CEJ: Series 3, Vol. 10, No. 1

EDUCATIONAL REFORMS OF WITTENBERG AND THEIR FAITHFULNESS TO MARTIN LUTHER'S THOUGHT

Christopher D. Jackson
Saint John's Lutheran Church, Lexington, KY

Abstract: Early Lutheran educational reforms carried out the educational vision of Martin Luther and were consistent with his thought. Humanistic concerns deeply influenced Melanchthon's educational reforms in lands allied with Wittenberg. Melanchthon's humanism was faithful to Luther's thought. Luther, like Melanchthon, reconciled Northern Renaissance Humanism and his evangelical theology. Luther's and Melanchthon's humanism was consistent with their theology insofar as they worked from a framework that distinguished between two kinds of righteousness. Melanchthon and Luther could uphold humanistic commitments as long as they did not encroach upon the doctrine of justification.

Keywords: Humanism, Luther, Lutheran, Melanchthon, education

Introduction

"Lutheran educational reforms were Lutheran" is a controversial rather than tautological statement. This paper will outline in broad fashion the educational agenda of the Wittenberg Reformers and argue for its consistency with the thought of Martin Luther in contrast to views that it departed from his theology.

In the field of education many scholars hold that Lutheran educational reforms were not Lutheran. Educational reforms in Lutheran lands like Saxony and Hesse were influenced mainly by Phillip Melanchthon, a professor alongside Luther at the University of Wittenberg and the most influential Lutheran Reformer behind Luther himself. Melanchthon promoted humanistic educational goals and methods. Many scholars believe this humanistic educational program departed from Luther since they consider him either ambivalent about or opposed to humanism. In other words, they contend that Lutheran educational reforms were not Lutheran.

The view that Lutheran educational reforms departed from Luther's thought presents two problems. First, this understanding marginalizes

Luther. Lutheran educational reforms shaped the history of Western education, and they continue to influence education today. Marginalizing Luther from these reforms lessens his perceived importance in Western history. This lessening presents a problem if the perception does not match what actually occurred, resulting in a deficient historical account. Second, the view that Lutheran educational reforms were not Lutheran potentially delegitimizes these reforms in the minds of those presently concerned with education. Luther remains a touchstone for many Protestants, from Presbyterians to Pentecostals. Even Roman Catholics have given him greater respect in recent decades. Luther's voice matters to Christian thinkers throughout Christendom. If Christians concerned with education—parents, teachers, administrators, pastors, and so forth—perceive that Lutheran educational reforms contradict Luther's thought, they may question the legitimacy of present day educational movements that share similar goals and methods. In particular, Luther may be seen as a voice against the contemporary classical education movement or collegiate liberal arts education.

As stated above, this paper will outline in broad fashion the educational agenda of the Wittenberg Reformers, discussing the educational goals and methods in Lutheran lands, paying special attention to the relationship these goals and methods have to Northern Renaissance Humanism. This first discussion, while helpful perhaps to some readers, rehearses the well-known and contributes nothing new. The final portion of this paper, however, will expand understanding of Lutheran educational reforms. Specifically, it will argue that these reforms were in fact Lutheran by carrying out the educational vision of Martin Luther. The following sections will analyze the Wittenberg Reformers' educational agenda by examining its philosophy and reforms.

Lutheran Educational Philosophy and Reforms

Humanistic Philosophy of Education

The educational reforms championed by Phillip Melanchthon reflect his deeply held humanistic commitments. This section will outline the humanist movement of the Northern Renaissance, to which Melanchthon belonged.

Northern Renaissance Humanism. Some readers may need clarification regarding the meaning of humanism as used in this paper. Contemporary Secular Humanism (CSH) may initially come to mind. Melanchthon's humanism differed from this variety. CSH, championed by the likes of Bertrand Russell and Carliss Lamont, developed out of a second wave of humanism in the 18th century. This second wave of humanism viewed human potential ex-

tremely optimistically and gave way to CSH as well as Marxism, both movements with marked antireligious sentiments.

In contrast, Renaissance Humanism did not reject God (Kristeller, 1961, pp. 74, 75; Rosin, 1990, p. 302). It was indeed interested in human potential but viewed this potential as the fulfillment of humanity's creation in God's image (Kristeller, 1961, p. 20; Rosin, 1990, p. 303). Northern Renaissance Humanism (NRH) developed in the mid-15th century and continued through the early 16th century as ideas from the Italian Renaissance crept northward (Spitz, 1988, p. 381).While NRH was a broad movement with many nuances among individual thinkers, this paper will focus on a few common concerns of the movement relevant to its argument.

Above all NRH was concerned with personal and social reform and sought to better the well-being and morality of the general populace by improving institutions and leaders. The movement pursued this goal primarily by focusing efforts on creating an educated, virtuous, and able elite class that would in turn effect institutional reforms and influence the moral inclinations of others (Aguzzi-Barbagli, 1988, p. 92; Arnold, 2011, pp. 106–107; Rummel, 1995, p. 12; Spitz, 1988, p. 383; Wright, 1987, p. 412). The training of this class included instruction in Latin and Greek grammar or language, poetry, rhetoric, history, and moral philosophy (Kristeller, 1961, p. 10; Rosin, 1990, p. 303). This course of study allowed students to do primary source study of the Scriptures and the noble pagan writers like Cicero, Quintilian, and Aristotle, thereby exposing them to the best sources and examples in such areas as poetry, rhetoric, and moral philosophy. Studies in poetry and rhetoric would shape students into orators able to persuade others to choose the good and beneficial (Aguzzi-Barbagli, 1988, p. 92). Moral philosophy gave students the material for such oration and also imparted to them ethical reasoning ability. Historical study contextualized original sources, thereby eliminating anachronistic readings and other interpretative errors (Kelley, 1988, p. 237). It also allowed for the recovery and retention of accumulated knowledge and wisdom (Kelley, 1988, p. 261). Finally, historical study provided moral exemplars (Kristeller, 1988, p. 271).

In addition to these curricular commitments of NRH, three attitudinal commitments also deserve mention: religious concern, the *ad fontes* commitment, and concern with practicality. In contrast to Italian Renaissance Humanism, NRH was especially concerned with religious issues, taking on perceived immorality within the Church and criticizing the Aristotelian Scholasticism that so dominated Church life (Korcok, 2011, p. 24; Van't Spijker, 2001, pp. 291–294). The humanists averred that Scholasticism said nothing among all its fine analytical distinctions. Additionally, they blamed Scholasticism for shaping students into rather useless people, dull, pedantic, and unable to accomplish change or persuade others. This perspective on

medieval Aristotelian Scholasticism influenced the humanistic *ad fontes* commitment, the emphasis on studying primary sources in the original languages (Arnold, 2011, pp. 106–107; Kristeller, 1961, pp. 13, 21, 95; Rummel, 1995, p. 12). *Ad fontes* developed in part out of a desire to reread Aristotle (Ashworth, 1974, p. 13). During the medieval period, texts of Aristotle's works expanded as notes, comments, and other accretions crept in. The humanists did not object to Aristotle as much as they rejected his medieval Scholastic interpreters (Kristeller, 1961, pp. 42–43). Going back to the source of Aristotle's original text was therefore necessary. *Ad fontes* also would help instill eloquence in students by reading the ancient literary masters like Cicero, whose full effect can only be apprehended in the original language, not in translations (Kristeller, 1961, pp. 98–99; Overfield, 1984, p. 76). Third, study of the ancients exposed students to the best material developed in the realm of moral philosophy (Overfield, 1984, p. 85). Such mastery of eloquence and moral philosophy related to the third attitudinal emphasis of the humanists: the practicality of learning. Humanism was a program aimed at social reform; learning eloquence and moral philosophy enabled elites to better execute the practical aim of encouraging the good and beneficial in society.

Desiderius Erasmus. Desiderius Erasmus (1466–1536) so dominates memory of NRH that he has come to exemplify and symbolize the movement (Lindhardt, 1986, p. 44). He was a former monk, social commentator, compiler of critical editions of the Hebrew Old Testament and Greek New Testament, early friend and later critic of the Reformation, and dialogue partner with Martin Luther. A largely self-taught language scholar, Erasmus utilized humanistic approaches to interpreting the Bible (Arnold, 2011, pp. 106–107). In an effort to "get to the source of the Scriptures," he published critical editions of the Bible in its original languages, using the oldest manuscripts available (Arnold, 2011, pp. 106–107). This new critical edition of the Bible, he hoped, would help correct corruption in the Church due to mistranslations and textual errors in the long-prevailing Latin translation called the Vulgate (Arnold, 2011, p. 110). Erasmus was convinced of the value of utilizing the best gifts of the ancient pagans in service of Christ, such as their accomplishments in moral philosophy and rhetoric (Arnold, 2011, pp. 106–107). One of Erasmus's most significant contributions was the conviction that young children should receive a humanistic education in the world's best literature at the youngest of ages (Korcok, 2011, pp. 27–31). This differed from most previous humanists' perspective that this course of study should be kept to higher education (Korcok, 2011, p. 27). Though originally cautious yet friendly toward the Reformation movement, he later rejected it, due mainly to a heated and even vitriolic exchange between him and Luther over the

topic of freewill and predestination in the years 1524–1527 that ended all productive relations between the two men (Arnold, 2011, p. 115).

While a personal breech occurred between Luther and Erasmus, the theologian and the humanist Phillip Melanchthon unified Luther's theology and Erasmus's humanism. While fully committed to and fundamentally transformed by Luther's discovery of the Law/gospel distinction and understanding of the gospel as divine promise, Melanchthon shared certain commitments with Erasmus. For example, Melanchthon shared with him the humanistic concern with grammar and rhetoric and criticized the Scholastic divorce of grammar and rhetoric from dialectic (Bayer, 2009, p. 147). Also, while the utilization of classical studies in the service of religion was paramount to Melanchthon, social reform was also a concern of his (Spitz, 1988, p. 387).

Lutheran Educational Reforms

These humanistic concerns deeply influenced Melanchthon's educational reforms in lands influenced by Wittenberg. This section will outline the educational reforms of the Wittenberg Reformation, especially attending to the influence of humanism. Outlining these reforms, however, requires a brief overview of the pre-Reformation educational situation.

Pre-Reform Education. In the years preceding the Reformation, a two-tier educational system developed. On the one hand was a more practically oriented course of studies. This tier taught subjects such as rudimentary arithmetic, writing, and perhaps some Latin in order to prepare boys for merchant and artisanal vocations (Wright, 1975, pp. 184–185). In the Reformation's early years, this type of education tended even more towards what was considered practical due to the worldly mentality of an increasingly wealthy class of city dwellers (Wright, 1975, p. 185). This emphasis on "practical education" resulted in a decline of the second tier of education that prepared students for university education by instructing them in Latin grammar and rhetoric (Wright, 1975, pp. 184–185). The Reformation itself contributed to this decline in preparatory education and, therefore, university education due to suspicions that such learning was Romanist as well as notions of the left wing of the Reformation that emphasized spiritualized, direct divine revelation and therefore deemphasized textual study (Rosin, 1990, p. 313; Wright, 1975, p. 185).

Wittenberg's Educational Reforms. The humanistic commitments of Melanchthon motivated him to encourage educational reforms in lands

influenced by Wittenberg like Saxony and Hesse. This section will outline these reforms.

First, the two-tier primary and preparatory system was discouraged in favor of humanistic classical education combined with religious instruction (Korcok, 2011, pp. 69–70; Wright, 1975, pp. 193–194). The classical instruction included the mastery of Latin grammar and readings in Cicero, Aesop, Virgil and the Colloquies of Erasmus, studies in rhetoric, logic, history, moral philosophy, and poetry (Korcok, 2011, pp. 73–76; Rosin, 1990, pp. 311–312; Spitz, 1988, pp. 384–387; Wright, 1975, p. 194). Religious instruction occurred as each day began and ended in the ancient prayer offices of Matins and Vespers with the children chanting Psalms and singing hymns (Korcok, 2011, p. 77; Wright, 1975, p. 195). Classes began and closed in prayer (Wright, 1975, p. 195). Students received formal catechismal instruction for a full day and a half each week (Korcok, 2011, p. 77; Wright, 1975, p. 194).

Second, such primary and preparatory education had wide access. The Wittenberg Reformers advocated that primary education be compulsory and universally available (Spitz, 1988, p. 385). If students showed ability in studies, they desired that provision be made to remove all obstacles to further study (Korcok, 2011, pp. 70–71; Spitz, 1988, pp. 385–387). To this end, scholarships were given to students of modest means within Reformation lands (Wright, 1975, pp. 195–196). In addition to opening education to the poor, the Reformers also extended it to girls. Education of girls admittedly differed from that of boys. Girls were educated separately, their education did not have the goal of preparing them for university education, and it was more practical in nature (Korcok, 2011, pp. 71–72). Nonetheless, extending education to girls dramatically broadened the scope of primary education.

Third, university education was reformed along humanistic lines. Before 1518, humanism had a distinct but limited presence within German higher education (Overfield, 1984, p. 246). In 1518 and 1519, the University of Wittenberg enacted humanistic curricular reforms influenced by Melanchthon (Overfield, 1984, pp. 302, 303; Rosin, 1990, p. 309). Wittenberg provided the impulse for other universities to follow suit, including Erfurt, Leipzig, Ingolstadt, Heidelberg, and Vienna (Overfield, 1984, pp. 304–327).

Fourth, Melanchthon composed new curricular material for primary, secondary, and university education:

> Melanchthon's greatest contribution . . . was the publication of a wealth of pedagogical material on a wide range of subjects, which became the basis for instruction in the Wittenberg arts faculty and many other Lutheran institutions. They included manuals for instruction in Greek and Latin, texts on dialectic, rhetoric, moral philosophy, arithmetic, and etymology; commentaries on Aristotle's *Politics, Ethics,* and *De anima*;

> and editions of works by dozens of ancient writers, among them Cicero, Plutarch, Demosthenes, Pliny, Virgil, Xenophon, Aristophanes, Ptolemy, and Lycurgus. (Overfield, 1984, p. 303)

In time these educational reforms bore fruit. Data from Hesse show that the goals of broadly available humanistic education were largely met in that land. One third more Hessian towns sent students to university after enacting Melanchthon's advised reforms (Wright, 1987, p. 419). Matriculation rates in the Latin schools soared to previously unseen levels (Wright, 1987, p. 420). Even more importantly, the goal of educating an elite class of leaders in humanistic studies largely was met. Available data from other regions are scarce, but in Hesse the majority of top-tier public officials were graduates of the University of Marburg, the university established in Hesse as part of its humanistic educational reforms, once Melanchthon's advised education reforms had time to culminate (Wright, 1987, pp. 420–423).

The Consistency of Wittenberg's Educational Reforms with Luther's Theology

In education Lutherans have a significant legacy, but is it legitimate? Specifically, were Lutheran educational reforms consistent with Lutheran theology?

Some scholars indeed argue that they were inconsistent with Luther's theology. Association with Melanchthon arouses doubts about their consistency with Luther since already in his own time many believed that he departed from Luther's theology (Grimm, 1973, pp. 399–401; Tracy, 1999, pp. 92–93). After Luther's death, some of Melanchthon's peers thought that he conceded too much to both Roman Catholics and Calvinists. On the one hand, Melanchthon advocated for compromise in *adiaphora*, things neither commanded nor forbidden in the Scriptures, with regards to Roman Catholic customs that were enforced by imperial law upon Lutheran congregations during the Augsburg Interim. For example, Melanchthon argued that it was permissible to operate under an imposed Roman Catholic episcopal structure of polity. On the other hand, Melanchthon was viewed as not opposing strongly enough Calvinist views of the Lord's Supper. Such capitulations caused theologians like Matthias Flacius Illyricus to aver that Melanchthon was no true Lutheran, and Melanchthon's legitimacy as a Lutheran theologian has been suspect to many ever since.

Given Luther's antipathy toward Erasmus and Melanchthon's perceived weakness as an authentic Lutheran, many scholars present Melanchthon's humanism as a break from Luther. It has been presented as a change in

emphasis, a return from focusing on the evangelical back to the ethical (Van't Spijker, 2001, p. 298). Some have called it a "wanderer between the camps" of Romanism and Lutheranism (Bainton, 1952, p. 69). Others have gone further, stating either that Melanchthon's humanism was the means by which the Reformation was corrupted from within by the reintroduction of Scholastic thought or as the perfection of Luther's work, which did not go far enough in breaking from medieval religion (Bayer, 2009, p. 135). Even those who question the utility of using Luther as the rule by which other Reformers can be measured yet note that Melanchthon's humanism was not consistent with the thought of Luther (Kittelson, 1976, p. 305).

These opinions regarding the anti-humanism of Luther seem to arise out of the soured relationship between him and Erasmus as well as some of Luther's more bombastic decrees against Aristotle and reason. Luther's low opinions regarding Erasmus are cited (Faber, 2005, p. 30; Van't Spijker, 2001, p. 292). Likewise, Erasmus is cited as at first having a public ambivalence toward Luther that later became an antipathy (Van't Spijker, 2001, pp. 293, 296). Their mutual antipathies arise out of the break that occurred between the two through their famous debate on the nature of human will. Luther's understanding of the human will, as well as the related and even more fundamental issue of his high view of God's grace and the undeserved nature of salvation, is cited as the point of departure by which Luther becomes an anti-humanist (Faber, 2005, pp. 30–36; Van't Spijker, 2001, p. 296). It is argued that this low view of the human will is the basis for Luther's statements against philosophy, reason, and the interaction with Aristotle by Christian theologians (Van't Spijker, 2001, pp. 294–296). Frequently cited statements to this end come from Luther's famous *Disputation Against Scholastic Theology* (1957), including words such as these: "It is an error to say that no one becomes a theologian without Aristotle. This counters what is commonly said. Moreover, no one becomes a theologian unless it is without Aristotle. . . . In short, all Aristotle is to theology as darkness is to light" (p. 12). While such statements had the Scholastics as their target, they also undercut the humanistic position which so heavily relies on philosophy, reason, and even Aristotle, especially in moral instruction (Van't Spijker, 2001, pp. 294–297).

Despite such evidence to the contrary, this paper contends that Melanchthon's humanism was faithful to Luther's thought.

First, Luther never censured or hindered Melanchthon. On the one hand, this paper has shown the wide scope of Melanchthon's humanistic commitments and activities. Through his influence, universities were established and school systems were reformed. On the other hand, the distance between Luther and Melanchthon both geographically and collegially was narrow. Reformation Wittenberg was a small locale, and the university community even smaller. Also, the close working relationship between Luther and

Melanchthon is well established. Melanchthon's humanistic educational work was certainly known by Luther, and no record exists that Luther acted or spoke against it. Moreover, Luther even gave his imprimatur upon Melanchthon's reforms. The *Instructions for the Visitors of Parish Pastors in Electoral Saxony*, otherwise known as the *Saxon Visitation Articles,* a document penned by Melanchthon but circulated under Luther's name, prescribed a heavily humanistic course of study including materials from Erasmus's pen (Luther, 1958). These articles were circulated after Luther's break from the legendary humanist.

Second, Luther himself depended upon humanism. The *ad fontes* commitment of humanism, along with the resulting emphasis on the study of ancient languages, profoundly influenced Luther (Kristeller, 1961, p. 79; Lindhardt, 1986, pp. 163–171; Rosin, 1990, p. 303; Spitz, 1988, p. 383). Moreover, the humanists provided him the grammars, commentaries, and biblical texts necessary for his most powerful and enduring weapon of the Reformation: the translation of the Bible into the vernacular (Kristeller, 1961, p. 79; Rosin, 1990, p. 308). Augustine of Hippo also highly influenced Luther, and the humanists caused the resurgence in study of the late ancient Christian bishop and theologian (Kristeller, 1961, pp. 82–86). Luther was deeply influenced by humanistic emphasis on rhetoric. Rhetoric was emphasized in Luther's studies at the University of Erfurt and in his order of Augustinian monks (Lindhardt, 1986, pp. 61–62). He praises Cicero and Quintillian and even makes use of Quintillian's thought in his works (Lindhardt, 1986, pp. 62–65). While his sermons seem simple, upon closer examination they follow classical rhetorical rules in minute detail, and his famous work *On Christian Freedom* used classical Latin structural rules, which he transferred even into the German version (Lindhardt, 1986, p. 63). Moreover, humanistic rhetorical thought influenced Luther's understanding of homiletics (Rosin, 1990, p. 304). Humanism's interest in poetry contributed to Luther's ardent use of hymnody to catechize the Reformation church (Rosin, 1990, p. 304).

Third, Luther himself promoted humanistic educational reforms early in his career. Humanistic ideas and approaches were already present at Wittenberg before Luther's arrival, but he instigated full-fledged humanistic reforms there (Rosin, 1990, p. 308). In 1516 and 1517, the Elector of Saxony asked Luther and his colleague Spalatin to advise him on making changes at the university. These changes, enacted in 1518, read like a humanistic wish list (Overfield, 1984, p. 302; Rosin, 1990, p. 309). The study of Aristotle continued, but students read his work through new translations preferred by the humanists (Rosin, 1990, p. 309). The university established chairs in Greek and Hebrew. With their addition Wittenberg became the first university to incorporate trilingual study of Scripture into the formal curriculum (Rosin, 1990, p. 309). Reforms continued in 1519. Melanchthon, the avowed

humanist, was enticed to remain on the faculty by increasing his salary (Rosin, 1990, p. 309). Luther himself bragged in a letter to a friend that the university added humanistic courses in the biblical languages, Quintillian, and Ovid (Rosin, 1990, p. 309). Course changes and faculty shuffling deemphasized Scholastic theology (Rosin, 1990, pp. 309–310). Significantly, Luther pushed for the omission of Peter Lombard's *Sentences*, the widely used compendium of statements from the Scripture and the Fathers, in favor of "going to the sources" of the Scripture and the Fathers themselves (Rosin, 1990, pp. 309–310))

Some might object that many of these humanistic dependencies and actions manifested early in Luther's career and that once he matured into his Reformation theology he gave up on humanism. However, recent studies show how thoroughly Luther was influenced by humanism throughout his life. Index studies demonstrate that Luther frequently cited ancient pagan authors:

> There are a total of over 700 references in the WA [Weimar Edition of Luther's Works] indices to Aristotle and his works. . . . We find in the indices over 300 references to Cicero and his works. Luther's favorite poet, Virgil, is in third place with over 250 references, closely followed by Horace with over 200 and Terence with just under the same number. There follow, then, each with a hundred or more references, in this order: Ovid, Pliny the Elder, Plato, and Aesop. With over 50 references each, we find Seneca, Demosthenes, Suetonius, Juvenal, Homer, Plautus, and Epicurus. Plutarch is referred to or quoted over 40 times, Quintilian, Lucian, and Livy over 30 times, and Martial . . . 20 times. (Springer, 2007, pp. 31–33)

Additionally, Luther himself attributed his success in hymn writing to the stylistic influence of Virgil, and he was engaged in hymn writing late in life (Springer, 2007, p. 36). In 1529, after his break with Erasmus and his full appropriation of his evangelical theology, he wrote a letter to Duke George of Brandenburg encouraging him to enact humanistic educational reforms (Luther, 1934). In the final years of his life, Luther composed two Latin poems that imitated ancient pagan style but upbraided pagan morality (Springer, 2007, p. 50). A slip of paper found on Luther's body after his death containing his last written words is most famous for its final German line: "We are beggars" (1919, p. 318). Yet even this fragment contains humanistic style and subject matter. Before the final line he considers, in Latin, how one can best apprehend Virgil and Cicero. He also praises Virgil's Aeneid in Latin poetic verse utilizing the same meter as the Aeneid itself (Kellerman, 1999). To the end Luther utilized and engaged the ancient sources both stylistically and ideologically. Furthermore, Luther's qualms with the archhumanist Erasmus

surfaced as early as 1517 when he wrote, "I am afraid, however, that he does not advance the cause of Christ and the grace of God sufficiently. . . . Human things weigh more with him than the divine" (Luther, 1955, p. 40). Luther was wary of Erasmus at an early date, and he demonstrated humanistic influence and concerns late in his life. Luther, like Melanchthon, could reconcile humanism, his break with Erasmus, and evangelical theology.

The Two Kinds of Righteousness and the Inner Consistency of Reformation Theology and Humanism

Thus far this paper has demonstrated that the humanistic concerns and work of Melanchthon were consistent with Luther's educational vision. While Luther was not as actively engaged in the work of humanistic reforms as Melanchthon, humanism influenced Luther, and he engaged in humanistic educational reforms early in his career. The question remains, however, if Luther was consistent with himself. Others have noted Luther's humanistic concerns in the realm of education and have argued that the Reformer maintained an inconsistency, rejecting Erasmus's anthropology but accepting the educational reforms that grew out of his more optimistic view of humanity (Faber, 2005, p. 34). Such an argument is indeed plausible since many regard Luther as an unsystematic theologian who could hold paradoxical, even contradictory positions. In the following section, I will demonstrate that Luther's and Melanchthon's humanism was internally consistent with their theology insofar as they worked from a framework that distinguished between two kinds of righteousness.

Recent work by Lutheran theologians has exposed an overlooked paradigm within early Lutheran theology, the two kinds of righteousness. *The Apology of the Augsburg Confession* contains the fullest treatment of this paradigm. Throughout this document, Melanchthon argued that the opponents conflate the two kinds of righteousness. Instead of recognizing a righteousness before the world and a righteousness before God, they recognized only one kind of righteousness, maintaining that one can be righteous before God by exercising righteous deeds (Melanchthon, 2000, sec. II: pp.12, 43; IV: pp. 12–16, 43). Aristotelian moral improvement therefore became for them the vehicle to salvation (Arand, 2001, p. 428).

In contrast, Arand argues that Melanchthon held that righteousness before the world and righteousness before God, the two kinds of righteousness, must always be kept separate. "What made us genuinely human in God's sight had to be distinguished from what made us genuinely human in the eyes of the world" (Arand, 2001, p. 431). Melanchthon's care to demonstrate that there were two kinds of righteousness came from two directions. First, it was

necessary to affirm that humans are saved by grace through faith alone and not by works (Arand, 2001, p. 431). The glory and honor of Christ as the sole source of salvation could not be obscured (Arand, 2001, p. 427). However, it was also necessary for Melanchthon to affirm that God had indeed given commands to humanity but that these commands did not necessarily mean that salvation could be attained through them (Arand, 2001, p. 431). But, if salvation could not be attained through them, what purpose did they have? First, living according to the commandments promoted harmonious, peaceful, and thriving life on earth (Arand, 2001, p. 432). Commands to avoid adultery and live in love and respect with one's spouse, to avoid physical harm of the neighbor and to protect him, and to avoid false witness and to protect the reputation all encourage habits that allow for human flourishing. Living in such ways is righteous living in the world, but these do not make one righteous unto salvation before the judgment seat of God. Also, the pursuit of righteousness before the world through the commandments shows one just how difficult attaining righteousness before God can be (Arand, 2001, p. 432).

> First, the pursuit of righteousness in the horizontal realm is difficult at best. External righteousness can be attained only in a limited way. In Apology XVIII Melanchthon argues that even though the Ten Commandments can be kept to some extent without Christ and the Holy Spirit, we are shackled by concupiscence and the devil. For these reasons, "even civil righteousness is rare among human beings." Despite his praise for Aristotle, Melanchthon notes that "not even the philosophers, who seemed to have aspired after this righteousness, attained it" (Ap XVIII:5). Second, while reason can achieve civil righteousness to some extent (Ap XVIII:7, 9), reason cannot grasp the real demands of the law, namely, the requirements of the First Commandment. Reason deals with the senses and external actions, not the inner heart (Ap IV: 134). "We concede to free will the freedom and power to perform external works of the law; nevertheless we do not ascribe to free will those spiritual capacities, namely, true fear of God, true faith in God, the conviction and knowledge that God cares for us, hears us, and forgives us, etc." These are works which "the human heart cannot produce without the Holy Spirit" (Ap XVIII:7). Finally, both of these are highlighted in the life of the Christian whose inchoate obedience is impure, scanty, and imperfect. "Although the renewal has begun, nevertheless the remnants of sin still cling to this nature and always accuse us unless by faith in Christ we take hold of the forgiveness of sins (Ap IV:i59 +)." (Arand, 2001, pp. 432–433)

The distinction between two kinds of righteousness was also necessary for Melanchthon to uphold on account of the new role that good works played in Reformation theology (Arand, 2001, pp. 433–434). Since works no

longer had a part to play in salvation, the realm of everyday life was opened for believers to live lives of love toward others, and their works, motivated by the love of God, were truly good. Since all the humanly contrived means of attaining salvation—the pilgrimages, indulgences, and so forth— had been removed by salvation by grace through faith, believers were able to focus once more on living out the commandments that had been given by God. Yet again, however righteous these works were, they did not merit salvation before God.

While *The Apology* was primarily penned by Melanchthon, it was also Luther's theology. He heavily influenced it and ascribed to it. Furthermore, Luther (1963) himself spoke in similar terms: "We teach a precise distinction between these two kinds of righteousness, the active and the passive [righteousness before the world and before God], so that morality and faith, works and grace, secular society and religion may not be confused. Both are necessary, but both must be kept within their limits" (p. 7).

The two kinds of righteousness show that Melanchthon's and Luther's humanism was indeed consistent with their evangelical theology. Melanchthon and Luther could uphold humanistic commitments as long as they were "kept within their limits." The *ad fontes* commitment opened the Scriptures to them and exposed them to ancient pagan insights into rhetoric and moral philosophy. Rhetoric and moral philosophy in turn helped prepare an elite that could, in theory, persuade the populace to moral living and ways of life that would contribute to peace and prosperity. Poetry conveyed biblical truths in memorable ways to millions of people through hymnody. However, there was one place that humanism could not go: justification. This is where the Reformers and the humanists who preceded them parted ways. For earlier humanists like Erasmus, humans, though fallen, could participate in their salvation through the will. For Melanchthon and Luther, however, salvation was a complete and utter gift of God, given, not earned.

Implications

Several implications can be drawn from this study. First, it vindicates the educational reforms of Melanchthon as faithful to Luther's educational vision. While one may disagree with Melanchthon's educational reforms, such disagreement cannot proceed from the view that Melanchthon's philosophy of education capitulated to Romanism or betrayed evangelical theology. Moreover, this study lends credibility to the classical education and liberal arts movements in Christian circles. Luther remains a touchstone for Christians of all traditions. Knowing that Luther himself supported and contributed to classical, liberal arts education will be an encouragement to administrators, teachers, parents, and students in that movement.

Second, this study helps legitimate the Two Kinds of Righteousness paradigm by demonstrating that it resolves a perceived inconsistency in the Reformers' thought. While this paradigm has been accepted by many within Lutheran theological circles, it is still suspect to some. This essay shows that this paradigm was a guiding principle for the Reformers, influencing not just their theological statements like the Augsburg Confession but also shaping their practice.

Third, Luther and Melanchthon can be viewed as proponents of the integration model of Christian education propounded by scholars like James Estep (2008). Luther and Melanchthon were comfortable utilizing the theories and thoughts of non-Christians like Plato, Aristotle, and Virgil in shaping education. However, their philosophy and practice of education was also distinctively Christian. While they viewed the Scriptures as wholly sufficient unto salvation, they also understood that good education should be formed by the best observations of the greatest minds, Christian or not. While they knew that non-Christians had profound insights into education, they also believed that the Scriptures and Christian theology and philosophy should both correct pagan errors and guide appropriation of non-Christian thought.

Fourth, the educational commitments of Luther and Melanchthon might help guide current educational priorities, especially where current aims and goals depart from their perspective. For example, one might expect that contemporary Lutheran educators would share much of the Reformers' philosophy of education. However, a recent survey of primary and secondary Lutheran educators suggests that as a group they do not hold some central commitments of the Reformation's educational agenda (Doering & Eells, 2010). While contemporary Lutheran educators share the Reformers' commitment to sharing Christian dogma, they do not seem concerned with effecting social improvement, the raising up of elite Christian leaders, or the transmission of the Western intellectual tradition. Luther and Melanchthon testify that such goals are not only consistent with evangelical commitment but also even incumbent upon Christian educators. All Christian educators, including, but not only, Lutherans, should examine their goals against these neglected Reformation commitments. Additionally, Luther and Melanchthon suggest the need for church bodies to shape their most gifted students, even those not enrolled in church-related schools. Like Reformation-era Germany, contemporary American society is shaped by its elites. However, the majority of America's elites carry degrees from institutions like Harvard, Stanford, and MIT. To carry out the Reformers' commitments in the present context, church bodies and parachurch organizations could establish programs to influence the formation of their most promising high school and college students. Such programs would encourage them to use their gifts in ways consistent with the Christian worldview. They might also, like Reformation educa-

tion of elites, transmit the Western intellectual tradition to these future elites, a task that has in large part been abandoned by America's elite educational institutions.

Conclusion

Were Lutheran educational reforms Lutheran? Indeed, they were. Melanchthon legitimately carried out an educational program consistent with Luther's theology and educational vision. Their unified voice in favor of the humanistic liberal arts confronts us as it did the Germans of 500 years ago. Four contemporary implications have been drawn above, but potential implications abound. Our present context significantly differs from theirs, but there are some similarities. Like Reformation-era Germany, the contemporary United States is increasingly urban, wealthy, and marked by ideological, philosophical, and theological differences. As in Melanchthon's time, great value is placed upon the "practical" arts like science, technology, and engineering so that the humanistic liberal arts have been relegated to forsaken corners of college campuses. Contemporary Christian educators may choose to disagree with the call of Luther and Melanchthon to elevate the status of the humanistic liberal arts. Yet, it is a call that should be heard.

REFERENCES

Aguzzi-Barbagli, D. (1988). Humanism and poetics. In A. Rabil Jr. (Ed.), *Renaissance humanism: Foundations, forms, and legacy* (Vol. 3. *Humanism and the disciplines*). Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Arand, C. P. (2001). Two kinds of righteousness as a framework for law and gospel in the Apology. *Lutheran Quarterly, 15*(4), 417–439.

Arnold, J. (2011). *The great humanists: An introduction.* New York, NY: I.B. Tauris.

Ashworth, E. J. (1974). *Language and logic in the post-medieval period.* New York, NY: Springer. Retrieved from http://books.google.com/books?id=Ctdzf5fhrEoC

Bainton, R. H. (1952). *The Reformation of the sixteenth century.* Boston, MA: The Beacon Press.

Bayer, O. (2009). Philipp Melanchthon (J. Mumme, Trans.) *Pro Ecclesia, 18*(2), 134–161.

Doering, S., & Eells, R. (2010, June 4). Toward a common Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod philosophy of education. *Lutheran Education Journal.* Retrieved from http://lej.cuchicago.edu/church-work-professional/toward-a-common-lutheran-church-missouri-synod-philosophy-of-education/

Estep, J. R. (2008). What makes education Christian? In J. R. Estep, M. J. Anthony, & G. R. Allison (Eds.), *A theology for Christian education* (pp. 25–43). Nashville, TN.: B&H Academic.

Faber, R. A. (2005). Humanitas as discriminating factor in the educational writings of Erasmus and Luther. *Dutch Review of Church History / Nederlands Archief voor Kerkgeschiedenis, 85*(1), 25–37.

Grimm, H. J. (1973). *The Reformation era, 1500–1600* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Macmillan.

Kellerman, J. A. (1999). The last written words of Luther. *Project Wittenberg.* Retrieved from http://www.iclnet.org/pub/resources/text/wittenberg/luther/beggars.txt

Kelley, D. R. (1988). Humanism and history. In A. Rabil Jr. (Ed.), *Renaissance humanism: Foundations, forms, and legacy* (Vol. 3. *Humanism and the disciplines*). Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Kittelson, J. M. (1976). Humanism and the Reformation in Germany. *Central European History, 9*(4), 303–322.

Korcok, T. (2011). *Lutheran education: From Wittenberg to the future.* St. Louis, MO: Concordia.

Kristeller, P. O. (1961). *Renaissance thought: The classic, scholastic, and humanist strains.* New York, NY: Harper Torchbooks.

Kristeller, P. O. (1988). Humanism and moral philosophy. In A. Rabil Jr. (Ed.), *Renaissance humanism: Foundations, forms, and legacy* (Vol. 3. *Humanism and the disciplines*). Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Lindhardt, J. (1986). *Martin Luther: Knowledge and mediation in the renaissance* (Vol. 29). Lewiston, NY: E. Mellen Press.

Luther, M. (1919). Die letzten gedancten D M Lutheri. In *D. Martin Luthers Werke: Kritische Gesamtausgabe* (Tischreden, Band 5, pp. 317–318). Weimar, Germany: Hermann Böhlaus Nachfolger.

Luther, M. (1934). Luther an Markgraf Georg von Brandenburg. In *D. Martin Luthers Werke: Kritische Gesamtausgabe* (Briefwechsel, Band 5, pp. 119–121). Weimar, Germany: Hermann Böhlaus Nachfolger.

Luther, M. (1955). *Letters: I, Vol. 48* (F. Sherman, Ed.). Saint Louis, MO: Concordia.

Luther, M. (1957). Disputation against scholastic theology. In H. J. Grimm (Ed.), *The career of the Reformer: I* (Vol. 31, pp. 3–16). Philadelphia, PA: Muehlenberg Press.

Luther, M. (1958). Instructions for the visitors of parish pastors in Electoral Saxony. In C. Bergendoff (Ed.), *Church and ministry: II* (Vol. 45, pp. 263–320). Philadelphia, PA: Muehlenberg Press.

Luther, M. (1963). *Lectures on Galatians.* (W. A. Hansen, Ed.) (Vol. 26). Saint Louis, MO: Concordia.

Melanchthon, P. (2000). Apology of the Augsburg Confession. In R. Kolb & T. J. Wengert (Eds.), *The book of Concord: The confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church* (pp. 107–294). Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press.

Overfield, J. H. (1984). *Humanism and Scholasticism in late medieval Germany.* Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Rosin, R. (1990). The Reformation, humanism, and education: The Wittenberg model for reform. *Concordia Journal, 16*(4), 301–318.

Rummel, E. (1995). *The humanist-scholastic debate in the Renaissance & Reformation.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Spitz, L. W. (1988). Humanism and the Protestant Reformation. In A. Rabil Jr. (Ed.), *Renaissance humanism: Foundations, forms, and legacy* (Vol. 3. *Humanism and the disciplines*). Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Springer, C. (2007). Martin's martial: Reconsidering Luther's relationship with the classics. *International Journal of the Classical Tradition, 14*(1/2), 23–50.

Tracy, J. D. (1999). *Europe's reformations, 1450–1650.* Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Van't Spijker, W. (2001). Early Reformation and Scholasticism. *Dutch Review of Church History/Nederlands Archief voor Kerkgeschiedenis, 81*(3), 290–305.

Wright, W. J. (1975). Impact of the Reformation on Hessian education. *Church History, 44*(2), 182–198.

Wright, W. J. (1987). Evaluating the results of sixteenth century educational policy: Some Hessian data. *The Sixteenth Century Journal, 18*(3), 411–426.

AUTHOR

Christopher D. Jackson (M.Div., Concordia Seminary, Saint Louis, MO) serves as Associate Pastor at Saint John's Lutheran Church, Lexington, Kentucky. He is currently in the Ed.D. program at The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary in Louisville, KY. E-mail: revcjackson@gmail.com.