more likely source for this inspiration. This is significant because it demonstrates Calixtus’ engagement with a wider intellectual world, and provides a genesis for one of his key

⁴⁸ Halling, *Beiträge*, 14: “dem deutschen Rom.” Also in Davey, *Pioneer*, 151; Merkt, *Das patristische Prinzip*, 21.

⁴⁹ Henke, *Georg Calixtus*, 1:139. Cf. Dowding, *Life and Correspondence*, 55.

⁵⁰ Calixtus, *De pontificio missae sacrificio tractatus* (Frankfurt: Johann Bringer, 1614), 63, quoted in Henke, *Georg Calixtus*, 1:139n1: “superstitiosis et ridiculis.”

⁵¹ Dowding, *Life and Correspondence*, 56; Henke, *Georg Calixtus*, 1:140–41.

⁵² See chapter four, below.

⁵³ See below, § 3.1.

theological ideas in the ideals of Renaissance humanism, rather than in the details of doctrinal debate. From London, Calixtus went to Paris and there, on Casaubon's recommendation, met the historian Jacques-August de Thou (1553–1617).⁵⁴ Curiously, apart from the fact that Calixtus spent three months in Paris, and used his time there to visit the local libraries and to attend disputations at the Sorbonne, it seems little else is known about this part of his tour.⁵⁵ It is possible that his meeting with de Thou proved anti-climactic—de Thou was apparently an appalling Latin speaker.⁵⁶ From Paris, Calixtus returned home; Henke suggests that he would have liked to have visited the Italian states as well, but was afraid that the tract he had written on the Roman Catholic mass would attract the attention of the Inquisition.⁵⁷

Calixtus was influenced by many people in his scholarship and on these tours. He came into physical contact with many of his contemporaries, and through his studies he was exposed to the work of great names such as Saint Vincent of Lérins, Bonaventura (1221–1274), and Georg Witzel (1501–1573). Given the sheer number of people that he met, and of scholars whose work he busied himself with, we cannot hope to discuss them all in depth, even though it is important to consider the diverse interests of those people with whom he was engaged. Instead, the following section will focus on the lives and work of five individuals: Jan Gruter, Cornelius Martini, Philipp Melanchthon, Balthasar Mentzer, and David Pareus. These men have been chosen because of their close proximity to Calixtus (excepting Melanchthon, he met all of them), and also because of their diverse areas of scholarship. It will show that, despite different professions, backgrounds, and confessions, common threads link all these people. They all possessed a yearning for confessional peace, reverence for historical knowledge, conviction in the value of reason and logic, and love of learning and education—values that find themselves expressed time and again in Calixtus' work.

⁵⁴ Dowding, *Life and Correspondence*, 60; Henke, *Georg Calixtus*, 1:153.

⁵⁵ Dowding, *Life and Correspondence*, 60–61; Henke, *Georg Calixtus*, 1:153; Moller, “Georgius Calixtus,” 123; Titius, *Laudatio funebris*, sigs B3^r–B3^v. Casaubon's letter of recommendation to de Thou: Isaac Casaubon to Jacques-August de Thou, 8 July 1612, in Casaubon, *Epistolae*, ed. Theodor Janson van Almeloveen (Rotterdam: Caspar Fritsch & Michael Böhm, 1709), 476.

⁵⁶ Grafton, *Worlds*, 154.

⁵⁷ Henke, *Georg Calixtus*, 1:153–54. Cf. Dowding, *Life and Correspondence*, 62.

2.3. The Scholars

2.3.1. Jan Gruter

Jan Gruter (1560–1627) was born in the Netherlands, though his family soon moved to England because of the religious and political struggles in their homeland.⁵⁸ Such dislocation quickly became a theme in his life: he left England for similar reasons in the late 1570s, returning to the Netherlands, where he received his doctorate in law; and in 1584 Gruter again fled the Netherlands after Spain's besieging of Antwerp, this time to the Holy Roman Empire. He spent the next few years travelling throughout continental Western Europe, spending time in France, Switzerland, and the Italian states, before returning to the German lands. He served as a professor of history in Wittenberg in 1590, and later at the University of Heidelberg. In 1602 he was appointed librarian of the Palatinate, and there built up his own library, collecting editions of, and commentaries on, Cicero, Livy, Plautus, Pliny the Younger, and Suetonius, among others, by scholars all over Europe. Among these scholars were people such as Isaac Casaubon, Hugo Grotius, and Joseph Scaliger, all three of whom Gruter was in correspondence with.

Gruter and Martini are peculiar in this selection of people that influenced Calixtus, as they are the only two not remembered as theologians. When one surveys a list of Gruter's works one sees collections of poetry, and commentaries on classical texts, instead of biblical and theological commentaries. When Calixtus met him, he was working on his commentary on Seneca.⁵⁹ He also wrote a seven-volume "Light, or Flame of the Liberal Arts, that is, a Critical Thesaurus in which the Infinite Matters of Theology, Jurisconsultancy, and Medicine . . . are Presented," and a massive compilation of Roman inscriptions which Calixtus would have come across in the library at Helmstedt.⁶⁰ This range of humanist and polymathic scholarship is significant because it is illustrative of the fact that Calixtus was in dialogue with

⁵⁸ Unless otherwise noted, the following discussion is based on Peter Fuchs, "Gruter(us) (de Gruytere), Jan(us)," in *NDB*, 7:238-40.

⁵⁹ Henke, *Georg Calixtus*, 1:126.

⁶⁰ *Lampas, sive fax artium liberalium, hoc est thesaurus criticus in quo infinitis locis theologorum, jurisconsultorum, medicorum . . . scripta supplentur . . .*, 7 vols (Frankfurt, 1602–23), cited in Fuchs, "Gruter(us)," 239; *Inscriptionis antiquae totius orbis Romani, in corpus absolutiβ. redactae* (Heidelberg: Commelin, 1603), at HAB, shelf-mark H: T 242.2° Helmst.

people from a wide range of intellectual backgrounds, and even in his early twenties was fostering a broad and diverse scholarly network.

2.3.2. Cornelius Martini

We have already noted that Cornelius Martini (1568–1621) was one of Calixtus’ most influential teachers during his time at Helmstedt, and that he had moved there with Caselius in 1591.⁶¹ In 1592, Martini graduated Master of Arts and was appointed professor of logic. His work on Aristotelian logic and metaphysics was to prove his greatest legacy to Calixtus and to the Protestant universities of Germany. During his time at Helmstedt he wrote, according to Charles Lohr, one of “the most important treatises on metaphysics composed in Germany in the seventeenth century.”⁶² Martini was also staunchly opposed to Petrus Ramus’ (1515–1572) approach to philosophy (otherwise very popular at the time), and was instrumental in influencing the Duke of Brunswick-Wolfenbüttel to pass edicts restricting the use of Ramist philosophy in local schools, and in the university. Thus began what Christoph Böttigheimer refers to as an “Aristotelian renaissance” at Helmstedt,⁶³ a movement which spread throughout the Holy Roman Empire. Through this work and with the help of some of his students, Martini was able to play a key role in shaping the teaching of philosophy in Protestant universities. He led the evolution of philosophy from a philological, rhetorical discipline to a more realistic, logically argued ontology, as it would be taught in German schools in the seventeenth century.⁶⁴ In later years, Calixtus would emulate his esteemed teacher in this respect, engaging the help of his students and of Duke August the Younger of Brunswick-Lüneberg (1579–1666) to disseminate his teachings across the duchy.⁶⁵

⁶¹ See above, p. 23. Unless otherwise noted, the following discussion is based on Walter Sparr, “Martini (Martinus), Cornelius,” in *NDB*, 16:296–97.

⁶² Charles H. Lohr, “Metaphysics,” in *The Cambridge History of Renaissance Philosophy*, ed. Charles B. Schmitt, Quentin Skinner and Eckhard Kessler (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 627. Some of Martini’s publications are listed in Lohr, “Renaissance Latin Aristotle Commentaries: Authors L–M,” *Renaissance Quarterly* 31, no. 4 (1978): 567–68.

⁶³ Böttigheimer, “Auf der Suche,” 220; *Zwischen Polemik und Irenik*, 18: “Aristoteles-Renaissance.”

⁶⁴ See also Hunter, *Secularisation*, 42–43. Anselm Schubert and Max Wundt both credit Martini as the founder of metaphysics in German Lutheranism. Schubert, “Die Diskussion,” 61; Max Wundt, *Die deutsche Schulmetaphysik des 17. Jahrhunderts* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1939), 98, quoted in both Calixtus, “Apparatus,” 117n152, and Wallmann, *Der Theologiebegriff*, 86n4.

⁶⁵ See below, § 2.5.

2.3.3. Philipp Melanchthon

Philipp Melanchthon (1497–1560) was a key player in the Reformation and a personal friend of Martin Luther.⁶⁶ His early education was at the hands of his relatives Johann Reuter and Johann Reuchlin (1455–1522), and the linguist Johann Unger.⁶⁷ He received his Bachelor of Arts from the University of Heidelberg in 1509, and his Master of Arts from Tübingen in 1514. He taught at Wittenberg University from 1518, and there earned a “Bachelor of Bible”⁶⁸ and met Luther. Melanchthon was a prolific writer and published dozens of works, including translations of texts by Pythagoras, Plutarch, and Terence, among others, as well as many classical essays, commentaries, textbooks, and theological works.⁶⁹ He was also instrumental in bringing to fruition Luther’s German edition of the Bible, prompting Luther to embark on the project in the first place, and spending more than twenty years of his own life working on it.⁷⁰

As well as his contribution to Renaissance humanism, Melanchthon had a significant impact on the German education system, and on Lutheran theology. He was named preceptor for his work in reforming schools throughout the German lands and aided in the founding of at least three universities, and in the reorganisation of several others.⁷¹ His *Unterricht der Visitatoren* (Instructions for Visitations) of 1528 became the foundation of the first public school system, and its primary school syllabus was enacted in law in Saxony and widely copied in the rest of the Holy Roman Empire. Melanchthon was the German author of the Augsburg Confession and its apology, documents which, to this day, are key doctrinal statements of the Lutheran church. He also authored the *Loci communes rerum theologicarum*

⁶⁶ For Melanchthon’s basic biographical details see, Clyde L. Manschreck, “Melanchthon, Philipp,” in *The Encyclopedia of Religion*, vol. 9, ed. Mircea Eliade (New York: Macmillan, 1987), 349; “Melanchthon, Philipp,” *Britannica Biographies* (January 2008): 1. Australia/New Zealand Reference Centre, EBSCOhost (accessed March 25, 2009). A slightly longer discussion is Robert Stupperich, “Melanchthon (eigtl. Schwarzerdt), Philipp,” in *NDB*, 16:741–45.

⁶⁷ I have not been able to locate dates of birth and death for either Reuter or Unger.

⁶⁸ Heinz Scheible, “Philip Melanchthon (1497–1560),” in *The Reformation Theologians: An Introduction to Theology in the Early Modern Period*, ed. Carter Lindberg (Oxford: Blackwell, 2002), 68.

⁶⁹ A selection can be found in Lohr, “Renaissance Latin,” 576–82.

⁷⁰ Scheible, “Philip Melanchthon,” 69.

⁷¹ Manschreck, “Melanchthon, Philipp,” in *Britannica Biographies*, para. 9.

(Commonplaces of Theological Matters),⁷² better known simply as *Loci communes*, the first systematic treatment of Lutheran theology, which was emulated by many later theologians.⁷³ The *Loci communes* employed the *loci* method to treat its subject under discrete heads, enabling the presentation of a complex array of information in a “simple and understandable” way.⁷⁴

Although Melanchthon worked closely with Luther for many years, and three of his works became symbols of the Lutheran faith (the aforementioned Augsburg Confession and its apology, and his *Treatise on the Power and Primacy of the Pope*), his stance differed from Luther’s on several issues. Melanchthon always favoured irenics to polemics, and his position on doctrinal issues such as the Lord’s Supper, and his acceptance of non-fundamental articles of faith as *adiaphora* (indifferent), meant that there was often tension between him and Luther. For example, when a controversy over the sacrament of the Lord’s Supper reached a head in 1543, Luther polemicised against his opponents, while Melanchthon worked actively to try and alleviate tensions.⁷⁵ As Luther is at times remembered for his “customary coarseness,”⁷⁶ or for having “too much passion and far too little patience,”⁷⁷ Melanchthon is sometimes portrayed by orthodox Lutherans as compromising and synergistic. That is, they believe that he was too eager to forsake crucial questions of doctrine for ecclesiastical peace, and that he taught that human will and the grace of God cooperated in the achievement of salvation.⁷⁸ This accusation of synergism seems to be rooted in Melanchthon’s use of philosophy in theology.

In contrast to Luther’s exhortation to “despair of your own reason and understanding”⁷⁹ in all matters concerning God, Melanchthon saw human reason as integral to the study of theology. In this sense, he saw reason as the employment of philosophical tools to understand Scripture, though he did not believe that these tools could be used to interpret it. Logic, dialectics, and rhetoric were skills to aid in the

⁷² Manschreck, “Melanchthon, Philipp,” in *Encyclopedia of Religion*, 9:349.

⁷³ Robert D. Preus, *The Theology of Post-Reformation Lutheranism*, vol. 1, *A Study of Theological Prolegomena* (St Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1970), 32.

⁷⁴ Howard, *Protestant Theology*, 73.

⁷⁵ Scheible, “Philip Melanchthon,” 76–77.

⁷⁶ Scheible, “Philip Melanchthon,” 76.

⁷⁷ J. W. Allen, *A History of Political Thought in the Sixteenth Century*, rev. J. W. Gough (London: Methuen & Co, 1960), 15.

⁷⁸ See for example, Preus, *Theology*, 68n21, 81–82.

⁷⁹ Martin Luther, *Luther’s Works*, vol. 34, ed. and trans. Robert R. Heitner (St Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1960), 285–88, quoted in Howard, *Protestant Theology*, 72.

physical act of reading, not the spiritual experience of revelation.⁸⁰ In contrast, Luther's aversion to the use of reason extended even to the act of reading. He advocated a formula of prayer, meditation, and testing as the best approach to the study of theology. After first placing one's faith in God in order that they might receive divine revelation in their pursuit of erudition, a student of theology must rigorously study the Scriptures, constantly reading and re-reading, before being tested by the experience of spiritual adversity.⁸¹ We can see here the origins of an accusation of synergism—while Melanchthon saw the acts of understanding and interpreting the gospel as discrete, orthodox Lutherans saw them as one and the same, acts which could only be engaged in by surrendering reason and placing one's faith entirely in God.

All these features of Melanchthon's work—his broad classical as well as patristic knowledge, his belief in education, his employment of philosophy in theology, and his tendency toward irenicism—can be seen in Calixtus' work. The discussion which follows later in this chapter, regarding the controversies that Calixtus endured in his later life, draws on many of these themes. However, just as the introduction pointed out that one must be conscious of historical anachronism when considering the disciplinary boundaries of Calixtus' world, one must also be conscious of the risk inherent in relying on an individual, or even a single group of people, as a defining influence on his work. As the present discussion shows, Calixtus interacted with many different people during his formative years, and they all had an impact on the evolution of his thought.

2.3.4. Balthasar Mentzer

Balthasar Mentzer (1565–1627) went to school in Hersfeld (modern Bad Hersfeld) from 1577 and in 1583 entered the University of Marburg.⁸² He received his Bachelor's degree in the same year, and his Master's degree at the end of 1584. He worked in Marburg as a scholar in the following years, and received his doctorate in 1600. Political developments played a key role in shaping his influence as a Lutheran

⁸⁰ Scheible, "Philip Melanchthon," 73.

⁸¹ Howard, *Protestant Theology*, 72. Howard seems to prefer the German word *Anfechtung* to "spiritual adversity" here, which can also be translated as "temptation."

⁸² The following discussion is based on Theodor Mahlmann, "Mentzer, Balthasar d. Ä.," in *NDB*, 17:98–100.

theologian. As noted above, the Peace of Augsburg of 1555 had provided legal recognition for Lutheran and Roman Catholic confessions, and stipulated that the religion of a particular region would be determined by that of its ruler. When Prince Moritz (1572–1632) took over as Landgrave of Hesse-Kassel in 1592, he consequently attempted to impose his strict Reformed views on his subjects.⁸³ In 1605 Moritz met with a group of Lutheran theologians in Marburg (Mentzer among them) in an effort to prohibit discussion of contentious doctrinal issues between the Reformed and Lutheran confessions. Citing legal rights and reasons of conscience, the Lutheran theologians refused this meeting and were subsequently dismissed from their posts.⁸⁴ During the uprising that followed, they fled for their lives to Giessen. Fortunately for Mentzer, the Lutheran Landgrave Ludwig V of Hesse-Darmstadt (1577–1626) worked with the superintendents of Giessen and Darmstadt to found a new Lutheran university in Giessen which could accommodate Mentzer and his exiled colleagues. Mentzer was involved in the foundation of the university and, when it opened in 1607, was appointed as a professor of theology. Theodor Mahlmann suggests that as a result of Mentzer’s “intuition and skill” as a consultant in the establishment of this new university, scholars from all disciplines were attracted to Giessen.⁸⁵ Mentzer’s and his colleague Konrad Dieterich’s (1575–1639) textbooks became widely used throughout the Holy Roman Empire, and hundreds of Lutherans “from near and far” came to study with them.⁸⁶ Mentzer’s influence meant that the University of Giessen quickly reached a reputation equal to or better than many of the older Lutheran universities.

Apart from playing a key role in the founding of a university that would thrive until 1879, Mentzer also made a significant contribution to Lutheran theology.⁸⁷ He engaged in many disputations on the subject, and was one of the pioneers in developing doctrinal writings for the laity. His biggest contribution to the confessional debate was probably his work in the area of Christology. He had specific ideas about the nature of Christ, particularly in regard to His three roles of prophet, priest, and king. Mentzer’s writings regarding the divine nature of Christ provoked opposition from other German universities and in an effort to quell the

⁸³ On Moritz, see Fritz Wolff, “Moritz der Gelehrte,” in *NDB*, 18:136–39.

⁸⁴ Cf. Hotson, “Irenicism,” 246.

⁸⁵ Mahlmann, “Mentzer, Balthasar,” 99: “Spürsinn und Geschick.”

⁸⁶ Mahlmann, “Mentzer, Balthasar,” 99: “von nah und fern.”

⁸⁷ Cf. Preus, *Theology*, 52, which suggests that Mentzer’s works “are of little value to us today.”

controversy, he sought the assistance of Ludwig V, whom he had worked with in establishing the University of Giessen. Despite Ludwig's intervention, the attacks continued. Although respected in many quarters, Mentzer spent the last years of his life defending his views. In his meetings with Mentzer, as with Gruter, Calixtus would have come face-to-face with the realities of confessionalization: the physical upheaval imposed on individuals and families, and the spiritual stresses of fighting over religion. Coupled with his interaction with irenicists such as David Pareus, and the later turmoil of the Thirty Years War, one can see why Calixtus would have wanted to engineer a way to ease these tensions.

2.3.5. David Pareus

David Pareus (1548–1622) was born in *Frankenstein in Schlesien* (modern Żąbkowice Śląskie in Poland). He began training as a chemist and as a cobbler, though turned from these disciplines to the Reformed church, and was ordained as a priest in 1571.⁸⁸ During the seventh, eighth, and ninth decades of the sixteenth century, Pareus was forced to move several times. *Cuius regio, eius religio* officially recognised only Lutheran and Roman Catholic confessions. As such, as a member of the Reformed church, Pareus had no legal protection anywhere he went, and was forced from Hirschberg (modern Jelenia Góra in Poland) in 1566 because of Lutheran pressure, Bergzabern in 1571 because of Roman Catholic opposition, and from Hemsbach in 1577, again forced out by Lutherans.⁸⁹ He eventually settled in Heidelberg in 1584, and there turned his attention to university life.

Pareus' experience of physical dislocation under the tenet *cuius regio, eius religio* seems to have had a marked effect on him. After three decades of moving from one city to another because of religious differences, he spent the rest of his life attempting to effect peace between the Protestant (Lutheran and Reformed) churches in the Holy Roman Empire. It is worth noting that, if his efforts had been successful, the Reformed church (united with Lutheran) would have gained protection under the Peace of Augsburg.⁹⁰ Given his Reformed confession, this would no doubt have been a favourable outcome for him. Pareus' plans for reunion were articulated in his most

⁸⁸ Traudel Himmighöfer, "Pareus (Wängler), David," in *NDB*, 20:65.

⁸⁹ Himmighöfer, "Pareus," 65–66.

⁹⁰ See Nischan, "Reformed Irenicism," 10–11.

famous work—his *Irenicum* of 1614.⁹¹ In it he suggested that Lutheran and Reformed confessions agreed on all fundamental articles of faith (that is, those things that a Christian must believe in order to receive salvation), and that they disagreed with the Roman Catholic confession on at least 39 articles. On that basis, he proposed a reunion of the two Protestant churches in defence against the Roman Catholics.⁹² Pareus' goal during the last years of his life was always the achievement of such a syncretism of the Protestant churches. Despite these lofty aspirations, his irenic overtures were continuously rebuffed by his Lutheran contemporaries.⁹³ His other scholarly endeavours also came under attack. During 1587 and 1588, for example, he published the first Reformed bible and, despite retaining the bulk of Luther's translation, earned the ire of many Lutheran theologians.⁹⁴ Although Pareus' efforts failed to achieve a reunion of the Protestant churches during his lifetime, Traudel Himmighöfer suggests that they did lay the foundation for a reunion of the two confessions in the German Palatinate in 1818.⁹⁵

In Pareus we see a grand irenicism that is still one step short of Calixtus' lofty ideal. While Pareus' goal was the reunion of the Protestant confessions against the Roman Catholic, Calixtus aimed to reunite all three. Although Jews and Muslims could not be considered members of the true faith, Calixtus believed that all Christians could, regardless of their differences of opinion. However, even concerning Jews and Muslims, Calixtus was willing to keep an open mind, and spoke to his students upon his first appointment to the pro-rectorship of the University of Helmstedt about how the members of these "false religions" might be brought back to the Christian fold.⁹⁶ Although Calixtus had already been exposed to the tolerant ideas of Melanchthon and Georg Witzel, Pareus would have been one of Calixtus' first Protestant contacts with a practical project for ecclesiastical reunion.

⁹¹ *Irenicum sive de unione et synodo evangelicorum concilianda liber votives paci ecclesiae . . . dicatus* (Heidelberg, 1614), cited in Hotson, "Irenicism," 270n21.

⁹² Hotson, "Irenicism," 236.

⁹³ See Hotson, "Irenicism," 234–38.

⁹⁴ Himmighöfer, "Pareus," 66.

⁹⁵ Himmighöfer, "Pareus," 66.

⁹⁶ See Calixtus, "De populis a nobis in religione dissidentibus, Judæis, paganis et Muhammedanis, ad veritatis agnitionem ducendis oratio," in *Orationes selectæ*, ed. Friedrich Ulrich Calixtus (Helmstedt: Typographeo Calixtino, 1660), 69–77.

2.3.6. Summary—The Scholars

These people, and many others, played a part in informing Calixtus' thoughts during his early education and his days at university. We have Gruter, a philologist and poet who published mammoth multi-volume works of history, and was in contact with some of the most erudite minds of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries; Martini, the leader of an "Aristotelian renaissance" and an influential proponent for reason in philosophy rather than rhetoric; Melanchthon, one of the most important figures of the Reformation, a personal friend of Martin Luther, and an early Lutheran proponent of moderation in matters of confessional discord; Mentzer, a key player in the founding of the University of Giessen, and a discussant of many contemporary questions of Lutheran theology; and Pareus, one of the most famous irenic figures of the time, and of particular influence in his efforts to unite the Reformed and Lutheran branches of Protestantism. As already noted, despite very different religious, personal, and professional circumstances, common threads link all these people. The desire for ecclesiastical peace, the practical value of philosophy and history, and the importance of education are all echoed in their life experiences, in their work, and in their influence on Calixtus.

The impact of the confessional movement on these individuals, and on Calixtus himself, must not be underestimated. The principle of *cuius regio, eius religio* meant that religious unity no longer existed between German states. As already noted, the confessionalization of states and of universities resulted in much confrontation between both political and religious rivals. In a time of such intellectual discomfort, compounded by the stresses of the Thirty Years War, it is no surprise that confessional peace was at the forefront of many scholars' minds.⁹⁷ The influence of this environment, and of these people, can be seen in Calixtus' early work as well as in his later designs for confessional peace. For now, some of the controversies that Calixtus was involved in will be considered, in order to illustrate some of the competing values which found expression in the religious disputes of the day.

⁹⁷ Anthony Grafton has also observed that this was a major concern of many post-Reformation thinkers. Grafton, *Forgers and Critics: Creativity and Duplicity in Western Scholarship* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990), 107.

2.4. The Controversies

Given that so many individuals were concerned with the problem of religious dissension in the first half of the seventeenth century, and that there were a number of people actively trying to alleviate these tensions, one might wonder what made Calixtus so unique. The answer can perhaps be found in his understanding of the *consensus antiquitatis*.⁹⁸ Of course, there were other aspects of Calixtus' work that his opponents found objectionable—the role he afforded to philosophy in theology, for example, was the butt of much criticism.⁹⁹ However, Calixtus' understanding of the *consensus antiquitatis* placed him squarely between the Lutheran and Roman Catholic confessions, and he worked harder than almost any of his contemporaries to bridge the gap between them.¹⁰⁰ This made him an obvious target for attacks from both sides.

Calixtus based this understanding of the *consensus antiquitatis* on his reading of the works of Saints Augustine of Hippo (354–430) and Vincent of Lérins. Augustine's *De doctrina Christiana* (On Christian Doctrine) was for Calixtus the perfect guide to reading and understanding Scripture, and Vincent's *Commonitorium* contained the perfect definition of tradition. Together, they could be effectively used to define the true church and to refute heretics.¹⁰¹ For Calixtus, a definition of the true church could also serve as the basis for a reunion of the Christian confessions. As he put it, the “the truth and legitimacy of tradition is universal,”¹⁰² and Vincent provided the most appropriate criteria for identifying this tradition—“that which has been believed everywhere, always, and by all.”¹⁰³ For Calixtus, “always” (the

⁹⁸ This is borne out by the existing literature, which consistently highlights it as a peculiar feature of Calixtus' understanding of Christian doctrine. See, for example, Böttigheimer, “Georg Calixt im ökumenischen Horizont aus katholischer Sicht,” in Mager et al., “Theologie im Dialog: Georg Calixt (1586–1656) als Wegbereiter der Ökumene,” special issue, *Quellen und Beiträge zur Geschichte der Evangelisch-lutherischen Landeskirche in Braunschweig* 17 (2007): 62–64; Engel, *Die eine Wahrheit*, 120; Kantzenbach, *Das Ringen*, 236–41; Hans-Walter Krumwiede, *Kirchengeschichte Niedersachsens* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996), 201; Mager, “Georg Calixts interkonfessionelle Kommunikation im Dienste des Kirchenfriedens,” in *Das Athen der Welfen*, 54–55.

⁹⁹ See, for example, Engel, *Die eine Wahrheit*, 58; Preus, *Theology*, 155; Wallmann, *Der Theologiebegriff*, 113.

¹⁰⁰ Cf., for example, J. Minton Batten, *John Dury: Advocate of Christian Reunion* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1944).

¹⁰¹ Calixtus, “Prooemium,” 1:369–70.

¹⁰² Calixtus, “Prooemium,” 381: “verae et legitimae traditionis est Universitas.”

¹⁰³ See above, p. 13n41.

criterion of antiquity) referred to those things that were deemed necessary to believe in the first age of the apostles and the subsequent generation.¹⁰⁴ These he saw practised in the first five hundred years of the church, after which time the church fell into such disrepair that it no longer reflected the true church of Christ. For example, Pope Boniface III (d. ca. 607) gained his seat through the parricidal and tyrannical Emperor Phocas (d. 610).¹⁰⁵ As Andreas Merkt notes, for Calixtus, this event highlighted the “secularisation” of the papacy.¹⁰⁶

Calixtus’ deference to the first five hundred years of the church as a kind of normaliser positioned him directly between the Lutheran and Roman Catholic confessions. Although he claimed never to forsake the Lutheran principle of *sola Scriptura*—that Scripture should be the only theological authority—orthodox Lutherans saw any regard for tradition as tending toward Roman Catholicism. Roman Catholics were quite open to such interpretation, but were far from willing to limit it to the first five hundred years of the church.¹⁰⁷ In his efforts to find a common ground for negotiation between the confessions, Calixtus rather found himself the butt of attacks during much of his professional life. Throughout this time, in a curious paradox, Calixtus stood by his *consensus antiquitatis* and used it to counter the arguments of his opponents, while they used it to bolster their own arguments against him.

This controversial career began in 1614 with a disputation between Calixtus and the Jesuit August Turrianus. The disputation took place in an effort to prevent a young Brunswick nobleman, Ludolph von Klenke, from converting to Roman Catholicism.¹⁰⁸ Though he failed to prevent von Klenke from converting, Calixtus’ performance as a “skilled and competent” debater meant that he was nevertheless granted a professorial position at Helmstedt, where he worked for the rest of his life.¹⁰⁹ His forty-two-year career included appointment to the pro-rectorship of the university on four occasions, investiture with the abbacy of Königsutter in 1635, and

¹⁰⁴ Calixtus, “Prooemium,” 392.

¹⁰⁵ Calixtus, “Apparatus,” 205.

¹⁰⁶ Merkt, *Das patristische Prinzip*, 88: “Zum Fanal der Verweltlichung des Papsttums wird die Anerkennung von Papst Bonifaz III. als ökumenischer Patriarch durch Kaiser Phokas.”

¹⁰⁷ Fasolt, *Limits of History*, 56–57.

¹⁰⁸ On this disputation, see Dowding, *Life and Correspondence*, 63–66; Henke, *Georg Calixtus*, 1:161–66. Cf. Moller, “Georgius Calixtus,” 123–24. I have not been able to locate dates of birth and death for either Turrianus or von Klenke.

¹⁰⁹ Wilhelm Gaß, “Calixt: Georg,” in *ADB*, 3:697: “geschickter und sachkundiger.”

promotion to *professor primarius* in 1636.¹¹⁰ In these high-profile positions, his work was especially visible and although he deplored the polemic of his day and sought to distance himself from it when possible, in his irenic efforts Calixtus found himself writing responses and apologies and participating in pamphlet wars for much of his life. The most notable of these were probably those with Berthold Nihus and Abraham Calov, the latter of whom has certainly caught the attention of contemporary Lutheran theologians.¹¹¹ There was also a brief controversy involving Statius Büscher (d. 1641) in 1640, when he published his *Cryptopapismus novae theologiae Helmstadiensis* (The crypto-Papism of the New Theology of Helmstedt), accusing Calixtus of (among other things) harbouring secret Roman Catholic tendencies and of abandoning the *Corpus doctrinae Julium*, which he was required to subscribe to as a subject of the duchy of Brunswick-Wolfenbüttel.¹¹² Calixtus denied the allegations that Büscher had made and sought the assistance of Duke August the Younger in denouncing the book. As Büscher was the subject of a neighbouring duke, Georg of Brunswick-Lüneburg (1583–1641), August forwarded the request to him, but Duke Georg was already aware of the contents of the book and had taken measures to try and prevent its further dissemination. He called several times for Büscher to appear before him and account for what he had written, yet Büscher never did. Duke Georg subsequently made a public announcement denouncing Büscher's claims and defending Calixtus and his fellow theologians at Helmstedt. Calixtus, for his part, published an untitled response to Büscher's book in 1641. The controversy then came to a sudden end: Büscher had no opportunity to engage in further debate with Calixtus, as he died that same year.¹¹³

Berthold Nihus was a different case. He had been Calixtus' colleague and friend at Helmstedt but during travels through Cologne, Leiden, and Antwerp in 1614 had begun to question some of the thinking behind the Reformation. The main

¹¹⁰ Schüssler, *Georg Calixt*, 6. See also Dowding, *Life and Correspondence*, 128–29, 198–200; Henke, *Georg Calixtus*, 1:395–97, 450–52, 2.1:61–62, 197–200, 2.2:210–11; Mager, “Georg Calixtus interkonfessionelle Kommunikation,” 53–54.

¹¹¹ See, for example, Axel C. M. Ahlén, “Seventeenth Century Dogmaticians as Philosophers,” *Concordia Theological Monthly* 30, no. 3 (1959): 162–67; Harrison, “Abraham Calov”; Mayes, “Syncretism in the Theology of Georg Calixt, Abraham Calov and Johannes Musäus,” *Concordia Theological Quarterly* 68, nos 3–4 (2004): 291–317; Preus, *Theology*; Schmeling, “Lutheran Orthodoxy”; “*Strenuus Christi athleta* Abraham Calov (1612–1686): Sainted Doctor and Defender of the Church,” *Lutheran Synod Quarterly* 44, no. 4 (2004): 357–99; Yoffie, “Biblical Literalism.”

¹¹² Henke, *Georg Calixtus*, 1:119.

¹¹³ See Dowding, *Life and Correspondence*, ch. 23; Henke, *Georg Calixtus*, 1:129–32.

question for Nihus was whether or not the entire Roman Catholic church could be in error: could the church that Christ had promised to aid really be guilty of apostasy? He came to the conclusion it could not, and converted to Roman Catholicism in 1622.¹¹⁴ His new confession, and his stances on the Reformation, on the doctrine of the church, and the Lutheran ideal of *sola Scriptura*, meant that his friendship with Calixtus came to an end. After his conversion Nihus wrote several works against Calixtus and the rest of his former colleagues at Helmstedt. The best-known of these is his *Ars nova* (New Method) of 1632.¹¹⁵ Although it was not the first anti-Protestant work that Nihus had written, it was perhaps the most provocative. It was a confessional tract directed at Lutheran theologians, alleging that their doctrinal claims had no basis in Scripture.¹¹⁶ Furthermore, it asserted that it was the Lutherans who were obliged to prove their position, as it was they who had broken from the Roman Catholic church.

In response to the *Ars nova*, Calixtus published his “Digressio de Arte nova” (Digression on the New Method) as an addendum to his *Epitomes theologiae moralis* of 1634. Calixtus directed this specifically at Nihus, naming him on the title page of the “Digressio,”¹¹⁷ and imploring him to consider a conciliar approach to the stalemate between the Lutheran and Roman Catholic churches. He argued that the goal of all parties must be the reunion of Christendom, and he was convinced that Roman Catholic theologians must have this same desire for peace and unity.¹¹⁸ Calixtus argued using his understanding of the *consensus antiquitatis* that *both* the Lutheran and Roman Catholic sides had to substantiate their positions based on Scripture and the traditions of the primitive church;¹¹⁹ it was not up to one or the other to prove themselves worthy. If they could come together in an open dialogue

¹¹⁴ Schüssler, *Georg Calixt*, 104–5. Cf. Dowding, *Life and Correspondence*, 96–99; Henke, *Georg Calixtus*, 1:338–42. See also Calixtus’ own account in *Epitomes theologiae*, 125–62, where he provides the details of his relationship with Nihus, and of the controversies which led to the publication of the “Digressio de arte nova” in 1634.

¹¹⁵ *Ars nova dicto s. Scripturae unico lucrandi e pontificiis plurimos in partes Lutheranorum, detecta nonnihil et suggesta theologis Helmstedensibus, Ge. Calixto praesertim et Conr. Horneio, qui monentur, imo etiam atque etiam rogantur, ne compendium hoc negligant* (Hildesheim, 1622). See Henke, *Georg Calixtus*, 1:495n1.

¹¹⁶ Schüssler, *Georg Calixt*, 105.

¹¹⁷ Calixtus, *Epitomes theologiae*, 123: “Digressio qua excutitur Nova ars, quam nuper commentus est Bartoldus Nihusius, ad omnes Germaniae academias Romano pontifici deditas et subditas, inprimis Coloniensem.”

¹¹⁸ Calixtus, *Epitomes theologiae*, 168.

¹¹⁹ Calixtus, *Epitomes theologiae*, 317–18.

on this basis, they could reconcile their differences and reunite as one church.¹²⁰ In an effort to engage in this dialogue himself, Calixtus also answered Nihus' call for proof of Lutheran doctrine, supporting his argument by reference to Scripture and to the doctrine of the primitive church. For Calixtus, this doctrine was embodied in the Apostles', Nicene-Constantinopolitan, and Athanasian creeds, and in the decisions of the councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon.¹²¹ By constant reference to Scripture and to the church of antiquity, Calixtus hoped to show conclusively that his understanding of the *consensus antiquitatis* could be used to reveal the true nature of the original, catholic church, and thus serve as a basis for reunion.¹²²

The controversy that would take up the later years of Calixtus' life began after the Colloquy of Toruń in 1645. The colloquy was convened by King Władysław IV of Poland (1595–1648) and although undoubtedly a platform for dialogue between the confessions, its ultimate goal was to bring the Polish Protestants back to the Roman Catholic church.¹²³ Calixtus saw this as a great opportunity to unify the Lutheran, Reformed, and Roman Catholic confessions on the basis of his *consensus antiquitatis*. As he had proposed in his response to Nihus eleven years earlier, he believed that discussion on the basis of primitive Christianity and Scripture would allow the confessions to find a common truth and solve the outstanding issues between them.¹²⁴ As it turned out, Calixtus had difficulty obtaining his invitation to the colloquy, and once there was not permitted to represent the Lutheran party. It was at the Colloquy of Toruń that Abraham Calov first met Calixtus, and thereafter Calov became one of his most vocal critics. Johann Hülsemann (1602–1661) was another of Calixtus' opponents that was present at the colloquy. His and Calov's machinations meant that Calixtus was prevented from representing the Lutherans. Instead, Calov and Hülsemann acted for the Lutheran party, and Calixtus helped the Reformed to produce their declaration of faith.¹²⁵

¹²⁰ Calixtus, *Epitomes theologiae*, 205–6.

¹²¹ Calixtus, *Epitomes theologiae*, 463.

¹²² We see this motivation throughout the “Digressio.” See, for example, Calixtus, *Epitomes theologiae*, 246–47, 303, 463–64. All these passages argue that a combination of Scripture and the tradition of the primitive church can be used to explicate the word of God and quell controversies.

¹²³ Franz Jacobi, “Das liebeiche Religionsgespräch zu Thorn 1645,” *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 15 (1895), 349.

¹²⁴ Calixtus, *Wiederlegung . . . Weller* (1651), 3–4, cited in Jacobi, “Das liebeiche Religionsgespräch,” 357–58. Cf. Mager, “Brüderlichkeit und Einheit,” 212.

¹²⁵ Schmeling, “*Strenuus Christi athleta*,” 361, suggests that “[t]he meeting was doomed from the beginning when Calixtus, a supposed Lutheran representative, took the side of the Reformed. This

At Calov's instigation, the polemics against Calixtus began in earnest following the Colloquy of Toruń. What came to be termed the "Syncretistic Controversy" has been broken into three phases: from the Colloquy of Toruń until Calixtus' death in 1656; from the colloquies of Hesse-Kassel and Berlin in 1661 until the banning of polemics in 1669; and from 1675, when Abraham Calov renewed his polemics against Calixtus (whose legacy was then being defended by his son, Friedrich Ulrich Calixtus [1622–1701]), until Calov's death in 1686.¹²⁶

Of Calov's works against Calixtus, one in particular is worth mentioning, as it had widespread repercussions for contemporary Lutheran theologians.¹²⁷ Intended to reinvigorate the orthodox Lutheran position against the "syncretists," the *Consensus repetitus* (Revisited Consensus) of 1655 specifically targeted the teachings of Calixtus and his colleagues at Helmstedt in order to illustrate their errors.¹²⁸ The impact of Calixtus' notion of the *consensus antiquitatis* is evident in the first preliminary article of the *Consensus repetitus*, which specifically condemned the ideas that all that is necessary for salvation can be found in the Apostles' Creed, and that all those who believe in the Creed are members of the true church. It also rejected Calixtus' secondary principal of tradition.¹²⁹ The *Consensus repetitus* then went on to systematically refute each of the teachings of Calixtus and his adherents

infuriated Calov and Hülsemann." However, the literature makes it clear that Calixtus was prevented from representing the Lutherans at Toruń *because* of Calov and Hülsemann's intervention, rather than that he "abandoned" the Lutheran cause. See Dowding, *Life and Correspondence*, chs 26–27; Sven Göransson, *Ortodoxi och Synkretism i Sverige, 1647–1660* (Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksells Boktryckeri, 1950), 147–48; Henke, *Georg Calixtus*, 2.2:92–94; Jacobi, "Das liebeiche Religionsgespräch," 495–96; Kaplan, *Divided by Faith*, 139–40; Mager, "Brüderlichkeit und Einheit," 212; "Georg Calixt," in *Orthodoxie und Pietismus*, ed. Martin Greschat (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1982), 145; Schüssler, *Georg Calixt*, 128–29; Stewart, "Catholicity or Consensus?," 237–38; Paul Tschackert, "Syncretism, Syncretistic Controversies," in *The New Schaff-Herzog Religious Encyclopedia*, vol. 11, *Son of Man—Tremellius*, ed. Samuel Macauley Jackson (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1953), 219. Cf. Schmeling, "Lutheran Orthodoxy," 323.

¹²⁶ Tschackert, "Syncretism," 219. Cf. Harrison, "Abraham Calov," 5.

¹²⁷ See Heinz Staemmler, *Die Auseinandersetzung der kursächsischen Theologen mit dem Helmstedter Synkretismus: Eine Studie zum "Consensus Repetitus Fidei Vere Lutheranae" (1655) und den Diskussionen um ihn*, ed. Johann Anselm Steiger (Waltrop: Hartmut Spenner, 2005).

¹²⁸ On the *Consensus repetitus*, see Schmeling, "Lutheran Orthodoxy," 328–31; Staemmler, *Die Auseinandersetzung*, 111–266. The *Consensus repetitus fidei vere Lutheranae* . . . was distributed in 1655, but not actually published until 1664. Although the authorship is not stated, it is widely attributed to Calov. See Schmeling, "Lutheran Orthodoxy," 325 and, for example, Harrison, "Abraham Calov," 6; Mager, "Georg Calixt," in *Orthodoxie und Pietismus*, 146; Stewart, "Consensus or Catholicity?," 9, 11. Cf. Göransson, *Ortodoxi*, 266; Schmeling, "Lutheran Orthodoxy," 353n53.

¹²⁹ Schmeling, "Lutheran Orthodoxy," 332, 339.

that were considered in conflict with the *Book of Concord* and the Augsburg Confession.¹³⁰

C. George Fry argues that Calov considered himself first and foremost a Lutheran (as distinct from Christian), and as a Lutheran he felt it was his duty to staunchly defend the true faith.¹³¹ Many of his writings were therefore overtly polemical.¹³² As noted above, after the Colloquy of Toruń Calov became “Calixtus’ tireless opponent,”¹³³ and wrote several polemic tracts against him and his fellow theologians at Helmstedt. Although Georg Calixtus died on 19 March 1656, Calov’s publications continued until his own death thirty years later, during which time the Calixtine legacy was defended by Calixtus’ son Friedrich and by Calixtus’ former students, including Hermann Conring (1606–1681) and Gerard Molanus (1633–1722).¹³⁴ Until his death, Calixtus’ goal remained the reunification of Christendom, while theologians of the Calovian school continued to see Calixtine theology as a threat to orthodox Lutheranism.¹³⁵

¹³⁰ Timothy Schmeling notes that this “comprehensive refutation” of the syncretist position can be considered as such only if “the [*Consensus repetitus*] has an accurate grasp of their theology.” Schmeling, “Lutheran Orthodoxy,” 336. Benjamin Mayes suggests that it does not. Mayes, “Syncretism,” 292–93.

¹³¹ Fry, “Three Lutheran Fathers,” 137, 138.

¹³² Timothy Schmeling lists as one of Calov’s works *E diaboli excrementa [sic] Calixtinas sordes exquirere* (1675), but I can find no record of this publication anywhere else. The phrase does appear in the *New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia*, however, where Paul Tschackert uses it to describe Calov’s goal in life: “to seek out the Calixtine filth in the excrement of the devil” (my translation). It appears to be a reference to Calov’s description of Calixtus’ theology as “the excrements of Satan” in his *Fides veterum et imprimis fidelium mundi antediluviani in Christum* of 1655. See Schmeling, “Lutheran Orthodoxy,” 327. Cf. Tschackert, “Syncretism,” 220, 222–23.

¹³³ Gaß, “Calovius: Abraham C. (Kalau),” in *ADB*, 3:712: “unermüdliche Gegner Calixt’s.”

¹³⁴ Adams, “Leibniz’s *Examination*,” 521–22; Fasolt, “Political Unity and Religious Diversity: Hermann Conring’s Confessional Writings and the Preface to Aristotle’s *Politics* of 1637,” in *Confessionalization in Europe*, 322; Miller, “Molanus,” 201; Schmeling, “Lutheran Orthodoxy,” 537.

¹³⁵ This is reflected in the titles of the publications promulgated on each side of the debate. From Calov see, for example, *Consideratio theologiae Helmstad.* (1649), cited in Schmeling, “Lutheran Orthodoxy,” 325; *Nöthigen Ablehnung etlicher Injurien* (1651), *Harmonia Calixt. haeretica* (1655), and *Syntagma antisyncretisticum* (1668), all cited in Gaß, “Calovius,” 713. These titles can be translated to “An Examination of Helmstedt Theology,” “A Necessary Rejection of Several Insults,” “The ‘Harmony’ of the Heretical Calixtus,” and “An Ordered Treatise Against Syncretism.” From Calixtus see, for example, *Judicium de controversiis* (1650) and *Desiderium et studium concordiae ecclesiasticae* (1650), both cited in Schüssler, “Georg Calixt(us),” in *NDB*, 3:97; Calixtus, *Wiederlegung . . . Weller*. These titles can be translated as “An Opinion on Controversies,” “The Desire for, and Pursuit of, Ecclesiastical Peace,” and “Refutation of Weller.” Jakob Weller (1602–1664) was one of Calixtus’ opponents in the Syncretistic Controversy, and wrote to the three Dukes of Brunswick in 1649 requesting that they condemn Calixtine theology. See Calixtus, *Georg Calixtus’ Briefwechsel*, 192–95. See also Schackert, “Syncretism.”

These controversies revolved around a number of issues which plagued Calixtus throughout his life and which he attempted to address in proposing the *consensus antiquitatis* as a basis for ecclesiastical reunion. Despite this, because of the precarious position he occupied between the Lutheran and Roman Catholic confessions, he was never able to achieve his goal. His belief that the confessions were members of the same church was in direct contradiction to both the Lutheran *Book of Concord*, which specifically condemned “false and seductive doctrines and their stiff-necked proponents and blasphemers,”¹³⁶ and to the Tridentine decrees, which held on the Roman Catholic side.¹³⁷ He was accused of abandoning Lutheran doctrine by Büscher, of the incorrect interpretation of Scripture by Nihus, and of heresy by Calov. These concerns are worth bearing in mind when we consider the relationship between Calixtus and Isaac Casaubon in chapter four.

2.5. The Calixtine Legacy to Lower Saxony

One final aspect of Calixtus’ life that warrants attention here is his impact on the relationship between church and state in Lower Saxony. There is a small body of literature that explores this topic and, when viewed through the lens of the confessionalization thesis outlined above, it shows that Calixtus played an important role in the emergence of the early modern absolute state in this region. At the turn of the seventeenth century, a distinct “post-orthodox” Lutheran theology was emerging at the University of Helmstedt, and Calixtus’ appointment as professor of theology in 1614 saw this continue. Over the following decades, through his actions as *professor primarius* of the university, his influence as abbot of Königslutter, and his close personal relationship with Duke August the Younger, Calixtus made a lasting impression on his local region.

Calixtus’ ultimate goal was always the reunion of Christendom and he believed that this could be achieved most effectively through the involvement of the state.¹³⁸ As such, as key positions became available in the local duchy, he used his contacts to ensure that people favourable to his ideas (usually his students) were appointed to these posts. Thus, Brandanus Daetrius (1607–1688), Justus Gesenius

¹³⁶ “Preface to the Book of Concord,” 11.

¹³⁷ *Canons and Decrees*; Mayes, “Syncretism,” 301–2.

¹³⁸ Kelly, *Theological Faculty*, 14; Reller, “Die Auswirkungen,” 40.

(1601–1673), and Gerard Molanus, among many others, came to occupy positions such as *Stadtsuperintendent* of the city of Brunswick, *generalissimus* in Hannover, and abbot of Loccum, while Calixtus' brother-in-law, Johann Schwartzkopff (1596–1658), was chancellor of Wolfenbüttel. With many key positions occupied by people sympathetic to his cause, Calixtus was able to work with August the Younger to ensure that Calixtine ideals were spread throughout the local territories.¹³⁹ The fact that Helmstedt served as the only university for this area also meant that all priests and scholars could be appropriately trained. We see here several key features of confessionalization in action, and Calixtus' influence throughout the territories of August the Younger and his brothers went hand-in-hand with the strengthening of the state during this time.¹⁴⁰

Calixtus' efforts for the reunion of Christendom were continued by others throughout the seventeenth century and into the eighteenth. Gottfried Leibniz (1646–1716) was an important supporter of Calixtus' work and, together with Cristobal de Rojas y Spinoza (1626–1695) and Molanus, worked ardently to effect the reunion of Christendom based on Calixtine principles.¹⁴¹ As we have noted, at Helmstedt Calixtus' legacy was maintained by his son Friedrich, and by his students Conring and Molanus. At the turn of the eighteenth century it was continued by Johann Lorenz von Mosheim (1693–1755), “the new Calixt[us].”¹⁴² This meant that, as well as helping to facilitate the rise of the absolute state through the process of confessionalization, Calixtus' work maintained a continuous influence in Brunswick and the surrounding territories for over a century.¹⁴³

¹³⁹ See in general Krumwiede, *Kirchengeschichte*, 212–222; Mager, “Die Beziehung Herzog Augusts von Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel zu den Theologen Georg Calixt und Johann Valentin Andrea,” *Pietismus und Neuzeit* 6 (1981): 76–98; Reller, “Die Auswirkungen”; Uhlhorn, “Die Bedeutung Georg Calixts.”

¹⁴⁰ In addition to the works cited in the previous note see, briefly, Schilling, “Confessionalization in the Empire,” 237–38.

¹⁴¹ See Adams, “Leibniz's *Examination*”; Maria Rosa Antognazza, *Leibniz: An Intellectual Biography* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009); Miller, “Molanus”; Schüssler, *Georg Calixt*, 157–71.

¹⁴² Kelly, *Theological Faculty*, 26. See also Krumwiede, *Kirchengeschichte*, 240–44.

¹⁴³ On Calixtus' legacy, see also Böttigheimer, *Zwischen Polemik und Irenik*, ch. 4; Mager, *Georg Calixts theologische Ethik*, 150–73; Mager et al., “Theologie im Dialog”; Wallmann, “Zwischen Reformation und Humanismus.”

2.6. Summary—Background and Biography

This chapter has taken the time to introduce Calixtus by outlining his early life, his education, and some of the controversies that he was involved with in his later years. He was educated in his earlier years in an explicitly humanist, melanchthonian environment and early on gained an appreciation for classical knowledge. At university he studied under Cornelius Martini, a master of Aristotelian philosophy, and in two tours of universities and libraries throughout Europe he met many eminent scholars, coming face-to-face with the realities of confessionalization, and developing a deeper appreciation for historical reasoning. On these tours Calixtus also interacted not only with Lutheran scholars but also Roman Catholic and Reformed, recognising the skill and knowledge that these people brought to the confessional debate. He was thus able to deepen his own understanding of different doctrines, and gain a more tolerant disposition to the Reformed and Roman Catholic parties than many of his Lutheran contemporaries.¹⁴⁴ Calixtus' work brought him under heavy fire from Lutherans, Roman Catholics, and members of the Reformed confession, each charging him with particular errors in his theology. These attacks were exacerbated after the Colloquy of Toruń, when he was embroiled in several theological quarrels, beginning the Syncretistic Controversy, a “grave crisis in ecclesiological understanding within Lutheranism,”¹⁴⁵ which would continue after his death in 1656. Calixtus spent his last days defending his views, and fervently argued for confessional peace in all of these dialogues.

Having provided a broad overview of Calixtus' life and work, this thesis can begin to look at particular aspects of this narrative more closely, and to question some of the assumptions that have endured at least since Ernst Henke published his biography of Calixtus in the nineteenth century.¹⁴⁶ The following chapter will

¹⁴⁴ Tschackert, “Syncretism,” 219. For examples of this anti-Reformed and anti-Roman Catholic bias in Lutheranism, see Hotson, “Irenicism”; Nischan, “Reformed Irenicism.”

¹⁴⁵ Harrison, “Abraham Calov,” 5.

¹⁴⁶ Although it is likely that the somewhat narrow picture we have of Calixtus has its genesis in our reliance on Henke's biography, it must also be noted that Moller, “Georgius Calixtus,” published in the mid eighteenth-century, also focussed almost overwhelmingly on what might be considered the “theological” aspects of Calixtus' life. Around that time modern disciplinarity was emerging and it is likely that Moller, as have later scholars, imposed his own specialisation on his subject. See Foucault, *Order*, 51–77; Robert Mayhew, “British Geography's Republic of Letters: Mapping an Imagined Community, 1600–1800,” *Journal of the History of Ideas* 65, no. 2 (2004): 266; Westerhoff, “Polyhistor,” 101–2; “World of Signs,” 640–42.

explore existing opinions regarding the main objects of our critique in later chapters: the origins of Calixtus' understanding of the *consensus antiquitatis*, and his engagement with the intellectual world of Renaissance humanism.

3. Calixtus and Humanism: A Partial View?

Scholarly interest in the life and works of Georg Calixtus has been at best sporadic since his death in 1656. Few comprehensive treatments were published prior to the twenty-first century, and even in the last fifty years, when interest seems to have been greatest, the works which have been published have, by and large, limited themselves to the concerns of the modern disciplines of theology and ecclesiastical history. This chapter will consider this body of work in relation to the foci of chapters four and five: the development of Calixtus' understanding of the *consensus antiquitatis*, and his interaction with the wider world of humanist scholarship. For the English reader, the treatments by William Kelly and Quentin Stewart provide the best introductions to Calixtus' work, although Stewart's in particular contains little, if anything, that cannot be gleaned from German sources.¹ Kelly provides a little more original information, offering his reader interesting synopses of two dissertations for which Calixtus acted as praeses in 1643.² However, errors in Kelly's endnoting mean that it is unclear which sources he has used, and it is thus extremely difficult to confirm several of the details of his narrative.³ For the German reader at least ten books, and many more journal articles and book chapters, are devoted either in whole or in part to Calixtus' work,⁴ however, they again focus specifically on those aspects which are of interest to a modern student of theology. This chapter will contend that although the literature does consider Calixtus' engagement with the wider world of humanist scholarship, a much deeper consideration is warranted.

¹ Kelly, *Theological Faculty*, 8–15; Stewart, “Catholicity or Consensus?,” 232–63.

² Kelly, *Theological Faculty*, 10–11.

³ The errors appear to have been introduced during the transition from PhD thesis to published monograph. Notes 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, and 48 in *Theological Faculty*, for example, correspond with notes 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, and 47 on pp. 108–12, 215–16 of “Theological Faculty.” Notes 49, 50, and 51 in *Theological Faculty* have no sources, while notes 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64 on pp. 10–12 correspond with notes 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60 on pp. 115–21, 216–17 of “Theological Faculty.” Notes 61 and 62 on p. 13 of *Theological Faculty* are correct, while note 63 on p. 13 has no source, and notes 64 and 66 on p. 13 correspond with notes 63 and 64 on pp. 123–24, 217 of “Theological Faculty.” Notes 65 and 66 on p. 14 of *Theological Faculty* are correct.

⁴ Books include Böttigheimer, *Zwischen Polemik und Irenik*; Engel, *Die eine Wahrheit*; Gaß, *Georg Calixt und der Synkretismus: Eine dogmenhistorische Abhandlung* (Breslau: A. Gosohorsky, 1846); Henke, *Georg Calixtus*; Kantzenbach, *Das Ringen*; Mager, *Georg Calixts theologische Ethik*; Merkt, *Das patristische Prinzip*; Ritschl, *Dogmengeschichte*; Heinrich Schmid, *Geschichte der synkretistischen Streitigkeiten in der Zeit des Georg Calixt* (Erlangen: Carl Heyder, 1846); Schüssler, *Georg Calixt*; Wallmann, *Der Theologiebegriff*. Articles and book chapters will be cited as required. See also the bibliography, below, pp. 109–28.

First, it will explore this literature in order to explicate existing views on the genesis of Calixtus' understanding of the *consensus antiquitatis*. This will provide the foundation for chapter four, which discusses Isaac Casaubon's role in the development of this understanding. Second, this chapter shall explore to what extent the current body of knowledge considers Calixtus' engagement with the humanist tradition. This will provide a reference point for chapter five, which explores this engagement in the context of the genre of the *ars historica*.

3.1. The Genesis of a Calixtine *consensus antiquitatis*

Despite the several monographs and numerous articles devoted to Calixtus' theology, only a handful deal in any significant detail with his understanding of the *consensus antiquitatis* and, more specifically, how this understanding was formed. The most fully articulated view places the focus squarely on the contribution that Georg Cassander and Marco Antonio de Dominis' work made to the evolution of Calixtus' theology. It notes that Dominis' third volume of his *Respublica ecclesiastica*, containing his model for church unity, was released in 1622,⁵ and that between this time and 1634, Calixtus' irenic ideals were formed.⁶ The evidence most often cited to support this is that the "Prooemium" to Calixtus' 1629 edition of Augustine's *De doctrina Christiana* and Vincent of Lérins' *Commonitorium* was the first work in which he advocated the *consensus antiquitatis* as a basis for confessional reunion.⁷ That the 1620s were a watershed in Calixtus' work is also almost universally acknowledged, and it is clear that during this period his ideas for church unity saw ultimate fruition, at least in published form. The Thirty Years War reached Helmstedt during this time as well, and there is little doubt that this played a key part in Calixtus giving expression to his ideas for a reunion of the confessions: his speech at the University's foundation day in 1626 makes it clear that he believed ecclesiastical peace was vital to ending the war.⁸ At issue, however, is not the final

⁵ Ritschl, *Dogmengeschichte*, 4:398; Schüssler, *Georg Calixt*, 51.

⁶ Böttigheimer, *Zwischen Polemik und Irenik*, 173–74; Kantzenbach, *Das Ringen*, 238; Merkt, *Das patristische Prinzip*, 97–98; Ritschl, *Dogmengeschichte*, 4:398–401; Schüssler, *Georg Calixt*, 53.

⁷ See, for example, Böttigheimer, "Auf der Suche," 230–31; Engel, *Die eine Wahrheit*, 130; Merkt, *Das patristische Prinzip*, 102–5.

⁸ Calixtus, "Oratio de cæsareæ maiestatis dignitate et auctoritate," in *Orationes selectæ*, 17–27; "Oratio de caesareae maiestatis dignitate et auctoritate: 1626," in *Werke*, 3:180–90. See also Mager, "Georg Calixts interkonfessionelle Kommunikation," 54; Schüssler, *Georg Calixt*, 45–46.

evolution of Calixtus' model for church unity, but the beginnings of it: what happened *before* the 1620s? Apart from his interaction with Dominis' *Respublica ecclesiastica* and the terrors of the Thirty Years War, were there other factors that led to Calixtus' irenic disposition? An important matter to consider when answering these questions is Calixtus' relationship with Casaubon and here, unlike the consensus surrounding the evolution of his thought in the 1620s, the literature is divided.

As the bulk of literary interest in Calixtus has to date been from theologians and ecclesiastical historians, the issue of his relationship with Casaubon has received little attention. The majority of comments regarding Casaubon's interaction with Calixtus appear to be made in passing during wider discussions of Calixtine theology. In these allusions, we find two schools of thought: the first believes that Calixtus' meetings with Casaubon were of great importance to him; the second suggests that Casaubon had no (or at most, a minimal) effect on Calixtus' intellectual development. Unfortunately, neither school explicates its stance for us. In the first we have scholars such as Friedrich Kantzenbach, Andreas Merkt, and Ernst Henke, whose opinion was that Calixtus' meeting with Casaubon had an "overwhelming and permanent" effect on the younger man.⁹ In the second school of thought stands Hermann Schüssler, following the lead of Otto Ritschl's 1927 *Dogmengeschichte* (History of Dogmas). Christoph Böttigheimer, in his more recent monograph, concurs with their position. The lack of in-depth discussion regarding the matter makes it difficult to find a basis for their assertion that Casaubon's influence cannot be found in Calixtus' view of the church—Schüssler and Böttigheimer simply cite Ritschl to support their stance,¹⁰ while Ritschl suggests that Calixtus' "traditionalism" was not articulated until the end of the 1620s, and thus Cassander (through Dominis) was more important for the development of Calixtine theology than Casaubon was.

Ritschl seems to feel that the only reason for emphasizing a connection between Calixtus and Casaubon is to highlight the humanist influence on Calixtus' thought (which is, of course, the purpose of the present analysis). As Cassander was also influenced by humanism, Ritschl regards this motivation as moot.¹¹ The

⁹ Henke, *Georg Calixtus*, 1:148: "überwältigender und unvergänglicher."

¹⁰ Böttigheimer, *Zwischen Polemik und Irenik*, 190n445; and Schüssler, *Georg Calixt*, 199n76.

¹¹ Ritschl, *Dogmengeschichte*, 4:398n21.

difficulty with this stance is that it ignores the implications associated with a Casaubonian influence. Of course, Renaissance humanism was an inescapable aspect of the European intellectual milieu throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, for Cassander as much as for anyone else; however, if the prime impetus for Calixtus' understanding of the early church came from Casaubon—famous for his classical and philological works, rather than patristic and theological—we are prompted to reconsider Calixtus' interaction with the humanist tradition and his use of classical as well as patristic sources in his work, as well as connections between scholars that have previously been overlooked because of modern notions of disciplinarity. The dismissal of his relationship with Casaubon as a factor of possible relevance rejects the possibility that Calixtus involved himself in much wider circles of contemporary thought than those relating only to matters of church and state, or to doctrinal or theological concerns.

The most fully articulated argument for the origins of Calixtus' understanding of the *consensus antiquitatis* comes from Hermann Schüssler, who contends that Calixtus based his model on that of Marco Antonio de Dominis and Georg Cassander. As the next chapter will show, there are obvious similarities between Cassander's, Dominis', and Calixtus' understandings (and application) of the *consensus antiquitatis*, and Schüssler is not the only scholar to have noticed this. Indeed, many authors have acknowledged that Calixtine theology has a place in the tradition of "old catholic" irenicism. Christoph Böttigheimer, Friedrich Kantzenbach, Andreas Merkt, Otto Ritschl, Rob van de Schoor, and Johannes Wallmann have all emphasised the debt that Calixtus owes to irenicists such as Cassander and Dominis.¹² Calixtus' contemporaries, including Abraham Calov, also saw this connection.¹³ However, while all these scholars agree that Calixtus fits within this tradition, Schüssler takes this consideration a step further by attempting to illustrate not only a direct connection with this tradition (epitomised by Cassander and Dominis), but a fundamental *reliance* on it in Calixtine theology.

¹² Böttigheimer, *Zwischen Polemik und Irenik*, 188–93; Kantzenbach, *Das Ringen*, 237–40; Merkt, *Das patristische Prinzip*, 27–36; Ritschl, *Dogmengeschichte*, 4:398–99; Rob J. M. van de Schoor, "Reprints of Cassander's and Witzel's *Irenica* from Helmstedt: The Meaning of the Irenical Tradition for Georg Calixtus, Hermann Conring and Johannes Latermann," trans. H. S. Lake, *Lias* 20, no. 2 (1993): 173–80; Wallmann, "Union, Reunion, Toleranz," 29.

¹³ Abraham Calov, *Consensus repetitus . . .* (Wittenberg: Typis Johannis Borckardi, 1666), 2, cited in Schmelting, "Lutheran Orthodoxy," 322; Calov, *Historia syncretistica . . .* (1685), cited in van de Schoor, "Reprints," 174–75.

Schüssler argues that Calixtus based his theology on that of Cassander and Dominis by making reference to five of Calixtus' published works.¹⁴ He points to the fact that in his 1658 publication *De pontifice Romano orationes tres* (Three Speeches on the Bishop of Rome), Calixtus mentioned how important Dominis' work was to him: "[Calixtus] was already acquainted with the first part of [Dominis'] *Respublica ecclesiastica* in 1617, the same year that it was published."¹⁵ Schüssler also provides examples of how Calixtus used this work in his own writings, pointing to places in which Calixtus cited Dominis, and where Calixtus wrote of Dominis' erudition in matters of the church of antiquity.¹⁶ Of course one must remember that it was not uncommon at this time to praise other scholars as *peritissimus* (most expert), *doctissimus* (most learned), or *eximius* (remarkable), even if one did not necessarily agree with their opinion.¹⁷ As such, these statements alone cannot be relied on for proof of influence. However, Schüssler does provide additional evidence, quoting Calixtus' 1652 publication *Positiones summam doctrinae Christianae complexae* (A Presentation of the Chief Points Concerning Christian Doctrine), wherein it was acknowledged that Dominis "prudently recommend[ed]" the Apostles' Creed as a standard for articles of faith.¹⁸ Having already shown that Dominis' work was an evolution of Cassander's, Schüssler thus contends that the views of these men were the basis for Calixtus' model of the true, catholic church.¹⁹

It is almost certain that Calixtus had early exposure to the work of people like Georg Cassander and Marco Antonio de Dominis. We already know that these men lived in close intellectual, and temporal, proximity. Excluding Cassander, they were all alive at the same time, and even he was involved in the beginnings of the

¹⁴ These date from 1628 to 1661. See Schüssler, *Georg Calixt*, 51–52, 196nn95–97.

¹⁵ Schüssler, *Georg Calixt*, 51: "Bereits 1617 kennt er den ersten Teil der *Respublica Ecclesiastica*, der in diesem Jahr erschien."

¹⁶ Schüssler, *Georg Calixt*, 196nn96–97.

¹⁷ See, for example, Casaubon, *The Answer of Master Isaac Casaubon to the Epistle of the Most Illvstrious, and Most Reuerend Cardinall Peron. Translated out of Latin into English. May 18. 1612* (London: William Aspley, 1612), 1. Despite this letter being part of an argument with du Perron (see below, § 4.2), Casaubon writes in most friendly terms: "[B]oth your letters, which . . . you sent me, seasoned with singular courtesie, humanitie, and prudence, witnessing the faire ingenuitie of the author, were sweeter to me than any honey." Cf. Thomas Conley, "Vituperation in Early Seventeenth Century Historical Studies," *Rhetorica* 22, no. 2 (2004): 169–82.

¹⁸ Calixtus, *Positiones summam doctrinae Christianae complexae* (Helmstedt: 1652), § 22, quoted in Schüssler, *Georg Calixt*, 196n97: "Symbolo Apostolico jam addenda esse alia Symbola verum articulorum Symboli Apostolici sensum explicantia prudenter suadet M. Antonius de Dominis lib. VII."

¹⁹ Schüssler, *Georg Calixt*, 49–52.

confessional debates that followed the Reformation, and which intensified in the seventeenth century. And no doubt Calixtus was exposed to Cassander's work in his younger years: he was raised in a humanist, irenic environment, attended a school that fostered similar values, and went to university at one of the most liberal institutions in Germany. Although it does not appear that any of Cassander's books were to be found in the library at the Flensburg Grammar School,²⁰ the library at Helmstedt did hold at least eight of his works, including the *Traditionum veteris ecclesiae et sanctorum patrum defensio* (A Defence of the Tradition of the Ancient Church and of the Sainted Fathers) of 1564 and the oft-cited *De officio pii* (On the Obligation of the Pious).²¹ Despite this potential early exposure, it is difficult to assert, as Schüssler does, that Calixtus' theology is *based* on that of Cassander and Dominis. There is a gap here in that the influence of other people, such as Isaac Casaubon, has been overlooked in the development of these ideas. Chapter four will introduce Casaubon, and will show that his theology also bears remarkable similarities to Calixtus'. It will also introduce other evidence to suggest that Casaubon's influence on the younger man was at least as great as that of Cassander and Dominis. When considered in regards to Calixtus' relationship with the humanist tradition, a Casaubonian influence in his younger years has important implications for his later work.

3.2. Humanism, Calixtus, and History

Although it is generally acknowledged that history played a key part in the development of Calixtus' theology, the details of his interpretation and use of history—the focus of the second part of this study—have received relatively little attention. This section will explore to what extent the literature *does* consider this relationship, providing a space within which to position the analysis which follows in

²⁰ Moller, *Erneuertes Andenken*, 45–50.

²¹ Georg Cassander, *Traditionum veteris ecclesiae et sanctorum patrum defensio, adversus Io. Calvini importunas criminationes* . . . (Cologne: Arnold Birckmann Erben, 1564), at HAB, shelf-mark H: G 5.4° Helmst. (2); *De officio pii ac publicae tranquillitatis vere amantis viri, in hoc Religionis dissidio* . . . (Cologne: Arnold Birckmann Erben, 1562), at HAB, shelf-marks H: G 5.4° Helmst. (3), H: H 149.4° Helmst. (1), H: S 211.4° Helmst. (18). Other works at HAB, shelf-marks H: D 133.8° Helmst. (3), H: D 150.8° Helmst. (2), H: G 5.4° Helmst. (4), H: S 332.8° Helmst. (1), H: Yv 272.8° Helmst. (3), H: Yv 783.8° Helmst. (4). It must be noted that current catalogue information does not detail when these works were acquired by the library at Helmstedt, though it is likely they were there at the same time as Calixtus.

chapter five. What the literature agrees on is that Calixtus owed much to his humanist upbringing although, as noted in the introduction, it tends to portray Calixtus as a consumer, rather than a producer, of humanist ideals. Hermann Schüssler, for example, discusses in some depth the “humanist view of history,”²² and how Calixtus shaped it to his own purposes in his theology, but he makes no note of how Calixtus’ contribution fits in with wider contemporary discussions regarding the study and use of history. The focus is on how Calixtus adopted the classical ideals of humanism, and how these ideals were reflected in “the plethora of citations of the [church] fathers” and the relative scarcity of Reformation citations in Calixtus’ work.²³ This humanist influence is generally acknowledged throughout the literature as the basis for Calixtus’ concern with the affairs of the ancients.²⁴ It is interestingly not always explicitly named as “humanist,” though Johannes Caselius, Cornelius Martini, and Philipp Melancthon, all now widely regarded as standing in the humanist tradition, are almost ubiquitously named as key figures in relation to this aspect of Calixtus’ intellectual development.²⁵ The discussion of their influence on Calixtus’ thought—whether through the application of Aristotelian logic in systematic theology, or the desire to emphasise commonalities rather than differences between the Christian confessions, for example—shows how he drew on this

²² Schüssler, *Georg Calixt*, 35–39: “Humanistische Geschichtsbetrachtung.”

²³ Schüssler, *Georg Calixt*, 39: “die Fülle der Väterzitate.”

²⁴ Böttigheimer, *Zwischen Polemik und Irenik*, 31–32, 34–35; Gaß, *Georg Calixt*, 12–13; Bengt Hägglund, “Verständnis und Autorität der altkirchlichen Tradition in der lutherischen Theologie der Reformationszeit bis zum Ende des 17. Jahrhunderts,” in *Oecumenica: Annales de Recherche Oecuménique* (Strasbourg: Centre d’Études Oecuméniques, 1971), 53; Henke, *Georg Calixtus*, 1:105–9; Husung, “Georg Calixtus,” 283–84; Mager, “Georg Calixt,” in *Orthodoxie und Pietismus*, 138; Mager, “Georg Calixt—der niedersächsische Unionstheologe,” in *Vier Jahrhunderte lutherische Landeskirche in Braunschweig: Festschrift zum 400 jährigen Reformationsjubiläum der Braunschweigischen evangelisch-lutherischen Landeskirche im Jahre 1968*, ed. Friedrich Wilhelm Wandersleb and Martin Wandersleb (Brunswick: Landeskirchenamt, 1968), 79–80; Merkt, *Das patristische Prinzip*, 16, 18–20; Merkt, “Die alte Kirche als Remedium Schismati: Zum Typus der sogenannten Altkatholischen Irenik,” in *Union, Konversion, Toleranz*, 7–8; Miller, “Molanus,” 198; Karl Müller, *Kirchengeschichte*, vol. 2, bk. 2 (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1919); 584; Martin Schmidt, “Ecumenical Activity on the Continent of Europe in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries,” in *A History of the Ecumenical Movement, 1517–1948*, ed. Ruth Rouse and Stephen C. Neill (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1954), 77; Schüssler, *Georg Calixt*, 35; Stewart, “Catholicity or Consensus?,” 232, 234; Uhlhorn, “Die Bedeutung Georg Calixts,” 201–2; Wallmann, *Der Theologiebegriff*, 85–86; “Union, Reunion, Toleranz,” 24–25; “Zwischen Reformation und Humanismus,” 70–71.

²⁵ In addition to the works cited in the previous note see, for example, Kantzenbach, *Das Ringen*, 234–35; Krumwiede, *Kirchengeschichte*, 213; Mager, *Georg Calixts theologische Ethik*, 37–41.

humanist upbringing to develop peculiar ways of addressing the doctrinal challenges of the day.

Johannes Wallmann makes special note of the influence that humanism had on Calixtus' theology. In particular, he suggests that, under the influence of Calixtus' teachers Caselius and Martini, and under Calixtus himself, the University of Helmstedt broke free of the "Orthodoxy—Pietism—Enlightenment" evolution that bound other German universities, and instead progressed through "Orthodoxy—Early Enlightenment—Early Pietism," with the break from orthodoxy coming at least thirty years earlier, prior to the outbreak of the Thirty Years War in 1618.²⁶ Here, one sees a broader consideration of the impact that humanism, via Calixtus, had in the local duchy. Hans-Walter Krumwiede also recognises the impact that Calixtus had on the region, and both he and Wallmann identify this in three key areas: Calixtus' separation of faith from theology; his development of a moral theology; and his projects for the reunion of Christendom.²⁷ All three of these achievements stemmed from his humanist education, in particular from the use of philosophy in theology, and from the practical use of history.

Beyond his theological contributions, Calixtus' relationship with Renaissance humanism tends to be viewed as one-sided. Mager, for example, makes a great deal of Melanchthon's influence on Calixtus, and is a pioneering scholar in the field of Calixtine moral theology. However, in discussing Calixtus' treatment of the Lotharian legend, she mentions only his penchant for historical critique, a point that is important to consider if one is to evaluate his relationship with the humanist tradition.²⁸ Beyond Calixtus' influence on his student Hermann Conring, now well-known as the "founder of German legal history,"²⁹ barely a mention is made of the *contribution* that Calixtus' exercise made to contemporary legal debates, or the fact that this exercise saw him participating in the same activities as humanist scholars

²⁶ Wallmann, "Zwischen Reformation und Humanismus," 65–70. Ian Hunter points out that these developments also had repercussions for political science at Helmstedt, similarly allowing it "to reach across the Thirty Years War and join hands with Pufendorf's and Thomasius's [*sic*] . . . natural law in the post-war period." Hunter, *Secularisation*, 43.

²⁷ Krumwiede, *Kirchengeschichte*, 199–202; Wallmann, "Zwischen Reformation und Humanismus," 75–80. See also Böttigheimer, *Zwischen Polemik und Irenik*; Engel, *Die eine Wahrheit*; Mager, "Georg Calixts interkonfessionelle Kommunikation"; *Georg Calixts theologische Ethik*; Merkt, *Das patristische Prinzip*; Schüssler, *Georg Calixt*.

²⁸ See Mager, *Georg Calixts theologische Ethik*, 128–34.

²⁹ Otto Stobbe, *Hermann Conring, der Begründer der deutschen Rechtsgeschichte* (Berlin: Hertz, 1870), quoted and trans. in Fasolt, *Limits of History*, 74.

elsewhere in Europe, such as Isaac Casaubon or François Baudouin (1520–1573). Indeed, the term “humanist” is mentioned nowhere in the discussion.³⁰

In regards to Calixtus’ relationship with the humanist view of history, Andreas Merkt and Hermann Schüssler are the only scholars to have treated the matter in any depth. The only other tacit acknowledgement that Calixtus may have made a contribution to historical thought seems to be the mention of his “De studio historiae ecclesiasticae” (On the Study of Church History) in Astrid Witschi-Bernz’s survey of early modern historical literature.³¹ The following section will provide an outline of Merkt and Schüssler’s discussions and will suggest that, although they acknowledge humanism’s importance to Calixtus, much more research needs to be done to evaluate Calixtus’ importance to humanism.

3.2.1. Merkt and Schüssler

Schüssler notes that although Calixtus did not provide us with a complete history, he did leave us with a “thoroughly developed historical methodology,” albeit scattered among several works.³² We have already noted the reverence that Calixtus held for historical knowledge, and his legacy of a *methodology* rather than a *history* suggests that, for him, as for other humanists, historical knowledge served above all a practical purpose. Both Merkt and Schüssler concur with this, determining that for Calixtus, history had two main applications.³³ First, it could provide one with a complete knowledge of all matters divine and human. Second, and most important, history could teach one practical lessons to deal with contemporary problems. This

³⁰ Mager leads us tantalizingly close when she mentions Calixtus’ citation of Justus Lipsius (1547–1606), yet the activities of the humanists regarding the historical critique of legal and political mores remain beyond the scope of her discussion. Mager, *Georg Calixts theologische Ethik*, 133.

³¹ Calixtus, “De studio historiae ecclesiasticae,” in *Apparatus theologici et fragmenti historiae ecclesiasticae occidentalis*, 2nd edn, ed. F. Calixtus (Helmstedt, 1661), 182–98, cited in both Witschi-Bernz, “Bibliography of Works in the Philosophy of History—1500–1800,” *History and Theory* 12, Beiheft 12 (1972): 18, and “Main Trends in Historical-Method Literature: Sixteenth to Eighteenth Centuries,” *History and Theory* 12, Beiheft 12 (1972): 79. Although Witschi-Bernz has mentioned this publication in her survey, there is no indication of any engagement with it.

³² Schüssler, *Georg Calixt*, 37: “eine durchgebildete historische Methodik.”

³³ Merkt, *Das patristische Prinzip*, 91; Schüssler, *Georg Calixt*, 36, both citing Calixtus, “Apparatus”; “De historia”; “Epitome theologiae: 1619,” in *Werke*, 2:30–309. When noting citations by Merkt and Schüssler in the following discussion, I refer to modern editions of Calixtus’ works where available.

meant that history could also be used as a means of argument to defend true doctrine and disprove heretics.³⁴

According to Merkt and Schüssler, the practical uses of history come not from history itself, but from the *truth* which it represents. They both point to the Tertullian adage “that which is oldest is truest,” and to Calixtus’ insistence that anything new in philosophy is at least suspect, but anything new in theology is downright false.³⁵ Here, both Merkt and Schüssler credit Renaissance humanism with providing Calixtus with a starting point for his view of history, and they both ground this humanist ideal of history in a nostalgic yearning for better times: “in the origins lies truth; after the initial age of purity comes decay; this can be overcome today by returning to the beginnings.”³⁶ Merkt sees this yearning as the trigger for a paradigm shift that ultimately led to the Reformation. He views humanism as characterised by an increased level of self-awareness, as opposed to the insular, unquestioning acceptance of historical truth in late scholasticism.³⁷ This self-awareness encouraged people to reflect on their own position in history. A product of this reflection was the historical critique of the degeneration of the church during the medieval period, and this provided the “historical legitimation” for reform of the church.³⁸

Of course, as Schüssler points out, if one is to rely on history as a means of accessing some long-lost truth, one must believe that an eternal, unchanging truth actually exists, and he suggests that for Calixtus it did.³⁹ Schüssler believes that the discovery of this truth was Calixtus’ ultimate goal (this is also the overriding theme of Peter Engel’s book, *Die eine Wahrheit in der gespaltenen Christenheit* [The One Truth in a Divided Christendom], and is suggested by Böttigheimer’s article “Auf der

³⁴ Merkt, *Das patristische Prinzip*, 92; Schüssler, *Georg Calixt*, 36–37, both citing Calixtus’ “Apparatus”; “De historia”; “Epitome theologiae.” Both Merkt and Schüssler fail to recognise that, in “De historia,” Calixtus separates the second use of history into two discrete applications, thus offering his reader three uses for history. See below, p. 88.

³⁵ Schüssler, *Georg Calixt*, 35: “Antiquissimum quoque verissimum”; Merkt, *Das patristische Prinzip*, 89, both citing the foreword to Calixtus’ *De sanctissimo trinitatis mysterio exercitatio* (Helmstedt, 1645 [2nd edn, 1653]).

³⁶ Schüssler, *Georg Calixt*, 35: “bei den Ursprüngen liegt die Wahrheit; auf die reine Zeit des Anfangs folgt die des Verfalls; diesen gilt es heute durch die Rückkehr zu den Anfängen zu überwinden.” Cf. Merkt, *Das patristische Prinzip*, 86.

³⁷ Merkt, *Das patristische Prinzip*, 91. For further discussion, see Riccardo Fubini, “Humanism and Scholasticism: Toward an Historical Definition,” in *Interpretations*, 127–36.

³⁸ Merkt, *Das patristische Prinzip*, 90: “historische Legitimation.”

³⁹ Schüssler, *Georg Calixt*, 36.

Suche nach der ewig gültigen Lehre” [In Quest of the Eternally Valid Doctrine]⁴⁰). Schüssler suggests that Calixtus believed that “the scholarship of history, by taking us back to the time of pure truth, can help us to determine truth itself.”⁴¹ Here, he is again demonstrating the humanist influence on Calixtus’ understanding of history by emphasising a yearning for a purer age.

Merkt and Schüssler both contend that it was, at least partly, Calixtus’ view of history that set him apart from his orthodox Lutheran contemporaries. Although the Reformation meant that all parties became obliged to prove their theological positions historically,⁴² Calixtus elevated history above and beyond that which orthodox Lutherans considered acceptable. For him, it became of prime importance in any consideration of theology—in his ideal curriculum, a student would study church history before anything else, while in the curriculum of a more orthodox Lutheran such as Johann Gerhard (1582–1637), for example, it was undertaken “at the end of theological studies, and thereby [made] a mere appendix to the actual teaching.”⁴³ Schüssler believes that this preoccupation with the history of the church meant that, over time, Calixtus came to view the church of antiquity with an uncritical attitude. While, in his earlier works, Calixtus had referred to the church of antiquity to prove novelty in the contemporary church, in his later works the ancient church became representative of a “blissful” state which could be reclaimed.⁴⁴

Both Merkt and Schüssler make some other interesting observations regarding Calixtus’ approach to history. In particular, they both point out his division of history into three phases—*prima*, *media*, and *ultima*—and the similarity of this division to our contemporary understanding of antiquity, medievalism, and modernity.⁴⁵ Schüssler suggests that Calixtus heralded the replacement of a “chronological division” of history with a “classification scheme . . . based on

⁴⁰ I borrow the translation from the English abstract attached to the article. Böttigheimer, “Auf der Suche,” 234.

⁴¹ Schüssler, *Georg Calixt*, 36: “kann die Geschichtswissenschaft, indem sie auf jene Zeit der reinen Wahrheit zurückgeht, dazu helfen, die Wahrheit selbst zu ermitteln.” For this point, Schüssler cites Calixtus’ “Apparatus”; “De historia.”

⁴² Merkt, *Das patristische Prinzip*, 91; Schüssler, *Georg Calixt*, 37.

⁴³ Merkt, *Das patristische Prinzip*, 92: “Dieser stellt nämlich die Kirchengeschichte an das Ende des Theologiestudiums und macht sie dadurch zu einem bloßen Anhang der eigentlichen Lehre.” On the place of history in theology at this time, consider also, briefly, Witschi-Bernz, “Main Trends,” 78–79.

⁴⁴ Schüssler, *Georg Calixt*, 39: “beglückenden.” Cf. Stewart, “Catholicity or Consensus?,” 235n93.

⁴⁵ Merkt, *Das patristische Prinzip*, 86–87; Schüssler, *Georg Calixt*, 37, both citing Calixtus’ “Epitomes theologiae,” and the latter also citing his “Epitome theologiae.”

internal criteria.”⁴⁶ Merkt is not quite so generous, attributing the advent of such periodisation instead to Heinrich Canisius (ca. 1557–1610).⁴⁷ It seems, however, that both Merkt and Schüssler have credited Calixtus with more originality than he deserves—many of Calixtus’ contemporaries employed similar techniques of periodisation,⁴⁸ and Leonardo Bruni (1370–1444), for one, employed a tripartite division of history approximately two hundred years earlier.⁴⁹ However, Calixtus’ division stemmed from a different source. While Bruni saw the fall of the Roman Empire in the west as the turning point for civilization, Calixtus’ view of history was shaped by the Reformation “decay schema” (*Verfallschema*). That is, the “depravation of the church was tied to the history of the papacy.”⁵⁰ Nevertheless, both views were couched in the humanist belief in a purer age long past.

There are other pieces of evidence in Merkt and Schüssler’s discussions that suggest Calixtus’ engagement with contemporary intellectual debates. They both, for example, point out Calixtus’ definition of inner and outer criteria for considering the accuracy of historical sources. As Anthony Grafton has observed, this was an area of vociferous debate amongst the humanists of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.⁵¹ Merkt and Schüssler also note Calixtus’ insistence that historical sources were to be as complete as possible. As such, one ought to consult both ecclesiastical and secular sources.⁵² Given his humanist education at the hands of his father and under Johannes Caselius at Helmstedt, and his interaction with figures such as Jan Gruter, Isaac Casaubon, and Jacques-August de Thou, it should be no surprise that Calixtus placed as much emphasis on secular history as he did ecclesiastical. Despite

⁴⁶ Schüssler, *Georg Calixt*, 37: “Es kündigt sich die Ersetzung der chronologischen Einteilung durch ein Einteilungsschema an, das sich auf innere Kriterien gründet.”

⁴⁷ Merkt, *Das patristische Prinzip*, 86n2.

⁴⁸ George Nadel, “Philosophy of History Before Historicism,” *History and Theory* 3, no. 3 (1964): 307.

⁴⁹ James Hankins, “Introduction,” in Leonardo Bruni, *History of the Florentine People*, vol. 1, *Books I–IV*, ed. and trans. Hankins (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001), xvii–xviii. Merkt acknowledges that Bruni identified a period of decay after the fall of Rome, though fails to recognise the periodisation evident in Bruni’s work. Merkt, *Das patristische Prinzip*, 86n2. Cf. Wickenden, *G. J. Vossius*, 138, which suggests that the tripartite division of history was epitomised in the work of Christoph Cellarius (1638–1707) in the latter half of the seventeenth century.

⁵⁰ Merkt, *Das patristische Prinzip*, 87: “die Depravation der Kirche mit der Geschichte der Päpste in Verbindung.” Cf. Engel, *Die eine Wahrheit*, 122–23; Schüssler, *Georg Calixt*, 38, 67–69; Stewart, “Catholicity or Consensus?,” 247n117.

⁵¹ Grafton, *Forgers and Critics; What Was History?*

⁵² Merkt, *Das patristische Prinzip*, 94; Schüssler, *Georg Calixt*, 37, both citing Calixtus’ “Apparatus.” A great example of this is “De historia.” See chapter five, below.

this, the implications of this interaction are overlooked—the relationship of Calixtus’ historical writings to those of other humanists, for example, is not considered. Merkt and Schüssler only explore his writings insofar as they tell us about his work as an independent scholar, not as a traveller in a much broader intellectual world. Chapter five will look at Calixtus’ “De studio historiarum oratio” not as an independent work, but in relation to other works in the same genre, and in consideration of the intellectual debates that were flourishing at the time.

3.3. Summary—Calixtus and Humanism

This chapter has shown that the ambit of the extant literature concerning Calixtus has not adequately considered his relationship with the humanist tradition. Although it certainly acknowledges that Calixtus owed a debt to Renaissance humanism, and thus recognises his role as a consumer of humanism, at no point does the literature consider what contribution Calixtus made to this tradition, that is, his role as a producer of humanist ideas and techniques. It is certainly well known that Calixtus met Isaac Casaubon in 1612, but the importance of this meeting is overlooked in favour of a thesis which grounds Calixtus’ significance in the work of other “theologians.”⁵³ This focus means that only “theological” aspects and implications of his work have been considered. As we have noted, this imposition of modern specialisations on scholars that lived and worked in a polymathic society is inherently problematic. If one approaches the existing literature under the premise that Calixtus was a humanist operating in an intellectual environment where disciplinary interdependence was the norm rather than the exception, one is struck by the vast lacunae in this body of knowledge. Apart from acknowledging a strong humanist presence in his early education, and the appropriation of humanist ideals in the development of his theology, almost no consideration is given to Calixtus’ relationship with the humanist tradition beyond his religious concerns. There is no

⁵³ It should be noted that Marco Antonio de Dominis also published in a number of different scholarly genres, but this fact is not acknowledged in the literature regarding Calixtus and, according to a search of the catalogue at HAB, none of these works were available in the library at Helmstedt. It is unlikely that Calixtus was familiar with these treatises. For discussion of these works see, for example, Federico Bonelli and Lucio Russo, “The Origin of Modern Astronomical Theories of Tides: Chrisogono, de Dominis and their sources,” *British Journal for the History of Science* 29 (1996): 385–401; R. E. Ockenden, “Marco Antonio de Dominis and His Explanation of the Rainbow,” *Isis* 36, no. 1 (1936): 40–49.

acknowledgement of his participation in contemporary debates about historical criticism or chronology, and there is barely any recognition of the profound influence that protagonists on the stage of humanism, such as Isaac Casaubon, had on the development of his ideas. The final part of this thesis aims to begin filling these gaps by illustrating that Calixtus not only drew on the humanist tradition in shaping his ideas about the church and about the interpretation of Christian doctrine, but he also made an active contribution to this tradition. He did this by thinking about and reformulating existing ideas and techniques, and by refining these ideas and techniques for practical use by himself and others.

4. Isaac Casaubon and the Consensus of Antiquity

This chapter aims to begin answering this thesis' research question—*What exactly was Calixtus' relationship to Renaissance humanism?*—by taking a closer look at Calixtus' relationship with Isaac Casaubon, arguably one of the most famous humanists alive at the beginning of the seventeenth century. Shedding more light on Casaubon's importance for Calixtus' intellectual development will do two things. First, it will highlight one aspect of Calixtus' biography that has, until now, received less attention than it deserves, prompting us to rethink the implications of his humanist education for his intellectual development. If one of Calixtus' most important ideas came from Casaubon, rather than from Dominis' *Respublica ecclesiastica*, it is likely that he was also exposed to other scholarly activities that have not previously been considered in the literature, including the philological methods forged by the humanists and the “practical lessons [they found] in the classics” mentioned in the introduction. Second, illuminating the relationship between Casaubon and Calixtus will provide an example of the much broader intellectual links that were forged in early modern Europe. With boundaries between disciplines blurred, and a vast network of correspondence, the exchange of ideas during this time may have been much more prevalent than has previously been allowed for when considering people like Calixtus. This suggestion is borne out by ongoing research regarding the early modern “Republic of Letters,”¹ and prompts us to revisit the work of scholars who have previously been considered only through the anachronistic lenses of modern disciplines.

Chapter two intimated that the current view of the relationship between Calixtus and Casaubon sees Casaubon only as one of many interesting people that Calixtus met throughout his life. The literature devotes barely any time to discussing the matter and Casaubon, for his part, regarded their meetings together as little more

¹ See, for example, Austin and Anderson, “Faith, Friendship and Learning”; Paul Dibon, “Communication in the Respublica Litteraria of the 17th Century,” *Res Publica Litterarum* 1 (1978): 43–55; Grafton, *Bring Out Your Dead; Defenders; Worlds*, esp. ch. 1; Alfred Hiatt, “Diplomatic Arts: Hickeys against Mabillon in the Republic of Letters,” *Journal of the History of Ideas* 70, no. 3 (2009): 351–73; Franz Mauelshagen, “Networks of Trust: Scholarly Correspondence and Scientific Exchange in Early Modern Europe,” *The Medieval History Journal* 6, no. 1 (2003): 1–32; Saskia Stegeman, “How to Set Up a Scholarly Correspondence: Theodorus Janssonius van Almeloveen (1657–1712) Aspires to Membership of the Republic of Letters,” trans. P. J. E. Hyams, *Lias*, vol. 20, no. 2 (1993): 227–43.

than a leech on his time.² Chapter three showed us that existing scholarship suggests the influence of Marco Antonio de Dominis and, through him, Georg Cassander was more important for Calixtus' development. Otto Ritschl and Herman Schüssler go so far as to suggest that Calixtus *based* his model for church unity on their theology, and that it did not really develop until the 1620s.³ Without playing down the importance of these two men to Calixtus' work, this chapter will contend that Calixtus' theology owed as much to the influence of Isaac Casaubon as it did to Dominis and Cassander.

We have already seen at least three pieces of evidence that suggest Calixtus was involved in a broad array of intellectual debates during his career: he expressed critical interest in the Lotharian legend; his model for church unity bore striking resemblance to Casaubon's; and he developed a keen interest in history at a time when it was the subject of rigorous discussion in other parts of Europe. This chapter draws on the second of these pieces of evidence to argue that one of Calixtus' most significant ideas came from someone traditionally associated with these broader debates, rather than with religious controversies. As a first step to exploring the genesis of Calixtus' understanding of the *consensus antiquitatis* in relation to the wider world of Renaissance humanism, the following section will explore Cassander and Dominis' theology. We will then be in a position to evaluate the argument that the work of Cassander and Dominis was *the* decisive influence on Calixtus' understanding of the *consensus antiquitatis*, and to contrast this with the evidence for a Casaubonian influence.

4.1. The *consensus antiquitatis* of Cassander, Dominis, and Calixtus

It has been acknowledged by several scholars that Dominis' irenic theology was similar to (or even a development of) Cassander's.⁴ As such, we shall now treat the two together, while acknowledging the points on which they differ. Cassander was a Roman Catholic theologian who sought peace between the Roman Catholic and

² Mark Pattison, *Isaac Casaubon, 1559–1614*, 2nd edn, ed. Henry Nettleship (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1892), 306.

³ See above, § 3.1.

⁴ See, for example, Kantzenbach, *Das Ringen*, 239; Ritschl, *Dogmengeschichte*, 4:398; Schmeling "Lutheran Orthodoxy," 316–55; Schüssler, *Georg Calixt*, 49–51. Near-contemporaries also made this observation. See, for example, Gerard Brandt, "De vreedzame Christen," in *Poëzy* (Amsterdam: Aart Dirksz Ooszaan, 1688), 204–5.

Protestant confessions in the middle of the sixteenth century. In this capacity, he is sometimes recognised as a father of the irenic movement, standing in the company of other famous irenicists such as Desiderius Erasmus and Georg Witzel.⁵ Dominis was also a Roman Catholic theologian. He was archbishop of Spalato, but moved to England in 1616 after being embroiled with various controversies in the Roman Catholic church. He eventually returned to Italy, where he was charged with heresy and died in prison. His body and books were later burnt by the church.⁶

For both these men, the “old catholic” church (that is, the universal church of antiquity) provided the ideal model on which to base the reunion of a divided Christendom, and the Apostles’ Creed contained all that was necessary to believe in order to receive salvation.⁷ As Merkt puts it, for Cassander, the Creed was the “shibboleth” that would admit the faithful to the inner circle of the church.⁸ Given that the Creed contained all the fundamental articles of faith, both Cassander and Dominis believed that the various Christian confessions were already members of the true, catholic church. The fact that they were divided by adherence to *additional* creedal formulations and confessions did not change the fact that they agreed on the fundamentals. As such, if agreement could not be gained on other points of doctrine, their practice should be tolerated in the interests of ecclesiastical peace.⁹ However, this did not mean that the different confessions were free of error. Dominis, for example, argued that in the Roman Catholic church there were many non-fundamental (unnecessary) articles of faith, as well as the abuse of papal authority.¹⁰ The only way these errors could be exposed was by reference to the “old catholic” church, that is, the *consensus antiquitatis*.

⁵ See, for example, Böttigheimer, *Zwischen Polemik und Irenik*, 193; Merkt, *Das patristische Prinzip* 27.

⁶ See S. Cavezza, “De Dominis, Marcantonio,” in *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*, vol. 33 (Rome: Istituto della Enciclopedia italiana, 1987), 642–50; Henke, *Georg Calixtus*, 1:342–48; Patterson, *King James VI and I*, 220–59.

⁷ Schüssler, *Georg Calixt*, 49, 50.

⁸ Merkt, *Das patristische Prinzip*, 32.

⁹ Patterson, *King James VI and I*, 245; van de Schoor, “Reprints,” 170. Cf. *Canons and Decrees*, 90–91, which acknowledges Protestants as Christians, but which does not consider them as being in communion with Roman Catholics.

¹⁰ Patterson, *King James VI and I*, 230. Cassander also recognised that there were abuses in the Roman Catholic church, yet still believed it maintained a continuous link to the true church of Christ via apostolic succession. Kantzenbach, *Das Ringen*, 211.

Both Cassander and Dominis believed that a church, once reunited on a model of that of antiquity, would be impregnable to heresies.¹¹ For Cassander, heresies were an inherent part of this model.¹² He believed that the relationships between the heretics of antiquity and the church fathers provided a tenable foundation on which to base a contemporary church. Irena Backus has demonstrated this effectively using a case study of Cassander's approach to the heretics Adam Pastor (ca. 1510–1552) and Menno Simmons (ca. 1496–1561).¹³ The importance of heresy to Cassander's model of consensus is evident in his assertion that all heresies contain a grain of truth.¹⁴ This acknowledges that the heretics of antiquity shared something in common with the church fathers. As such, Cassander's approach was to *emphasise* these commonalities in an effort to bring heretics back to the fold of the true, catholic church, rather than to chastise them for wrongdoing. In the cases of Pastor and Simmons, he drew parallels between their positions and those of Nestorius and Eutyches, two heretics who challenged the primitive church. He asserted that particular aspects of their theology were valid and, if the correct aspects of each were adopted, and the incorrect aspects discarded, their views could be conflated to present the correct, catholic doctrine. Cassander closed his argument by referring to the decision of the Council of Ephesus, which supported the "true" doctrine that he had formulated from the "false" doctrines of Pastor and Simmons.

When defining the scope that should be afforded to a consensus of antiquity, and in defining tradition, both Cassander and Dominis relied heavily on the Vincentian Canon. By applying Vincent's criteria of antiquity, universality, and consensus, they were able to identify a period in which the church remained pure. Though Cassander did not restrict his definition of the primitive church to a particular period or set of events, Backus extracts from his writings an intention to reflect on the "first five or six centuries" in order to obtain a valid interpretation of the Bible.¹⁵ Cassander believed that both the doctrines of the Protestant church and apostolic tradition fulfilled the Vincentian criteria. Together they reflected the form

¹¹ See Schüssler, *Georg Calixt*, 50–51.

¹² Irena Backus, "The Early Church as a Model of Religious Unity in the Sixteenth Century: Georg Cassander and Georg Witzel," in *Conciliation and Confession*, 113, 114.

¹³ See Backus, "Early Church," 117–19.

¹⁴ Backus, "Early Church," 112–13.

¹⁵ Backus, "Early Church," 119. Cf. Stewart, "Catholicity or Consensus?," 245.

of the true, catholic church of Christ.¹⁶ As such, they could serve as a basis for mediation between the confessions; however, Cassander still believed in the transmission of doctrine via unwritten as well as written tradition.¹⁷ Dominis also identified the purity of the church in primitive tradition, though took his interpretation a step further, specifically delineating the first five centuries as representative of the church in its purest form.¹⁸ He saw this purity in the external form of the church. Having experienced abuses of papal power in his position as an archbishop, he advocated a reversion to a church comprised of independent sees, bound by a common faith.¹⁹ As we will see, for Dominis this common faith was embodied in Scripture and in the creeds issued by the early ecumenical councils.²⁰ It was this common, apostolic heritage that both Cassander and Dominis believed could be reinvigorated to reunite Western Christendom after the Reformation. As with their approach to heresies, their emphases on commonalities reflected genuine attempts to encourage confessional peace.

The main point on which Cassander and Dominis differed was in the relative import they each attributed to the authority of Scripture versus tradition. Cassander, in this respect “wholly [Roman] Catholic,”²¹ believed that in the event of disagreement, tradition should be the deciding factor.²² Conversely, Dominis argued that no tradition could stand on equal footing with Scripture. While the writings of the church fathers were useful as guides to interpreting Scripture, the resolution of contemporary controversies must rest on the words of Scripture, rather than tradition.²³ Such resolution could be achieved through a general church council involving representatives from all confessions. He believed that if such a council could agree on the fundamentals required for salvation, then they could agree to tolerate differences in non-fundamental articles of faith until the future resolution of these differences at another council. These councils were not intended as a means for reaching agreement on a *new* interpretation of Scripture. As Dominis saw the decisions of the councils of the primitive church as the only infallible interpretation

¹⁶ Kantzenbach, *Das Ringen*, 215; Schüssler, *Georg Calixt*, 49–50.

¹⁷ Stewart, “Catholicity or Consensus?,” 245.

¹⁸ Merkt, *Das patristische Prinzip*, 34–35.

¹⁹ Patterson, *King James VI and I*, 224, 231.

²⁰ Patterson, *King James VI and I*, 231; Schüssler, *Georg Calixt*, 50.

²¹ Schüssler, *Georg Calixt*, 49: “ganz katholisch.”

²² Backus, “Early Church,” 120; Schüssler, *Georg Calixt*, 49.

²³ Patterson, *King James VI and I*, 244–45.

of Scripture,²⁴ any new council could only serve to reach agreement on these existing interpretations, rather than to develop a new argument. Here, Dominis was again similar to Cassander: both of them believed that reference to the traditions of old, in this case embodied in the decisions of the primitive church councils, could effectively ward off contemporary heretics. This form of the Christian church is perhaps best summarised by Dominis' analogy of the church as a ship. This ship, impregnable to heresies, must be guided by "the infallible Card [chart] of the holy Scriptures, and the true compasse quartered out into the foure first generall councils, and seconded with the under-windes of the holy Fathers."²⁵ Interestingly, when Dominis came to negotiate a union with the Greek Orthodox church in 1619, he suggested that the "true compasse" be not quartered, but divided into seven. This point will be returned to shortly, in section 4.3

Calixtus' understanding of the *consensus antiquitatis* was remarkably similar to that of Cassander and Dominis, and Schüssler's argument that it was based on theirs is not without merit. Like Cassander and Dominis, in applying the Vincentian criteria of tradition, Calixtus came to the conclusion that the Apostles' Creed contained all the articles of faith required for salvation.²⁶ He also believed that these criteria could be used to identify the true form of the church. Scripture was to be relied on as the first principle of theological knowledge, and tradition was to be relied on only to resolve differences in its interpretation. In this sense, tradition acted as a witness to Scripture.²⁷ It is interesting to note here the tension between Calixtus' use of tradition and the Lutheran principle of *sola Scriptura*. As we saw in chapter two, Calixtus was accused by various people of abandoning the fundamentals of Lutheran doctrine. However, as Quentin Stewart points out, Calixtus was very careful to emphasise the primary importance of Scripture in his theology—tradition

²⁴ Schüssler, *Georg Calixt*, 51. It should be noted that this infallibility came from the agreement of these councils' decrees with Scripture, not from any divine authority of the councils themselves. See also Patterson, *King James VI and I*, 244.

²⁵ Marco Antonio de Dominis, *A Sermon Preached in Italian, by the Most Reuerend Father, Marc' Antony De Dominis, Archb. of Spalato, the First Sunday in Aduent, anno 1617; in the Mercers Chappel in London, to the Italians in That City, and Many Other Honorable Auditors Then Assembled* (London: John Bill, 1617), 4, quoted in Patterson, *King James VI and I*, 236.

²⁶ This also stems from his separation of faith and theology. See Krumwiede, *Kirchengeschichte*, 199–200; Wallmann, "Zwischen Reformation und Humanismus," 72–73.

²⁷ Calixtus, "Epitome Theologiae," 117–19; "Prooemium," 379–80. See also Gaß, *Georg Calixt*, 49–50.

was never intended to supplant it as a doctrinal authority.²⁸ In elevating Scripture over tradition, Calixtus could thus contend that he was upholding Lutheran principles, whilst also providing another parallel with the work of Dominis, a failed Roman Catholic archbishop.

In treating the articles of faith, Calixtus also followed the trend set by Cassander and Dominis, taking as his starting point a differentiation between fundamental and non-fundamental articles.²⁹ He then took this a step further, following Bonaventura's model and dividing them into *antecedentia*, *constituentia*, and *consequentia*.³⁰ Antecedent articles are accessible through human reason; constituent articles constitute the articles of faith; and consequent articles are the result of theological debate regarding the first two. As examples of antecedent articles, Heinrich Schmid mentions the immortality of the soul, the infallibility of Scripture, and its interpretation.³¹ That is, any person of reason can believe that the soul is eternal, they can trust the accuracy of the Scriptures, and they can read and understand the Bible. No faith is required for these things to be understood. However, the constituent articles—the articles of faith (*articuli fidei*)—can only be truly understood through divine revelation.³² These are the articles that must be believed in order to receive salvation. The two classic examples here are the doctrine of the trinity and that of the nature of Christ (the incarnation). As the constituent articles are the only ones required to receive salvation, the others (antecedent and consequent) should not be divisive of communion. Indeed, just as Cassander and Dominis, Calixtus believed that the different Christian confessions *were* in fact in communion as members of the true, catholic church, as they all believed in the fundamental articles of faith.³³ As such, they should be able to tolerate differences involving “unnecessary” articles in the interests of ecclesiastical peace. Also like Dominis, Calixtus believed that the church fathers, through the early ecumenical councils, were infallible in their interpretation of Scripture, and the decisions of those

²⁸ Stewart, “Catholicity or Consent?,” 261.

²⁹ Calixtus' separation of the articles of faith was most fully expressed in his *Responsum maledicis theologorum Moguntinorum* (Response to the Slanders of the Mainz Theologians) of 1644. I have been unable to consult this work directly, so have had to rely on secondary literature for the following discussion. Note also Melancthon's treatment of non-fundamental articles as *adiaphora*, mentioned in chapter two.

³⁰ Schmid, *Geschichte*, 156.

³¹ Schmid, *Geschichte*, 157.

³² Schmid, *Geschichte*, 157–58. See also Böttigheimer, “Auf der Suche,” 224.

³³ Schüssler, *Georg Calixt*, 61.

councils could thus be relied upon to settle any contemporary disputes.³⁴ As such, he was a firm believer in the convention of councils to effect unity between the different confessions. We saw this in the confrontation between Calixtus and Berthold Nihus, when Calixtus fervently advocated for discussion on contentious points of doctrine in order to identify a common basis from which to negotiate as a prelude to an ecumenical council. Like Cassander, Calixtus believed that emphasising commonalities between confessions, rather than lambasting dissenters, was a more productive way of encouraging people back to the fold of the true, catholic church.³⁵

We have already seen the argument that Schüssler makes for the Cassander/Dominis influence on Calixtus, and it is clear from the above discussion that the thinking of these three men on the nature of the primitive church was very similar. But similarity and citation alone are not enough to prove that Calixtus relied almost solely on the work of these two men in developing his own irenic theology. The following section introduces Casaubon, and shows that his theology also bears remarkable similarities to Calixtus'. It will then introduce other evidence to suggest that Calixtus' interaction with Casaubon was at least as important for the development of the younger man's ideas as his exposure to the works of Cassander and Dominis.

4.2. Isaac Casaubon

When Calixtus was born in 1586, Isaac Casaubon was twenty-seven years old and had already been lecturing at the Academy of Geneva for four years.³⁶ Like Calixtus, Casaubon had been raised by a pastor, though they had quite different experiences as children. While the young Calixtus had lived in a relatively peaceful part of Europe, and had received regular tutoring from his father before attending school, Casaubon was born of a Huguenot (French Calvinist) family during the Wars of Religion. His father was often away, sometimes for years at a time, and Casaubon later wrote that his education had not begun in earnest until the age of twenty.³⁷ Despite these

³⁴ Calixtus, *Discurs von der wahren Christlichen Religion und Kirchen* (Brunswick: Christoff-Friedrich Zilliger, 1652), §§ 96–97. See also Böttigheimer, “Auf der Suche,” 230–31.

³⁵ See Calixtus, quoted in Henke, *Georg Calixtus*, 1:533n3.

³⁶ On Casaubon, see Pattison, *Isaac Casaubon*. But consider Grafton, *Worlds*, ch. 11.

³⁷ Casaubon to Franciscus Vertunianus, 12 June 1605, in *Epistolae*, 241, quoted in Pattison, *Isaac Casaubon*, 6.

challenges, Casaubon proved himself a worthy scholar and was appointed professor of Greek at the Academy of Geneva in 1582. During his time at Geneva, Casaubon continued to lecture in Greek, as well as in Latin and Hebrew, and published editions of classical works by authors including Aristotle, Polyaeus, and Strabo. Later in his career he also published influential editions of Athenaeus, Suetonius, and Polybius, among others, and lectured at different times in history, medicine, philosophy, law, and philology. He worked in Montpellier, Paris, and London, and found favour in the courts of Henry IV of France and James I of England and VI of Scotland.

Casaubon became one of the most famous figures of late sixteenth-century humanism. His extraordinary depth of learning meant that he could critically analyse and expose forgeries with ease, and he was well-placed to advise on both classical and patristic texts.³⁸ The greatest exercise Casaubon ever undertook was to begin writing his *Exercitationes* contra the *Annales ecclesiastici* of Cardinal Cesare Baronius (1538–1607).³⁹ The *Annales* were a popular Roman Catholic history of the church, first published in twelve volumes in the late sixteenth century, and were themselves a refutation of the Protestant *Magdeburg Centuries*, which had been published in thirteen volumes between 1559 and 1574.⁴⁰ Casaubon was working on his *Exercitationes* when Calixtus met him in London in 1612 and, despite the work being over 800 pages in length by the time he died in 1614, he only ever completed a fraction of what he had intended.⁴¹

Serving in the king's court in England, Casaubon was called to write to the Cardinal Jacques Davy du Perron (1556–1618) in 1612 in order to express King James' theological stance on various religious controversies of the time. This was not the first time that Casaubon had corresponded with du Perron. In 1600, during his time in Paris, Casaubon had served as a referee at the Conference of Fontainebleau between Philippe de Mornay (1549–1623)—Seigneur du Plessis-Marly and a leading Huguenot figure—and the cardinal.⁴² The conference had been held in response to a book written by de Mornay, whose use of biblical and patristic citations was

³⁸ See, for example, Grafton, *Defenders*, ch. 5; Nuttall, *Dead*, 154–62, and on Casaubon's place in the tradition of this discipline, Grafton, *Forgers and Critics*, ch. 3.

³⁹ Casaubon, *Exercitationes XVI. ad Cardinalis Baronii prolegomena in Annales, & primam eorum partem, de Domini nostri Jesu Christi natiuitate, vita, passione, assumptione* (London: John Bill, 1614). See Early English Books Online, <http://eebo.chadwyck.com> (accessed March 8, 2010).

⁴⁰ On Casaubon's refutation of the *Annales*, see Pattison, *Isaac Casaubon*, ch. 6.

⁴¹ Henke, *Georg Calixtus*, 1:147; Pattison, *Isaac Casaubon*, 306, 332, 340.

⁴² See Pattison, *Isaac Casaubon*, 135–46.

challenged by the Roman Catholic church. The conference was decided in favour of the Roman Catholic party, and misinterpretations (or perhaps misappropriations) of Casaubon's opinions at the conference meant that he was suspected of considering conversion to Roman Catholicism. Following the conference, du Perron had taken the opportunity to dun Casaubon to this end. After Casaubon moved to England following the assassination of Henry IV in 1610, du Perron continued his correspondence with him, and also began soliciting the conversion of King James. Casaubon's letter of 1612, though written on behalf of the king, is often cited as evidence of his own theological stance, not least of all by Georg Calixtus.⁴³ The following discussion is based on this letter,⁴⁴ and provides the foundation upon which we might begin to consider the influence that Casaubon had on Calixtus as a young man.

Like Dominis, Casaubon found the consensus of antiquity in the *form* of the ancient church. He compared the times of Saint Augustine of Hippo to his own, and noted that the primitive church was ancient, universally present and universally acknowledged.⁴⁵ The apostolic world was one

whereby all the members of the Catholike Church were knit together in the ioynture [union] of one bodie; which bodie was for that cause very eminent, conspicuous, and in the faire view of all, which no man could chuse but know.⁴⁶

In this reflection on the antiquity, universality, and consensus of the primitive church, Casaubon applied the Vincentian criteria of tradition, just as Cassander, Dominis, and Calixtus did. In his own time, Casaubon believed that the various Christian confessions were still in communion via a common belief in the fundamental articles, even though they no longer presented a united front. In order to reunite these confessions, and reinvigorate the true, catholic church, Casaubon believed it necessary to reflect on Scripture and on the traditions of the church

⁴³ See, for example, Patterson, *King James VI and I*, 133. For Calixtus' use of the letter, see below, pp. 77–78.

⁴⁴ Casaubon, *Ansvere*.

⁴⁵ Casaubon, *Ansvere*, 9–10.

⁴⁶ Casaubon, *Ansvere*, 10.

fathers, which together defined the nature of this church.⁴⁷ He did not contend that there were no controversies in the early church, but argued that the nature of that church allowed such controversies to be quelled so easily that if someone erred, even “a child [could] deprehend him.”⁴⁸ Thus he asserted that in the church of antiquity, and in the traditions of the church fathers, an institution immune to heresy could be found.

Casaubon’s treatment of the articles of faith also had an irenic bent. Like Cassander, Dominis, and Calixtus, he asserted that all confessions should be able to agree on the fundamental articles of faith. Those not necessary for salvation should not be ignored, but tolerated in those who chose to use them.⁴⁹ In determining which articles were fundamental and which were not, he turned again to Scripture, and to the tradition of the primitive church. He defined tradition as the practices “which the ancient Church by necessarie consequence, hath drawne out of the word of God.”⁵⁰ Casaubon distinguished these practices from those of later times, which were introduced only as *beneficial* to salvation. In establishing what beliefs and sacraments constituted the articles of faith, he turned to the decrees of the first four ecumenical councils. However, only articles of faith that could be proven to have originated with the apostles could be deemed fundamental.⁵¹ This determination could be made by reference to Scripture. Only there could the fundamental articles of faith be found. Like Calixtus, Casaubon believed that the church fathers had divine authority to interpret Scripture, and thus their writings could be relied upon to settle contemporary controversies.⁵² Casaubon, in the dedicatory epistle attached to his letter, suggested that the form of any such discussion could take place via “but one Kings streete, as it were, . . . namely the free celebration of a Generall Councell.”⁵³

It is quite clear from the above (albeit brief) analyses that there are strong similarities between the theology of all these men and their understanding of the consensus of antiquity. Cassander, Dominis, and Calixtus all pointed explicitly to the Apostles’ Creed as containing the articles of faith fundamental to salvation. Even if

⁴⁷ Casaubon, *Ansvvere*, 11–12.

⁴⁸ Casaubon, *Ansvvere*, 10.

⁴⁹ Casaubon, *Ansvvere*, 16, 19.

⁵⁰ Casaubon, *Ansvvere*, 19.

⁵¹ Casaubon, *Ansvvere*, 24–25.

⁵² Casaubon, *Ansvvere*, 27.

⁵³ Casaubon, *Ansvvere*, sig. A3^r. See also Casaubon, *Ansvvere*, 13: “let vs haue a free Councell which may not depend vpon the will of one.”

confessions differed on other points, a common belief in these articles meant that the different confessions were already members of the true catholic church. Similarly, though he did not mention the Apostles' Creed in relation to the articles of faith, Casaubon asserted that "[t]he name of Catholike can be denied to none . . . which beleuees all those things that were thought necessarie to be beleueed to salvation in the first foure ages."⁵⁴ Thus, he acknowledged, like Cassander, Dominis and Calixtus, the communion between the different Christian confessions.⁵⁵

There are also marked similarities between all four in how they differentiated the articles of faith. As we have seen, they all argued that the different Christian confessions were in agreement on the fundamental articles. That is, they all believed in everything required to receive salvation. Where the confessions differed was in beliefs *not* fundamental to salvation. Cassander, Dominis, Casaubon, and Calixtus all suggested that these non-fundamental articles should be tolerated in the interests of ecclesiastical peace. Calixtus took this a step further by refining the differences between fundamental and non-fundamental articles of faith. The ones that were fundamental to salvation, as drawn from Scripture and summarised in the Apostles' Creed, were accessible only through faith in God. As such, only true believers could receive salvation. Other articles of faith—accessible through reason, or the result of theological debate—could be safely left unknown without hindering one's chances for salvation.

Cassander, Dominis, Casaubon, and Calixtus all adhered to the Vincentian Canon. They revered Vincent of Lérins' definition of tradition, and used his criteria to identify the true form of the Christian church. We can see each of them applying Vincent's criteria of antiquity, universality, and consensus to their understanding of the true church. They reflected on a time when they believed the church, despite its challenges, presented a united front against heretics, and they believed they could reinvigorate this model to ensure the Christian church would again be protected from perversion. Dominis, Casaubon, and Calixtus also advocated general councils as the best means to achieve this end. By engaging princes, bishops, and monarchs across Europe, they felt they could achieve a contemporary consensus equal to that of antiquity.

⁵⁴ Casaubon, *Ansvere*, 5–6.

⁵⁵ See also Casaubon, *Ansvere*, 11.

This analysis shows that Casaubon's theology bore strong semblance to that of irenicists such as Cassander, Dominis, and Calixtus. Not only was his model of the church of antiquity consistent with theirs, his understanding of the very terms *consensus* and *antiquitas*, and his application of them, also corresponded with theirs. As Calixtus actually met Casaubon in 1612, and acknowledged in his own work that Casaubon furnished him with an understanding of the church of antiquity that he could include in his vision of the *consensus antiquitatis*,⁵⁶ it is difficult to reconcile oneself with the notion that Casaubon's ideas had little influence on him. We will now treat this difficulty, with specific reference to the current literature available on the topic, and testimony from some of Calixtus' writings.

4.3. Casaubon in Calixtus

In emphasising the impact that Dominis (and, through him, Cassander) had on Calixtus, Schüssler, Böttigheimer, and Ritschl seem to gloss over the role that Isaac Casaubon played in Calixtus' intellectual development. Though mentioning Casaubon, they do not give the subject any significant treatment. For example, when introducing Calixtus to their reader, both Böttigheimer and Schüssler mention the meetings that he had with Casaubon in London in 1612.⁵⁷ Schüssler also mentions Calixtus' own observation that his ideas for ecclesiastical peace were forged during this time,⁵⁸ and how close in intellectual temperament Casaubon was to Johannes Caselius, Calixtus' teacher at Helmstedt.⁵⁹ In fact, Ernst Henke shows us that Casaubon and Caselius were not only like-minded humanists; they had been in contact with each other since at least 1602.⁶⁰ In July of that year, Casaubon wrote to Caselius, letting him know that it had been almost twenty years since he had first become familiar with his work, and that, every day, his admiration for Caselius grew, and of that admiration was born love (*amor*).⁶¹ He went on to explain why, despite

⁵⁶ Calixtus, *Epitomes theologiae*, 258. See further below, pp. 77–78.

⁵⁷ Böttigheimer, *Zwischen Polemik und Irenik*, 38; Schüssler, *Georg Calixt*, 4.

⁵⁸ Schüssler, *Georg Calixt*, 45.

⁵⁹ Schüssler, *Georg Calixt*, 35.

⁶⁰ Henke, *Georg Calixtus*, 1:146n2.

⁶¹ Casaubon to Johannes Caselius, 21 July 1602, in *Epistolae*, 153: “Anni sunt ferme viginti, αἰδεμ[]τῶ[]ε Caseli, cum adolescente quodam e vestra gente perhonesto, disciplinæ tuæ alumno, familiariter sum usus: qui de tua singulari pietate, probitate, & eruditione multa quotidie commemorans, magnam in animo nostro tui admirationem, & ex admiratione amorem excitavit.”

this admiration, he had not previously written to him, and entreated Caselius to join him in friendship in the Republic of Letters.⁶² Caselius' response is not published, but five other letters between the two men are: three more from Casaubon to Caselius, in 1605, 1606, and 1610;⁶³ and two from Caselius to Casaubon in 1608.⁶⁴ Though no mention is made of Calixtus in any of this correspondence, the two men did send each other books, discussed their scholarly pursuits, and shared details of their personal lives as though they were old friends. There also exists a 1607 edition of a letter from Saint Gregory of Nyssa to Eustathia, Ambrosia, and Basilissa, which was published in France by Casaubon and subsequently by Caselius in the Holy Roman Empire.⁶⁵ It seems highly likely that it was through Caselius that Calixtus came to visit Casaubon in 1612, and that Calixtus would have been familiar with Casaubon's work long before those meetings. Casaubon's editions of Polybius and Aristotle were standard fare for scholars of the time and when one reads that "Casaubon wiped the floor with Petrus Ramus" in the latter,⁶⁶ and remembers that Calixtus was educated in a distinctly anti-Ramist environment, one feels sure that Calixtus must have felt that he had found a soul mate when he met Casaubon in 1612.⁶⁷

Very little is known regarding the meetings themselves. The most detailed contemporary information we have is a quote from Christoph Schrader's funeral oration for Calixtus, which notes that Calixtus spoke with Casaubon "about good

⁶² Casaubon to Caselius, 21 July 1602, in *Epistolae*, 154.

⁶³ Casaubon, *Epistolae*, 230–31, 272, 358. See also Casaubon to Caselius, 6 September 1610, at HAB, shelf-mark H: P 574.4° Helmst. (43).

⁶⁴ Casaubon, *Epistolae*, 657; Caselius, *Ad principes, nobiles, viros celebres propinquos, cives ac familiares epistolae*, ed. Justus von Dransfeld and Hermann Conring (Hannover: Nicolaus Förster, 1718), 567, 570–71.

⁶⁵ Gregory of Nyssa, *Tu en agiois Grēgoriu tu Nyssēs pros Eusathian, Ambrosian, kai Basilissan Epistolē = B. Gregorij Nysseni ad Eustathiam, Ambrosiam, & Basilissam epistola, primum superiore aestate in Gallia Lutetiae, studio Isaaci Casauboni, V. Cl.mi edita, nostra nunc opera primum in Germania*, ed. Caselius (Helmstedt: Typis Lucius, 1607), at HAB, shelf-mark H: P 570.4° Helmst. (34).

⁶⁶ Gilbert Tournoy, "'Ad ultimas inscitiae lineas imus': Justus Lipsius and Isaac Casaubon in the Changing World of Classical Scholarship," in *The World of Justus Lipsius, a Contribution towards His Intellectual Biography: proceedings of a colloquium held under the auspices of the Belgian Historical Institute in Rome (Rome, 22-24 May 1997)*, ed. Marc Laureys (Turnhout: Brepols, 1998), 196.

⁶⁷ On Casaubon's editions of Aristotle and Polybius, see, respectively, J. Glucker, "Casaubon's Aristotle," *Classica et Mediaevalia* 25 (1964): 274–96; Arnaldo Momigliano, "Polybius' Reappearance in Western Europe," in *Essays in Ancient and Modern Historiography* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1977), 79–98. It is also worth noting that Calixtus commenced a series of lectures refuting Ramism at the conclusion of his academic tours. Quentin Stewart, "Catholicity or Consent?," 233.

literature, about our sacred religion and its corruptions and reformation, about the zeal of the factions, and the necessity of Christian concord.”⁶⁸ Casaubon himself mentioned nothing in his diary, and in his letter of recommendation to Jacques-August de Thou mentioned only that, “from one or two conversations,” he had found Calixtus “learned and of no common taste in letters.”⁶⁹ Despite this, it seems clear that the meetings had a marked effect on Calixtus. Andreas Merkt notes that Calixtus returned from his academic tours “more than ever the humanist”⁷⁰ and Henke, apart from the aforementioned “overwhelming and permanent” effect of their meetings, makes another point to illustrate the importance of Casaubon’s work to Calixtus. As has been noted above, when they met, Casaubon was working on his *Exercitationes*. This work was never completed and Henke suggests that Calixtus may have lamented this fact more than Casaubon himself.⁷¹ Calixtus echoed these sentiments in his *Apparatus theologicus*, where he bemoaned the loss of both Casaubon and of the great public benefit that Casaubon’s work would undoubtedly have effected:

With inestimable loss to ourselves, and to all those who love the truth, this great man [Casaubon] has ceased to exist amongst mortals before he could bestow upon the public the remaining volumes that he had planned. He now receives the glorious reward of that work, which he built of gold, silver, and precious stones on a solid foundation, his mind being most intent upon restoring—by right of return—harmony to the Church of Christ, and being, for that reason, far removed from partisanship (just as we observed it to be in the past when we engaged

⁶⁸ Christoph Schrader, *Progr. in fun. Cal.*, quoted in Henke, *Georg Calixtus*, 1:148n2: “de melioribus literis, de sancta nostra religione eiusque corruptelis et instituta reformatione, de partium studiis, de necessaria Christianis Concordia.” I adapt Dowding’s translation. Dowding, *Life and Correspondence*, 59–60. The passage is also quoted in Moller, “Georgius Calixtus,” 123, and Schüssler, *Georg Calixt*, 94, though it is not cited in the former.

⁶⁹ Casaubon to de Thou, 8 July 1612, in *Epistolae*, 476: “ex uno aut altero colloquio compererim, virum esse doctum, & iudicii in literis non vulgaris.” I borrow from Mark Pattison for the second part of the translation. Pattison, *Isaac Casaubon*, 306. Cf. Dowding, *Life and Correspondence*, 60; Henke, *Georg Calixtus*, 1:151. There appears to be no certainty about the days on which Calixtus actually met Casaubon. Pattison suggests that a second meeting occurred on 8 July, the same date as Casaubon’s letter of recommendation to de Thou. See Henke, *Georg Calixtus*, 1:149n1, 151n2; Pattison, *Isaac Casaubon*, 306. Cf. Casaubon, *Ephemerides*, 2 vols, ed. John Russell (Oxford: Typographeo Academico, 1850), 2:936.

⁷⁰ Merkt, *Das patristische Prinzip*, 23: “stärker den je der Humanist.”

⁷¹ Henke, *Georg Calixtus*, 1:146–47.

the man in private conversation), leaving those of us behind yearning for that which he had hoped to leave us, but was prevented from completing by his lamented death.⁷²

Calixtus then went on to quote a lengthy passage from the beginning of the *Exercitationes*. This passage summarises Casaubon's opinion of the *Annales*—a work which set out to illuminate the history of the church throughout the ages, but in which Casaubon could not see “any trace of fairness.” It was not cohesive, often strayed away from the narrative, and attacked Protestants throughout with “reprimands, insults, and abominable accusations.”⁷³ Calixtus clearly learnt something important from his meetings with Casaubon and agreed with Casaubon's view on Baronius' work. It is also apparent that Calixtus esteemed Casaubon's estimation of the *Annales* highly compared to others, as he quoted it to summarise his own opinion of the work. Calixtus also quoted Marco Antonio de Dominis, but it is Casaubon's opinion which received pride of place.⁷⁴

When considering commonalities between Calixtine and Casaubonian theology, Schüssler goes no further than to acknowledge their common interest in a *consensus antiquitatis*. He also notes that Casaubon continued “the tradition of Cassander,” while at the same time contending that Casaubon did *not* have aspirations for a reunion of the different confessions.⁷⁵ The only other significant references that Böttigheimer and Schüssler make to Casaubon's presence in Calixtus'

⁷² Calixtus, “Apparatus,” 283: “Inaestimabili . . . nostro et omnium veritatis amantium damno prius inter mortales esse desiit vir eximius, quam quae in reliquos tomos meditatus erat publico donare posset. Ille operis, quod ex auro, argento et lapidibus pretiosis super solidum fundamentum animo concordiae in ecclesiam Christi postliminio reducendae cupidissimo et a studiis partium propterea remotissimo, qualem cum viro aliquando conversati coram etiam deprehendimus, aedificavit, gloriosam mercedem nunc accipit, nobis residui, quod parabat et morte bonis omnibus lugenda praeventus perficere non potuit, ingens desiderium reliquit.” Translated by Gary Ianziti and myself; adapted from Dowding, *Life and Correspondence*, 59.

⁷³ Calixtus, “Apparatus,” 283–84. For the quotes, Casaubon, “Prolegomena,” in *De rebus sacris et ecclesiasticis exercitationes XVI. ad Cardinalis Baronii Prolegomena in annales* (Frankfurt: 1615), 4–5, quoted in Calixtus, “Apparatus,” 284, lines 2–3, 8–9: “ne qui . . . ullum usquam aequitatis vestigium in suis scriptis”; “Protestantes passim nullo discrimine conviviis, maledictis et infandis calumniis incessit.”

⁷⁴ See Calixtus, “Apparatus,” 284–86.

⁷⁵ Schüssler, *Georg Calixt*, 88: “In der Tradition Cassanders steht auch Isaak Casaubonus, der, von Hause aus reformiert, maßgebender Verfechter des altkatholischen Kirchenideals wurde, ohne freilich selbst mit praktischen Unionsbestrebungen hervorzutreten.”

intellectual world are found obscured in general discussion of Calixtus' theology.⁷⁶ The most telling example is that, in illustrating Calixtus' place in the irenical tradition, they both mention Casaubon as one of several who saw the first five hundred years of the church as representative of its purest form.⁷⁷ What is interesting about this is that Calixtus actually *reproduced* a portion of Casaubon's above-mentioned letter to Cardinal du Perron in his "Digressio de Arte nova," and it is this reproduction that both Böttigheimer and Schüssler cite.

Calixtus reproduced these portions of Casaubon's letter to du Perron in order to aid his refutation of the Roman Catholic stance on various issues. His special focus in this instance was the definitions of antiquity and consensus in the primitive church. Calixtus had already reflected on the importance of the Vincentian Canon for his understanding of tradition, and used Casaubon as evidence for, and justification of, his application of it. In the first passage (on the antiquity of the church), Casaubon noted

how highly he [King James] esteemeth of the Fathers, which liued in the fourth, and fifth age. . . . For his Maiestie heretofore hath vnfaignedly protested, that hee approoueth of those markes of truth giuen by *Vincentius Lirinensis: à principio, vbique & semper*: that is, from the beginning, euery where, and euer.⁷⁸

As noted above, although Casaubon was writing on behalf of the king, his own theological stance is reflected in these comments. For him, it was the criteria of the Vincentian Canon which played the strongest part in defining the true form of the church, and which ought to be used to recognise the fundamental articles of faith, those things "which may be cleerely proued to haue been continually obserued from the first originall of the Church vntill [the fourth and fifth ages]."⁷⁹

The second portion of Casaubon's letter that Calixtus quoted concerns what constituted "consensus" amongst the fathers. This passage points out two items of

⁷⁶ For the only reference by Ritschl, see above. p. 49.

⁷⁷ Böttigheimer, *Zwischen Polemik und Irenik*, 217; Schüssler, *Georg Calixt*, 67, 201n12.

⁷⁸ Casaubon, *Ad epistolam illvstr. et reverendiss. Cardinalis Peronij, responsio* (London: John Norton, 1612), 39–40, quoted in Calixtus, *Epitomes theologiae*, 257. I use the translation from Casaubon, *Ansvvere*, 24.

⁷⁹ Casaubon, *Ad epistolam . . . Peronij, responsio*, 42, quoted in Calixtus, *Epitomes theologiae*, 258. [Casaubon, *Ansvvere*, 25.]

consideration. The first is that “the consent of Fathers should then be thought to be sufficiently proved, when the worthiest of euery nation do consent in the auerring of any thing and that no man accounted orthodoxall doth oppose them.”⁸⁰ The second is that the authority of the Fathers is to be limited to their *witness* of the practices of the ancient church, rather than their teachings as doctors of the church.⁸¹ Here, we see some of the key elements in play regarding Calixtus and Casaubon’s understanding of tradition: it was to be limited to the practices of the ancient church, as implemented in the time of the apostles and confirmed by the decrees of the first four councils. Individually, the fathers of the church had no authority to pronounce on church doctrine; they were only to serve as reliable witnesses of how faith was practised.

In referencing Calixtus’ reproduction of these passages, Böttigheimer and Schüssler point to a superb example of Calixtus’ debt to Casaubon. Schüssler even goes so far as to acknowledge that Calixtus’ application of the Reformation *Verfallschema* to the decline of the papacy was similar to Casaubon’s.⁸² Both Böttigheimer and Schüssler also quote Erich Seeberg, who states that Calixtus “received the crucial idea of his life from Casaubon.”⁸³ However, they then note that, contrary to this viewpoint, we cannot see Casaubon’s “direct influence” in Calixtus’ vision of the church, and cite Ritschl as support for their assertion. As Merkt has pointed out,⁸⁴ against the assertion that Casaubon had no direct influence on him, Calixtus cited Casaubon to support his view of the early church and, as we have seen, even reproduced sections of Casaubon’s letter to du Perron to illustrate this. Friedrich Kantzenbach also makes specific mention of this detail in order to emphasise the impact that Casaubon had on the younger man.⁸⁵ It is peculiar that both Böttigheimer and Schüssler should contend that Casaubon had no direct influence on Calixtus’

⁸⁰ Casaubon, *Ad epistolam . . . Peronij, responsio*, 42, quoted in Calixtus, *Epitomes theologiae*, 258. [Casaubon, *Ansvvere*, 26.]

⁸¹ Casaubon, *Ad epistolam . . . Peronij, responsio*, 43, quoted in Calixtus, *Epitomes theologiae*, 258. [Casaubon, *Ansvvere*, 26.]

⁸² See Schüssler, *Georg Calixt*, 201n22: “Calixts Bild von der Verfallsgeschichte deckt sich mit dieser Sicht” (Calixtus’ picture of the history of decline coincides with this view). Quentin Stewart takes Schüssler’s comments slightly out of context when he translates *deckt sich mit* as “depends on” instead of “coincides with.” Stewart, “Catholicity or Consensus?,” 248n121.

⁸³ Seeberg, *Gottfried Arnold*, 475n1, quoted in both Böttigheimer, *Zwischen Polemik und Irenik*, 190n445, and Schüssler, *Georg Calixt*, 199n76: “die entscheidenden Gedanken seines Lebens von Casaubonus empfangen.”

⁸⁴ Merkt, *Das patristische Prinzip*, 23n31.

⁸⁵ Kantzenbach, *Das Ringen*, 235.

view of the church considering their common recognition of Casaubon's place in the "old catholic" tradition, their use of sources such as Ernst Henke's biography of Calixtus, which speaks very favourably of the impact the older man had on him, and their citing of Calixtus' reproduction of Casaubon's letter to du Perron. Schüssler's reference to Casaubon's letter also prompts another question: why, if he was familiar with its contents, would Schüssler suggest that Casaubon had no practical ideas for confessional reunion? As we have seen, in this letter Casaubon clearly presented a basis for church reunion, and went so far as to suggest ways in which such a union might be achieved.⁸⁶ We can only speculate that perhaps Schüssler was only familiar with those sections that Calixtus reproduced which, as already noted, were limited to outlining Casaubon's definitions for consensus and antiquity in the ancient church.

There is also evidence to challenge the commonly-asserted view that Calixtus' ideas for confessional union did not develop until the 1620s. Though perhaps these ideas were not fully formed, Henke quotes Calixtus as writing later that during his academic tours he had already been "thinking of ways to mitigate Christian hostility and discord."⁸⁷ As noted above, Calixtus undertook his academic tours between 1609 and 1613, long before the 1620s. Inge Mager also notes that the roots of Calixtus' "union theology" can be found in these years,⁸⁸ and it is clear that Calixtus' aforementioned "Prooemium" of 1629 was not the first work in which he discussed his understanding of tradition. Peter Engel and William Kelly both point out that it was first published in Calixtus' *Epitome theologiae* of 1619,⁸⁹ rendering tenuous at best Ritschl's reliance on the 1620s as the genesis of Calixtine traditionalism in order to discount Casaubon's influence. This is not to imply that at this stage Calixtus proposed a reunion of confessions on the basis of such a tradition (Mager confirms this explicitly),⁹⁰ yet he certainly saw it as a mediating principle in combating heresies.

One final point must be made before concluding this discussion. First, though Dominis, Casaubon, and Calixtus all believed that the decrees of the first four church

⁸⁶ William Patterson also makes this observation, even using Casaubon's plans for reunion as a comparison for Dominis'. Patterson, *King James VI and I*, 218: "Dominis's [*sic*] letter outlines a plan of union as ambitious as that enunciated in Isaac Casaubon's letters to Cardinal du Perron."

⁸⁷ Calixtus, *Responsum Moguntinis theologis*, 129, quoted in Henke, *Georg Calixtus*, 1:124n2: "de odiis et dissidiis Christianorum mitigandis cogitarem, eoque facientia proponerem."

⁸⁸ Mager, "Georg Calixt," in *Orthodoxie und Pietismus*, 138.

⁸⁹ Engel, *Die eine Wahrheit*, 127–28; Kelly, *Theological Faculty*, 9.

⁹⁰ Mager, "Georg Calixt," in *Orthodoxie und Pietismus*, 140.

councils were correct in their interpretation and explication of doctrine, only Casaubon and Calixtus limited the basis of their proposals for ecclesiastical reunion to the decisions of these four councils (as well as, of course, Scripture and the Apostles', Nicene-Constantinopolitan, and Athanasian creeds).⁹¹ Dominis believed that the decisions of the first *five* councils, as well as parts of the decrees of the sixth and seventh, ought to form the basis of such a reunion.⁹² As such, it appears Dominis was aligned more closely with the Roman Catholic stance, which would allow the decisions of *all* church councils, than with the orthodox Lutheran, which would allow only those of the first and second councils (embodied in the Nicene-Constantinopolitan creed). This is a significant difference in the theologies of these men, particularly considering the emphasis that the *consensus antiquitatis* receives in each of their visions of the true church, and their articulation of this *consensus* in the first five hundred years of Christendom. The emphasis on the first five hundred years, however, is diluted in Dominis' practical application of the *consensus antiquitatis*: The fifth, sixth, and seventh councils of the church were held in the sixth, seventh, and eighth centuries respectively, suggesting that Calixtus' translation of the *consensus antiquitatis* to his "union theology" in fact drew more heavily on Casaubon's work, with its emphasis on the first four councils, than Dominis'.

Chapter two painted an image of a young Georg Calixtus, still in his early university years, engaging with Reformed, Lutheran, and Roman Catholic scholars, and postulating ways to effect peace between these different confessions. During this time, he met Isaac Casaubon in England, a renowned classical scholar and advocate for confessional peace, who was known for his "unusual and vast knowledge of the church of antiquity."⁹³ Gerhard Titius (1620–1681), one of Calixtus' students, even noted that "in London, *Calixtus* entered [Casaubon's] friendship, and at just the right time," for it had a great effect on him, and it seems that it was the beginning of a lasting relationship: Casaubon "was always willing to provide [*ornare*]" for Calixtus' intellectual development.⁹⁴ Though this statement was made in a funeral oration, and must therefore be treated with some scepticism, it does reinforce for us the impact

⁹¹ Calixtus, "Prooemium," 398; Casaubon, *Ansvvere*, 24.

⁹² Patterson, *King James VI and I*, 216.

⁹³ Titius, *Laudatio funebris*, sig. B3^f: "inusitatam ac ingentem antiquitatis ecclesiasticæ peritiam."

⁹⁴ Titius, *Laudatio funebris*, sig. B3^f: "In hujus viri amicitiam Londini penetravit CALIXTUS, eoque justo tempore & multum usus est, qui & magni fecit ejus ingenium, & ornare semper studuit" (emphasis in original). Unfortunately, Casaubon's death in 1614 means that this relationship was cut rather short, and there appears to be no published correspondence between the two.

that these meetings had on Calixtus. Another piece of evidence can be found in a compilation of letters published by Henke in 1840. Here, we find a reference to the fact that Calixtus' familiarity with the work of people like Casaubon allowed him to effectively challenge the Roman Catholic church on points of doctrine.⁹⁵ Merkt specifically points out that Casaubon (and Hugo Grotius, for that matter) had as big a part to play in introducing Calixtus to Cassander's work as Dominis did.⁹⁶ In addition, he suggests that Calixtus later took Casaubon's theories of the early church and made them practical.⁹⁷ Perhaps it is this idea that Casaubon's ideas were theoretical, rather than practical, that Schüssler is considering when he suggests that Casaubon had no plans for a reunion of the different confessions.

4.4. Summary—Isaac Casaubon and the Consensus of Antiquity

In addition to the image of a young Georg Calixtus engaging with scholars from all confessions, this chapter has given us a certainty that Casaubon had a significant impact on Calixtus' thought, as well as an interesting timeline to explore. In 1598 Calixtus began attending the Flensburg Latin School, and in 1603 he commenced studying at the University of Helmstedt with Johannes Caselius, a humanist scholar in contact with other like-minded intellectuals, including Isaac Casaubon, with whom he was on quite close terms. Calixtus actually met Casaubon in 1612, and by all accounts this meeting had a lasting effect on him. In 1617 he read the first volume of Marco Antonio de Dominis' *Respublica ecclesiastica*, and in 1619 his *Epitome theologiae* was published, in which he outlined his doctrine of tradition. In 1622 the third volume of Dominis' work was released, containing his plans for a reunion of the Christian church, and in 1629 Calixtus published his "Prooemium," in which he expanded the ideas outlined in previous works. On this basis the argument can be made that, although Marco Antonio de Dominis' *Respublica ecclesiastica* (and through it, the ideas of Georg Cassander) certainly had an effect on Georg Calixtus, Isaac Casaubon deserves as much attention.

⁹⁵ Calixtus, "Commercii literarii Calixtini fasciculus," 23n*.

⁹⁶ Merkt, *Das patristische Prinzip*, 35–36. Little correspondence between Calixtus and Grotius appears to have survived. Only two letters to Calixtus are published in the collection of Grotius' correspondence, and Henke noted that he could find no letters between them in the archives at Wolfenbüttel. *Briefwisseling van Hugo Grotius*, 17 vols, ed. P. C. Molhuysen et al. (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1928–2001), 7:466–67, 8:639; Calixtus, *Georg Calixtus' Briefwechsel*, xii–xiii.

⁹⁷ Merkt, *Das patristische Prinzip*, 68.

Although, as noted in chapter two, one must be conscious of giving too much credit to a single person for shaping another's ideas, it is clear that through his meetings with Casaubon, Calixtus' vision of the ancient church was realised. He believed that it was in the traditions and creeds of the ancient church, the institution bequeathed to the apostles by Christ, that the "true Christian, apostolic, and catholic church" could be found.⁹⁸ For Calixtus, this understanding of tradition became a secondary theological principle, behind that of *sola Scriptura*, which could serve as a normaliser in combating heresies. He used this understanding to shape his conception of the *consensus antiquitatis*, which he used in his later years to counter accusations of crypto-Papism, of anti-Lutheranism, and of heresy. Certainly, after his meetings with Casaubon, Calixtus was exposed to the work of Marco Antonio de Dominis, and the latter's ideas for confessional reconciliation; however, this exposure served to strengthen and solidify Calixtus' model for church unity, rather than to provide a basis for it. It was from his father, his schooling, university and, ultimately, his travels and his meetings with Casaubon that the ideas originally came. This prompts us to think differently about how Calixtus' theology was shaped in his early years, and to reconsider his position in the early modern intellectual landscape. The fact that some of his most important ideas found their genesis in his interactions with a humanist famous for his classical and philological works, rather than his theological, has significant implications for Calixtus' later work. Though in the example of the *consensus antiquitatis* Calixtus used his interaction with the humanist tradition to develop and refine his theology, one must not discount the possibility that he also applied the critical techniques of Renaissance humanism in other fields of endeavour. The next chapter will explore this possibility further by considering a speech that Calixtus delivered in 1629, his "De studio historiarum oratio," in relation to the genre of the *ars historica*.

⁹⁸ Calixtus, *Discurs*, § 1: "wahre Christliche Apostolische und Catholische Kirche." See also Engel, 150.

5. On the Study of History

The previous chapter argued that Calixtus' meetings with Isaac Casaubon, a famous practitioner of late Renaissance humanism, were of great consequence for the development of some of his most important ideas. In so doing, it suggested that Calixtus was potentially exposed to currents of early modern thought that have been insufficiently taken into account in Calixtine scholarship. This chapter intends to explore in more depth the manner in which Calixtus drew on these currents of thought in his own work by exploring a particular genre of text in the early modern period, that of the *ars historica*, and Calixtus' place within it. This is important for considering Calixtus' relationship with the humanist tradition because this genre emerged in the work of sixteenth-century humanists and was used as a vehicle for the critique and dissemination of ideas concerning topics such as source criticism and the pedagogic value of history. As such, it allows us to consider Calixtus' work in relation to the wider intellectual debates of his age, and to begin to consider what contributions he made to the humanist tradition, rather than simply what he took from it. The following section will first introduce the *ars historica* by considering some of the existing literature concerning it. This will allow us to identify some of the key concerns and features of the genre, providing a basis upon which to evaluate Calixtus' participation within it.

5.1. The *ars historica*

Two broad strains of historical scholarship emerged in Europe from the fifteenth to the eighteenth centuries: a pedagogical variety that aimed to teach by examples, and a critical body of work that debated issues of epistemology, logic, and critique.¹ The former found its epitome in the *ars historica*, that genre of manuals that provided guidance on the reading, writing, and study of history, made famous by Jean Bodin's *Method for the Easy Comprehension of History* of 1566, which was afforded pride of

¹ Nadel, "Philosophy of History," 304–5; Witschi-Bernz, "Main Trends," 51. Anthony Grafton has identified similar trends in the general use of ancient texts in early modern Europe. See Grafton, *Defenders*, ch. 1.

place in Johannes Wolf's two-volume compilation later that century.² The latter (critical) body of work is generally acknowledged as emerging after the *ars historica* although, as Astrid Witschi-Bernz points out, the dichotomy between the two was often blurred.³ What is most important for this discussion is the fact that, despite confusion between genres in individual texts, these works had specific, recognisable features that allow one to position an example of such a work in a wider body of literature. Whether presented as speeches, individual treatises, or as parts of larger works, the *artes historicae* all explored similar themes and drew on similar ideas in their exploration of the art of history.

Both the pedagogic, "exemplar," historical texts, and those more critical, were born of the Renaissance humanist fascination with antiquity, and it should come as no surprise that it was from the classical authors that the humanists found their inspiration. George Nadel suggests that it was the Roman rather than the Greek tradition which shaped the humanist understanding of history; however, his discussion repeatedly provides examples of Greek influence on the Romans, a point also made by Beatrice Reynolds.⁴ When one considers that an early humanist like Leonardo Bruni drew on both Greek and Latin influences to construct his work, or that the library of a later humanist such as Isaac Casaubon contained forty-seven Greek but only five Latin manuscripts, one must question Nadel's insistence on the "Roman" influence on these individuals, rather than simply the "classical."⁵ Nevertheless, the influence of the classics (both Roman and Greek) is evident throughout historical works in the early modern period. Cicero's definition of history as "the witness of time, the light of truth, the life of memory, the mistress of life, and

² Jean Bodin, *Methodus ad Facilem Historiarum Cognitionem* (Paris: Martinus Iuvenis, 1566); *Method for the Easy Comprehension of History*, trans. Beatrice Reynolds (New York: Columbia University Press, 1945); Johannes Wolf, *Artis Historicae Penus*, 2 vols (Basle: Perna, 1579). See Grafton, *What Was History?*, 166, 167; Nadel, "Philosophy of History," 305–6; Reynolds, "Shifting Currents in Historical Criticism," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 14, no. 4 (1953): 489–90.

³ Witschi-Bernz, "Main Trends," 51. George Nadel also notes that the latter were "sometimes written by the same people who wrote the former type of book." Nadel, "Philosophy of History," 305.

⁴ Nadel, "Philosophy of History," 292–93, 296, 297, 302, 306; Reynolds, "Shifting Currents," 472.

⁵ See Ianziti, "Between Livy and Polybius"; T. A. Birrell, "The Reconstruction of the Library of Isaac Casaubon," in *Hellinga Festschrift / Feestbundel / Mélanges: Forty-three studies in bibliography presented to Prof. Dr. Wytze Hellinga on the occasion of his retirement from the chair of neophilology at the University of Amsterdam at the end of the year 1978*, ed. Anthony R. A. Croiset van Uchelen (Amsterdam: Nico Israël, 1980), 59. Cf. Peter Burke, "A Survey of the Popularity of Ancient Historians, 1450–1700," *History and Theory* 5, no. 2 (1966): 136.

the messenger of antiquity”;⁶ pseudo-Dionysius’ assertion that “history is philosophy teaching by examples”;⁷ and Tacitus’ exhortation to write history “*sine ira et studio*, without anger and without preconception,”⁸ find expression in almost every historical piece written during the period.⁹ These “tired assertion[s]”¹⁰ were repeated so often that Donald Kelley suggests it is more appropriate to speak of historical texts of this period as “a complex of rhetorical topoi,” that is, collections of commonplaces, than as comprising a discrete literary genre.¹¹

Both Anthony Grafton and Beatrice Reynolds have shown that, despite the almost monotonous repetition of commonplaces in these works, authors of the *ars historica* formed their own complex arguments around the standard formulae.¹² Within their publications, they debated issues such as the role of speeches, truth, and rhetoric in history, and the merits of ancient versus modern historians. The relationships between law, geography, chronology, and history were all considered, and the implications of these relationships argued and contested. And all these arguments were framed by the rhetorical topoi which derived from the classical authors. Polybius’ precepts that “the soundest education and training for a life of active politics is the study of history, and that the surest and indeed the only method of learning how to bear the vicissitudes of fortune is to recall the calamities of others”¹³ provided the groundwork for the majority of *artes historicae* in the early modern period, and the following implication that history must be true was echoed by both classical and early modern authors.¹⁴ The debates concerning truth in history did not concern the requirement for truth per se, but rather how much truth could

⁶ Cicero *De oratore* 2.9.36, quoted in “De historia,” 423: “testis temporum, lux veritatis, vita memoriae, magistra vitae, nuntia vetustatis.” I borrow my translation from Donald R. Kelley, “*Historia integra*: François Baudouin and his Conception of History,” *Journal of the History of Ideas* 25, no. 1 (1964): 44.

⁷ Nadel, “Philosophy of History,” 301; Witschi-Bernz, “Main Trends,” 53. See also, for example, Wickenden, *G. J. Vossius*, 77.

⁸ Nadel, “Philosophy of History,” 302.

⁹ Grafton, *What Was History?*, 31–33, 72; Kelley, “*Historia integra*,” 38–39, 43–44; Nadel, “Philosophy of History,” 299, 301; Witschi-Bernz, “Main Trends,” 53; D. R. Woolf, “Erudition and the Idea of History in Renaissance England,” *Renaissance Quarterly* 40, no. 1 (1987): 20.

¹⁰ Grafton, *What Was History?*, 252.

¹¹ Kelley, “*Historia integra*,” 39.

¹² Grafton, *What Was History?*; Reynolds, “Shifting Currents.”

¹³ Polybius *Histories* 1.1.2, quoted in Nadel, “Philosophy of History,” 295.

¹⁴ Grafton, *What Was History?*, 9–10, 39; Kelley, “*Historia integra*,” 47–48; Nadel, “Philosophy of History,” 299, 300, 303, 306; Reynolds, “Shifting Currents,” 474, 477, 481, 490–91; Witschi-Bernz, “Main Trends,” 53, 63–65.

reasonably be expected, and what “truth” itself actually was. As such, debates concerning the role of invented speeches in history concerned not only stylistic preferences, but also the interpretation of truth in history. For example, if one drafted a speech that took into account the customs and language of one’s subject, and contained the substance that could be reasonably expected of such a speech, made by such a person, in such circumstances, and at such a time, did that speech then not constitute a true narration of events? Different authors had widely different opinions on the matter, and thus constructed their own arguments around the classical notion that for history to be practical, it must be true.¹⁵

The various classical precepts that found expression in the *ars historica* provide some criteria that can be used to identify a participant in the genre. They also provide a framework around which one can compare the arguments of individual authors to those prevalent within the broader debates of the time, and thus allow one to gauge the originality of their contribution. It is on this basis that the following section will explore Calixtus’ “De studio historiarum oratio.” It will navigate the content of the text itself, identifying some of the various *topoi* common to the genre of the *ars historica*, and will relate Calixtus’ interpretation of these commonplaces to better-known authors such as Jean Bodin (1530–1596) and Gerhard Vossius. This pair has been selected for two reasons. First, their works include two of the most famous examples of the *ars historica*. Bodin and Vossius were therefore both extremely influential and the content of their treatises may be considered representative of the most prominent arguments of the genre. Second, Calixtus had access to Bodin’s book via the library at Helmstedt,¹⁶ and likely had access to Vossius’ work as well, as the two men were in personal contact during this time.¹⁷ By considering this speech in relation to the genre of the *ars historica*, this chapter will argue that, in addition to interacting with these people and their work, Calixtus played an active role in the intellectual debates that the humanist tradition provoked.

¹⁵ See Grafton, *What Was History?*, 34–49.

¹⁶ See, at HAB, shelf-marks H: T 1.12° Helmst., H: T 2.4° Helmst., H: T 2.12° Helmst., H: Yv 1087.8° Helmst.

¹⁷ See further below, § 5.3. It is interesting to note that Vossius was also in correspondence with Berthold Nihus. On the peculiar dynamics, and implications, of this epistolary triumvirate, see Schubert, “Kommunikation und Konkurrenz: Gelehrtenrepublik und Konfession im 17. Jahrhundert,” in *Interkonfessionalität—Transkonfessionalität—innenkonfessionelle Pluralität: Neue Forschungen zur Konfessionalisierungsthese*, ed. Kaspar von Greyerz, Manfred Jakubowski-Tiessen, Thomas Kaufmann, and Hartmut Lehmann (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlag, 2003), 101–31. I am grateful to Dirk van Miert for bringing this piece to my attention.

5.2. “De studio historiarum oratio”

Calixtus’ contribution to the genre of the *ars historica* is in the form of a speech,¹⁸ generally accepted to have been delivered to the students of the University of Helmstedt at the conclusion of his first appointment as pro-rector of the university in 1629.¹⁹ The speech began by responding to requests from Calixtus’ students for him to write a universal history, from the creation of the world to the birth of Christ. Calixtus noted that because such a work would require an enormous amount of time and effort—luxuries that he could not afford—he was unable to do so. When prompted to write an epitome instead, he noted that this would in fact be an even greater work, as it would require a much more nuanced exercise of judgement, lest important facts be omitted from the narrative. He suggested that it was an easier task to compile a universal history, because one could be less selective with one’s material for such a project. For an epitome, one needed to draw on the same broad array of sources, but from those had to select what information would be included and what would be left out. In his speech, Calixtus seemed hesitant to do this and proposed instead to offer his students a method rather than a history. That is, he would provide them with a way by which they might remember key events in history of their own accord, rather than handing them this content on a platter.²⁰

¹⁸ This has been printed in at least four editions: “De historia”; “De studio historiarum, inprimis vero de seculis ante & post natum Christum inter se conferendis oratio,” in *Orationes selectæ*, 111–24; *Oratio panegyrica, quam habuit anno MDCXXIIX. mense Martio, cum fasces magistratus academici deponeret: De studio historiarum, & inprimis de seculi ante & post natum Christum inter se conferendis* ([Helmstedt?], [1628/29?]); *Oratio panegyrica, quam habuit anno MDCXXXIIX. mense Martio, cum fasces magistratus academici deponeret: De studio historiarum, & inprimis de seculi ante & post natum Christum inter se conferendis* ([Helmstedt?], [1638?]). Subsequent references will be to the modern edition, “De historia.”

¹⁹ This date is based on the content of the speech, as the published edition most commonly cited was dated by Friedrich Ulrich Calixtus to 1638. In the speech, Georg Calixtus alluded to a work not long published, in which he had attempted to show the true church of antiquity. Both Henke and Mager suggest that this work can only be the “Prooemium” to Calixtus’ 1629 edition of Augustine and Vincent of Lérins, and Mager also notes that a manuscript in the Landesbibliothek Hannover suggests that the speech was delivered on 29 December 1629. This date corresponds with Calixtus’ first term as pro-rector, which ended at the end of that year. Although there is at least one published edition of this speech which has 1628 in the title (see previous note), this does not appear to be authorised by Calixtus, as it contains no publisher’s details, date, or place of publication. It seems likely that 1628 (MDCXXIIX) is an error or a misprint. As such, 1629 remains the most likely date for the speech. See “De historia,” 421n1; Henke, *Georg Calixtus*, 456n2.

²⁰ This hesitation to cull the content of history may go some way to explaining why Calixtus never wrote a comprehensive history himself. See above, p. 55.

In proposing to his students a method for the easy recollection of history, Calixtus was actively contributing to the genre of the *ars historica*. He did so by thinking about and engaging with the issues with which this genre concerned itself. In his opening comments, he had already expressed a hesitation to cull the content of history. Just like Jean Bodin and Gerhard Vossius, Calixtus believed that one must draw on a vast range of sources in the study of history, and that the ideal history was a universal one. As Bodin's definition of history embodied a knowledge of all things (human, natural, and divine),²¹ and as Vossius believed that a history of all times was far more satisfactory than simply "a scrap of ancient history,"²² Calixtus suggested in his "De studio historiarum oratio" that writing a universal history was "to lay nothing other than the foundations of universal knowledge, both divine and human, and to expose the origins of truth, both sacred and exotic."²³ He then went on to demonstrate this through a brief discussion of the *uses* of history.

Schüssler and Merkt have identified two uses of history in Calixtus' work,²⁴ though in his "De studio historiarum oratio," he in fact discussed three. These were to provide knowledge of events and wisdom from all the ages, and an understanding of how this wisdom has endured to the present time; to teach one prudent knowledge (*prudentia*) that might be of practical use in public and private life; and to enable one to defend the church against idolatry and false gods.²⁵ For Calixtus, knowledge of the past allowed one to grow intellectually and to draw connections between times past and one's own. It is clear that he stood in that school of thought that believed in the pedagogical value of ancient sources, and their relevance for contemporary problems. He also followed the accepted *modus operandi* of other authors of *artes historicae* when he introduced his discussion of these uses with a quote from Dionysius of Halicarnassus who, according to Calixtus, judged history to be "the source of prudent knowledge and wisdom,"²⁶ and with the Ciceronian topos of history as *magistra vitae*.²⁷

²¹ Bodin, *Method*, 15.

²² Gerhard Vossius to Daniel Pareus, [ca. 1631?], quoted in Wickenden, *G. J. Vossius*, 202.

²³ "De historia," 422–23: "Accedabat, quod considerarem historiam ab orbe condito deducere nihil aliud esse quam fundamenta universae eruditionis cum divinae tum humanae iacere et principia veritatis cum sacrae tum exoticae exponere."

²⁴ See above, § 3.2.1.

²⁵ "De historia," 423–25.

²⁶ Dionysius of Halicarnassus *Roman Antiquities* 1.1, quoted in "De historia," 423: "ἀρχὴ φρονήσεως καὶ σοφίας." I deviate from the standard translation of "prudence and wisdom" here in an effort to

For the second use of history—the practical application of prudent knowledge—Calixtus noted that there were three types of history that one might draw from. There were universal histories; those of the “middle age”; and those concerned with particular details or events. In each of these categories, Calixtus recommended various authors that might serve his audience well. In the first, Diodorus Siculus and Pompeius Trogus; in the second, Johannes Zonaras, Georg Cedrinus, and Paulus Orosius; and in the third Thucydides, Xenophon, Polybius, Livy, Sallust, and Tacitus. Finally, Calixtus suggested that for those who would venture into “public affairs and civil business, or military affairs,” the writings of Julius Caesar would prove invaluable.²⁸ In dividing history in this manner, Calixtus differed slightly from Bodin and Vossius. While they divided history according to its nature (natural, divine, or human), Calixtus divided it according to its subject (concerning all matters, those of a particular age, or only specific events and deeds). However, there are similarities here as well. Bodin, for example, used one of the first chapters of his *Method* to describe “the choice of historians,” suggesting, like Calixtus, whose work one might turn to for advice on various topics. “In civil training,” for example, “the following are pre-eminent: Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Plutarch, Livy, Zonaras, Dio, and Appian; in military training, Caesar, Paternus, Ammianus, Froissart, Hirtius, Du Bellay.”²⁹ Both Bodin and Calixtus felt it

capture some of the additional implications inherent in the Greek word φρονήσεως (*phroneseōs*), which is more akin to the Latin *virtus* or *prudentia*, as a quality which infers a kind of qualitative knowledge, than the English “prudence,” which might simply refer to judgement. My thanks are due Gavin Kendall for his assistance with the Greek. Cf. the translations by Earnest Cary (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1937–50); Edward Spelman (London, 1758); Friedrich Sylburg (Frankfurt: Apud heredes Andreae Wecheli, 1586). Consider also Aristotle’s understanding of φρονήσεως, which explicitly entails a knowledge of earthly affairs and the practical application of this knowledge for the public good. Jacob Soll, “Empirical History and the Transformation of Political Criticism in France from Bodin to Bayle,” *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 64, no. 2 (2003): 302. I note also that Calixtus’ translation is taken slightly out of context, as Dionysius actually notes that *truth* is the source of prudent knowledge and wisdom, and that *history* contains truth. Calixtus also excluded the word “τε” which follows φρονήσεως in the original. Gary Ianziti has suggested in conversation that these facts are a likely indication that Calixtus was quoting this passage from memory, rather than with the source in front of him. This is supported by the fact that the original publications of the speech do not provide the details of the source for the Dionysian quote, while at least one of them does for the Ciceronian. Cf. Calixtus, “De studio historiarum . . . oratio,” 113; *Oratio panegyrica . . . MDCXXIIX*, 4; *Oratio panegyrica . . . MDCXXXIIX*, 4.

²⁷ “De historia,” 423. See above, pp. 84–85.

²⁸ “De historia,” 424: “partim et potissimum quidem, quae in administratione reipub. et negotiorum civilium facem praeferat, partim quoque militaris, qualem praecipue suppeditant Julii Caesaris scripta.”

²⁹ Bodin, *Method*, 54.

important to foreground the import of selecting one's sources prudently, and were quick to point out that certain authors were better suited to the study of certain topics.

After introducing why one might study history, and suggesting some suitable historians from which to draw, Calixtus turned his attention to ancillary disciplines. He noted that "geography, chronology, and genealogy produce history," a fact which was widely recognised by other authors of the *ars historica*.³⁰ As one continues to read through the speech, it becomes quite clear why Calixtus felt it necessary to mention these ancillary disciplines: the crux of his method centred on chronology. At this point, rather than suggesting several sources for the *timing* of events, as he did for the *description* of events, Calixtus deferred to one authority: Joseph Scaliger. He was aware of the contemporary debates raging around the reconciliation of various dating systems and of myriad historical events, and evidently judged Scaliger to have addressed these issues most effectively, declining to consider the works of any others in this matter.³¹ Despite using Scaliger's work to judge the timing of particular events, Calixtus did not use Scaliger's Julian period in his speech. Instead, he constructed his own schema for interpreting relative historical events, based on the Dionysian era (centred on *anno Domini*),³² and the contemporary practice of dividing time into centuries.³³

Calixtus' method for the easy recollection of historical facts hinged on his chronological schema, which he based on the chronologies of Varro and Dionysius Exiguus. Varro's work has survived only in fragments, but Censorinus, in his *De die*

³⁰ "De historia," 425: "Ad historiam faciunt Geographia, Chronologia item et Genealogiae." Cf. Bodin, *Method*, 85–86, 303; Grafton, *What Was History?*, 92, 147–63; Wickenden, *G. J. Vossius*, 127–30, 203–4.

³¹ "De historia," 425: "Sicut neque Summam Universalem historicam tradenti integrum esse poterit Chronologicis minutiis et controversiis, quae maximas perplexitates et incertos exitus habent, immorari. Nobis consultum videtur omissis disputationibus unum certum auctorem deligere, quem sequamur. Et sequimur sane Iosephum Scaligerum, quod itidem a nostris Setho Calvisio et Christophoro Helvico, de historia et studio Chronologico praeclare meritis, factum videmus." On Scaliger and chronology, see Grafton, *Joseph Scaliger*, vol. 2, *Historical Chronology*.

³² Dionysius Exiguus had set the date for *anno Domini* in the sixth century. By the eleventh century it had become a standard, at least in Western Christendom, for dating events after the birth of Christ. Georges Declercq, "Dionysius Exiguus and the Introduction of the Christian Era," *Sacris erudiri* 41 (2002): 165.

³³ This practice was brought into the mainstream by the *Magdeburg Centuries* of 1559. Denys Hay, *Annalists and Historians: Western Historiography from the Eighth to the Eighteenth Centuries* (London: Methuen & Co., 1977), 123–24; Donald J. Wilcox, *The Measure of Times Past: Pre-Newtonian Chronologies and the Rhetoric of Relative Time* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987), 9.

natali (Concerning the Natal Day), noted that Varro divided history into three periods: before the flood (which he called “uncertain,” as no one could know exactly how long it was); from the flood to the first Olympiad (“fabulous,” because of the great number of myths and legends concerning it); and from the first Olympiad to Varro’s own times (“historical,” because reputable historians kept records of it).³⁴ Dionysian chronology reckoned two thousand years between the births of Abraham and of Christ. Despite his use of Varro and Dionysius Exiguus, one also finds here an example of Calixtus’ deference to Scaliger, who also calculated this period as “exactly two thousand years” long.³⁵

Having introduced Varro’s periodisation, and having referred to Dionysius Exiguus and Scaliger to confirm a period of two thousand years from Abraham to Christ, Calixtus proceeded to outline the framework for his method in more detail. He did this by first outlining an initial period (equivalent to Varro’s “uncertain” age) in which the forebears of Abraham lived. Apart from mentioning twenty generations between Adam and Abraham, this period received no further attention in this speech, presumably because all the pertinent details could be found in the Bible (a text which Calixtus’ students would have known intimately). Calixtus then noted that the period between Abraham and Christ could be conveniently divided into periods of one hundred years each. Here, it seems that he felt he was offering his students a novel way of thinking about the past: “I mean to say that, just as we distinguish the time from Christ’s birth (the church of the New Testament) by centuries—and that to the great aid of our memory—likewise we can divide the time before Christ’s birth (the church of the Old Testament).”³⁶ Thus, he outlined two more ages: a second, from the birth of Abraham to the birth of Christ; and a third, from the birth of Christ onwards.

³⁴ Censorinus *De die natali* 21.1, quoted in “De historia,” 425–26: “Varro . . . tria discrimina temporum esse tradit. Primum ab hominum principio ad cataclysmum priorem, quod propter ignorantiam vocatur ἀδηλον, secundum a cataclysmo priore ad Olympiadem primam, quod, quia in eo multa fabulosa referuntur, μυθικόν nominatur, tertium a prima Olympiade ad nos, quod dicitur ιστορικόν, quia res in eo gestae veris historiis continentur. Primum tempus sive habuit initium sive semper fuit, certe quot annorum sit non potest comprehendi.”

³⁵ “De historia,” 427: “A natali vero anno Abrahami usque ad annum natalem Servatoris verum, qui iuxta Scaligerum aeram Dionysianam duobus annis praevertit, numerantur praecise anni bis mille.”

³⁶ “De historia,” 427: “Sicut enim tempus a nato Christo sive ecclesiae Novi Testamenti per secula distinguimus, et hoc memoriae magno adiumento, ita quoque visum est nobis distinguere tempora ante natum Christum sive ecclesiae Veteris Testamenti.”

By dividing history into centuries *ante* and *post Christum* (before and after Christ), this speech shows us that Calixtus was a product of his times. Although the AD/BC dating system was not in widespread use in Europe until the eighteenth century, a number of writers around Calixtus' time were beginning to utilise it. The most well-known of these, sometimes regarded as the "inventor" of the AD/BC timeline, was Denis Petau (Dionysius/Domenicus Petavius, 1583–1652), who proposed the schema in his *Opus de doctrina temporum* (Work on the Science of Time) of 1627.³⁷ It had also been utilised in some form or other by various other writers since the Venerable Bede in the eighth century.³⁸ Despite this, it was not yet a wide-spread practice in the first half of the seventeenth century, and the way Calixtus approached it in his speech suggests that he felt he was offering something original to his students. Although it is not certain whether Calixtus was familiar with Petau's publication, it seems likely that he was not. The facts that he did not mention Petau, and that he felt the need to clarify to his students exactly what he meant by his *ante/post Christum* schema, suggest that Calixtus felt he had developed this way of thinking about dates himself.³⁹ He also noted in this speech that the method that he was sharing with his students was something that he held dear, and he hoped that his students would pay due attention to it. It is apparent that he was sharing an idea that *he* had come up with, something that was particularly special to him.⁴⁰ Masayuki Sato notes that "the invention of 'B.C.'" allowed "the Christian era system [to transform] itself into a chronological system capable of locating every historical event on a single time line."⁴¹ It is clear that this is what Calixtus saw himself doing—he was providing his students not only with an aid to memory, but with a

³⁷ Masayuki Sato, "Comparative Ideas of Chronology," *History and Theory* 30, no. 3 (1991): 294; Wilcox, *Measure*, 203–8.

³⁸ Sato, "Comparative Ideas," 293–94; Wickenden, *G. J. Vossius*, 128–29.

³⁹ The providence of the extant edition (1703) held at HAB also suggests that the library at the University of Helmstedt did not hold a copy of *De doctrina temporum*. See, at HAB, shelf-mark H: T 93.2° Helmst.

⁴⁰ "De historia," 423: "Ut autem quae dixi vera esse aliqua ex parte perspiciatis, et qua methodo, si, quod cupio et operam dabo, cis paucas septimanas rem auspicatus fuero, uti velim intelligatis; priusquam negotium, cuius ergo huc convenimus, aggrediamur, hunc ipsum finem pauca, quandoquidem multa tempus non admittit, subiciam, quae vos, sive coepta successum habuerint sive remoram patientur, audivisse, ut spero, non poenitebit."

⁴¹ Sato, "Comparative Ideas," 293. Cf. Wilcox, *Measure*, 8–9.

practical tool that would allow them to position any historical event in relation to others. He was giving them a new way of thinking.⁴²

Having described how one could divide time into centuries both before and after Christ, Calixtus turned to a discussion of the practical advantages for doing so. In trying to devise a method by which one might easily recall historical facts, Calixtus noted in his speech that he had spent time thinking about whether or not there might be events in the centuries before Christ that corresponded with later occurrences in the centuries after Christ. For example, if such-and-such a person did such-and-such a thing in the fifth century BC, was there an equivalent occurrence in the fifth century AD? Calixtus felt that if he could identify such a pattern, it would make it easy to remember historical events, and this turns out to be the core of his method. Having looked for these parallels, he managed to find them, and presented these to his students. Starting with his own age, Calixtus recounted parallels in each century that might aid his students' memory. In the twelfth century before Christ, for example, Calixtus noted that the Greeks captured and sacked Troy, just as Godfrey of Bouillon captured Jerusalem in the twelfth century after Christ.⁴³ In the tenth century,

the impious kings of Israel, Jeroboam and his successors, and Ahab, are represented by the Christian popes of that same tenth century, who were “unnatural men, who led shameful lives, and who were utterly repugnant in every conceivable way,” according to Cardinal Baronius.⁴⁴

Especially interesting is Calixtus' treatment of the sixth, fifth, and fourth centuries. Here, as well as providing his students with easy-to-remember events, he pointed out that the major writers during each period also had their equivalents. For

⁴² Prior to the advent of the AD/BC system of reckoning time on an absolute scale, many different methods were employed. One practice had been to consider events before the birth of Christ relative to other events, without considering what came before, or in relation to themes—for example *ab urbe condita* (from the foundation of the city [of Rome]) or *ab orbe condito* (from the creation of the world), or “when Cicero was consul” or “when Hannibal crossed the Alps.” For discussion of various practices, see Grafton, *Joseph Scaliger*, 2:25–35; Wilcox, *Measure*.

⁴³ “De historia,” 428–29.

⁴⁴ “De historia,” 429: “impios vero in Israele reges Ieroboamum eiusque successores et Ahabum repraesentent apud Christianos Pontifices eiusdem seculi decimi ‘homines monstrosi, vita turpissimi usquequaque foedissimi,’ ut de iis loquitur Cardinalis Baronius.”

example, “the ancient Greek philosophers Pythagoras, Solon, Aesop, and Anaximenes correspond with the Christians Fulgentius, Boethius, Cassiodorus, and Procopius of Gaza,” and “the Greeks have their historians Herodotus and Thucydides, just as the Christians have their own Paulus Orosius, Sulpicius Severus, Socrates [Scholasticus] and Sozomen.”⁴⁵ Thus Calixtus offered his students not only a method by which to recall key events in history, but also a means by which they might remember when each of the most important writers lived.⁴⁶

Calixtus’ schema is interesting for another reason as well: it is entirely adaptable to the needs of its user. The way he presented it in his speech, it strikes the reader as entirely reliant on imagination. In a time when the standard technique for remembering something was to take notes—whether in the form of marginalia, according to *loci communes*, or otherwise—in his “De studio historiarum oratio” Calixtus offered a mental, rather than a physical, mnemonic.⁴⁷ This is exemplified in his concluding remarks: “Suppose I want to know in which age before Christ Alexander the Great lived. I wonder which one corresponds, and Constantine the Great comes to mind. I know that Constantine was four ages after Christ, therefore Alexander ruled four ages before Christ.”⁴⁸ Using his schema he was able to quickly identify and match pertinent details in order to recall others. However, although presented as imaginary, Calixtus’ schema might also be compiled as a table. In fact, printed as an addendum to editions of the speech dated 1628 and 1638 one finds a “Tabula complectens collationem seculorum ante et post natum Christum” (A Table

⁴⁵ “De historia,” 431, 432: “Priscis autem Graecorum philosophis Pythagorae, Soloni, Aesopo, Anaximeni respondent apud Christianos Fulgentius, Boethius, M. Aurelius Cassiodorus, Procopius Gazaeus”; “Habent Graeci suos historicos Herodotum, Thucydidem, habent Christiani itidem suos Paulum Orosium, Severum Sulpitium, Socratem et Sozomenum.”

⁴⁶ Placing authors in the context of their times may suggest something about Calixtus’ attitude to his sources, though there is insufficient evidence here to draw a firm conclusion. Just as Bodin believed that one must divorce oneself from one’s prejudices when considering the testimony of people writing in different times and circumstances, we might infer from Calixtus’ speech that he believed being conscious of when a person was writing, and in what context, enabled one to consider their testimony more objectively. See Bodin, *Method*, 70–71; Grafton, *What Was History?*, 47–48.

⁴⁷ See Ann Blair, “Reading Strategies for Coping with Information Overload ca. 1550–1700,” *Journal of the History of Ideas* 64, no. 1 (2003): 11–28; Grafton, *Bring Out Your Dead*, 106–7; Daniel Rosenberg, “Early Modern Information Overload,” *Journal of the History of Ideas* 64, no. 1 (2003): 1–9; Richard Yeo, “Notebooks as Memory Aids: Precepts and Practices in Early Modern England,” *Memory Studies* 1, no. 1 (2008): 115–36.

⁴⁸ “De historia,” 433: “Cupio scire quoto seculo ante Christum vixerit Alexander magnus. Cogito, qui ei αντίστιχος. Ubi in mentem venerit Constantini magni, scio ut Constantinum quarto post Christum it Alexandrum quarto ante Christum seculo regnasse.”

Including a Collation of the Centuries Before and After the Birth of Christ).⁴⁹ This table neatly sets out the twenty centuries before and after Christ side-by-side, so that one might at a glance see the parallels between the various people and events that Calixtus described in his speech. The versatility of Calixtus' schema extends to how one chooses to employ it. One might remember corresponding facts by similarity in time, manner, purpose, or other detail. Alexander the Great might correspond with Constantine the Great, for example, because of their ruling in the fourth centuries before and after Christ respectively, because of similarities in their style of rule, because they were both rulers, or because they shared the same cognomen.

In emphasising the recollection of similarities as an aid to memory, Calixtus' model appears akin to classical precedents that had been popularly revived as part of the humanist movement. In the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, for example (written ca. 86–82 BC), the author imagined a columnar space, in which were arranged images and words that were intended to remind him or her of particular events, people, or places.⁵⁰ Similarly, in Calixtus' schema one might imagine a central marker (the birth of Christ), with a series of boxes either side, each containing one or more pertinent figures or events. Alternatively, one might simply remember key features of each age—opposition to God, for example (in the case of Saul in the eleventh century BC, and Pope Hildebrand in the eleventh century AD), or the destruction of a city (in the case of Babylon in the sixth century BC, and Rome in the sixth century AD).⁵¹ If one does not trust their memory and imagination to recall pertinent facts,⁵² one may presumably refer to the “Tabula.” The “Tabula,” for its part, seems a pared-down implementation of a method suggested by Bodin, who wrote that the first step in reading history was to

⁴⁹ Calixtus, *Oratio panegyrica . . . MDCXXIIX*; *Oratio panegyrica . . . MDCXXXIIX*. This table was also printed separately in at least one other edition. Calixtus, *Tabula complectens collationem seculorum ante et post natum Christum* ([Helmstedt?], [1650?]).

⁵⁰ *Rhetorica ad Herennium* 3.16; Yeo, “Notebooks,” 117–18. Cf. Donald Beecher, “Recollection, Cognition, and Culture: An Overview of Renaissance Memory,” in *Ars reminiscendi: Mind and Memory in Renaissance Culture*, ed. Beecher and Grant Williams (Toronto: Centre for Reformation and Renaissance Studies, 2009), 368.

⁵¹ See “De historia,” 429, 431.

⁵² Michael Screech points out in his edition of Montaigne's *Essais* that the concept of “imagination” around this time tended to include activities that we would regard as thinking. Calixtus' schema provided his students with a way to imagine, or to think about, particular aspects of history that would assist them to recall facts from memory. Michel de Montaigne, *The Complete Essays*, trans. M. A. Screech (London: Penguin, 2003), 109.

place before [oneself] a general chart for all periods, not too detailed and therefore easy to study, in which are contained the origins of the world, the floods, the earliest beginnings of states and of the religions which have been more famous, and their ends, if indeed they have come to an end.⁵³

While Calixtus' "Tabula" did not describe all these things, its focus does suggest a similar concern with the rise and fall of nations. As can be seen from the examples already quoted in this chapter, the vast majority of matters broached by Calixtus in his "De studio historiarum oratio," and summarised in the "Tabula," were wars which marked recognised turning points in the progress of empires, or reigns which did the same.

Though the imaginative aspects of Calixtus' schema remind one of generic classical techniques of memory, the associative aspect of it appears specifically Aristotelian in nature. Aristotle recognised that association was the key to an active mind and fundamental to accurate memory.⁵⁴ By drawing connections between key events in history, and by encouraging his reader to *associate* one or more events with another as an aid to memory, Calixtus provides us with yet another example of the Aristotelian influence on his thought. This also demonstrates Calixtus' ability to draw together ideas from different intellectual traditions—he was able to combine contemporary and medieval chronology with an Aristotelian understanding of the nature of the mind to present to his audience a new, functional way of thinking.

Calixtus' "De studio historiarum oratio" also provides some evidence for his use of criticism in interpreting historical sources. He made it clear in the speech that he had no time for falsified histories, describing the well-known forger Annius of Viterbo (Giovanni Nanni, ca. 1432–1502) as "not worth remembering."⁵⁵ This is a point worth noting, particularly when one considers that other humanists such as Jean Bodin relied on at least parts of Annius' work almost without considering his reputation as a falsifier of facts, and that Annius had a significant impact on the

⁵³ Bodin, *Method*, 21.

⁵⁴ Beecher, "Recollection," 370.

⁵⁵ "De historia," 426: "Quae vero ante annos CL plus minus sub ementitis Berosi, Metasthenis, aliorum nominibus illaudabili mangonio in publicum emisit Iohannes Annus Viterbiensis, quamvis a Naclero et pluribus descripta fuerint, ne quidem memorari digna sunt."

critical techniques of subsequent generations of scholars.⁵⁶ Future research may shed light on how aware Calixtus was of this influence, and how influential these techniques were on his work. One gets at least a hint of this when one reads Calixtus' suggestion that careful reading of histories by different authors would allow one to compare them, and to judge "the quality and genius of the writing."⁵⁷ Of course, as Merkt and Schüssler observe, in other works Calixtus also identified specific internal and external criteria against which one ought to evaluate one's sources. Coupled with his condemnation of Annius, it is clear that Calixtus felt strongly about the need for rigour in historical research. Despite this, he was not immune from the pressures of his religious convictions, nor from popular polemic. When he came to the ninth century, for example, Calixtus mentioned the legendary Pope Joan, whose existence had well and truly been rendered at least questionable, if not disproven entirely, by the time he was writing.⁵⁸ We also know that Calixtus was familiar with at least one work that was critical of this legend: Cardinal Baronius' *Annales ecclesiastici*, which Calixtus quoted in dealing with the tenth century, "lavished fulsome praise" on a major French book that had effectively brought the legend into disrepute.⁵⁹ This brings us to another aspect of Calixtus' critical use of sources. Even if he did not always hold the authors of sources like the *Annales*, or the tenor of their arguments, in high regard, he was willing to draw on these works when necessary and appropriate (or when they supported his position, as in the example quoted above). Like Bodin and Vossius, though resolute concerning the authenticity and integrity of sources, Calixtus did not always apply his own critical techniques and allowed his personal beliefs to interfere with their application.⁶⁰

5.3. Summary—On the Study of History

This chapter has shown that, in his "De studio historiarum oratio," Calixtus thought about, criticised, and developed ideas that were the subject of contemporary debate.

⁵⁶ See Grafton, *Forgers and Critics*, ch. 4; Ligota, "Annius of Viterbo."

⁵⁷ "De historia," 425: "adiuncta interim cuiusque summa sive argumento una cum iudicio sive censura de dotibus et genio scriptionis, ut lectoribus constare queat, quid ab unoquoque sit exspectandum."

⁵⁸ "De historia," 430. On the debunking of the legend of Pope Joan, and uses of the legend in religious polemic at this time, see Barbara Sher Tinsley, "Pope Joan Polemic in Early Modern France: The Use and Disabuse of Myth," *Sixteenth Century Journal* 18, no. 3 (1987): 381–98.

⁵⁹ Tinsley, "Pope Joan Polemic," 391.

⁶⁰ See also Wickenden, *G. J. Vossius*, 99–100. Cf. Grafton, *Worlds*, 24–27.

Although he did not specifically mention any *artes historicae* in his speech, the manner in which he considered matters such as chronology, historical criticism, the pedagogic value of history, and the best methods for remembering history suggests that he was familiar with this genre of writing. Like Jean Bodin and Gerhard Vossius, he believed that a universal history—one that encompassed all events since the creation—could provide the basis of all knowledge. He also recognised that history could not stand as a discipline in its own right—it must be supported by ancillary studies such as chronology, genealogy, and geography—and that it must be drawn from as wide a range of sources as possible. In this speech we see too the continued influence of those figures that we discussed in chapter two: Calixtus continued to emphasise the practical applications of history, including addressing dissension in the Christian church; he believed that one must apply reason and critique when considering one’s sources; and he recognised that a diverse and rigorous education was necessary in order to harness truly useful historical knowledge. Though Calixtus did not go to the lengths of drawing on non-literary sources such as inscriptions or physical artefacts, as Vossius suggested one ought,⁶¹ his “*De studio historiarum oratio*” attests to his broad learning and the practical application of his own advice: in a speech of less than 3,000 words, he managed to mention more than 80 different authors, both secular and ecclesiastical, pagan and pious.

Calixtus’ use of sources may also be another indicator of his familiarity with texts such as Vossius’ *Ars historica* of 1623. Both Calixtus and Vossius chose to use Varro’s chronology in their work and, apart from some of the aforementioned similarities between Vossius’ work and Calixtus’ brief discussion of history in the “*De studio historiarum oratio*,” there are other reasons to believe that Calixtus was familiar with Vossius’ book.⁶² We know that the two men were in contact during this time because one of Calixtus’ former students, Christoph Schrader (1601–1680), had written to him from Hamburg in 1627, and in his letter included salutations from

⁶¹ Although, as Nicholas Wickenden points out, Vossius never actually followed his own advice on this point, preferring instead to rely solely on literary sources in his work. Wickenden, *G. J. Vossius*, 89–90.

⁶² The possibility that Calixtus’ and Vossius’ use of the same source was coincidence cannot be ruled out; Anthony Grafton notes that Varro’s chronology was quite popular amongst early modern scholars. Grafton, *Bring Out Your Dead*, 274. Cf. Wickenden, *G. J. Vossius*, 132, which suggests the opposite.

Vossius.⁶³ We also know that Vossius lent various books to Calixtus, and it is possible that the *Ars historica* was one of those loans.⁶⁴ Just as Calixtus used Varro and Dionysius Exiguus as a basic structure for his own chronological schema, Vossius combined elements of Varro's periodisation with those of other writers when devising his own "ideal" periodisation of history.⁶⁵ Joseph Scaliger also cited Censorinus' *De die natali* extensively in his *Thesaurus temporum*, a work that Calixtus clearly had access to.⁶⁶ Of course, Calixtus may also have obtained his quote directly from its source (an edition of *De die natali* had been published in Hamburg in 1614, and several others in the sixteenth century). Although we cannot be sure of where Calixtus obtained the motive to utilise Varro's chronology, the fact that both Scaliger and Vossius also used it in their work suggests that Calixtus was supportive of at least this aspect of their judgement. Of course as evinced above, at least in the case of the "wise" Joseph Scaliger, this was not the only aspect of their work that he approved of.

In addition to the likelihood that he was familiar with Vossius' work, and his access to three editions of Bodin's *Method* at the library at Helmstedt, we know that Calixtus also had access to other examples of the *ars historica*. Through the University of Helmstedt, he had links to at least two major contributors to the genre: Reiner Reineck (1541–1595) and David Chyträus.⁶⁷ Reineck was a professor of history at the University of Helmstedt, and his work was continued and developed by Heinrich Meibom (1555–1625) and Henning Arnisäus (1575–1636), the former one of Calixtus' teachers, the latter a colleague.⁶⁸ Chyträus, of course, was one of Johann

⁶³ Henke, *Georg Calixtus*, 1:483n1. The published correspondence between Calixtus and Vossius does not start until 1632, though it is apparent from the content of these letters that the two had been in contact before this time. See Vossius, *Gerardi Joan. Vossii et clarorum virorum et eum epistolæ*, ed. Paul Colomiès (London: R. R. & M. C., 1690), pt 1, 211–12, 400, 433, 452–53, pt 2, 94, 132–33, 264, 269.

⁶⁴ C. S. M. Rademaker, *Life and Work of Gerardus Joannes Vossius (1577–1649)* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1981), 267. Rademaker references Vossius, *Het Uitleenboekje van Vossius* (Amsterdam: N. V. Noord-Hollandsche Uitgeversmaatschappij, 1962), which only includes loans from 1644–49, though this does not preclude loans to Calixtus before this period. See, for example, Vossius to Calixtus, 17 June 1642, in *Gerardi Joan. Vossii . . . epistolæ*, pt 1, 400.

⁶⁵ Wickenden, *G. J. Vossius*, 132.

⁶⁶ Grafton, *Defenders*, 277n9. Apart from the other references to Scaliger in "De historia," on page 425 Calixtus makes reference to the *Chronicon* of Eusebius. Mager notes that this was restored by Joseph Scaliger and published in his *Thesaurus temporum* of 1606. Calixtus, "Apparatus," 264n783.

⁶⁷ Grafton, *What Was History?*

⁶⁸ Grafton, *What Was History?*; Henke, *Georg Calixtus*, 1:106–7, 264–65, 386n2, 2.1:72.

Calixtus' teachers, and was a founder of the University of Helmstedt.⁶⁹ Both their works were available on the shelves of Helmstedt's library.⁷⁰

One of the most significant features of Calixtus' contribution to the *ars historica* is his construction of a schema around centuries pre- and post-Christ. Although the use of *ante Christum* was not unique, it was quite novel in the early seventeenth century, and shows that Calixtus was engaged with, not just aware of, the intellectual debates surrounding him. He was willing and able to draw from his various sources a framework which he could adapt to his own purposes, and which he could present to his students as a practical tool. Not only did thinking of historical dates in terms of pre- and post-Christ allow one to easily calculate when different events occurred in relation to each other, it also provided one—at least as far as Calixtus was concerned—with an easy way to *remember* these events, without the need to resort to complicated note-taking systems or endless compilations of *loci communes*.

We can now conclude that, in addition to the myriad religious debates and theological controversies that surrounded him, Calixtus also engaged with, and contributed to, debates in other fields of knowledge. The subject of history was an important one for his theology, but he also recognised its practical application to other fields of endeavour, including politics, military affairs, and personal relationships. In a brief speech, we find evidence of a much broader relationship with the humanist tradition than has previously been considered. Calixtus not only drew on this tradition for his own purposes, but also made active contributions to the debates and discussions that it engendered.

⁶⁹ Krumwiede, *Kirchengeschichte*, 181.

⁷⁰ Among many others see, for example, at HAB, shelf-marks H: B 117.4° Helmst. (2), H: T 1.8° Helmst. (1), H: T 2.8° Helmst. (1), H: T 71.8° Helmst., H: T 873.2° Helmst. (3), H: T 873.2° Helmst. (5).

6. Conclusion

This thesis has sought to explore and to clarify Georg Calixtus' relationship with the tradition of Renaissance humanism. The working definition of a Renaissance humanist that we have used comes from Anthony Grafton,¹ and it implies engagement with a broad array of intellectual concerns as well as a critical eye, an erudite mind, a reverence for the work of the ancients, and a keen appreciation for practical knowledge. By exploring Calixtus' work in light of this understanding of humanism, this study has paved the way for more nuanced considerations of his contributions to early modern thought, arguing that his interaction with the humanist tradition had greater implications for the genesis and transmission of his ideas than has previously been recognised. Apart from providing him with the tools by which he might forge a plan for universal Christian reunion, and thereby act as a "forerunner of ecumenism,"² Calixtus' interaction with the humanist tradition provided him with the critical techniques that he needed to make an active contribution to many other contemporary debates. These were not only religious discussions, but also philological, historical, and legal—dealing with matters of primary concern to famous early modern scholars like Jean Bodin, Isaac Casaubon, and Joseph Scaliger. Hence, this thesis also contributes to ongoing discussion about the vitality of the humanist tradition post-1600. It has shown that the "technical methods" forged by and the "practical lessons" learnt and taught by the humanists of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries were still being practised, developed, and refined well into the seventeenth. Calixtus is but one example of a figure whose contributions to this movement have been largely overlooked.

We have seen that the current body of knowledge surrounding Calixtus' life and works has been written for the most part by theologians and ecclesiastical historians and therefore focuses on matters of religious or theological interest. Although acknowledging the impact that humanism had on Calixtus, this scholarship pays little heed to the impact that Calixtus may have had on humanism. The literature positions itself in relation to religious concerns—interpretation of doctrine, practice of the sacraments, exegesis of Scripture—and overlooks evidence which suggests that Calixtus engaged in other intellectual debates such as historical and legal

¹ See above, p. 4.

² Mager et al., "Theologie im Dialog."

criticism and chronology. His use of history, for example, is only considered so far as it relates to his religious concerns, as is his criticism of the use of Roman law in the Holy Roman Empire. The present study has begun to fill this gap not by discussing the appropriation of humanist ideals in Calixtus' theology, as previous studies have, but rather by considering his *interaction* with the humanist tradition. When viewed from this perspective, it becomes clear that Georg Calixtus has much more to offer modern intellectual historians than his legacy as a controversial and influential theologian: he is worthy of attention as an exemplar of interdisciplinary collaboration and the dissemination of ideas in early modern Europe, and as an active contributor to the humanist tradition. Calixtus was a scholar who developed, fostered, and maintained a rich reciprocal relationship with Renaissance humanism, and his work deserves to be considered in this light. The two case studies presented in this thesis reinforce this assertion, and have also begun this project: the first by reconsidering Calixtus' relationship with Isaac Casaubon, and the second by exploring Calixtus' "De studio historiarum oratio" as an example of the *ars historica*.

The first case study, and the background discussion in chapter two, emphasised that Calixtus was exposed not only to humanist ideals as propounded in religious works by people such as Philipp Melanchthon and Marco Antonio de Dominis, but also to these ideals as explored in other genres such as philology and history. In his first academic tour he had already met Jan Gruter, and on his second tour, after meeting Casaubon in London, he had made the acquaintance of Jacques-August de Thou, a noted historian. Calixtus' meetings with Isaac Casaubon, for their part, must be considered one of the turning points in Calixtus' intellectual development. These meetings were the culmination of years of education—as a child under the supervision of his father, during his early teens at the Flensburg Latin School, his late teens at the University of Helmstedt, and in his early twenties through his first academic tour. Through his conversations with Casaubon, Calixtus was able to crystallise the knowledge developed throughout these years in his understanding of the *consensus antiquitatis*, which he employed as a cornerstone of his theology and in his later years as a practical tool to counter accusations of crypto-Papism, of anti-Lutheranism, and of heresy. In considering exactly what Calixtus' relationship was to the humanist tradition (epitomised in this case by Casaubon), this case study also showed that he had at least been exposed to different fields of scholarly endeavour such as philology and history, and thus also to the critical

techniques of Renaissance humanists, something that has previously been largely overlooked in the literature. With a new awareness of Calixtus' exposure to these aspects of the humanist tradition, it follows that a re-evaluation of his work is in order. Just such a re-evaluation was the focus of the second case study in this thesis, which looked at Calixtus' 1629 "De studio historiarum oratio" as a participant in the genre of the *ars historica*.

Calixtus' speech on the study of histories provides ample evidence of his interaction with a wide variety of early modern intellectual debates. In it, he drew on myriad sources to articulate ideas about history, about chronology, and about source criticism. He also discussed the importance of what would today be termed "interdisciplinarity," making sure that his students understood that the study of history could not stand alone, and that it must be supported by ancillary disciplines such as chronology, genealogy, and geography. Again drawing on the humanist tradition, Calixtus also recognised that each of these subjects, like history, was fundamentally practical. With this functional understanding of history and its propaedeutic disciplines, Calixtus was able to offer his students a concrete example of how these disciplines might be used in everyday life. He drew on classical and medieval works of chronology and philosophy, as well as contemporary chronological debates, to develop a means by which one might consider any historical event in temporal relation to any other. By presenting this method to his students, Calixtus offered them not only an aid to memory, but a new lens through which they might consider the past. In the manner of the greatest practitioners of Renaissance humanism, he combined ideas from different intellectual traditions to present to his audience a new, functional way of thinking.

In light of Grafton's observations, and of the analyses undertaken in this thesis, it is clear that Calixtus was a practitioner of Renaissance humanism: he was aware of the philological methods that the humanists developed (including internal and external criticism of sources) and utilised them in his own work; he drew lessons from both classical and patristic sources for use in every-day life; and he had a firm grasp of Latin, quoting contemporary, medieval, and classical sources and eloquently rendering his own opinions in the language. It is also apparent that much more work needs to be done to fully appreciate Calixtus' involvement with the humanist tradition. This thesis has only been able to consider two examples of his interaction with Renaissance humanism, and many more opportunities exist for future research

regarding Calixtus and his intellectual contributions to early modern Europe. As well as analysis of his critique of the Lotharian legend, mentioned in the introduction, Calixtus' contributions to the history of historiography warrant further attention, and this thesis offers a solid foundation from which to start such research. Further consideration of Calixtus' arguments regarding source criticism, periodisation, chronology, philology, and the pedagogy of history promises to provide valuable insight into German historiographical thought between Reformation and Enlightenment. It will also contribute to ongoing research regarding interdisciplinarity in the Republic of Letters. While existing research has tended to view early modern theologians as operating in a discrete intellectual milieu, this thesis encourages us to consider them in relation to the broader humanist scholarship of the time. As noted in the introductory remarks to chapter four, "with boundaries between disciplines blurred, and a vast network of correspondence, the exchange of ideas during this time may have been much more prevalent than has previously been allowed for when considering people like Calixtus."³ Only by considering Calixtus' work, and that of his contemporaries, in relation to this exchange of ideas, can we truly appreciate the contributions they made to the scholarly life of early modern Europe.

³ See above, p. 61.

Bibliography

1. Primary Sources

“The Augsburg Confession.” Translated by Theodore G. Tappert. In *Book of Concord*, 23–96.

Bodin, Jean. *Method for the Easy Comprehension of History*. Translated by Beatrice Reynolds. New York: Columbia University Press, 1945.

The Book of Concord. Edited by Theodore G. Tappert. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1959

Brandt, Gerard. “De vreedzame Christen.” In *Poëzy*, 155–232. Amsterdam: Aart Dirksz Ooszaan, 1688. In Google Books. <http://books.google.com.au> (accessed July 25, 2009).

Calixtus, Georg. *Ad Augustum ducem Brunsvicensem epistolae XII*. Edited by Ernst Ludwig Theodor Henke. Jena: Typis Schlotteri, 1835.

Calixtus, Georg. “Apparatus sive introductio in studium et disciplinam sanctae theologiae: 1628–1656.” In *Werke*, 1:37–364.

Calixtus, Georg. “Commercii literarii Calixtini fasciculus tertius.” In Ernst Ludwig Theodor Henke. *Viro summe venerabili perillustri amplissimo Carolo Guilielmo Justii*, 1–58. Marburg: Typis Elwertii Academicis, 1840.

Calixtus, Georg. “De populis a nobis in religione dissidentibus, Judæis, paganis et Muhammedanis, ad veritatis agnitionem ducendis oratio,” in *Orationes selectæ*, 69–77.

Calixtus, Georg. “De studio historiarum, imprimis vero de seculis ante & post natum Christum inter se conferendis oratio.” In *Orationes selectæ*, 111–24.

Calixtus, Georg. “De studio historiarum oratio: 1629.” In *Werke*, 1:419–33. [“De historia.”]

Calixtus, Georg. *Discurs von der wahren Christlichen Religion und Kirchen*. Brunswick: Christoff-Friedrich Zilliger, 1652, <http://diglib.hab.de/drucke/g-159-4f-helmst/start.htm> (accessed July 26, 2009).

Calixtus, Georg. “Epitome theologiae: 1619.” In *Werke*, 2:30–309.

Calixtus, Georg. “Epitomes theologiae moralis pars prima: 1634.” In *Werke*, 3:25–142.

Calixtus, Georg. *Epitomes theologiae moralis pars prima, vna cum digressione de Arte nova, ad omnes Germaniae academias Romano pontifici deditas et subditas, inprimis coloniensem: Cujus digressionis ergo, haec epitomes par seorsim nunc editur*. Helmstedt: Typographeo Calixtino, 1634.

Calixtus, Georg. *Georg Calixtus' Briefwechsel*. Edited by Ernst Ludwig Theodor Henke. Halle: Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses, 1833.

Calixtus, Georg. “Oratio de caesareae maiestatis dignitate et auctoritate,” in *Orationes selectae*, 17–27.

Calixtus, Georg. “Oratio de caesareae maiestatis dignitate et auctoritate: 1626.” In *Werke*, 3:180–90.

Calixtus, Georg. *Oratio panegyrica, quam habuit anno MDCXXXIIX. mense Martio, cum fasces magistratus academici deponeret: De studio historiarum, & inprimis de seculi ante & post natum Christum inter se conferendis*. [Helmstedt?], [1628/29?].

Calixtus, Georg. *Oratio panegyrica, quam habuit anno MDCXXXIIX. mense Martio, cum fasces magistratus academici deponeret: De studio historiarum, & inprimis de seculi ante & post natum Christum inter se conferendis*. [Helmstedt?], [1638?],

at Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt in Halle (Saale), shelf-mark 00 A 6446 (3).

Calixtus, Georg. *Orationes selectæ*. Edited by Friedrich Ulrich Calixtus. Helmstedt: Typographeo Calixtino, 1660.

Calixtus, Georg. "Prooemium ad Augustini 'De doctrina Christiana' et Vincentii Lerinensis 'Commonitorium' (Auswahl): 1629." In *Werke*, 1:365–418.

Calixtus, Georg. *Tabula complectens collationem seculorum ante et post natum Christum*. [Helmstedt?], [1650?], <http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:1-24356> (accessed February 15, 2010).

The Canons and Decrees of the Sacred and Oecumenical Council of Trent. Edited and translated by J. Waterworth. London: Dolman, 1848, <http://history.hannover.edu/texts/trent.html> (accessed March 5, 2010).

Casaubon, Isaac. *Ad epistolam illvstr. et reverendiss. Cardinalis Peronij, responsio*. London: John Norton, 1612. In Early English Books Online. <http://eebo.chadwyck.com> (accessed March 11, 2010).

Casaubon, Isaac. *The Ansvvere of Master Isaac Casavbon to the Epistle of the Most Illvstriovs, and most reuerend Cardinall Peron. Translated out of Latin into English, May 18. 1612*. London: William Aspley, 1612. In Early English Books Online. <http://eebo.chadwyck.com> (accessed May 29, 2009).

Casaubon, Isaac. *Ephemerides*, 2 vols. Edited by John Russell. Oxford: Typographeo Academico, 1850.

Casaubon, Isaac. *Epistolae*. Edited by Theodor Janson van Almeloveen. Rotterdam: Caspar Fritsch & Michael Böhm, 1709, http://www.uni-mannheim.de/mateo/cera/autoren/casaubon_cera.html (accessed August 25, 2009).

Caselius, Johannes. *Ad principes, nobiles, viros celebres propinquos, cives ac familiares epistolae*. Edited by Justus von Dransfeld and Hermann Conring. Hannover: Nicolaus Förster, 1718, http://www.uni-mannheim.de/mateo/cera/autoren/caselius_cera.html (accessed March 9, 2010).

Dionysius of Halicarnassus. “Antiquitatum sive originum Romanarum liber primus.” In *Scripta quae exstant, omnia, et historica, et rhetorica*. Translated by Friedrich Sylburg. Frankfurt: Apud heredes Andreae Wecheli, 1586. In Internet Archive, <http://www.archive.org/details/dionysiouhalikar00dion> (accessed January 26, 2010).

Dionysius of Halicarnassus. *Roman Antiquities*, 7 vols. Translated by Earnest Cary. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1937–50).

Dionysius of Halicarnassus. *Roman Antiquities*, vol. 1. Translated by Edward Spelman. London, 1758. In Google Books, <http://books.google.com.au> (accessed January 26, 2010).

Molhuysen, P. C., B. L. Meulenbroek, Paula P. Witkam, Henk J. M. Nellen, and Cornelia M. Ridderikhoff, eds. *Briefwisseling van Hugo Grotius*, 17 vols. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1928–2001, <http://www.dbnl.org/auteurs/auteur.php?id=groo001> (accessed December 1, 2009).

Montaigne, Michel de. *The Complete Essays*. Translated by Michael A. Screech. London: Penguin, 2003.

“Preface to the Book of Concord.” Translated by Theodore G. Tappert. In *Book of Concord*, 3–16.

Titius, Gerard. *Laudatio funebris memoriae svmmi et incomparabilis viri Georgii Calixti ss. theol. doct. et primarii professoris in Academia Iulia, abbatis regio Lothariensis &c.*. Helmstedt: Henning Muller, 1656, <http://mdz10.bib-bvb.de/~db/0002/bsb00027511/images/> (accessed November 4, 2008).

Vossius, Gerhard Johannes. *Gerardi Joan. Vossii et clarorum virorum ad eum epistolæ*. Edited by Paul Colomiès. London: R. R. & M. C, 1690.

Vossius, Gerhard Johannes. *Het Uitleenboekje van Vossius*. Amsterdam: N. V. Noord-Hollandsche Uitgeversmaatschappij, 1962.

2. Secondary Sources

Adams, Robert Merrihew. "Leibniz's *Examination of the Christian Religion*." *Faith and Philosophy* 11, no. 4 (1994): 517–46.

Ahlén, Axel C. M. "Seventeenth Century Dogmaticians as Philosophers." *Concordia Theological Monthly* 30, no. 3 (1959): 162–67.

Allen, J. W. *A History of Political Thought in the Sixteenth Century*. Revised by J. W. Gough. London: Methuen & Co, 1960.

Antognazza, Maria Rosa. *Leibniz: An Intellectual Biography*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Austin, Kenneth, and Wendy Anderson. "Faith, Friendship and Learning: Intercultural Communication in the Republic of Letters." *Language and Intercultural Communication* 10, no. 1 (2010): 17–31.

Backus, Irena. "The Early Church as a Model of Religious Unity in the Sixteenth Century: Georg Cassander and Georg Witzel." In Louthan and Zachman, *Conciliation and Confession*, 106–33.

Batten, J. Minton. *John Dury: Advocate of Christian Reunion*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1944.

Beecher, Donald. "Recollection, Cognition, and Culture: An Overview of Renaissance Memory." In *Ars reminiscendi: Mind and Memory in Renaissance*

Culture, edited by Donald Beecher and Grant Williams, 367–433. Toronto: Centre for Reformation and Renaissance Studies, 2009.

Beyreuther, Erich. “Hülsemann, Johann.” In *NDB*, 9:734.

Birrell, T. A. “The Reconstruction of the Library of Isaac Casaubon.” In *Hellinga Festschrift / Feestbundel / Mélanges: Forty-three Studies in Bibliography Presented to Prof. Dr. Wytze Hellinga on the Occasion of His Retirement from the Chair of Neophilology at the University of Amsterdam at the End of the Year 1978*, edited by Anthony R. A. Croiset van Uchelen, 59–68. Amsterdam: Nico Israël, 1980.

Blair, Ann. “Reading Strategies for Coping with Information Overload ca. 1550–1700.” *Journal of the History of Ideas* 64, no. 1 (2003): 11–28.

Bonelli, Federico, and Lucio Russo. “The Origin of Modern Astronomical Theories of Tides: Chrisogono, de Dominis and Their Sources.” *British Journal for the History of Science* 29 (1996): 385–401.

Böttigheimer, Christoph. “Auf der Suche nach der ewig gültigen Lehre: Theologische Grundlagenreflexion im Dienste der Irenik bei Georg Calixt.” *Kerygma und Dogma* 44, no. 3 (1998): 219–35.

Böttigheimer, Christoph. “Georg Calixt im ökumenischen Horizont aus katholischer Sicht.” In Mager et al., “Theologie im Dialog,” 57–74.

Böttigheimer, Christoph. *Zwischen Polemik und Irenik: Die Theologie der einen Kirche bei Georg Calixt*. Münster: Lit, 1996.

Brady Jr, Thomas A. “Confessionalization: The Career of a Concept.” In Headley, Hillerbrand, and Papalas, *Confessionalization in Europe*, 1–20.

Bruning, Jens, and Ulrike Gleixner, eds. *Das Athen der Welfen: Die Reformuniversität Helmstedt 1576–1810*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2010.

- Burke, Peter. "A Survey of the Popularity of Ancient Historians, 1450–1700." *History and Theory* 5, no. 2 (1966): 135–52.
- Cantor, Moritz. "Christmann: Jakob." In *ADB*, 4:222.
- Cavezza, S. "De Dominis, Marcantonio." In *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*, vol. 33, 642–50. Rome: Istituto della Enciclopedia italiana, 1987, <http://www.treccani.it/Portale/ricerche/searchBiografie.html> (accessed July 14, 2010).
- Conley, Thomas. "Vituperation in Early Seventeenth Century Historical Studies." *Rhetorica* 22, no. 2 (2004): 169–82.
- Curran, Brian, and Anthony Grafton. "A Fifteenth-Century Site Report on the Vatican Obelisk." *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 58 (1995): 234–48.
- Davey, Colin. *Pioneer for Unity: Metrophanes Kritopoulos (1589–1639) and Relations Between the Orthodox, Roman Catholic and Reformed Churches*. London: British Council of Churches, 1987.
- Declercq, Georges. "Dionysius Exiguus and the Introduction of the Christian Era." *Sacris erudiri* 41 (2002): 165–246.
- Dibon, Paul. "Communication in the Respublica Literaria of the 17th Century." *Res Publica Litterarum* 1 (1978): 43–55.
- Dowding, William Charles. *The Life and Correspondence of George Calixtus, Lutheran Abbot of Königslutter, and Professor Primarius at the University of Helmstadt*. Oxford: J. H. & J. Parker, 1863.
- Durchhardt, Heinz, and Gerhard May, eds. *Union, Konversion, Toleranz: Dimensionen der Annäherung zwischen christlichen Konfessionen im 17. Und 18. Jahrhundert*. Mainz: Von Zabern, 2000.

Engel, Peter. *Die eine Wahrheit in der gespaltenen Christenheit: Untersuchungen zur Theologie Georg Calixts*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1976.

Falkmann, August. "Simon VI." In *ADB*, 34:362–67.

Fasolt, Constantin. *The Limits of History*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004.

Fasolt, Constantin. "Political Unity and Religious Diversity: Hermann Conring's Confessional Writings and his Preface to Aristotle's *Politics* of 1637." In Headley, Hillerbrand, and Papalas, *Confessionalization in Europe*, 319–45.

Fausel, Heinrich. "Hafenreffer, Matthias." In *NDB*, 7:460.

Findlen, Paula, ed. *Athanasius Kircher: The Last Man Who Knew Everything*. New York: Routledge, 2004.

Fletcher, John E. "A Brief Survey of the Unpublished Correspondence of Athanasius Kircher, S.J. (1602–1680)." *Manuscripta* 13, no. 3 (1969): 150–60.

Forster, Marc. "Catholic Confessionalism in Germany after 1650." In Headley, Hillerbrand, and Papalas, eds, *Confessionalization in Europe*, 227–42.

Foucault, Michel. *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*. New York: Random House, Vintage Books, 1994.

Fry, C. George. "Three Lutheran Fathers of the 17th Century: The Search for Identity." *Concordia Journal* 5, no. 4 (1979): 133–40.

Fubini, Riccardo. "Humanism and Scholasticism: Toward an Historical Definition." In Mazzocco, *Interpretations*, 127–36.

Fuchs, Peter. "Gruter(us) (de Gruytere), Jan(us)." In *NDB*, 7:238–40.

- Fumaroli, Marc. "The Republic of Letters." Translated by R. Scott Walker. *Diogenes* 143 (1988): 129–52.
- Gaß, Wilhelm. "Calixt: Friedrich Ulrich." in *ADB*, 3:704–6.
- Gaß, Wilhelm. "Calixt: Georg." In *ADB*, 3:696–704.
- Gaß, Wilhelm. "Calovius: Abraham C. (Kalau)." In *ADB*, 3:712–15.
- Gaß, Wilhelm. *Georg Calixt und der Synkretismus: Eine dogmenhistorische Abhandlung*. Breslau: A. Gosohorsky, 1846.
- Glucker, J. "Casaubon's Aristotle." *Classica et Mediaevalia* 25 (1964): 274–96.
- Göransson, Sven. *Ortodoxi och Synkretism i Sverige, 1647–1660*. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksells Boktryckeri, 1950.
- Grafton, Anthony. *Bring Out Your Dead: The Past as Revelation*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001.
- Grafton, Anthony. *Defenders of the Text: The Traditions of Scholarship in an Age of Science, 1450–1800*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1991.
- Grafton, Anthony. *Forgers and Critics: Creativity and Duplicity in Western Scholarship*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990.
- Grafton, Anthony. *Joseph Scaliger: A Study in the History of Classical Scholarship*, 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983–93.
- Grafton, Anthony. *What Was History? The Art of History in Early Modern Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Grafton, Anthony. *Worlds Made by Words: Scholarship and Community in the Modern West*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2009.

Hägglund, Bengt. "Verständnis und Autorität der altkirchlichen Tradition in der lutherischen Theologie der Reformationszeit bis zum Ende des 17. Jahrhunderts." In *Oecumenica: Annales de Recherche Oecuménique*, 34–62. Strasbourg: Centre d'Études Oecuméniques, 1971.

Halling, Adolph. *Beiträge zur Familiengeschichte des Geschlechtes Callisen*. Glückstadt: J. J. Augustin, 1898.

Halling, Adolph. *Stammtafel der familie Callisen*. Glückstadt: J. J. Augustin, 1907.

Hankins, James. "Introduction." In Leonardo Bruni. *History of the Florentine People*. Edited and translated by James Hankins, ix–xxi. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001.

Harrington, Joel F., and Helmut Walser Smith. "Confessionalization, Community, and State Building in Germany, 1555–1870." *Journal of Modern History* 69, no. 1 (1997): 77–101.

Harrison, Matthew C. "Abraham Calov on Eastern Orthodoxy." *Logia* 9, no. 4 (2000): 5–16.

Hay, Denys. *Annalists and Historians: Western Historiography from the Eighth to the Eighteenth Centuries*. London: Methuen & Co., 1977.

Head, Randolph C. "Catholics and Protestants in Graubünden: Confessional Discipline and Confessional Identities without an Early Modern State?" *German History* 17, no. 3 (1999): 321–45.

Headley, John M., Hans J. Hillerbrand, and Anthony J. Papalas. *Confessionalization in Europe, 1555–1700: Essays in Honor and Memory of Bodo Nischan*, 1–20. Hants: Ashgate, 2004.

Henke, Ernst Ludwig Theodor. *Georg Calixtus und seine Zeit*, 2 vols. Halle: Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses, 1853–60.

- Hiatt, Alfred. "Diplomatic Arts: Hickeys against Mabillon in the Republic of Letters." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 70, no. 3 (2009): 351–73.
- Himmighöfer, Traudel. "Pareus (Wängler), David." In *NDB*, 20:65–66.
- Hotson, Howard. "Irenicism in the Confessional Age: The Holy Roman Empire, 1563–1648." In Louthan and Zachman, *Conciliation and Confession*, 228–85.
- Howard, Thomas Albert. *Protestant Theology and the Making of the Modern German University*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Hsia, Ronnie Po-chia. *Social Discipline in the Reformation: Central Europe 1550–1750*. London: Routledge, 1989.
- Huber, Max. "Dieterich, Konrad." In *NDB*, 3:672.
- Hughes, Michael. *Early Modern Germany, 1477–1806*. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1992.
- Hunter, Ian. *The Secularisation of the Confessional State: The Political Thought of Christian Thomasius*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Husung, Max Joseph. "Georg Calixtus zu Helmstedt, ein gelehrter Drucker des 17. Jahrhunderts." *Gutenberg-Jahrbuch* 14 (1939): 283–90.
- Ianziti, Gary. "Between Livy and Polybius: Leonardo Bruni on the First Punic War." *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome* 51/52 (2006/07): 173–97.
- Ianziti, Gary. "Bruni on Writing History." *Renaissance Quarterly* 51, no. 2 (1998): 367–91.
- Jacobi, Franz. "Das liebevolle Religionsgespräch zu Thorn 1645." *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 15 (1895): 345–63, 485–560.

Jüttner, Franziska, and Jenz Bruning. "Ausgewählte Literatur zur Geschichte der Universität Helmstedt." HAB, http://uni-helmstedt.hab.de/docs/bibliographie_helmstedt.pdf (accessed August 20, 2009).

Kämmel, Heinrich. "Helwig: Christoph H. (Helvicus)." In *ADB*, 11:715–18.

Kantzenbach, Friedrich Wilhelm. *Das Ringen um die Einheit der Kirche im Jahrhundert der Reformation: Vertreter, Quellen und Motive des "ökumenischen" Gedankens von Erasmus von Rotterdam bis Georg Calixt*. Stuttgart: Evangelisches Verlagswerk, 1957.

Kaplan, Benjamin. *Divided by Faith: Religious Conflict and the Practice of Toleration in Early Modern Europe*. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2007.

Kauertz, Claudia. *Wissenschaft und Hexenglaube: Die Diskussion des Zauber- und Hexenwesens an der Universität Helmstedt (1576–1626)*. Bielefeld: Verlag für Regionalgeschichte, 2001.

Kelley, Donald R. "Historia integra: François Baudouin and his Conception of History." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 25, no. 1 (1964): 35–57.

Kelly, William Ashford. *The Theological Faculty at Helmstedt: An Outline of its Intellectual Development as Mirrored in its Dissertations and Programmata*. East Linton: Cat's Whiskers Press, 1996.

Kelly, William Ashford. "The Theological Faculty at Helmstedt: An Outline of its Intellectual Development, as Mirrored in its Dissertations, Together with a Chronological Catalogue." PhD diss., University of Strathclyde, 1991.

Kinzig, Wolfram, and Markus Vinzent. "Recent Research on the Origin of the Creed." *Journal of Theological Studies* 50, no. 2 (1999): 535–59.

Kratz, Wilhelm. "Becanus (Schellekens), Martin." In *NDB*, 1:686.

- Kraye, Jill, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Renaissance Humanism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Kristeller, Paul Oskar. *Renaissance Thought and the Arts*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980.
- Krumwiede, Hans-Walter. *Kirchengeschichte Niedersachsens*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996.
- Lee, Stephen J. *Aspects of European History 1494–1789*. 2nd edn. London: Methuen & Co., 1984; reprinted London: Routledge, University Paperbacks, 1990.
- Ligota, Christopher R. “Annius of Viterbo and Historical Method.” *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 50 (1987): 44–56.
- Lohr, Charles H. “Metaphysics.” In *The Cambridge History of Renaissance Philosophy*, edited by Charles B. Schmitt, Quentin Skinner, and Eckhard Kessler, 537–636. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Lohr, Charles H. “Renaissance Latin Aristotle Commentaries: Authors L–M.” *Renaissance Quarterly* 31, no. 4 (1978): 532–603.
- Lotz-Heumann, Ute, and Matthias Pohlig. “Confessionalization and Literature in the Empire, 1555–1700.” *Central European History* 40, no. 1 (2007): 35–61.
- Louthan, Howard P., and Randall C. Zachman, eds. *Conciliation and Confession: The Struggle for Unity in the Age of Reform, 1415–1648*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2004.
- Louthan, Howard P., and Randall C. Zachman. “Introduction.” In Louthan and Zachman, *Conciliation and Confession*, 1–12.
- Mager, Inge. “Brüderlichkeit und Einheit: Georg Calixt und das Thorner Religionsgespräch 1645.” In *Thorn: Königin der Weichsel, 1231–1981*, edited by

Bernart Jähnig and Peter Letkemann, 209–38. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981.

Mager, Inge. “Die Beziehung Herzog Augusts von Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel zu den Theologen Georg Calixt und Johann Valentin Andrea.” *Pietismus und Neuzeit* 6 (1981): 76–98.

Mager, Inge. “Einführung.” In *Werke*, 1:9–28.

Mager, Inge. “Georg Calixt.” In *Orthodoxie und Pietismus*, edited by Martin Greschat, 137–48. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1982.

Mager, Inge. “Georg Calixt—der niedersächsische Unionstheologe.” In *Vier Jahrhunderte Lutherische Landeskirche in Braunschweig: Festschrift zum 400 jährigen Jubiläum der Braunschweigischen ev.-luth. Landeskirche im Jahr 1968*, edited by Friedrich Wilhelm Wandersleb and Martin Wandersleb, 79–93, 147–48. Brunswick: Landeskirchenamt, 1968.

Mager, Inge. “Georg Calixts interkonfessionelle Kommunikation im Dienste des Kirchenfriedens.” In Bruning and Gleixner, *Das Athen der Welfen*, 52–57.

Mager, Inge. *Georg Calixts theologische Ethik und ihre Nachwirkungen*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969.

Mager, Inge, Wolfgang Sommer, Christoph Böttigheimer, and Martin Friedrich. “Theologie im Dialog: Georg Calixt (1586–1656) als Wegbereiter der Ökumene.” Special issue, *Quellen und Beiträge zur Geschichte der Evangelisch-lutherischen Landeskirche in Braunschweig* 17 (2007).

Mahlmann, Theodor. “Mentzer, Balthasar d. Ä.” In *NDB*, 17:98–100.

Manschreck, Clyde L. “Melancthon, Philipp.” *Britannica Biographies*. January 2008: 1. Australia/New Zealand Reference Centre, EBSCOHost (accessed March 25, 2009).

- Manschreck, Clyde L. "Melanchthon, Philipp." In *The Encyclopedia of Religion*, vol. 9, edited by Mircea Eliade, 349. New York: Macmillan, 1987.
- Mauelshagen, Franz. "Networks of Trust: Scholarly Correspondence and Scientific Exchange in Early Modern Europe." *The Medieval History Journal* 6, no. 1 (2003): 1–32.
- Mayes, Benjamin T. G. "Syncretism in the Theology of Georg Calixt, Abraham Calov and Johannes Musäus." *Concordia Theological Quarterly* 68, nos 3–4 (2004): 291–317, <http://www.ctsfw.edu/library/files/pb/1950> (accessed August 9, 2008).
- Mayhew, Robert. "British Geography's Republic of Letters: Mapping an Imagined Community, 1600–1800." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 65, no. 2 (2004): 251–76.
- Mazzocco, Angelo, ed. *Interpretations of Renaissance Humanism*. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Meikle, Maureen M. "A Meddlesome Princess: Anna of Denmark and Scottish Court Politics, 1589–1603." In *The Reign of James VI*, 126–40. Edited by Julian Goodacre and Michael Lynch. Edinburgh: Birlinn, John Donald, 2008.
- Merkt, Andreas. *Das patristische Prinzip: Eine Studie zur theologischen Bedeutung der Kirchenväter*. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- Merkt, Andreas. "Die alte Kirche als Remedium Schismati: Zum Typus der sogenannten Altkatholischen Irenik." In Durchhardt and May, *Union, Konversion, Toleranz*, 1–19.
- Miller, Samuel J. T. "Molanus, Lutheran Irenicist (1633–1722)." *Church History* 22, no. 3 (1953): 197–218.

Milne, Mark. "Two Humanistic Translations of Polybius." *Res Publica Litterarum* 12 (1989): 123–29.

Moller, Johannes. "Georgius Calixtus." In *Cimbria literata sive scriptorum ducatus utriusque Slesvicensis et Holsatici quibus et alii vicini quidam accensentur historia literaria tripartita*, vol. 3, *Quadragesima sex insignium scriptorum, partim indigenarum, partim adoptivorum historias longiores exhibens*, 121–210. Copenhagen: Typis Orphanotrophii Regii, 1744.

Moller, Olaus Heinrich. *Erneuertes Andenken der milden Stiftungen, durch welche sich der vor 200 Jahren verstorbene Stifter der lateinischen Schule, Ludolphus Naamani, und dessen gottselige Eltern um die Stadt Flensburg rühmlichst verdient gemacht haben*. Flensburg: Serringhausen, 1774.

Momigliano, Arnaldo. "Polybius' Reappearance in Western Europe." In *Essays in Ancient and Modern Historiography*, 79–98. Oxford: Blackwell, 1977.

Müller, Karl. *Kirchengeschichte*, vol. 2, bk. 2. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1919.

Nadel, George. "Philosophy of History Before Historicism." *History and Theory* 3, no. 3 (1964): 291–315.

Nauert, Charles G. *Humanism and the Culture of Renaissance Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Newald, Richard. "Caselius (Kessel, Chesselius, Bracht, Bractus), Johannes." In *NDB*, 3:164.

Nischan, Bodo. "Reformed Irenicism and the Leipzig Colloquy of 1631." *Central European History* 9 (1976): 3–26.

- Nuttall, Anthony David. *Dead from the Waist Down: Scholars and Scholarship in Literature and the Popular Imagination*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003.
- Ockenden, R. E. "Marco Antonio de Dominis and His Explanation of the Rainbow." *Isis* 26, no. 1 (1936): 40–49.
- Patterson, William Brown. "Foreign Visitors to the Jacobean Church of England." Paper presented at the 154th annual meeting of the American Society for Church History, Williamsburg, VA, April 1–4, 1993.
- Patterson, William Brown. *King James VI and I and the Reunion of Christendom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Pattison, Mark. *Isaac Casaubon, 1559–1614*. 2nd edn. Edited by Henry Nettleship. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1892.
- Pearl, Jonathan L. "Humanism and Satanism: Jean Bodin's Contribution to the Witchcraft Crisis." *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 19, no. 4 (1982): 541–48.
- Pistor, Julius. "Winckelmann, Johannes." In *ADB*, 43:362–63.
- Pomata, Gianna, and Nancy G. Siraisi, eds. *Historia: Empiricism and Erudition in Early Modern Europe*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2005.
- Preus, Robert D. *The Theology of Post-Reformation Lutheranism*, vol. 1, *A Study of Theological Prolegomena*. St Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1970.
- Pünjer, Bernhard. "Major, Johannes." In *ADB*, 20:111–12.
- Rademaker, C. S. M. *Life and Work of Gerardus Joannes Vossius (1577–1649)*. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1981.

Reinhard, Wolfgang. "Pressures towards Confessionalization? Prolegomena to a Theory of the Confessional Age." In *The German Reformation: The Essential Readings*, edited by C. Scott Dixon, 172–92. Oxford: Blackwell, 1999.

Reinhard, Wolfgang. "Reformation, Counter-Reformation, and the Early Modern State: A Reassessment." *Catholic Historical Review* 75, no. 3 (1989): 383–404.

Reller, Horst. "Die Auswirkungen der Universität Helmstedt auf Pfarrer und Gemeinden in Niedersachsen." *Jahrbuch der Gesellschaft für Niedersächsische Kirchengeschichte* 74 (1976): 35–52.

Reynolds, Beatrice. "Shifting Currents in Historical Criticism." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 14, no. 4 (1953): 471–92.

Ritschl, Otto. *Dogmengeschichte des Protestantismus*, vol. 4, *Das orthodoxe Luthertum im Gegensatz zu der reformierten Theologie und in der Auseinandersetzung mit dem Synkretismus*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1927.

Roensch, Manfred. "Die Konkordienformel in der Geschichte des deutschen Luthertums." *Lutherische Theologie und Kirche* 2/79 (1979): 37–52.

Rosenberg, Daniel. "Early Modern Information Overload." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 64, no. 1 (2003): 1–9.

Rowland, Ingrid. *The Scarith of Scornello: A Tale of Renaissance Forgery*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004.

Sato, Masayuki. "Comparative Ideas of Chronology." *History and Theory* 30, no. 3 (1991): 275–301.

Scheible, Heinz. "Philip Melancthon (1497–1560)." In *The Reformation Theologians: An Introduction to Theology in the Early Modern Period*, edited by Carter Lindberg, 67–82. Oxford: Blackwell, 2002.

Schilling, Heinz. "Between the Territorial State and Urban Liberty: Lutheranism and Calvinism in the County of Lippe." Translated by Thomas A. Brady Jr. In *The German People and the Reformation*, edited by Ronnie Po-chia Hsia, 263–83. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1988.

Schilling, Heinz. "Calvinism and Civic Liberties: Political and Theological Pamphlets of the 'Patriots' in Emden and Groningen and the Political Culture of Germany and the Netherlands." In *Civic Calvinism in Northwestern Germany and the Netherlands, Sixteenth to Nineteenth Centuries*, 69–104. Kirksville: Sixteenth Century Journal Publishers, 1991.

Schilling, Heinz. "Confessional Europe." Translated by Thomas A. Brady Jr. In *Handbook of European History 1400–1600: Late Middle Ages, Renaissance, and Reformation*, vol. 2, *Visions, Programs, and Outcomes*, edited by Thomas A. Brady Jr, Heiko A. Oberman, and James D. Tracy, 641–81. Leiden: Brill, 1995.

Schilling, Heinz. "Confessionalization: Historical and Scholarly Perspectives of a Comparative and Interdisciplinary Paradigm." In Headley, Hillerbrand, and Papalas, *Confessionalization in Europe*, 21–35.

Schilling, Heinz. "Confessionalization in the Empire: Religious and Societal Change in Germany between 1555 and 1620." In *Religion, Political Culture and the Emergence of Early Modern Society: Essays in German and Dutch History*, 205–45. Leiden: Brill, 1992.

Schmeling, Timothy R. "Lutheran Orthodoxy Under Fire: An Exploratory Study of the Syncretistic Controversy and the *Consensus repetitus fidei vere Lutheranae*." *Lutheran Synod Quarterly* 47, no. 1 (2007): 316–55, <http://www.blts.edu/lsq/47-4.pdf> (accessed March 23, 2009).

Schmeling, Timothy R. "Strenuus Christi athleta Abraham Calov (1612–1686): Sainted Doctor and Defender of the Church." *Lutheran Synod Quarterly* 44, no. 4 (2004): 357–99, <http://www.blts.edu/lsq/44-4.pdf> (accessed October 29, 2009).

Schmid, Heinrich. *Geschichte der synkretistischen Streitigkeiten in der Zeit des Georg Calixt*. Erlangen: Carl Heyder, 1846.

Schmidt, Martin. "Ecumenical Activity on the Continent of Europe in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries." In *A History of the Ecumenical Movement, 1517–1948*, edited by Ruth Rouse and Stephen C. Neill, 73–120. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1954.

Schorn-Schütte, Luise. "Lutherische Konfessionalisierung? Das Beispiel Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel (1589–1613)." In *Die lutherische Konfessionalisierung in Deutschland*, edited by Hans-Christoph Rublack, 163–98. Gütersloh: G. Mohn, 1992.

Schott, Theodor. "Osiander: Lucas II." In *ADB*, 24:495–96.

Schubert, Anselm. "Die Diskussion um die Calixtinische Anthropologie." In *Das Ende der Sünde: Anthropologie und Erbsünde zwischen Reformation und Aufklärung*, 59–106. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2002.

Schubert, Anselm. "Kommunikation und Konkurrenz: Gelehrtenrepublik und Konfession im 17. Jahrhundert." In *Interkonfessionalität—Transkonfessionalität—binnenkonfessionelle Pluralität: Neue Forschungen zur Konfessionalisierungsthese*, edited by Kaspar von Greyerz, Manfred Jakubowski-Tiessen, Thomas Kaufmann, and Hartmut Lehmann, 101–31. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlag, 2003.

Schüssler, Hermann. *Georg Calixt, Theologie und Kirchenpolitik: Eine Studie zur Ökumenizität des Luthertums*. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1961.

Schüssler, Hermann. "Georg Calixt(us)." In *NDB*, 3:96–97.

Seeberg, Erich. *Gottfried Arnold, die Wissenschaft und Mystik seiner Zeit: Studien zur Historiographie und zur Mystik*. Meerane, 1923; reprinted Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1964.

- Soll, Jacob. "Empirical History and the Transformation of Political Criticism in France from Bodin to Bayle." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 64, no. 2 (2003): 297–316.
- Spam, Walter. "Martini (Martinus), Cornelius." In *NDB*, 16:296–97.
- Staemmler, Heinz. *Die Auseinandersetzung der kursächsischen Theologen mit dem Helmstedter Synkretismus: Eine Studie zum "Consensus Repetitus Fidei Vere Lutheranae" (1655) und den Diskussionen um ihn*. Edited by Johann Anselm Steiger. Waltrop: Hartmut Spenner, 2005.
- Stegeman, Saskia. "How to Set Up a Scholarly Correspondence: Theodorus Janssonius van Almeloveen (1657–1712) Aspires to Membership of the Republic of Letters." Translated by P. J. E. Hyams. *Lias*, vol. 20, no. 2 (1993): 227–43.
- Stewart, Quentin. "Catholicity or Consensus? The Role of the Consensus Patrum and the Vincentian Canon in Lutheran Orthodoxy: From Chemnitz to Quenstedt." PhD diss., Concordia Seminary, 2006.
- Stolleis, Michael. "Hermann Conring und die Begründung der deutschen Rechtsgeschichte." In Hermann Conring. *Der Ursprung des deutschen Rechts*. Edited by Michael Stolleis and translated by Ilse Hoffmann-Meckenstock, 253–67. Frankfurt: Insel, 1994.
- Stolleis, Michael. "Zur Bedeutung der Juristischen Fakultät und insbesondere Hermann Conrings für die Universität Helmstedt." In Bruning and Gleixner, *Das Athen der Welfen*, 190–97.
- Stupperich, Robert. "Melancthon (eigtl. Schwarzerdt), Philipp." In *NDB*, 16:741–45.
- Thomson, S. Harrison. *Europe in Renaissance and Reformation*. London: Rupert Hart-Davis, 1963.

- Tinsley, Barbara Sher. "Pope Joan Polemic in Early Modern France: The Use and Disabuse of Myth." *Sixteenth Century Journal* 18, no. 3 (1987): 381–98.
- Tournoy, Gilbert. "'Ad ultimas inscitiae lineas imus': Justus Lipsius and Isaac Casaubon in the Changing World of Classical Scholarship." In *The World of Justus Lipsius, a Contribution towards His Intellectual Biography: proceedings of a colloquium held under the auspices of the Belgian Historical Institute in Rome (Rome, 22-24 May 1997)*, edited by Marc Laureys, 191–208. Turnhout: Brepols, 1998.
- Trinkaus, Charles. *The Scope of Renaissance Humanism*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1983.
- Tschackert, Paul. "Syncretism, Syncretistic Controversies." In *The New Schaff-Herzog Religious Encyclopedia*, vol. 11, *Son of Man—Tremellius*. Edited by Samuel Macauley Jackson. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1953, <http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/encyc11.s.ix.html> (accessed 16 April 2010).
- Uhlhorn, Friedrich. "Die Bedeutung Georg Calixts für die lutherische Kirche der welfischen Lande." *Zeitschrift der Gesellschaft für Niedersächsische Kirchengeschichte* 33 (1928): 201–17.
- Van de Schoor, Rob J. M. "Reprints of Cassander's and Witzel's *Irenica* from Helmstedt: The Meaning of the Irenical Tradition for Georg Calixtus, Hermann Conring and Johannes Latermann." Translated by H. S. Lake. *Lias* 20, no. 2 (1993): 167–92.
- Vatican II Council. *Lumen gentium, Dogmatic Constitution on the Church*. Vatican: The Holy See, 1965, http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_const_19651118_dei-verbum_en.html (accessed March 5, 2010).
- Wallmann, Johannes. *Der Theologiebegriff bei Johann Gerhard und Georg Calixt*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1961.

- Wallmann, Johannes. "Union, Reunion, Toleranz: Georg Calixts Einigungsbestrebungen und ihre Rezeption in der katholischen und protestantischen Theologie des 17. Jahrhunderts." In Durchhardt and May, *Union, Konversion, Toleranz*, 21–37.
- Wallmann, Johannes. "Zwischen Reformation and Humanismus: Eigenart und Wirkungen Helmstedter Theologie unter besonderer Berücksichtigung Georg Calixts." In *Theologie und Frömmigkeit im Zeitalter des Barock: Gesammelte Aufsätze*, 61–86. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1995.
- Wedgwood, Cicely Veronica. *The Thirty Years War*. London: J. Cape, 1938; reprinted New York: New York Review of Books, 2005.
- Westerhoff, Jan C. "Polyhistor and Poeta Doctus: Notes on the Baroque Conception of Signs and Signification." *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft* 10 (2000): 91–130.
- Westerhoff, Jan C. "A World of Signs: Baroque Pansemioticism, the Polyhistor and the Early Modern Wunderkammer." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 62, no. 4 (2001): 633–50.
- Wickenden, Nicholas. *G. J. Vossius and the Humanist Concept of History*. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1993.
- Wiegand, Friedrich. "Henke: Ernst Ludwig Theodor." In *ADB*, 50:185–87.
- Wilcox, Donald J. *The Measure of Times Past: Pre-Newtonian Chronologies and the Rhetoric of Relative Time*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987.
- Williams, Gerhild Scholz. *Ways of Knowing in Early Modern Germany: Johannes Praetorius as a Witness to His Time*. Hants: Ashgate, 2006.
- Witschi-Bernz, Astrid. "Bibliography of Works in the Philosophy of History—1500–1800." *History and Theory* 12, Beiheft 12 (1972): 3–50.

- Witschi-Bernz, Astrid. "Main Trends in Historical-Method Literature: Sixteenth to Eighteenth Centuries." *History and Theory* 12, Beiheft 12 (1972): 51–90.
- Witt, Ronald G. *In the Footsteps of the Ancients: The Origins of Humanism from Lovato to Bruni*. Boston: Brill, 2003.
- Wolf, Erik. *Grosse Rechtsdenker der Deutschen Geistesgeschichte*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1963.
- Wolff, Fritz. "Moritz der Gelehrte." In *NDB*, 18:136–39.
- Woolf, D. R. "Erudition and the Idea of History in Renaissance England." *Renaissance Quarterly* 40, no. 1 (1987): 11–48.
- Yeo, Richard. "Notebooks as Memory Aids: Precepts and Practices in Early Modern England." *Memory Studies* 1, no. 1 (2008): 115–36.
- Yoffie, Adina Miriam. "Biblical Literalism and Scholarship in Protestant Northern Europe, 1630–1700." PhD diss., Harvard University, 2009.