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Abstract

In both medicine and theology, the early modern period was one of flux, characterized by Reformation and Revolution. Scholars tend to analyze shifts in natural philosophy and theology separately. This dissertation brings them together to question how early modern Christians understood their own bodies and souls, the diseases to which they were prey, and the physicians and medicine that treated them.

In doing so, it highlights one influential group of thinkers who addressed these questions: late sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century Lutheran physicians, theologians, and natural philosophers in the so-called Wittenberg Circle. As shown in chapter one, out of inter- and intra-confessional debates in theology, the study of anatomy, and the study of the soul building on the long Aristotelian De anima commentarial tradition, Lutheran thinkers helped create a field of study called anthropologia. Enshrined in the basic curriculum for all students, including physicians, theologians and philosophers, this discipline endeavored to synthesize the fundamental findings of anatomy, philosophy, and theology to explain the nature of human bodies and souls. Building on the intellectual background sketched in chapter one, the second chapter shows how Lutheran physicians attempted to understand bodies and disease in light of this system of thought. To do so, they called on two principal sources of authority: the Bible and medical theory. Following this overview of basic intellectual commitments, the thematic chapters three and four trace evolving notions of (1) the
physician as healer of body and of soul, an imitator of Christus Medicus and (2) the spread of learned ideas about body and soul in vernacular literature, and the way patients should understand and cope with their own sicknesses of body and soul.

This dissertation builds on a wide body of academic Latin and popular vernacular sources, from theological and medical treatises to sermons, commentaries, and devotional literature. It highlights the influence of Philip Melanchthon’s commentaries on Aristotle’s De anima, and those of his students and friends, as well as the influential writing of the prominent Wittenberg physician Daniel Sennert. In books of prayer, sermons, and biblical commentaries that treat disease and healing, Lutheran pastors and theologians utilized academic medicine and theology to console patients and to popularize pious understandings of body, soul, and medicine. Together these sources reveal a set of beliefs about the relationship of body and soul and their relationship to material and spiritual forces that permeated every level of society.
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Introduction

This dissertation started with a simple question posed in a graduate seminar at Yale on early modern European religion and society: how and where did (and do) people access the divine in their daily lives? Like many good questions, it was something that stood right in front of me, so obvious that I typically overlooked it. I could not suspect at the time the variety of places that my grappling with it would lead me.

The question was rooted in a simple, yet powerful, observation: across medieval and early modern Europe, people went to particular places and visited outstanding individuals, all in an effort to witness and to access some manifestation of divine power in the world. Shrines and relics that promised to mediate spiritual power in the material world proliferated.¹ Individuals spoke and wrote excitedly about evidences of divine activity through saints and through nature; matter and spirit were both distinct and deeply connected. “Issues of how matter behaved,” writes Caroline Walker Bynum, “both ordinarily and miraculously, when in contact with an infinitely powerful and ultimately unknowable God were key to devotion and theology. The God who lay

¹ Describing medieval religion, Carlos Eire writes, “The religion shared officially by all Western European Christians sought to establish links between earth and heaven, body and soul, the human and the divine, the living and the dead, and also between neighbors...The world was continually in the process of being sacralized, that is, of being brought into contact with the divine. This sacralization took place in multiple interlocking spheres of behavior, all of which were seamlessly woven into the fabric of daily life.” Further there was “keen fixation on specific earthly points that were believed to be closer to heaven.” Idem, Reformations: The Early Modern World, 1450-1650 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2016), 22, 20.
beyond the world in unimaginable and unanalyzable darkness or light was also a God
to whom human beings were led back by a human Christ.” Though a perpetual
temptation into which some fell, to deny the goodness of the material world constituted
heresy. Indeed, Christian hope centered on matter (a physical body) in which divine
and human natures mingled fully and perfectly, while remaining whole in themselves—
Christ’s. Each time Mass was said, Catholic Christians believed, as they still do, that
another marvelous transformation of matter occurred—transubstantiation. This belief
inspired devotion to the Eucharist and the host and natural philosophical attempts to
support the theological explanation of it.3

Yet, I wondered, what about a body other than Christ’s? To be sure, no human
body or soul aside from Christ’s could be a perfect combination of divine and human
natures. Yet late medieval and early modern Christians believed that because ensouled,
there are more than material forces at work in and on their physical bodies. As Brad
Gregory writes, “Sixteenth-century souls were often devout, but they were never

---

3 Caroline Walker Bynum, Christian Materiality: An Essay on Religion in Late Medieval Europe (New York: Zone
Books, 2011), 17; Throughout her career, Bynum has uncovered aspects of this belief in striking ways. See
eadem, Holy Feast and Holy Fast: The Religious Significance of Food to Medieval Women (Berkeley: University of
California Press, 1986); eadem, Metamorphosis and Identity (New York: Zone Books, 2001); eadem, Wonderful
Blood: Theology and Practice in Late Medieval Northern Germany and Beyond. (Philadelphia: University of
Pennsylvania Press, 2007). See also Robert Bartlett, The Natural and the Supernatural in the Middle Ages
3 Miri Rubin, Corpus Christi: The Eucharist in Late Medieval Culture (Cambridge, UK and New York:
disembodied,” and as he shows, this is part of what made early modern Christians regard martyrdom as deeply meaningful.⁴

One answer to that challenging graduate seminar question, then, was that an individual’s body could be seen as a point at which divine and earthly powers meet. This undergirded the Catholic belief that faith could really and literally transform flesh that made ascetic practices meaningful, or that an individual’s sanctity might leave behind physical traces. Scholars investigating such beliefs, which stand in stark contrast to modern, post-Cartesian, and mechanistic assumptions that there is a divide between body and soul, have produced a number of studies highlighting the intersection between theological and natural philosophical or medical explanations of such phenomena.⁵ It started to become clear that my own questions about how it might be possible for a human body to relate to God, and to be open to His influence, might take me beyond the scholarly subfield, “early modern religion.” Belief in the unity of body and soul was based on theology, but also on natural philosophical and medical frameworks that operated on principles different from our own.

---

More questions presented themselves to me. Even with glorious potential, human bodies are all too frail and weak, subject to disease, death, and decay. What about some claims, contrary to the above, that argue Christianity over the centuries also included a number of notable despisers of the body? What about the bodies and souls of those who were not saints? Broadly, I asked myself, “How did early modern Christians understand what a body is, and how an individual body can be a point of contact with God? How could this body be subject to disease? And if sanctity could improve flesh, could sin destroy it?”

To add to the complexity of the questions that began to form and slowly evolve in my head, I also began to wonder whether and if so how Protestant theology challenged or changed things. If Protestantism broke with the Catholic sacramental view of the world that underpinned the belief that an individual body could be a site of access to the divine, to what extent did this affect the way in which Protestant Christians regarded the natural world, and the individual human body in it? Turning to secondary literature, I found a surprisingly small number of studies on Protestant theological perspectives on the natural world in the Reformation era. Additionally, literature on

---

Reformation-era theological anthropology focused almost exclusively on questions about free will and justification. This, though a vital part of understanding how Protestant theology explained the value and potential of individual human persons, did not get at my questions about the way in which sixteenth-century theological shifts impacted Protestant views about bodies and souls.⁸

As I thought about these questions, I also began to read Protestant devotional literature written for the sick. It quickly became clear that presuppositions about bodies and souls and their relationship permeated instruction on how to pray for healing. Just

---


as in accounts of miraculously glorified flesh, devotional literature for the sick, even that by Protestants, presented body and soul as integrally related, such that disease or health in one affects the other. In addition, God and the devil were both active agents influencing the onset and course of disease and its treatments. I realized that fully understanding this literature required moving beyond it, to explore the framework of thought about bodies and souls that shaped it, a framework that was both theological and natural philosophical. It drew on Christian theology, Galenic-Hippocratic medicine, and Aristotelian thought about the soul as the form of the body. Only by combining these elements could one begin to understand assumptions in that devotional literature about medicine caring for the body, but also curing the soul, while at the same time questioning the extent to which it evinced any distinct confessional theological commitments, and puzzling out how natural philosophical, medical, and religious notions of soul related.

In all this, it became clear that modern scholarly talk of “construction” was foreign to the way early moderns discussed the body. Early modern Christians did not simply construct an idea of their bodies as spiritual and physical; instead, they

---

9 Since the 1980s, a vibrant history of the body, building on Michel Foucault and Thomas Laqueur among others, emphasizes the way in which various people and cultures have constructed the body. As Caroline Walker Bynum pointed out as early as 1995, this unsatisfyingly ignores actual beliefs about and experiences of the body. Since then a variety of scholars have hastened to echo that critique, including medical historians such as Roger Cooter and Michael Stolberg. See: Caroline Walker Bynum, “Why All the Fuss About the Body? A Medievalist’s Perspective,” *Critical Inquiry* 22.1 (1995): 1-33; Roger Cooter, “The Turn of the Body: History and the Politics of the Corporeal,” *Arbor* 186.743 (2010): 393-405; Michael Stolberg, *Experiencing Illness and the Sick Body in Early Modern Europe* (Basingstoke, Hampshire and New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011).
understood them to be actually so. Comprehending them and their way of thinking would require beginning from this and taking it seriously as I studied both the theological and natural philosophical groundwork of thought about bodies and souls.10 Doing so had the potential to contribute to scholarship on early modern religion and theology and to studies of early modern natural philosophy and medicine.

Addressing these questions effectively required locating a distinct body of sources that would allow me to explore the various, intertwined aspects of early modern thought about body and soul. The study needed to be rooted in a specific set of thinkers, operating with broadly similar educations and assumptions. This I found among early modern Lutherans writing between the mid-sixteenth and the mid-seventeenth centuries (roughly 1550-1650). Thinkers and writers in the so-called “Wittenberg Circle,” building on Philip Melanchthon’s seminal work on natural philosophy, the soul, and theology, worked to explain the relationship of bodies and souls, their openness to disease, and the goods of medicine for them in a wide variety of sources, ranging from learned natural philosophical, medical, and theological treatises to vernacular expositions, to sermons and commentaries, to books of consolation and devotion. This

---

9 In this, my approach is similar to the one Brad Gregory outlines in Salvation at Stake, “My depiction of sixteenth-century Christians is intended to be one in which they would have recognized themselves, not puzzled over modern or postmodern reconfigurations of who they were. I have sought to reconstruct, not deconstruct, their commitments and experiences as far as the evidence permits” (11). “Contextual understanding compels us to relate religion to other aspects of life—social, political, economic, cultural—while resisting absorption by any of them. To treat early modern Christians on their own terms is not to study their religiosity in splendid isolation. Indeed, to do so would misrepresent them badly…” (13).
group offered a discreet, albeit voluminous, set of sources that would allow me to take
up the complex, multi-faceted question that had slowly developed out of a simpler one.

These are the questions and assumptions that have guided my research on the
ways that Lutheran physicians and theologians wrote about body, soul, medicine,
natural philosophy, and religion in early modern Europe. Having explained my basic
questions and approach, let me briefly outline some major bodies of secondary literature
that inform this project. This dissertation builds on work in the history of theology and
the history of science and medicine, but also on more general studies of early modern
Europe and early modern Christian (especially Lutheran) religious culture.

**Early Modern Lutheran Intellectual Culture**

Why Lutherans? What about the early modern Lutheran milieu lends itself to
addressing the questions I raised? The answer to this question is multilayered.

Sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Lutherans working in the Wittenberg
circle—a group that either studied at or was influenced by the university at the heart of
Lutheran reform in the era—produced a variety of works on body and soul that grew
out of Philip Melanchthon’s work on natural philosophy and theology. In a seminal
study of Melanchthon, Sachiko Kusukawa suggested that the *Preceptor Germaniae*
approached natural philosophy as a propaedeutic to the study of theology, in such a
way that the two functioned together to encourage understanding of God’s providential
work in the world, bodies, and souls. While Kusukawa and other scholars have worked to elucidate Melanchthon’s thought, little has been done to investigate how Lutheran thinkers after him received, developed, and in some cases transformed his thought.

Thought about natural philosophy, medicine, the soul, and theology did not wither away in Wittenberg after Melanchthon’s death. Just the opposite. Lutherans continued working to articulate their understanding of body and soul, an endeavor that spanned multiple disciplines, and that they expressed in an umbrella field termed *anthropologia* that developed in the first decades of the seventeenth century. As chapters one and two will show, scholars trained and teaching in Wittenberg continued to write books explaining the good of natural philosophy and the importance of studying body and soul in a Melanchthonian vein. A series of notable Lutheran professors of medicine—including Caspar Peucer, Caspar Bartholin, Jakob and Gregor Horst, and Daniel Sennert—discussed their medical work within this overarching natural philosophical view that recognized God’s work in the world and in individual bodies.

Furthermore, in the wake of Melanchthon’s life and work, Lutheran theologians splintered into competing parties, centered above all around rival theological anthropologies. As chapter four will show, their debates about the extent of the effects of

---

11 Kusukawa, *The Transformation of Natural Philosophy.*
the Fall reached outside learned circles to influence lay thought about bodies and souls. Though they disagreed forcefully about the extent to which sin destroyed the powers of both body and soul, in formulating a doctrine of the Fall, Lutheran thinkers universally attributed to sin the fact of bodily disease and human susceptibility to it. This is why, as chapters two and three will show, physicians understood that patients needed to be cured in both body and soul.

Lack of scholarship on learned Lutheran natural philosophy and theology after Melanchthon corresponds to similar gaps in the study of early modern Lutheran religion and religious culture. In spite of some notable recent studies, the era between 1550 and 1650, typically dubbed the era of “Lutheran Orthodoxy,” has consistently received less scholarly attention than the early years of reform and the career and thought of Martin Luther. Yet, as chapters three and four of this dissertation demonstrate, Lutheran thought developed in the generations after Luther. Lutheran physicians and pastors analyzed belief in the work of God in human bodies and souls; it underpinned rich and extensive pastoral instruction and advice. This literature sought to inculcate a sense of God’s providential care for the body by way of sermons and commentaries on medicine and creation. Altogether, Lutheran thinkers and writers continued, attempted to

---

disseminate, and sometimes subtly challenged and changed Melanchthon’s work in ways that are still understudied.

Just as Melanchthon drew on theology and *scientia de anima*, the commentarial tradition on Aristotle’s *De anima*, in writing his influential books on the soul, so too, Lutheran natural philosophers and theologians in the generations following him continued his interest in learning and teaching Aristotle. Though Luther excoriated Aristotle, by the end of the sixteenth century there was a remarkable change. Scholars suggest this was a result of the pressure to define and defend Lutheran doctrine vis-à-vis confessional polemics from Reformed and Catholic rivals, particularly from Jesuits well-educated in the arts of rhetoric and philosophy. The move among Lutheran theologians and philosophers to readopt Aristotle corresponds in many ways with a similar trend among Reformed thinkers, which Richard Muller identifies as “Protestant Scholasticism.”

As yet, the Reformed variant is better known and studied. So too contemporary Catholic *Schulphilosophie*. Lutheran Orthodoxy—both in its similarities and differences—has received less attention, aside from a series of important German

---


studies early in the twentieth century and Walter Sparn’s depiction of a “Wiederkehr der Metaphysik.”

In readopting Aristotle, and in addressing the relationship of natural philosophy and theology, Lutherans working in the Wittenberg Circle also point to another body of scholarship informing this dissertation, which focuses on the history of the relationship of early modern science and religion.

**Early Modern Science and Religion**

In taking up the relationship of Lutheran theologians and natural philosophers to Aristotle, this dissertation incorporates a significant body of research in the past two decades, inspired by the work of Charles Schmitt. He unflinchingly argued that early modern Aristotelianism is notable more for its variety than its unity. In the same vein, Lüthy, Leijenhorst and Thijssen introduce their collection of essays on Aristotelian natural philosophy with the simple affirmation, “There is no single definition of ‘Aristotelian’; on the contrary, for every case to which it is applied, this predicate needs to be clarified.” Schmitt’s clarion call urged scholars to recognize that if Aristotelianism

---


18 Cees Leijenhorst, Christoph Lüthy and J. M. M. H. Thijssen, ed., _The Dynamics of Aristotelian Natural Philosophy from Antiquity to the Seventeenth Century_ (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2002).
was in any way unified, it was “not so much by a common system of ideas as by common source materials, a common terminology, a common set of definitions, and a common method of discussing these problems.”

Thinkers of a variety of confessions utilized and shared these basic methods, while simultaneously advocating different theologies.

Multiple scholars of early modern natural philosophy point to the ways that confessional considerations influenced the development of Aristotelianisms in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, in ways that sometimes supported and sometimes intentionally or unintentionally undid the system. According to Lüthy, Leijenhorst, and Thijssen, “natural philosophy was everywhere adjusted to the needs of the reigning Protestant confession, which led not only to a further multiplication of Aristotelianisms, but in some cases clearly into anti-Aristotelian territory.”

Michael Edwards argues that distinct confessional agendas are discernible in traditional formats such as textbooks and commentaries: “many early modern authors also departed from, or attempted to refigure Aristotle’s texts more radically to suit their philosophical or confessional agenda.” Craig Martin maintains that, across confessions, a growing sense of Aristotle’s incompatibility with Christian theology led to critical and creative (and

---

20 Leijenhorst et. al., *Dynamics of Aristotelian Natural Philosophy*, 27.
sometimes thwarted) attempts to reconcile received natural philosophy with theology. While highlighting religious concerns in early modern Aristotelian natural philosophy, these scholars work separately from historical theologians such as Muller, who are interested in exploring how second-, third-, and fourth-generation reformers attempted to formulate systematic Protestant theologies, with reference to scholastic and Aristotelian methods. Showcasing early modern Lutheran thinkers who worked across disciplines in describing body and soul underscores this mostly unacknowledged overlap in scholarly interests.

In taking seriously the religious concerns of natural philosophers, this intellectual history of Aristotelianism complements some trends among social and cultural historians of science that emphasize the importance of context in shaping scientific pursuits and goals. It also brings into focus work highlighting the importance of understanding the terms “science” and “religion” in historical context, that argues it is anachronistic to apply those terms without qualification to earlier studies different from our own.

In this vein, Peter Harrison argues that imposing modern notions of “science” and “religion” on medieval and early modern activities that resemble them has

---

handicapped scholarly understanding of the past, and leads to false ideas about the relationship of “science” and “religion” in the present. He strikingly warns, “we distort the past if we uncritically apply our modern categories to past activities that would have been conceptualized by those who engaged in them in a quite different way.”

Harrison devoted his 2011 Gifford Lectures to disentangling ancient, medieval, and early modern “natural philosophy,” “scientia,” and “theologia,” from “science” and “religion,” respectively. Harrison maintains that scientia and religio were primarily ways of being and knowing, and less facts or systems known. Natural philosophy and theology were “ways of life” in the sense that Pierre Hadot emphasized. As a way of being and thinking, not a discrete set of objective facts or creeds, scientia and religio together constituted a way approaching the world and seeking meaning, intimately tied together.

---

24 Peter Harrison, The Territories of Science and Religion (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2015), 5. Harrison draws on the work of Andrew Cunningham and Roger French, who first championed the thesis that early modern natural philosophy cannot be equated with “science” as we think of it in the twenty-first century. Tracing the development of natural philosophy to Dominican Franciscan friars in thirteenth century, Cunningham and French argued that “Neither the content nor the purpose of the ‘natural’ scientiae could be divorced from the purpose of philosophy as a whole, which was to perfect man, both in soul and in mode of life, in the light of the knowledge that philosophy supplied.” Roger French and Andrew Cunningham, Before Science: The Invention of the Friars’ Natural Philosophy (Brookfield, VT: Scholar Press, 1996). See as well Andrew Cunningham, “Getting the Game Right: Some Plain Words on the Identity and Invention of Science,” Studies in the History and Philosophy of Science 19.3 (1989): 365-389.

This thesis has been strongly contested. Its most prominent critic is the distinguished historian of medieval science, Edward Grant, who responded to Cunningham in an unyielding essay, “God, Science, and Natural Philosophy in the Late Middle Ages,” that sparked a fiery exchange in the pages of Early Science and Medicine. Throughout his work, Grant argues that natural philosophy was, indeed, the equivalent of modern science and that, “the penetration of substantive religious material into natural philosophy was minimal during the late Middle Ages.” What is more, according to Grant, history that emphasizes theology’s influence on natural philosophy reverses their roles, for in fact, by the late Middle Ages, “while natural philosophy was virtually independent of theology, theology was utterly dependent on natural philosophy.” Idem, A History of Natural Philosophy from the Ancient World to the Nineteenth Century (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 261, 273.
to spiritual and moral concerns. This resonates with the approach to studying the natural world that Melanchthon delineated, in which he encouraged both would-be theologians and physicians to appreciate the wonder of God’s work in the world and the signs of His lawful ordering of it.

In *The Emergence of a Scientific Culture*, Stephen Gaukroger suggests that the development of modern science and religion is the result of a long, slow evolution in the relationship between natural philosophy and theology that commenced in 1277. He contends that “[i]t is certainly true that the relations between religion and natural philosophy shifted quite radically in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, but,…these shifts are by no means straightforward, and the outcome is by no means a turn away from religion, but rather in many respects a turn towards it.” Like Harrison, Gaukroger carefully distinguishes medieval and early modern natural philosophy and theology from modern “science and religion,” but argues that there is a line of development from one to the other. Nonetheless, as studies of the scientific revolution argue for the period this dissertation treats, the two remained related, such that, as Margaret Osler

26 Stephen Gaukroger, *The Emergence of a Scientific Culture: Science and the Shaping of Modernity, 1210-1685* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2006). Indeed “a distinctive feature of the Scientific Revolution is that, unlike other earlier scientific programmes and cultures, it is driven, often explicitly, by religious considerations: Christianity set the agenda for natural philosophy in many respects and projected it forward in a way quite different from that of any other scientific culture.” 22, 3.
writes, “[w]hat we could call theological issues were as important for determining the acceptability of a philosophy as its success in explaining natural phenomena.”

Osler’s claim rests on her work in *Divine Will and Mechanical Philosophy* in which she demonstrates that differences in Descartes’s and Gassendi’s respective mechanical philosophies “were related to differences in their underlying theological assumptions about God’s relationship to the creation, specifically, the issue of how binding God’s act of creation is on his future interactions with the world.” Other studies exploring the nexus between early modern natural philosophical or scientific thought and early modern theology highlight the way they combined in studies of astronomy and astrology. Altogether, this scholarship reinforces Amos Funkenstein’s observation three decades ago in *Theology and the Scientific Imagination*, that in the seventeenth century there existed “a peculiar idiom, or discourse, in which theological concerns were expressed in

---

terms of secular knowledge, and scientific concerns were expressed in theological terms."  

Seeking to build on these studies of the relationship of science and religion, Ole Peter Grell and Andrew Cunningham tantalizingly suggested that “a comprehensive account of the interrelation of medicine and religion…would almost be equivalent to a complete history of medicine in the period.” For early modern Germany, works on Paracelsus and the plague both emphasize the significant impact of religious thought on medical systems of thought. The interest in Paracelsus brings to mind as well scholarly interest in magic and the occult. While valuable for pointing to widespread belief in non-physical forces in medicine and the body, even among learned (if sometimes controversial) early modern physicians, this scholarship does not fully address the

difference between magic and occult forces and confessional Christian faith and how early modern Christians understood the relationship of the latter to medicine. In studies that do take up the latter, disagreement persists about the extent of the relationship. In contrast to Grell and Cunningham, some scholars suggest that by undermining saintly intercession and sacramentals, Protestantism secularized medicine. By focusing on the intersection of medicine and religion among Lutherans, and specifically how both treated body and soul, this dissertation takes up this unresolved dispute among historians investigating the relationship of early modern religion and medicine.

Together, this scholarship on Aristotelianisms and calls for more study of the relationship of early modern medicine and religion also underscore the importance of exploring an aspect of Aristotelian thought particularly important for the questions this dissertation considers: Aristotle’s work on the soul and its long commentarial tradition. As the dominant system guiding thought about the soul before Descartes, theologians and natural philosophers used Aristotelian thought on the soul to identify and define connections between human beings and other living creatures, which was a key part of understanding the ontological relationship of souls and bodies, and the relationship of

the two together to medicine. As I will show in more detail in chapter one, the Wittenberg system of thought as Melanchthion framed it centered on his discussion of the soul.

The soul as Aristotle defined it is not the same soul that Galen mentioned in his medical works, nor the soul about whose salvation theologians vociferously debated. Though early modern thinkers in different fields all used the term “soul,” one cannot simplistically equate their uses. Instead, it is important to question when and how different, simultaneously held understandings of the soul overlapped and influenced each other. Doing so by selecting a set of thinkers with common intellectual and theological commitments (in this case, Lutherans from the mid-sixteenth to mid-seventeenth century) can begin to answer the questions that prompted this dissertation. Investigating this complex relationship in an individual confession also lays the necessary groundwork for future comparative, cross-confessional study.

---

Dennis, Des Chene, Life’s Form: Late Aristotelian Conceptions of the Soul (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 2000); idem, Physiologia: Natural Philosophy in Late Aristotelian and Cartesian Thought (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1996). While acknowledging the importance of Descartes, in an attempt to avoid anachronistically reading Cartesian foreshadowings into the sources I handle, I largely avoid mentioning Descartes in what follows. With a figure as seminal as Descartes looming on the horizon, it is all too easy for historians of sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century medicine, theology, and philosophy to treat thought about body and soul in the decades just before his work primarily as a precursor to his thought. Yet the predecessors of Descartes did not have the (dis)advantage we do: they did not know he was coming. Only by beginning with this in mind—by consciously resisting the urge to begin by mining texts for hints of a proto-Cartesian philosophy and by asking ourselves what their questions and intended answers were—can we make progress in understanding the logic and effects of the system of thought before him. This does not mean disregarding consequences. Instead, it suggests that our understanding of consequences can only be true insofar as this harder historical work is done first.
Early Modern Religion: Disenchantment and Confessionalization

By approaching the study of body and soul as a way of considering the historical relationship of science and religion, and by considering the growth of a Lutheran system of thought touching on theology and natural philosophy from the mid-sixteenth century to the mid-seventeenth century, this dissertation also incorporates the two historiographical frameworks that have most significantly shaped recent scholarship on early modern religion and religious culture: debates about disenchantment and studies of confessionalization.

Though professional divides between historians of science and historians of religion mean that the two literatures are not frequently put into serious conversation, the large body of scholarship emphasizing the importance of religion to early modern natural philosophy addresses debates similar to those that drive some important studies of early modern religion. A part of that scholarship has lived in the shadow of Max Weber since he first published his Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism. Weber’s influential argument about a Protestant “Entzauberung der Welt” has been taken to suggest widespread “demystification” or “rationalization” of the world, or even just what Alexandra Walsham terms “desacralization.”37 Perhaps most famously, Keith Thomas summed up a “decline of magic” in which “[m]any men were now unwilling to believe that physical objects could change their nature by a ritual of exorcism and

---

consecration.” This lead the way to the growth of science and the falling away of religious views of the natural world.

As historians of science question the extent to which one can properly divorce early modern natural philosophy and religion, historians of early modern religion suggest that disenchchantment was a slow process. For example, Alexandra Walsham notes that “overly bold claims about the role played by the Reformation in promoting disenchchantment may run the risk of eclipsing the curious and paradoxical side effects of this complex movement.”

Recent contributions to this ongoing debate suggest in different ways that Protestant theology did change the way the natural world was understood, though they differ in explaining the extent or speed of the change. In *Enchanted Europe: Superstition, Reason, and Religion, 1250-1750*, Euan Cameron depicts the early modern world not as disenchanted, but as one in which “matter and meaning were closely intertwined,” claiming that, “most thinking people in Europe believed that the physical matter of the cosmos was full of meaning.” Even while recognizing this, Cameron also pushes back

---

39 Here too it is helpful to keep in mind the distinction mentioned above in studies of medicine and the occult, one that sometimes gets occluded in these discussions: that between magic and confessional Christianity. I am concerned with the latter, and with the question of what if any significance particular confessional commitments had for beliefs about the natural world, bodies, and souls.
41 Euan Cameron, *Enchanted Europe: Superstition, Reason, and Religion, 1250-1750* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009). Here Cameron’s perspective is rather different than Carlos Eire’s. The latter argues
against interpretations that categorically deny any shift toward “demystification” in the Reformation, arguing that traditional “superstitious” belief co-existed with moves toward new, more “rational” understandings of nature. According to Cameron, the situation was in flux. In The Unintended Reformation, Brad Gregory argues that “Protestantism as such did not disenchant the world.” Nonetheless, he argues, by adopting a largely univocal metaphysics, Protestant theology encouraged a division between religious and scientific frameworks of understanding that developed over time, and that—“unintentionally”—“probably did contribute to an eventual conception of a disenchanted natural world.”

Building on the historiography of religion and science, this dissertation emphasizes the way in which Lutheran thinkers drew on Melanchthon’s approach to natural philosophy as a way of studying God’s work in the world. But, acknowledging the importance of theological shifts and the way that Protestant theologians evinced fundamental metaphysical commitments over generations, I also make clear that after Melanchthon, generations of Lutheran theologians and natural philosophers debated

that Protestant theology entailed for Protestants a “radical desacralizing” of the world that sundered traditional ties between heaven and earth, and matter and spirit. See idem, Reformations, 749-752.

42 Here Cameron has the work of Bob Scribner in view. Scribner pointed to the necessity of revisiting and revising the Weberian scheme in his early programmatic article, “The Reformation, Popular Magic, and the ‘Disenchantment of the World,’” The Journal of Interdisciplinary History 23.3 (1993): 475-494. It presents the framework for Scribner’s expert studies of early Lutheran religion and society in which he highlighted continuing “magical” thought even among Protestants.

among themselves and increasingly strained to explain the relationship of natural
philosophy and theology and the claims both made in explaining bodies and souls. In
some cases, they even resorted to the long-controversial notion of “double truth” as a
solution to their conundrums.

Finally, was Lutheran thought about body and soul confessionalized? The
narrative of confessionalization has powerfully shaped the study of early modern
religion since famously put forward first by Ernst Walter Zeeden and then Heinz
Schilling. Originally, the thesis postulated that the partition of Europe on confessional
lines formed the prototype for the division by nation-state that is traditionally thought to
have begun with the treaty of Westphalia. These confessions formed a “balance-of-
confessions” connected to the European balance-of-power that was forming in these
same decades.44 Scholars almost immediately began to expand the definition to include
“the formation of religious ideologies and institutions…the articulation of belief
systems…the recruitment and character of various professional clerical bodies, the
constitutions and operations of church institutions, and systems of rituals.”45 As the
social turn among historians morphed into the cultural turn, scholars repurposed the
word even further, finding it a useful way to explain many other differences observed

44 Ernst Walter Zeeden, Die Entstehung der Konfession: Grundlagen und Formen der Konfessionsbildung im
Zeitalter der Glaubenskämpfe (Munich: R. Oldenbourg, 1964); Heinz Schilling, Konfessionskonflikt und
Staatsbildung: Eine Fallstudie über das Verhältnis von religiösem und sozialem Wandel in der Frühneuzeit am Beispiel
45 R. Po-chia Hsia, Social Discipline in the Reformation: Central Europe, 1550-1750 (London and New York:
Routledge, 1989), 4-5.
between Lutheran, Reformed, and Catholic people and communities. Recently, Ian Maclean has argued that there is a clear element of confessionalization even in matters as practical as the production and marketing of medical texts.

Recognizing how early modern thinkers across confessions shared in common some aspects of this system (especially the Galenic and Aristotelian elements), requires cautiously questioning the extent to which discrete confessional interests evince themselves in the texts. Yet taking these studies of confessionalization seriously, in what follows, I underline the importance of particular Lutheran theological positions (especially in theological anthropology) in shaping the system by which thinkers in the Wittenberg Circle understood body and soul.

Outline of Sources and Chapters

Sources

This dissertation rests on research encompassing a wide variety of sources, in numerous genres, in both Latin and German. It includes university disquisitions and academic theological, medical, and natural philosophical treatises, as well as sermons,

---

47 Ian Maclean, Scholarship, Commerce, Religion: The Learned Book in the Age of Confessions, 1560-1630 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2012). “The effect of these measures was greatly to expand the field of theological publication, and to make authors, publishers, even genres no longer confessionally neutral: history, medicine…elements of jurisprudence, and natural philosophy all became implicated in religion…There may be some exceptions, but the infiltration of theological issues into the broad compass of scholarship seems to me to be irrefutable.” (8).
commentaries, and devotional literature. These sources give access to an influential way of thinking about body and soul. Together, they reveal that early modern Lutherans at various levels of society shared common understandings of body, soul, and medicine. Because the sources I consider are largely descriptive and prescriptive, future work is required to incorporate into the narrative how these ideas manifested themselves in practices.

Scholarly sources include university orations and books on medicine, natural philosophy and theology by Lutheran physicians and theologians. Crucial sources for this dissertation are Melanchthon’s university orations on medicine, and his influential works on the soul. Commentary on the latter helped crystalize a scholarly field of study called *anthropologia* that included commentary on the soul in the *scientia de anima* tradition, and discussions of theological anthropology along with medical-anatomical studies. Another important thinker featured in this dissertation is the Wittenberg professor of medicine Daniel Sennert. One of the key figures in medicine and natural philosophy in the seventeenth century, Sennert led the way in attempting to reconcile Paracelsian “chymistry” (though, it should be noted, not Paracelsianism *tout court*) with Galenic medicine in an effort to remedy what he saw as deficiencies in traditional medical theory. His widely influential work spread beyond Wittenberg to the rest of Europe, Russia, North America, and even the Ottoman Empire.
The devotional book Sennert produced at the end of his life leads to the other significant body of literature upon which my dissertation draws: religious and devotional literature in the form of books of prayer, sermons, and commentaries on biblical passages that speak of healing and the relationship of body and soul, especially Sirach 38. In these works, the learned work of the Wittenberg School shaped popular understandings of sickness and spirituality. Lutheran pastors and theologians consoled patients and popularized pious understanding of body and soul that drew upon academic medical and theological views, in some cases going so far as to offer specific medical advice based on the biblical text. They also encouraged appreciation for medicine and physicians in another crucial set of sources for this dissertation: funeral sermons. An especially popular form of devotional reading, funeral sermons (printed and distributed after delivery) included both religious instruction and brief, glowing biographies of the deceased that give access to Lutheran ideals about particular vocations.

**Chapters**

This dissertation is composed of four chapters. Chapter One ("Anthropologia: An Early Modern Framework of Body and Soul") explores the intellectual framework that buttressed early modern medicine in the Wittenberg Circle. The coherence of this program rested on a shared common basis of teachings in the works of the leading Lutheran theologian, Philip Melanchthon, his curriculum for Wittenberg University and
his commentaries on Aristotle’s *De anima*. It argues that Melanchthon’s works encouraged an outpouring of texts on body and soul by Lutheran natural philosophers, physicians, and theologians, who labeled their study *anthropologia*, and regarded it as a comprehensive study of body and soul undertaken from a variety of disciplinary perspectives.

I discuss Lutheran *anthropologia* by selecting and briefly discussing representative texts in each of the major fields (natural philosophy, medicine, theology) that together composed it. The authors of these texts were leading Lutheran theologians and physicians (Balthasar Meisner, Gregor Horst, Caspar Bartholin, Johannes Magirus), and educators (Sigismund Evenius) in the decades after Melanchthon, who were either educated at or taught in Wittenberg, or who (like Magirus) directly commented on Melanchthon’s work. Drawing on Aristotelian thought on the soul, theological discussion about the image of God and the Fall, and medical-anatomical studies of the body, these thinkers in the Wittenberg Circle attempted to explain the relationship of body and soul, and to provide a foundation for medicine as a means of treating both by way of *anthropologia*.

Chapter Two, (“Scripture and Sickness”) builds on the intellectual groundwork laid in the first chapter by exploring how Lutheran physicians and natural philosophers attempted to understand and treat body and soul with the help of two major authorities: the Bible and medical theory. Because medicine as Lutheran physicians saw it was a part
of natural philosophy, understanding the body was a way of understanding God’s creation and tracing His work in the world. Understanding the body and its diseases, then, required both special revelation (the Bible) and respect for the doctrine about human nature that it taught, as well as medical theory. In discussing medical theory, I highlight the significance of theories about occult causes of disease, as well as theological questions that doctors raised about their own work, namely, theodicy and the relationship between primary and secondary causation. In conclusion, I briefly consider how particular treatments reflect the relationship of the body to the natural world and the importance of the connection between body and soul. Because his attempts to reconcile Galenism and Paracelsianism and his thought on occult diseases were particularly and widely influential, this chapter features Daniel Sennert. It argues that, to the extent that they have written about him at all, historians of science have primarily regarded Sennert in isolation from the Wittenberg tradition of which he was a part. Integrating him into that context is an important step toward understanding the motivation for and goals of his work, as well as understanding the development of that tradition.

Chapter 3 (“Physicians and Christus Medicus”) and Chapter 4 (“Patients and Piety”) discuss, respectively, (1) the physician as healer of body and of soul and (2) lay reception of learned ideas about body and soul, and devotional literature written for the sick. In both chapters, I utilize an overlooked set of sources that provides rich insight
into Lutheran thought about medicine: commentary on Sirach 38. Lutheran treatment of the text comes in biblical commentaries and sermons, especially funeral sermons for physicians. As I make plain, because scholars have emphasized above all how Protestants reformed the biblical canon, the way in which books like Sirach and Tobit continued to be respected and widely used has been almost entirely overlooked.

Chapter three argues that Lutherans constructed an ideal image of a physician as an imitator of Christus Medicus and praised medicine as a good gift of God. In doing this, Lutheran writers encouraged physicians to view their occupation as a work of charity, and to cultivate personal piety. By doing so, a physician would be better able to treat patients and honor God with his profession. Chapter four samples a variety of types of vernacular literature to show how ideas about body, soul, and medicine explored in learned Latinate literature in chapters one and two found their way to a larger audience.

Taken together these chapters outline an intertwined system of medicine, natural philosophy, and theology in early modern Europe that encouraged physicians, pastors, and patients to appreciate the close relationship between body and soul and between each individual and the natural world. While lamenting the effects of sin (disease and decay) on the body, early modern Lutherans stressed the goodness of God in ordering the world to provide medicine for their diseases. In so doing, the Creator showed his care to cure the bodies of His people, while also offering the greatest healing of all, that of the soul in salvation. In all this, they believed, both in disease and health,
Christians should know that their individual bodies and souls were sites in which material and spiritual powers were at work.
1. Anthropologia: An Early Modern Framework of Body and Soul

Describing the ideal course of education for future doctors, Daniel Sennert, professor of medicine at the University of Wittenberg and personal physician to the Elector of Saxony, minced no words on the starting point. “In the first place, the zealous [student] of medicine should early on acquire for himself knowledge of Anthropologia and materiae Medicae . . .”¹ He went on to argue that the successful practice of medicine required knowing the nature of the patient as a unity of body and soul in the way that anthropologia treated them. Only thus could a physician hope to comprehend “what might be the use of individual parts and by what reason the human soul brings about which actions through individual parts (of the body).”² Sennert advised students they

¹ Sennert had a remarkably successful career. In an era of prolonged academic peregrinations, his career was unusually stable and centered on one place: Wittenberg. Born to a shoemaker in Breslau in 1572, Sennert matriculated at Wittenberg in 1593. He left with his M.A. in 1598 to study medicine briefly in Frankfurt Oder and Basel, then returned to receive his licentiate from Wittenberg in 1601, before joining the medical faculty a year later. There he stayed for the next thirty-five years until his death in the midst of an outbreak of plague in 1637. As was typical for the time, and especially for aspiring academics who hailed from the hinterlands and had few connections, upon arrival at university, his first marriage (of three) was with Magaretta Schatto, the daughter of a Wittenberg medical professor under whom he studied, Andreas Schatto. The two had five sons and two daughters, of whom two sons and one daughter survived into adulthood: Margaretha, who married a physician; Michael, who followed his father into medicine; and Andreas, who became a prominent professor of oriental languages and philosophy as well as occasional dean and rector of Wittenberg late in his career.
could master *anthropologia* through consulting books and charts and “more diligently reading” anatomy, both structural and functional. Though he directly referenced writings by Vesalius, Riolan, Bauhin, and others “belonging to this genre” Sennert’s mention of the “faculties of the soul and operations depending on these” suggests his acquaintance with the long tradition of commentary on Aristotle’s *De Anima*, study of which was a requirement for bachelor’s students across Europe.³ His advice was consistent with his definition of human beings and description of his method for discussing the soul in Book 8, Chapter 1 of the first of his two natural philosophy surveys, *Epitome naturalis scientiae* (1618, 1624, 1633, 1650). In traditional fashion, only after outlining the nature of *physica* in the world (celestial and terrestrial), did he move

requiritur, ut sciat Medicus, qui singularum partium sint usus, & quas actiones, & qua ratione, anima humana per singulas partes perficiat. Equidem Anatomicorum plerumque industria laudana, dum in minutissimas etiam partulas inquirunt: verum nisi etiam earundem partium usus innotescat, ad symptomatum naturam & causas, in quo Medicinae pars maxima occupatur, investiganda, ea non sufficit. (brackets mine).

on to the human being, as body and soul. There he outlined his way of proceeding by presenting the soul (again in traditional terms) as the form of the body, with its principles and parts, followed by discussing “in what way the rational soul is related to the body of a human being” and the operations of that soul in it.4

Sennert concerned himself more with matter theory, natural philosophy, and the practicality of disease and treatment than with anatomy and the study of the soul. Yet in his claims for the importance of anthropologia, as I will show below, his work was very much in step with that of his colleagues who did study anatomy, as well as those in philosophy and even, to an extent, theology. Seeing the structure of body and soul as related to the structure of the world, as I will show throughout this dissertation, Sennert and his contemporaries regarded medicine as tied to natural philosophy—it was all of a piece. Sennert’s injunction also packed a punch, coming as it did from a widely respected and read physician and professor, who was influential beyond German and Lutheran circles. His works were almost immediately translated in England, and also spread to Russia, North America, and the Ottoman Empire, and even crept up in a

4 Daniel Sennert in Epitome naturalis scientiae, Bk. 8, C. 1, in Opera Omnia, vol.1, sig: L1r: Constat autem Homo...Anima & corpore. De Anima primo loco dicemus. Cum autem quaelibet anima duplici respectu possit considerari, primo ut principium, & pars altera composite, seu ut forma corporis; secundo, ut efficiens operationum: utroque etiam modo de ea agemus, & primo dispiciemus, quomodo ad corpus hominis se habeat anima rationalis: deinde quas operationes edat.”
Roman Catholic treatise on canonization (after going through some Inquisitorial purging, as I’ll show below).  

Sennert’s praise of *anthropologia* was not the freakish eccentricity of a subtle mind that attempted to harmonize Galen and Paracelsus with Aristotle and atomism, in complex ways that continue to intrigue and frustrate scholars by turns. In part, it reflects a long-established concern for medical students to master questions related to the soul, which Nancy Siraisi has described in her studies of works about Avicenna’s *Canon* and the circle of thinkers around Taddeo Alderotti, as well as in the dissemination of basic *scientia de anima* (the study of the soul in the Aristotelian *De anima* tradition) in comprehensive medical surveys. She points out simply, “All masters learned in theoretical medicine had to be familiar with current philosophical doctrines concerning


the soul, since the soul was held to affect the body…” A part of medical debate was determining whether and how one could square the various inheritances from ancient authorities and their commentators with Christian theology.

Although Sennert was not unique, his choice of term is significant. For he chose to encourage this traditional study under the rubric of anthropologia, which is not a word that comes directly from the medieval Aristotelian tradition, though it inherited much from that tradition. Yet the word would have had important connotations for Sennert’s contemporaries, who would have understood it as reference to an umbrella discipline touching on medicine, natural philosophy, and theology. As this chapter will show, Sennert’s suggestion to students adverted to an important interdisciplinary field that included, but also surpassed, the efforts to reconcile Galen and Hippocrates with Plato and Aristotle that Siraisi and others have compellingly depicted.

Sennert wrote in a time when anthropologia was a scholarly trend or catch-phrase, though historians have hardly noticed. Many writers used the word in an era when scholars openly prized adherence to authority and conventionality. Leaving aside


8 Though the term “anthropologia” does not seem to have been used in this way in Antiquity or the Middle Ages, the type of study it denoted did draw on a long tradition. See: Theodor Köhler, Grundlagen des philosophisch-anthropologischen Diskurses im dreizehnten Jahrhundert: die Erkenntnisbemühungen um den Menschen im zeitgenössischen Verständnis (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2000). In the following, I retain the Latin term “anthropologia” to emphasize the difference between it and the modern discipline of anthropology.
dictionaries and other works that include the word in the body of the text, at least thirty books appeared across Europe between 1500-1700 that feature the term *anthropologia* in the title. In Sennert’s own learned Lutheran circles, a bevy of books using the term poured off the presses, especially in the early seventeenth century when Sennert was writing his advice to would-be physicians. These reflected the medieval tradition of commentaries on Aristotle, the humanist emphasis on recovering and reprising authoritative ancient texts, medical and anatomical developments and discoveries, the influence of inter- and intra-confessional polemics, and the Lutheran and Reformed re-embrace of metaphysics. An introductory and inexhaustive list of these studies includes Johannes Magirus’ *Anthropologia* (1603); Basil Zölner’s *Anthropologia, id est, hominis contemplatio* (1603); Chistopherus Butelius’s *Anthropologia seu synopsis considerationis hominis quoad corpus et animam* (1605); Sigismund Evenius’s *Anthropologia*, (1613); Balthasar Meisner’s *Anthropologia sacrae* (1619-1623); Georg Friedrich Blintzig’s *Antropologia, hoc est problematum moralium de homine ethico* (1623); *Excercitationum physicarum decima-quarta de homine: quae est anthropologia* (1632); and Johannes Sperling’s *Anthropologica physica* (1637). Inspired by the slogan of *sola Scriptura* and in keeping with

---

9 See Appendix 1 for a list of *Anthropologia* texts from across Europe between 1500 and 1700.

10 A series of classic studies about early modern Lutheran metaphysics appeared in the decades around the turn of the twentieth century, though little has been done since then. These include: Ernst Troeltsch, *Vernunft und Offenbarung bei Gerhard und Melanchthon* (Gottingham: E.A. Huth, 1891); Paul Althaus, *Die Prinzipien der deutschen reformierten Dogmatik im Zeitalter der aristotelischen Scholastik* (Leipzig: Deichert, 1914); Emil Weber, *Die philosophische Scholastik des deutschen Protestantismus im Zeitalter der Orthodoxie* (Leipzig: Quelle & Meyer, 1907); Peter Petersen, *Geschichte der aristotelischen Philosophie im Protestantischen Deutschland* (Leipzig: F. Meiner, 1921).
the general inclination to derive all sciences directly from the Bible, the theologian and pastor Georg Vechner presided over a 1618 disputation adducing an “Anthropologia Mosaica” from Genesis 1:26. This move was not reserved for theologians. The Lutheran physician-cum-theologian Caspar Bartholin did the same in the Manulectio ad psychologiam veram adeoque anthropologiam ex sacris literis exstruendam appended to his Systema physicum. These authors occupied positions on philosophical, medical, and theological faculties. As should be clear from the list above, they presented anthropologia in ways condign with their specialties (e.g. Meisner’s Sacred Anthropology and Sperling’s Physical Anthropology). While this made for internal differentiation, various emphases, and sometimes even apparent incompatibility, the term anthropologia originally denoted a multi-faceted whole. As a field of knowledge it was heavily Aristotelian, even when, as with Vechner or Bartholin, some claimed it was based primarily on scripture.

Anthropologia—long overlooked by historians—was an essential field of knowledge for these early modern thinkers. It went beyond advocating mere familiarity

---

11 Johannes Magirus, Anthropologia, Hoc est: commentaries eruditissimus in aureum Philippi Melanchthonis libellum de anima (Frankfurt, 1603); Christoperus Butelius, Anthropologia seu synopsis considerationis hominis quoad corpus et animam (Stettin, 1605); Sigismund Evenius, Anthropologia, seu, de hominis secundum corpus at animam constitutione doctrina, inter scientiae naturalis partes longe praestantissima, repetita, disputationibus undevegiinti inclusa (Wittenberg, 1613); Gregor Horst, De natura humana libri duo, quorum prior de corporis structura, posterior de anima tractat (Wittenberg, 1612); Basil Zölnner, Anthropologia, id est, hominis contemplatio (Leipzig, 1603); Balthasar Meisner, Anthropologia Sacrae in qua status naturae humanae & eo spectantes articuli expositione (Wittenberg, 1619-1625); Georg Friedrich Blintzig, Anthropologia, hoc est problematum moraliun de homine ethico (Aldorf, 1623); Anonymous, Exercitationunm physicarum decima-quarta de homine: quae est anthropologia (Mulhausen, 1632); Johannes Sperling, Anthropologia physica (Wittenberg, 1637); Georg Vechner, Anthropologia mosaica: E textu sacro Gen: 1. V. 26. & c. petition, & iuxta publicas (Beuthen, 1618); Caspar Bartholin, Systema Physicium (Copenhagen, 1628). On the widespread use of the Bible to ground science, see Ann Blair, “Mosaic Physics and the Search for a Pious Natural Philosophy in the Late Renaissance,” Isis 91.1 (2000): 32-58.
with debates among philosophers and theologians to comprise a field for discussing what a human person is. In so doing, it centered on elucidating the relationship between body and soul from a variety of different, yet overlapping, disciplinary perspectives. In these early modern discussions, natural philosophy and medicine sometimes trespassed on important theological matters while theological positions intersected with debates in medicine and natural philosophy. Altogether, they outlined what human bodies and souls are, how they are structured, what this means for what a person is and can do, physically and spiritually. This had several consequences, including the ways in which body and soul should be understood, how they relate, the best ways to care for and cure body and soul, and the goal and end of life. Treatises billing themselves as *anthropologia* customarily handled questions stretching from the moment of conception to the state of soul and body after death. This made *anthropologia* the intellectual undergirding of medicine.

Because of the extent of the questions it covered, this umbrella field—*anthropologia*—was significant for pastors and physicians. The disciplines that comprised it were parts of basic education, and topics covered in the broad field of *anthropologia* came up often in a variety of places. Even before the huge outpouring of books bearing the word in the title, topics *anthropologia* encompassed found their way into
encyclopedias and textbooks. This shows that many early modern thinkers regarded it an essential part of basic knowledge. Written for young students, Gregor Reisch’s *Margarita philosophica* (1503) covered basic anatomy and included extensive discussion of vegetative, sensitive, and rational souls. Other early encyclopedias had different goals and outlines, but all include anthropological topics. The Catholic humanist and pedagogue Joachim Sterck van Ringelbergh outlined basic knowledge in the liberal arts, including a lengthy section entitled “De homine” in his *Lucubrationes vel potius absolutissima kyklopaideia* (1538). Similarly, the Catholic humanist Juan Luis Vives grounded his comprehensive educational program on his thought in *De anima et vita* (1538), which explained the faculties of the soul (including the intellect) in relationship to the body. The Lutheran Paul Skalich’s *Encyclopaedia seu orbis disciplinarum tam sacrarum quam prophanarum epistemo* (1559) primarily aimed polemic at Catholics, but after sketching universal knowledge in a mere 100 pages, his second chapter on the soul stretched 70 pages, a considerable foray for a quarto-sized book. The Reformed Johann

Friedrich Alsted’s famous encyclopedia included *psychologia* in multiple places, though all within portions of the text on theoretical, not practical, philosophy. For him, it was primarily tied to metaphysics and physics.\(^\text{15}\)

The widespread interest among early modern thinkers and writers in describing and defining human beings stretched across borders, across confessions, across movements, and across disciplines. Paradoxically, the wide range of disciplines and terms that touched on the topics covered in *anthropologia* indicate how much it mattered. In addition to *anthropologia*, these include *scientia de anima*, *somatologia*, *anatomia*, *de natura humana*, *de homine*, and *imago Dei*. But early modern thinkers saw all these studies and concepts as intertwined, reflecting a unified reality of which human bodies and souls were a part. As this chapter aims to demonstrate, they took pains to describe the practical importance of studying *anthropologia* and its sub-fields (*scientia de anima* and anatomy) for a wide variety of fields, including medicine. It was, even more literally than Wilhelm Dilthey knew, the age of the “anthropological turn.”\(^\text{16}\)

When Sennert advised medical students to master *anthropologia*, therefore, he was exhorting them to understand how their own study of the body—its structure,
diseases, and cures—was part of a broader approach to understanding what a human person is. Placed under the rubric of natural philosophy, study of the human body depended on understandings of matter and forces that move it (either within the matter itself or external to it). Seen theologically, illness and distress preyed on body and soul because of sin. This must influence the vision of what health (spiritual and bodily) is. By incorporating both studies under one heading, *anthropologia* formed the foundation of medicine treating body and soul together, though it could at the same time make hazy the distinction between the Aristotelian soul as form of the body and the Christian soul as incorporeal, sinful, and in need of salvation.

All this long pre-dated eighteenth-century French “anthropological medicine” that Stephen Gaukroger has recently suggested “included every aspect of human experience, and anything external to the body that affected physical, mental, intellectual, or emotional states was included within the scope of medicine, for it had an effect on the well-being of the person…In this way the objectives of anthropological medicine became far more ambitious than anything to which physicians had aspired up to this point.”  

Those Montpellier and Parisian physicians Gaukroger examines were—wittingly or not—part of a long tradition of seeing the two as combined. Indeed, physicians who studied *anthropologia* as it was understood in Sennert’s time would have concerned

---

themselves studying not sensibilité, but salvation. This could make for a medical project even more ambitious than that of their Enlightenment-era successors.

This chapter will sketch out early modern anthropologia in order to understand what this early modern term meant: the multi-faceted discipline it defined, its origins, evolution, debates, and consequences. In dissecting the discipline, this chapter will highlight its significance for medicine. First, I will begin by observing how the term and others closely related to it evolved and were defined, situating it within wider intellectual and cultural developments. Then, I will turn to consider the Lutheran context, asking what about that milieu encouraged the production of multiple works in multiple disciplines (natural philosophy, anatomy, psychology, theology), billing themselves as anthropologia. Then I will dig into representative works of anthropologia from each of those disciplines and observe the ways in which they overlapped, as well as noting how they differed. Discussing these works will involve briefly overviewing the state of each of these disciplines in order to appreciate what driving questions and concerns motivated each author, what intellectual resources he brought to the topic, and how he understood these questions to relate to the broader discipline of anthropologia. In conclusion, I will consider the contested relationship of faith and reason in Lutheran thought, a debate which played a part in the evolution of anthropologia in the seventeenth century, with significant consequences for both theology and natural philosophy.
This discussion will highlight how *anthropologia* established a framework for the early modern understanding of the relationship between medicine curing bodies and religion caring for souls developed by thinkers in the Wittenberg Circle. The fame of his life and thought typically earns Paracelsus the most attention in discussions of an intersection of medicine and theology, or bodies and souls, in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Europe (especially Germany). But it is clear from the large number of sources available from non-Paracelsian authors that he and his followers by no means had a monopoly on those relationships. Indeed, the majority of early modern medical professors and practitioners, Lutheran, Reformed and Catholic alike, did not operate within a Paracelsian framework and eschewed it as heretical. (I will consider Paracelsus more in Chapter 2). Yet they largely recognized the need to accept and articulate some relationship between medicine and the soul, whether that be understood as spiritual (in the theological sense) or as a less inherently spiritual, even if incorporeal, Aristotelian “principle of life.” Indeed, the problem was how to reconcile those two conceptions of the soul. The chapter will conclude by reflecting on this, in anticipation of subsequent chapters that focus on how Lutherans working this tradition worked out a medicine of body and soul in medical theories, practices, and relationships between physician and patient.
1.1 Anthropologia: Historiography and History of the Term

1.1.1 Historiography

There is very little modern scholarship from which to develop an account of early modern *anthropologia*. Among Anglo-American scholars, there is no extant study of early modern *anthropologia* used in the way that Sennert employed it or of its ramifications. Literature on “anthropology” in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries employs the term anachronistically to focus exclusively on European exploration and imperialism, as well as the ways in which increasing contact with non-European lands and peoples drove the popular genre of travel accounts and encouraged the production of theories to account for political, cultural, and social differences. Thought the word “anthropology” is rarely used in this literature, the few identifiable uses are telling. Margaret Hodgen’s classic *Early Anthropology in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* is entirely concerned with presenting early modern travel narratives and ethnography as precursors of modern anthropology, and does not contain any discussion of the texts titled *anthropologia*. More recently, *Humankinds: The Renaissance and its Anthropologies*...

---

18 Margaret Hodgen, *Early Anthropology in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1964). According to Hodgen, “This sixteenth-and seventeenth-century literature, which laid the foundation of modern anthropology, comparative religions, anthropogeography, and many other related studies, exhibits the emergence of what must now be regarded as scientific method in the study of culture and society: first, in a definite transition from the motive of entertainment to that of organized inquiry; second, in the more or less clear statement of questions or problems of importance; and third, in the choice of organizing ideas to be employed in dealing with the problem of the origin of man, the diversity of cultures, the significance of similarities, the sequence of high civilizations, and the course of the process of cultural change” (8). The literature on early modern cultural exchange and early modern ethnography is vast and growing, thanks especially to the global turn in historiography in the last two decades. Space only
takes a similar approach, though focused on literary depictions of otherness and
bestiality.\textsuperscript{19} Rather more promisingly, Han Vermeulen’s \textit{Before Boas: The Genesis of}
\textit{Ethnography and Ethnology in the German Enlightenment} briefly mentions the existence of
books calling themselves \textit{anthropologia} before the eighteenth-century ethnographies he
discusses, but he does not explain the field or its relationship to his own topic in depth.\textsuperscript{20}

This may be understandable. Though strikingly similar to a modern term and
field of study (anthropology), Sennert’s description of \textit{anthropologia} does not correspond
well (if at all) to the modern academic discipline bearing that name, though there are
some resonances with the traditional fourfold division of the discipline by Anglo-
American scholars into physical and biological anthropology, archaeological
anthropology, linguistic anthropology, and cultural or sociocultural anthropology.\textsuperscript{21} But
neither historians nor anthropologists have taken the time to investigate how early
modern thinkers used the term \textit{anthropologia} to indicate not, as scholars most often do,
an interest in the study of cultural and social practices around the world, but rather the

\textsuperscript{19} Andreas Höfele and Stephan Laqué, ed., \textit{Humankind: The Renaissance and Its Anthropologies} (Berlin and
\textsuperscript{20} Han F. Vermeulen, \textit{Before Boas: The Genesis of Ethnography and Ethnology in the German Enlightenment}
\textsuperscript{21} Robert H. Lavenda and Emily A. Schultz, \textit{Anthropology: What Does it Mean to be Human?}, 3rd Ed. (New
study of human persons in body and soul, from before birth to the afterlife. The persistence of the fields “theological anthropology” and “philosophical anthropology” suggests that some of this early modern understanding survives in some disciplines. While there may be a genealogical connection between the fields referenced by the similar terms (a subject for future work), it is impossible to establish a connection between anthropologia and the modern discipline of anthropology without first fully understanding early modern anthropologia as early moderns themselves would have. That is, as a congeries of medicine, natural philosophy, and theology.

Among non-Anglophone scholars, the situation is almost, but not quite, as bleak. Insights about the field come particularly from scholars working on the history of the scientia de anima or psychologia (the study of the soul), one of the main sub-divisions of anthropologia. Fernando Vidal’s The Sciences of the Soul dates the development of anthropologia later than the sources in this dissertation indicate, tracing it, like Gaukroger, to the eighteenth century. He does acknowledge that it is tied to earlier studies, particularly, as his title makes obvious, the study of the soul. According to Vidal, anthropologia originated as a discipline subordinate to psychologia. In his account,

---

A popular anthropology textbook, A History of Anthropological Theory, adopts a typical narrative, tracing the study of anthropology back to ancient attempts to explain behavior as cultural convention (notably, Herodotus on the Scythians). Skimming brusquely over the Middle Ages, the book slows down in the early modern era, describing European exploration and ensuing debates about those encountered in far-flung places before skipping ahead to Enlightenment ethnography with its impossible-to-ignore orientalist overtones. Finally, it proceeds with relish, and more detail, to the effusion of anthropological theories in the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Paul A. Erickson and Liam D. Murphy, A History of Anthropological Theory, 4th ed. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2013).
the two switched roles in the eighteenth century, with *anthropologia* becoming the overarching field under which *psychologia* and somatology (anatomy and physiology) were grouped. This is hard to reconcile with Sennert’s definition, or the history of the term as I will shortly explore it. But there may be something to it. Identifying increasing emphasis on the body, Vidal correctly sees a turn toward more mechanistic, even materialistic anthropology and psychology in the eighteenth century. Nonetheless, psychological concerns remained key, for “if there is a leitmotiv in Enlightenment anthropology, it is certainly the idea that man as a composite totality of soul and body must be taken as an autonomous object of study.”

Sascha Salatowsky’s survey of the development of the *De Anima* tradition among German thinkers fixes the crystallization of the field *anthropologia* in the early seventeenth century. As he tells the story, the appearance of *anthropologia* was a subsidiary of the evolution of both Protestant and Catholic commentaries on Aristotle’s *De Anima* and the Renaissance proliferation of Aristotelianisms and the Reformation. Therefore for Salatowsky, “… their anthropologies stand entirely within the contemporary interdisciplinary heading of an all-embracing *ontological* and *theological* consideration of human beings in view of their bodies and souls.”

---

23 Fernando Vidal, *The Sciences of the Soul*, 109
masterful in discussing *De Anima* texts, Salatowsky’s goal is not to outline *anthropologia* per se, but to discuss just one component of it: study of the soul. In doing so, he provides important insight into *scientia de anima*, while pointing toward the development of the larger field and leaving full explanation of it, with all its component parts, to other scholars.

Other German-language scholarship offers several helpful studies. Tanja van Hoorn mentions *anthropologia* in passing in her work connecting the distinctive Pietism-infused psycho-physical medicine taught in Halle in decades around the turn of the eighteenth century with the development of anthropology in following decades. Because she does not detail the content of *anthropologia*, her work leaves open the question of where the Halle tradition came from and upon what they built. Gideon Stiening explores the possibility of a “secularization” in *anthropologia*, tying open questions in late-sixteenth century works to Hobbes’s resolutely materialist vision of human beings. Yet, he too does not explore where *anthropologia* originated.

Simone De Angelis gives an account of the developing field in *Anthropologien: Genese und Konfiguration einer ‘Wissenschaft vom Menschen’ in der frühen Neuzeit*. De

---


Angelis depicts the development of the field as combination of developments in medicine and natural philosophy, attempting to draw a direct connection between the field and natural law theories in the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. A rich and helpful account, De Angelis contends that *anthropologia* derived solely from medicine, natural philosophy, and *psychologia*, in particular highlighting the work of Juan Luis Vives, Philip Melanchthon, Julius Caesar Scaliger, Rudolph Goclenius, and Otto Casmann for the early development of the field before moving to the challenge of Cartesianism and the development of theories of natural law (particularly in the work of Samuel von Pufendorf). His account, then, makes evident the interest in and contributions to the development of *anthropologia* by others from across Europe and a variety of confessions. Significantly, though, he does not concentrate on texts calling themselves “*anthropologia*,” but focuses instead on texts in related or in sub-disciplines of *anthropologia*.

De Angelis does explicate some of the ways that theological considerations could shape the field. These he ties primarily to ethics, or, in theological terms, the third use of the Law, and to attempts to counter Cartesianism. However, because he argues that the growth of the field was in large part the result of a split between metaphysics as the study of ontology and anthropology as the empirical and experimental study of human

---

beings in society, his account does not factor in the theological works I will note below that explicitly employed the term (e.g. Balthasar Meisner’s *Anthropologia Sacra*). Thus, De Angelis does not include the development of Protestant Scholasticism as a factor influencing the development of *anthropologia*, or the way that Reformation and post-Reformation debates about theological anthropology could play into the development of the field. Furthermore, De Angelis argues that a division of the field into subfields focusing on body and soul resulted from debates between Rudolph Goclenius and Julius Caesar Scaliger. Yet a brief look at the history of the term suggests that this division was part of the field from the beginning.

### 1.1.2 History of the Term

As with all “firsts,” there is some debate about when the word “anthropologia” was first used. But several very different works that appeared over the course of the sixteenth century offer some insight into the early development of the term, and the field. The first instance (known thus far) of the term is Magnus Hundt’s *Antropologium* (1501), in which the Leipzig gymnasium instructor mixed both physiological and psychological ideas in the title almost exactly as Sennert would later define it:


---

Parts, and Members of the Human Body. Hundt began by explaining the human being as the creation and image of God, drawing from biblical creation accounts, before focusing most of the book on an anatomical description, backed up with seventeen schematic woodcuts (See Figure 1) to help readers. His use of a variety of ancient and medieval Christian authorities (e.g. Aristotle, Ovid, Augustine, and Albertus Magnus) foreshadows later anthropologia that also incorporated a wide range of ancient Christian and non-Christian sources.

Figure 1: Anatomy of head and brain-- Magnus Hundt, Antropologium (1501).

---

29 Magnus Hundt, Antropologium de hominis dignitate, natura et proprietatibus, de elementis, partibus et membris humani corporis (Leipzig, 1501).
Shortly after Hundt’s book, the Italian humanist, historian, theologian and cleric Raffaele Maffei used the term as the title of the second book of his influential and encyclopedic Commentarii urbani (1506). Maffei’s book was popular and widely influential, going through at least eight editions by 1603. Instead of a disquisition on body and soul, Maffei’s Anthropologia offered a vivid historical account from biblical antiquity to the present. He saved discussion of the human body and Aristotelianism for the section of the work entitled “Philology.”

The term became more common in following decades, and can be found in works across the European continent. Its definition apparently remained unsettled, as these works reflect both Hundt’s and Maffei’s different uses of the word. Following Maffei in Italy, Galeazzo Capella arranged his 1533 Anthropologia as a classic humanist dialogue in three parts (treating respectively, the dignity of human beings, the excellence of women, and the miseries of both sexes) among a “friend of the muses,” a physician, and a poet. For Capella anthropologia pertains not to anatomy and psychology, but rather the recognizably Renaissance humanist leitmotif of the dignity of man in the world. In France, the poet Jean Boucher briefly referred to “entropologie,” while the theologian Robert Ceneau in 1557 offered a detailed description of the inhabitants of his country dubbed an “anthropology” in the first volume of History of Gaul Divided into Two

31 Raffaelo Maffei, Commentariorum rerum urbanorum libri XXXVIII (Rome, 1506).
The Englishman Richard Harvey’s Philadelphus, or a Defence of Brutes, and the Brutans History (1593) similarly termed the study of the history and cultural customs “anthropology.”

Hundt’s usage did not disappear, and ultimately it became dominant. A 1592 anthropologia published in Leipzig optimistically promised to explain human “affections” (tied to the body) succinctly. More significantly, the Reformed philosopher Otto Casmann employed the term as Hundt did in his major two-volume work Anthropological Psychology, or the Doctrine of the Human Soul (1594), followed up two years later by a book on anatomy, titled (so no one could be confused), Second Part of Anthropology, Which is, the Fabric of the Human Body (1596). Casmann’s scholarly cribbing of Vesalius’s title for his own book suggests the significance of the anatomical revolution for the development of anthropologia.

---

34 Richard Harvey, Philadelphus, or a Defence of Brutes, and the Brutans History (London, 1593), 15.
35 Johannes Triller, Anthropologia, id est, disputatio de homine in qua principia et affectiones illius, succinte quidem sed perspicuis certis thesibus comprehenduntur & explicantur (Leipzig, 1592).
37 Casmann labored to differentiate between matter and spirit in a series of texts. Just two years later, Casmann published Somatologia, physica generalis; seu, Commentationum disceptationumque physicarum syndromus problematicum: I. De naturalium corporum in genere essentia, & qualitatis physici, tum manifestis tum occultis (Frankfurt, 1598); This was followed by Angelographia; sive, Commentationum disceptationumque physicarum prodromus problematicus de angelis seu creatis spiritibus a corporum consortio abiunctis (Frankfurt, 1605). The hierarchical relationship between humans and angels was as important as the relationship between humans and animals, though it has gotten less attention in secondary literature.
Casmann defined the field at the beginning of the first volume in step-by-step sentences. “Anthropologia is the doctrine of human nature. Human nature is two universal natures sharing (the same) essence, spiritual and bodily united in one substance (hyphistamenon).” Immediately he tied this definition to the creation account in Genesis: “Moses describes the human being in Genesis as made in the image and likeness of God, at creation he first formed the body from the earth, from that moment actually reproducing it through generation from human seed: and making the body alive by blowing the spirit or breath of life in his face, (the human being) exists joined together in one substance (hyphistamenon).” Furthermore, Casmann argued that one “cannot properly call a human being” a soul without a body or a body without a soul.38 This meant that ultimately, for Casmann, psychologia was the most important part of anthropologia.39 One of Casmann’s later textbooks (Homo novus: sive spiritualis) built on the anthropologia he offered in these two volumes to offer a “spiritual” anatomy of the

38 Otto Casmann, Psychologia anthropologica, Sig: B1r-v: Anthropologia est doctrina humanae naturae. Humana natura est geminae naturae mundaneae, spiritualis & corporeae in unum hyphistamenon unitae, particeps essentia. Mosaica enim Genesis hominem descripturum ad imaginem & similitudinem Dei factam, corpore per creationem primum ex terrae pulvere format hinc vero ex humano semine per generationem propagato: ac spiritu seu vitarum spiraculo in faciem corporis vivificandi inspirato, in unum hyphistamenon coniunctis constantem. Spiritus igitur seu anima a corpore seorsum existens: corpus item inanime, seu ab anima desertum, hominis nomine propriie non censetur. Humanitatem proinde & hominis essentiam in hypostatica utriusque naturae physicae, spiritualis & corporeae, animae nimium logicae & erecti corporis coniunctione collocamus. (parentheses mine)

39 Otto Casmann, Secunda pars anthropologiae, “Psychologia est prior pars Anthropologiae, quae docet naturam humani spiritus seu animae logicae per eiusdem facultates” (As cited by De Angelis, Anthropologien, 199, footnote 117).
human being, based on scripture and observation, complete with prayers to accompany each body part.  

From the 1590s, use of the term *anthropologia* exploded. Until the end of the seventeenth century, it was primarily, though not exclusively, used in the way that Hundt, Sennert, and Bartholin used it, as a study of human bodies and souls in medicine, natural philosophy, and theology. Usage derived from Maffei dwindled. For example, in 1655 an anonymous *Anthropology Abstracted* in London summed up the field: the *History of Human Nature, (which is, in the Vulgar (yet just) impression, distinguished into two Volumes; The First entituled Psychologie, the Nature of the Rationall Soule Discoursed: the Other Anatomie, the Fabrick or Structure of the Body of Man Revealed in Dissection.*  

At the end of the seventeenth century, in France, the Caen philosophy teacher Pierre Cally structured his *Anthropologia, sive tractatio de homine* around the same bipartite division.  

Even as this definition began to solidify, some quibbled. The Calvinist Clemens Timpler testily charged that dividing anthropology into psychology and somatology/anatomy  

---


41 Anonymous, *Anthropology Abstracted: or the History of Human Nature, in the Vulgar (yet just) Impression, Distinguished into Two Volumes; The First Entituled Psychologie, the Nature of the Rationall Soule Discoursed: the Other Anatomie, the Fabrick or Structure of the Body of Man Revealed in Dissection* (London, 1655).  

42 Pierry Cally, *Primum philosophiae perficiendae rudimentum, anthropologia, sive tractatio de homine* (Caen, 1683).
undermined the inherent unity of body and soul, and ceded the entire study to
dualism.\textsuperscript{43}

As the list in Appendix 1 shows, books of \textit{anthropologia} continued to be published
throughout the seventeenth century. It increasingly became the domain of physicians.
Indeed, Martin Lipinius’s three-volume \textit{Bibliotheca realis} (1679) contains an entry for
anthropology in the medical volume, but not the theological one.\textsuperscript{44} This trend continued
into the eighteenth century, as studies of both French and German thinkers have argued.
As seen above, Stephen Gaukroger details an “anthropological medicine” propounded
by \textit{médecins philosophes} in 1730s Montpellier while Elizabeth Williams has traced a
holistic “science of man” that viewed physical and moral medicine as intertwined that
survived in France into the nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{45} John Zammito bases his argument that
“German anthropological discourse crystallized in three distinct manifestations around
the year 1772” on the publication of Ernst Platner’s \textit{Anthropologie für Ärzte und Weltweise}
in that year as well as Kant’s seminal lectures on anthropology and Herder’s essay on

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{44} Martin Lipinius, \textit{Bibliotheca realis medica} (Frankfurt am Main, 1679); cf. Paul Mengal, \textit{La naissance de la psychologie} (Paris: L’Harmattan, 2005).
\end{itemize}
the origins of language. To this point, historians have tended to focus on one national history (e.g. France or Germany), with international exchanges de-emphasized—something for future studies to undertake.

In addition to the need to consider international exchange and debate in the eighteenth century, the list in appendix 1 indicates that eighteenth-century “anthropological medicine” had a longer heritage than scholars thus far have noted—one genealogically connected to the slow sixteenth- and seventeenth-century evolution of Galenic and Aristotelian medicine and natural philosophy. Zammito, Gaukroger, and Williams, like Vidal, are postdating the beginning of discussions of *anthropologia* and medicine. Furthermore, a glance at the list shows that the number of texts published in one or two decades by thinkers in the same confessional and intellectual circle (Lutheranism) at the beginning of the seventeenth century stands out and begs for exploration.

Having noted the early and varied uses of the term, and the increasing consensus that *anthropologia* referred above all to studies of body and soul, it is time for a close look

---

at the contents of the works. This will reveal the intellectual impulses that shaped it, as well as foreshadow its consequences.

1.2 Lutheran Anthropologia: Influences and Development from Melanchthon to Magirus

1.2.1 Background to Development of Anthropologia

Lutherans were not the only authors of anthropologia texts, but publications with that word in the title in the first three decades of the seventeenth century did come overwhelmingly from them. It is worth taking a closer look at Lutheran anthropologia and the milieu in which it developed, to ask what encouraged this trend, and where it led, and then to ask what can be discerned from this anthropologia. Only after fully understanding this context, can one move on to international and cross-confessional comparison of anthropologia texts.

First, Reformation polemics and consolidation into different, doctrinally defined confessions centered around many classic theological anthropological issues: what a person is, what powers a person has, the extent to which sin damages body and soul. Similar questions were central to divisions between the so-called via moderna and via antiqua in the century and a half before the Reformation, and carried over as Reformers began to work out distinct soteriological and anthropological positions.47

Martin Luther’s famous dictum, “Justification is the article by which the church stands or falls,” indicates that fundamental disagreements about theological anthropology, that is, how the human person should be understood to relate to God, was at the heart of the Reformation. The controversies about it divided confessions from each other, as well as causing heated debates within each confession itself. Calvinists became embroiled in heated debate over the finer points of election and reprobation at the Synod of Dort. Catholics hardly existed in untroubled peace after the Council of Trent’s pronouncements on justification and tore themselves up in debate about the ultra-Augustinian Baius and the Jesuit Luis de Molina, which set the stage for future showdowns between Jansenists and Jesuits. Meanwhile, as Robert Kolb has


50 Indeed, as John O’Malley deftly shows, debate between those more and less Augustinian at the Council itself was strong. Idem, *Trent: What Happened at the Council* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard
argued, the apparently intractable and esoteric divisions between so-called Philipists and Gnesio-Lutherans in the generation after Melanchthon “arose because each party was driven by different concerns, which ... projected a different light on questions of theological anthropology, psychology, and ethics because these concerns proceeded from different points of orientation.”\textsuperscript{51} (I will explore this in more detail below in discussing anthropologia sacra). Notwithstanding this general unrest, Anselm Schubert correctly laments that, among scholars, “[e]xplorations specifically of early modern theological anthropology can \textit{mutatis mutandis} be counted on one hand.”\textsuperscript{52}

What is especially important for this dissertation is that disputes about justification centered on questions of human ability and the extent of the Fall. Therefore, each confession needed to articulate a view of the extent to which sin damaged both soul and body. This could lead (as I will show in chapters two and four) to linking sin’s


damage to the soul with disease or unpleasantness in the body, both in scholarly and popular literature. In addition, it also played a role in each confession’s attempt to define a relationship between domains of knowledge (faith and reason, or theology and philosophy), because these questions were central to understanding what unaided human reason could ascertain about human beings, the world, and God. Indeed, Peter Harrison argues, “…the various solutions offered to the problem of knowledge in the early modern period are closely related to assessments of exactly what physical and cognitive depredations were suffered by the human race as a consequence of Adam’s original infraction.”

Second, and closely related to this, Protestants—Lutheran and Reformed—slowly re-incorporated Aristotelian philosophy, as it became obvious that rebutting Catholic polemists—above all, Robert Bellarmine and the Jesuits—required understanding sophisticated philosophy and being able to critique and/or reconcile it

---

Peter Harrison, *The Fall of Man and the Foundations of Science* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 6. According to Harrison, a sense of the limitations of human intellectual powers after the Fall encouraged early moderns to seek some way to find certainty through prescribing methods for thinking and investigation, a search for certainty that encouraged the development of scientific method. “…it is possible to establish significant links between particular thinkers’ commitments in the sphere of theological anthropology and their methodological prescriptions in the realm of the sciences” (7). Similarly, Matthew Jones remarks, “Early modern thinkers maintained that usable forms of truth-telling had to be tempered by the real epistemic and social qualities human beings possessed after the Fall of Adam and Eve. Rather than overcoming any supposed medieval insistence on human inability or removing otherworldly veils of ignorance, early modern natural philosophers and mathematicians worked to acknowledge, to characterize, and to compensate for human epistemic and affective limits … Concerns about human nature helped constitute what we retrospectively consider major scientific achievements in the early modern period. These concerns spurred the development of alternative practices of knowledge acquisition. The new mathematics and natural philosophies, and the methodological lessons gleaned from them, were defended based on visions of human capacity.” Idem, *The Good Life in the Scientific Revolution*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2008), 8.
with their own distinctive theologies. It was not sufficient to proclaim “Sola Scriptura” and “Sola Gratia” and when a Catholic remained unconvinced, just say it louder.54

This involved several things. First, it required articulating a relationship between theology and philosophy—something that, especially for Lutherans, became heavily contested and problematic. Second, it involved moving from this to attempts to reconcile distinct theological positions with Neo-Platonic and/or Aristotelian philosophy, and presenting this in traditional scholastic formats (e.g. lists of disputed questions, collections of theological commonplaces). In contributing to anthropologia, this combined with several trends, including the tradition of commentary on Aristotelian thought about the soul (scientia de anima) and the evolution in late sixteenth-century Aristotelian natural philosophy that encouraged a variety of interpretations, all calling themselves

Aristotelian, even as they differed. As Charles Schmitt noted in his classic lectures, Aristotelianism thrived through multiplication. It splintered into a variety of Aristotelianisms that formed “... an immense variety within an overall unity.” Part of this splintering was due to critiques of Aristotelianism by religious thinkers, some to re-fashioning and re-appropriation of it based on those critiques, some to Humanist source criticism, and some to developments in experimental natural philosophy and medicine. All of these long-term intellectual developments converged in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. This is more easily recognized since recent scholarship has begun to reappreciate the complexity and enduring influence of early modern scholasticism. As Sascha Salatowksy observes, “The fixing of the term ‘Anthropologica...”

55 Cees Leijenhorst, Christoph Herbert Lüthy and J. M. M. H. Thijssen, ed., The Dynamics of Aristotelian Natural Philosophy from Antiquity to the Seventeenth Century (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2002).
56 Charles Schmitt, Aristotle and the Renaissance (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1983), 14. Schmitt contends: “… the philosophy of Aristotle was adopted, in varying forms though scarcely varying degrees by essentially all segments of the newly fragmented European Christianity. It is important to underline this point in order to refute the common misconception that post-Reformation Aristotelianism was largely confined to the areas of Catholic religion. Indeed, I think that one can almost say that from 1550 to 1650 the tradition was stronger among the Protestants than among Catholics” (26).
57 Michael Edwards, “Aristotelianism, Descartes and Hobbes,” The Historical Journal 50.2 (2007): 449-464. This is stark contrast to previous sweeping aside of the period as obscurantist, a habit that “… contributed to the impression that scholastic authors were largely mediocrities whose devotion to such absurdities as the doctrine of forms obstructed the development of modernity and philosophical progress. Consequently, narratives about the emergence of modernity in the mid-seventeenth century, whether generated by contemporary rivals of the Aristotelian tradition or by later historians, frequently depend on a strategy of downplaying the complexity and significance of early modern scholasticism.” (449-450).
... in Lutheran and Calvinist university philosophy with this background appears as the endpoint of a long tradition, connected with Renaissance Aristotelianism.”

In all, this return to natural philosophy and metaphysics attests to the truth of Walter Sparn’s conclusion in his seminal study: that in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century, Lutherans re-embraced traditional metaphysics and attempted to fuse it with theology to address perplexing questions raised by inter-confessional polemics and new developments in natural philosophy. Ian Hunter agrees, “… the return of metaphysics was driven more by the needs of confessional religion than by the destiny of reason.” He points to the example of Christoph Scheibler (author of a textbook on the soul mentioned below) who earned the nickname “Protestant Suarez” thanks to his Opus metaphysicum (1617). Scheibler, according to Hunter, advanced a

89 Walter Sparn, Wiederkehr der Metaphysik: die ontologische Frage in der Lutherischen Theologie des frühen 17. Jh. (Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1976). The Reformed have Richard Muller’s four-volume Post Reformation Reformed Dogmatics (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1987-2003) to chart their scholastic turn. See also Aza Goudriaan, Reformed Orthodoxy and Philosophy, 1625-1750: Gisbertus Voetius, Petrus von Maastricht, and Anthonius Driessen (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2006). Paul Richard Blum tells the story of Schulphilosophie for Catholics, especially Jesuits. Idem, Philosophenphilosophie und Schulphilosophie: Typen des Philosophieren in der Neuzeit (Stuttgart: F. Steiner, 1998); idem, Studies on Early Modern Aristotelianism (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2012). A comprehensive, updated account for Lutherans is conspicuous by its absence. Muller summarizes what he means by the term “Protestant scholasticism”: “Whereas the Reformers were intent upon distancing themselves and their theology from problematic elements in medieval thought and, at the same time, remaining catholic in the broadest sense of the term, the Protestant orthodox were intent upon establishing systematically the normative, catholic character of institutionalized Protestantism, at times through the explicit use of those elements in patristic and medieval theology not at odds with the teachings of the Reformation.” (Muller, Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics, Vol. 1, 37).
90 Ian Hunter, Rival Enlightenments: Civil and Metaphysical Philosophy in Early Modern Germany (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 41. What is more, Hunter claims, “… the objective of early seventeenth-century metaphysics was not to rationalize theology but to keep potentially secular (‘empiricist’) knowledges and their subjects within the orbit of Christian academic culture.” (43).
doctrine of intelligible being with the explicit purpose of confuting confessional rivals.\textsuperscript{61}

In a similar vein, Christoph Lüthy and Cees Leijenhorst argue that confessional debates about the Eucharist intersected with quibbling over Aristotelian matter theory.\textsuperscript{62}

Finally, although \textit{anthropologia} grew out of a complex tangle of theology and Aristotelian philosophy, it was not scholasticism \textit{redivivus}. The relationship between humanism and scholasticism was frequently contested but hardly a zero-sum game, as Erika Rummel has shown.\textsuperscript{63} Humanism powerfully shaped \textit{anthropologia}, in part by providing another impetus for studying human beings. A series of classic studies has highlighted the importance of philosophical anthropology for the Renaissance.\textsuperscript{64} This

\textsuperscript{61} Christopher Scheibler, \textit{Opus metaphysicum} (Giessen, 1617). Scheibler is not the only Lutheran who wrote a major metaphysical \textit{summa}. Other notable contributions include: Abraham Calov, \textit{Scripta philosophica. I. Gnostologia. II. Noologia, seu habitus intelligentiae. III. Metaphysicae divinae pars generalis. IV. Metaphysicae divinae pars specialis} (Wittenberg, 1673); Georg Gutke, \textit{Primae philosophiae, quam vulgo Metaphysicam vocant, pars generalis XIV disputationibus tum publicis, tum privatis ventilatae in Illustrissima Academia Wittebergensi} (Wittenberg, 1618); Cornelius Martini, \textit{Compendium metaphysicum} (Strassburg, 1605); Idem, \textit{Metaphysica commentatio} (Wittenberg 1605); Idem, \textit{Metaphysica} (Helmstedt 1622); Jakob Martini, \textit{Exercitationum metaphysicarum libri duo} (Wittenberg, 1615); Balthasar Meisner, \textit{Philosophia sobria; Hoc est, pia consideratio quaestionum philosophicarum in controversiis Theologicis} (Wittenberg, 1618). Jakob Martini also saw fit to produce a vernacular account of basic philosophy: \textit{Vernunftspiegel, Das ist Gründlicher und unwidertreiblicher Bericht was die Vernunft samt derselben perfection, Philosophy genandt sey, wie weit sie sich erstrecke, und fürnemblich was für einen gebrauch sie habe in Religions Sachen … In Zwey Bücher abgeteilet, da das erste handelt von der Natur, Das ander von der Philosophy selbstten} (Wittenberg, 1618).

\textsuperscript{62} Cees Leijenhorst and Christoph Lüthy, “The Erosion of Aristotelianism. Confessional Physics in Early Modern Germany and the Dutch Republic,” in \textit{The Dynamics of Aristotelian Natural Philosophy from Antiquity to the Seventeenth Century}, 375-411.


was not, however, inevitably or always divorced from religious interests, as Lewis Spitz and Charles Trinkaus argued in their classic studies. Trinkaus suggested in the introduction to his magisterial *In Our Image and Likeness*, “The idea of human nature during the Renaissance cannot be other than the conception of man’s nature in relation to the divine nature, and in a subsidiary way in relation to animal nature as well.” For Spitz, “more literary and more metaphysical humanists” emphasized “the importance of a knowledge of nature … (and) the place of natural philosophy within the religious system.” This natural philosophy helped place the human being within the system of the universe. Here Neo-Platonism mingled with Aristotelianism in consideration of human bodies as microcosms of the universal macrocosm. (Future research will need to disentangle the combination of Aristotelian and Platonic influences in *anthropologia*).

This helped ground discussions of the importance of astrology for understanding the body—key components of Melanchthon’s and Peucer’s thought in particular.

Humanism also reveals itself in certain emphases in *anthropologia*, particularly in how often it led to discussion of ethics.67

---

Beyond that basic interest in questions about human nature, many humanists also shaped the field by providing critical editions of antique (Christian and non-Christian) authorities, especially Aristotle and Galen. The number of editions of these authors in circulation in the sixteenth century is impressive. Erik Midelfort notes “… there were almost twice as many editions of Aristotle of all sorts from 1541 to 1600 as in the seventy-five year period before 1541.” Greek and Latin citations from ancient authorities, Christian and non-Christian litter *anthropologia* texts. Aside from Aristotle and Plato, Augustine, Basil the Great, Gregory of Nyssa, and Nemesius of Emesa are particularly prominent because of their influential works on creation (Basil’s *Hexaemeron*) and on body and soul (Nemesius’s *De natura hominis*). Early modern authors attempted to reconcile them with critical appraisal of recent developments in natural philosophy and theology.

---


These rediscovered sources spurred a particular sort of humanism significant for the development of *anthropologia*: medical humanism.\(^70\) As Craig Martin notes, “During the sixteenth century, attitudes toward the teaching of medicine reflected growing interest in Greek texts and the privileging of the authors of antiquity.”\(^71\) This drove the effort to establish an authoritative edition of Galen (coming off the Aldine press in 1542), and the diffusion of editions of Aristotle across the continent. A rediscovery and rethinking of ancient medical and philosophical texts spurred developments in sixteenth-century medicine. No example is as striking as that of Vesalius, whose anatomical demonstrations and discoveries were explicitly tied to his quest to confirm or refute Galen. This humanist impulse was deeply rooted in Lutheran Wittenberg. Melanchthon led the way by incorporating Plato, Aristotle, Galen, Ptolemy, and Cicero in his works on the soul, medicine, and astronomy. The effort to reconcile old and new thought is apparent in the way Caspar Peucer tried to synthesize Ptolemy with Copernicus, and later in the way Sennert tried to combine Galenic medicine with “chymistry” and Aristotelianism with corpuscularianism.\(^72\)

---


\(^72\) Claudia Brosseder, *Im Bann der Sterne: Caspar Peucer, Philipp Melanchthon und andere Wittenberger Astrologen* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2004).
1.2.2 Philip Melanchthon

Philip Melanchthon first combined these factors and began debates that animated the plethora of publications on Lutheran anthropologia. The predominantly scholastic form and combination of Platonic and Aristotelian content of the field bear witness to the long-lasting influence of the Praeceptor Germaniae’s efforts to blend humanist scholarship, traditional philosophy, and Lutheran theology. Fernando Vidal, Simone De Angelis, Sascha Salatowsky, and Rafael Mandressi have all argued that the medical and natural philosophical program in Wittenberg that Melanchthon instituted shaped later Lutheran anthropologia. This curriculum centered on his commentary on Aristotle’s De anima, which appeared in two editions (1540 and 1552/3), and his survey of natural philosophy Initia doctrinae physicae (1550).

In addition, Philipp Melanchthon delivered 19 orations on medicine between 1529 and 1557, which ranged from biographical portraits of Hippocrates, Galen, and Avicenna (De Hippocrate, 1540/3 (?), De vita Galeni, 1540, De vita Avicennae, 1549); to

---

discussions of anatomy and physiology (De doctrina anatomica, 1550, De partibus et motibus cordis, 1550, De anatomia, 1553, De causis putrefactionis, 1556, De pulmone et de discrimine arteriae tracheae et oesophagi, 1557, De medicinae usu, item rerum sympathia et antipathia, 1557, De febri non intermittente, 1557, De aphorismo VI, Partis II, 1557, De consideratione corporis humani, seu de anatomica doctrina, 1559, Explicatio Aphorismi XLII partis secundae Aphorismi, 1560); to critical discussion of the state of the discipline, (Contra empiricos Medicos, 1531); to effusive praise of medicine (Laus artis medicae, 1529/30, Encomium medicinae, 1529/30, De dignitate artis medicae, 1548).

His works on the soul combined speculation on the soul with descriptions of the body in line with anatomy and medicine. In the first, Melanchthon drew heavily upon Galen, devoting over one-third of the text to an outline of human anatomy, including the traditional tripartite division of the soul and association of the three primary faculties thereof (vegetative, sensitive, rational) with the liver, heart and brain.\textsuperscript{76} In the second edition, Melanchthon endeavored to unite his philosophical and theological reflection with Vesalius’s revolutionary De humani corporis fabrica (1543).\textsuperscript{77} For instance, as I’ll note in more detail below, by amalgamating anatomy with theological discussion of Holy Spirit, Melanchthon reasoned that the “animal” and “rational” spirits physicians


\textsuperscript{77} Philip Melanchthon, Commentarius de Anima (Wittenberg, 1540) and Idem, Liber de Anima (Wittenberg, 1552).
understood to be coursing through the body from the brain and the heart must be related to the work of the Spirit of God in the body.\textsuperscript{78}

In the Preface to his 1552 \textit{Liber de anima}, Melanchthon explained the concerted effort he made to incorporate Vesalian anatomy into the text in words that could have been written by Daniel Sennert: “For certainly the powers of the soul cannot be discerned unless their locations or machines in the body of man are shown in some way.”\textsuperscript{79} Because anatomy provided insight not only into the structure but also the functions of the soul, studying it was a vital part of proper understanding of theology and philosophy, including ethics. Only thus could the full extent of the consequences of the Fall and the wonder of justification be understood.\textsuperscript{80} Fernando Vidal contends, “Melanchthon’s \textit{de Anima} books are distinctive for the way they anchor psychological discourse in anatomy and physiology, and for the connection they make among a

\textsuperscript{78} Combining anatomy with psychology was an inter-confessional impulse. Marcus Hellyer argues that Jesuits “… were advised when treating \textit{De Anima} not to be led into anatomical questions, which were the province of the medical faculty, yet numerous texts did cover anatomical and physiological questions.” Marcus Hellyer, \textit{Catholic Physics: Jesuit Natural Philosophy in Early Modern Germany} (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2005), 73. In general, Hellyer contends, “One should be wary of making gross distinctions between Catholic and Protestant institutions regarding the content of instruction. The Catholic institutions generally lagged—both objectively and in their own perceptions—behind the Protestant contemporaries in the teaching of modern approaches to law, politics, and government along with their supporting disciplines such as history, but in the natural sciences the distinction is not quite as clear-cut” (214). Cf: Jürgen Helm, “Protestant and Catholic Medicine in the Sixteenth Century? The Case of Ingolstadt Anatomy,” \textit{Medical History} 45.1 (2001): 83–96.

\textsuperscript{79} Melanchthon, \textit{Liber de Anima} (Wittenberg, 1552), sig. A5r: “Nam discerni potentiae animae non possent quidem, nisi earum domicilia seu machinae in corpore hominis aliquo modo ostendantur.”

\textsuperscript{80} As Kusukawa notes, “This natural philosophy was developed in order to prove the starting point of moral philosophy, which was itself knowledge of Lutheran Law.” (\textit{The Transformation of Natural Philosophy}, 107). My discussion below draws on Kusukawa.
Galenic framework, an account of the passions, and the question of freedom.”

This made for a work that treated the whole person, and that touched on theology, natural philosophy, and anatomy.

Melanchthon proceeded from considering the lowest powers of the soul to the highest in the De Anima. Thus, after outlining the vegetative and sensitive souls, he proceeded to discuss the rational soul and its powers. Each one performed different functions, and the proper ordering of their powers was explicit: it corresponded quite literally with the lowest position in the body to the highest. The liver served the vegetative soul’s functions. It was thus associated with the lowest spot in the body and was least powerful, while the “rational” soul (functioning in the brain) was the most important and should be the part of the soul that controls the others.

The rational soul is the human intellect and will. The intellect, according to Melanchthon, could have two sorts of knowledge, “speculative” and “practical.” While the “speculative” powers of the intellect had to do with the ability to learn and reason, the “practical” powers of the intellect corresponded to the civil responsibility to regulate behavior, by knowing and distinguishing between moral and immoral actions. Even though perfect knowledge of these duties by the “practical” intellect became impossible after the Fall, enough remained that each person should be able to distinguish between

---

81 Vidal, Sciences of the Soul, 40.
good and bad “not because evidence from outside affects our eyes, but because this
belief has been placed in the mind by the divinity.”\textsuperscript{82}

The other power of the rational soul, the will, should be the “pre-eminant power,
supreme and freely acting on an object indicated by the intellect.”\textsuperscript{83} In the perfect
ordering of powers, the will would direct the intellect, as well as the powers of the
sensitive and vegetative souls. Yet, just as the intellect retained some inherent
knowledge, but was affected by the Fall, so too the will could choose in a limited way in
accordance with the limited “practical” knowledge left to the person after the Fall, but
not it could will the ultimate good, i.e. salvation. “(T)he object of the will is infinite
Good, and other good things to be desired in due order …”\textsuperscript{84} This object—and perfect
will—could only be attained by the God’s grace.

Melanchthon’s understanding of the will is the part of his teaching on the soul
that led to the heated theological controversies he sparked among Lutherans in the
generation after him, leading to \textit{anthropologia sacra}. (This will come up this in more detail

\textsuperscript{82} Philip Melanchthon, \textit{Commentarius de anima} (Wittenberg, 1542), S3r-v: “Ut speculativa principia, ita
practica certa et firma sunt, sed practica facilius labefieri sinimus, propter voluntatis nostrae infirmitatem et
mobilitatem. Certa est firma sententia. Adulterium est turpe. Sed non tam firmiter eam amplectimur, ut
hanc bis 4. sunt 8. Re ipsa tamen certitudo similis est, non quia foris evidentia movet oculos, sed quia et haec
sententia divinitus insita est menti. Itaque nos sequemur Pauli sententiam de haec controversia, qui testator
divinitus insita se esse mentibus has noticias, quod est Deus, quod Deo sit obendiendum. Item discriforme
honestorum et turpium, seu leges naturae.” As translated by Kusukawa, \textit{Transformation}, 94.
\textsuperscript{83} Melanchthon, \textit{Commentarius de anima}, Sig. S8v: “Voluntas est potentia appetens, suprema ac libere agens
monstrato obiecto ab intellectu. Actiones eius sunt velle ac nolle.” As translated by Kusukawa, 95.
\textsuperscript{84} Melanchthon, \textit{Commentarius de anima}, Sig. T4r-v: “Discedamus igitur iam a scholis Philosophorum, et
sciamus nobis vocatis ad Evangelii agnitionem objectum esse voluntatis, Bonum infinitum, et certa bona suo
below). Successive editions of his theological *summa* reflect the evolution of his thought about the will, and conclusions he made about it in his natural philosophical work on the soul, thereby indicating the close relationship of all his interests, theological and natural philosophical.

The freedom of the will is the issue that clarified the divide between Luther and Erasmus, placing the young Melanchthon—Luther’s colleague and assistant with humanist training and instincts—in a tight spot between the two. Melanchthon’s thought on the matter is complex, but can be roughly traced in the successive editions of his systematic theology, *Loci communes*, which went through three editions over the course of his career and became a fundamental text for Lutheran theological education. They hint as well at the future “scholasticization” of Lutheran theology, so key to later developments in *anthropologia*. While the first edition of the *Loci* presented itself above all as a commentary on Scripture, successive editions took up theological questions (*loci*) in an increasingly more traditional academic style.

The first edition of the *Loci communes* (1519-1522), like Luther in his famous (or infamous) exchange with Erasmus over the matter of human will, flatly denied the freedom of the will. The second edition of the *Loci communes* (1533) saw Melanchthon

---

highlighting some residual ability to recognize the moral law, a theme that appeared more fulsomely less than a decade later in *Commentarius de anima*. “Because there is some remnant of good judgment even in sinful human beings, they can to an extent behave rationally and perform external actions which promote civil goods.” That is, humans can know and do certain moral goods, even if these do not suffice for justification. The final edition of the *Loci* (1555), coming just before his second book on the soul, shows a strong emphasis on powers remaining to the person after the Fall, and the ability to know and to perform civil goods. Though without the fall knowledge of moral good would have been perfect, even with sin, free will remains, a reversal of his original position.

It was ultimately impossible to come to a conclusion on the matter of free will. The wisest position was to acknowledge that it may not be possible to know the answer. Luther responded almost immediately in 1525, with a book whose title indicates its contents *De servo arbitrio* (*The Bondage of the Will*). Throughout the book, Luther stressed two main themes: the absolute inability of man, and the absolute love and ability of God. He adopted a strikingly determinist line, “that all we do, however it may appear to us to be done mutably and contingently, is in reality done necessarily and immutably in respect of God’s will.” (Martin Luther, *The Bondage of the Will* De Servo Arbitrio. English, Ed. O. R. Johnston and J. I. Packer. Old Tappan, N.J.: Revell, 1957, 80).

---


Fundamental to Melanchthon’s thought is the distinction between what reason can know and what can only be attained by revelation, a question at the heart of Lutheran attempts to hammer out theological and natural philosophical accounts of the world. In generations after Melanchthon, it inspired debates (as I’ll show below).

Melanchthon’s view of the matter was tied to his interpretation of Luther’s “Two Kingdoms” theology. While entrance to the heavenly kingdom was not based upon human will, knowledge of and choices in the earthly kingdom were very much subject to reason and human will, and thus moral responsibility. The distinction between the civil righteousness that could be observed by knowing and acting according to natural law, on the one hand, and righteousness unto salvation that could only be attained by the grace of God, on the other, was fundamental to Melanchthon’s understanding of anthropology. “He used the concept … to temper the absolute determinism of God, and in doing introduced a new reactive, or at least cooperative aspect to his doctrine of God in all human and natural events not pertaining to salvation.”

According to Kusukawa, this shift in Melanchthon’s thought began in the course of his encounters with Anabaptism in the 1520s. To Melanchthon, Anabaptist theology’s extreme emphasis on

integram Legi, hoc est, in natura hominis esset lux firmius statuens de Deo, et essent motus omnes consentientes Legi Dei...” (653-654); “Cum in natura hominis reliquum sit iudicium et delectus quidam rerum, quae sunt subiectae rationi aut sensui, reliquus est etiam delectus externorum operum civilium: Quare voluntas humana potest suis viribus sine renovation aliquo modo externa Legis opera facere. Haec est libertas voluntatis, quam Philosophi recte tribuunt homini.” (654).

inwardness and human powerlessness seemed to pave the way to civil disorder and complete irresponsibility, and he struggled to find a way to counter it and emphasize each person’s ongoing choice and responsibility in civil activities. This required a more capacious account of human reason and will than Luther had offered in De servo arbitrio.

In addition to this, Melanchthon’s forthright willingness to ground his philosophy and theology on things learned from observing the body and from the medical and anatomical authorities Galen and Vesalius raises the question of the status and goals of anatomy in Wittenberg. It was not only physicians who recognized anatomy’s importance. One of second generation Lutheranism’s most famous pastors and homilists, Johannes Mathesius, arranged with Caspar Peucer the transport of animal corpses from Joachimsthal, the small mining community he served, to Wittenberg to be used in anatomies there.\(^89\) The goal of these anatomies? As Vivian Nutton argued long ago, “Wittenberg anatomy” was less concerned with fresh discoveries than with edification.\(^90\) Melanchthon’s text served as an introduction to the field, but was unillustrated. A series of popular and vividly illustrated anatomical woodcut

---


\(^90\) Vivian Nutton, “Wittenberg Anatomy,” in *Medicine and the Reformation.* ed. Andrew Cunningham and Ole Peter Grell, (London and New York: Routledge, 1993), 11-32; This is in keeping with Carlino’s contention that early modern anatomy was less about discovery than instruction. Andrea Carlino, *Books of the Body: Anatomical Ritual and Renaissance Learning,* trans. John Tedeschi and Anne C. Tedeschi (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999). Carlino argues: “It seems as if the perspective drawn from the philosophers’ anatomy was much more open to empirical research and to factual verification than that which was drawn from the physicians’. The philosophers were far more likely to have questioned the unknown and the invisible … than were the physicians, who were restrained by their own epistemological paradigm” (Carlino, 127).
broadsheets circulated in Wittenberg (See Figure 2), while Salomon Alberti’s *Historia plerarunque partium humani corporis* offered a richly illustrated guide to anatomy for beginners. 

Figure 2: Wittenberg anatomical *Flugschrift*: Skeleton (1573)

Altogether, study of anatomy in Wittenberg reinforced the message that the essential goal of the art was twofold: first, and most importantly, to reveal God’s providential design and care, and second, to reveal “how the mind or soul could go

---


wrong.” Malfunctioning bodies provided evidence of disturbed souls, while immoral souls in turn affected the condition of the body. “… (S)in had a physical effect, corrupting both soul and brain and preventing them from functioning as well as they ought.”93 A healthy body indicated a soul in good order.94

A series of pious treatises on various parts of the body from various medical professors and theologians bore the argument out, illustrating in detail the marvelous design and ideal functioning of organs, while also tying them to theological truths. For example, the physician Johannes Mathesius the younger wrote on ears and hearing—an ironically ideal topic for the son of a famous Lutheran preacher who managed to ship animal specimens to Peucer for anatomies. He argued in a way similar to later natural theologians that each part of the body had its own “dignity and utility, by which we know God to be the wisest artisan.” Furthermore, each part is designed and works


together ideally with other parts so that it is not possible to cannot claim that any single part of the body is unnecessary.95

One of Melanchthon’s prize pupils, the theologian, historian, and Rostock university professor and dean David Chytraeus, wove encomiums to particular organs in the body and the spiritual truths they demonstrated into his overview of natural philosophy. For instance, he claimed that the windpipe is connected to the heart, so we might better praise God for the love He pours into our hearts.96 In all according to Chytraeus, the marvelous, interconnected design and functions of the body served as continual lesson to marvel at God’s handiwork and to respect and love others. “... (T)he combination of the human soul and heart reminds us ... that we should serve the common good. It admonishes us likewise that God wishes to be joined and unified with us, which He demonstrates most clearly through the marvelous joining of the divine and human natures.”97

---

95 Johannes Matheius the Younger, *Oratio de admirabili auditis instrumenti* (Wittenberg, 1577). “Sed hac de re verbosius disputare, nunc non est nostri propositi, quod certo statuamus corpus humanum ea providentia a natura esse constructum, vt singulis partibus sua constet dignitas & utilitas, cum sciamus Deum sapientissimum opificem, ita universum humani corporis ... seu compagnum, mira ac impervestigabili arte, omnium membrorum ac partium apta & necessaria collocatione construxisse, ut nihil deesse, nihil in eo non necessarium conspiciatur.” On his father’s relationship to Peucer see, Robel, *Huamanistische Medizin und Cryptocalvinismus*, 50.

96 David Chytraeus, *De studiis doctrinae physicae* (Rostock, 1589), Sig A3r: “Ac ut Trachea, seu canalis Oratorius, in nostro pectore cordi proxime additus est, ut intimos sensus ac motus cordis declarer: sic Ministerium Evangelii, intima penetralia pectoris divini, & bonitatis ac misericordiae erga nos immensus, patefacit. Quam agnitam, cum vera cordis gratitudin & oris praedicatione celebrare debeatamus: instrumentum Musicum etiam, quo conditoris ac redemptoris nostri laudes decantemus, cordi adiunctum est.”

97 Chytraeus, *De studiis*, Sig B4v-B5r: Amiciciae & gratitudinis mutuae imago est Epatis actio, Cordi, a quo calorem vivificum & vim exercendi actiones accipit, reddens sanguinem, quo alatur. Imo singularia totius
Marginalia on the inside front cover of one heavily annotated copy of the *Liber de anima* (1552) now held by the New York Society Library suggests the book required “chaste” readers, who would not abuse the opportunity to learn about the body by indulging in impure thoughts. Instead, they should be filled “with piety and admiration for the works of God.”

Figure 3: Front endpaper of Windesheim *Liber de anima* at New York Society Library.

---

*corporis humani membra, miranda ...& plurimis vinculis ac officiis inter se connexa, & functiones suas, quas alia alii nobiliores habent, ad communem totius corporis incolumitatem conferentia: Imo omnium in tota mundi compage, corporum coagentiation & continuatas miranda; de coniunctione & ... animorum & cordium humanorum mutua nos admonet, ut omnibus officiis consociationem tueamur & communem salutem iuvenus. Monet etiam, Deum nobiscum velle conjunctum & unitum esse, quod miranda copulatione divinae & humanae naturae clarus ostendid.”

* My thanks to Anthony Grafton for introducing me to this copy of *Liber de anima*. This photo used by his permission.
Caspar Peucer reveals how Melanchthon’s influence was transmitted, though in the case of Peucer, not transformed. Melanchthon’s son-in-law and successor as the leading intellectual light of Wittenberg, Caspar Peucer continued Melanchthon’s work as professor of medicine, and occasional rector of the university as well as personal physician to the Elector of Saxony. His work on medicine bears striking similarities (and extensive cribbed quotes) from his famous father-in-law. Ultimately, Peucer found himself in ignominious exile—stripped of his position and relegated to a prison in Leipzig, because of suspicion that he was a “crypto-Calvinist.” Unlike his father-in-law, Peucer’s output was primarily medical and natural philosophical, though never without remarking upon the theological overlaps in his work, especially in treaties like *Oratio de cerebro* (1560); *De sympathia cordis et cerebri in magnis doloribus animi* (1566); and *De essentia et ortu animae* (1590).

A prolific author, Peucer’s most successful treatise by far was the *Commentarius de praecipuis divinationum generibus*, first published in 1553, but revised and expanded multiple times by his death. (It expanded from 350 to over 500 pages.) The *Commentarius* centered on the ways in which spiritual or supernatural truths could be discerned in nature. In the book, Peucer delineated two types of divination: first, that

---

99 See Roebel, *Humanistische Medizin und Cryptocalvinismus*. This will be covered in more detail in chapter 2 of this dissertation.

which was unacceptable for Christians to practice because magical or superstitious, and
second, divinations centered on learning the structure of the world and leading to
knowledge of God. Under the latter, he included several chapters that reflected his own
practice of medicine, including one on interpreting Galenic indicators of health, and
another on physiognomy. According to Peucer, physiognomy could reveal a variety of
things about an individual’s internal state. In addition to indicating the state of the body,
it could disclose affections and morals as well as motivations for action.  
I will point
out a similar argument about physiognomy in a vernacular book by the Helmstedt
physician Jakob Horst in chapter four). This tight connection between a theological
reading of nature, natural philosophy, and empirical medicine can be seen in
*anthropologia*, as it developed into a field of study.

In addition to Peucer’s continuation of his father-in-law’s work, Melanchthon’s
own work went through many editions across Europe by the end of the sixteenth
century. Many commented on it, including Johannes Stigel, Victorin Strigel, Rudolph

---

101 Caspar Peucer, *Commentarius de praecipuis divinationum generibus* (Wittenberg, 1553), sig. k2r: “Ut notarum
signorum(ue) in corpore humano sensibus subiectorum plura sunt ac diversa genera: sic artium quae illa
considerant, aestima(n)t, atq(ue) interpretantur, non unum genus. Aliae notae integram aut affectam
valetudinem referent ac declarant. Aliae congenitam toti corpori vel praecipuis partibus temperiem,
naturaeq(ue) robor ac firmitatem, vel languorem atque imbecillitatem detegunt. Aliae initias a prima origine
inflexiones prope(n)sionesq(ue) ad certa morum, actionum, studiorum, affectuum genera, vel abditos
animorum sensus affectionesq(ue) & a natura constitutiones ac conformationes arguunt, & ceu aperient ac produnt.
Aliae naturae ductus atque impulsus ad foelices eventus ac prosperos, aut contrarios,
praesensionesque et vim future praesagam patefaciunt.”

102 In 1540, editions of the *Commentarius de anima* came out in Wittenberg, Strassburg, Paris, and Lyon. In the
following years these editions appeared:
1542: Wittenberg and Lyon;
Snell, and Bruno Seidel, and, much less positively, Veit Amerbach.\textsuperscript{103} Others published their lectures on Melanchthon, including the Wittenberg medical professors Salomon Alberti and Andreas Schatto (father-in-law of Daniel Sennert).\textsuperscript{104} Melanchthon’s influence on the content of instruction across Germany and Scandinavia is well-documented. From Jena and Greifswald to Rostock, Strassburg, and Marburg, university curricula enshrined Melanchthon’s approach to natural philosophy in general and the study of soul and body in particular.\textsuperscript{105} It even reached beyond university walls to much

1543: Wittenberg and Basel;  
1544: Strassburg;  
1545: Wittenberg;  
1548: Strassburg;  
1550: Wittenberg.  


103 Johannes Stigel, De anima commentarii clarissimi atque doctissimi viri, D. Philippi Melanchthonis explicatio (Mulhausen, 1570); Victorin Strigel, In Philippi Melanchthonis libellum de anima notae breves et eruditae (Leipzig, 1590); Rudolph Snell, In Philippi Melanchthonis De anima, vel potius de hominis physiologia libellum commentationes (Frankfurt, 1596); Bruno Seidel, Commentarius didascalicus, valde eruditus et perspicuus de corpore animato; ac potissimum quidem corpore et anima hominis. Accommodatus ad faciiliorem intelligentiam librorum Aristotelis & interpretum eius, ut & P. Melanthonis, De Anima; itemq(ue) Galeni, Vesalii, & alioru(m) qui de fabrica corporis humani scriperunt (Hannover, 1594); Veit Amerbach, Quattuor libri de anima (Strassburg, 1542). See Kusukawa, Transformation, 174-188; Davide Cellamare, Psychology in the Age of Confessionalization, 120-126.

104 Salomon Alberti, Orationes duae, prior de studio doctrinae physicae, et co libello qui de anima inscribitur… (Wittenberg 1576); Andreas Schatto In Librum de Anima … Annotata (in manuscript, available in Ms. Erlangen, Universitätsbibliothek, 720).

younger students. Johannes Grün translated Melanchthon’s Liber de Anima into a series of handy tables (see Figure 4) adapted to the needs of his grammar school students in Jüterborg, 20 miles from Wittenberg.

Figure 4: Opening diagram from Johannes Grün, Liber de anima Philippi Melanthonis in diagrammata methodica digestus (1580).

(Stuttgart: Thorbecke Verlag, 2001); Barbara Bauer, ed., Melanchthon und die Marburger Professoren: (1527-1627) (Marburg: Schriften der Universitätsbibliothek Marburg, 1999); Ralf-Dieter Hofheinz, Philipp Melanchthon und die Medizin im Spiegel seiner akademischen Reden (Herbolzheim: Centaurus, 2001).


Although it inspired so much discussion and shaped education so widely, one commentary on Melanchthon’s work by a professor of medicine in Marburg can help us trace a connection between it and the texts bearing the title *anthropologia* that began appearing in greater numbers in the early seventeenth century: Johannes Magirus’ *Anthropologia*.

1.2.3. Johannes Magirus, *Anthropologia* (1603)

Though, as shown, authors used the term *anthropologia* with increasing frequency after Hundt’s first use of the term in 1501, the book that started the groundswell of Lutheran books on the topic was the physician Johannes Magirus’ *Anthropologia, hoc est commentarius erudissimus in aureum Philippi Melanchthonis libellum de anima* (1603). As the title indicates, it directly drew on and expanded on Melanchthon’s thought by way of providing an expansive commentary on it. It thereby serves as a connection between Melanchthon’s natural philosophy, medicine, and theology, on the one hand, and the *anthropologia* texts that began to be produced in greater numbers in the decades around the turn of the seventeenth century, on the other.

It is not clear why Magirus chose to use the word; but it is important to note that he had ties to two of the authors who helped shape the emerging field of *anthropologia*. Magirus joined the faculty of medicine at the University of Marburg in 1591. There he was acquainted with another Marburg professor, Rudolph Goclenius, who assumed the still unenviable task of collecting essays from colleagues for an edited volume. In doing
so, he produced a book, *Psychologia* (1590), that helped define that half of *anthropologia*. His contributors included contemporary luminaries such as Franciscus Junius, Johannes Jacobus Grynaeus, Aegidius Hunnius, and Caspar Peucer—a cross-confessional sampling of philosophers, physicians, and theologians. Goclenius taught Otto Casmann (discussed above), and wrote a glowing preface to the first volume of the latter’s *Anthropologia*. Casmann’s two volumes titled “anthropologia” preceded Magirus’s by just a few years, appearing while the latter was teaching at Marburg. Given all these connections, it is reasonable to speculate that Magirus was exposed to this work.

Like many others, Magirus took a *peregrinatio medica* that lead him to the leading medical faculty in Europe (Padua), where he studied with the influential and controversial Giacomo Zabarella before taking a medical degree at Marburg and joining the faculty there. He remained until his early death in 1598. Of his two major works, Magirus’ first and most widely used book was an introductory textbook, *Physiologiae Peripateticae libri sex* (1597). It drew on a wide range of authors across all of the major confessions to expound basic natural philosophy. The book spread widely and was used throughout the seventeenth century as a comprehensive introduction to the field.

---
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Magirus’ \textit{Anthropologia} appeared posthumously, collected from his teaching on Melanchthon’s book and assembled into a running commentary by Georg Caufunger, city physician in Friedberg.\footnote{On this see Gideon Stiening, “Psychologie,” in \textit{Melanchthon und die Marburger Professoren} (1527-1627), vol. 1, ed. Barbara Bauer (Marburg: Universitätsbibliothek Marburg, 1999), 315-344. On Magirus, see 334-341.} The \textit{Anthropologia} reprinted each chapter of Melanchthon’s \textit{Liber de anima} with in-text notations linking key points to a list of Magirus’s comments produced as an appendix to each of Melanchthon’s chapters. These give us a glimpse into how Lutherans explained and extended Melanchthon’s work. At times Magirus’s notes merely give references to quotations from ancient authors that Melanchthon did not name in the text, but usually he expounded on key points in ways that point toward later \textit{anthropologia} texts. For instance, where Melanchthon tended simply to provide a laundry list of body parts in the anatomical chapters, Magirus discussed their structure and function in detail. (Though, it should be noted, the dense book had no accompanying illustrations). In commenting, Magirus did not slavishly follow Melanchthon, but corrected him whenever medical authorities contradicted the
Praeceptor Germaniae. For example, at the end of the chapter on the heart, Melanchthon’s text ended, “[t]he heart is the proper seat of the substance of the soul.” Magirus quietly rejoindered: “But the whole school of physicians oppose this statement, who think that the seat of the soul is in the brain, where the animal spirits are generated.”

Magirus also felt free to point out lessons from the body along the way, such as highlighting the hands as the way to perform good works, and offering a detailed biological justification for palm-reading.

Overall, according to Magirus, studying anthropologia was good for contemplating with wonder the constituent parts of each human being. But like Casmann, his preference for and prioritizing of the soul comes through in words that tend more to Neo-Platonic slur than one might expect from a largely Aristotelian thinker. “The human being (homo) consists of two essential parts, namely body and soul … One [who undertakes this study] distinguishes the superior powers from the body: the rational soul is by nature heavenly and immortal; the body however is subject to corruption and made up of a mixture of the [material] elements.”

---

112 Magirus, Anthropologia, sig. R6r: “Cor domicilium esse proprium substantiae Animae.” Sig. S3v: “Sed huic sententiae refragatur tota Schola Medicorum: qui sedem animae in cerebro collocant, ubi generantur spiritus animales, & in cerebro fieri cogitationem, rationem & intellectum existimant.”

113 Magirus, Anthropologia, B4v: Nona & ultima utilitas, est consideratione admirandae copulationis dissimililarum rerum in homine. Homo enim constat ex duabus partibus essentialibus, nempe Corpore & Anima. Discernit enim potentias Animae, quae principaliter agunt cum DEO, & recipient vitam aeternam, ut sunt mens & voluntas, ab iis potentii, quae sunt brutae; quaru(m) usus tantum est in hac vita; ut sunt Sensitiva, Appetitiva, Vegetativa, quae tamen sunt cum prioribus copulatae. Discernit etiam easdem superiores potentias a corpore: Anima enim rationalis est natura coelestis & immortalis; Corpus autem ex elementis conflatum & corruptioni est obnoxium.”
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Because Melanchthon broke his Liber into three sections, describing the purpose of the study, the structure of the body, and the faculties of the soul, Magirus’s comments indicate how the disciplines that received Melanchthon interpreted him, built on his text, and began to frame increasingly complex and distinct medical, natural philosophical, and theological systems as part of the overarching study of anthropologia. Authors of anthropologia texts after Magirus tended to explicate one discipline extensively, rather than attempting a large synthesis such as Melanchthon’s (or Magirus’s). Though anthropologia was a unified field in theory, in practice the component disciplines slowly became distinct. Hence, Magirus’s work serves as a hinge to the outpouring of anthropologia texts in the next decades. Magirus, the physician, explicitly linked his commentary to Lutheran theology and ethics; he discussed anatomy in detail; and he wove in discussion of Aristotelian thought on the soul.

Looking at a representative work of anthropologia from each of the disciplines that composed it will illustrate this. In the following, I will briefly consider Magirus and Melanchthon’s comments relating to different aspects of anthropologia and representative texts in each field that offered more detailed accounts of each part of the field. In doing so, I will also consider how each field developed, so as to understand what concerns writers of anthropologia texts brought to their works, and the things that shaped the questions they asked and answered. In all, the discussion will demonstrate anthropologia texts building on the Melanchthonian heritage by offering expert medical, philosophical,
and theological thought, while retaining the inherently teleological understanding of body and soul as bearers of theological and moral truths.

1.3 Lutheran Anthropologia After Magirus

1.3.1 Scientia de anima--Sigismund Evenius, Anthropologia (1613)

Because Lutheran anthropologia developed from Melanchthon’s work on the soul, let me first consider studies of the soul, or scientia de anima. When Melanchthon and his successors produced their books on the soul, they were participating in a long tradition, though the word “psychologia” under which it would appear as part of anthropologia was new.¹¹⁴ A catalog entry for Marko Marulic’s Psichilogia de ratione animae humanae liber I suggests that the Croatian humanist used the word in print first, though the work itself is lost to us. Like equating anthropologia with anthropology, equating psychologia with modern psychology is anachronistic, though there are some common concerns.

Scientia de anima was a flourishing field of study across early modern Europe; one scholar estimates that over 200 authors in Central Europe alone wrote books on it in the decades around the turn of the seventeenth century.¹¹⁵ While this leaves out the number

---


¹¹⁶ Cf: Salatowsky, De Anima. Aside from Evenius, other example of Lutheran works on psychologia include: Christoph Scheibler, Liber de anima...in quo tota doctrina animae, tum in genere, tum in specie, quoad singulos eius
of influential Italian and Spanish contributions to the topic in the same period, it does include the Lutheran thinkers who inherited Melanchthon’s work and elaborated on it.116

*Scientia de anima* had a long heritage dating back to Aristotle, who defined the soul in deceptively straightforward fashion as the principle of life. In it, he distinguished three separate functions whose effects influenced the whole body: vegetative, sensitive, and rational. (Whether these should be considered three distinct, hierarchically ordered souls or rather three powers of one single soul inspired its own lengthy tradition of debate). The vegetative, traditionally associated with or located in the liver, is that which gives basic vital existence (plants). The sensitive soul, associated with the heart, is that which divides animals from plants—it is the power to receive impressions, to perceive and to make judgments about material things. The rational soul is the power to know and to understand and, according to Aristotle and thinkers following him, belongs exclusively to human persons. These various powers of the soul(s) are intrinsically connected to the body, such that “The operations or faculties of life stand in relation to the soul both as ends and as efficient-causal effects of the soul.”

gradus, & singulas animae facultates, succinte, & clare petractatur (Giessen, 1614); Jakob Martini, *Exercitationes nobles de anima* (Wittenberg, 1606); Johannes Conrad Dannahuer, *Collegium Psychologium, in quo maxime controversae quaestiones circa libros tres Aristotelis de anima proponuntur, ventilantur, explicantur* (Strassburg, 1660).

116 On Jesuit Neo-Scholasticism, see: Denis Des Chene, *Life’s Form*. Cf. also Salatowsky, *De Anima*. 93
Explaining these operations and their bases in the body was one abiding concern of work about the soul. While Aristotle and his followers stressed that “the whole soul is in the whole body and wholly in each part,” medical tradition highlighted the association, or even localization, of certain powers with or in particular parts of the body.\textsuperscript{117}

After the re-introduction of Aristotle in the West, commentaries on his \textit{De anima} became the center of discussion. In the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, scholastics wrangled with Aristotle’s thought, and the Arabic commentators on it. (Primarily here, Averroes and Avicenna. The former prompted debates with his theory of a unique, supra-individual intellect; the later in his discussion of soul as the ‘perfection’ of the body). It proved a challenge to square all this with Christian theology. In addition to the central concern that Aristotelian philosophy might challenge the tenet of the soul’s immortality (by defining the soul as the body’s ‘substantial form’), key questions included whether body and soul each have their own distinct substantial form, or whether there is just one substantial form for an ensouled (animated, living) body. Positing strict unity raised problems in accounting for what happens to the soul at the death of the body; on the other hand, accounts of the soul-body relation in terms of distinct substantial forms made it harder to describe how body and soul are actually united.\textsuperscript{118} Moving from questions of ontology to function, debates raged about the

\textsuperscript{117} Des Chene, \textit{Life’s Form}, 105, 8.
\textsuperscript{118} On this see De Boer, \textit{The Science of the Soul}.
sensitive and rational souls, and their respective operations. How does one actually sense things? And how does one cognize what one senses? Furthermore, how can one account for the different powers of the intellect: the potential to know something and the actual knowing of it? And where is the soul located in the body? Is it, as both Aristotle and Augustine maintained, that the whole soul is the whole body and wholly in each part? And if so, what does this mean—does it mean that your foot has the power of sight, at least in principle?

Problems became particularly pressing with respect to the rational soul. These included when a soul enters the body (more on this below) and whether or not it can be proven that this soul is immortal. For Christians, this latter issue was tied to debates about the resurrection of the body, and the status of the soul after death, a question that became particularly heated after Pomponazzi.

---

119 Des Chene explains: “When it arrives at the human rational soul, however, it is confronted with a new kind of object, a spiritual object, but one that is fitted by nature to be joined with matter, and that depends for its knowledge on the senses, which are corporeal.” (Life’s Form, 19).

120 The Lutheran theologian Johann Gerhard presided over a disputation called “psychologia” that was entirely taken up with the question of the status of the soul after death. See: Gerhard, Psychologia generalis: H.E. disquisitio de statu animarum post mortem (Jena, 1633). In addition to the treatment in Stephen Gaukroger’s Emergence of Modern Science, see Martin L. Pine, Pietro Pomponazzi: Radical Philosopher of the Renaissance (Padova: Antenore, 1986); Charles Douglas and R.P. Hardie, eds., The Philosophy and Psychology of Pietro Pomponazzi (Hildesheim: G. Olms, 1962); Jürgen Wonde, Subjekt und Unsterblichkeit bei Pietro Pomponazzi (Stuttgart: Teubner, 1994); Nelson H. Minnich, The Fifth Lateran Council 1512-1517 (Aldershot, Great Britain and Brookfield, VT: Variorum, 1993). Luther, rejecting purgatory, emphasized peaceful sleep of the dead in ways that conduced to belief in psychopannychism (soul sleep); simultaneously, Calvin inveighed against belief in soul sleep in 1542. Reintroducing Aristotelian philosophy to Lutheran thought, Melanchthon also restored debate about the soul and its immortality in the tradition of commentary on De Anima. New matter theories significantly influenced the debate about how the matter of the body could possibly be understood to resurrect, as well as whether and how bodily matter was related to an immortal, spiritual soul. While some thought explaining the resurrection demanded Aristotelian matter theory, others,
Sigismund Evenius’s *Anthropology, Or, Of the Person According to Body and Soul,* can give us insight into the content of *psychologia* in Wittenberg, as well as how it was understood as part of the discipline of *anthropologia.* In the work, Evenius outlined *anthropologia* in a series of nineteen disputation, with an emphasis on *scientia de anima.*

Evenius’ *Anthropologia* appeared early in his career. Printed in Wittenberg in 1613, it came out at the end of his tenure as a philosophy instructor there, just as he moved to Halle to assume oversight of the Gymnasium there. It does not, therefore, reflect his later interest in reforming education and teaching in the vernacular. Instead, it sums up the state of the field as taught in Wittenberg in the same decades that Sennert

such as the Dutch Reformed natural philosopher David Gorlaeus, argued that corpuscularianism could account for it better. At the same time, Cartesian dualism challenged both the possibility of and the need for bodily resurrection: it denied the reality of an embodied soul, a key element in traditional Christian theological anthropology. By the end of the century, some natural philosophers attempted experimentally to produce resurrections in the comfort of their workrooms, so as to figure out the mechanism (if such there was) underlying the process. See: Christoph Lüthy, *David Gorlaeus (1591-1612): An Enigmatic Figure in the History of Philosophy and Science* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2012).

121 Evenius was the son of a weaver from Nauen, a small town near Potsdam. He matriculated at Wittenberg in 1602 and studied under the philosopher Martini as well as the theologians Leonhard Hutter and Salomon Gessner. By 1611, he had obtained his Magister degree and joined the philosophy faculty. He stayed only a short time, though, moving to Halle to become director of the Gymnasium there. There he became an educational reformer, as the title alone of his parting speech in 1622 indicates, *De contemptu scholarum scholasticique ordinis.* From Halle he moved to Magdeburg, where he continued his career as an educator, again directing the Gymnasium. There he faced multiple challenges, including plague outbreaks and multiple sieges in the course of the Thirty Years’ War. Nevertheless, he remained there until forced to flee in 1631, when Catholic armies approached the city and began to massacre the inhabitants. (Some estimates suggest that only 5000 of the city’s 30,000 inhabitants survived. See Salatowsky, 287, n. 21). Evenius and his family escaped, but the event marked a profound change in his outlook and his output. From educational works he turned to produce mostly pious books of devotion and prognostications about the end of the world. See: Ludolf Bremer, *Sigismund Evenius (1585/89-1639). Ein Pädagoge des 17. Jahrhunderts* (Köln: Böhlau, 2001); Mary Noll Venables, “Responding to God’s Anger: Sigismung Evenius and the Siege of Magdeburg (1631),” in *A Linking of Heaven and Earth: Studies in Religious and Cultural History in Honor of Carlos M.N. Eire,* ed. Emily Michelson, Scott K. Taylor, and Mary Noll Venables (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2012), 113-128.

96
was advising his students there about its importance. It is arranged in a series of nineteen academic disputations and littered with as many Greek as Latin citations.

Evenius divides the disputations nearly evenly between body and soul, though he makes clear the priority of the soul, even in his treatment of the body. Beginning with a disputation on the “nature and structure” of the subject, Evenius moved on to describe humors and spirits, cartilage, nerves, arteries, and the skin before proceeding to individual disputation on each of the traditional Aristotelian souls (vegetative, sensitive, rational). In this conventionally-structured discussion, Evenius examined the powers of each soul that respectively accounted for the ability to taste, smell, hear, eat, feel, and think, and that ultimately, in this line of Aristotelian argument, differentiated humans from other animals on account of the powers of the rational soul. His work included the following disputations:

1) On the nature and structure of *anthropologia*
2) On hair and nails
3) On humours and *spiritus*
4) On skin, bones, and cartilage
5) On veins, arteries, and nerves
6) On flesh
7) On the lowest cavity’s parts destined and designed for the first digestion
8) On the lowest cavity’s members designed for making blood and reproduction
9) On the middle cavity, or the parts of the vital faculty
10) On the highest cavity, or the parts of the animal faculty
11) On the soul in general
12) On the faculties of the soul in general
13) On the vegetative soul and its faculties
14) On the sensitive soul in general and the external senses
15) On the internal senses and the power of motion
16) On the essence of the rational soul
Starting in the first Disputation, Evenius, like many contemporaries, tied anthropologia to Scripture. In particular, he pointed to Genesis 2: 7, a key verse for discussions both of the image of God and of the rational soul and/or spiritus. He argued that the “breath of life” God breathed into Adam carried the living soul, in Aristotelian terms, the form of the human being.\(^\text{123}\) This made describing the connection between them both pious and an essential part of natural philosophy. Evenius’ first anatomical disputation picked up on that theme, while making the influence of Nemesius of Emesa patent. There he commenced with a quote from the ancient Christian physician’s De natura hominis that presented the study of the body as a praiseworthy pursuit that led to the knowledge of God through the action of the soul in the individual body parts.\(^\text{124}\)


\(^{123}\) Evenius, Anthropologia, Disputation I, Sig. B1v: “Scripturae oraculo Gen 2.v. 7. Quod post inspiratum a Deo in faciem hominis vitae spiraculum, homo factus fuerit in animam viventem; … ergo ab hoc spiraculo accepit ut forma.”

\(^{124}\) Evenius, Anthropologia, Disputation II, Sig. A2r: quoting Book 1 of Nemesius’ Liber de homine: “Ultra autem harum partium in explicationis progressu familiam ducere jure debeat, dubitari non immernito posset, cum in altera praecellat dignitas in altera judicitas & voluptas, in utraque miraculum & divinae sapientiae contemplatione dignissimum vestigium.”
Like many such anatomical discussions, Evenius’ was not illustrated. Instead, it focused on describing the function of the various body parts. In so doing, Evenius attempted to define and highlight the way in which the body is the instrument of the soul. In the discussions of various parts of the body, he drew connections to the soul in fairly typical ways. For instance, in Disputation III, on humors and spiritus, he discussed the importance of blood and spiritus as carrier of the soul, and as the “chain” (vinculum) that binds body and soul respectively.125 Furthermore, Evenius highlighted the practical significance of understanding the connection of the parts of the body for the soul. For him as for Sennert, it undergirded the practice of medicine. Evenius reminded his readers that “Philippus” (Melanchthon), ancient authorities, and the Bible (especially Sirach 38) all argue that the two studies are integrally linked. Furthermore, he asked rhetorically, “What could a physician do if he ignored the place of the affections?”126

125 Evenius, Anthropologia, Disputation III, Sig A2v: “Pars quomodo vocetur iterum est sub judice. Animatam qui volunt ac cursum & recursum, ascensum & descensum in corpore configiunt, qui si animam informantem non arguat, arguet dubio procul animalis eo effuse interitus. Unde S. pagina, Animam omnis carnis esse dicit in sanguine. Levit. 17. V. 14; Sig B4v: Non ergo usus huius proprie est, esse vehiculum caloris innati, cum sit ipse calor, sed vinculum esse unionis animae cum corpore, operationumque organum.”

126 Evenius, Anthropologia, Disputation 2, A4r: “Partium harum omnium cognitio accuratio ex anatome potissimum dependet, quae, ut Philippus ait: I. non inani curiositate tentata est, sed propter multas gravissimas causas omnibus aetibus est expetitia. Quid enim faciet Medicus si locum affectuum ignorerat?”

Unde II. Vetus tas adeo necessariam esse cognitionem partium corporis humani judicavit, ut in Medicorum familiis usitatum fuerit, domesticas dissectiones facere spectandas adolescentibus inde usq(ue) a prima aetat.

Et quando III. Scriptura Medicum commendat Syracid. 38. V. 1. & curam corporis habenda monet, Rom. 13. V. 14. & ab homicidio, quod sui neglectione non raro committi potest & solet, absterret Exod. 20. V. 13: quid aliud facit, quam quod hanc operam non approbet modo sed suadeat potius & nobis injungat?
In keeping with this approach in his disputations about parts of the body, Evenius’s psychological disputations evince his concern to make a case for the tight connection of body to soul. Tackling a series of hotly debated questions, Evenius advocated positions that conduced to the tightest connection between body and soul. According to him, the two are not separate natures loosely tied, but combine to produce one nature.127 The soul is what makes the body alive (the very definition of the Aristotelian soul).128 This means that the soul cannot be localized. It is not in only one part of the body, but (in classic terms) is wholly in each part.129 Building from this, Evenius also labored to prove that the soul was one substance with many powers, and not tripartite.130 The powers (or “faculties”) of the soul came from it as one unified substance, and not as several accidents with different actions.131

Evenius’ concern to highlight the practical import of his work—his emphasis on its importance for medicine—echoes Melanchthon, who argued that the “doctrina” of the

127 Evenius, Anthropologia, Disputation XI, B2r: “... cum potestia & actus eiusdem suopte ingenio in unam coeant naturam, ut nullo aliunde quaestio vincula aut nexu ex iis unum fiat.”
128 Evenius, Anthropologia, Dipuation XI, B1v: “Caussam conjunctionis Animae cum corpore praeter duas hasce partes non esse quaerendam, nec formam corporis animati praeter animam.”
129 Evenius, Anthropologia, Dipuation XI, B3r: Timplerum quod attinet, crasso ille sensu animam in corpore ut in loco esse statuit, quem crissum conceptum non potest non crassa & absurd illa sequi opinio.” The theologian Meisner backed Evenius up: “Proinde statuimus & affirmamus, animam non in toto duntaxat corpore totam, sed in singulis quoque ac universis corporis partibus totam reperiri & existere ...” (Meisner, Philosophia Sobria I, Sect. III, c. I, Q. II).
130 Both of these debates had a long history. See: Klaus Corcilius and Dominik Perler, ed., Partitioning the Soul: Debates from Plato to Leibniz (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2014).
soul was “most useful … in all of life and in every art.” Magirus expanded on this point, suggesting that it allowed one to distinguish between virtue and vice because “it reveals temperaments and inclinations of the whole body and (its) individual parts.” Thus, studying the soul demonstrated not just principles but causes. This made it a highly practical science, with applications not just for theology, but also for law and medicine.

This concern to indicate the practical utility of psychologia also had a long pedigree. Other thinkers also pointed out the importance of the scientia de anima for all fields. Goclenius’ introduction to Casmann’s first volume (Psychologia anthropologica) briefly adumbrated all the ways that the study of the soul mattered for other fields. According to him, “… ethicists, lawyers, physicians, and theologians can fruitfully be instructed from parts of this.” It is impossible for physicians to treat patients without

---

132 Melanchthon in Magirus, Anthropologia: Sig. A7v-A8r: “Praeterea causae virtutum & discrimina virtutum & vitiorum sine hac Doctrina conspici nequaquam possunt. Itaque cum caeterae artes multum sumunt ab hac doctrina tum vero tota Philosophia moralis velut ex hac scaturigine manat … Nec vero dubium est; plurimas utilitates esse huius doctrinae in tota vita, & in omnibus artibus.”

133 Magirus, Anthropologia, Sig. B3v: “Quinta utilitas: quod conferat ad doctrinam moralem. Prodest enim primo omnibus hominibus ad mores regendos; quia monstrat temperamentum & inclinationes totius corporis & singularum partium. Deinde docet non tantum de principiis practicis, ex quibus demonstrationes Ethice exstruuntur: sed monstrat etiam causas virtutum & vitiorum. Enumerat enim potentias Animae, quarum aliae principaliter, aliae minus principaliter ad virtutis vel vitiorum actionem congruent. Ex quibus liquet, per consequens etiam hanc doctrinam lureconsultis prodesse: quia haec doctrina, quae enumerat potentias & partes humani corporis, monstrat discrimen actionum, quae iuunt dolo, culpa, consulto, inconsulto, voluntarie, involuntarie. Monstrat quinetiam, quod (sic) sit tempus pubertatis; qui sit iustus partus; quae vulnera lethalia?” (sic)

134 Albertus Magnus, Thomas Aquinas, Giles of Rome, and John Buridan all pointed out the utility of the subject. On this see, Tuomo Aho, “The Status of Psychology as Understood by Sixteenth-Century Scholastics,” in Psychology and Philosophy: Inquiries into the Soul from Late Scholasticism to Contemporary Thought, ed. Sara Heinämäa and Martina Reuter (Dordrecht: Springer, 2009), 47-66, at 55-56.
knowing the motions of the soul. Legal experts need *psychologia* because without it, it is impossible to determine guilt and whether capital punishment should be administered. It helps determine whether and when a fetus is a human being, and thus when someone should be held accountable for having committed abortion. Theologians dealing with perplexing questions about the image of God in man, the freedom of the will, and the natures of Christ all need input from *psychologia*.\(^{135}\)

One important application of the study of the soul was ethics, which was also understood as part of *anthropologia*, as Georg Friedrich Blintzig’s *Antropologia: hoc est problematum moralium de homine ethico*, announced. Like other works in the *cultura animi* tradition, Blintzing’s work focuses on discussing how to order the passions.\(^{136}\) In this, his work is similar to the most famous early modern Lutheran book of ethics, Joachim Camerarius’s *Explicatio librorum ethicorum ad Nicomachum* (1578).\(^{137}\)

---


137 It is interesting here to note another break with Luther, who savaged the *Nichomachean Ethics* in his *Address to the Christian Nobility.*
discussion focused on psychology, centering on the traditional Aristotelian distinction between the cognitive power and the passions, and the Augustinian concern about the ordering of these powers. The will mediates between the passions (controlled by the animal spirit) and the reason. Camerarius wrote: “There is in the human being a free and self-regulating power which we call the will. It can always turn to both parts of the soul. If this power joins with the animal part of the human being, turning away from reason, then it cannot deliberate on anything well, nor think rightly, nor investigate the matter in an uncorrupted manner.”

The key problem of ethical decision-making is that knowledge of universal principles does not immediately conduce to knowing how to correctly apply them in particular situations, including medical encounters. Camerarius pointed out that this general principle could manifest itself in quite practical ways, such as a physician making mistakes in treating patients. Illness also sometimes intervenes so that a

138 Camerarius, Explicatio librorum Ethicorum ad Nicomachum, (Frankfurt, 1578), 8: “Est autem in homine quaedam libera et plane sane iuris, quam voluntatem nominamus. Ea in utramque partem potest omnia. Quod si patitur haec vis allici sese ad eam partem quae est animalis in homine, et recedit a ratione, tum nihil neque consul laudabiliter, neque recte cogitari, neque decerni incorrupte solet” (As quoted in Saarinen, Weakness of Will, 144, n. 161). On Camerarius, see: Stephan Kunkler, Zwischen Humanismus und Reformation: Der Humanist Joachim Camerarius (1500-1574) im Wechselspiel von pädagogischen Pathos und theologischem Ethos (Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 2000).

139 Camerarius, Explicatio, 325: “Medicus quispiam scit in febri certa danda esse aegroto quae refrigerent et sint humida, sed in iis temperandis et adhibendis, quorum frigus et humor conveniens sit, et talem febrim corrigat, scientia similiter certa non est. Unde et peccatur saepe, et est diligentiae atque artis eximiae felix curatio” (As quoted in Saarinen, Weakness of Will, 148, n. 173)
person cannot follow the dictates of reason, but instead succumbs to passion.\textsuperscript{140}

Camerarius’s recommendations on cultivating reason were included in a book on maintaining health in the traditional way of seeking balance in body and soul.\textsuperscript{141}

(Chapters 2 and 3 will offer more detail on these points, discussing theories of the disease and the soul and the ideal physician, respectively).

The fact that human beings err in judgment, are unable to balance reason and passion, and are subject to sin and disease is because they are fallen and sinful creatures. This points to the explicitly theological importance of studying the soul, that David Chytraeus, echoing his mentor Melanchthon, pointed out. Among other things it, “leads to the doctrine of the image of God, is the light in the mind of true knowledge of God, a uprightness of will and union of heart with God the Author...”\textsuperscript{142} Mentioning the knowledge of God and the hope being in relationship with Him leads to \textit{anthropologia sacra}.

---

\textsuperscript{140} Camerarius, \textit{Explicatio}, 10-11: “Quemadmodum autem morbus rationis usum saepe impedit, atque etiam pervertit, ita vehementia effraenatarum affectionum, et pertinacia voluntatis, rectam rationem suo munere fungi in animo non patitur ... de alis perturbationis, quae sunt vitiosae affectiones animi, similiter omnia commemorari possunt. Quae cum in rationem, ut ita dicam, sese insinuarunt, vel illam potius attrahendo corrupuerunt, confirmata voluntate ad scelus vel falgitium.” (As quoted in Saarinen, \textit{Weakness of Will}, 145, n. 161)

\textsuperscript{141} Johannes Curio, \textit{Medicina Salernitana. Id est Conservandae bonae valetudinis praecepta} (Frankfurt, 1573). The book went through multiple editions, including one in 1591 on which this discussion is based. This is part of the \textit{cultura animi} tradition. On that tradition see: Corneanu, \textit{Regimens of the Mind}.

\textsuperscript{142} Chytraeus, \textit{De studiis}, Sig: B8r-v: “Ac ut de praecipua nostrae naturae parce, videlicet de Anima, primum dicam, quantum lucem consideratione naturae Animae, & distinctione potientiarum seu virium animae, adfert Doctrinam de Imagine Dei, quae fuit lux verae agnitionis Dei in mente, rectitudo voluntatis, & congruentia cordis cum Deo Archetypo...”
1.3.2 Theology – Balthasar Meisner, *Anthropologia Sacra*, (1619-1623)

Melanchthon devoted the first section of his work on the soul to explaining the aims of the study. For Melanchthon, goals include: understanding the Law, the reality and extent of original sin, what the image of God in the person is, and how *spiritus* operates in the body. According to him, each human being is born with the Law written on their hearts, but the Gospel comes from God’s revelation.\(^{143}\) Similarly Magirus emphasized learning to “discriminate” between Law and Gospel as the first and most important goal of the study. According to him, human beings are born under the law and should naturally assent to it. He disambiguated this in more detail than Melanchthon as “the law of nature and the source of Ethics and Jurisprudence.”\(^{144}\)

According to Melanchthon, some knowledge of the Law remains after the Fall (something that I will point out Flacian theologians denying). This leads to recognizing and condemning sin. Carefully studying the soul leads to knowing the “injuries to

---


\(^{144}\) Magirus, *Anthropologia*, Sig, B4r: “Primum exemplum, est de discrimine Legis & Evangelii, quod ex hac doctrina sit manifestius, quae tradit de principiis nobiscum natis. Legis enim particula nascitur nobiscum, quae est lex naturae, estque fons Ethicæ & Jurisprudentiæ, eique naturaliter assentimur. Evangelium autem cum notitiis mentis humanæ naturae impressis non congruit; sed est arcanum consilium ex sinu aeterni Patris prolatum de redemptione humani generis, ab ipso Filio DEI patefactum.”
individual powers and what good remnants there may be in our miserable nature.”

Again, Magirus distilled this a bit more finely. He argued that, though residue of original righteousness remained, original sin had significant effects on the powers (potentiae) of the soul. He included a crucial distinction that even given the extensive damage it wreaks, sin is not the essence of the soul.

The third example concerns original sin, which could not be explained without this doctrine. For it demonstrates what in nature is destroyed, or what remains and in what way it is propagated. This itself (original sin) is not in the essence of the soul. For the powers (of the soul) are subject to original justice and original sin. Therefore, after the loss of original righteousness, destruction has occurred in the powers of the soul.

Explicating the doctrine of original sin, which “could not be explained without this doctrine,” fell to the Wittenberg theologian Balthasar Meisner. His Sacred Anthropology provided an extended meditation on the status and powers of the person before and after the Fall. In the three-volume work, Meisner outlined the theological condition of the person at four points: “integrity” (pre-Fall), “corrupted,” regenerated” and “glorified.” This entailed dissecting in detail questions about the image of God in man, the original status and righteousness of man, the nature and reality of sin, the

145 Melanchthon in Magirus, Anthropologia, Sig, A8v: “Cu(m) de labe Originis dicitur, necesse est recitari, quae sint in singulis poten(t)is vulnera; & quae bona sint reliqua in hac misera natura. Manent utcunque notitiae Legis; quia DEUS vult se agnoscì; vult peccatum intelligi & accusari; vult etiam regi disciplinam.”

146 Magirus, Anthropologia, Sig, B4r-v: “Tertium exemplum est de peccato Originis, quod non potest explicari sine hac doctrina. Monstrat enim, quid in natura sit destructum; quidve reliquum, & quomodo propagetur? ... Non in ipsa Animiæ essentia. Potentiae enim tantum sunt subjectum iustitia & peccati originalis. Igitur amissa iustitia originali, facta est destructio in potentiis animae.”
causes and consequences of the Fall, original sin, mortal sin and the “sin against the
Spirit.”

In order fully to understand the significance of Meisner’s work, it is helpful to
step back and place it in the context of debates out of which it grew. While hardly a new
concern for Christian thinkers in the sixteenth century, debates about original sin took
on new importance in the Reformation, since it carried profound implications for
understanding soteriology, arguably the core theological concern of the movement.
Addressing the question entailed crucial debates about what authorities should or could
be utilized to answer it. Theological questions tended to cluster around the notion of
synderesis. That is, given that humans were originally created in the image of God, and
then fell, what powers remain to the human after the Fall? What is the extent of the Fall?
What is more, embedded in this question is the problem of human freedom and

---

147 The contents of the three volumes include:
Volume 1: De statu integritatis et corruptionis: 1) De imagine Dei; 2) De justitia originali; 3) De peccato in
genere; 4) De lapsu primi hominis; 5) De peccato originali existentia et propagatione; 6) De peccati originalis
essentia & definitione; 7) De peccati originalis poena & ultione; 8) De peccati originalis venia & sublatione; 9)
De peccato mortali, veniali & in duratione; 10) De peccato in Spiritum Sanctum.
Volume 2: De gratia Dei et praedestinatione fidelium: 1) De gratia Dei; 2) De universali voluntate et
dilectione Dei; 3) De univerali merito Christi, et vocatione hominum ad salutem; 4) De aeterna
praedestinatione creditum ad vitam; 5) De libro vitae; 6) De praedestinationis immutabilitate et totius
articuli usu; 7) De universali electione; 8) De numero et certitudine electorum; 9) De lapsu electorum et
excussione Spiritus Sancti; 10) De reprobatione infidelium
Volume 3: Ad statum reparationis pertinens, de libero arbitrio et justificatione: 1) De liberi arbitrii natura et
de viribus eiusdem circa civiles actiones; 2) De arbitrii servitute circa conversionem hominis, aliosque actus
spirituales; 3) De argumentis papisticis quae pro libero arbitrio afferri consueverunt; 4) De vocabulis in
articulo justificationis occurrentibus & de illius causa efficiene, impellente & meritoria; 5) De merito &
satisfactione Christi Photinianis opposita; 6) Quibus argumentis Photiniani meritum Christi oppugnent; 7)
De causa formali justificationis nostrae, Pontificis opposita; 8) Quibus argumentis Pontificii, contra justitiam
impurativam, pro inhaerente pugnare consueverunt; 9) De certitudine justificationis vel remissionis
peccatorum; 10) Quibus argumentis Bellarminus certitudinem gratiae impugnare tentaverit.
concomitant responsibility. To what extent has the Fall affected human will? Can someone choose to approach God, and if so, can s/he perform any work that merits grace? What is the proper ordering of the human powers of bodily movement, intellect and will? How is that order, in turn, affected by the Fall? How are these human powers properly reordered and restored? Sixteenth-century Lutheranism was embroiled in particularly vehement debates about these questions, in large part because disagreement about Melanchthon’s thought resulted in a rupture among Lutheran theologians beginning at the end of his life and continuing after it.148

The wrangling theologians sorted themselves into roughly two parties: Philipists (who, as the name indicates, defended Melanchthon) and their opponents, Gnesio-Lutherans.149 Crucial disagreements between the parties centered on the so-called “Synergistic Controversy” and, as a consequence of that, dispute over the doctrine of predestination. The former revolved around the notion of the cooperation (or synergy) of human and divine wills in salvation, which seemed to be suggested by the ambiguous words Melanchthon hammered out in the Augsburg Interim: “Since God does not justify human beings on the basis of the works of righteousness that they do, but gratuitously, that is, without their merit, if they want to glory, let them glory in Christ alone, by whose merit alone they are redeemed from sin and justified. Yet the merciful God does

149 Given the length and complexity of these debate, the discussion in this chapter will only summarize the most significant points and point out the main participants. See Kolb, Bound Choice for full treatment.
not deal with such people as with a dead block of wood, but draws them through acts of will, if they are of the age of reason. For such people do not receive the benefits of Christ unless their minds and wills are moved by the prevenient grace of God to detest sin.”

Led by one of Melanchthon’s former students, Nikolaus Gallus, who penned a programmatic critique of the Interim in *The Confession, Instruction, and Admonition of the Christian Church* at Magdeburg in 1550, the nascent Gnesio-Lutheran movement charged that in these words from the Interim, Melanchthon betrayed the Lutheran doctrine of salvation. Controversy over synergism became public with official efforts to resolve the problem at the Altenburg Colloquy after quite public disputes between Nikolaus von Amsdorf and Johannes Pfeffinger and Matthias Flacius and Viktorin Strigel. Though space does not permit outlining the debate in full, it is important for our purposes to note the position of Matthias Flacius, since it will come up again in chapter four of this dissertation. Concerned to defend the absolute inability of the person to will or work good, he maintained a radical doctrine of original sin in his treatise *De peccati originalis aut veteris Adami appellationibus et essentia*, arguing that it became the “substance” of the human person after the Fall. By somewhat ham-fistedly introducing this word into the

---

150 *Augsburger Interim* (1548). As quoted by Kolb, 106.
151 These were not the only disputants. Other theologians caught up in the controversy were: Philipst: Christoph Lasius, Philip Keyser, Joachim Meister; Gnesio-Lutheran: Johannes Wigand, Tilemann Heshusius, Christoph Irenaeus, Cyriakus Spangenberg, Georg Herbst, Timotheus Kirchner, Christoph Oberhin.
debate, he commenced a seemingly interminable debate over the application of philosophical terminology to Lutheran theological anthropology that would continue into the seventeenth century.\textsuperscript{153} The synthesis the Formula of Concord advanced did help temper the heat of the argument as the Lutheran reform moved into the third and fourth generation, but it by no means ended the debate.

Lutherans did not only argue amongst themselves. They faced stiff criticism from outside their circles about their theological anthropology, especially from Robert Bellarmine. Bellarmine is known to us now primarily for his notorious encounter with

\textsuperscript{153} Because the notion of synergism is tied closely to notions of determinism and predestination, those doctrines became the center of controversy, from the mid-1560s on. Among the most important participants in this debate were Nikolaus Selnecker, Cyriakus Spangenburg, David Chytraeus and Martin Chemnitz. Their views were, briefly, as follows. In his \textit{Doctrina de Praedestinatione} (1565), Selnecker gave an extended discussion of “fate,” concerned, like Melanchthon, that positing strict necessity would induce fatalism and despair, and logically lead to assigning responsibility for evil to God. Spangenburg, on the other hand, sided wholly with the Gnesio-Lutherans, arguing that predestination was a necessary part of acknowledging God’s total responsibility for saving sinners. Importantly, he attracted controversy himself for his defense of Flacius’ radical Aristotelian-inflected formulation of anthropology. See Nikolaus Selnecker, \textit{Doctrina de praedestinatione}, \textit{Idem de fato quaedam utilia et necessaria} (Frankfurt am Main, 1565); Cyriakus Spangenburg, \textit{Wider den vermeinten Freyen Willen des Menschen und Mitwirkung desselbe in Bekerung sein selbst. Eine Predigt uber das Evangelium Marci VII} (Frankfurt, 1562).

Chytraeus and Chemnitz both sought to establish a sort of vademecum, affirming both that God is not responsible for sin and that sinners cannot exercise will in salvation. Chemnitz, along with Chytraeus and Jakob Andrae, led the attempt to fashion a compromise in the Formula of Concord. Chemnitz’s moderation comes through in his commentary upon the \textit{Loci Communes}. “We must tread cautiously and prudently between the Pelagians and Enthusiasts .” On the one hand, he asserted, “if one asks whether the free will of its own natural powers contributes any ability or activity toward conversion and renewal which can be called either a partial cause or by a name similar to that, we can truthfully answer that the will remains merely passive.” Yet conversion is not a forced sudden turn, but a gradual turning of the will to God, under the guidance of the Spirit. There is a mysterious participation of the human will, “it cannot be shown at what mathematical point the freed will begins to be active.” Martin Chemnitz, “Free Will,” in \textit{The Doctrine of Man in Classical Lutheran Theology}, ed. Herman A. Preus and Edmund Smits (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1962), 120, 122.
Galileo and his championing of the political power of the papacy. But here the confluence of intra- and inter-confessional debates becomes manifest. The Jesuit Bellarmine cut his teeth as a professor in Louvain, teaching theology by way of commenting on Thomas Aquinas’ *Summa theologiae* and responding to his colleague on the Louvain theological faculty Michael Baius. Baius’ teaching was widely regarded by Catholics as too friendly to Lutheranism. In moving on from his contest with Baius in Louvain to critique Lutheran theological anthropology, Bellarmine used, as Anselm Schubert notes, the notes from his Louvain lectures “fast wortwörtlich” in his *Disputationes de controversiis christianae fidei adversus huius temporis haereticos* (also referred to as *De controversiis*). Coming off the press in Catholic Ingolstadt between 1586 and 1593, Bellarmine’s *Controversies* were the most influential and devastating systematic rebuttal of Protestant theology. The three volumes treated, respectively, ecclesiology (pope, council, church militant and triumphant); sacramentology; and soteriology. They inspired multiple attempts to reply. Lutheran *anthropologia sacra* arose from this morass of intra- and inter-confessional dissension and conflict.


155 Schubert, *Das Ende der Sünde*, 46; on Bellarmine, see 41-52.
Alongside Johann Gerhard, Balthasar Meisner was one of the most influential theologians of third generation Lutheranism. Born in 1587, the son of a Dresden pastor, Meisner arrived in Wittenberg in 1602, where he lived with Aegidius Hunnius and studied under Jakob Martini and Leonhard Hutter. He continued his studies in Giessen, Strassburg, Basel, and Tübingen before becoming a professor of ethics at Tübingen. His earliest writings indicate what would become a lifelong interest in the relationship between philosophy and theology, and how to reintroduce metaphysics into theological discourse. Meisner’s work shows the influence of Jacob Andreea’s pivotal reframing of Wittenberg theological education in the 1580s to center on producing rhetorically forceful disputations. His work encompassed a range of theological sub-fields from Christology and anthropology to an attempt to define “religion” in a way suggestive of later comparative study of religions around the world.\(^{156}\)

This turn toward a more scholastic form of *disputatio* signaled a change in content as well. As mentioned above, Lutheran theologians in the last decades of the sixteenth century and first decades of the seventeenth began to reemphasize the importance of mastering philosophy for their theological work. Kenneth Appold argues that this

\(^{156}\) Balthasar Meisner, *De religione et eius articulis generatim consideratis* (Wittenberg, 1625-1626). This work consisted of 19 disputations, including: 1) *De religione in genere*, 2) *De religione christiana, quod illa sola sit vera et capessenda*, 3) *De religione Lutherana, quam comprehendit Augustana Confessio et Formula Concordiae*, 4) *De argumentis Papistarum, quae religioni Lutheranae genere opponunt*, 5) *De religionis verae oppositis in genere et specialim de Epicureismo*, 6) *De Puccianismo, Machiavellismo et Samaritanismo*, 7) *De gentilismo*, 8) *De religione Judaica*, 9) *De religione Turcica*, 10) *De haereticismo sive haereticis in genere*, 11) *De religione Papistica*, 12) *De Calvinismo*, 15) *De Photinianismo*, 17) *De religione fanatica*, 19) *De articulis fidei in genere*. On this see, Kenneth G. Appold, *Orthodoxie als Konsensbildung: Das Theologische Disputationswesen an der Universität Wittenberg zwischen 1570 und 1710* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 244-265.
interest was due in part to the influence of Giacomo Zabarella’s *Opera logica* within Lutheran intellectual circles. In the wake of Zabarella, theology was reconceived and reorganized as a practical pursuit. It was now “an applied science that teaches men how to lead others toward salvation—much like medicine is a science that teaches physicians how to lead their patients to physical health. In this regard Orthodoxy changed the notion of theology’s practical nature in an important way: following Luther, previous generations had deemed it practical because it leads the person who practices it to faith; now, it was practical because it helped lead others to faith. It had become a teaching science.”¹⁵⁷ Not all Lutheran theologians signed on to this program. The most notable dissenters were the prominent theologians Jakob Martini (Meisner’s teacher) and Johann Gerhard.

Meisner, however, signed on whole-heartedly and his work on philosophy and theology made him a leading player in the efforts to forge a systematic or scholastic Lutheran Orthodox theology. To that end, he produced a wide variety of disputations on an array of theological topics. All this made him a central figure in Sparn’s Lutheran “wiederkehr der Metaphysik.” Key to this effort was his *Philosophia sobria*, a three-...

---

volume effort to reconcile philosophy and theology by making the former an auxiliary to the latter.

Meisner’s *Anthropologia sacra* betrays all of these influences. He began the work by explaining the practical import of understanding oneself and others: it would encourage charity. He then made a distinction between two types of *anthropologia* that dealt with different questions about the human being: sacred or Christian anthropology and what he called “anthropologia physica,” which was natural philosophical anthropology.\(^{158}\) Daniel Sennert’s student Nicholas Sperling utilized the same distinction in the opening pages of his *Anthropologia physica* just two decades later. In so doing, both Meisner and Sperling opened the way to an ultimate division between theological and natural philosophical *anthropologia*.

In a series of disputed questions, Meisner outlined a theology of original sin, free will, predestination, grace, and what (if any) powers remained to a person after the Fall. Each major topic includes a collection of “quaestiones” that break down and analyze the component theological parts. Meisner took a common approach, discussing the state of the person at four points: “integrity,” “corrupted,” “regenerated,” and “glorified.”\(^{159}\)

---

\(^{158}\) Meisner, *Anthropologia Sacra*, Decas 1, Sig a1v: “Cognoscitur autem homo, vel secundum essentiam partesq(ue); vel secundum status diversos. Prior cognitio magis est Philosophica & construit anthropologiam Physicam: posterior Theologiae est propria, ideoqu(ue); anthropologia … sacra vel Christiana non incommode nuncupatur.”

\(^{159}\) For a shorter summation of the same, see Salomon Gessner, *Theses de quadruplici hominis consideratione in statu naturae integrae, corruptae, regeneratae, et glorificatae* (Wittenberg, 1596).
According to Meisner, theology centered around knowing God and knowing self as they truly are. Referring to Augustine and Bernard of Clairvaux as well as the ancient oracle “Know thyself”, he argued that this knowledge was the only way that true health—health of soul—could be recovered. He explained that the image of God and original righteousness in human beings was “duplex,” consisting of the soul (his primary interest) and the body. Like Melanchthon and others who praised the divine design evident in the human body and the natural world, Meisner noted that “God created every animal perfect in its own way, and for that reason, the human being is too. This is apparent from the body, which was created perfectly, with such a state of soundness, height, and manly strength. Hence the soul too was perfectly brought about …”

He began to lay out his explanation of the image of God in Quaestio VI of Book I (“In quonam ratio divinae imaginis praecise fuerit sita?”), insisting that the body must

---


161 Meisner, Anthropologia sacra, Decas I, Sig. a4v: “Quaestio III: Quanam regulae observanda sint (sic), ut Essentia divina imaginis recte cognoscatur? Allii intelligent ideam hominis in mente divina conceptam ad quam homo a Deo fuerit effermat. Flaciani putant fuisset ipsam substantiam. Pontificii, partim animam, partim dona quaedam supernatralia, non connaturalia. Calviniani quaerunt, tum in substantia hominis; tum in qualitatibus, tum in dignitate vel dominio … Ex nostris quidam collocant in sola rectitudine animae; quidam simul in corporis dignitate & externo dominio.”

162 Meisner, Anthropologia sacra, Decas I, Sig b3r: “Deus enim omnia animalia creavit in suo quaeque genere perfecta, ideoque & hominem. Apparet hoc ex corpore, quod creatum est perfectum, quantum ad integritatem etatis, proceritatem staturae, & firmitatem virium. Ergo & anima perfecta fuit condita, ac per consequens cum cognitione & scientia, quippe in qua perfectio animi consistit.”
not be left out of accounts of the image of God. Thought not itself the image of God, the body, revealed the image of God in man by helping to manifest its presence in the soul. For this reason, the body should be valued. In discussing anthropologia sacra, Meisner explicated the theology behind much that will come in subsequent chapters of this dissertation (especially chapter four): the effect of the Fall on both bodies and souls, the fact that sin disrupts both spiritual and physical life, and that God cares for and aims to redeem both.

Meisner’s work calls attention to the fact that the internecine debates about Lutheran theological anthropology focused on articulating the extent of the consequences of the Fall upon each person, both in body and soul. While this bore principally upon soteriology, it also had consequences for the other disciplines that comprised anthropologia. It could influence a person’s ability to discern truth by observation and reason, and it explained both the origin of the body and its weakness and susceptibility to disease and decay. Any attempt to discuss anthropologia without taking the theological aspect of it into account misses an important part of how early modern Lutherans understood what a person is.

\footnote{Meisner, \textit{Anthropologia sacra}, Decas I, Sig. a8v: “Neque imago Dei relucet in corpore … quatenus ita formatum est, ut evidenter arguat animam quae in ipso habitat, ad imaginem Dei esse factam …”}
1.3.3. Anatomy & Medicine—Gregor Horst and Caspar Bartholin

The second major section of Melanchthon’s Liber was a long anatomical description. It emphasized how the parts and powers of the soul must be understood in relation to anatomy; how their proper ordering was reflected in the body; how the powers remaining to them affected the body and accounted for human responsibility for things done in the body; and how the Spirit of God could affect their operation. This had potentially profound consequences not just for theology, but also for medicine, which in the sixteenth century, was occupied primarily with ordering the body’s humors and spirits, and thus the powers of the various parts of the soul.

Anatomy and the study of the soul were, first of all, important to understand health. Melanchthon stated simply that it was important for maintaining health. Yes, Magirus agreed, protecting health was the third major use of studying the soul.

“Moreover nobody is able to know his own body, except by investigating its nature and describing these things it consists of, that is, solid parts, humors, and Spirits.” But again, he expanded on the point, by explaining that understanding one’s body leads to preventing disease by regulating diet and exercise.

164 Melanchthon in Magirus, Antropologia, Sig. A7v: “Estq(ue) ad regendam ac tuendam valetudinem haec pars magnopere necessaria.”

165 Magirus, Anthropologia, Sig B3r: “Tertia utilitas; quod videlicet profit ad tuendam valetudinem … Nemo autem corpus suum noscere potest; nisi earum rerum, ex quibus constat, naturam & descriptionem norit; ut pote partium solidarum, humorum & Spirituum. Qui ergo ita sui corprois habet notitiam, plurimos gravissimosque morbos cavere, diligentiisque uti potest in diaeta: ne cibo, potu & exercitiis inconvenientibus & naturae suae repugnantibus corpus destruct. Deinde cum actiones impediantur organis laesis; poterit homo parcere organis, quibus ipsi maxime opus est.”
Understanding the body also promoted understanding the work of the Holy Spirit in each person, which could affect the passions and thereby (in the Galenic system) overall health. Melanchthon observed, “... the vital spirits in a human being are born in the heart, and are truly flames enkindled by every passion, scattered in joy, despair, love, hate, rage, and other [passions] ... And from this shadow we think of the name of the Holy Spirit ...” Magirus reiterated the point. “... just as the vital spirits, generated in the heart and diffused throughout the whole body through the arteries, supply the power of life and movement to the body, likewise it is possible to think about the third person of the Trinity called the Spirit that this is his office: vivifying, moving, and maintaining everything in the world.” In discussing the operation of the heart, Magirus went even further. After detailing the movement of humors and fluids, he concluded: “For God the author of true happiness makes it grow by the spirits which are generated in the heart, and these produce greater glowing of divine light, so that [our] knowledge of God might be clearer. Just as Paul testifies in 2 Corinthians 2, ‘Do you not know? You are the temple of God and the Spirit of God lives in you.’ On the other hand,

---

166 Melanchthon, in Magirus, Anthropologia, Sig B1r-v: “Praeterea Spiritus vitales in homine nascuntur in corde, & vere sunt flammae, quae in omnium affectuum incendiis, in laetitia, dolore, amore, odio, ira & aliis sparguntur; Et cum motibus voluntatis non simulatis hae flammae in corde congruent. Ex hac umbra utcunque cogitamus de nomine Spiritus sancti: & discimus ei hanc appellacionem in divinis literis tribui, quia sit agitator & quasi flamma a voluntate Patris & Filii procedens: quia divinitas immensa bonitate nos sibi copulat, & nos laetitia compleat: sicut effundit mater vitales spiritus, osculans infantem, filiam aut filium. Haec vocabulorum interpretatio (sic) sobrie & pie considerata, de multis magnis rebus studiosos admonet.”

167 Magirus, Anthropologia, Sig.B4v: “Ostendit, hanc doctrinam conferre quoque ad intelligendam appellacionem Spiritus sancti. Quia, sicut spiritus vitales in corde generati, & per arterias in totum corpus diffusi, vim vitalem, & motum corpori suppediant: ita cogitare possum, cum tertia persona Trinitatis dicatur Spiritus, hoc illius esse officium: ut omnia in mundo vivificet, agitet, & foveat.”
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an impure heart is the abode of the Devil, [who] when he enters, agitates the spirits and causes horrible delirium.” Daniel Sennert would consider the influence of the Holy Spirit and especially the Devil on the spirits as a cause of occult disease, as I’ll demonstrate in chapter two.

That professors of medicine and natural philosophy should present study of the body as closely tied to study of the soul, and that they argued further that the work and wisdom of God might be discerned through study of the body is unsurprising, and not unique to Lutheran thought. Andrew Cunningham argued two decades ago in The Anatomical Renaissance that “anatomy in the Western tradition was essentially about the soul.” Roger French similarly maintained, “Almost every anatomist down to early modern times gave a philosophical or theological reason for doing anatomy before he gave a medical or surgical reason.”


These, of course, refer to ultimate justifications for studying anatomy. The connection went even deeper than simply indicating the work of the soul in the body. As Nancy Siraisi remarks, “… physiological knowledge was as much a part of natural philosophy as medicine, the study of the subject being equally valid under either discipline. Furthermore, theologians who included discussions of physical human nature in their works did not merely draw on physiological information but made their own contributions to physiological debate.”171 This lasted into the late seventeenth century, as William Bynum remarks—almost in passing—of Thomas Willis that “the dilemma in Willis’ work was created by his belief—shared by virtually all scientists of his day and for almost two centuries afterward—that the theological soul has physiologic functions.”172 As a time of fast and sweeping change, sixteenth-century debates about anatomy, its goals, lessons, and limits also influenced the development of anthropologia.173

171 Siraisi, Medieval and Renaissance Medicine, 79.
172 William F. Bynum, “The Anatomical Method, Natural Theology, and the Functions of the Brain,” Isis, 64.4, (1973): 444-68, 459. Thomas Willis is praised as the “Father of Neurology,” not only because the word “neurologie” first appeared in his 1664 work Cerebri anatomie, but also because of his groundbreaking studies of the brain and nervous system in that book, including the discovery of the “Willis Circle,” study of which is still a standard element in first-year medical training. His two most significant works were Cerebri Anatomie (1664), and De Anima brutorum (1672). These books contain the results of Willis’ systematic dissection of the brain and nervous system, as well as the speculations on the human soul he based upon it. The former consists of a detailed account of the structure and function of the brain, liberally illustrated with anatomical diagrams made by Christopher Wren. The latter work delves into comparative anatomy of human and animal brains, using disjunctures in structure to argue for differences in function, and, ultimately for the superiority of the human person.
173 Roger French, Dissection and Vivisection in the European Renaissance (Aldershot, UK and Brookfiled, VT: Ashgate, 1999); Cynthia Klestinec, Theaters of Anatomy: Students, Teachers, and Traditions of Dissection in
Gregor Horst

Gregor Horst was an almost exact contemporary of Daniel Sennert, and like Sennert, he attempted to forge a synthesis of various medical doctrines and emphasized the importance of incorporating empirical observation and practical experience into medical education and theory. While Sennert was known to his contemporaries as “our German Galen,” Horst earned the nickname “Asclepius of the Germans.” Born in Torgau, he studied medicine at Helmstedt (where his uncle Jakob was a member of the medical faculty—I’ll speak more of Jakob in Chapter 4) and Wittenberg, before taking his degree at Basel. He returned to teach at Wittenberg in 1606, but moved to Giessen in 1608, as professor of anatomy and botany. There he remained until 1622, also serving as Stadtarzt and personal physician for Ludwig V of Hessen-Darmstadt. From 1622, he was the head physician in Ulm. In his life, then, Gregor Horst was famous both for his voluminous academic writing on medicine and for his practice. His son (Gregor Jr., also a physician in Ulm) collected his father’s work and published it in folio in Nuremberg in 1660.174

Though not adopting the word *anthropologia* in the title of the text, Horst’s *De natura humana* (1612) corresponds exactly to the concerns that his colleagues had in defining the field: the first volume consists of an anatomy of the body, while the second delves into disputed questions about the soul. Horst’s introduction to *De natura humana* included a “Preface to the candid reader about the living and the dead anatomy” that waxed eloquent about the utility and wonder of the field. Here, he rhapsodized in words reminiscent of Melanchthon that, in the design of the human body, “… marvelous power, extraordinary wisdom and infinite goodness are abundantly evident … Who does not praise the extraordinary wisdom of God’s highest work, considering the astonishing arrangement of [the body’s] parts, joined together with unique sympathy? Finally, who would not extol with glory his infinite goodness, when he knows the action and uses of the various parts by considering all of its signs?”

Beyond this paean to providential design, Horst labored in the preface to highlight the significance of “vital” anatomy, as opposed to “dead” anatomy. “Dead” anatomy rested at naming the parts of the body; vital anatomy aimed for more, to

175 Gregor Horst, *De natura humana*, sig: C4v-C5r: “(C)um in humani corporis fabrica summi conditoris mirabilis potentia, incredibilis sapientia & infinita bonitas abundanter appareat … Quis incredibilem Dei Opt. Max. sapientiam non extollit, in consideratione mirabilis dispositionis partium, non sine singulari sympatheia coniunctarum? Quis tandem infinitam bonitatem eius laudibus non extollit, ubi cuiuslibet partis actionem & usum respectu totius insignem intelligit?”
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describe not just the body parts, but “the essence, principles, faculties, and functions” of those parts.\textsuperscript{176}

According to Horst (echoing Goclenius on the uses of studying the soul), vital anatomy was useful for all fields, including philosophy, theology, and law. Horst argued that studying anatomy would give insight into Christology (since Christ assumed a human body) and ecclesiology (since the church is compared to a body in scripture).\textsuperscript{177} Lawyers needed anatomy in order to distinguish between lethal and non-lethal wounds. Anyone studying philosophy needed anatomy in order to understand the sources of action.\textsuperscript{178} But anatomy, was, obviously, most important for medicine: both

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{176} Horst, De Natura Humana, sig A1v: “Et quemadmodum duo potissimum hominis essentiam absoluunt, corporea videlicet & spiritualis natura, sic etiam … non solius coporis, nec etiam solius animae, sed utriusque cognitione simul absolvitur. Huic cognitioni plurimum inservit Anatomia, non ea tantum, qua corpus in partes minimas artificiose secatur, cuius utilitatem postea considerabimus, sed & illa, quae merito vitalis dicitur, ubi non tam de corpore, quam ipsius corporis essentia, principiis, facultatibus atque functionibus solliciti sumus.” Horst connected this vital anatomy to his theory of occult disease. On this, see Schackelford, Philosophical Path, 300-304.

\textsuperscript{177} Horst, De Natura Humana, sig. C4r: “Nam quod sacrosantam Theologiam attinet, quamvis vera fidei fundamenta non ex Hippocratis, Galeni, vel Aristotelis placitis, sed ex limpidissimis Israelis fontibus haurienda & addiscenda nobis esse meritum & lubenter confiteamur: nullus tamen negabit, artificiosam humani corporis structuram docent Theologo plurimum inservire, praesertim cum declaratio multorum in sacris literis absque intellectione fabricae humanae commodo fieri nequeat. Adde quod ipse Salvator illa similitudine delectetur, qua partes plures diversas, unum corpus costituentes in nobis, cum Ecclesiae suae corpore comparat.”

\textsuperscript{178} Horst, De Natura Humana, Sig. c4r-c4v: “Quo ad Jurisprudentiam negari no(n) potest, quod cognitum … ad plurima legum fundamenta perfectius intelligenda faciat: ubi nobis impraesentiarum illud sufficiat, quod Jureconsultus in criminalibus actionibus interdum salva veritate nihil absque structurae humanae peritia determinare possit. Quomodo enim lethale vulnus ab aliis discernendum sola Anatomia partium corporis nostri demonstrat, propertia quod in qua natura partium diversa nostris oculis subiiciatur, unde colligimus, quae membra & ex prpria essentia & ex consensu lethaliter vel minus vulnerari queunt.”

On anatomy’s utility for philosophers: idem, sig c4v: “Porro si ad aurem Philosophiae studium accedimus, illud sine corporis humani fabrica cognita mutilatum & imperfectum statuius. Quis enim rerum cognoscendarum scientiam sibi polliceri potest absque sui cognitione, quae merito primum locum obtinet, cum sibi quisque proximus dicatur? Quis mores & actiones hominum iuxta praecepta practicae
\end{flushright}
for diagnosing and treating disease and performing surgery. After such sweeping praise, Horst’s execution of his project was notably traditional. He divided each book into thematic “exercises” with a series of disputed questions covered under each topic, and in doing all this he followed a fairly standard organizational schema, moving from how the body is formed to the activity of spirits and humors, before turning to consider individual body parts. As for the soul, he moved from “De anima in genere” to trace the vegetative and sensitive souls and their powers before turning to the intellectual/rational soul.179

**Caspar Bartholin**

As chapter three will show in more detail, the career of Caspar Bartholin indicates that describing an author as “physician” or “theologian” can be dangerous.

philosophiae informabit, nisi fundamentum ex quo omnes actiones nostrae prodeunt, naturam videlicet humanam, utpote quam animi mores sequuntur, cognoscat ac perpendat.”

179 Exercises in Book 1, on the body: 1) De principiis ex quibus partes humani corporis generantur, utpote de semine & sanguine materno; 2) De principiis ex quibus partes humani corporis constituantur & conservantur, utpote de calido innato, spiritibus ac humoribus; 3) De iis quae actione partium in humano corpore securuntur, tam in prima, quam in secunda & tertia concoctione; 4) De partibus humani corporis proprie dictis in genere, atque de ossibus in specie; 5) De cartilagine, ligamento, tendine, fibra, vena, arteria, nervo, membrana, carne, cute & panniculo carnoso; 6) De partibus dissipulare in genere, ac de membris primae & secundae concoctioni dictis in specie; 7) De membri in utroque sexu generationi dictis; 8) De organis vitae ac respirationi prospicientibus; 9) De communi sensus & motus animalis organo; 10) De sensuum externorum ac vocis atque sermonis instrumentis proprisi; 11) De organis motus animalis proprii, atque in specie de manibus & pedibus; 12) De productione partium humani corporis, ipsius(que) hominis generatione.

Born in Malmö (now in Sweden) in 1585, the son of a Lutheran pastor, he showed intellectual promise from a very young age: reading at age three, and publicly delivering Latin and Greek orations by thirteen. He left to study at the University of Copenhagen, and then embarked on a typical *peregrinatio academica*, studying in Wittenberg and Rostock and traveling through the Netherlands, Germany, and Italy before returning to assume a post as professor of medicine at the University of Copenhagen in 1611. In an unusual move, even in an age of faith, after an acute illness, Bartholin gave up his chair of medicine in Copenhagen to become, instead, professor of theology in 1624. In his day, Bartholin was famous as an author of textbooks, a task he took up gusto and with the goal of infusing the curriculum with his brand of Lutheran piety.\(^{180}\)

Part of Bartholin’s massive *oeuvre* was the most widely used anatomy textbook in medical schools across Europe in the seventeenth century, *Institutiones anatomicae*. An introductory anatomy textbook, it was known less for originality (of which there was little) than the clarity with which it summed up the state of the field when it was first published in 1611. First issued by Caspar Bartholin in 1611, his son Thomas updated it in the 1630s to reflect Harvey’s discoveries, and it went through at least thirty editions by 1686, being produced in Latin, French, Italian, English, German, and Dutch editions, as

---

well as translated into Chinese. For several generations, it was the standard anatomy textbook for any European medical student.

Bartholin promised in its subtitle to include “many new observations and opinions, not just from the most illustrious, that come up in *anthropologia*.” Lest anyone reading the subtitle should wonder, Bartholin pithily defined anthropology in the first sentence of the book as “[T]he doctrine of the human person, commonly and correctly separated into two parts: Anatomy, which treats the body and its parts, and psychology, which (treats) the soul.”181 Then he dove into a description of the parts of the body, brimming with detailed illustrations. The “controversies” in *anthropologia* that he promised to include show up much prominently in a follow-up text.

Bartholin entertained philosophical and theological questions in more detail in the *Controversiae anatomicae*, the companion to his famous anatomy textbook.182 While the *Institutiones* gave an extended and richly illustrated introduction to the structure of the body, questions of physiology and function mostly show up in the *Controversiae*. Aside from the first two sections of the book, the *Controversiae* addresses parts of the body in the same order that the *Institutiones* does, thus making it easy to match the two. Here Bartholin raised questions about the human person and the soul, from traducianism to the state of body and soul after death and the doctrine of the resurrection of the body.

181 Caspar Bartholin, *Institutiones Anatomicae* (Wittenberg, 1611), Sig. B1r: “Anthropologia seu doctrina de Homine, vulgo & recte tamen in geminas dispescitur partes: Anatomiam, quae de corpore, eiusq(ue), partibus agit, & psychologia, quae de anima.”
Like Horst and Sennert, Bartholin started by giving an introduction to the state of the field of medicine, describing disputes between parties (Paracelsians and Galenists). From there he moved to broader questions. The third *quaestio* tackled the question: “Whether human beings are the most outstanding (creature) in creation?” Bartholin’s answer to the question indicates his wide reading and the tone of his overall attempt to synthesize thinkers like Aristotle, Julius Caesar Scaliger, and Jean Bodin with the Bible. Each of them, he claims, attest in various ways to the truth one learns from Genesis 2:7— that God’s breath of life blown directly into Adam sets human beings apart from other creatures.183 Bartholin explained this “breath of life” in more detail in his *Manuductio ad psychologiam veram adeoque anthropologiam ex sacris literis exstruendam*, the appendix to his *Systema physicum*, where he attempted to square the text of Genesis with Aristotelian thought on the soul. Book 1, *quaestio* 4 of the *Controversiae*, “whether human beings are a little world or microcosm,” adduces another wide range of authors (Hermes Trismegistus, Augustine, Gregory of Nazianzen, Gregory the Great, and John Damascene) to explain the way in which a human person encapsulates the make-up of

---

the universe. (Here, understandably, Bartholin employed primarily Platonic, rather than Aristotelian thinkers).\textsuperscript{184}

Bartholin took up the relationship of body and soul primarily in his discussions of controversies about traducianism and the resurrection of the body. He devoted the most space to the latter. There, he went out of his way to critique Goclenius for an insufficient understanding of the relationship of soul and body that would ultimately undercut Christian doctrine. In so doing, he called primarily on Scripture to back up his points. In no place did Bartholin discuss his method— he just assumed that Scripture should directly address questions he raised. (Chapter two will discuss use of the Bible in natural philosophical and medical works in more detail). The essential dilemma for Bartholin is “whether in dead human bodies there are yet remains of life.” For him, the answer is a clear no, because there is no soul in the matter, and when there is no soul, there is no life.\textsuperscript{185} According to him, this is the only natural philosophical stance one can properly reconcile with the account of the valley of dry bones in Ezekiel 37.


\textsuperscript{185} Bartholin, \textit{Controversiae}, Sig. D1r: Book I, \textit{Quaestio VI}: “An in hominis demortui cadavere vitae adhuc sint reliquiae? Ubi nulla anima, ibi nulla vita, & ubinullae animae reliquiae, ibi plane nulla vitae reliquiae. Vita enim est vis animae: in cadavere nulla anima est, nec uellae animae reliquiae…”
There is a clear shift in tone between Books 1 and 2 of *Controversiae*. Although, as I have mentioned, Bartholin backed himself up with references to church fathers and larded the text with scriptural references in the early *quaestiones*, from Book 2 onward, he focused on reconciling Galen and Aristotle in describing the function of various body parts, with reference to contemporary colleagues. Here again, he highlighted the superiority of the human being to other animals. Though human beings, like other animals, have vegetative and sensitive souls, they are yet superior, in large part because in humans, “there are more subtle and flexible spirits than there are in other animals.”

Subsequent discussion of the work of the spirits in the body made clear that discerning their work in the body was one of the main tasks of a physician.

### 1.4 Lutheran Natural Philosophy and Theology

In the *Controversiae*, Bartholin praised natural philosophy as the mother of medicine, and, as Galen had centuries earlier, suggested that every physician must be a philosopher. The variety of debates he engaged early in the book, including a defense

---

186 Bartholin, *Controversiae*, Book 1, *Quaestio* XIV: “An homini Spiritus plures subtiliores & fluxibiliores sint quam caeteris Animalibus? A.” [Bartholin sometimes made it easier for readers by revealing the answer to the controversy in the title of the *quaestio*. “A” indicated readers would find the question answered in the affirmative in the following; “N” told them a negation was coming. For instance, Bartholin eschewed any attempt to posit a fundamental difference in dignity between the sexes, expectorating “neutiquam,” in answer to the question (Quaestio XII), “Whether woman is a freak of nature and generated by accident, as Aristotle would have it?” (Melier an aberratio sit naturae, & per accidentens generetur, ceu vult Aristotiles? *Neutiquam.*).]

of the resurrection of the body, indicate his concern to live up to the ideal. As mentioned, though he took up the knotty question of the resurrection in the most detail, a part of that text saw Bartholin exerting much effort attempting to untangle the knot of a topic that preoccupied a wide variety of Lutheran thinkers: traducianism.\textsuperscript{188} In his call for physician-philosophers, Bartholin echoed Melanchthon, who in his \textit{Initia doctrinae physicae} noted: “The art of medicine is built up from this doctrine, in which is discerned elements, qualities, the actions of qualities, cognition, disagreement, the causes of changes in elements & mixtures, the different nature of humors in the human body, temperaments, the accompanying spirits, inclinations, and affections in the human

naturalium scientia principia petit pars Medica; &c subjectum suum cognoscit corpus humanum secundum omnes partes & facultates. Ex hac omnia remediorum alimentorumque genera & naturas cognoscit.”

Sig B1v: “Ex quibus omnibus solidissime conficimus, Optimum Medicum neminem esse, nisi qui optimo sit Philosophus, his(que) Galeni verbis haec themata co(n)cludimus. Ergo ipsi Philosophiae navemus strenua(m) opera(m), si modo veri sumo (sic) emulatores Hippocratis: quod quide(m) si fecerimque, nihil vetat (sic), quo minque evadamus, no(n) dica(m) illi similes, sed superiores certe illo, percipientes quidem quae recte ab eo sunt tradita, quae vero restant, nostra ipsorum industria invenientes.”

This is because all sub-sciences would lead ultimately to the question of being itself, metaphysics. Sig A3r: “Ut ita(q)ue; omissis inferioribus disciplinis, variis(ue); idiomatum generibus, sine quibus ad graviore nemini patent aditus, a scientiarum illa Regina Metaphysica auspicium ducamus; cum haec universim ens sumptum, eiusque modos communes contempletur, utique ad omnes scientias quae partem dumtaxat Entis aliquam sibi praescindunt, toto sapientiae relictum, usum extendi liquidissimum est.”

\textsuperscript{188}Bartholin, \textit{Controversiae}, Sig. e6r-v: Questio IX: “Unde animae humanae ortus? An a Deo immediate creetur & infundatur; An v: a parente in generatione cum semine in fobolem traducatur & propagetur? Ardua satis haec est Quaestio, eo quod hominis productio, ut recte fassus est Avicenna, sit opus supra mirabilia mirandum. Unde Melanchthon, hanc quaestionem abruptens, monet dicernenda, ea quae acie mentis utcumque penetrari possunt, ab iis quae perstigari no(n) possu(n). Arbitramur a: Quaestionem hanc, utat (sic) difficilem non tamen penitus inexplicabilem, etiam quod modum propagationis; quamquam in hoc multa humanum ingenium fugere differiti nemo potest ... Etenim de origine animae rationalis varias admodum reperire licet opiniones ...”
being.” ¹⁸⁹ David Chytraeus echoed his mentor.¹⁹⁰ The connection between medicine and natural philosophy anchored the approach to understanding the human body and soul among thinkers in the Wittenberg circle.

This understanding manifested itself in various ways, especially in theories of disease I will discuss in chapter two. There I will discuss approaches to understanding the body that were tied to ways of comprehending the work of God in the natural world as a whole. But it is also necessary to discuss natural philosophy because it crystallizes the question that undergirds much of this chapter: the relationship of faith and reason, or theology and other disciplines.

¹⁸⁹ Melanchthon, Initia doctrinae physicae (Wittenberg, 1550), Sig B1v: “Ex hac doctrina extruitur ars Medica, quia hic discernuntur elementa, qualitates, qualitatum actiones, cognatio, dissidia, causae alterationum in elementis, & mixitis, naturae dissimiles humorum in corpore humano, temperamenta seu crases, & his congruentes spiritus, inclinationes et adventus in hominibus.” Melanchthon went on to argue that physica encompassed both medicine and ethics.


Ethice vero postquam a physicis gradus animae, & diversas actions, noticias...dversos ad sectus sumpsit, hinc doctrinam extruit de Fine hominis, de legibus naturae, quae regunt omnes actions. Itaq(ue); si magnificimus Ethicen, & dulcissimam naturae cognitionem, quam Medici complexi sunt, necese est haec exordia, quae in physicis traduntur, cognoscere.”

¹⁹⁰ Chytraeus, De Studiis, Sig: B7r-v: “De Medica arte, perspicuum est, non tantum initia & fontes, verumtam partem illius praecipuam, Physicis disputations explicari. Imo plurimae & nobilissimae & propriae doctrinae Physicae considerationes partium humani corporis, plantarum, animantium, metallorum naturae & vires, quas Aristotelium & Theophrastum suis scriptis complexos esse videmus: A Medicis occupatiae possidentur, negligentia Professorum Physicæ, qui prima tantum & tenuissima Physicæ initia, de principis, motu, loco, tempore, vacuo, infinito, elementis &c. obruta inanissimis cavillationibus, quorum nulla est utilitas in naturae & rerum consideratione, in Scholis retinuerunt. Nobilissimam vero illam & dulcissimam et vere auream Physicæ partem, quae & caeterorum animalium omnium, & Hominis praecipue partes externas & interiores, modum generationis, victum, inclinationes, mores & simulacra virtutum at vitiorum singulis impressa, & plantarum ac metallorum naturas considerat & explicat, plerique neglexerunt.”
Early modern Lutheran philosophers and theologians hotly debated this. Because there were articulate defenders of a variety of positions, the answer was not clear-cut. It is tempting to attempt to impose coherence on Lutheran thought retroactively, but that is anachronistic. Instead, it is important to note that a variety of viewpoints co-existed, such that, on the one hand, a theologian and a natural philosopher would both espouse the notion of “double truth,” while, on the other, a famous physician could come under pressure for the seemingly heretical implications of his theory of the generation of souls. For all these reasons, it is worth charting briefly some of the ways in which Lutheran thought evolved from the mid-sixteenth to the mid-seventeenth century. Debates about reason and faith coincided with the development of *anthropologia* among early modern Lutherans, and the specialization among writers of *anthropologia* that one can see in the decades after Johannes Magirus may be tied to it.

The relationship of Lutheran theology to philosophy was long contested. Luther’s *Disputatio de Homine* (1536) revealed his skepticism about the value of philosophy (including natural philosophy) in attempts to understand the nature of human beings, and his understanding of the ordering of human powers. The Reformer’s short disputation seems to indicate a rupture with the medieval traditions of combining philosophical and theological discussions of body and soul, in favor of a biblically-based anthropology. The first nineteen theses of the *Disputatio* look promising for continuity: a short overview of philosophical anthropology, in which Luther acknowledged the
traditional philosophical distinction between human and animal: that the intellect, or reason distinguishes one from the other and makes men superior to animals and responsible to exercise dominion over them (Theses 6-8). Yet, discontinuity follows soon after, for in spite of all this, Luther argued, a person cannot rely on philosophy to understand his or her nature and being because philosophers themselves disagree about the soul, and do not understand the true end of life (Theses 10-19). Turning to theology in Theses 20-40, Luther concluded that those who rest their arguments on Aristotle and the philosophers misunderstand the extent of the Fall, and the fact that, although humans have an exalted position, sin is nevertheless the essential part of their existence. People are slaves to sin, subject to its power, and unable to overcome it without the grace of God. Such knowledge can come only through Scripture and the Spirit.191

Melanchthon, for his part, forthrightly established natural philosophy as a support for philosophy and ethics, arguing that it led to knowledge of God and His ways. In his Initia doctrinae physicae, Melanchthon defined the subject simply: “It is what inquires into and reveals the connection, qualities, motions, of all bodies and species in nature, and the causes of generation and corruption and other motions in the elements

and in other bodies, which arise from the mixture of the elements, insofar as is allowed to this weakness of the human mind …" 192 As Kusukawa points out, Melanchthon believed that the study of causes of growth, change, and decay in natural philosophy "would lead the mind to seeking more remote causes, and ultimately God. Causal investigation leads man from God’s footprints in nature to knowledge about God Himself." 193 This, in turn, undergirded Melanchthon’s work on human bodies and souls. Like his father-in-law and mentor, Caspar Peucer believed that knowledge of nature led to knowledge of God. Even more, as he explained it in the dedication to his most important work, we depend upon God for the ability to know. “This wisdom we must acknowledge to be God’s gift …” he argued at the beginning of his Commentarius de praecipuis generibus. 194

Melanchthon’s pupil David Chytraeus highlighted the importance of natural philosophy for individual Christians and for the church in De studiis doctrinae physicae recte inchoandis (1589). In a Melanchthonian vein, he emphasized the role of natural philosophy in teaching ethics through observing the natural order of the world. Aside from biblical models, he professed his admiration especially for the work of Basil the

---

192 Melanchthon, Initia doctrinae physicae, A1r: Est quae seriem, qualitates, et motus omnium corporum et specierum in natura, et causas generationum, corruptionum et aliorum motuum in elementis et alii corporibus, quae ex elementorum commixtione oriuntur, inquirit et patefacit, quantum in hac caligne humanae mentis conceditur…” As translated by Kusukawa, Transformation of Natural Philosophy, 145.
193 Kusukawa, Transformation, 155.
194 Peucer, Commentarius de praecipuis generibus, Sig: A2v: “Hanc sapientiam debebamus agnoscere Dei donum esse …”
Great and Gregory of Nyssa, and praised Plato. Chytraeus concerned himself with the hierarchy of authorities in addressing natural philosophical questions. He emphasized in good sola Scriptura Reformation fashion that the Bible is more reliable than Aristotle. Noah knew more about animals because he was trapped in an ark with them. Solomon, Christ, and the Apostle Paul rounded out a list of exemplary biblical models of natural philosophers.

---


196 Chytraeus, De studiis, Sig A6v: “Noham vero, præ caeteris, doctrinae Physicæ studio eximie deditum fuisse, illud etiam ostendit, quod animantia omnia in Arca toto anno congregate pavit. Ut enim Aristoteles, aureos illos libros de naturis animantium, quae praecipua & utilissima Physicæ pars est, scriptures, per venatores, aucupes & piscatores, naturas animantium observavi & multas bestias ali curavit, ut conspici earum naturae, partes, modus generationis, victus, ingenia, & virtutum ac vitiorum simulacra possent, ad quam inquisitionem 800 Talenta sive 48000 coronatorum Alexander Magnus ab Aristotele praecipitó rogatus liberaliter contulit: ita Nota, cum omnium animantium genera simul collecta in arca habuerit, & toto anno huic uni rei vacari, multo commodius quam Aristoteles singulorum naturas ipse considerare & patefacere potuit. Aristotelem enim, in plerisque descriptionibus, non ea, quae ipse observat, sed quae ab aliis, quibus inquirendi negotium dedit, acceperat, monumentis literarum commendass e existimant. Multo autem uberior & perfectior Physicæ sapientia instructus fuit Salomon, quem non modo de cunctis animantiumibus quadrupedinibus, volucribus, insectis & piscibus, verum etiam de omnium stirpium ac arborum & herbarum natura & viribus, disputationes & libros reliquisse, sacra Regum historia testator. Idem in sententiis, homines ad Physicam considerationem ingenii & industriae ac sedulitatis minimi fere insecti formicae deducit. …Christus etiam, a volucribus caeli & floribus agrorum discere iubens, & similitudines a multis naturae partibus a Margaritis, a frugum generatione, a panibus arte coctis, a Sole, luna, stellis, meteoris, & arborum aliquot ac barbarum & animantium, ovium precipue naturis petens, non obscure nobis Physicæ doctrinae studium commendat… Paulus etiam aliquot collationes utens sumpta a membris humani corporis, quorum singular suas vires & functiones ad aliorum utilitatem & communem totius corporis incoluitatem & salute conferunt, & quidem Honorem Corpori habere iubes, non plebeiam & oscitantem, sed tanga præsantiss & divini operis attentam & cum singuli reverentia & diligentia coniunctam Corporis nostris aspectionem flagitat. … sic cum corpori humano Honorem habere Paulus praecipit, divinum opus & artem in singularum partium constructione, situ, coagmentatione, substantia, figura, qualitatibus viribus, & actionibus ad certos fines destinatis, & ad hunc summum usum conditis, ut domicilia & templa Dei, & actionum divinarum organa sint; reverenter & attente agnosci vult & pia voce celebrari, & singulares diligentia & cura hoc Dei domicilium & actionum Dei mirandum officinam, conservari. Non enim tribui honore verus nisi agnito bono divino potest.”

135
Given his training at Wittenberg, it can come as no surprise that Daniel Sennert framed natural philosophy as a discipline that promoted piety in the introductions to his two major *summa*. Sennert famously extolled “reason” and “experience” as the guides for knowledge. But he also acknowledged that philosophers will fail, and that we must rely on Scripture for some questions. Thus while it is true that in passages devoted primarily to technical expositions, Sennert does not advert to theological discussions, it is nonetheless clear that he was aware that natural explanations could go only so far and, at a certain point, answers had to be conceded to theology (an admission that would also arise in discussion of primary and secondary causes in disease, noted in chapter two of this dissertation). At the end of his life, in his final summation of natural philosophy he confessed that there are things that “philosophers cannot completely know relying on only nature and by reasoning of intellect. Nevertheless, we are able to know them out of sacred letters (the Bible) for which use God by his grace gave them, and because of this, in those things in which philosophers lack, they may be supplemented out of this (scripture).”

Sennert’s student Sperling, in his turn, included disquisitions on the relationship between natural philosophy and theology, and whether or not the Bible could be relied

---

on in non-religious matters in his natural philosophy surveys. *Physica*, for Sperling is a “friend” of other disciplines (jurisprudence, medicine, and theology), but that does not mean that truth is necessarily unified. Propositions that are true in one field may be false in another. Specifically, Sperling pointed to the long-contested notion of “double truth.” “… contradictory facts occur, where in one discipline are true, what in another are false … *Physica* is concerned with the natural operation of things, theology with the supernatural, because what is impossible to nature, is possible to God.”

As examples, he pointed to doctrines such as the virgin birth and the presence of Christ’s body in several places—including in the Eucharist. Instead of attempting to reconcile natural philosophy with theology, he essentially begged the question of explaining or reconciling apparent discrepancies and chalked it all up to *physica* and *theologia* having different rules (modes). In the same manner, in his *Anthropologia physica*, he posited the same distinction that Meisner did between “sacred” and “physical” anthropology. He

---

argued that physical anthropology was “the knowledge concerning a human being, inasmuch he is a natural body.”

These conflicting views and voices betray the influence of the hot dispute that engulfed many early seventeenth-century Lutheran theologians and philosophers: a debate that wracked the University of Helmstedt but spread beyond that university’s walls, the so-called “Hoffmann-Streit.” The long-contested notion of “double truth” that Sperling advocated resurfaced in Helmstedt as early as 1596, when the Helmstedt theologian Daniel Hoffmann advocated a two truths doctrine in his work De usu et applicatione notionum logicarum ad res theologicas (On the Use and Application of Logical Concepts to Theological Matters). In doing so, while Cornelius Martini at Wittenberg encouraged Aristotelian logic and metaphysics for the theology curriculum, Hoffmann sparked a wide debate among Lutherans about the respective roles of theology and

---

199 Johannes Sperling, Synopsis anthropologiae physicae (Wittenberg, 1650), sig A1r: “Anthropologia physica, est scientia hominis, quatenus corpus naturale est.”

philosophy (including natural philosophy) that moved beyond his own institution to Lutheran intellectuals throughout Germany.  

A Telling Dispute

Early modern Lutherans struggled (and arguably failed) to articulate a single position on the relationship between natural philosophy and theology. A commotion involving a common topic in anthropologia texts that dominated the final years of Daniel Sennert’s life indicates that even as discussion of “double truth” picked up, real concern about the theological ramifications of natural philosophical disputes (and vice versa) continued.  

Detailed discussion of souls and their powers, as well as descriptions of matter and bodies came up in the context of comprehensive natural philosophy surveys, as well as in books entitled anthropologia. Daniel Sennert’s and Caspar Bartholin’s comprehensive natural philosophy texts, Epitome naturalis scientiae and Systema physicum, respectively, both culminate with accounts of the powers of the human soul and its interaction with the body after careful delineations of the relationship of matter and form in the natural world, and descriptions of all sorts of natural and supernatural phenomena, including, among other things, the earth, stars, water, movement, and time. The fact that this is not at all unique—but rather typical of almost any early modern

---

201Daniel Hoffmann, De usu et applicatione notionum logicon ad res theologicus (Frankfurt, 1596); Cornelius Martini, Commentarius in Aristoteles librum Perihermeneias (Helmstedt 1594); idem, Metaphysica commentatio, (Wittenberg 1605).  
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natural philosophy *summa* you might pick up—reveals something important. Like Melanchthon, early modern thinkers viewed an account of the soul and its powers as the logical endpoint of any comprehensive account of natural philosophy. Understanding the human body and soul is essentially connected to understanding the world as a whole. Aristotelian hylemorphism, in which soul inhere in matter as a substantial form, allowed natural philosophers and theologians to posit connections between human beings and other living creatures, accounting for connections and differences between different types of matter, and for the different powers of soul or (as time went on) “occult” forces that could obtain at different levels. (This is something I will take up in more detail in chapter two).202

A sticky problem, though, was determining at which point, exactly, humans got souls, and how they developed to the point at which humans were clearly superior to other animals, that is determining when the rational soul entered the body. Different answers to the question had a host of profound theological and philosophical consequences. If God simply infuses the soul into a fetus in utero, then how can an all-loving and all-good God, who can create only good, place in a child something that is, according to Christian understanding, sinful? But if God does not infuse the soul, is the soul transmitted in some way from parents to child? Do parents pass on sin in this way?

And if so, is the soul—and is sin—in any way material? Just as with modern debates about when a fetus becomes a person, the stakes for the student of *physica* and medicine—natural philosophy—were high. Christian theologians labored to reconcile the necessary fundamental theological truths—that God is good and the creator of good things; that matter, and thus human bodies, are not fundamentally evil; that the soul is immaterial, yet integrally connected with (or “informing”) matter. Physicians had their own long tradition of discussion on that matter—which co-existed alongside theological views with varying levels of complementarity or discomfort. As both theories of physical matter and principles of medicine changed in the sixteenth century, a number of leading thinkers formulated creative answers to the problem of the soul and embryology, among whom was Daniel Sennert. Hiro Hirai argues that “… the generation of living beings was the central and by far the most difficult problem confronting natural philosophers.”

This is where Sennert tripped up, in a debate that sounds like theological esoterica to twenty-first century historians, notwithstanding resonances with contemporary arguments about the status of fetuses. But it is crucial, for it reveals how a traditional theological conundrum fused with a classic natural philosophical problem could become part of confessional polemics in discussing *anthropologia* topics. In short,

---

203 See Nancy Siraisi, *Taddeo Alderotti and His Pupils*.

Sennert argued that God created “forms” (souls) only once—at creation. Since that time, form is handed on from parent to child as part of reproduction. For Sennert, “… the act of the production of souls is reserved for God alone who executed it in the Creation of the world, after which there is only the ‘multiplication’ of forms and souls through the seminal principle.” While carefully hedged, his arguments suggested the soul is physically transferred. This caused something of a firestorm, because it could justify traducianism.

This theory inspired debate from the patristic period through the early modern era, though it was mostly regarded as heretical from the time Tertullian propounded it until (and through) the time some early modern Lutherans adopted it. In the early modern period, Catholics maintained their long tradition of rejecting the idea. The question popped up occasionally in Reformed university towns. The Zürich theologian Johann Jakob Coler tackled the topic in two 1586 disputations, published collectively, while Jakob Lebzelter and Salomon Teichmann, medical students in Basel, disputed questions on the soul “about which physicians are occupied,” including traducianism.

207 Johannes J. Coler, Quaestio theologica et philosophica, num anima sit ex traduce, an vero a Deo quotidie inspiretur, (Zürich, 1586); Johann Niklaus Stupanus, Multa tulit fecitque puer sudavit & alsit, Qui cupit optatam
But Lutherans were the ones who tore themselves up over the matter.

Melanchthon addressed the topic in his *Commentarius de anima* and *Liber de anima*, roundly condemning the idea. In Lutheran Copenhagen, Hans Rasmussen Skomager weighed in with *Theses de traduce animae humanae* (1608). In 1616 one Polycarpus Albinus oversaw a dispute “in which it is most plainly shown by six reasons that the rational soul is not created new or immediately inspired by God but passed on by way of traduction,” though it should be noted that passing on a rational soul does not mean that sin is passed on with it. In 1623, the Tübingen theologian Theodor Thumm summed up the theological and philosophical debate in *Controversia de traduce sive ortu animae rationalis*, attacking a joint opposition force (as he saw it) of Bucer and Bellarmine as the respective representatives of Reformed and Roman thought, and wholeheartedly defending Lutheran traducianism (something that would have alarmed Melanchthon, who decried it).208

---

Sennert’s formulations earned the opprobrium of his contemporaries, the Lutheran-turned-Reformed physician Johannes Freitag in Groningen and the Catholic Spanish royal physician Juan Gallego de la Serna, in Madrid, both of whom took it upon themselves to critique his theory.\(^{209}\) Called out as a blasphemer, not by fellow Lutherans but by a Calvinist and a Roman Catholic, respectively, Sennert took what appears to us an unusual step: he turned, not to other natural philosophers and physicians, but to eight leading Lutheran theological faculties (Wittenberg, Leipzig, Jena, Altdorf, Rostock, Königsberg, Strassburg, and Marburg (most often Reformed, but in the midst of a Lutheran phase in the 1630s) and one Reformed faculty (Basel), to vindicate the theological and philosophical orthodoxy of his position. All pronounced the Wittenberg physician orthodox, but he died in 1637, just as the controversy was really getting going, a victim of plague sweeping Wittenberg and his own dogged insistence on staying in town to treat patients rather than evacuating for safety. Triumphanty, Sennert’s friends published the collected opinions exculpating him, but this hardly ended the matter.\(^{210}\)

Four years after his death, Sennert’s final *summa* of natural philosophy, *Hypomemnata physica*, found its way on to the Inquisition’s index of forbidden books, and, as Michael Stolberg has revealed, notes in a copy of the book in the Vatican library

\(^{209}\) Johannes Freitag, *Detectio et solida refutatio novae sectae Sennerto-Paracelsiae* (Amsterdam 1636, Groningen 1637); Juan Gallego de la Serna, *De naturali animarum origine, invectiva adversus Danielem Sennertum* (Brussels, 1640).

\(^{210}\) *De origine natura (sic) animarum in bruis: sententiae clariss: theologor. in aliquot Germaniae academiis, quibus simul D. Daniel Sennertus a crimine blasphemiae & haeresos, a D. Johanne Freitagiio ipsi intentato, absolutur* (Frankfurt, 1638).
indicate that censors primarily based the condemnation not on the ramifications of Sennert’s matter theory for transubstantiation, but on this very point—traducianism.\(^\text{211}\)

Not two decades later, a Catholic edition of Sennert’s book appeared, with the offending traducianist parts expunged, while Lutherans simultaneously published in favor of traducianism, especially in Wittenberg. There, Sennert’s orientalist, philologist, theologian son Andreas published a book of excerpts on the topic, while Sennert’s protégé in medicine and natural philosophy Nicholas Sperling, took up the defense of his teacher. Sperling’s own student Georg Caspar Kirchmaier openly advocated traducianism—a great shift from just a century before, when Melanchthon rejected the idea in his books on the soul.\(^\text{212}\)

The controversy that engulfed Sennert was, then, not an unusual or esoteric dispute. It encapsulates questions preoccupying natural philosophers and theologians across Europe at the time. Descartes’ revolutionary views were, similarly, founded on his attempts to reconcile his natural philosophy—particularly his ideas on physical matter—with his philosophical and theological views of the human soul, and attempts

\(^{211}\) Stolberg, “Particles of the Soul,” at 193.

\(^{212}\) Andreas Sennert, Assensus de traduce: quae est sententiae, datus, oppositusque adversae opinioni cuidam addicto traducianorum (Wittenberg, 1648); Nicholas Sperling, Defensio tractatus de origine formarum: pro D. Daniele Sennerto &c. Contra D. Johannem Freitag &c (Wittenberg, 1638); Georg Caspar Kirchmaier, Posterior de origine animae humanae, contra creationis defensores, pro traduce disputatione physica (Wittenberg, 1658); Christoph Latzke, Exercitatio philosophica de origine animae humanae creationis propugnatoribus opposita pro traduce (Wittenberg, 1650); Johann Jacob Fesslin, De origine animae humanae, contra creationis defensorum Helmstadiensem pro traduce (Wittenberg, 1669).
to answer him worked with the same material. But Sennert’s story does more than offer another interesting example of a general problem. This particularly colorful case manifests an intellectual system that continued to see a fundamental connection between natural philosophy and theology, and the effort required to maintain that relationship as both theology and science changed. It shows how thinkers in one broad circle could maintain a variety of positions, and how the Melanchthonian system changed over time. As evolving natural philosophy and medicine intersected with theological debates, traditional assertions about matter, body, and soul changed in ways that had practical consequences at the time and profound implications for future thought.

**Conclusion**

When Daniel Sennert advised would-be physicians to master *anthropologia*, it meant mastering questions about human bodies and souls that, in some cases like *anthropologia sacra*, seem to us in the twenty-first century to be totally unrelated to medicine. *Anthropologia* offered a complete picture of the human person. As I have argued, for physicians like Horst and Bartholin, anthropology centered on a recapitulation of anatomy and physiology, with gestures toward theology and philosophy. For philosophy instructors like Evenius, it entailed summing up thought

---

about the soul in the form of a series of academic disputations that included a brief overview of anatomy. And for others like the theologian Meisner, anthropology hinged on lengthy discussions of the status and powers of human beings before and after the Fall in the Garden of Eden and the doctrine of justification. Yet all reflect in some way the two-fold nature of the project as study of both body and soul.\textsuperscript{214}

Despite open questions about the relationship of reason and faith, disagreement about the extent of the Fall’s effects, and the way in which the soul entered the body, Lutheran thinkers attempted to frame an overarching multi-faceted description of what a human being is, in body and soul. \textit{Anthropologia} provided an intellectual system in which human beings and their constituent material and spiritual parts were defined in close relation to each other. Because of this, health in body and in soul were closely connected.

Early modern writers of \textit{anthropologia} were keen to point out the practical implications of the study. Bodies and souls influenced each other in observable ways, and in ways that a physician attempting to diagnose or treat a disease had to understand. It is to attempts to discern these influences that I now turn.

\textsuperscript{214}With such a wide-ranging discipline, one temptation that constantly arises for a historian is to attempt to impose coherence on a system with in-built inconsistency. Quentin Skinner, “Meaning and Understanding in the History of Ideas,” \textit{History and Theory} 8.1 (1969): 3–53.
2. Scripture and Sickness

Looking at the *anthropologia* developed among early modern Lutherans is just the start of comprehending the way that thinkers in the Wittenberg Circle approached the study of bodies, souls, and their diseases. As Sennert enjoined teachers and students to recognize, it served as the essential foundation for this broader goal. By continuing the traditional emphasis on the connection between body and soul in studies of Aristotle and Galen, and combining it with Lutheran theology emphasizing the natural world and the human body as the handiwork of God, the framework of medicine and natural philosophy that prevailed among thinkers in the Wittenberg Circle entailed seeing the human body and soul as subject to a variety of influences. These included both divine and diabolical powers.

Because the human body was the site of physical and spiritual forces, understanding it and its proper treatment required both general revelation (reason, observation, experience) and special revelation (God’s word as revealed in the pages of Scripture). In this it was like the natural world as a whole—explicable only in light of reason and faith. Even as Lutherans struggled to define the relationship between reason and revelation, they continued to turn to both to understand body and soul.¹

This chapter shifts to consider the principal authorities on medicine, the divine, and human nature upon which thinkers in the Wittenberg Circle such as Sennert, Bartholin, and Peucer called as they attempted to comprehend and treat bodies and souls. Though Daniel Sennert features prominently here, the chapter as a whole includes various physicians all either educated or teaching at Wittenberg, or connected to it in some way. The discussion is structured in two sections about the two most important resources Lutheran physicians used to understand bodies, souls, and their diseases and to confront theological dilemmas their work raised: (1) the Bible and (2) medical theory. I then point out some theological questions that arose for physicians considering treatment based on these authorities.

While both Lutheran physicians and theologians concerned themselves with curing bodies and souls, this chapter will concentrate on how doctors and natural philosophers approached the task. Chapters three and four will take up the thought of theologians and pastors in more detail. The sources used here—primarily academic books on disease and medical theory — are, as elsewhere in this dissertation, mainly descriptive and theoretical, affording only passing glimpses of physicians at work with patients. They reveal how, based on natural philosophical and religious principles, Lutheran physicians in the Wittenberg Circle explained bodies and souls and forces at work in them to themselves, not how they interacted with patients.
With this discussion, I show how physicians drew in various ways on two crucial bases of authority. From the Bible, they discussed medicine as a gift of God, a reminder of redemption and healing in spite of the curse of the Fall. Based on that, they worked to square principles of natural philosophy and learned medicine with the biblical text and fundamental Christian ideas about human bodies and souls. Their ways of using the scriptural text were as varied as the passages selected and principles deduced from them, and the purposes for which they undertook discussion. As I will make plain, in his work on medical theory Daniel Sennert used scripture to provide doctrinal principles that a doctor or system of medicine must respect, but he did not necessarily aim to derive details of physiology, anatomy, or pathology from it. In more popular writing, his co-religionist Thomas Bartholin took a different approach to discussing medicine in scripture, one that attempted to demonstrate the perfect, literal accuracy of accounts of disease in the biblical text.

Though concerned to uphold the place of scripture in their work, Lutheran physicians did not regard the Bible as the sole source of knowledge about the body. The goal was to reconcile what they learned from it with what they knew from the second fundamental source of authority: medical theory. This was, as elsewhere, primarily Hippocratic-Galenic. So, from a discussion of various ways of using the Bible and harmonizing it with medicine, I will turn to medical theories dominant among
physicians in the Wittenberg Circle, and the resources these provided to understand and treat body and soul.

Inherent shortcomings in this medical theory became increasingly pressing in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. Wrestling with these sparked the development of new theories about disease. Here, Daniel Sennert was a pivotal player. Some thinkers simultaneously drew on and challenged the Hippocratic-Galenic system (Jean Fernel and Girolamo Fracastoro) while others subjected all traditional medicine to disdainful critique (Paracelsus). All of them converge in Sennert, who operated within a primarily Galenic system, expounded on the notion of occult diseases from Jean Fernel, and denounced certain Paracelsian ideas as impious, while opening the way for more widespread acceptance of chymistry.

Though he was very different in some respects from Melanchthon and Peucer, Sennert nonetheless viewed nature and the human body as an arena of God’s work. In this, he can be seen as continuing the Wittenberg tradition of natural philosophy and medicine. Scholarly interest in Sennert to this point has focused almost exclusively on his thought on atomism and chymistry, overlooking other dimensions of his work. It rarely places him in the context of the Wittenberg tradition, preferring to focus on him as an individual thinker. None have yet has fully outlined his theory of occult disease, remarked on his use of the Bible, or noted how theological conundrums arise at various points in his books. Considering him in this context, alongside other Lutheran thinkers,
and noting interests and concerns he shared in common with them provides a richer view of his prolific output.

Sketching out Sennert’s theory of occult disease will lead from outlining uses of the Bible and evolving medical theory to a discussion of debates about the way in which diseased bodies manifest or relate to spiritual or immaterial powers. Sennert’s outline of occult forces at work in the world, and his recognition that disease could be caused by witches or the devil point again to the abiding struggle to work out the difference between divine and diabolic at work in nature. But just as the devil raised questions and concerns for physicians, so too did God. Thinking about nature and medicine in light of faith in divine providence entailed confronting some theological quandaries. In general, medicine was understood as a gift of God, and the practice of it as a work of Christian charity. It was, as I will show in chapter 3, a way of imitating the greatest physician of all, Christus Medicus. But Lutheran physicians at times grappled with theodicy, the idea of God’s inflicting disease, and His power over cures. Though they raised these questions in their medical work, they ultimately decided that neither natural philosophy nor medicine provided the means to address them. It was best left to theologians. As I conclude, brief attention to types of treatment will pull together various themes in this chapter by showing therapies premised on the relationship of body and soul to the natural world, and the effect on the body of balancing the spirits.
Altogether, this chapter builds on the *anthropologia* examined in chapter one by showing some of the ways in which viewing body and soul in a framework of overlapping natural philosophy, medicine, and theology worked itself out in ways of understanding the place of the human in the scheme of creation, and of disease in body and soul. Viewed as a whole, this chapter underlines the truth of Michael Stolberg’s remark that “The predominant medical terms, images, explanatory models, and practices of a society or social group are to a large degree the product of the cultural, social, economic, and political circumstances at a given time and place. They reflect a specific understanding of man and the world around him, a given set of hopes and fears, values and norms....” Examining Lutheran medical thought between (roughly) 1550 and 1650 gives us insight into wider cultural debates and beliefs about the action of God in the natural world, and the framework of the individual human body and soul (*anthropologia*), of which these explanations were a part.

### 2.1 An Illuminating Anecdote

By encapsulating many of the themes of this chapter, a colorful encounter between a physician and patient is a useful place to start. It serves as a window onto how voluble and confusing the debate about the body, disease, and deformity in the period could be. It also provides a glimpse of how a Lutheran physician in the

---

Wittenberg Circle might attempt to intertwine biblical and medical authorities, based on understanding medicine as part of a natural philosophical explanation of the world and bodies in it. The outcome of the encounter and subsequent debates about it highlights debate even among those in the same confessional circle about how to view the work of God in the body.

Something strange happened in Silesia in 1593. Christoph Mueller, a seven-year-old miller’s son, claimed to have grown a golden tooth. The variety of experts who examined the boy indulged in speculation about whether the tooth was a prank or a providential sign. Jakob Horst, veteran physician and professor at the Lutheran University of Helmstedt took it upon himself to examine the boy and to report on young Christoph’s condition. He was most concerned to establish “whether it was completely a miracle, or whether it was to be believed to be in part natural” and entertained questions such as whether natural processes necessarily make it impossible for miracles to occur and whether God is constrained in some way by the ordinary run (what he

---

3 Jakob Horst—the man himself and the larger body of his work—is little known. Not included in Melchior Adam’s remarkable collective biography Vitae Germanorum Medicorum, the best sources for Horst’s life are the brief account of his career in Justus Christoph Böhmer’s 1719 Memoriae professorum helmstadiensium in medicorum ordine, orations given at Horst’s death, and the 1596 collection of Horst’s letters, which testify to his wide network of correspondents, including his friendship with David Chytraeus and his epistolary mentorship of his nephew Gregor Horst (who appeared in chapter 1) while the latter was a medical student in Wittenberg. Horst’s virtual obscurity today contrasts with the popularity of his work in his own day, especially in his “bestseller” Wunderbarliche Geheimnisse der Natur in des Menschen leibe und Seel (sic). I will discuss that work in more detail in chapter 4. See: Justus Christophorus Böhmer, Memoriae professorum helmstadiensium in medicorum ordine qui diem suum obierunt prolationibus binis descriptae (Wolfenbüttel, 1719); Jakob Horst, Epistolae philosophicae et medicinales (Leipzig, 1596).
called “lauff”) of nature. No, Horst concluded firmly, “…God the almighty is not bound by the course of nature.” Then he immediately began to tiptoe through the minefield of primary and secondary causation. “Although certainly God cannot easily alter the course with which he ordered nature, surely he can if he wants to do this and alter other such things sometimes and act above and against the course of nature.”

That said, Horst did not immediately ascribe the appearance of the golden tooth to the miraculous. In his 1595 report of his encounter with the boy, Horst carefully outlined the medical and physical factors he considered that could account for the tooth, similar to those investigated in cases of monstrous births, including whether the boy had been conceived under a sky appropriate to produce such wonders and the possibility of shocks in utero. He also sedulously specified his own care to consult with others to confirm his conclusions. All this was important, “because God often uses natural means in his marvelous works” and it required care to establish when He did so. Medicine, as

---

4 Jakob Horst, *Zwei Bücher: Eins von den güldenen Zahn* (Leipzig, 1596), Horst structured the body of the account around three questions: (1) Ob erstlich solcher ganz güldener zahn dem knaben in Schlesien natürlicher weise gewachsen sei oder nicht? (2) Zum andern, Ob der güldene zahn etwas künfftiges bedeute oder nicht? 3) Zum dritten, Ob man solches zahnes bedeutung ausslegen und darvon handeln könne?

5 Horst, *Güldene Zahn*, Sig. D3r-v: “Denn so man solchem wunder so ganz unerhört, nachdenkt, findet sich eine solche frage: Ob er für natürlich oder ubernatürlich zuhalten. Darnach ob er dann ganzlich ein wunderwerck oder zum theil für natürlich zuhalten. So fern wir in diesen beiden ja sagen, kann so wol ein gelehrter in der heiligen Schrift als in der Arznei oder der naturkündigung davon handeln. Wo aber nit, so wird er entweder gar natürlich sein, derhalben er von einem Medico allerlei zubetrachten. Oder wird ganz für ein wunderwerck zuhalten sein, so er gleichfalls von ihnen nicht zuveracten. Sintemal sie gewis sein sollen und wol beherzigen, das Gott der allmechtige nicht an den lauff der natur gebunden sei. Ob aber zwar Gott den lauff, welchen er der natur geordnet, nicht leicht ändert, kann er doch wenn er will diss tun, ja ander auch solchen bissweilen und handelt über und wieder den lauff der natur.”

6 Horst, *Güldene Zahn*, Sig D5-r: “…weil Gott in seinen wunderwercken oft natürliche mittel zu brauchen pflegt.” On defining the bounds of natural, supernatural, and marvelous see chapter 1 in Robert Bartlett, *The
Horst explained it, required balancing one’s understanding of natural and supernatural forces at work in the body and keeping in mind at all times that God is the true healer (a line of thought that will come up in more detail in chapter three). Writing elsewhere in an outline of what a physician must know, Horst emphasized that logic and natural philosophy (physica) are the starting point, because medicine centers on how universal principles of nature work in and affect the human body. This is the same supposition that drove Caspar Bartholin to begin his Controversiae anatomicae by laying out the relationship of medicine to natural philosophy, as noted in chapter one, and to include a series of quaestiones on the relationship of the human being to the rest of nature, including the classic questions of whether man is the most noble creature and whether the human body is microcosm of the world. This is all condign with, even an extension

Horst’s use of the term seems to accord with what Barlett’s quote from Gervase of Tilbury, “However, we call things marvels that are beyond our understanding, even when they are natural.” (18)

“Tabula in qua traditua, qualem virum medicum esse convenit” in Jacobi Horstii D. Epistolae philosophicae et medicinales, Sig. O2v: “Rebus naturalibus excolate, hae duae artes Dialectica & Physica inter omnes medico maxime necessariae sunt, vel ut in omni discursu rationis animum Logicae praesidio confirmatum, verique perspicacem habeat, vel ut rerum naturalium cognitione communii ad naturalium rerum causas investigandus adsuefactus prius fit, quam ad medicam contemplationem ipsam quoque nihil alium quam particulararem Physicam corporis humani accedat.”

of, the system of thought outlined in chapter one. Melanchthon, Magirus, and other writers of *anthropologia* argued that the study of body and soul connected to both natural philosophy and theology. Studying it would lead to recognizing God’s design for the world. It could thereby confirm faith in Him, knowledge of His providence, and appreciation for salvation. In *Oratio de dignitate et utilitate artis medicinae* (1548), Melanchthon presented medicine in just this way—as part of a wider natural philosophical quest to appreciate the sovereign work of God.⁹

Caspar Peucer, Melanchthon’s son-in-law and an eminent professor on the Wittenberg medical faculty, expanded on this connection in his work. Because the relationship between the human body and the natural world is what it is, it is possible to read signs in the body, just as one can read signs in the natural world. This conviction

---

⁹ Philip Melanchthon, *Oratio de dignitate et utilitate artis medicinae* (Wittenberg, 1548), Sig. A3r-v: At bonae mentis sciant primum universae naturae vocem testificari, hunc mundum non casu exitisse, sed a mente aeterna architectatrice conditum &formatum esse. Deinde & homini noticias insitas esse, quae congruentes cum mente divina, rerum delectum ostendunt, ad in natura & in morbias iudicium nostra cum mente divina congruere debere. Vitam, bonam valetudinem, & vitae praesidia Deus adfirmat res bonas & se con(n)ditas esse, & iubet nos frui his muneribus divinis.” Sig. A4v: “Quid est autem honestius, & homini convenientius, quam in natura quaequet vestigia divinitatis, confirmare veram de providentia sententiam, agnoscre Deum opificem, & custodem generis humani & intelligere talem esse Dei mentem & voluntatem, qualem se expressit in ea luce, quam in nos transfudit, ad discernere eum a malis naturis, in quibus ordinis confusion est, & dirigere consilia & mores ad illam normam in mente congruentem cum norma diviniae.” Sig. A5r: “Cum igitur ars utilissima sit Vitae, ad valetudinem tuendam, & plurimum dignitatis propter maximarium rerum scientiam habeat, & laudata sit praecoonis divinis, & de providentia monstrat illustria testimonia, expedtendam, cognoscedam, & venerandam esse, non dubium est.”
undergirded the practice of medical astrology. As described in chapter one, Peucer’s influential book, *Praecipuis divinationum generibus*, centered on explaining the various ways in which God’s activity and signs in the world could be known. He began the book by explaining that it would describe how God created everything in the world good, for the use of man.¹⁰ Learning to divine all these types of signs could instil wonder at God’s wisdom and providence.¹¹

Peucer’s commentary covered a variety of types of “divinations” including: oracles, theomancy, magic, incantations, *hieroscopy*, augurs, numerology, dreams, medical semiotics, meterology, physiognomy, astrology, and tetrascopy.¹² These prodigious events, according to Peucer, had various causes. “Some derived immediately from God. Others, however, might come from intermediate causes in the angelic and human natures…. In sum, such anomalies could occur through the work of good or bad angels, astral causes, or the corruption of natural processes.”¹³ He sought to describe

---

¹⁰ Caspar Peucer, *Praecipuis divinationum generibus*, (Wittenberg, 1553), Sig B4v: “De tota rerum natura dicitur, Et vidit Deus omnia quae fecerat, & errant valde bona, id est, a Deo creat, congruentia ad ordinem in mente divina, destinata ad bonos usus necessaries hominum generi & animantibus ac naturis caeteris propter hominem.”

¹¹ Caspar Peucer, *Praecipuis*, Sig B1r: “Lucet in tota natura rerum Miranda Dei opificis sapientia, & vestigia praesentiae divinae tam expressa undiq(ue); oculis obversantur, ut animos non prorsus feros aut cyclopicos evidenter convincent, quod sit Deus, cogantq(ue); eos assentiri, insitis divinitus de providentia notionibus. Inter haec providentiae testimonianum minimum est connate animantibus a prima origine praesensio futurorum, significatioq(ue); eorundum in caeteris naturae partibus atq(ue) effectio, & scientia in hominum animis, seu potius naturae vis, quae ratione & arte progrediens, observatis ac notatis signis causisq(ue); in natura, futuras res colligit & obnuntiat.”


both the good and the bad, to encourage observers to avoid evil divination and to learn
to recognize and wonder at the signs of divine activity in the world. Learning to
decipher signs in the body by way of medical semiotics and physiognomy were both
praiseworthy. Again he premised the book on a view of natural philosophy and
theology that saw the two as connected in a common pursuit of recognizing the work of
God. The same forces worked in universe as a whole, from the heavens down to the
individual body.

Similarly, as noted in chapter one, surveys of natural philosophy typically began
by examining the structure of the universe and slowly working down to culminate in
discussing human beings (the soul and its powers), suggesting that the individual
should be understood in the framework of the whole of creation. In this, these works
mirrored the progression of the creation narrative in Genesis 1 that moves systematically
from the universal to the individual. The implicit argument was that God created and
continued to work in all levels of creation, including in the individual human body and
soul.

Like Peucer, who subjected signs to tests (not everything is a sign from God),
Horst’s account of his attempt to read the “sign” of the young boy’s golden tooth
included a confession that he had considered the story a fable at first and detailed his
tests. But examining the boy led him to an inescapable conclusion that the golden tooth
was a sign from God, partly natural, and partly supernatural. He hedged his decision
with equivocation. “I conclude that the golden tooth should be taken in part as natural, but without doubt extremely rare, and in part for a great marvel,” Horst wrote. He was more certain about the interpretation. The sign was given to bring “strong, great, and rich comfort to all poor, distressed people.”

In interpreting the “sign,” Horst compared the golden tooth to other extraordinary natural events God used to communicate His will or plans to people, including the stars and earthquakes, as well as Biblical events like the sun standing still. In this case, Horst likened the appearance of the tooth in the boy’s mouth to the golden head of the statue in Nebuchadnezzar’s famous dream in the prophetic book of Daniel. As the Biblical dream of a statue constructed of bands of gold, silver, iron, and clay from head to feet portended the coming and going of ancient kingdoms, Horst

---

14 Horst, Güldene Zahn, Sig L5r: “schliess ich, das der güldene zahn zum teil natürlich, aber doch überaus seltzam, zum teil, für ein gross wunderwerck zu halten sei... starcken, grossen und reichen trost allen armen bekümmerten leuten.”

15 The attempt to read divine messages in nature also made for some of early modern Germany’s bestselling vernacular reading material. Philip Soergel and Ken Kurihara have discussed the very popular genre of “wunderzeichen”: broadsheets and sermons used to read signs from God in weather and natural events. See Philip Soergel, Miracles and the Protestant Imagination: The Evangelical Wonder Book in Reformation Germany (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012); Ken Kurihara, Celestial Wonders in Reformation Germany (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2014).

16 Horst, Güldene Zahn, Sig. B6v-7r: Gleicher weise bedeutet auch das Gold nach des Propheten Danielis auslegung, das beste und herrliche Reich, nicht der grösse, weite, und breite nach zurechnen, sondern welches neben guter polici e gerechtigkeit handhabe in gutem bestendigem friede. Dessen ein beispiel ist das güldene haupt on der Regimentseulen oder Nebuchadnezars bild, an welcher die erste Monarchei ein gros Reich genennt wird, ob schon die ander Monarchei welche ein geringers geachtet, viel ein mehrers sintemal zu d. Assirer und Chaldeer Reich die Persen und Meden kamen waren, begriffe: Wie den die dritte welche dem Ertz verglichen wurde über die ganze welt fast herrschete. Derowegen dann der güldene zahn ein gross mechtig und neben solcher gewalt ganz ruhig Reich bedeutet, wie den Nebuchadnezar, nach dem er viel völcker bekriget und ihme untertan gemacht, bei 20. Jahren in guter ruhe geherrschet... Da auch die zähne wachsen es geschehe nun ungewönlich oder komm im trauum für bedeuts doch entweder auffnemung an ehr oder an gütern.”
maintained, the appearance of the golden tooth signified a shift in current politics. The
Turks, who seemed so menacing, were about to be thwarted.17

With his discussion of the case of the golden tooth, Horst disclosed the
assumption that God and the Devil both intervene in human bodies and cause medical
conditions, and that the Bible provides a guide for understanding the body. His account
revealed his confidence that the body is a center of spiritual, not just physical forces.
Like the rest of the natural world, bodies operated in accord with God’s will, and were
subject to divine and demonic activity. As David Gentilcore remarks, “The early
modern body was a battleground for differing interpretations of disease: natural, divine
and diabolical.”18

At the end of his life, the aging Horst’s explanation of Christoph Mueller’s tooth
provoked the ridicule of his younger colleague at Helmstedt, Duncan Liddell, who
found Horst’s account naïve and credulous, based more upon faith than knowledge.
Liddell argued that the tooth was a fabrication—a hoax.19 His skeptical reception of
Horst’s account replayed in other relations of the story, including Daniel Sennert’s. The

17 Horst, Güldene Zahn, Sig. B6r-v: “...das die liebe Christenheit nach dem der Türcke und dessen macht
ganzlich gekämpft in guter friede und ruhe bis zu der zukunft des Sohns Gottes zum Gericht sein und
bleiben werde.” This interpretation was not unique to Horst. Philip Melanchthon (and his son-in-law
Caspar Peucer, who continued the project where his father-in-law left off) used the scheme of four empires
from Daniel to structure historical time since the prophet Elijah in the Chronicon Carionis, a survey of the
history of the world. The intent, similar to Horst’s interpretation, was to demonstrate the providence of God
and the nearness of the end of the world. See Alexandra Kess, Johann Sleidan and the Protestant Vision of
18 David Gentilcore, Healers and Healing in Early Modern Italy (Manchester and New York: Manchester
19 Duncan Liddell, Tractatus de dente aureo (Hamburg, 1628).
latter evaluated the story of the boy with the golden tooth in the second book of his
*Practicae medicinae* and denoted Horst’s tale of a miracle a “fraud.” As Robert Jütte has shown, subsequent to Sennert’s account, Horst’s story of the boy with the golden tooth became an important test case for the possibilities of miraculous signs in the body in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. It sparked censorious remarks from no less than Voltaire and Pierre Bayle among others.

Sennert’s handling of Horst’s account is significant for us because it reveals Lutheran physicians debating and critiquing each other in the attempt to fathom the work of God in bodies. The famed Wittenberg physician was by no means a strict rationalist who thought that all bodily phenomena could be ascribed to physical causes. Increasingly dissatisfied by the limits of traditional medicine, Sennert wrote on occult diseases and studied alchemy. As noted in chapter one, Sennert maintained a healthy interest in fields beyond medicine. Medicine in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries increasingly prized practice and experience over theory derived from books, so physicians were correspondingly less obligated to write comprehensive natural philosophical texts. Yet, as Christoph Lüthy has observed, Sennert’s “mind seems to

---

20 Daniel Sennert, *Practicae medicinae, liber secundus* (Wittenberg, 1628). See Book 1 Chapter 15, “De dente aureo pueri Silesii” (G1r-G2r).

have worked in a less compartmentalized manner than that of most of his colleagues.”

Thus, as seen in chapter one, Sennert continued to pen sprawling natural philosophy texts that undertook to explain the place of the person in the hierarchy of the natural world, just as Bartholin and Peucer did. His praise of the study of anthropologia as the foundation of a physician’s work is based on this understanding of the connection between natural philosophy and medicine.

His own most successful works make this clear. Though famous for his practice of medicine (it earned him the affectionately proud nickname “Our German Galen”), Sennert’s reputation came primarily from his prolific writing. He did not, however, write anthropologia per se, or even treatises on anatomy or scientia de anima. (He did discuss the latter in his natural philosophy texts). Instead, he produced a synoptic Institutiones medicae that could serve as a comprehensive introduction to the field. In addition to theoria, he also wrote on practica, with a multi-volume Practicae medicinae. The his most enduring fame comes from his work in Chymicorum cum Aristotelicis et Galenicis consensu ac dissensu liber (1619) (henceforth: “Consensu ac dissensu”) in which

---

23 By Wolfgang Eckhart’s reckoning the 3-volume Opera omnia that appeared in Paris and Venice just three years after Sennert’s death stretched more than 3000 pages. Eckhart counts at least 5 more editions of this work appearing before 1700. See: Wolfgang Eckhart, “‘Auctoritas’ versus ‘Veritas’ or: Classical authority and its role for the perception of truth in the work of Daniel Sennert (1572-1637), Clio medica, 18.1 (1983): 131-140, 136.
he critiqued Paracelsian medicine, but not without recognizing the importance of
“chymistry” and seeking to reconcile Galenism with new developments in it to address
abiding problems in medical theory and treatment.25 His exploration of chymistry and
matter theory grew out of his interest in the natural philosophical underpinnings of
medicine and the art or practice of it.26 This interest in explicating applications of theory
also led him to include in Practicae medicinae a book entitled De morbis occultis, that
expounded on the importance of understanding and treating “occult diseases,”
including those caused by witchcraft. His work can thus be seen as part of the common
carentr to work out the natural and spiritual forces at work both in the universe and in
the body, using a variety of sources.

Sennert’s thought was influential in large part because it worked as a synthesis.
Not abandoning Galenism, Sennert attempted to harmonize it with insights from new
theories and practices, especially chymistry. In doing so, as I’ll note below, he remained
conscious of the need to uphold certain Christian doctrines—especially, that the human
being is created in the image of God, that God is the true source of good and all cures,

25 Throughout this chapter, I retain the early modern spelling of the word “chymistry” in order to
differentiate it from modern chemistry. This is meant to signal the relationship of chymistry to alchemy
(even though the two were distinct) and the different theories about matter and elements that supported the
early modern practice that slowly evolved into chemistry as we know it. See: William R. Newman and
26 As William Newman points out, alchemy was long seen as the way to determine the limits of the arts and
the extent of human knowledge, as well as the power of demons. Idem, Atoms and Alchemy: Chymistry and
and that God is more powerful than the Devil. All this he attempted to balance in his
Consensu ac dissensu and his writing on occult diseases.

In his discussion of Paracelsianism, Sennert devoted careful attention to biblical
discussions of creation and the image of God. He shared, then, Horst’s assumption that a
physician might use the Bible in combination with then-dominant medical theories to
describe and explain human bodies. Paracelsus’ anatomical and etiological theories—
that denounced traditional medicine in favor of medicine couched in biblical terms—
were hardly the only example of an early modern medicine attempting to incorporate or
base itself on biblical descriptions or principles. Horst, an orthodox Lutheran and well-
connected and respected university professor, would have eschewed the designation
“Paracelsian,” almost as vociferously as Daniel Sennert did, yet endeavored to meld
traditional Galenic-Hippocratic medicine with the Bible, using it as a source to describe
and explain natural events and bodies. Many others did the same. In seeing medicine as
a part of natural philosophy, Lutheran physicians and theologians labored to relate the
classical medical teachings they inherited to Christian teaching about the creation and
nature of the universe and of each person. For these things, the Bible provided an
authoritative account. It is time to scrutinize more closely this use of the Bible by
Lutheran physicians in the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

27 Charles Webster, Paracelsus: Medicine, Magic and Mission at the End of Time (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008).
2.2 The Bible

Lutheran thinkers turned to the Bible to address many questions, including where and when medicine originated, why we need it, and what principles about the world and human nature it contained that any medical system must take into account. In using the biblical text, they approached it in various ways, leading to differences in understanding the extent to which the Bible could provide a literal guide to medicine. This discussion will consider each of these briefly, in turn.

2.2.1 The Origin, Basis, and Need for Medicine

One of the most influential professors of medicine in early modern Germany, Leonhard Fuchs, explained the origin of medicine with reference to scripture in *Institutionum medicinae ad Hippocratis Galenis.* Fuchs, a professor of medicine in Tübingen from 1533 to 1566, played a key role in introducing humanism to the university, and in founding the famous botanical garden there. The title of his first publication *Errata recentiorum medicorum* (1530) gives a clue about his lifelong goal to identify contemporary errors and to draw on the newly published humanist editions of antique authorities like Galen (upon which Fuchs worked as an editor) to establish a

---

medicine purified by returning *ad fontes.* He was interested, above all, in establishing a clear method in medicine, and in questioning the authority of Avicenna’s *Canon,* while championing Galen.

In the course of his efforts to present a purified Galenism, Fuchs wrote one of the most influential medical textbooks of the sixteenth century, *Institutionum medicinae* first appeared in 1555 and proved immediately popular. The first book tackled the origin of medicine and from the beginning, Fuchs was clear: the best place to discover the origin of medicine is Genesis 1 and the book of Sirach. The creation narrative reveals that medicine is the gift of God. “The Lord put medicine in the earth, and a wise man will not scorn it…” Moses’s ancient work describes all the principles, arts, and plants “to be made use of up to the present day to protect health and drive off disease…” Even the pagans, according to Fuchs, knew to attribute medicine to the gods. “ Truly, not only sacred literature publicly proclaims God, and the remedies He gave us and the physicians He made, but even the impious… Accordingly the Greeks, among whom

---

30 Fuchs is perhaps most famous now for his work as a botanist, and his herbal, *De Historia Stirpium Commentarii Insignes.* On Fuchs’ method in his herbal—prioritizing clarity and accuracy and an interest in diffusing knowledge more broadly—see Sachiko Kusukawa, *Picturing the Book of Nature: Image, Text, and Argument in Sixteenth-century Human Anatomy and Medical Botany* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2012).
medicine was first developed, related that the god Apollo was the inventor.” Deftly, Fuchs pulled the classic humanist hat trick of educating a *prisca sapientia*, linking Christian understanding of medicine as a divine gift to the ensuing highlight reel of ancient medicine that served as his history of the discipline. The real origin of the Galenic medicine that Fuchs sought to reclaim and that dominated in Wittenberg, as elsewhere, was not Galen, but God.

In addition to Genesis, Fuchs cited the book of Sirach, singling out chapter 38 which discusses medicine. His reference echoed Melanchthon, who, in *Oratio de...*  

---

31 Fuchs, *Institutionum medicinae ad Hippocratis Galeni* (Venice, 1555), Sig a1r-v: *Quotquotum unquam a condito mundo vixerunt homines, uno omnes ore, ac consensus medicinae initia Diis immortalibus ascripsurunt. Nam ut a Mose, omnium eorum, qui extant Hebraeo scriptore antiquissimo, artiumque omnium principem, exordiamur; hic certe Geneseseos capite primo, Deum optimum maximum, herbas, stirpes, & arbores fructiferas, itemque; animantia, & alias res universas, quibus in hodiernum usque diem ad tuendam(m) sanitatem & propulsandos morbos utimur, e nihilum con didisse diserte scribit. Mosis verissimi vatis sententiam Iesus Syrach, inter Haebraeos vir singulari pietate, prudentia, varia rerum cognitione, divinioq; praeditus spiritu... Malvimus aute(m) septuaginta citare interpretationem, utpote nobis notiorem, cuius is plane sensus est: Affice medicu(m) suis honoribus, ac praemis, ut necessitate urgente uti illo possis: nam eum creavit dominus. Est enim a supremo medicamenta, & prudent homon non con temmit ea. Cede locum medico, dominus enim illum creavit. Haec ille. Statuendum itaque prorsus erit, medicinam Dei munus esse, in terris missam, ut virium nostrarum imbecillitatem aliquantisuper huius ope susten temus. Ea igitur, quum res poscit, ita utamur, ut agnoscamus non humano consilio, sed divino beneficio vitae prorogandae proposita esse remedia. Non solum vero sacrae literae palam docent Deum & remedia nobis proposuisse, & medicos con didisse, sed etiam prophanae hunc honorem arti nostrae tribuunt. Siquidem Graeci apud quos primum exculta est medicina, Apollinem Deum inventorem, eius fuisset tradunt...  
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**dignitate artis medicinae** extolled medicine and physicians as God’s gift with reference to Sirach, and who included biblical figures like the prophet Isaiah in a list of famous ancient physicians to be revered. In later chapters, I will demonstrate how this reference to Sirach 38 was as popular among the laity as with scholars. It was also a tradition that stretched back for centuries. Lutherans valued the book and continued to turn to it for authoritative advice, even while beginning to dispute its place in the biblical canon. While in academic works like Fuchs’ and Melanchthon’s’ ascribing medicine to God can sound like a *de rigueur* pious preface for traditional Galenic or Aristotelian content, expositions of Sirach 38, especially vernacular ones aimed at a lay audience, were extensive and pointed.

A closer look at the learned references, though, indicates that these were also more than devout verbiage. As I’ll show in more detail shortly, there was a real concern to understand the need for and nature of medicine in light of the Bible or principles within it. It was a pervasive practice, and it was not reserved to Lutheran or Reformed thinkers whose doctrinal confessions loudly proclaimed the principle of *sola scriptura*. In spite of Paracelsus’s polemical protestations to the contrary, he was not innovating

---

when he called for acknowledging the importance of medicine in the Bible, and he hardly had a monopoly on the practice. In fact, part of rejecting Paracelsus was rejecting his interpretation of the biblical account of creation, an account that undergirded his cosmology and his medicine.

In referencing the origins of medicine in Genesis and Sirach, Fuchs and Melanchthon not only sustained a centuries-long tradition, they also point to the “widespread disposition to harmonize Genesis with the findings of science” that Arnold Williams described over half a century ago that stretched far beyond Lutheran circles. In addition, though Genesis played a key role in attempts to correlate scripture and natural philosophy, the Bible as a whole was subject to it. As Ann Blair suggests, in

34 Arnold Williams, The Common Expositor: An Account of the Commentaries on Genesis, 1527-1633 (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1948), 23. “Renaissance authors traced the history of architecture, writing, history, armory, navigation, astronomy—whatever art, science, or culture interested them at the time—to some incident, real or supposed, in the first nine chapters of Genesis. Here was found the starting place for scholarship, secular as well as theological.” (140). Williams’ masterful, but dated, work remains the only overview of the important early modern genre of writings on Genesis. More recent scholarship contains some examples that confirm his argument. For example: Crofton Black, Pico’s Heptaplus and Biblical Hermeneutics, (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2006). As Black describes it, “At the start of each exposition Pico defines a certain body of knowledge: Aristotelian physics, for example, or the angelic metaphysics of Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite. He then proceeds to derive information concerning this body of knowledge from the Genesis narrative, by a process of allegorical reading.” (27). See also: William Poole, The World Makers: Scientists of the Restoration and the Serach for the Origins of the Earth (Oxford: Peter Lang, 2010). Poole takes up mid-late seventeenth-century English authors attempting to harmonize physics, meteorology, and geology with Genesis accounts, summarized in Edward Stillingfleet’s Origines Sacrae: or a Rational Account of the Grounds of the Christian Faith, as the Truth and Divine Authority of the Scriptures (1662).

35 Commentaries on the hexaemera traditionally incorporated a wide variety of material. As Frank Robbins observed, “…the Hexaemeral writers were also consciously or unconsciously under the influences that came from without, from philosophy and science.” Idem, The Hexaemeral Literature: A Study of the Greek and Latin Commentaries, (PhD Dissertation, University of Chicago, 1912), 2. The most famous Hexaemera come from the church fathers (especially Basil of Ceaserea and Ambrose), but it remained a popular genre through the Middle Ages. Some authors—such as Thierry of Chartes and Rupert of Deutz—hazarded interpretations based on current physics. Other notable contributions came from Hugh of Amiens, Gilbert de la Porrée,
the early modern era, everything from physics and medicine to ethics and law was rooted in biblical texts, especially—though not exclusively—Genesis. This is what earned it the nickname “Mosaic physics” from eighteenth-century historians first attempting the history of philosophy, like Johann Jakob Brucker. Authors of these works came from all confessions, from the staunch Calvinists Johann Heinrich Alsted and Otto Casmann, to the Catholics Francisco Valles and Jean Bodin, the Lutheran Kort Asklassøn, and the leader of the Bohemian Brethren Johann Amos Comenius. These authors also came from across the disciplinary spectrum—physicians, theologians, and philosophers all wrote Mosaic physics. In his study of Italian physicians, Andrew Berns highlights as well the pivotal role that Jewish physicians and commentaries on the Torah played. In all, according to Berns, “…in the sixteenth century the number of scholars interested in biblical natural philosophy swelled, and the scope of their


investigations expanded.” This occasioned “… a new approach to the Bible that considered scripture as more than an inerrant source for religious doctrine: it became a mine for valuable scientific and historical material as well.”\textsuperscript{37} Given the long tradition of using and referencing scripture in relationship to natural philosophy and medicine, one hesitates to agree that this was “new,” but Berns correctly identifies it as a significant feature of early modern texts. Indeed, Kevin Killeen and Peter Forshaw contend, “…exegesis was a prominent consideration in attempts to understand the natural world. Exegesis, it could be argued, was one of the crucial cultural activities of the early modern era…for all that such Biblicism has been occluded, by and large, in the historiography of the Scientific Revolution.”\textsuperscript{38}

As seen in chapter one, Melanchthon’s protégé David Chytraeus outlined Plato and Aristotle in his works on \textit{physica}, but emphasized above all, in good \textit{sola Scriptura} Reformation fashion, that the Bible is more reliable than Aristotle. His Danish co-religionist Kort Asklassøn attempted the same. The Calvinist Lambert Daneau, attempted to educe a complete system of natural philosophy from Scripture in his

\textsuperscript{37} Andrew Berns, \textit{The Bible and Natural Philosophy in Renaissance Italy: Jewish and Christian Physicians in Search of Truth} (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 18, 108.
Physica Christiana. Caspar Bartholin attempted to reconcile scientia de anima principally with the first chapters of Genesis in his Manuductio ad veram psychologiam. Robert Boyle, as well, attempted to describe the credibility of the Bible for natural philosophers in his “Essay of the Holy Scriptures.” There was even a “Mosaic Atomism.”

And it was not just physica in the broad sense that early moderns attempted to discern in the pages of Scripture. Scriptural texts highlighted all parts of medicine. Levinus Lemnius penned an herbal based on plants mentioned in the Bible. In an interesting twist on the genre, the Basel theologian Johannes Georg Grossius published a Compendium medicinae to explain basic Galenic medicine to theologians, keying the medical description to biblical references. Nor was this an impulse reserved to Protestants. Early in the seventeenth century, the Catholic physician Guillaume Ader produced an account of diseases in the Gospels, Enarrationes de aegrotis et morbis in

42 Levinus Lemnius, Herbarum atque arborum quae in Bibliis passim obviae sunt et ex quibus sacri vates similitudines desumunt (Antwerp, 1566) Alexandra Walsham notes the “persistence of the conviction that the surface of the landscape bore the marks of the mythical processes described in the Bible…The emergence of Cartesian mechanical philosophy and the Newtonian universe presented significant challenges to traditional cosmology, but, as we shall see, it did not dislodge Scripture from its role as the primary framework within which contemporaries understood the origins and character of the physical environment surrounding them.” Eadem, Reformation of the Landscape: Religion, Identity, and Memory in early modern Britain and Ireland (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 376-377.
Evangelio.\textsuperscript{43} These authors used the biblical text in various ways, some of them interpreting it literally, others using principles from cited passages as a gloss or proof text for their claims. But, as it should be clear by now, in describing Christoph Mueller with reference to the book of Daniel, and by weaving the Bible into his more famous medical work (on which see chapter 4), Horst was no credulous provincial or outlier.

The interpretation of Scripture and the interpretation of the natural world were closely tied to each other, according to James Bono and Peter Harrison. The latter contends there was “...an integrated hermeneutical practice, premised on the principle that the meaning of the words of scripture could not be fully known until the meanings of the objects to which the worlds referred were also known.”\textsuperscript{44} Interpretations of nature in the Middle Ages and into the early modern era reflected the traditional four-fold method of interpretation. Biblical passages could be mined not for exact scientific knowledge (although sometimes this), but were more helpful for deciphering tropological, moral, or allegorical lessons in nature. Melanchthon’s \textit{Commentarius in Genesin} (1523) suggested this approach. He did not advise reading the creation account

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item\textsuperscript{43} Johann Georg Grossius, \textit{Compendium medicinae ex Scriptura Sacra de primitum} (Basel, 1620); Guillaume Ader, \textit{Enarrationes de aegrotis et morbis in Evangelio} (Toulouse, 1621).
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
literally because all creatures and natural things therein should be seen as types or signs.  

But this changed over the course of the early modern period, Harrison suggests. Increasing reliance on literal interpretations of Scripture corresponded to a more literal approach to the natural world, so that approaches to “reading” both special and natural revelation continued to operate on similar principles. As later chapters will show, there was much talk of medicine from the Bible that was explicitly meant to encourage, console, and frame physicians and treatment in religious terms for the laity. Sometimes this took the form of direct prescription based on a literal reading. The practice of learned medicine and natural philosophy included identifying key theological doctrines by which medical or natural philosophical claims needed to be measured. In some cases, it could even stretch to applying descriptions in the Bible directly to medicine.

---


2.2.2 The Fall and the Need for Medicine

Given that the Bible was used in this way, so that a reader could find the origin of medicine in it, the next question is: why is there a need for medicine in the first place? Perhaps the most important set of biblical pericopes employed to address these questions are the ones to which Fuchs adverted at the beginning of Institutionum medicinae: creation and Fall. Adam and Eve were a Renaissance cliché. Their mental and bodily states pre- and post Fall occasioned the spilling of countless gallons of ink, and stories in Genesis could be incorporated into speculation on everything from language to epistemology to anatomy, even to exploration and colonization.47 Any discussion of the state of the human person and natural knowledge—biological or botanical, theological or philosophical—harkened back to Eden, to the beatific state of the first parents before sin and the consequences of the Fall.48 The narratives in Genesis 1-3 anchored any connection between sin and sickness and provided inspiration for utopian plans for recreating Eden on earth, or for reclaiming the perfect wisdom Adam and Eve

47 Peter Harrison argues that important as the Biblical injunction to preach the gospel to all nations was, there was only “an indirect connection” between it and English imperial and colonial expansion. Instead, explorers invoked the command in the Genesis 1 creation account to “Fill the earth and subdue it,” and set about doing this by seeking to acquire more precise botanical, astronomical, and geographical knowledge. See idem, “Fill the Earth and Subdue It:” Biblical Warrants for Colonization in Seventeenth Century England,” Journal of Religious History 29.1 (2005): 3-24, 9. This is similar to Patricia Seed’s depiction of the English in her classic Ceremonies of Possession in Europe’s Conquest of the New World, 1492-1640 (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press,1995). See also: Paul Stevens, “Leviticus Thinking” And the Rhetoric of Early Modern Colonialism,” Criticism 35.3 (1993): 441-461.

had there, and the perfect harmony with nature that they enjoyed. As seen in chapter one with Balthasar Meisner, and as I will point out in Chapter 4 with the work of the Lutheran pastor Christoph Ireaneus, an exposition about Adam and Eve and the deprivations the Fall caused could be very detailed and pointed, whether scholarly or popular. Meisner’s work was a sophisticated Latin theological treatise and Ireaneus’s was a vernacular book. Theological works were not only for theological readers. As the work of Daniel Sennert and Thomas Bartholin I’ll discuss shortly made clear, physicians also read biblical commentaries, and took seriously both their theological


50 Among early modern authors, Williams points out two particularly influential commentaries on Genesis, the Jesuit Benedictus Pererius’ 4 volume Commentariorum et disputationum in Genesin (released sequentially in 1589, 1592, 1595 and 1598, before the first complete edition in 1601) and the Calvinist Hieronymus Zanchius’ De operibus Dei intra spacieum sex dierum creatis opus. (1591). Zanchius labored to reconcile the six days of creation in Genesis with the books in Aristotle’s phsics. Insofar as he discusses Lutherans, Williams limit himself to Luther’s own lengthy comments on Genesis, ignoring the multiple volumes on Genesis that poured from the pens of second and third generation Lutheran theologians. On Luther: Johnnes Schwancke, Creatio ex nihil: Luthers Lehre von der Schöpfung aus dem Nichts in der Grossen Genesisvorlesung (1535-1545) (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2004).

51 They were far from the only authors of such texts. In addition to Meisner, prominent Lutheran theologians Nikolaus Selnecker, David Chytraeus, Aegidius Hunnius, Paul von Eitzen, Georg Fabricius, Simon Musaeus and Johann Gerhard produced commentaries on Genesis. David Chytraeus, In Genesis enarratio (Wittenberg, 1557); Nicholas Selnecker, In Genesin primum librum Mosis (Leipzig, 1569); Paul von Eitzen, Commentariorum in Genesin (Frankfurt Main, 1560); George Fabricius, In primum librum Mosis, sive Genesin commentarius (Strassburg, 1584); Simon Musaeus, Richtig und Reine Auslegung des Ersten Buchs Mosis (Magdeburg, 1576); Aegidius Hunnius, Praelectiones in viginti et unum priora capita Geneseos (Marburg, 1589); Johann Gerhard, Commentarius super Genesin (Jena, 1637); Salomon Gessner oversaw this disputation: Biblica disputatio prima in Genesin, quae Hexaemeron, id est pperia sex diorum examina (Wittenberg, 1595). Also widely-read, though written by a Reformed theologian: Wolfgang Musculus, In Mosis Genesim (Basel, 1554).
claims and the frequent instances when theological commentators ventured to explain physical and medical phenomena.

In paradise, Adam and Eve were at the height of their physical, emotional, spiritual, and intellectual powers—the very image of health. But this changed radically with sin, that brought about both physical illness and decay and corrupted the ability to understand them. “…sacred scripture makes it evident that all types of sickness came after the fall,” remarked Gregor Horst in *De natura humana*, as he attempted to reconcile the theory of seeds (*semina*) of disease with classic authorities and Christian belief in creation. And, Horst emphasized, sin had “calamitous” effects for the entire world. The dire consequences affected everything. After the Fall, literally no body is perfect. This view was ubiquitous. It was not just for theologians pondering the theology of the Fall or of justification or for physicians treating no-longer-perfect bodies prone to sickness. Even artists lamented the aesthetic and epistemological consequences of sin. Albrecht Dürer ruefully observed, “There lives on earth not one beautiful person who could not be more beautiful. There also lives no one who can say or show how the most beautiful form of a person should look.” Dürer attributed all this to the Fall’s effects on

---

human perception. "For the deception is in our cognition, and darkness lies so stubbornly within that our feeble gropings also fail." 53

Caspar Peucer agreed wholeheartedly in his Commentarius. The reason it is hard to “divine,” to discern the ways of God in the world, and thus fully to understand nature is because of the fall. 54 Caspar Bartholin echoed this in his Manuductio:

Knowledge is faulty unless God gives it. 55 Daniel Sennert ruefully acknowledged that the Fall adversely affected the human ability to know nature. The truth, he explained by utilizing a classic formulation, is “adapting ideas in the intellect to things.” While Adam could do this without error before sin, it is quite different for everyone after the Fall. 56

---

54 Peucer, Praecipuis, Sig B1r-v: “Et si retinuisset humanum genus sapientiae divinae radios, quos in primorum parentum animis de sua aeterna luce Deus accenderat, certius & causas multorum eventuum, quos nunc coniecturis prosequimur & explicamus quomodocunque; perspexisse mus & signa, quae in hunc finem condita & ante nostros sunt postia oculos, ut desingant aliquid & moneant homines, intellexissemus. Sed postquam obscuratum est & obfuscatum lumen sapientiae divinae lapsu primorum parentum: factum ut naturam nunc contemplarem habetata mentis acie, ceu solis faciem per densas nubes, aut atras in aere nebulae contuemur. Praeter haec & alia ingentia mala, simul pervasit in miseram atque irae Dei & tristissimis poenis subietam naturam hominum, ut metus perpetuus malorum voce divina denunciatorum…”
55 Caspar Bartholin, Manuductio ad veram psychologiam, as found in Franz Delittsch, System der biblischen Psychologie (Leipig, 1861): “Hinc sufficiens non est rebus luculenter amplexandis atque in luce si praestituendis, imo quae vitam Dei attinent nullam plane lucem habet reliquam, qua sibi eluceant, sed perpetuis mysteriis occulta, arcana et profunda, nullo nisi Dei ipsius spiritu revelari, exponi aut perscrutando exquiri poterunt, qua de re diximus in orationibus nostris de usu rationis humanae in mysteriis divinis.” (27).
56 Sennert, Chymicorum cum Aristotelicis et Galenicis consensu ac dissensu liber in Operum tomus, Vol. 3 (Lyon, 1650), Sig. PPP2v: “Veritatem esse adaequationem notionum, quae su(n)t in intellectu, cu(m) rebus, seu ut habet, lib. 1, de re Poetica c. 1. aequationem orationis cum re. Omnis enim cognitione & scientia naturalis eatenus vera est, quatenus cu(m) rebus co(n)sentit. Res enim mensurant cognitione(m) nostra(m), non contra: neque quia nos ita cogitamus, res ita se habent, sed quia sic se habent, ita eas cognoscimus, cum recte cognoscimus. Cu(m) vero notionis rerum omni(m), adeoque scie(n)tiam rerum naturalium nobis infrim non habeamus; aliunde nobis eam advenire necesse est. Etsi enim Adamo ea inerat rerum ante lapsum
Even with all these limitations, though, the mind was the place the image of God manifested itself.57

2.2.3 Sennert on the Bible and Chymistry

Sennert’s concession about the bounds of human knowledge appears in the work of his that featured the most discussions of the image of God and the Bible: *Consensu ac dissensu*. He used the biblical text in different ways in various chapters throughout the work. In the first place, he referred to biblical characters and events to ground his history of the art of chymistry. In the second, he expatiated on principles about the image of God and the goodness of creation from Genesis that Paracelsianism contradicted.

Since the origin of every art or science could (or should) be found in scripture, Sennert took up that topic in Chapter 3 of the book, after defending the importance and acceptability of chymistry. (Though not, as he wryly noted, all its practitioners—beware anyone who wants money for doing chymistry). Only then did he turn to his refutation of Paracelsus. The logic is unmistakable. Part of defending the importance and admissibility of “chymistry” while refuting Paracelsian impieties is demonstrating that

57 Sennert, *Consensu ac dissensu*, Sig. PPlv: “Capite vero, in quo mens residet, & e quo omnes sensus originem suam habent, non solum mundo illi supercoelesti seu angelico, ut alii appellant, similis est, sed etiam in hac parte imago Dei in homine & olim ante lapsum, & quae sunt eius reliquae post lapsum, se inprimis co(n)spiciendas exhibent.”
one interprets Scripture correctly and that one can identify the true foundation of the art. Sorting through a series of hypotheses about the origins of chymistry make it clear Sennert had read a considerable number of accounts adducing chymistry from different passages of scripture. Given all that I’ve said so far about reliance on the Bible, this is unsurprising. Allen Debus, Michael Walton, Peter Forshaw, Georgiana D. Hedesan, and Didier Kahn have all identified the centrality of the creation account to Paracelsus and spagyric thinkers working in his wake.⁵⁸ Even here, Paracelsus was perhaps not as innovative as he thought. A reader would have found interpretations of the Genesis account resembling his in various ways in Marsilio Ficino, Pico della Mirandola, and Agrippa von Nettesheim. It all highlights the significance of Sennert’s decision to

---

include a biblically-based account of the history of the art of chymistry, along with frequent discussion of theological principles from the creation narrative.

Sennert did not dispute the fundamental point that chymistry and medicine may be found in the words of scripture. Instead, he focused on incorporating biblical examples into his historical narrative of the development art, identifying the first person to use the art, and then describing various other scriptural passages from which one either could or could not adduce chymistry. Throughout the chapter, he included all that he considered most significant for the history of the art. This required interweaving biblical stories and figures with non-Christians such as Hermes Trismegistus, Jason and the Argonauts, Diocletian, and medieval Arabic commentators and physicians. He included them in chronological order, matching biblical and non-biblical figures he believed to be contemporaries. To achieve this, and critically to examine claims made about chymistry found in biblical texts, he referenced medical colleagues like Andreas Libavius and Thomas Erastus, ancient historians like Heliodorus, and even medieval theologians and commentaries like Nicholas of Lyra and the Glossa ordinaria.

Sennert commenced by assessing whether Adam and Eve’s perfect knowledge of the world included chymistry. He attributed the art to Cain, in direct reference to

59 Daniel Sennert, Consensu ac Dissensu, Sig. Ooo1v: “Nonnulli contra ut Chymiam ut plane antiquam esse demonstrenst, inventionem eius ad Adamum primum generis humani parentem referunt, eumque eius primum magistrum fuisse, Vincentium Bellovacum statuisse, refert Ioh. Picus Mirandul. Lib. 3. De Auro cap. 1. Cum enim Adamus Philosophiam suos docuerit, & alias artes; probabile esse existima(n)t, nec
Genesis 4:2, which refers to him as a master of the ground. The other principal founder of the art—Hermes—lived at the time of Noah and likely listened to him preach. As for others who did or did not practice it, it is absurd to think that the patriarchs who pleased God with fires on the altar were practicing chymistry. Some said Moses had to have some knowledge of the art to destroy the golden calf. Here, Sennert remained unconvinced, notwithstanding what he read in the Glossa ordinaria or Nicholas of Lyra about the beards of Israelite men turning gold after they drank the water in which Moses mixed the destroyed idol’s dust. Nor was he convinced by the story of Ezra making golden cups. Of course, “…nobody doubts (Solomon) was the wisest mortal
who ever lived, whose library written on natural things, if it survived, would easily surpass (that of) the Greeks and Arabs.” Since his library did not survive, one could logically surmise, but not prove, that he was a chymist. As he carefully worked through the accounts, Sennert made it clear that he would not abide people who produced tortured interpretations to give their art a biblical foundation or precedent. In addition to discounting various attempts to identify practitioners of the art in the Bible, he subjected to withering ridicule those who produced technical interpretations of Song of Songs, by reading descriptions therein as allegories for alchemical processes.

__________

isto insectareis dolorum & inflatione ventris. Pariebar, per qua(m) ab innocentibus discernedebatur, quib. dulce saporem exhibebat. Quae si ita se habent, de quibus tamen sacrae litterae nihil testantur, res procul dubio miraculosa fuit. Verum est; absit miraculum: an tamen Mosen Chymicum fuisse hinc probari possit, dubito…. Sig Ooo2v: “Quare nec illud, quod Esdrae. I c.8.v. 25 & seq habetur pro antiquitate Chymiae facile produxero… Ex quo loco nonnulli colligunt, cum inter tot aurea pocula vix duo illius eris inter donaria reperta sint, rarum & pretiosum iduisse aes, & vulgarii auro pretiosius, & pretiosum iduisse aes, & vulgarri auro pretiosius & forsane Chrymica confectum. Verum Aristoteles, in mirabilih. auscult. retert, apud Indos aes adeo splendidum, purum, sincerumque reperiri, ut colore & specie nequaquam ab auro discerni queat: Inde & inter Darii pocula quaedam fuisset, qua, nisi olfactus iudicio ab auro distare, non cognoscenetur. Quid si haec ipsa pocula essent ea, de quibus Esdras loquitur?”

64 Sennert, Consensus ac dissensu, Sig Ooo2v: “Salomonem postea Regum omnium, imo mortalium sapientissim(m) fuisset nemo est, qui dubitat: cuius libarii de natura rerum scripti si superessent, facile Graecorum & Abrabum scripta superarent. An aute(m) in specie Chymia calluerit vel excollerit, sine absurditate quidem affirmari potest; sed tamen nullo etiam evidenti documenti probatur. Nam quod vulgo quidam Chymici afferunt, eum immensas illas, quibus abundavit, opes, arte Chymica acquisivisse, id nulla probabilitate nititur: cum sacrae literae modum, quo illas divitias acquisiverit, explicent. Nam, I. Regum c. 10 clare scribunt, Classem Salomonis cum classe Regis Hiram ex Ophir aurum attulisse, & ibide(m) narrator, quod pondus aurii, quod singulis annis Salomoni obtigit & allatum fuit, fuisset sexcentorum & sexaginta sex talentorum, sine eo, quod Mercatores & Reges Arabiae attulerunt & transmiserunt.”

65 Sennert, Consensus ac dissensu, Sig Ooo2v: “Ridiculum vero est, quod quidam in Cantico Canticorum artificium Chymicu(m) latere existimant, & per Sponsum Rege(m) sive Aurum; per sponsam Reginam sive Argentum, quae duo in arte coniungantur, seq(ue); amplexentur, intelligendum consent; & cum diciur: Nigra sum, sed Formosa, caput corvi intelligendu(m) putant, quod foris nigrum sit, intus aute(m) summis divitias pleno(m); per Turturis collum varietatem coloru(m) & panonis caudam(m) explicant; per Hiemem te(m)pus putrefactionis; per imbrem, imbitionem; per Flores & rosas albas & rubras colorem aureum &
So much for the history of the art. The core concern in *Consensu ac dissensu* was not to give a history of the practice, but to explore the permissibility and utility of chymistry, and whether or not it necessarily required abandoning traditional authorities. This meant Galen first, but also the Bible. His effort at reconciling Galen and Paracelsus saw Sennert focus on identifying the ways in which Galenic and Paracelsian systems operated with some similar principles, though sometimes employed different terms. This led him to accuse Paracelsians of the classic scholarly sin of overcomplicating things by inventing technical-sounding words they could not define for the sake of sounding innovative. He commenced chapter 5 with a sarcastic expostulation that one could read 600 and more never-before-used words in Paracelsian texts that none of the practitioners could clearly define. As part of his effort at reconciliation, he sought to disambiguate a series of spagyric terms and tenets and match them with corresponding notions in other physicians and philosophers, including *archaeus, astra*, and *semina*. For example, Sennert saw *archaeus* as substantially the same as Aristotelian faculties or *album* in Lapide; per amissione diletci, Auri occultationem intelligere, & nomenclationum novitate aliquam sapientiae laudem captare. Hinc libros suos inscrisit Paracelsus Paragranum, Paramirum: apud eundum occurrint saepe Ens Pagoycum, Cagastricum, Iliastrum, Archaeus, Relolleum, Cheronium, Evestrum, Ylech, Trarames, Turban, Lessas, Sranar, Perenda, Zenda; & sexcenta alia nova & omnibus seculis inaudita vocabula, & talia omnino, ut ad quam linguam pertineant, & cuius originis sint, nemo sectatorum Paracelsi adhuc explicare potuerit…

---

*Sennert, Consensu ac dissensu*, Sig PPp1v: “Principio autem id non praetereundu(m), Sectae huius proprium esse nominibus ludere, & nomenclationum novitiate aliquam sapientiae laudem captare. Hinc libros suos inscrisit Paracelsus Paragranum, Paramirum: apud eundum occurrint saepe Ens Pagoycum, Cagastricum, Iliastrum, Archaeus, Relolleum, Cheronium, Evestrum, Ylech, Trarames, Turban, Lessas, Sranar, Perenda, Zenda; & sexcenta alia nova & omnibus seculis inaudita vocabula, & talia omnino, ut ad quam linguam pertineant, & cuius originis sint, nemo sectatorum Paracelsi adhuc explicare potuerit…”
Galenic spirits, while *semina* was really just an old fashioned Form.67 Lurking in the dense combination of scholastic terminology and critical evaluation of Paracelsus was Sennert’s argument about mixtures and reduction of elements to pristine state.68

For all his interest in the practice of chymistry and synthesizing the useful lessons from spagyric works with Galenism to reform the practice of medicine in his day, Sennert identified some problems with Paracelsianism and its founder. If the art of chymistry were to be saved, it had to be dissociated from certain heretical views. To do this, they had to be clearly identified and rejected. Like almost all established academics in his day, Sennert devoted a lengthy chapter to assailing Paracelsus for a dissolute life, characterized by impiety, pride, and serial drunkenness. But beyond these fairly standard personal attacks, for Sennert, a central point of concern about Paracelsianism was the extent to which it jibed with teaching in Genesis about the image of God in the human being and the goodness of God and His creation. Problems with Paracelsus and his interpreters like Petrus Severinus, according to Sennert, began when their doctrines exceeded the bounds of chymistry or natural philosophy and trespassed into theology, with no regard for the core Christian doctrines compromised in the process.

67 Sennert, *Consensu ac dissensu*, PPp2r: “Ita Paracelsus, a quo ista hausit Severinus, saepe res antiquas novis nominibus appellat…Qua necessitate adductus Paracelsus vocabulu(m) Archaei introduxit; cum si rem diligenter perpendamus, nihil aliud istud vocabulu(m) significer, quam quod in Scholis Philsophoru(m) & Medicorum facultatem & virtutem, naturale(m), aut, si mavis, spiritum naturale(m) facultatis naturalis ministru(m), nominamus.” Sig QQq2r-v: “Ista autem omnia, quae de Seminibus & Astris a Severino inprimis cap 6. & atq(ue); aliis Chymicis ex eo traduntur, si in genere species, nova non sunt, sed vulgatam de formis, inprimis viventium, quae Animae dicuntur, doctrinam continent.”

Therefore, as he worked through Paracelsian philosophy and pointed out similarities and differences with traditional medicine and natural philosophy, Sennert also pointed out places where he believed that Paracelsus or his followers transgressed against orthodox Christian doctrines. These centered primarily on the doctrine of creation, the account of Adam and Eve and the Fall, the goodness of the human body, the Incarnation, and the image of God. The critique began in chapter 4, as Sennert wrapped up his colorful account of Paracelsus’s debauched life and began to consider his ideas. The Wittenberg professor’s core concerns immediately evinced themselves: the doctrine of creation and the nature of human bodies.

Regarding the creation of bodies, Paracelsus famously asserted that Adam and Eve had no genitalia before the Fall; human sexual organs and the process of reproduction are a result of sin. For that matter, so are teeth and the need to eat. Further, Paracelsus postulated that it might be possible for someone to produce a “homunculus,” creating a human body simply by mixing together the appropriate elements. (This accounts for the existence of pygmies and giants and explains how islands distant from Adam and Eve may have been populated by spontaneous generation). All this was bad enough, but spagyrics then proceeded to claim that the body that Christ assumed at the Incarnation was not the same as those of human bodies after the Fall. Indeed, neither Christ nor Mary had the same sort of flesh as Adam. In fact, Sennert concluded at the end of a long paragraph, there were so many bizarre claims about Adam, Eve, Mary,
and Christ that it was not worth the effort to recount them all. Some went even farther, to claim that God created two kinds of bodies: those like Christ’s that did not die, and those like Adam’s, that did. In fact, God created death. These claims could in no way be reconciled with Christian doctrine. They called into question the possibility of salvation, radically challenged the goodness of God’s creation of human bodies, and rendered the resurrection of the flesh impossible. They also rested on a view of the biblical text that did not see it as perspicuous. Paracelsian interpretations suggested one must have special illumination to make out the true meaning, since, among other things, Moses did not mention elements central to Paracelsian doctrine.

---

69 Sennert, Consensu ac dissensu, Ooo5v, 718: “Ex his ergo satis patet, eum plurima absurda statuiisse. An vero impia dogmata non sparsit, ex his patebit. Lib. 1. De rerum natura generatione docet & modum quoque proponit, quo sine patre & matre, artis Chymicae beneficio, homunculus generetur; atque hoc secretum maximum esse dicit, quod tamen iam olim Pygmaeis & Gigantibus non incognitum fuerit, utpote qui talem originem habuerint. Nam ex talibus homunculus, ubi ad virile aetatem pervenerint, fieri Pygmaeos & Gigantes. Atque tales omnia arcana scire, que ali homines ignorant. Nam cum arte vitam & corpus accepit, artem & scientias ipsas illas connatas esse, nec opus habere, ut eas discant. Quae de generatione stultorum & eorum fabris scripserit, in peculiari de ea re libro, ut modo dictum, legat, qui volet. Lib. i. Philosophiae Sagacis cap. 2. Statuit, homines in novis Insulis non esse procreates ex Adamo nostro primo parente, neque nobis sanguine coniunctos, sed ab alio quodam Adamo progenitos esse. Cuius notae sint ea, quae in libro Azoth seu de Ligno & Linea vitae, habet, cuilibet sine affecti iudicanti considerandum & iudicandum permittimus. Ut alia omittamus, scribit, eius libri cap 2. Paracelsus, Adamum & Evam ante lapsum non habuisse testes, renes, & uterum, & omnino membra genitalia, sed ea post lapsam accepisse...imo nec me(m)bra nutritioni dicata, nec dentes habuisse concedit, hominesque post lapsam pro monstruo habet, & conceptionem humanam, que post lapsam sit, monstrasom appellat. Ibidem, Christum non assumisse corpus, quale primi parentes habuerint, & nos post lapsam habemus, sed corpus suum per Spiritum Sanctum ex caelesti Aquastro accepisse. Verba Jehovae: Non est bonum, hominem esse solum, faciamus ei adiutorem. In fine, dicit, Deum mortem creasse. Pagine seq. explicans locum Jobi, in carne mea videbo Deum meum, duo genera carnis in terra constituit, unum ex Adamo, alterum ex nova nativitate per Christum.”

70 Sennert, Consensu ac dissensu, Sig O0o5v, “Mira quoque de morte & resurrectione mortuorum habet, Philosophiae Sagacis, lib. 2. Cap. 1. P. 432. In fine, dicit, Deum mortem creasse. Pagine seq. explicans locum Jobi, in carne mea videbo Deum meum, duo genera carnis in terra constituit, unum ex Adamo, alterum ex nova nativitate per Christum.”

71 Sennert, Consensu ac dissensu, Sig O0o5v: “Neque ista, quasi ex Mose hausta sint, palliare potest: cum talia in Mose non exstent; Mosi etiam in physicis parum, & vix plus, quam Galenus tribuat. Ita enim de eo scribit,
In the same vein, Sennert fulminated over even more theologically questionable views about human beings and creation that were inherent in Paracelsian thought. First, Paracelsus argued in neo-Platonic terms that the human being is a microcosm of the world. This is false, according to Sennert. Genesis shows that man is in the image of God not, as Paracelsus contended, in the image of the world. Second, like Thomas Erastus upon whose critique he drew, Sennert argued that the contention that seminal forces in the universe were divided between evil and good amounted to Manichaeism. It posited two balanced powers and failed to recognize the supreme power of God. Calling on Augustine’s refutation of Manichaeism, Sennert reasoned that the Paracelsian-Severinian doctrine of semina also suggested that the seeds were evil in substance. This would make God, who created all substances and all semina, responsible for the bad in the world. It betrayed a deep misunderstanding of evil as deprivation of good, and the devil as the creature who introduced it. What is more, it disregarded the biblical

---

in sine allegati libri: Moses donum intelligentiae particulariter habuit, non totum. Nihil enim scribit de proprietate, qualitate, prima materia limbi aeterni & limbi elementorum, sed saltem de materia terrae, e qua homo; & tamen saltem una parte: trium partium, Aëris, Aquae, Ignis non facit mentionem. Non enim Moses fuit Physicus, sed a Deo vocatus, ut esset Dux sui populi. Ideoque eius descriptione Laicus plane obscura est: & Physicus valde infirmis fundamentis niteretur, si textui Mosis sine explicatione fidem haberet, imo rem ridiculum ageret.”

72 Sennert, Consensu ac dissensu, Sig. Vvv6v: “Creationum vero hominis quod attinet, in ea describenda Crollius est temerarius. Sacrae literae nos docent, hominem formatum fuisset e limo & pulvere terrae: at quod ills pulvis quinta essentia totius mundi & materiam machina vires extraheret, & homini inderet. Deusque sua infinita potentia hominem creavit, eique vires, quas voluit, indidit; non necesse habuit, ut Spargyrica arte e tota mundi machina vires extraheret, et homini inderet. Hominem etiam ad sui imaginem a Deo factum legimus, non ad imaginem mundi.”
account’s clear statement that God rested on the seventh day, and creation was complete. He did not create new, morbid semina after the Fall, because He did not create anything at all after the sixth day. This third, by making evil a part of the structure or substance of things, it smacked of determinism, by calling into question man’s free will and free choice of sin. This again made God out to be responsible for evil and undermined the message of salvation through Christ. Those who critiqued the

73 Sennert, De consensus ac dissensu, Sig. Xxx3r: “Deinde duplicem faciunt creationem, priorem, quae benedictione & sex dierum spatio perficitur: alteram, iam diebus sex elapsis, post hominis lapsum, qua maledictione Dei rerum puris seminibus & radicips radices malae vel tincturae morborum & mortis autores concreatae & additae sint: cum tamen litterae sacre expresse testentur, Deum die septimo quiesisse ab omni opera, & nihil amplius creasse. Et maledictio Dei tantum poenam indicavit, non vero naturam pravam induxit.”


goodness of the elements in this way made clear how fundamentally Paracelsians questioned the goodness of God and His creation.⁷⁶ In all, when it passed from chymical arts to cosmological and theological claims, Paracelsus’s “pseudochymia” constituted a false religion, that set out to reform not just medicine, but theology and philosophy. In so doing, it postulated outrageous things about God’s creation and creatures.⁷⁷ Like many questionable self-appointed prophets, it required unverifiable and dubious claims of direct revelation from God.⁷⁸

---

substantia, quatenus talis, est bona. Cui malum non consubstantialiter, sed accidentaliter solum inhaeret. Unde idem Augustinus, de civitate Dei, lib. 14. Cap. 11. Scribit: Mala sine bonis esse non possunt; quia naturae, in quibus sunt, in quantum naturae sunt, utique bonae sunt. Detrahitur porro malum, non aliqua natura, quae accesserat, vel ulla eius parte subjacta, sed ea quae vitiata ac depravata fuerat, sanata atque correcta.”

⁷⁶ Sennert, Consensu ac dissensu, Sig Ppp6v: “Praetera non video, quomodo tolerari possit, quod nonnulli Recentiores Elementis, quae aeque, ut aliae res naturales, Dei creaturae sunt, ita iniqui sunt, & illa vilia ac servilia pecora appellant. Cedunt etsi in ignominiam Natura, & Authoris Natura Dei, qui vidit omnia, quae fecerat, & errant valde bona. Et propterea in Elementa, quae etiam inter Creaturas Dei sunt, in quibus is suam omnipotentiam, sapientiam & bonitatem declaravit, & sine quibus ne momento vivere possimus, ita iocari non docet. Serviunt Deo & hominibus, & omnibus Creaturis sublunaris, atque eo nomine non vituperanda, sed laudanda sunt; qua in re nobis praestet Psal. 114, qui laudat Deum, quod omnia in Sapientia fecerit, atque inter ea etiam Elementa.”

⁷⁷ Sennert, Consensu ac dissensu, PPp2v: “Habet ita Pseudochymia sua(m) velut peculiarem religionem. Nam quia Philosophiam & Medicinam omnem sive reformasse, sive perfecisse se putant, in Philosophia non subsistunt, sed ad Theologiam etiam progregiuntur, & res sacras profanes, profana sacris miscent. Hac elegantia harmonia quicquid volunt absurdi adstruunt(n), & de beatorum regno, & angelis, & miraculis, de fide, de resurrectione & mirifice arguantur, & tanto licentiosius, quanto verbi divini consensus nihil opus habent, sed dixisse vel somniasse inter credulos suos abunde sufficit. Nam qui hoc impetrarunt, ut credantur interno lumine splendescere, iis facilius est, suum illum hiamtem curisoumque gregem verbis insoluts pascere, cui hoc unum plausibile, credere incredibilia, scire incerta, possidere lubrica, affirmare paradoxo, iactare(ue); impossibilita; tantaque obsequie promptitudo est, ut uno mense ab uno impostrum plus persuasum, quam a Christo multisannis impetratum, aut ministri eius creditum, liquido deprehensum sit.”

⁷⁸ Sennert, Consensu ac dissensu, PPp2v, 724: “Ideoque quicquid sciant homines, vel immediate a Deo per peculiariam revelationem & illuminationem ipsis communicatur, vel alio modo, ut iam dictur, discitur. Peculiarem illuminationem cum secta Paracelsica nec sibi ut propriae arrogare ausit, nec eam ipsi
In *Consensu ac dissensu*, the pivotal role that the biblical account of creation, fall, and human nature played in understanding nature of the body and and the universe, and in evaluating conflicting natural philosophical and medical claims about these things is patent. While open to reforming medicine, and incorporating chemical arts into it, Sennert made it clear that this must be done in accordance with correct doctrine about God and creation, as revealed in scripture. His critical appraisal of Paracelsian contentions about the universe and the human body make evident his training in the Wittenberg system of thought about natural philosophy and theology.

### 2.2.4 Thomas Bartholin on Diseases in the Bible

But how closely can one mine the biblical text for natural philosophical meaning? Do biblical pericopes include anything suggesting that they are reliable sources of information for medical treatments for the body? On these questions, Lutheran thinkers provided some different answers. Sennert’s work reveals how the Bible could contribute both to the history of the practical art of chymistry and provide important theological claims by which to measure natural philosophical and medical theories about the human body, human nature, and the world. Thomas Bartholin’s work, by contrast, shows a presumption of literal reliability in biblical descriptions of disease and

---

concedere possimus: reliquorum hominum more discant necesse est, & ex rebus ipsis cognitionem hauriant.”
treatment. As he evaluated the two side-by-side, Bartholin’s work worked to demonstrate how the Bible accorded perfectly with contemporary medical theory. Though they shared much on the surface, including the resort to the Bible in discussion of medicine, these are two different ways of interpreting the text. Sennert evaluated things outside the biblical text by it, even mocking those who might try to push an interpretation too far in an effort to derive medical knowledge from passing comments in scripture; Bartholin assessed biblical accounts of disease by things outside the text, to prove its reliability in even the smallest details.

Caspar Bartholin’s son Thomas inherited his father’s intellectual gifts and his interest in scripture. (On Caspar Bartholin and the Bible, see chapter three). Over the course of his career, Thomas wrote a series of texts in which he combined biblical pericopes and current medical teaching either retrospectively to diagnose diseases and assess cures described in the Bible, or to offer anatomically detailed meditations on the placement and depth of the wounds in Christ’s body.\(^7\) This started with a study on the

---

\(^7\) Thomas Bartholin, son of Caspar Bartholin, was a cosmopolitan, polymath, and famous professor of anatomy at the university of Copenhagen from 1648 to 1660. His educational journey through most of Europe’s major medical faculties started at Leiden, where he stayed from 1637 to 1640. His teacher in Leiden, Jan Waleaus, happened to be undertaking the anatomical experiments that converted him from loud skepticism to loud faith in William Harvey’s writings on the circulation of the blood at the same time that young Thomas was studying with him. Convinced mostly (not entirely) along with his teacher, the younger Bartholin re-issued his father’s anatomy textbook (the famous Institutiones anatomicae discussed in chapter one of this dissertation), including an appendix advancing Harvey’s findings—the first textbook on the continent officially to espouse the circulation of the blood. Sharing his father’s somewhat eclectic interests, he also revised his father’s work on the medical uses of unicorns (Caspar Bartholin, Thomae Bartholini De unicornu observationes novae, secunda edition auctores & emendatores editae a filio, Amsterdam, 1678). As a professor of anatomy in Copenhagen from 1646-1660, the younger Bartholin’s prolific writing and his
wounds of Christ (1646), and moved on to studies of paralytics in the New Testament and the crucifixion of Christ. Finally, urged on, he over-modestly claimed, by a publisher who saw the profit potential based on how popular his study of New Testament paralytics was, Bartholin “threw (a/this) miscellany onto paper faster than one cooks asparagus.” It was a final contribution to the genre: De morbis biblicis: miscellanea medica.50

The small, fast-paced book advanced through biblical pericopes systematically from beginning to end, starting in Genesis and ending in the New Testament, giving short accounts of each. It kicked off with Adam’s sleep and the extraction of his rib—traditionally regarded as a divine mandate for surgeons—but for Bartholin, more interesting as a rumination on the difference between lethargy and ecstasy. It then proceeded through various colorful Old Testament accounts of disease, some rather spectacular skill as an anatomist made him famous, especially when he proved the reality of the lymphatic system, whose existence before had merely been postulated.

50 Thomas Bartholin, De latere Christi aperto dissertatio (Leiden, 1646); idem, De cruce Christi Hypommemata IV (Copenhagen, 1651); idem, Paralytici Novi Testamenti medico et philologico commentario illustrati (Basel, 1662); idem, De morbis biblicis miscellanea medica (Frankfurt, 1672). There is translation of Bartholin’s De morbis biblicis: On Diseases in the Bible, a Medical Miscellany, 1672, trans. James Willis, ed. Johan Schioldann-Nielsen and Kurt Sørensen (Copenhagen: The Danish National Library of Science and Medicine, 1994). I reference translations from this critical edition, and provide Latin citations from the original. “Letter to the reader,” Unpaginated: “Aliud agentem ad has pagellas compulit Bibliopola noster. Oppertune tamen. Cum enim Opuscula sacra hactenus dispersa, uno fasciculo juncta in lucem proferre animus esset, & de Paralyticis N. T. olim me quaedam esse commentatum haud ignoraret, rogavit, de coeteris quoque morbis in sacro Cadice, si quid haberem, bono publico ne in viderem, ut conspectitus & majori prompta prodiret Volumen, quod propediem est adornaturus. Arrepto calamo Miscellanea haec situs in chartam conjeci quam coquantur asparagi, quae additamenta esse possunt eorum quae de Paralyticis repetitione Hasniensium & Basileensium praelo commissa benigna exceptisti.”
unpredictable, such as Lot’s wife turning into a pillar of salt, and an indulgent digression on nose-rings in the Old Testament. He then moved on to consider several of Christ’s healing miracles and the apostle Paul’s thorn in the flesh. The book concluded with remarks on healing oils as used in the early church.

As for a guiding medical method, at first read, the book seems to lack one. Bartholin unabashedly mixed together humoral theory, speculation on the possible influence of the Devil over humors and their imbalance and his own reading and empirical research on the circulation of bodily fluids in the lymphatic and circulatory systems. Yet, each account has two principal concerns that are rather different than Sennert’s use of the Bible for theoretical purposes. Bartholin sought to assess the disease recounted in the biblical text, then to assess the treatment in order to demonstrate how the Bible accurately described care for the body. Achieving these goals induced Bartholin to combine ancient and contemporary medical opinions, folk tales, personal experience (at times sounding downright gossipy), and almost pedantic philological parsing of words (showing off his command of Hebrew). It is clear that his notoriously large personal library was well-used. The citations in the text come from wide variety of commentators, from ancient authorities like Galen and Hippocrates to Daniel

---

81 Bartholin, De morbisbiblicis, “De annulisnarium” (E2r-E5v). Thomas Bartholin also wrote on bracelets: De armillis veterum (Copenhagen, 1647). His father Caspar wrote on amulets [Caspar Bartholin, De lapide nephriticopusculum, cum præcipuis ad plerosq[ue] morbos Amuletis (1628)].
82 He is said to have assembled a personal library so big that it trumped the local university library, until it (alas!) burned down. This prompted a lengthy and desolate disquisition addressed to his sons, De bibliothecae incendiodissertatio ad filios (Copenhagen, 1670).
Sennert to contemporary Catholic theologians. Bartholin believed this allowed him to establish both what a biblical character suffered and the various sorts of treatment described in the text. Like Sennert, he played medical and theological thinkers and commentators off one another, but with the goal of showing how the biblical text accorded with (early) modern medicine.

To appreciate Bartholin’s method, consider his account of Job and his ulcers. Bartholin devoted three-quarters of the discussion to narrowing down the correct diagnosis, by lining others’ opinions up and systematically refuting them. He began his analysis of Job by curtly dismissing Stephanus Rodericus Castrensis, who attributed Job’s disease to anxiety. Then he moved on to take issue, in great detail, with the famous Jesuit theologian Juan de Pineda’s opinion that Job had syphilis.83

According to Bartholin, Pineda took several wrong steps. First, and most importantly, he ignored clear biblical signs that it could not be syphilis, and this Bartholin based on the exact words in the biblical text. Pineda’s reasoning, he said, is


196
“...contrary to God’s concession to Satan, which extended to ordinary kinds of disease, not to such as bring disgrace. Job lived a chaste and God-fearing life, with no base or illicit lust to bring him ill repute.”

In addition to ignoring the biblical text, Pineda disregarded expert academic medical opinions. Bartholin contended that the weight of scholarly opinion agreed that the disease (syphilis) was not even known in biblical times. Here, Bartholin proffered the example of Vallesius and Reusnerus’ interpretations of Hippocrates that purported to find syphilis in the ancient physician. Daniel Sennert decisively refuted these opinions, according to Bartholin, because he proved by closely examining the symptoms that Hippocrates described that the disease must have been plague, not syphilis. Finally, Bartholin charged, Pineda compounded all of these errors by attempting to save appearances, and claiming that the devil might have copped a syphilis that looked like plague, and indeed, one that could have infected Job without any intercourse. This is patently ridiculous, scoffed Bartholin. The Devil has limited powers, and can only make do with a person’s given humors and temperament; he cannot change them drastically. Job simply did not have the humoral disposition for it.

84 Bartholin, *De morbis biblicis*, Sig: B7r: “Ita quidem de optimo Castissimoque Viro Pineda ratiocinator, praeter rationem divinae indulgentiae, quae ad honesta se extendit, non ignominiosa morborum genera. Castus fuerat Vir sanctissimus, nec uilla prava concupiscentia aut illicita, meruit sinistram famam.”

85 Bartholin, *De morbis biblicis*, Sig: B7r- B7v: “Neque isto Jobi seculo turpissimum hoc morbi genus inter mortales innotuit. Quippe loco illo Hippocratis 3. Epid. Sect. 3. quem Vallesius & Reusnerus pro antiquitate huius luis afferunt, pestilentiam longe gravissimmam describi recte cum Galeno alisque Interpretibus defendit diligentissimus Senneruts l.6. Prax. Part. 4.c.i. ex ipsa historiae evidentia. Nam morbus ille ut plurimum cum febre invasit, quod non accidit in lue Venerea: & fuit epidemius, cum lues Venerea saltam per contagium, & nullo alio modo fuerit disseminata; longe etiam alia ratio morbi illius, quam luis Venereae curandae fuerit. Audet tamen Pineda de Jobo affirmate potuisse hoc morbo laborare, nam Daemonis arte potuit ad eiusmodi
(This emphasis on the limited power of the Devil to change the course of nature or afflict the body will come up again shortly in Sennert’s discussion occult diseases).

Having dispatched with Pineda, Bartholin moved on to consider a more common opinion that Job had elephantiasis. Again, a close philological examination of the biblical text grounded his objection. The text describes Job’s malady as “ulcer,” which is hardly the same thing. This makes the diagnosis clear: if, as the text clearly states, Job had an ulcer, than Job had a particular kind: a Syrian ulcer. First of all, Job lived in the right place for it. Second, Job had all the right symptoms. Once more, Bartholin relied on a literal parsing of the Biblical text, lining up what Job says or is said of him with what experts know of the disease. In one lament, Job complained that he felt that he was being strangled. That makes it clear, according to Bartholin, that he must have had the very sore throat known to mark the beginning of the disease. Another verse includes the claim that his bones felt like they were drying up? Obviously, that’s because Syrian ulcer brings high fevers.87


87 Bartholin, De morbis biblicis, Sig C1r-v: “Quid si de Ulcer syriaco cogitemus? Ulcera tonsillarum maligna Aegyptiaca & syriaca appellate describit accurate Arctaeus lib. 1 de Caus. & sign Accut. Morb. C. 9. cuius...
Finally, to the treatment. Would the ashes that Job applied to himself, according to the biblical text, actually have done anything? Would they have been at least palliative, if not curative? Yes, claimed Bartholin, absolutely so. Ashes were a medicament known to antiquity, and Rabbinic commentaries attested to their efficacy, as did Dioscorides and Galen. There was one last problem, though. Syrian ulcer is generally an acute disease, and Job’s case was clearly chronic. Bartholin stood ready with an explanation: “Job’s balanced temper, the thicker and colder humours being increased by his mental suffering, his age being mature and declining towards the frigid,


slowed down the acute fits of the disease and the Evil One made his own contribution in accommodating the disease to Job’s temper, so as to keep him longer in torment.”

In contrast to Pineda, Bartholin claimed to have landed on a diagnosis in line with the patient’s age, humoral disposition, medical authority, and description of the symptoms in the biblical text. Though the Devil can, in fact, intervene in disease, his influence is constrained by God’s providential ordering of nature—he cannot run roughshod. In a similar way, in other chapters, Bartholin made it clear that just as the Devil could intervene in disease, but within limits, so God made certain treatments more effective. A combination of natural and supernatural power is most effective when the treatment prescribed aligns with medical authorities and experience.

Bartholin’s work evinced his confidence that even passing comments in the biblical text can be made to line up with what physicians thought to be true about treating the body. While his literal reading and parsing might augur, or at least open the way for, later biblical criticism, this developed in the seventeenth century as slowly as Galenism simultaneously declined. One need only point, in closing, to the work of Christian Warlitz, professor of medicine in Wittenberg at the turn of the eighteenth century and personal physician of Sophia Margarethe von Anhalt-Dessau. Warlitz wrote

---

89 Bartholin, De morbis biblicis, C2v-C3v: “Ingens scrupulus superest, qui amovendus omni ope. Febris actua ulceri Syriaco jungitur, cum Jobi morbus chronicus fuerit…Jobi tempories temperata, cumulates animi moerore crassioribus frigidioribusque humoribus, aetate confirmata & ad frigidam declinante, morbi acutas periodos tardavit, quo etiam operas suas Daemon contulit, qui ad tempiem eius morbus accommodavit, ut diutius eum in tormentis haberet.”
several books on medicine and the bible, but his *Diatribe medico-sacra: de morbis biblicis* undertook specifically to correlate Biblical principles and passages with standard medical authorities and advice on the Galenic naturals and non-naturals. The prefatory letter to the reader presented Warlitz’s work as a continuation of the practice of reading of medicine in the Bible in the tradition of Lemnius, Ader, and Bartholin.\(^90\)

In sum, Lutheran physicians in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries resorted frequently to the Bible as a source from which to champion or critique medical or natural philosophical ideas. Their discussions touched on everything from the foundation of medicine in creation, the effects of the Fall, principles of human nature, and evaluations of accounts of disease and healing and various healing arts included in scriptural passages. Though they interpreted the Bible in various ways, their use of it betrays a fundamental belief that the world and all things in it are to be understood in

\(^{90}\) Christian Warlitz, *Diatribe medico-sacra: De morbis biblicis, E prava diaeta animique affectibus resultantibus.* (Wittenberg, 1714); His other books include: *Scrutinium lachrymarum medico-sacrum* (Wittenberg 1705) and *Valetudinarium Salomonaeum medico-sacrum*, (Wittenberg, 1708). Martinus Chladenius, the author of the prefatory letter to the reader in Warlitz’s *Morbis biblicis* confessed to reading the Catholic Ader: “Afectit me legentem Guielamus Aderus, medicus eruditis, qui cum morbos et aegrotos in Evangeliiis enarratos susciperet…” (1) And then praised Warlitz by presenting him as a continuer of the tradition: “Saltem non veriti praestantissimi artis illius Salutarii magistri, quicquid in Philologia excellenter didicerunt, in illustramentum divini codicis adhibere, quod exempla LEMNIORUM, CARDILUCIORUM, RUEVORUM, BARTHOLINORUM, et si non pari ubique successu, evincent. Quibus cum eminentis famae existimatione Medici se sociant, quos Witteberga ad nostra utque tempora nutriit, inter quorum pulcherrimos conatus, se nunc consciuum fistit labor Viri Nobilissimi Excellentissimi Experientissimique Domini CHRISTIANI WARLIZII, Artis Salutaris Doctoris Extraordinarii, et Archiatri Anhaltini meritissimi, qui ingenii sui felicissimi nervos judiciique robur inter reliquis labores eo convertit, ut fructus aliquis ad Lectores et scrutatores Scripturae redundaret, dum nunc de aromatibus, nunc de plantis, aliisque ex natura et foro medico a Spiritu S. in codicem sacram translatiis, in praesenti vero eruditissimo scripto de morbis Biblicis nova et distincta method communtatus, et unique sobrie…doctrinae sanioris versatus est, operamque dedit, ne rationis regulis Spiritus S. circulos turbaret, sed eos potius dilucidiores reddert, et explanaret.” (2-3).
light of revelation, as well as reason. Since nature included the body, the Bible, in various ways, offered help in understanding it and treating its diseases.

2.3: Medical Tradition: Galen, Hippocrates, and Lutherans

The Bible and Christian doctrine were but one set of authorities that Lutheran natural philosophers and physicians considered as they examined and treated bodies and souls. As they had been for centuries, Galen and Hippocrates were by far the most significant authorities for sixteenth-and seventeenth-century physicians across confessions, and thus, in the Wittenberg Circle. Their work, along with Aristotle’s and Plato’s, and that of the variety of authors and professors who had commented on and taught these ancient medical and natural philosophical models over the centuries were the other major body of thought Lutheran physicians like Sennert and Horst utilized to understand human bodies, souls, and their diseases. Combining these authorities had never been straightforward or unproblematic. Just as there was debate about harmonizing Hippocrates, Galen, and (most dramatically) Aristotle, with Christianity, the reconciliation between Galenic and Aristotelian systems of thought was fraught. After the reintroduction of Aristotelianism in the thirteenth century, a pressing problem became reconciling Galenic and Aristotelian accounts of body and soul, something that could never be perfectly achieved.91 The result of all these different types of

91 As Siraisi observes, “Discussion and attempted reconciliation of the differences between the two presentations of anatomy and physiology became a major theme in Latin medical (and some philosophical)
reconciliation, according to Nancy Siraisi, was a Galenism “as wide, as flexible, as as
variable a category in the Renaissance as Charles Schmitt has recently shown
Aristotelianism to be.”\(^92\) What is more, over the course of the sixteenth and seventeenth
centuries, deficiencies in the Galenic account of disease upon which all physicians
depended became increasingly pressing.

In sixteenth-century Wittenberg, as elsewhere, Galenic medicine was the core of
medical education. The Wittenberg tradition stemmed from Melanchthon’s works on the
soul, which as described in chapter one, heavily depended on his incorporation of Galen
in light of his vision of the theology of providence and the natural world. The second
version of his work, though Vesalian, did not fundamentally challenge Galenic
medicine. In addition to these books, Melanchthon’s thought on medicine appeared
primarily in academic discourses praising it as a study leading to knowledge of God and
acclaiming Galen and Hippocrates.\(^93\)

Melanchthon’s son-in-law Caspar Peucer was a professor of medicine, one who
took over the chair of Galenic medicine from Melanchthon’s friend and comrade Jakob
Millich. This means that Peucer’s primary job was to explicate Galen and Hippocrates.

writing in the thirteenth century and remained a preoccupation of physicians until the seventeenth
century.” Idem, *Taddeo Alderotti and His Pupils: Two Generations of Italian Medical Learning* (Princeton:
\(^\text{92}\) Siraisi, *Avicenna*, 12
\(^\text{93}\) Ralf-Dieter Hofheinz, *Philipp Melanchthon und die Medizin im Spiegel seiner akademischen Reden*
(Herbolzheim: Centaurus, 2001)
Aside from lecture notes that remain from his students the majority of Peucer’s output as well comes from university disputations and orations that make clear his debt to his famous father-in-law. He, like Melanchthon, praised Galen, while emphasizing the ethical and spiritual aspects of the system.94

Galenic medicine continued to dominate in decades following Melanchthon. Like his mentor, David Chytraeus designed a curriculum of study that proved widely influential beyond his university in Rostock. His recommendations indicate the ideal reading list in a Lutheran university as the sixteenth century waned. According to the Regulae studiorum he produced at the end of his career in the 1590s, the best texts for mastering medicine remained Galen, Hippocrates, and Aristotle. Indeed, “nothing more delightful exists in philosophy” than Aristotle and Galen.95 At the beginning of the seventeenth century, Caspar Bartholin primarily discussed Galenic medicine and cures in his Controversiae anatomicae and Gregor Horst, though he would work on reforming pathology, began his career by presenting his uncle Jakob’s Galenic exercises in

95 David Chytraeus, Regulae studiorum, seu de ratione et ordine discendi in praeceptis artibus recte instituendo (Leipzig, 1595), Sig. C1r: “In Medicina, Galenus totam artem complexus est, cuius libros de Elementis, Temperamentis, Facultatibus naturalibus, Placitis Hippocratis, & Platonis, usu partium, anatomicis administrationibus, de simplicium medicamentorum facultatibus, de sanitate tuenda, de causis & differentiis morborum ac symptomatum, de locis affectis...& ad Glaucenom, & commentaries in scripta Hippocratica, ordine a studiosis Medicinae cognosci oportet.” Sig. V5r-v: “...Nominarum Aristotelis de Anima & parvis naturalibus, & generatione ac partibus animalium, & Galeni de usu partium quibus nulli dulciores in Philosophia extant, libros.”
Even Sennert, who sought to reform medicine, did not want to dispense with Galenism altogether, as is clear from his effort to reconcile chymistry with it. Moving into the second and third decades of the seventeenth century, his reforming efforts concentrated on reckoning with lacks in the system, not overturning it altogether. His *Institutiones medicinae* followed a traditional outlined by delineating, in turn, Galenic causes of disease and signs, with standard instructions on reading diagnostic signs from urine and pulse, and preserving and achieving health by balancing naturals and non-naturals. After recommending *anthropologia*, Sennert’s *Methodus discendi medicum* highlighted the critical importance of mastering Galen and Hippocrates.

What were the basic features of the medical system early modern Lutheran physicians utilized? From Hippocrates, “the Father of Western medicine,” came the
long-dominant theory of the humors, found in *The Nature of Man.*

According to humoral theory, four physical “humours” (blood, black bile, yellow bile, and phlegm) in the body determine the health of the individual. Each of these humors is associated with a particular bodily organ and with the four elements of the universe (earth, air, fire water). Good health in the Hippocratic scheme involved achieving and maintaining the ideal balance of humors. Excesses or imbalances were the primary cause of any disease and, accordingly, treatment aimed at restoring balance. Notably, health in the Hippocratic scheme was highly individualized: each person has a distinct, different humoral balance, so, although treatments can draw on general principles or guidelines, they must be dispensed and regulated so as to achieve each individual’s specific and unique best balance. This would prove a stumbling block to early modern thinkers attempting to explain outbreaks of highly contagious diseases like plague and syphilis.

Galen built upon the foundations that Hippocrates laid, attempting to add empirical proof by way of dissections that led him to speculate on the circulatory and nervous systems; his work would be used later to develop the idea of *spiritus* as a material instrument of the soul circulating in the body. He combined his work on the

---


99 Because the literature on Galen is vast, it is impossible to cite fully. A go-to is still: Owsei Temkin, *Galenism: Rise and Decline of a Medical Philosophy* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1973); See also Rudolph E. Siegel, *Galen’s System of Physiology and Medicine: An Analysis of His Doctrines and Observations on Bloodflow, Respiration, Humors and Internal Diseases* (Basel and New York: Karger, 1968); Luis García-Ballester, *Galen and*
circulation of blood and spirits with faithfulness to Hippocrates’ humoralism. Building on that, Galen posited the theory of temperaments—that each physiological humor can be associated with certain psychological characteristics. Further, in each person, one physical humor tends to dominate, and this physiological predisposition helps determine psychological characteristics and health. Thus, persons prone to irritability can be diagnosed with a tendency to have with an excess of yellow bile, while those given to melancholy tend to have an excess of black bile, a theory known as “complexion.” Physicians had to know each patient and his/her ideal balance well in order to read symptoms and treat effectively. This required establishing a relationship with them. Drawing on this teaching about complexion, chapter four will point out

---


100 On complexion, see Valentin Groeber, “Complexio/Complexion: Categorizing Individual Natures, 1250-1600” in The Moral Authority of Nature, ed. Lorraine Daston and Fernando Vidal (Chicago: Univesity of Chicago Press, 2004), 361-383. On the development of complexion theory in the Middle Ages, see Roger French, Canonical Medicine: Gentile de Foligno and Scholasticism (Leiden: Brill, 2001). In the early modern era, some physicians attempted to forge very practical applications from this theory. For instance, Spanish physician Juan Huarte de San Juan’s Examen de ingenios para las ciencias argued that each person’s innate psychological disposition, based on complexion, established what he or she can do best. His goal was eminently practical: to help parents and teachers guide the young to the career where the individual would be most successful. Huarte de San Juan also attributed the divide between Catholic dominance in southern Europe and Protestant success in the north to complexion, i.e., to differences in the powers of understanding and memory, a result of humors and temperament. Spaniards had better understanding, thus truer religion, but were poor homilists because they had bad memories. Among northern Europeans, the reverse obtained: good memory produced better sermons, but these were pointless due to bad understanding. On this, see books see books 8 and 10. The Protestant English translator of de San Juan’s work, Richard Carew, diplomatically chose to elide the portions of the original text that voiced anti-Protestant sentiments. The book appeared in 15 Spanish, 26 French, 6 Italian, 5 English, 1 Dutch, and 3 Latin editions. Despite its popularity, it was condemned by the Inquisition for potentially undermining the doctrine of immortality of the soul. Juan Huarte de San Juan, Examen de ingenios para las ciencias (Baeza 1575).
pastors encouraging laity to understand that each one of them had a unique complexion, that he or she should know well.

Given the theory of temperaments, humoral balance had implications for more than biological well being; it was also directly related to psychological and spiritual health. Linking the material humors to immaterial emotions and thoughts in this way meant that “…passions were literally organic events, actions of the body that turned the soul inside out…”\textsuperscript{101} An imbalance of the humors signified not only physical, but also psychological and emotional upset, while conversely, properly balanced humors suggested health in both body and soul. In all, health was more than a biological state. It was also a psychological or spiritual one. Indeed, for Galen, “… (excessive) passions were properly, and non-metaphorically, classified as diseases affecting the functioning of the organism.”\textsuperscript{102} Physicians needed to be aware of the patient’s psychological, even spiritual state, or they would easily overlook a factor in the imbalance causing illness.\textsuperscript{103} This accounts for the development and importance of the “cultura animi” tradition mentioned in passing in chapter one in relation to the Lutheran scholar Joachim

\textsuperscript{103} Medieval thinkers including Albertus Magnus, Pietro d’Abano, Willam of Auvergne, and Willam of Conches discussed the relationship of temperaments and humors to dispositions. The last of these writers purported to deduce the various types of humours from the creation narrative in Genesis. In the twelfth century, Hughes de Fouilloi’s \textit{De medicina animae} correlated humoral states with spiritual states of bitterness or contemplation. On this tradition of medieval thought see, Raymond Klubansky, Erwin Panofsky and Fritz Saxl, \textit{Saturn and Melancholy: Studies in the History of Natural Philosophy, Religion, and Art} (New York: Basic Books, 1964), 67-123.
Camerarius, and as chapter three reveals, this helped Chytraeus and Peucer in
discussing medicine and sin. Lutheran theologians too, as I’ll show in chapters three and
four, stressed this as well, though from a scriptural and doctrinal basis.

In all, Lutheran thinkers in the Wittenberg Circle inherited and deployed a
medical view of the body as malleable and in flux.\textsuperscript{104} This openness of the body to
external influences and the dominance of moving fluids and spirits in this system meant
seeing the body as “much more permeable and determined by the constant movement
of fluids, spirits, and vapors through it rather than by processes and structural changes
in its solid parts…”\textsuperscript{105} In addition to good, natural, and health-giving spirits, bad spirits
in the body were considered the primary cause of disease and disorders. “Physicians
and laypeople alike believed that the most important cause of (non-traumatic) pain were
mobile disease substances, especially the so-called fluxes…”\textsuperscript{106}

These spirits were considered to be corporeal, an essential physiological feature
of the body, and it is these spirits that account for connections between sensation (such
\textsuperscript{104}As John Sutton notes, “…across boundaries between Aristotelian and Hippocratic/Galenic systems, the
body was by nature open, the internal environment always in dynamic interrelations with the external
environment. Its state depended on interaction with the ‘non-naturals’…on regulation of temperature, and
on the maintenance of fragile internal fluid balance.” idem, “Controlling the Passions: Passion Memory
and the Moral Physiology of Self in Seventeenth-Century Neurophilosophy,” in \textit{The Soft Underbelly of Reason: The
146, at 126.
\textsuperscript{105} Michael Stolberg, \textit{Experiencing the Body}, 83.
\textsuperscript{106} Michael Stolberg, \textit{Experiencing the Body}, 28. See also: Ulinka Rublack, “Fluxes: The Early Modern Body and
as hearing) and physical change. But they also contributed to psychological and emotional health, and there were attempts to relate these spirits to the spiritual.

Lutheran thinkers, as pointed out in chapter 1, sometimes followed Melanchthon in tying spiritus to the Holy Spirit, either as a comparison, or to emphasize the Holy Spirit’s influence over the spiritus. If this were so, then in addition to knowing the patient’s spiritual state (which could play a part in humoral balance), a physician regarding a patient’s body also had to be aware of the possibility that something they were observing might be the movement of the Spirit of God.

Galen’s enduring importance and the resources and lacks in the system provided to Lutheran thinkers is evident by recalling the work of Leonhardt Fuchs, who summarized what he regarded as a purified Galenic medicine in what would become one of Germany’s standard medical textbooks in the second half of the sixteenth century, Institutionum medicinae. Book one discussed in succession, the elements, the temperaments, the humors, and the parts of the human body, the faculties (vital, sensitive, rational), the actions of the body (how it acts), the spirits. Book two moved on to discuss treatment, starting from the Galenic non-naturals (air, motion, food, rest,

---

107 D.P. Walker, “The Astral Body in Renaissance Medicine, Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes 21.1-2 (1958): 119-33 “The vital spirits are manufactured in the heart and conveyed by the arteries; their main function is to distribute innate or vital heat to all parts of the body. Animal spirits are elaborated from these and are contained in the ventricles of the brain, whence through the nervous system they are transmitted to sense-organs and muscles; their functions are motor-activity, sense-perception, and usually, such lower psychological activities as appetite, sensus communis and imagination. They are the first, direct instrument of the soul.” (120). See also Gerhard Klier, Die Drei Geister des Menschen: Die Sogenannte Spirituslehre in der Frühen Neuzeit (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 2002).
sleep, waking) to phlebotomy and purgatives and how to read urine. After discussing these signs for balancing the body, Fuchs concluded book two with a short excursus on “perturbations of the soul” before proceeding in Book three to outline “things outside of nature,” i.e. occult diseases. Fuchs’s inclusion of disruptions of the spirits (De spiritibus) and “diseases of the soul” (De animi perturbationes) in his Institutionum make clear the persisting belief that physicians and natural philosophers have an important part to play in promoting health of the soul.

In Fuchs and in the Wittenberg Circle as everywhere, the goal of Galenic treatment was to achieve good balance. This is made evident in a popular book that channeled the approach of the famous “School of Salerno.” Medicina Salernitana. Id est conservandae bonae valetudinis praecepta, collected and edited by Johannes Curio, featured chapters from Joachim Camerarius on cultivating reason and balance and Philip Melanchthon on moderation in food, drink, and sleep center on this, in addition to a chapter by the famous medieval physician Arnau of Villanova. Because “physicians had long placed the accidentia animae, or passions of the soul, among six ‘non-

---

108 Fuchs, Institutionum, Sig Y8v: “Proinde cum tanta sit perturbationum animi vis, debent a medico, quibuscunque artibus possunt arceri, ac corrigi.”
110 Johannes Curio, Medicina Salernitana. Id est Conservandae bonae valetudinis praecepta (Leiden, 1577). There were at least 10 editions of the book by 1638. Siraisi points out how this also characterized medieval medicine: “Discussion of such subjects as cognition, the way in which the soul and its powers or ‘virtues’ cooperate in bodily processes, the physical effects produced by the emotions, the organization of the senses, and the process of vision was part of an already time-honored tradition among natural philosophers, theologians, and physicians.” Eadem, Alderotti, 205.
naturals’...that inevitably affect human life,” their work entailed tackling topics that border on what we would today call psychology and physiology.  

Because of its emphasis on shifting humors and spirits that were related to psychological conditions (and for some authors, to spiritual states), Galenism seemed to account well for individual afflictions like melancholy. Longstanding interest in melancholy became marked in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries across Europe—something scholars have devoted some time to unraveling. In Central Europe, Erik Midelfort notes a striking preoccupation with diseases of the mind or soul, as evidenced by the number of university dissertations or disputations about them.

This common concern with diseases of the soul manifested itself in physicians trained in Wittenberg. Daniel Sennert charted seven types in melancholy in Book One, Part 2 of Practicae medicinae, grouping a set of melancholic disorders under the heading “De morbis capitis,” along with (among other things) immoderate sleep, vertigo,

Siraisi, Alderotti, 226


Erik Midelfort, A History of Madness in Sixteenth-Century Germany (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999). “Of the 241 disputations registered by Oskar Diethelm for the period 1550-1650 (in a list that is far from complete), fully 138 dealt with just four classical disorders: melancholy, hypochondriasis (and hypochondriacal melancholy), mania, and phrenesis... After 1600, theses on hysteria...became increasingly common as well...By the last decade of the sixteenth century, of 33 dissertation in Diethelm’s list, 10 dealt with disorders of the black bile (as did a further 23 of the 79 dissertations from the period 1601 to 1620).” (158).
delirium, mania, hydrophobia, lethargy, sleepwalking, horror, and fear. Sennert included various types of melancholy. The primary sort primarily affected the brain, but others might be a disruption in the relationship of the heart and spirits with the body.\textsuperscript{114} Both Sennert and his colleague Gregor Horst especially made it clear that disordered affection constituted a type of melancholy.\textsuperscript{115} Their taking up of \textit{quaestiones} “de amore insano” as a type of melancholy reflects the standard practice of physicians disputing how strong passions (including love, anger, and despair) could interfere with humoral balance and the functioning of the body.\textsuperscript{116} Giving this traditional topic a spiritual valence, Sennert began his discussion of the causes of this sort of disordered love by explaining it as turning away from love of God, good, and virtue, before assembling an array of classical authors (Seneca, Cicero, Plautus, Virgil) to back up his argument for the superiority of stoic order.\textsuperscript{117} Similarly, Gregor Horst’s \textit{De natura amoris} commenced with a long paragraph about the surpassing value of loving God in view of his amazing love for man in salvation and in providential care of the world. He referenced a veritable

\textsuperscript{114} Sennert, \textit{Practicae Medicinae Liber 1 Partis II: De symptomatibus, quae in sensibus internis & cerebri accident} in \textit{Operum tomus secundus} (Lyon, 1650) includes the following chapters on melancholy: 1) De melancholia in genere, 2) De prima melancholiae specie, quae sit cerebro primario affecto, 3) De amore insano, 4) De melancholia per consensum cordis & totius, 5) De melancholia hypochondriaca, 6) De melancholia ex utero, 7) De melancholia errabunda, Arabibus kutubuth dicta.

\textsuperscript{115} Gowland, \textit{Worlds}: “Just as physiological health required a median state between the excess of qualities in the body, psychological health was a condition in which the soul was held midway between all excessive affecttions.” (48)


\textsuperscript{117} Sennert, \textit{Practicae Medicinae Liber 1 Partis II}, Sig. Kk3r: “Caussa enim huius deliria pirmaria est impressione fortis rei amabilis; seu Amor, non ille blandus Dei, virtutis, boni, ac honesti, parentum, liberorum, imo &coniugum, sed Venereus, quo homines cum ratione insaniunt.”
Who’s Who of ancient and medieval Christian writers, including Ambrose, Augustine, Basil the Great, Gregory the Great, and Bernard of Clairvoux. He then went on to detail a variety of types of love with reference to Plato, and, like Sennert, emphasized how human loves stray from God. Reading the effects of intertwined emotional, spiritual, and physical states in a patient required a physician trained to understand them well enough to recognize them. This meant, as chapter 3 will show, that some like Caspar Bartholin emphasized the need for a physician who was himself pious.

Though Lutheran physicians worked with a Galenic-Hippocratic system that had persisted for centuries, they also increasingly confronted critiques to it as the sixteenth century brought changes to medicine with the work of Vesalius and increasing emphasis

---

118 Gregor Horst, *Dissertatio de natura amoris* (Giessen, 1611), Sig. B2r-v: “Nullus est appetitus, nullu(m) est desiderium, in quo non praestantissimam quiq(ue); Scriptores vocabulo Amoris frequene(t)sse utantur: imo tanta est vocis dulcedo in aurib. hominu(m), ut sanctissimi Patres, summiiq(ue); Theologi res sacras tractando ab eade(m) abstinere nequeant, unde Ignatius Amorem suum crucifixum dicit. D. Hieron. In Epist. Ad Demetriadem illum praedicit felicem, cui nullus est alius, qua(m) solius Christi amor: D. Ambros. De fuga seculi, adhortatur Christianos, ut maxime eo respiant, quo amor divinus iisdem curae sit: D. Aug. sup. Pflil. 64. duas describit civitates, Babylonem & Hierusalem, quorum illam amore praesentis seculi, hanc v. amore Dei occupatam fuisse pronunciat: D. Gregor. Lib. 16. Moral. & sup. Ezech. etiam firmiter statuit, nose propinquiores esse Deo, quo magis amorem exercemus. O jugu(m) sancti amoris, inquit D. Bernhard. In tr. Dilige Deum, quam dulciter capis, qua(m) gloriose laqueas, suaviter premis, delectanter oneras, fortiter stringis, prude(n)ter erudis. Unguentum suave & optimum est amor summi boni, quo pestes mentis sanantur & cordis oculi illuminantur, ait Basil. In Hexameron. Neq(ue); hoc sufficit; ulterius n. procedimus, a creaturis videlicet ad Creatorem, a finitis ad Infinitum, Deum Ter Opt. Max. ens illud primum, independens, simplicissimum, perfectissimum, in quo & per quod omnia, cui gloriosum Amoris nomen, quamvis non eo modo ut rebus creatis, tum a profanes, tum etiam a sacris Scriptoribus rectissime tribuitur, quam ab causam Plato dicit, ex amore Deum totu(m) hoc mundi systema creasse & constituisse, in quod hominem ad sui imaginem conditum, tanquam Dominum reliquarum creaturarum posuit, quod signum amoris ineffabilis erga genus humanu(m) nullus est qui non statuat. Quid quaeso divina(m) majestate(m) com(m)o vit, ut sanctos angelos custodes nobis adderet, qua(m) arde(n)tissimus amore erga nos homines? O altissima charitas, o inexplicabilis amor, quo DEI filius ab aeterno generus in tempore carnem humanam assumit, ut nos deperditos proprio sanguine liberet, sibi qve cohaeredes faciat! Sufficeret profecte sola generalis providentia totius universi, quae sane non aliunde, quam ex amore creatoris erga creaturam profuit.”
on practice and experimentation, rather than theory. At the same time, increasingly popular Hermetic thought presented the human body as microcosm of the macrocosm of the world. Seen in this way, the spirits in the body corresponded with and were directly affected by spirits in the world, a view explicated forcefully in the works of Ficino and Paracelsus. One should be careful not to overestimate the speed of a change away from Galenism. As Owsei Temkin noted long ago, “….the extinction of Galenism was not a sudden event but a process in which very dramatic episodes were interchanged with inconspicuous, though not less important, developments.”\textsuperscript{119} The evolution away from it was slow and halting. It continued to form the basis of medical curricula across Europe throughout the seventeenth century, including in Wittenberg where the physician and professor Christian Warlitz continued to write about it in the opening decades of the eighteenth century. Caught between traditional medicine and the new medicine that slowly and haltingly developed in the early modern period, confusion and contradiction were rife.\textsuperscript{120}

Traditional etiology emphasized the individual and his conjoined psychological and physical state to such an extent that it was hard to account for contagious diseases like plague, a disease that repeatedly attacked Wittenberg and from which Sennert himself would die. While always problematic, this issue became more pressing in the

\textsuperscript{119} Temkin, \textit{Galenism}, 135-6.
\textsuperscript{120} “Physicians resorted to different theories and therapeutic rationales and thus inevitably came up with different results.” (Stolberg, \textit{Experiencing Illness and the Sick Body}, 73).
wake of exploration and expansion and the introduction of syphilis to Europe.

Combined with continuing waves of plague, the situation demanded a theory that could account for the spread of epidemic disease. As Ian Maclean contends, “Of all parts of medicine, pathology is probably the most debated in the sixteenth century.”

One key contribution came from the Italian physician Girolamo Fracastoro, whose ideas reached Wittenberg in the first half of the sixteenth century. After studying in Padua and being named a professor there at the tender age of nineteen, he spent of his life practicing in Verona, his hometown. He first became famous for a poem about a shepherd boy who insulted the gods and was punished with the French Disease. Entitled, *Syphilidis, sive morbi Gallici* (1530), the name Fracastoro gave the disease, “syphilis,” caught on. His pathology centered on the theory of sympathy he expounded in *De sympathia et antipathia rerum.* There Fracastoro accounted for the spread of disease by attributing it to hidden tendencies for attraction or repulsion. A key element of Fracastoro’s thought was that these sympathies were not “occult,” but were the result of small particles or atom-like elements, called *semina.* While not adopting the theory of disease seeds, both Melanchthon and Peucer produced medical orations explicating the

---

theory of sympathy and antipathy as a sign of God’s providential work, and the
discerning of it as yet another way of deducing His ways in nature.\textsuperscript{123}

Two other influential sixteenth-century medical thinkers were more influential
for Daniel Sennert’s work. The first is Jean Fernel, who while not intentionally
iconoclastic, played a part in advancing critiques of Galen.\textsuperscript{124} He posited in \textit{De abditis rerum causis} (1548) that by careful observation a physician could see detect the difference
between diseases occasioned by “manifest” and “occult” factors in disease. Fernel
explained in the preface:

I suspected some twenty years ago that something that might be called
divine lurked wholly hidden within the art of healing, and was not yet
coming properly to light; so I was impelled by zeal and eagerness for it to
search out its nature. I realized that it was the management of hidden
diseases, a thing not really familiar, nor set out in the counsel of the
anceints; yet without it the art of healing would be hampered and be only
a beginning, destined not to possess all its components.”\textsuperscript{125}

\textsuperscript{123} Philip Melanchthon, \textit{Oratio de consideranda sympatia et antipathia in rerum natura} (Wittenberg, 1550); Caspar Peucer, \textit{Oratio de sympathia et antipathia rerum in natura} (Wittenberg, 1574).
\textsuperscript{124} This was perhaps a case of “methinks thou dost protest too much” as Nancy Siraisi observes: “Fernel’s
tendency to restrict the role of complexion theory in physiology and pathology and to emphasize the
importance of spiritus, innate heat, and idiosyncratic or individual factors was rightly perceived by
orthodox Galenists as undermining the claims of their medicine to be a rational science based on the
analysis of qualitative or complexional balance.” (Siraisi, \textit{Avicenna}, 298).
\textsuperscript{125} Quotation taken from John M. Forrester’s critical edition, \textit{Jean Fernel’s On the Hidden Causes of Things:
Forms, Souls, and Occult Diseases in Renaissance Medicine}, ed. and trans. John M. Forrester, introduction by
Richardson, “The Generation of Disease: Occult Causes and Diseases of the Total Substance,” in \textit{the Medical
Renaissance of the Sixteenth Century}, ed. Andrew Wear, Roger K. French, and I.M. Lonie (Cambridge and
Building on these occult powers Fernel influentially postulated the existence of diseases of the total substance. As John Henry and John Forrester explain, “diseases of these types did not act on the humours but on the substantial form of the body, which Fernel called the total substance. What’s more they did so by some occult power.”

Fernel’s work proved tremendously popular—according to Brockliss and Jones, his *Physiologia* was reprinted 31 times. Sennert, as I’ll discuss in more detail below, read Fernel closely and utilized the Frenchman’s work on occult diseases in his own book on the same.

As might be expected from the discussion of his *Consensu ac dissensu* above, the most radical critique of traditional medicine, that offered by Paracelsus, was just as influential as Fernel for Sennert. Phillipus Aureolus Bombastus von Hohenheim would not wait for the system to evolve, or tweak it from the inside. He publicly and loudly called for revolution. The famous incident in 1527, when he threw the books of traditional medical authorities into a bonfire in the center of Basel exemplifies his contempt for medical authority. Charles Webster points out that “this mission was inseparably associated with his broader philosophical and religious aspirations,” that

---

aimed at critiquing widespread hypocrisy and abuses and emphasizing a sort of mystic spiritual life.128

Paracelsus’s system of medicine centered on his view of man as a microcosm of the macrocosm of the universe. He emphasized the profound influence of the stars and celestial bodies on the human body and the importance of being able to decipher the signs (or “signatures”) of natural bodies, animals, and plants. This, he suggested, was something best learned from those better acquainted with the natural world by prolonged exposure to it, rather than learned physicians who knew the world through books.129 Rejecting humors, Paracelsus posited that minerals (salt, mercury, sulphur) were the basis of the human body, and health consisted of a balance of these minerals that mirrored the balance in the universe. This could best by achieved by learning to distil chymical medicines based on the signatures of plants and minerals.

Sennert’s own book—that included both withering critique of Paracelsus and curiosity about chymistry—demonstrates the range of response to Paracelsus’s work and theories. Paracelsus inspired passionate replies, from both outright vilifications to admiring attempts to render his polemical approach more palatable for academic physicians. Thomas Erastus, the most vociferous critic of Paracelsus, argued that the

128 Webster, Paracelsus, xii. Indeed “His new outlook on medicine and natural philosophy never strayed far from the language and concepts evolved in the religious sphere of his work.” (98)
latter’s theories hinged on faulty theology and should be rejected outright. Sennert drew on Erastus in his criticism of what he viewed as inherent Manicheanism in Paracelsianism. On the other hand, Jole Shackleford charts an increasingly wider acceptance of Paracelsian theory in the wake of Petrus Severinus’ *Idea medicinae philosophicae* (1571), a book to which Sennert referred repeatedly in his *Consensus ac dissenso*. According to Shackleford, central to Severinus’s success was that he integrated Fracastoro’s more widely accepted theory of disease *semina*, and made the system he propounded in *Idea Medicinae* “…not just a medical theory, but a metaphysical system, which applies generally to change in the natural world.” Furthermore, Severinus proved less prone than Paracelsus to dispense with Galenism wholesale. While he might question Galenic theory, he retained many Galenic therapies. In his somewhat eclectic approach, Severinus typified late sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century medical thought and helped make Paracelsian elements more acceptable for learned physicians. Sennert carefully read and learned from Severinus’s effort to render

---

132 “In the dissertations and medical treatises of many of the medical men of this period we find an eclectic attitude prevailing. There is no strong desire to abandon the hard-won wisdom of Galen and the Arabic authors, but rather a willingness to assay the writings of the chemical philosophers, in order to fill in gaps or weak points in traditional medicine and to find some way to incorporate the seemingly successful chemical therapy into learned medicine.” Shackleford, *A Philosophical Path*, 298.
Paracelsus more palatable to learned physicians by reconciling aspects of Paracelsian theory with Galen.

**2.4 Daniel Sennert on God, the Devil, and Occult Diseases**

As noted above in discussing Sennert’s *Consensu ac dissensu*, Wittenberg’s famous physician was aware of weaknesses in traditional medicine, and interested in exploring possibilities for change and improvement. He was not the only one in the wider circle of Wittenberg-trained physicians who explored reforming medicine. Gregor Horst also wrote on pathology and, like Sennert, professed his own interest in discovering what might usefully be appropriated from chymical medicine. While these two contemporary prominent physicians in the Wittenberg Circle agreed on much, Gregor Horst proved more sympathetic than Sennert to the idea of morbid *semina* in nature. But like Horst, Sennert’s dissatisfaction with traditional medicine and sense that it must be reformed grew and intensified over the course of his career.

Sennert’s interest evinced itself above all in the *Consensu ac dissensu* (discussed above) and in the sixth book of his *Practicae medicinae*, that dissected the types of occult diseases: *De morbis occultis*. Here, Sennert drew on the work of Jean Fernel and other

---

133 In addition to discussing this briefly in the introduction to *De natura humana*, Horst’s major work on disease was: *De morbis, eorumque causis ac symptomatibus liber, cum declaration quaestionum controversarum* (Marburg, 1629). On Horst see, Shackleford, A Philosophical Path, 299-310; MacLean, Logic, Signs, and Nature, 267-268.

writers on occult disease, who saw themselves as faithful inheritors of the Galenic system, and elaborated on certain concepts in it to account for otherwise mysterious instances of sickness in new ways. The title page offers a glimpse at the variety of sources upon which Sennert drew (see Figure 5). At the bottom, in the center, Hippocrates and Hermes shake hands in friendship over an altar dedicated to Hygeia, ancient Greek goddess of health and hygiene. Beside the picture of Sennert, the figures of “Experience” (on the left side of the page) and “reason” (on the right) represented the way to true knowledge that Sennert had defined elsewhere. Above the image of “experience” stood a tower with the reminder to commit one’s work to God (“Deo duce comite labore”), while placed above the figure of reason was an image of ship at sea, and a reminder of God’s sovereignty, “Dominus providet.” In all, the title page encapsulated Sennert’s goal to integrate, in light of Christian faith, insights from spagyric arts and medical theories of occult disease with traditional medicine. The book itself contained core concerns evident as well in Sennert’s Consensu ac dissensu: that creation is good and that God holds sway over all of creation and the created beings in it, including the Devil. Any reform of medicine must adhere to these principles.

A striking aspect of the “occult diseases” Sennert described is that they are, first and foremost, natural processes. The majority of them are not related to the work of the devil, though, as the ninth section of the book makes clear, some occult diseases are. In spite of the way that the word tends to be used today, “occult” for Sennert and his contemporaries did not have inherently sinister or diabolic overtones. It simply referred
to things hidden from view that may or may not be attributable to the activity of spiritual agents. As Alexandra Walsham observes, throughout the early modern era, “Critical enquiry did erode aspects of the magical universe, but it could also exist harmoniously with the notion that God employed the natural world as a communicative medium and with continuing belief in the occult.”

The hiddenness of occult causes meant, first, that they would be harder to read than Galenic indicators would be. Second, it implied that a physician must be able to differentiate between various types of occult causes and diseases. This required detailed disambiguation such as Sennert provided. In all, the goal was to describe how to read signs and diseases in the body for which traditional Galenic medicine could not fully account, to help physicians puzzle out the signs of the Devils’ activity, and to emphasize that even the work of the Devil should be seen as on the continuum of natural causation, because he is limited to working in and with creatures and laws that God made.

---


137 Walsham, *Reformation of the Landscape*, 373. Further: “Early modern science, like Protestantism, was hostile to the materialization of the holy implicit in medieval religion, but it did not undermine the idea that nature was a providential instrument.” (376).
Sennert commenced by defending the reality and significance of occult forces. He explained how they can be seen in nature, and whether and how they should be considered in medicine. Only after outlining this theory did he turn, in the eight subsequent sections of the book, to define different types of occult disease. This included those caused by: (1) internal humors, (2) water, air, or infection, (3) venereal disease, (4) poisons, (5) minerals, (6) plants (7) living creatures, and (8) witchcraft, charms and incantations. The list of the various types of occult disease made it clear that learning about occult qualities would reveal that the universe, as well as flora and fauna on earth were designed by God to harbor healing for human ills (as Fuchs and Melanchthon claimed). Yet even though God created it good, nature can also be threatening and mysterious, due to sin and the devil.

*De morbis occultis* started by explicating the theory behind the explanations in the later chapters. Because it is the foundation of the remainder of the discussion, it is worth giving special attention. That there are occult forces is evident from simply observing many things in day-to-day life: the power of magnets, the power of certain purging medicines, the forceful effects of opium, even the inexplicable aversion some people have to cats. Sennert traced recent discussion of occult disease back to “qualities of the

---

138 Sennert, *De morbis occultis*, in Operum tomus, Vol. 3 (Lyon, 1650), Sig. Xx3r-v: “Occurrere profecto multas actiones admirandas in rerum natura, & multa in natura fieri, quae supra vires elementorum sunt, adeo notum est, ut hominis vel imperiti & ignari, vel impudentis sit, talia negare, vel in dubium vocare. Magnes trahit ferrum, & quidem Magnes Armatus vic univarum duarum plus quam libram ferri trahit, & id continuo a se pendulum sustinet, nec unquam decidet permittit. Nonnulli ita feles aversantur, ut etiam
whole substance” that Galen postulated. According to Sennert, the “most learned doctor” (“Medicus doctissimus”) Fernel lengthily and learnedly (“prolixe et erudite”) defended these.

Drawing on Fernel, Sennert based his definition and explanation of the power of occult forces on the distinction between “occult” and “manifest” qualities. Manifest causes are those such as heat, coldness, dryness, and wetness—things an observer can directly see. On the other hand, occult forces are those people know not by understanding the substance, but just by observing their activity in the world around us.139 This explanation makes clear how, as in the following books, some “occult” forces may be considered natural, as hidden forces in plants and animals, while others are the result of spiritual agents at work in the world, like the devil. It also shows how categories such as “substance” and “form” got applied to a Galenic argument about

alicuius cistae inclusae, & quam nunquam viderunt, praesentiam ferre non possint, ut nisi ea amoveatur, frigidi sudores ipsis erumpent, animi deliquium immineat. Quae sit medicamentorum purgantium vis, nimi ignorum, puta, aliquod e fortioribus paucorum saltem granorum sumptum purgans e corpore humores copiose evacuate. Quam paucar opini grana in corpore munionem efficient, & quantum narcosin excitent, nec tyriones Medicorum latet.”

139 Sennert, De morbis occultis, Sig Xx3v: “Cum ergo ex his pateat, dari effectus multos in natura, qui a qualitatibus manifestis deduci non possunt, recte in Scholis Physicorum & Medicorum qualitates dividuntur, quod aliae sunt manifestiae, aliae occultae. Manifestae sunt, quae sensibus externis, tactui imprimis, sunt obviae, eoque perceptibles, quales sunt caliditas, frigiditas, humiditas, & siccitas, & aliae ex elementis proxime ortae. Occultae seu obstrusae & abditae qualitates sunt, quae sovum vim ex operatione & effectu percipimus, eas tamen ipsas sensu non apprehendimus.”
disease, for Sennert and Fernel argued that the actions of occult qualities are a result of their form or total substance.  

Diagnosing an occult disease can be difficult since it is not always clear to the physician when he is faced with an occult force, and when it is simply a hitherto unseen mixture of manifest qualities. That is, it is hard to discern the signs, since despite the fact that there are some general rules, the nature of the phenomenon is that it evades standardization or recognition. Nonetheless, resorting to occult explanation is not irrational or the result of desperation, claimed Sennert. It’s quite true that human beings may not understand occult qualities perfectly, but that is because of the nature of the thing, and because their minds are weak and darkened. (Here there are strong echoes of his discussion of the effects of the Fall in *Consensus ac dissensu*). Even so occult qualities are real. Full knowledge of substances, forms, and occult qualities is reserved to God.

Occult qualities are not all the same. In Book 1, Chapter 3, Sennert divided occult qualities into five major categories that would structure the rest of his book: First, he

---

140 Sennert, *De morbis occultis*, Sig. Xx4r: “Actio igitur a tota substantia est, quae non provenit a primis qualitatibus, utpote, quae sunt accidentia, & pertinente ad dispositionem subjectae materiae, in rebus naturalibus compositis, sed quae ab ipsa rei essentia provenit. Equidem totius substantiae nomen totum mistum significat, cui definitionem & individuationem tribuit, & ab illa proficiscitur operatio propria: primario tamen illa fluit a formi, & quidem, ut Avicennas ait, a forma elementis superveniente.”

141 Sennert, *De morbis occultis*, Sig. Xx4v: “Etsi vero nonnulli qualitates has, quia occultae nominator, derident, ac ignorantiae asylum appellant: tamen imbecilla mentis nostrae acies ad investiganda naturae penetralia hoc modo potius accusatur, quam qualitates hae culpantur. Si enim vera qualitatum harum origo, de qua non ita multi solliciti fuerunt, inquiratur, eius cognitione non minus certam scientiam parit, quam qualitatum manifestarum notitia: Et ut Avicennas, de virib.cord.tract.1.cap.10 loquitur, sicuti sciens ignem propter caliditatem calefacere, vere sciit, & non ignorant: ita qui scit magnetem attrahere ferrum, quia cirtutem habet, cuius naturae est, attrahere ferrum, procul dubio sciens est, & non ignorans...Interim in hac humane mentis caligine, aequo forma ignis, ac magnetis nobis ignota est...”
identified individual qualities. These are powers in a living thing to act on another thing. These powers exist only as long as that thing stays alive and are prevalent in nature. As an example, Sennert, citing Pliny’s *Historia naturalia*, alluded to a legendary type of fish called an “echeneis.” It was said the fish could stop ships by latching on to them and slowing them down.\(^\text{142}\) Second, there are occult qualities that can be found in some living things, but not others of the same kind. These sorts of qualities explain why some people like certain foods (such as cheese) or odors (such as roses) that others dislike. These qualities are known to change over time.\(^\text{143}\) These qualities are the result of individual sympathies and antipathies in response to the form of the quality, not the result of the form of the person who has the aversion. What determines the effect here is the individual in which the occult quality acts—in some people it acts more than others.

Third Sennert named inanimate occult powers. These are a result of the occult force

\(^{142}\) Sennert, *De morbus occultis*, Sig. Xx6r: “Primo ergo nullo modo negandum esse puto, quod viventium quaedam sint, quae occultas vires habet, quae immediate ab eaerum forma fluunt…. Echeneis, piscis vivus navam sistit, mortuus vero id non praestat, & si navis piscibus talibus mortuis operiretur, non sistoretur. Et procul dubio tales occultae proprietates in natura plures sunt, quas nos latent.” For description of echeneis, see: Isidore of Seville, *Etymologies*, Book 12, 6:34: “The remora (echenais), a small fish half a foot long, takes its name because it holds a ship fast by clinging to it. Even if winds rush and storms rage, still the ship seems to stand in the sea as if rooted, and is not moved, not as a result of being held back, but simply by being clung to.” (*The Etymologies of Isidore of Seville*, trans. and ed. Stephan A. Barney, W.J. Lewis, J.A. Beach and Oliver Berghof, Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 261.

\(^{143}\) Sennert, *De morbis occultis*, Sig. Xx6v: “Secundo sunt mirae & occultae qualitates, quae in rebus quibusdam viventibus, sed non omnibus eiusdem specie, sed aliquibus tantum individuis reperiuntur. Ita aliud caseum; aliui aliud genus cibi aversantur, eoque non nisi cum damno valetudinis utuntur. Reperiuntur, qui rosurum odore offenduntur…. Et sunt omnino eiusmodi occultae qualitates quibusdam individuis propriae, plurimae & hinc ortae Sympathiae & Antipathiae multae, quae non toti specie communes sunt, sed certis speciebus propriis, quorum cuassa propterea non est forma illius specie, utpote, quae communis est omnibus eiusdem speciei individuis, sed ad potentias & impotentias naturales reducenda est, & a corporis illius individuis peculiari constitutione pendet. Unde etiam observatum, eiusmodi qualitates interdum cum aetas mutari & quibusdam id, quod in juventute fuit ingratissimum, & quod non sine periculo iuvenes usurpassent, in virili, vel senili aetate fieri gratissimum.”
acting on the form of the inanimate thing, e.g. the magnetic power of a loadstone.\textsuperscript{144}  

Fourth, Sennert identified postanimate qualities—forces in things that once lived, but live no longer. This is what accounts for the power of rhubarb to purge, as well as the effectiveness of many other medicaments.\textsuperscript{145}  

Fifth, Sennert discussed occult forces that are \textit{secundum naturam}, that is that arise in animals and plants in the natural order of things, e.g. the venom of snakes or the power of opium.\textsuperscript{146}  

Finally, only after delineating these five sorts of occult quality, Sennert tacked on the admission that certain occult qualities in living things are generated, \textit{praeter naturam}, though he gave no details on how these acted.\textsuperscript{147}  

In all, occult diseases could be broadly defined as either those

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{144} Sennert, \textit{De morbis occultis}, Sig. Xx6v: “Tertio sunt occultae qualitates, quae in rebus inanimatis animadveruntur, quae cum sint certae rerum naturalium species, qualitates illae merito ab illarum forma specifica deducuntur. Talis qualitas & vis est in magnete trahendi ferrum, idque in medio aëre pendulum, sive adhaerens servanci, & vis movendi sese versus polum. Tales vires proprites omnes habent gemmæ, metalla, mineralia, ut passim ex autoribus, qui de gemmis, lapidibus, mineralibus ac metallis scipserunt, notum est.”
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{145} Sennert, \textit{De morbis occultis}, Sig. Xx6v: “Quarto sunt occultae proprietates in rebus naturalibus, quae anteavixerunt, sed iam amplius non vivunt. Quales passim in plantis & animalibus, quibus loco medicamentorum utimur in Medicina, sed iam mortuis. Ita busonis ex siccatis utimur ad extrahendum venenum; cinis cancrorum fluviatilium medetur morsui canis rabidi: Alcis cornua & ungulae contra epilepsiam utiles sunt: cornu cervi, & os de corde cervi contra venena usurpantur: cranium humanum contra epilepsiam medetur; rhabarbarum, agaricus, mechoacanna, helleborus albus & niger, atque aliae plantae purgandi vim habent: radices paoniae contra epilepsiam utiles sunt: scordium veneno adversatur, sunt aliae plurimae insignes plantarum vires.”
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{146} Sennert, \textit{De morbis occultis}, Sig. Xx6v: “Quinto reperiuntur tales qualitates in iis, quae secundum naturam in viventibus, tam animalibus, quam plantis generantur. Hu(n)c pertinent venenum scorpionis, aspidis, serpentis, tarantulae, & aliorum animalium venatorum: item lapis bezoar, moschus, ziberhum, castoreum, & si quae huius generis alia sunt, quae in animalibus secundum naturam generantur. Huc referenda plantarum succi, lacrymae, & gummi, aloë, scammonium, elaterium, euphorbium, gummi gotte, opium, succu cicutae; & huius generis plurima alia.”
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{147} Sennert, \textit{De morbis occultis}, Sig. Xx6v: “Tandem sunt ea, quae in viventibus, animalibus praecipue, praeter naturam generantur. Tale est venenum canis rabidi, & aliorum animalium rabidorum, & venena aliae, quae in corpore humano generantur: quo & pestilens venenum referri potest.”
\end{flushright}
produced internally by the body, or occasioned by an external thing (usually, air, water, plant, animal, or poison, and more rarely, by the Devil through witches). 148

Books 2-8 of De morbis occultis delved into detail about the natural forms of occult qualities and the corresponding occult qualities that could be counterbalanced to them for a cure. Occult qualities are an important part of medicine, Sennert argued in Book 1, Chapter 4. 149 Though they may lie dormant in someone for years, they should never be forgotten. Once the physician determines that the case in front of him is an occult disease, it must be remembered that they are cured only by medicines that act on occult qualities. Overlooking their reality risks leaving a patient uncured.

This being a book of practica, the following chapters included description, prognosis, and treatment suggestions to assist physicians as they learned to read the signs of occult forces and diseases. Sennert highlighted the fact that occult diseases and

148 Sennert, De morbis occultis, Sig. Yy5v: “Deinde caussae illae occultae, malignae, & venenatae, quaeque aliis, quam elementaribus viribus corpus nostrum afficiunt, vel in corpore nostro humores malignos & pestilentes... Caussae vero mororum occultorum, quae extra corpora humana adveniunt, variae sunt. Primo enim aer potest variis qualitatum excessibus humores corrumpere, vel etiam malignis vaporibus, & inquinamentis infici... Secundo...est contagium, quod ab aliis, qui contagiosis morbis laborant, tum per aerem, tum aliis modis allii corporibus communicarum, eosdem in iis morbos excitat. Tales morbi sunt saepe febres malignae & pestilentes, epidemicae, ipsa pestis, scorbutus, elephantiasis, lues Venerea, qui omnes per contagium in alios transferri possunt. Tertio sunt venena assumpta quocunque modo, quae omnino sunt varia, & sumuntur vel a mineralibus, vel a planits, vel ab animalibus. Quarto etiam sunt venena extra communicata & corpori nostro immisa morus & ictu venenatorum animalium, ut morsu rabidorum animalium, ictu scorpii, tarantulae, serpentium & similia; imo ipso visu vel halite & effluvio occult communicata... Quo pertinent unguenta venenata, & alia, quibus sagittae, gladii, vestes & alia, quae hominem attingere possunt, illinuntur & inficuntur. Tandem, si libet, possunt huc & morbi per veneficia illari referri.”

149 Sennert, De morbis occultis, Sig. Yy2v: “Summa: quicquid ad partium corporis humani naturalem dispositionem pertinent, id ad eius sanitatem pertinent. Sanitas enim est seu potentia naturalis exercendi naturales actiones, pendens a constitutione partium secundum naturam; seu dispositio partium corporis humani naturalem, pertinent & occultare proprietates, & earum beneficiuo multae actiones perficiuntur. Ergo qualitates occulte etiam ad hominis sanitatem pertinent.”
cures are not always, or even often, far removed from normal diseases. Like Fernel, who saw his work as a continuation of Galen’s, Sennert employed Galenic and Hippocratic causes, more than any sort of disease-entity or semina such as Fracastoro postulated. Occult diseases worked on and in certain places, passions, and personal temperaments more than in others. Book 2, discussing corruption of the humours, makes this reconciliation especially clear. This can happen in a variety of ways, many of them recognizably Galenic: bad food, excessive passions, and inflamed imagination. In addition to traditional authorities, Sennert called on observations he made in the course of his own practice to describe his belief that anger, fear, and excessive passions worsened plague epidemics he saw and treated during the early years of the Thirty Years War in Wittenberg. Similarly, book 3 took up the topic of infested air and water that Hippocrates first pointed to in *Airs, Waters, and Places*. Throughout his examination of occult diseases arising from humours, airs, waters, poisons, minerals, plants, and animals, Sennert reminded readers to keep in mind that the effect of anything is keyed to the individual disposition. It remained important to read signs in the body as

---

150 Sennert, *De morbis occultis*, Sig. Zz5v: “Tandem inter caussas efficientes, humores corrumpentes, merito referuntur imaginatio & animi affectus... Item ex terrore & timore etiam multos in pestem incidisse, vulgo notissimum est. Observavi etiam hoc tempore, dum hic Professorem & Medicum ago, quo plus quam sexies valde (ut leviore infectiones, quae saepissime acciderunt, praeterea) hic pestis grassata est, non paucos quoque ex ira in pestem incidisse. Quod qua ratione fiat, equidem explicare facile non est, & dictum de febr. Lib.4.cap. 2. Hoc maxime mihi probable videtur, in pestilentibus constitutionibus corpora, sive coeli sive aëris ambientis vi, seu aliis de caussis ad pestilentem potius, quam aliam corruptionem (unde alii morbi pene omnes silent & cessant) disposita esse plurima. Cui si imaginatio, terror, timor, vel ira accidat, facile illa dispositione in actum deduci potest.”
medicine had always done. Above all, a physician should keep in mind that occult diseases are natural. Though mysterious, they are not all menacing.

This list did not account for all the types of occult disease that a doctor might encounter. In Book 9, Sennert turned to witchcraft, magic, and incantations, and appended as well a series of disputed questions about the power of the devil and magic to the book. In including discussion of the Devil and witchcraft in this context, and as the culmination of a long discussion of natural, but mysterious, forces at work in the human body, Sennert was fully in line with contemporary approaches to discussing the work of the Devil. As Stuart Clark’s magisterial work on witchcraft has argued, early modern debates across Europe about witchcraft and diabolic activity typically approached the task of interpreting them as a natural (albeit mysterious) phenomena. “In early modern Europe,” Clark contends, “it was virtually the unanimous opinion of the educated that devils, and a fortiori, witches, not merely existed in nature but acted according to its laws.” Accordingly, writers like Adolf Scribonius framed arguments

151 Disputed questions about the Devil and magic appended to Sennert’s De morbis occultis:

about witchcraft as a part of natural philosophy or medicine. The title of Scribonius’s major work makes this manifest: *De sagarum natura et potestate, deque his recte cognoscendis et puniendis physiologia. Ubi de purgatione earum per aquam frigidam* (1588). Scribonius’s approach continued through the seventeenth century.\(^{153}\)

While true of early modern Europe as a whole, this was also the characteristic of the approach at Sennert’s university. According to Clark, “Among the natural philosophers at Wittenberg in the 1620s…it was assumed that *actiones magicae* fell within the scope of the physics syllabus, since although the devil, as their originator, might not be relevant, the subjects of his operations and the operations themselves certainly were.”\(^{154}\) Sennert’s contemporary and colleague on the theological faculty at Wittenberg Jakob Martini oversaw a disputation on magic early in the 1620’s: *Diaskepsis philosophica, de magicis actionibus earumque probationibus* (1623).\(^{155}\) Beyond Wittenberg, other Lutheran authors took a similar tack. The influential Lutheran physician Andreas Libavius, whose work on chymistry and Paracelsianism influenced Sennert’s, speculated on abstruse

---

\(^{153}\) Clark, *Thinking with Demons*: “For one of the principal aims of demonological enquiry was precisely that of establishing what was supernatural and what was not; and there was scarcely an author who did not state categorically that demonism was an aspect of the natural world. The devil lacked just those powers to overrule the laws of nature that constituted truly miraculous agency. Whatever the scale of his intervention, it could never, therefore, turn natural into supernatural causation.” And “In 1703, for example, Friedrich Hoffmann published Buechinger’s doctoral dissertation *De potentia diaboli in corpora*, which explained that the devil acted on the ‘animal spirits’ in the human body, thus interfering with the imagination, other mental functions, and the motor activities, and inducing illusions, trances, and convulsions. Various internal physiological factors, together with differences of sex, age, and diet made some people more prone to this than others.” 168, 188.

\(^{154}\) Stuart Clark, *Thinking with Demons*, 155.

\(^{155}\) Jakob Martini, *Diaskepsis philosophica, de magicis actionibus earumque probationibus* (Wittenberg, 1623).
natural philosophical questions such as how witches fly to the Sabbat in his

*Singularium*. Natural philosophers, physicians, and theologians had conversations about the devil and his work, all in light of the Wittenberg tradition of natural philosophy that saw the subject as a science revealing the sovereignty of God in creation and individual bodies.

In his discussion, Sennert focused on providing what a physician might need to identify accurately the signs of this type of occult force or occult disease in the body. He proceeded by categorizing types of witchcraft and incantations, identifying telling signs of illness so caused, and remarking on treatment. He began by outlining three primary types of witchcraft: “vulgar,” “philosophical,” and “magical.” The first two types he dismissed as less important for physicians to know about. The third, concerning the things that the devil or someone who has made a deal with the devil might be able to accomplish, would be the focus of the text. For any who might doubt the reality of

156 Andreas Libavius, *Singularium pars prima*. In *qua de abstrusioribus, difficilioribusque nonnullis in philosophia, medicina, chymia etc quaestionibus…plurimis accurate disseritur*. (Frankfurt: 1599-1601). For other examples among German Lutheran authors at this time, see Clark, *Thinking with Demons*, 273-279.

157 Sennert, *De morbis occultis*, Sig. KKk4v: “Secundo fascinatio interdum accipitur pro laesione, quae alicui a corpore alio noxio & venenato per occultas…& effluva affertur: Quae fascinatione, si modo fascinatio dicenda est, ut mox dicitur, omnino naturalis est. Hoc modo Fascinum definite Langius, *lib. 2. Epist. 36*. quod sit vaporis virulenti a corpore noxio, natura a baliis diffidente…id est, defluvium, quo aliorum corporis habitus & spiritus, per visum, contactum, inviidiam, ob vocis & maledicæ linguae virulentiam, per vaporis halitum conspurcati, corpora tabescere cogit.”

158 Sennert, *De morbis occultis*, Sig. KKk5r: “Tertium genus quod attinet, probabitur in sequentibus, dari morbos a veneficiis. Nam ut alias Diablous iis, cum quibus pactum inii, persuadet, si res nullius momenti vel liminibus domus, vel lectis imponant, se iis effectus illos, quos cupiunt, praestare; cum tamen omne illud Diaboli opera praestetur: ita quoque idem veneficis persuadet, ut eum, cui nocere volunt, toruum aspiciant, ei male precentur; interim visus, voxque nihil tale praestant, sed omnium illorum, quae hominibus vel brutis accidunt, malorum autor Diabolus est.”
witchcraft, Sennert referenced a wide number of examples from contemporary authors and noted that witches frequently confessed to the crime in front of judges, so it must be true. Not content with this and the numerous descriptions of witchcraft he avidly collected and included in the text, Sennert appended to the book a set of letters describing a case of witchcraft in detail sent to him by a friend and colleague, explaining sorrowfully that, because the doctor was attending the military camps of the Elector, the letters arrived too late to include; the book had already been typeset when the they arrived. He piled up his evidence of witchcraft.

---

159 Sennert, De morbis occultis, Sig LLI2r: “Et tales historiae plurimae, ut dictum, a Sprengero, in malleo maleficarum, a Bodino, de Damonomania, Nicolao Remigio, de Damonolatria sagarum, & aliiis autoribus plurimis, qui de veneficiis scriperunt, rece(n)sentur. Imo vulgo etiam passim notum, sagas & maleficas iudicibus confessas esse, se alios caecos, alios claudos, paralyticos efficisse, alios saevissimis doloribus diu exercisse, & alios plurimos morbos excitasse: qui plerique cum supra caussas naturales fuerint; ut ex symptomatibus, quae in iis acciderunt & apparuerunt, adminirandis manifestu(m) est, non sine caussa plurimi consent, dari morbos a veneficio inductos.”

160 Sennert, De moribus occultis Appendix, Sig. MMm5r: “Cum vir Excellentissimus & Clarissimus, dn. Balthasar Han, Medicinae Doctor, & Sereniff. Dn. Electoris Saxoniae Archiater, Collega, Compater, & Amicus meus honorandus a me intelligeret, me in Libro Sexto Practicae etiam aliquid de mobris a Veneficio dicturum; miram eius rei historiam mihi narravit, eamque planius descriptum se paulo post per epistolam exhibuisse, & alios plurimos morbos excitasse: qui plerique cum supra caussas naturales fuerint; ut ex symptomatibus, quae in iis acciderunt & apparuerunt, adminirandis manifestu(m) est, non sine caussa plurimi consent, dari morbos a veneficio inductos.”
Throughout his discussion, Sennert repeatedly emphasized that the Devil can only bring about about disease by natural causes with God’s permission. He used as evidence the example of Job. Like Bartholin above, Sennert agreed that the Devil’s power was limited to interfering with the patient’s natural humoral disposition. The Devil might exacerbate disease and interfere with the effectiveness of treatment, but he could not introduce new causes of disease, nor could he upend or destroy nature.

---

161 Sennert, De morbis occultis, Sig. LL13v: “Quinta Morbos vero illos Diabulos interdum per causas naturales hominibus inducit. Cum enim Diabolo rerum naturalium vires ac sympathiae & antipathiae non ignotae sint, & optime norit, quid hominis cuiusque valetudini commodum, quid noxium sit, quid hunc vel illum morbu inducit & venena ad causas moribificas hominium corporibus, vel secundum totam substantiam, vel ipsarum partem spirituosam & maxime efficiem ulam ingerere & inferred valeat, vel humores pravos in corpore latent, & etiam bonos corrupere, atque in varias partes immittere, atque ita naturalem earum constitutionem mutares, imo violenter quaedam, permisso DEI, in corpore humano perverttere; praeda affectus varios, spiritibus & humoribus motis excitare; hoc modo varios morbos a Diabolo excitari negant; cum a caussis naturalibus provenire possint…. Diabolum autem quandoque mediis naturalibus morbos inducere, etiam sacrae literae docent. Nam I Reg. cap. 16. de Saule Rege legitur, quod certis tempore intervallis malus Daemon ipsum exagitaverit. Et, Luc. 13. Extat historia mulieris habentis spiritum infirmitatis annis octodecim, quae erat inclina, nec poterat sursum respicere, quam IESUS sanavit die Sabbati, & indignati Arachisynagogae respondit: Hypocritae, unusquisque vestrum Sabbato non solvit bovem suum aut asinum suum a praesepio, & ducit ad aquam: Hanc autem filiam Abrahae, quam alligavit Satanas octodecim annis, non oportuit solvi a vincula die Sabbati?”

162 Sennert, De morbis occultis, Sig. LL13r: “Ubi omnino statuendum, lamias & sagas ipsas operationum talim casussas non esse, sed Diabolum… ad quaru(m) voluntatem & preces Diabolus, DEO permittente, tales morbos hominibus infiligi(n)t; aut qui a natura ortum habent, eos sua ope a sagis induci iis persuadet. Ideoque ut veneficium appellantur, necessarium est, ut Daemon & saga concurrant. Ubi enim Daemon solus, precibus & pacto sagarum non instigatur, hominem affligit, id quod Jobo accidunt, tum propriae veneficium aut action Magica non appellatur, sed tum solum veneficium dicitur, cum Diabolus in grataim veneficae, & eius precibus vel pacto invitat, homini nocet, & damnun affere.” Sig. LL16r: “Nona conclusio: Licet magna Diaboli sit potestas, nulli tamen, etiam ad sagarum voluntatem, nocere potest, sine DEI permissione. Id quod non solum ex hisotria Jobi, sed & Evangelica patet, e qua notum, quod nec suibus Daemon nocere potest sine permissione DEI, & quod nec capillus capitis sine voluntate DEI capite nostro decidit. Ideoque; etsi interdum sagae a Daemone suo petunct, ut hominius morbos vel damna inferat, idque Diabolus ipsis se praestitutum promittat, & eius rei consequenae gratia quaedam fecere iubeat: tamen si Deus non permittat, saepissime voli compotes non fiunt. … Et inprimis, ut infra etiam, cap. 7. Dictetur, Diabolus, a sagis quoque instigatus, nocere non potest iis, qui DEO quotidie sese precibus commendant, ac pietati studenti, & a peccatis gravibus abstinent; deinde Magistratus qui sagarum caussas agnoscent & iudicant. Cum enim iudicia publica exercerant, potestate a DEO concessa, DEUS etiam eos protegit, ne a Diabolo, vel eius mancipiis in officio suo haedantur ac turbentur.”
Notwithstanding these limits on the Devil’s power, reading the signs of this type of affliction is especially tricky. Here, Sennert gave a few helpful pointers to his colleagues. One sign that the case in front of him is diabolic is that the physician doubts himself and all the signs he typically trusts. Another is that these diseases do not seem to correspond to typical courses of disease. A third is that there are extraordinary or dramatic symptoms.

As for treatment, it is generally not possible to cure the work of Satan by natural means—though people foolishly try by using various plants and incantations to drive the devil from their homes, just as Tobit used a fish. It is not permissible to turn to a

---

163 Sennert, De morbis occultis, Sig. LL1fr: “Morbos a veneficiis ortos agnoscre loge difficillimum est; cum Diabolus naturalibus caussis sese saepe immisceat, Iisque utatur, ut non facile sit discernere, quid a caussis naturalibus, quid ab ipso Daemone prefectum sit Imo in iis, quos obsedit, saepe sat diu sub naturalis morbi larva latet.”

164 Sennert, De morbis occultis, Sig. LL6r: “Et omnino primum hoc signum est morborum a veneficiis illatorum, quod Medici etiam doctissimi in morbo cognoscendo dubii sunt, & hesitant, ac omnino fluctuant, & vix aliquid certi, quo vel sibi ipsis satisfaciant, statuae possunt; & quamvis multa remedia adhibeant, iis tamen nihil proficient, sed morbus indies deterior redditur.”

165 Sennert, De morbis occultis, Sig. LL6r: “Secundum signum est, quod cum morbi naturales sensim incipient, & sua tempora percurrant, & statum perveniant; morbi a Diabolo revera inducti saepe nullis praesentibus caussis, pravisque humoribus, statim in suo vigore constitui videntur & gravissimis doloribus, ac aliis symptomatibus aegrum affigunt.”

166 Sennert, De morbis occultis, Sig. LL6r: “Tertio aegri inusitata & a Medicis vix dum annotate symptomata patiuntur, & modo in hac, modo in illa parte de dolore conqueruntur; plurimi sine caussa toto corpore emaciantur, fiunt melancholici, quidam convulsiones patiuntur.”

167 Sennert, De morbis occultis, Sig. LL6r: “Et hodie rustici ac vulgus nonnullas plantas in domibus suspendere solent, ad veneficio & incantationes avertendas; & hypericum vulgus ea de caussa Fugam daemonum appellat. Fugere etiam aiunt daemones fusitum cornu caprini, & cuiusvis stercoris, ac praecepue humani. Et pro sententia ista probanda afferunt exemplum Tobiae iunioris, qui iussu Angeli Raphaelis suffitu iceris piscis cuiusdam daemonem, qui septem Sarae sponsos antea occiderat, fugabit, Tobiae. 8.

Verum cum praeervatio nihil aliud fit aliud, quam caussae morbium factuere averse; morbi vero isti, ut supra probatum, proxime ab ipso Diabolo induca(n)tur: facile hinc patet, res istas naturales, & similis Daemones morbom inducturos fugare & avertere non posse. Nam cum Daemones sint incorpori, & sensuum organis careant, a corporibus naturalibus affici, & ex iis vel voluptatem, vel molestiam percipere naturaliter non possunt. Interim Deus, qui supra naturam est, rebus naturalibus vim agendi etiam in
witch to cure a disease, even (or especially) one caused by witchcraft. This is putting one’s hope in the devil, not in God. Even if there is no remedy for what has befallen someone, he should select to die rather than resort to sin, by consulting a witch. Instead, there are licit natural and/or divine cures that one might seek. In the end, all diseases by witchcraft are incurable except by God’s mercy.

While an extreme sort of occult disease, Sennert based his discussion of diabolic disease and treatment on the fundamental belief that any medicine was effective only because God made it so (this theme will come up repeatedly in chapters three and four). While perhaps particularly pressing in cases of witchcraft, this applied to all types of disease. The deep awareness of intermingled human and divine power in the practice of medicine lead to theologically-pointed questions arising in the midst of medical works. These related to the key questions that troubled Jakob Horst in his examination of Christoph Mueller: to what extent can someone discern the will of God? What is the role

incorporea tribuere potest. Quam procul dubio etiam suffitus ille iecoris piscis non ex se, sed ex vi a Deo concessa habuit.”

Sennert, *De morbis occultis*, Sig. LLl6r: “Cum ergo res naturales vim veneficia averrendi & praecavendi non habeant, porro quaeitur; si quis veneficam aliquam suspectam habeat & metuat, ne sibi noceat, an liceat eam orare, vel blandittis persuadere, ne noceat; aut liceat ab aliqua alia saga amuletum contra veneficia petere. Ubi omnino respondendum, non licere. Nam cum, ut supra probatum, ipsae sagae morbos non inducant, sed Diabolus; hoc modo Diabolus honoraretur, & ab eo peteretur, ne noceat; quod nullo modo licet.”

Sennert, *De morbis occultis*, Sig. LLl6v: “Suppediatak & haec historia Prognosticum quoddam; nimirum morbos omnes a veneficio inductos curabiles non esse, sed, Deo permittente, a Diabolo corporis humani constitutionem ita saepi vitari posse, ut nulla humana ope in pristinum statum reduce possit….Et omnino multi morbi Dei permisssu a Diabolo induci possunt, qui plane sunt incurabiles.”
of providence in disease and treatment? How are primary and secondary causation at work in the bodies and souls of individual people?

In *De morbis occultis*, Sennert metaphorically dodged the question that logically followed from his insistence that the Devil can only inflict disease with God’s permission: why does God even allow it in the first place? This was the proper domain of a theologian, he claimed. It would have to suffice to remark that though God’s justice may seem as mysterious (occult) as the occult disease itself, it is always right. But he was not the only Lutheran thinker to acknowledge and grapple with the tricky relationship of providence and disease in a medical text. His probing question, in fact, echoed Caspar Peucer in *Oratio de peste*. After a detailed rumination on the providence of God in the natural world, Peucer stumbled upon the question: “But if God is the cause of good, and human nature is suited for health, from whence is born in humans so much disease?” He struggled to affirm that God himself was not the author of disease; it was the result of secondary causes. The theologian Daniel Cramer took up the same vexed and vexing topic in relation to the plague, pointing out that while physicians were experts on secondary causes, the primary cause of all things is God, and His inscrutable

---


171 Caspar Peucer, *Oratio continens commonefactionem de peste* (Wittenberg, 1565) Sig. A6v: “Sed si Deus causa boni est, & ad hominum salutem natura condita est, unde est in genere humano tantum morborum?”
will. These things were properly the domain of theologians.\textsuperscript{172} Physicians could not completely explain outbreaks of disease; theologians had a part to play as well.

Sennert also intervened in the debate about God’s relationship to disease and cure in \textit{Consensu ac dissensu}. There, Sennert hinted at an underlying paradox in early modern thought about medicine. While disease is bad, and God is not the author of evil, nonetheless, He provided cures for disease even before the fall. Indeed, cures for bodily disease revealed the same divine mercy as the ultimate cure for the human condition: (salvation).\textsuperscript{173}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Daniel Cramer, \textit{De peste, nova dissertatio theologica et scholastica} (Leipzig 1625), Sig. C7r-8r: “\textit{Sed in causarum indagatione, cur tam alte progreditur Theologus? Facit hoc omni jure, \& ex liberalissima tum Medicorum tum Philosophorum concessione. Nam propter densissimam, Philosophiae \& totius Sapientiae humane caliginem mens humanae etiam in humanis caecutit, ut nocta ad Solem, ut volens nolens adigitur suspirare ad…divinam. Sic item \& Medici, quando in hoc proprio suo foro versantur, \& de morbis agunt, non tantum in Peste, sed \& alibi agnosce coguntur…Et plerumq(ue); ad primam causarum causam transcendente, ut nota est Hippocratis sententia, quam sic Fr. Valleriola explicat, \& simul etiam ad Galeni testimonium provocat: \textit{Est profecto, inquien, in morbo quid divinum, spiritualis, abditum, nec Medico satis prospectum. Et paulo post: Naturam a seipsa doctam, ex seq, discemtem agree, ac prouide inessabilem reconditam, longeaeq(ue), nostra cognition profoundiorem illius operationem esse, rectissime a Galeno dictum est. Et Laurentius Joubertus: Pestis causa omnium certissima, prima, praecipua est, quam Theologi ad DEI omnipotentis justitiam referent, \& c. Quapropter nec ullus Ethnorum tam caecus fuit, quin hac lue saeviente, ad primam omnium causarum DEUM resperxerit. Et merito: Nam solis causis secundis asscrbendae calamitates non sunt, sed ascendendum alitus ad considerationem causae primae, sine qua secundae nihil possunt, cum illa fine his possit omnia, inquit D. David Rungius in Exodum.”}
\item Sennert, \textit{De consensus ac dissensu}, Sig. Yyyv-Zzz1r: “Rationes vero, quibus recep(n)tiores quidam probare conantur, omnes morbos esse curables, nullius plane ponderis sunt. Si enim, inquiunt, quidam morbi essent incurabiles, tales essent vel caussa naturae, vel autoris naturae. Non naturae, quae sibi conservationem vult, \& omnia cum ad salutem, tum ad voluptatem hominum necessaria producit. Non Dei. Si enim Deus medicamenta contra omnes morbos non condidisset, fecessit id vel ed invidia vel impotentia. No(n) illud. Si enim Deus ita amavit genus humanum, ut etiam ad aeternum mortem evertendam remedium concesserit, etiam remedia contra morbos concessit. Omnipotentiae vero divinae derogare velle, nefas est. Deinde dicunt, exempla morborum pro incurabilibus habitorum idem testari, talesque morbos curavisse Arnoldum de Villanova, Rulandum seniorem \& alios.
Verum enim vero, etsi in rerum natura omnia, quae ad necessitate \& voluptatem homini necessaria sunt, exstent, \& Deus potuisset medicamenta co(n)trea omnes morbos creare, sicut notum, a Salvatore multos incurabiles morbos curatos fuisset, imo mortuos excitatos: tame(n) non sequitur, quod sit invidus, si hoc non
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
In closing, let me consider a few of those divinely appointed treatments and what they reveal about the relationship of the human body and soul to the natural world and to each other.

2.5 Therapies

Drawing on these medical theories, the Bible, and natural philosophy, what cures could sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Lutheran physicians like Sennert and Horst offer patients? Popular imagination portrays early modern medicine as a series invasive procedures that make us grimace at the thought of enduring them sans anesthesia. Famous examples include John Calvin’s doctor recommending riding a horse at a gallop across rough terrain to dislodge his often recurring kidney stones, or John Donne’s doctor prescribing the application of pigeon carcasses to the souls of the feet to draw bad humours down from the head when he fell victim to typhus.174 Others may think of a


174 Bruce Gordon includes an excerpt from a letter Calvin wrote to Heinrich Bullinger in which he wrote a vivid description of his pain and the treatment including this: “…on the advice of my physician I mounted a horse that the jolting might assist in discharging the stone…” See idem, Calvin. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), 329. John Donne traced his illness in his Devotions upon Emergent Occasions (1624).
set of odd ‘receipts’ that include everything from rare spices newly introduced to Europe to traditional old wives’ blends of herbs and roots to feces in a medical mish-mash. But many treatments were less invasive, depending on pleasant smells and sounds to restore the balance of the humours. For example, both a cloud of rosemary and music were said to have the power to keep the plague away.

As Fuchs claimed above, and as chapter 4 will show, early modern Lutherans believed and stressed that God providentially planted natural medicines in nature. (Though it was never clear why the earth was designed with remedies for diseases that did not exist before sin. The paradox Sennert pointed out went largely unanswered). One key goal of herbals like Fuchs’s or Conrad Gessner’s was to provide a comprehensive introduction to this natural wonder. Herbs and plants, as well as particular places like healing springs and waters that were considered especially effective at driving away illness were a key cause for wonder at nature, the link between

When he mentioned the physicians and the pigeon carcasses, Donne both explained the object of the treatment and noted a spiritual symbolism in it. As the doctors applied the pigeons to his feet he fervently prayed, “Therefore thou hast been pleased to afford us this remedy in nature, by this application of a dove to our lower parts, to make these vapours in our bodies to descend, and to make that a type to us, that, by the visitation of thy Spirit, the vapours of sin shall descend, and we tread them under our feet.” (John Donne, Devotions Upon Emergent Occasions, University of Michigan: Ann Arbor Paperbacks, 1959, 82).

individual health and the natural world, and God’s providence. In seventeenth-century Germany, the popular writer Joannes Praetorius used his *Zodiacus* (1667) and *Theatrum* to describe healing springs in small German towns, along with efforts to prove the efficacy of the waters. The German merchant Balthasar Paumgartner’s travails and travels, and the letters he and his wife Magadalena shared about them, repeatedly reveal the importance of visits to special healing springs and the hope for cures invested in them, all subject to God’s mysterious will. For example, on 7 June 1584, Magdalena wrote to her husband who was visiting springs near Lucca, “I understand…that you have been drinking the waters for eight days and are doing better than others there. As always, such news brought me heartfelt joy…… I have hope that Almighty God will grant my heartfelt prayer and restore your health there by Christian means, since it has not been his will to do so here.”

The use of herbs and springs, as well as phlebotomies and evacuations, was part of the general aim of medical therapy: restoring the proper balance and functioning of the body, and, because closely tied to it, the soul. In the Galenic system inherited and employed by physicians in the Wittenberg Circle, the coincidence of physiological and


psychological health meant that treatment applied to one of these things affected the other. Achieving and maintaining (as nearly as possible) the optimal balance of humours depended on balancing sets of factors, naturals, counter-naturals, and non-naturals.179

Briefly, “naturals” were the natural physical functions of the body and the world; counter-naturals were pathologies or diseases, and non-naturals were factors that could be used to promote the best possible functioning of the “naturals,” and thereby eliminate or thwart the effects of counter-naturals. Non-naturals included: emotion, “air and environment; food and drink; sleep and waking; motion and rest; and repletion and evacuation.” Guidebooks for health offered suggestions on the most appropriate ways to balance these things, including suggestions for diet, ideal number of hours for sleep, etc.180 These last were, as I’ll show in chapter four, one of the most popular genres of vernacular literature.

One example of a non-natural treatment can sum up many of the themes of this chapter, and help us move into the next chapters. Music was a non-natural that directly

179 “…although in Galenic therapeutic terms a ‘cure’ consisted of the destruction of a pathological cause through the manipulation of the bodily qualities, the physiological theory of humoral complexions did not allow for the real existence of a perfectly balanced and healthy state. Whether a patient was technically ‘cured’ in terms of ancient and early modern medicine, then, depended not on his or her self-evident return to a condition of perfect health, but rather on the recognizable eradication of the specific functional impairment which defined the disease—with the likely possibility of relapse due to one’s humoral complexion or even the continued existence of another pathological condition.” (Gowland, Worlds, 75-76).
affected passions. It could be described using all of the sources of medical thought mentioned in this chapter: the Bible sanctioned it and provided an example of its use, while Lutheran physicians explained its effectiveness by reference to either Galenic spiritus or occult forces.

Writers regularly referenced an episode from the Old Testament as the prototypical example of the power of music to affect and to effect physical and psychological health. I Samuel 16:23 states, “And whenever the harmful spirit from God was upon Saul, David took the lyre and played it with his hand. So Saul was refreshed and was well, and the harmful spirit departed from him.” Over the centuries, expositions of the text from figures as diverse as Boethius, Augustine, Marsilio Ficino, and Robert Burton drew upon prevailing medical and anatomical notions, derived from Hippocrates and Galen and reconciled with Christian theology, to explain the force of David’s music and, more generally, the power of music to heal diseases, especially (but not exclusively) those of mind and soul like melancholy. For example, the medieval theologian Nicolas of Lyra devoted discussion of the episode of David and Saul in his influential Postilla litteralis to the healing power of music.181 Centuries before this, Boethius offered tales of mysterious and marvelous healings effected by music in his

influential *De institutione musica*, the work that proved the foundation of much (not all) subsequent Western musical theory.

Lutheran writers in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries inherited and recited this tradition, both physicians and theologians. In his commentary on the book of I Samuel published in 1555, Hieronymous Weller described the use of music and its effect on the spirits, remarking that it “was created by God in order to dissipate sadness and grief of soul.” As for physicians who commented on music, Johannes Magirus contented himself with referencing Boethius in passing while comparing the harmony of the heart to musical intervals. (This hints as well at the relationship of harmonics in music to the harmony of the natural world, so important to Johannes Kepler in *Harmonices mundi*).

---

182 Hieronymous Weller, *Samuelis Liber Primus, Annotationibus piis iuxta ac eruditis explices* (Frankfurt, 1555), Sig. M1r-v: “Apparet autem ex his verbis doctrinam hanc populo Israel tum notam fuisse, scilicet mortiferas illas cogitationes, non a eo, sed a Diabolo oriri, Deum autem permittere, ut Diabolus his suis ignites telis interdum excruciet homines. Item Musicam in hoc creatam esse a Deo, ut tristiciam ac moerorem animi discutiat, & ab angoribus nos avocet, praevertim si fuerint piae cantilenae, ut sunt Psalmi, & similes cantiones de sacris rebus ac historiis.”

183 Magirus, *Anthropologia*, Sig. K7v: “Tertio, alia similitudine declarant harmoniam trium praecipuarum potentiarium; Quae similitudo est desumpta ab intervallis musicis, quae docte explicat Boetius lib. 4. Musices cap. 10…”

The harmony of the soul was of a piece with this, and begins to show why music could be regarded as an effective medicine. Caspar Bartholin extolled the power of music in his *Problematum philosophicorum & medicorum* (1611) in an *exercitatio* entitled: “An cantus & Musica ad curam morborum aliquid faciant." He described music’s power to calm and bring joy to the soul, though he did not provide a detailed description of the mechanism by which music did this. According to Bartholin, certain ailments are best treated by music, such as tarantanism and St. Vitus’s Dance. For his part, Daniel Sennert in *Consensu ac dissensu* acknowledged as well the power of music to move and cure the soul. Music encouraged *spiritus* to move about the body, to

---


Sed mirum magis est, morbos aliqua esse qui solum Musica exstirpantur, nec remediis, aliiis facile, quod quidem adhuc cognitum. Est enim Phalangian genus quoddam in Apuliae partibus a Tarento Tarantula dictum cuius morsu quam vespeaictu acerbiore homines, ut messores vexati perpetuo canunt, illacrymant, delirant, inprimis vero omnes saltant; nec aliter sanitati restituuntur, quam adhibitis Musicis modulis animum delinientibus. Hinc ex animalibus hisce pulvis rite factus & usurpatus hominem perpetuo quasi saltare facit. Qua de re videatur in Magia naturali lib. 2. Celeberrimus vir Johannes Baptistae de Porta Neapolitanus fautor & amicus noster colendissimus.

Hic affectus similis videtur isti, quem saltum S. Viti, qua huius in vocatione se liberari putant, appellant: in quo homines perpetuo per septimanas etiam aliquod noctu & interdui chreas ducent, donec viribus prostrates, & attritis pedibus ad se redeunt, adeo tum imbecilli ut vis refici queant.

186 Sennert, *Consensu ac dissensu*, Sig. KKK4r: “Quanta, aiunt, orationis vis sit ad move(n)dos & varie flectendos animos, notissimum est. Nec ignora Musicae vis, quae homines ad chreas & tripudia, ad iram, ad tristitiam, ad misericordiam, ad arma concitare potest. Animi vero affectus magnam vim habere corpora nostra alterandi, extra dubium est. Observatum etiam esse putant, verbis quibusdam prolatis a vetulis infantis quosdam aegrotare, alios inferire, foemindas uterum gerentes, abortum facere, nonnullus macie consumi, alios gravissimis doloribus corripi.”
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circulate faster or slower when warmed or cooled, and in this way had a direct effect on physiological and psychological health (as spiritus was integrally connected to both).  

Expanding on this Galenic approach to music, Sennert returned to the importance of it in De morbis occultis. Because, as shown above, excessive passions could exacerbate occult diseases, he highlighted its usefulness in balancing them, as well as pointing out a number of commenters who suggested that music was effective against plague.  

---


melancholy or psychological diseases like Saul’s in I Samuel, though it was especially highly regarded for those cases. Gentile da Foligno, a leading medical professor in Perugia, urged those worried about the Black Death sweeping Europe to buttress their immunity by keeping humors balanced and positive. This could best by accomplished by actively seeking happiness and by listening to “melodies, songs, stories, and other similar pleasures.” Others prescribed other applications. Ulrich von Hutten encouraged patients to combine pharmacological treatment with listening to music, as the most effective remedy for syphilis. In 1614, the Spanish physician Rodericus a Castro observed simply, “Throughout Spain, whenever anyone falls seriously ill, it is usual to summon musicians.” Speculation about the power of music as a medical cure continued throughout the early modern era.

As with other topics I’ve mentioned (the ubiquity of Sirach, the centrality of the creation and fall narrative), an understanding of the power of music reached beyond non vero in ita, in qua humores etiam ad ambitum corporis moventur, ubi caussa a me antea allata potior videtur. Inter animi affectus, qui humores corrumpere, ipsisque naturam venenatam inducet possunt, Cardanus, lib. 1. De venen. Cap. 6. Etiam odium refert, affectum ex tristitia & ira compositum, eumque accerrime corrumpere humores, si quid aliud, scribit. Nam ira excalefacit, tristitia refrigerat, quo ipso motus contrarii fiunt, & in qualitate & ratione loci, atque inde multos abditis, ut putantur, caussis perire existinat.”

Examples here come from Peregrine Horden, “Musical Solutions” in Music as Medicine: The History of Music Therapy since Antiquity.

It was expressed not just in things like the intriguing early eighteenth century Dutch piece by Johannes Schenck, Les fantaisies bizarres de la goutte, but rather systematically expounded in works like Richard Browne’s Medicina Musica: or a Mechanical Essay on the Effects of Singing, Music, and Dancing (1729), Richard Broklesby’s Reflections on Ancient and Modern Musick, with an Application to the Cure of Diseases (1749) and the French physician Louis Roger’s Tentamen (Examination) de vi soni et musices in corpus humanum (1748) and in the thriving belief in tarantism—that music and dance can heal the bite of the spider.
learned treatises to the laity. In 1631, the Lutheran pastor Bernhard Albrecht published a collection of his sermons, reworked into a text entitled *Melancholia: Das ist, Christlicher und zu diser Zeit sehr nothwen(n)diger Bericht von der Melancholischen Schwermut und Traurigkeit*. Drawing on his decades of pastoral experience, Albrecht described various sorts of melancholy, and offered practical suggestions to overcome it, including prayer. But music, according to Albrecht, “has a special power to awaken sad hearts to joy and merriment. Melancholy is not dispelled by weeping and wailing but with hymns of praise and witty and joyful songs.”  

Adducing the classic example of David and Saul, as well as encouraging readers to consult David’s book of songs (the Psalter) as a whole, Albrecht exhorted those suffering from melancholy to take advantage of the consolation and healing that only music could offer, just as his contemporary in England, Robert Burton, did in his more famous *Anatomy of Melancholy*.

In sum, the non-natural music gives insight into how a treatment could be understood to influence the body by affecting the soul, bringing both back to proper balance. Discussions of the power of music, like those of medicine from Sirach 38 and the creation narrative reached beyond learned circles to vernacular literature, which

---

191 Bernhard Albrecht, *Melancholia: Das ist Christlicher und zu diser zeit sehr nothwendiger Bericht, von der Melancholischen Schwermut und Traurigkeit, woher sie kommt, durch was für mittel derselben zu begegnen, unnd wie man sich wider alle und jede Anfechtung trösten möge* (Oetingen, 1631), Sig. G6v: “...eine sonderliche krafft hat die traurige herzen zu Frewd und Fröligket zu erwecken. Mit heulen und weinen ist die Schwermut night zu vertreiben aber mit seinen Lobgesängen und geistreichen freudigen Liedern.”
indicates that it may be hard to establish a stark divide between elite and lay notions—a topic to which I will return in chapter four.

**2.6 Conclusion**

In attempting to understand the body and God’s work in it, Lutheran physicians in the Wittenberg Circle, like Sennert, Bartholin, and Horst resorted to explanations utilizing a variety of authorities and with reference to divine or diabolic forces at work in the body. While based on traditional authorities (Hippocrates, Galen, and the tradition of commentary on them), early modern medicine as practiced by physicians in the Wittenberg Circle was in flux, and any attempt to ascribe “occult” or “spiritual” diseases and cures only to uneducated or lay opinion founders in the face of overwhelming evidence to the contrary. Discerning the difference between normal, divine, diabolic, activity in the individual body was at the heart of medical debates.

In order to understand bodies and souls, and various sorts of forces at work in them, Lutheran physicians believed that they must be seen within the framework of God’s whole creation. Understanding and treating disease thus required balancing a variety of authorities and principles: from Galen and Hippocrates to the Bible. Together, these provided a system by which to understand diseases of body as related to the soul, in light of Christian theology. As chapter three will show, practicing this sort of medicine could be a way of imitating the greatest physician of all, *Christus medicus*. 
3. Physicians & Christus Medicus

“…Herr Doctor Sennert did much for us, but had to lose his own life for it. I remember something he said...’I could just as easily move from here for a time; I am not obligated to stay. But I would not prefer to do anything other than remain and gladly serve every man with my advice’...O the praiseworthy Christian love!”

Upon the death of the famous physician and medical professor on July 21, 1637 (the date recorded on the funeral sermon), the pastor of the Wittenberg Stadtkirche Paul Röber mounted his pulpit to eulogize the dead and comfort the living. Röber, a product of Wittenberg’s theological faculty, studied under Jakob Martini and Balthasar Meisner and became a doctor in theology on the centenary of Luther’s 95 Theses. The symbolism of that conjuncture should not be overlooked. One of the most influential theological voices in Wittenberg in the opening decades of the seventeenth century, Röber’s credentials as a leading Orthodox Lutheran theologian and preacher were unquestionable. This makes his praise of the practice of medicine as a work of Christian charity in his sermon for Sennert noteworthy. As this chapter will demonstrate, his remarks on the goodness of the physician’s profession were conventional, not idiosyncratic, wholly in line with standard Lutheran thinking. Furthermore, coming just

---
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after the famous physician found himself embroiled in the traducianist controversy discussed in chapter one, Röber’s firm defense of Sennert’s fidelity to his faith to the end of his life is significant.

Indeed, though a physician could, like Sennert, inspire effusive admiration for his personal piety, some traditional prejudices and qualms about the profession persisted and thrived in Lutheran Germany, as across Europe, and only slowly abated. Lutheran thinkers like Röber hammered out and championed a positive view of learned physicians and medicine in the midst of widespread debate and doubts about them in the second half of the sixteenth and first decades of the seventeenth centuries. The damaging charges by his colleagues outlined in chapter one that Sennert’s work on the origin of souls made him a “blasphemer” in contrast to Röber’s eulogy make this two-sided take on doctor patent. Manifold concerns about the theological implications of and questions raised by natural philosophy and medicine could, and often did, stretch to worries about the person of the physician himself.

This was true among Lutherans, as well as in Catholic and Calvinist territories and England. Perhaps the most famous early modern meditation on physicians and faith came from Sennert’s contemporary, Thomas Browne. His book Religio medici boasted an eye-catching frontispiece that depicted a physician tumbling headfirst from the sky, saved only by a mysterious hand from heaven. The physician Browne commenced with a confession that he wrote the book because suspicions of faithless irreligiousness were
As had been true since antiquity, physicians came in for equal parts praise and blame. For some like Röber they were pious, charitable, and knowledgeable servants of God; for others they were covetous quacks or even atheists. At the very least, worrisome temptations beset the profession. Yet just as natural philosophical and medical theories themselves could harmonize with faith, so too, could a physician honor God with his practice of medicine.

This chapter will show how early modern Lutheran thinkers crafted a dominant narrative for their circles that depicted learned medicine as God’s gift, and the physician as an imitator of Christ, who fulfilled a divinely-given vocation of charity. Patent concern to defend medicine and physicians against detractors, and the not-so-veiled critiques of abuses in the art and its practitioners spurred this keen concern to construct a counter-image of the ideal pious physician. This physician must be knowledgeable and virtuous, but above all a lover of God. Some authors, as I’ll show below, pointed out that an important reason for this is that while a doctor’s primary task was to heal bodily diseases and discomforts, his work also affected the soul. Because a doctor must understand and treat the bodies and souls of his patients, he had best be able to understand both, in the way that anthropologia taught, while also nourishing spiritual

\[2\] Thomas Browne, A true and full copy of that which was most imperfectly and surreptitiously printed before under the name of Religio medici (London, 1643), Sig. A3r. The literature on Browne is vast. A good starting place is still Andrew Cunningham, “Sir Thomas Browne and his Religio Medici: Reason, Nature and Religion” in Religio Medici: Medicine and Religion in Seventeenth-Century England, ed. Ole Peter Grell and Andrew Cunningham, (Aldershot, England and Bookfield, VT: Ashgate, 1996), 12-61.
life. Encouraging a physician to approach practice in this way stimulated a literature that encouraged doctors to cultivate personal piety.

Though discussions of the role of a physician rarely delved deeply into medical theory, the presentation of the physician as a healer of body and soul was founded on a view of medicine as part of natural philosophy that sought to understand and treat bodies and souls, subsumed under a broader quest to recognize the work of God in the world. In this way, it relates to the *anthropologia* and medical theories discussed in chapters one and two of this dissertation. It also derives from common and extensive comparisons of physicians to Christ. In many of these, the medical act of healing the body directly analogized to the divine act of saving the soul.

In order to understand this outlook on the physician and his profession, this chapter will consider, in turn, critique and praise of medicine in orations and commentaries; literature devoted to describing or encouraging a doctor’s education in medicine and piety; and the widespread view of physicians as imitators of *Christus Medicus* in remarks on the medical profession found in sermons and biblical commentaries. It is important to remark at the outset that the sources considered in this chapter were prescriptive and idealistic, not descriptive. They do not afford detailed accounts of actual practice, aside from passing biographical comments on the lives of physicians in funeral sermons, nor is that the goal. Instead, taken together, these orations, sermons, and books give access to Lutheran mentalité: an ideal of the practice of
medicine and doctors rooted both in faith and in the understanding of medicine as addressed to body and soul, deriving from theories detailed in chapters one and two.

Several historiographical strands intertwine to inform this presentation. This chapter and the next draw on trends in the history of medicine to examine it in light of how particular social, cultural, and religious milieus influenced understandings of it. Thirty years ago, Roy Porter acerbically critiqued a history of medicine that “has tended to produce histories of itself essentially cast in the mold of its own current image” rather than realizing that it “ought centrally to be about the two-way encounters between doctors and patients.” Just as was true of the history of science more broadly, Porter lamented a historiography that had primarily concerned itself with a succession of “Great Men” and great events, while ignoring day-to-day perceptions and experiences. While some studies have begun to address Porter’s challenge, none have outlined how early modern Lutherans idealized the person and role of the physician in religious terms, such that a doctor’s relationship to God affected his relationship to medicine and to his patients.

In turning from the model of history Porter criticized to portray the effect of social and cultural attitudes on physicians and views of physicians, some historians explore the history of medical ethics or self-fashioning and self-presentation for physicians. In that vein, Roger French argued that a key part of successful practice was framing a “Good Story,” convincing onlookers that a doctor was learned, rational, moral, and reliable. While a useful start for this discussion, the role of religion in literature on self-presentation, while not entirely absent, is downplayed. Further, as this chapter will demonstrate, Lutheran doctors and theologians argued that the vocation of medicine was a real good and the (ideal) physician was truly Christian, not simply presenting himself as such.

In a slightly different vein, Darrell Amundsen traces the history of Christian thought about medicine from antiquity through the Middle Ages. In Amundsen’s telling, debate among Christians about medicine as a good or an evil hailed back to the early church. While some (Tertullian and Tatian) rejected medicine, a much longer list of
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7 Roger French, Medicine Before Science: The Rational and Learned Doctor from the Middle Ages to the Enlightenment (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003). A doctor, “had a great deal of knowledge and many modes of handling it, which he could use in persuading an audience that he was an effective practitioner. He used it primarily in constructing a story about his kind of practitioner, a Good Story...that he could tell his patients, his pupils, the powerful and the legislators about the effectiveness of his medicine and about his right to practice it.” (2). “The Learned and Rational Physician had based his Good Story almost wholly on traditional natural philosophy. The logic employed in natural philosophy not only demonstrated the solidity of these principles but provided the doctor with a means of convincing other people that the philosophical doctor’s philosophical medicine was the best possible. When and where traditional natural philosophy collapsed under the attack of the new philosophers the Learned and Rational Doctor was at a crisis.” (4).
Christian luminaries (Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Basil of Caesarea, John Chrysostom, Jerome, and Augustine) extolled medicine as a divine gift, while also explaining how sickness might be used by God to chastise or teach spiritual lessons. The divide continued through the Middle Ages with debates about the relationship of sin and disease in penitential literature, connections between healing and the growing cult of saints, clerical apprehensions about superstitious folk healing, and the framing of guidelines for clergymen who also studied and practiced medicine. Amundsen’s informative study provides critical background for understanding early modern Lutheran accounts of medicine that utilized patristic arguments, and evolved out of the late medieval milieu. But, Amundsen does not trace the narrative beyond the fifteenth century. It is up to another study to carry the story forward into the next generations to consider how religious and medical changes in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries relate. More recently, Christi Keating Sumich sketched early modern debates about medicine among and about English physicians that are similar in many ways to the German sources that appeared in the same centuries discussed here. Some English authors too treated the office of the physician as both a way of imitating Christ or a threat to faith and critiquing greed and fraud in medical practice. Her work provides

---

rich material for a comparative work, but does not reference any of the Lutheran discussions included below.

Finally, exploring these writings will highlight how mistaken it would be retroactively to apply Michel Foucault’s concept of the “clinical gaze” to this early modern Lutheran milieu. In *The Birth of the Clinic*, Foucault argued that in the course of the early modern era, and especially by the end of the eighteenth century, physicians developed a dehumanizing approach to treatment in which the patient’s identity was progressively separated from the patient’s body. The physician assumed a detached, dispassionate relationship to a medicalized body, with no interest in souls, or in the patient as a composite body-soul being. The practice of medicine became another avenue to exercise power and coercion. Critiquing Foucault, Michael Stolberg argues that “…the early modern doctor-patient relationship can neither be sweepingly characterized as a relationship of patronage nor be seen as the expression of an increasing disempowerment of patients by an omnipotent medical profession which medicalized every aspect of human life.”

Instead, as this chapter will show, Lutherans presented medicine as above all an expression of charity, a mark of a Christian relationship between physician and patient.

---

It was a vocation that centered on understanding God’s design of the world and the body, and an imitation of the greatest healer of all, Christ. In the course of his practice, a physician should cultivate humility and personal piety and recognize how his work influenced a patient’s spiritual and physical health. In turn, as chapter four will demonstrate, a patient was to respect godly physicians and their divinely-given vocations, and praise God for the gift of medicine. Both, together, were to love God as the true Healer who would make any medical treatment effective. Far from being a way to exert coercive power over a patient’s body, medicine was a way to serve a human person in body and soul.

Starting with a broad overview of concerns expressed about the medical profession across Europe will put into starker relief the pervasive and pointed Lutheran emphasis on the good of physicians and their art. Considering learned descriptions of medicine and advice to colleagues and students will give insight into how physicians themselves should understand the role of faith in their work. Exploring sermons about doctors and healing will show how Lutheran pastors and theologians translated these learned discussions into vernacular terms and spread the message about medicine as a good to a wider audience.

3.1 Doctors—Atheists or Imitators of Christ?

As mentioned above, a bifurcated view of medicine as either divine gift or dubiously materialist practice was not the creation of Wittenberg’s physicians and
theologians. It can be traced to antiquity. In the Middle Ages, an oft-repeated trope tarred physicians with atheism: *ubi tres medici, duo athei*. Of the physician on the road to Canterbury, Chaucer jested that “His study was but little of the Bible.” Alain Mothu recounts tales of a miraculous healing performed by Saint Louis, who, it was widely rumored, removed a putrid humor that caused atheism from a physician by extracting it through his nose.

Some Renaissance Humanists maintained this critical attitude, in critiques that Paracelsus later echoed, and against which Orthodox Lutherans framed their arguments. Petrarch, for example, polemically eviscerated a physician in his famous invective *Contra Medicum*. “But Galen, though himself not unlearned, spawned a great host of unlearned and garrulous successors.” He was distinctly unimpressed by claims that a physician could cure the soul, “Armed with these arts, he claims that he can cure not only bodily maladies, but those of the soul as well. …Here is a half-barbarian savior... And you call me proud!” Though he backpedaled enough to concede that medicine was

---

12 Similarly, John of Salisbury lamented: “Physicians however, placing undue emphasis upon nature, in general encroach upon the rights of the author of nature by their opposition to faith. I am not accusing all of them of error although I have heard very many of them arguing about the soul, virtue, and its works, growth and decay of the body, the resurrection of the same, and creation in a manner contrary to the tenets of faith.” Both Chaucer and John of Salisbury are quoted in C.T. Wolfe, “Tres medici, duo athei? The Physician as Atheist and the Medicalization of the Soul,” in *Early Modern Medicine and Natural Philosophy*, ed. Peter Distelzweig, Benjamin Goldberg, and Even R. Ragland (Dordrecht: Springer, 2016), 343-366, 348
14 According to Charles Trinkaus, “The humanists’ antagonism to medicine... was not mere professional jealousy but a desire to give recognition to the greater importance of their own range of problems (involving the soul more than the body) within the hierarchy of values they accepted.” Idem, *In Our Image and Likeness: Humanity and Divinity in Italian Humanist Thought*, vol. 1. London: Constable, 1970, 25.
a gift of God, Petrarch’s disdain for doctors was rife.\textsuperscript{15} Throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, as Angus Gowland has observed, “The greatest obstacle to the integration of Renaissance moral philosophy, theology, and orthodox learned medicine was the association of both Galenism and Aristotelian natural philosophy with atheism.”\textsuperscript{16}

In a similar way, Paracelsus caustically critiqued university physicians and learned medicine as he knew them in sixteenth-century Germany, condemning his contemporaries for rapacious money-grubbing. They exploited patients to line their pockets and left the sick unhealed. Charles Webster argues that Paracelsus’s dire assessment of the state of medicine was bound up with his fervent anti-clericalism. “He generalized his anticlerical critique and argued that in every significant respect the medical profession merited exactly the same damning verdict.” Indeed, “…commercialization that was endemic in the church was equally rife throughout the

\textsuperscript{15} Francesco Petrarca, “Against a Physician,” in \textit{Invectives}, ed. and trans. David Marsh (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004), 17, 41. “Whether our health comes from Him, from an expert physician, or from a doddering crone versed in herbals, the science of medicine is a gift of God, together with the health it restores or maintains. Thus, I have absolutely nothing against medicine. I have said this a thousand times, but apparently it doesn’t suffice. So if I seem to have spoken against physicians, I shout it out passionately that the whole class of learned may hear me. Against you alone, and men like you, have I spoken and will speak in what follows.” (107)

field of medicine.” Physicians thus made it impossible for themselves to achieve the spiritual enlightenment that Paracelsus deemed necessary for any successful treatment.17

In the wake of his damning critique, Paracelsian and anti-Paracelsian partisans hurled the epithets “Galenist” and “Paracelsian” as terms of the most intense opprobrium, each side regarding the other side’s name as synonymous with atheism. The contest frequently degenerated to ad hominem attempts to undermine reputation and demonstrate that a physician was personally impious. Daniel Sennert, as mentioned in chapter two, went out of his way to detail Paracelsus’s personal faults, while retaining what he could of chymistry. On the flip side, the English Paracelsian Richard Bostocke’s feelings were quite clear. He titled the 1585 book in which he denigrated classical, learned medicine as unchristian, The Difference Between the Auncient Phisiske, First Taught by the Godly Forefathers, Consisiting in Unitie, Peace and Concord; and the Latter Phisiske Proceeding from Idolators, Ethnickes and Heathens; as Galen and Such Other Consisting in Dualitie, Discorde and Contrarite. And Wherein the Naturall Philosophie of Aristotle Doth Differ from the Trueth of Gods Worde, and is Injurious to Christianitie and Sound Doctrine.18 (A long title even by sixteenth-century standards).

17 Charles Webster, Paracelsus: Medicine, Magic and Mission at the End of Time (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008), 98, 108.
18 Richard Bostocke, The Difference Between the Auncient Phisiske, First Taught by the Godly Forefathers, Consisting in Unitie, Peace and Concord; and the Latter Phisiske Proceeding from Idolators, Ethnickes and Heathens; as Galen and Such Other Consisting in Dualitie, Discorde and Contrarite. And Wherein the Naturall Philosophie of Aristotle Doth Differ from the Trueth of Gods Worde, and is Injurious to Christianitie and Sound Doctrine (London, 1585).
Even when not directly concerned with a doctor’s potential atheism, popular books detailing physicians’ faults proliferated across Europe. These ranged in genre from scholarly screeds to literature and theater. This included some physicians critiquing their colleagues, such as John Securis’ *A Detection and Querisome of the Daily Enormities and Abuses Committed in Physic* (1566), Laurent Joubert’s *Erreurs Populaires au Fait de la Medecine* (1578), and Johann Freitag’s long list of grievances in *De Abuso Medicinae Tractatus* (1616). More popular literature cuttingly depicted the foibles of medical experts. Shakespeare wrote ‘Trust not the physician/ His antidotes are poison, and he slays/ More than you rob.” An early seventeenth-century English play, *The Lover’s Melancholy* warned, “Physicians are the cobblers, rather the butchers of men’s bodies.…” At the end of the century, Molière’s mocking depictions of physicians delighted French audiences. The leading Dutch printmaker and engraver Hendrick Goltzius produced a series of images in 1587, *Allegories of the Medical Profession*, that summed up the various visions of a physician circulating at the time: the physician as Christ, the physician as ordinary man, the physician as angel, and the physician as devil. They were copied and reproduced several times by 1650.

---


20 As quoted in Chrsit Keating Sumich, *Divine Doctors and Dreadful Distempers*, 22

Such widespread wariness of medicine as the outpost of the avaricious did infect Lutheran circles in which medicine was effusively praised as a way to imitate Christ. An exchange between the Helmstedt medical professor Jakob Horst and his older brother Gregor early in the former’s academic career is revealing here. In June 1559, as his younger brother was deciding to take up medicine, Gregor dashed off a bossy letter. He suggested in no uncertain terms that “Mother and all of us are much amazed that you study medicine, my brother…” Jakob would be best advised to change his mind. In the pugnacious, defensive spirit of younger siblings, Jakob quickly defended himself, acknowledging his older brother’s concerns, but steadfastly maintaining the orthodox Lutheran narrative that because God is the author of all good things, one could live a pious life as a physician, even if some physicians were avaricious. His motives were good and he had faith that his profession would not destroy his soul.
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22 Iacobi Horstij D. Epistolae Philosophicae et Medicinales (Leipzig, 1596), Sig D4v-D5r: “Gregorius Horstius Iacobo Fratri suo S. Mater & nos omnes, mi frater, miramur, te studia Medicinae, quae tot sumptus requirunt, quot tenuitas rei familiaris nostrae tibi suppeditare nequit, sectari. Profecto prudentis est simul considerare, quomodo ad metam pervenire queat. Ego quidem studia literarum magis continuassem, nisi paupertas obstilisset, & huius sublevandae gratia, aliam rationem vitae, nimirum aulicam subire coactus fuissem, Deo ago gratias, qui mihi benign adsit, nec irrita mea esse finat, & clementissimos principes conciliet, is porro faciet mecum quicquid sibi visum fuerit. Vale. Drasdae. I. Junii, Anno 59.”

23 Iacobi Horstij D. Epistolae, Sig, D5r-6r: “Iacobus Horstius Gregorio fratri fuo S. Recte mones, mi frater, multa consideranda esse egentibus, & medicinam excolere cupientibus. Sumptus, qui ad haec studia requiruntur, nescio. Sed tamen certo mihi persuadeo, Deum autorem omnis boni mirabiliter memet tecum ex omnibus fratribus solos ad genus vitae literarium vocasse. … iam ad Academiam Francofordianam profectus, cum diu humaniores artes & discam & doceam, multo ante mecum de adiungendo studio facultatis alicuius deliberavi, a Juris studio abhorreo, a Theologico memet balesus deterret, Medicinam subinde vale amavi. Itaq(ue); artium humaniorum linguaruma; cognitioni addidi Medicinae studium, vt si aliter fieri non posset, vel sanitati meae aliquid prodesset, & tamen alius in artibus doctis par essem. Si vero Deus plus vellet, omnino ad excellentiam in arte medica contenderem, quod felicius mea opinione succedere video, & iam diu divinam clementiam mihi adesse intelligo. Cur igitur non entiar, vt studia mea cum laude absolvam,
All this makes Paul Röber’s panegyric to Sennert’s life and faith with which I started this chapter stand out. In his funeral sermon, Röber showed his awareness of possible problems and valid critiques of medicine. He praised Sennert by comparing him to a variety of other physicians, mostly immediate predecessors or contemporaries, whose careers touched in some way on both theology and medicine. In all cases, according to Röber, Sennert’s example of faithfulness exceeded theirs. Stretching across confessions (Röber included a Catholic, a Calvinist, and a Lutheran, in addition to Paracelsus), all of them in some way fell short of the true knowledge of God. These included Johann Pistorius, who grew up Lutheran and trained in medicine at Wittenberg before serving as court physician for the Margraves of Baden-Durlach. He converted in succession to Calvinism, and then to Catholicism. Upon his last conversion, he became a priest and ended his life as the confessor for Emperor Rudolf II. Pistorius’s confessional flip-flopping corresponded to career instability as he switched from being a
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Röber, *Sennertianum Symbolum*, Sig. B1r: “Zwar man hat auch sonst tough Vortreffliche Medicos gefunden, vor alters und neulicher zeit. Aber sie haben den allergrösten Héüptmangel gehabt, dass sie der wahren erkenntnis Gottes geféhlet, auf irrtum and schwermerei geraten, und also shiffbruch an ihrem glauben gelitten haben.”
physician to being a theologian. Röber then critiqued the Reformed physician Thomas Erastus, famous to history as much or more for his theological and political views as for his medical writing, as well as the early modern European physician everyone loved to hate, Paracelsus. Even Caspar Peucer provided a cautionary example, due to questionable teachings that led to his eventual removal from Wittenberg toward the end of his career. Aside from these contemporaries, there were negative examples in history, above all Averroes, whose transgressions was too obvious and egregious even to detail. Because Sennert remained consistently orthodox (according to Röber), he had true knowledge, a good conscience, and a peaceful death. In all these things, his example was better than the others.

---


27 Röber took three pages of the “Vorrede” to recount the story of Peucer’s fall from grace due to his suspiciously Calvinist-leaning teaching, *Sennertianum Symbolum*, Sig. 3v-4v.

28 Robert, *Sennertianum Symbolum*, C1r: “Ich wil von dem Averroe Arabe nichts melden, dessen Gottlosigkeit bekand ist, was massen Er der Christen lehre verspottet, als welche ihren eigenen Gott mit zehnen zerbissen oder mit dem munde essen...”

29 Röber, *Sennertianum Symbolum*, C1r: “Diesen allenn is under H. D. Sennertus keines weses gleich gewesen, sondern hat sich zu der Evangelischen himlischen Wahrheit... von hertzen bekennet. Darumb Ihn
Röber’s account further makes it clear that early moderns of any confessional affiliation were accustomed to physicians who also indulged theological interests (and even wrote on theology), and that they expected that a physician should be personally pious and concern himself with the religious implications of his work. The Lutheran preacher’s objection was not to the fact of medical doctors having theological interests and concerns, but to the questionable theological positions some espoused. Although he did not mention the cases, there were several examples of Lutheran physicians and medical professors who took up theology and *vice versa*. Paul Eber skipped from Wittenberg’s medical faculty to the theological faculty to become one of the most influential theological voices among Lutherans in the second half of the sixteenth century.\(^3\) As I’ll discuss in more detail below, Caspar Bartholin made a similar switch of faculties in Copenhagen in the mid-1620s. On the flip side, the prominent Lutheran theologians Johann Gerhard and Johann Arndt both started their academic careers as medical students.

Throughout the sermon, Röber went out of his way to depict not only Sennert’s fame and influence within and without the German lands but also took pains to mention the way that “Our German Galen” served every person in every social station with his

\[\text{denn Gott bei seinen gefunden tagen ein fröliches Gewissen, und hertzliche liebe zu Gottes wort, endlich aber ein seliges ende verliehen.}\]

\(^3\) Walter Friedensburg, *Geschichte der Universität Wittenberg* (Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1917), 259.
work as a physician. While he attended the Saxon Electors as court physician and was frequently sought out for advice by other nobles, Sennert was not above personally paying the apothecary for medications poorer patients could not afford. Though Röber does not mention it, according to other sources, Sennert also charged students relatively little for the private chymistry collegium he hosted in his house starting in 1616. He was a man with a “golden soul,” the sort to whom Sirach 38 referred when it suggested one should honor physicians. Sennert knew that his medical care was only effective because God made it so. He received honor from far and wide, and from all ranks of society, because he honored God. Röber devoted the bulk of the sermon to an account of trust in God’s providence, and a pointed argument against the Jesuit doctrine of

---

32 Röber, Sennertianum Symbolum, Sig. B1r-v: “Ins gemein aber, wie schon gedacht, hat er sich gegen jederman friedlich und schiedlich, als einem rechten Christen gebührt, verhalten mit seinem rat, beides in der Theoria und Praxi jederman, der es nur begeret, trewlich gedienset, sich gegen männlinglich willfährig erzeiget, und keinen jemals Tag und Nacht ohne unterscheid, wie bekant, seine dienst versaget, nicht achtend, was vor genies offtmals er darfür behommen, wie er denn von keinem Patienten so wol von denen, so ihm etwas, als von denen so ihm nichts gegeben, jemals etwas gefodert. Ja zum offertermal vor die, so die Arznei in der Apothecken zubezahlen nicht gehabt, dieselbe selbst bezahlet, oder ihnen dass Geld darzu geben: In summa, bei dieser Stadt hat er sein Leib und Leben darzu auffgequestet, wie er den nun zum wenigsten die siebende grassierende Pest und hauptseüche allheir ungezwungen aussgestanden, und bei solch ein gefährlichen leüfften seine treue sorgfältigkeit und fleiss unberflüssig bewiesen, ja auch endlich so viel darbei zugezetzet, dass er bei dieser izigen grassirender seüche inserviendo allis sich selbsten consumiret.”


34 Röber, Sennertianum Symbolum, Sig. C3r: “…einen Weitberümbten Medicum, welcher wol verdienet, das man ihme eine güldene Seele auffrichtete. Worzu Sirach anlass gibt, wenn er sagt: Ehre den Artzt mit gebührlicher verehrung…”

35 Röber, Sennertianum Symbolum. Sig. C3v: “Er hat wol gewust, das ohne sen segen des Höchsten alle mittel und Arznei vergebens und umbsonst sein, darumb er nicht allein fleissig umb benedieijung (sic) derselben Gott angeruffen, sondern auch seine Andacht und Gottesfurcht zubezeügen ein herrliches Buch geschrieben, wie man Christlich leben und Selig sterben, und also im lebe(n) und tode auf Gott allein sich verlassen solle.”
justification because, he claimed, this best conveyed the personal faith that motivated Sennert’s activity as a physician.

But outside, as within Lutheran circles, it was not all satire, scolding, and suspicion. Paolo Zacchia’s Quaestiones Medico-Legales (1621-35) attempted to adjudicate disputed questions about medicine and physiology, thereby earning him later historians’ regard as one of the founders of medical jurisprudence.\textsuperscript{36} Widespread concern to offer guidelines for physicians’ behavior and to regulate their practice resulted in faltering efforts of the College of Physicians in London. Though long regulated by guilds, concern to police medical malpractice shifted to scholarly groups and government agents by the end of the seventeenth century, as Harold Cook as shown.\textsuperscript{37} Further, a series of books appeared between 1550-1650 to advise doctors on best practices, including Johannes Siccus’ De optimo medico (1551), Baptista Condronchio’s De Christiana ac tuta medendi ratione (1591), and Roderigo a Castro’s Medicus politicus (1614). Condronchio outlined \textit{in extenso} when a doctor was and was not culpable for mistakes, or even when a doctor sinned or not, along the way taking up

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
vexed and vexing questions such as whether it is a duty to treat enemies. Roderigo a Castro’s subtitle hints at his two goals: to portray acceptable behavior and to provide a guide to identifying quacks. (In quibus non solum bonorum medicorum mores ac virtutes exprimuntur, malorum vero fraudes & imposturae detegnuntur). In the course of the book, he discussed the importance of each of the parts of academic medical training, and also highlighted the importance of understanding the movements of the soul, pointing out how closely tied medicine is to moral philosophy. On the whole, the urge to

38Baptista Condronchio, De Christiana Ac Tuta Medendi Ratione (Ferrara, 1591). Some of the questions Condronchio considered included: In Book One: 1) Medicum graviter peccare sine sufficienti scientia ad medendum se exponentem, exceptis casibus non periculosis, & dummodo remedia periculoa non adhibeantur, vel scandalum, & occasione alii non praestetur idem mediation; 2) Medicus curando, antequam morbum cognoscat, peccat, nec in quibusdam morbis solos Practicos exciendos esse contra Navarri opinionem, ex quo horum vitia, & fraudes detegnuntur, & in morbo difficilis cognitionis aliquod remedium leve adhiberi posse probatur. 3)Qui medicinae praecepta neglectit, vel studiis vacare, cum est opus, contemnit, experimento suo nimis dicens, ac proprio sensui nimis tribuenus, peccat, & damna praestare debet. 4) Medicus valde negligentem in studendo, visitando, morborum signa animadvertendo, vel in consulendo cum est opus, graviter peccat, & aliquando ad damna tenetur, & irregularis evadit. 6) Dubia medicame(n)ta praebens, ut experientur, vel quaeusius causa, aut ne videatur imperitus, grave peccatum admittit, quod modo mortale, modo veniale esse poterit.

39Roderigo a Castro, Medicus politicus: sive de officiis medico-politicis tractatus, quatuor distinctus libris: In quibus non solum bonorum medicorum mores ac virtutes exprimuntur, malorum vero fraudes & imposturae detegnuntur (Hamburg, 1614), Sig. H4v-I1r: “...quae sunt corrumpendae valetudinis causae infestissimae, humores & spiritus conturbando, corpus alterando, ac vires deiciendo, siquidem tales perturbationes morborum symptomata sunt, interdum etiam causa ea, quae & morbos & somptum augent: quippe anima & corpus suo morbos in se mutuo transfundunt, ideoque Galenus librum edidit, cui titulum fecit: Quod animi mores corporis temperamentum sequuntur, & alterum De cognoscendis curandisqu(e), animi affectibus, cuius praeceptum illud potissimum esse arbitrator, ut qui corporis salubritate frui velit, animum primum componat, deinde corpus & animum simul movet, quod praeceptum ut omnibus perutile est, ita litterarum cultoribus, qui profundis contemplationibus saepe detinentur, per necessarium. Ut enim neque oculos sine capitis curatone, neq(ue); vero sine corporis cura caput unqua(m) recte sanandum aggregimur: ita neq(ue); corporis curationem absque animae curatione rite moliemur: & vero ut bonum corporis temperamentum probimetum morum largitur, ita composita more corpori semper temperamenti bonitatem conciliant, quorum alterum philosophiae moralis, medicinae alterum proprium est munus. Frequentius tamen experimur, affici corpus ob animi affectus, quam corporis vitia in animum penitus redundare. Videmus enim quam citro irati animi signa, aut moerentis, aut exultantis in corpore appareant, pallor, & subtristis vultus, & cum hilaritate interdum risus ac similia: At non dederit fam repente de se argumentum animus in affecti corporis commercium tractus. Sic ut igitur ex duobus malis, quae in unum conveniunt, pessimum semper aliquid
distinguish between posers and professionals reflects the competitive environment of the burgeoning “medical marketplace.”

This outpouring of literature concerned to root out frauds and delineate principles of good practice reveals an early modern concern to clarify the role of the physician in society. Lutheran writers too, manifested this worry. It all points to an obvious conclusion: one should simply assume that the idealized picture of physician as imitator of Christ is to be expected in a religious culture. Because of this extensive interest in the subject and the popularity across Europe of critiquing physicians, the fulsome praise of learned medicine among early modern Lutherans becomes particularly remarkable. It is time to consider the elements of this pious defense of doctors and their art.

3.2 Lutheran Views of Medicine as God’s Good Gift

In commending medicine, Lutheran thinkers drew on the long tradition of praising it that Amundsen traces, stretching back through the Middle Ages to the early church. The enduring influence of these ancient views is easily discernable in Lutheran writing. Röber’s funeral sermon for Sennert offers a nice example of the common practice of embellishing discussions of medicine with extensive quotations on the subject
from the Church Fathers. In a parenthetical addition to the printed sermon that stretches four-and-a-half quarto pages, Röber concluded by parsing selections from John Chrysostom, Augustine and Bernard of Clairvoux, all popular among Lutheran theologians. From Chrysostom, Röber highlighted a lesson for physician and patient alike: the importance of recognizing the providence of God in disease and its treatment. From Augustine, Röber pointed out the lesson that because of that providence, God knows what is good for our souls and necessary for healing.

---


41 Röber, Sennertianum Symbolum, Sig. K2v-K3v: “(Aus der Arzneikunst haben auch sonst die H. Väter Chrysostomus, Augustinus, Bernhardus & c. seine anleitung genommen, die werck Gottes und seine Rahtschläge über die Gleübigen zu erklären. Chrysostomus bringet seine gedancken von Gottlicher Providenz und wunderlicher regierung also für: Universorum enim Deus nostri curam agens, non semper in adversis nos manere relinquit, ut non opprobretur nobis (deprehendatur) nostra infirmitas, sed celeriter & ipse opitulatur, firmans nostram alacritatem, & mentem excitans: Neque semper in prosperitate nos esse relinquit, ut ne siamus neglegentiiores, alioquin ad malum proclives. Huna ens natura, quando multum prospere ei succedit, suae obliviscitur nobilitatis, neque intra suos limites subsistit: idcirco quasi clementissimus pater aliquando nobis indulget, aliud gulaet, ut variis viis nostrae animae salutem curet. Quoniam & Medicus, quando infirmum curat, neque semper fame detinet, neque semper larga mensa frui finit, ut non voracius febrin pariens augeat morbum, fames vero infirmiorem eum efficit: sed conjectans apud se, quantae sint agrotantis vires, ut diligenter utens arte, omnia sua in medium affert. Similiter & misericors Deus, sciens quid cuivis expedit, aliquando concedit nobis prosperitate frui, aliquando autem exercitationis gratia rentationibus nos circundat. Gott, welcher für uns alle sorget, lest uns nicht in widerwertigkeit allzulange stecken, damit unsere schwachheit und unvermögen nicht offenbar werde, sondern hilfft geschwinde, sterckt unsern muth, und verleit uns freudigkeit. So lest er uns auch nicht allezeit auff rosen gehen, damit wir nicht in sicherheit oder nachlessigkeit, worzu wir sonst geneigt sein, gerathen mögen. Denn der Mensch, wens ihm allzuwel gehet, vergisst seines Adels, und helt sich nicht in den schrancken: Darumb handelt Gott mit uns, else in treuhertziger Vater, bisweilen verzeiht er, bisweilen aber züchtigt er uns, damit er auff allerlei wege unsere Seligkeit befördere. Wie denn auch ein Arzt dem krancken nicht allezeit hunger, noch jederzeit reichlich speisen lesset, damit nicht der überflus kranckheit verursache und vermehr, oder der hunger die kräftte allzusehr schlewe. Wol erwegt erts bei sich, was des Patientien zustand leiden kan, und geheet seiner kunst nach, dass er den sachen nicht zu viel oder zu wenig tue. Also ist auch der Barmhertzige Gott gesinnet, welcher sehr wol erkennet, was einem jedwedern (sic) nützlich oder schädlich sei. Darumb lest er uns bisweilen gutter tage und freude genissen, bisweilen aber prüfet er uns, und führet uns ins Examen oder in die Schule der versuchung.”
Furthermore, it is important to pray to him, even when not knowing what to ask for. The doctor, after all, knows better than the patient what will heal him.\(^42\) Expanding on that last point, Röber turned to Bernard of Clairvoux, from whom he argued that, just as a good doctor knows when to wield comforting cures and when it is more useful to apply treatments that may temporarily increase the pain, just so God cures us of sin by using both pleasures and pains.\(^43\)

Martin Luther, whom Augustinian theology heavily influenced, praised medicine as a gift of God, and consistently compared the art of healing bodies with the greatest healing of all: salvation. Johann Anselm Steiger details the extent to which Luther utilized medical metaphors in discussing sin and salvation, describing the word

\(^{42}\) Röber, Sennertianum Symbolum, Sig. K4r-v: “Ut urs medicinae cum eadem maneit, neq(ue); ullomodo ipsa mutetur, mutat tamen pracepta languentibus: quia mutabilis est nostra valetudo: ita divina providentia, cum sit ipsa omnino incommutabilis, mutabili tamen creaturae varie subvenit: & pro diversitate morborum alii alia jubet aut vetat: ut a vitio, unde mors incipit, & ab ipsa morte ad naturam suam & essentiam, ea quae deficiunt, id est, ad nihilum tendunt, reductat & firmet. Gleich wie die kunst der Arznei, ob sie gleich auff ihrer richtigkeit bestehet, dennoch die Recept verendet oder wandelt weil unser gesundheit wandelbar ist. Also ist auch die Göttliche Providenz oder vorsorge in ihr selbst unwendelbar jedoch kömpt sie unterschiedlicher weise dem wandelbaren Geschöff zu hülffe: und gebeut oder verbeüt, nach dem die Krankheit ist; damit sie uns von lastern daher der Tod kömpt, und vom Tode selbst das Geschöpf so abselt, das ist, in nichtigkeit gerächt, zu recht bringen, stercken und erhalten möge. Fideliter supplicans Deo pro necessitatibus huius vitae & misericorditer auditor, & misericorditer non auditur. Quid enim infirmo utile sit, magis novit medicus, quam aegrotus. Wer Gott in nöt en anrufft in warem glabuen wird bisweilen aus gnaden erhöret, bisweilen aus gnaden nicht erhöret: Denn was dem Kranken dienlich und heilsam sei, weis der Arzt besser als der krancke.”

\(^{43}\) Röber, Sennertianum Symbolum, Sig. K4v: “Sicut medicus non solum ungeuento, sed igne utitur & ferro, quo omne quod in vulnere superfluum excruerit, facet & urat, ne sanitatem, quae ex uinguento procedit, impeditat: Sic medicus animarum Deus, huiusmodi animae procurat tentationes, immittit tribulationes, quibus afficta & humiliat gaudium vertat in luctum. Gleich wie ein Arzt nicht allein einen Balsam oder Salbe sondern auch feuer und eisen brauchet, damit er alle dasjenige was ausgewachsen und überflüssig dafür die Wunder nicht kann geheilet werden absenge und abbrenne; das die wirckung der Salbe nicht verhindert werde: Also tut Gott der Seelen Arzt und schicket einer solchen seele versuchung und trúbsal zu, dadurch sie gezüchtiget und gedemütiget, endlich aber ihr trauern in freuide verkehret werde.”
of God as itself a medicine, comparing Law and Gospel to medical diagnosis and cure, and wondering at Christ as the great physician.  

Other prominent Lutherans picked up extended medical analogies to describe salvation and piety. Some compared the use of herbs and medicines and the practice of botany to cultivating the soul. Steiger suggests this grew out a stream of devotional writing inspired by the popular medieval book of prayers that employed the same conceit, *Hortulus animae*. He highlights Conrad Rosbach’s *Paradeisgärtilen*, which offered readers a reliable introduction to medical botany keyed to meditations and prayers.

Among many others, Johannes Arndt’s wildly popular and similarly-titled *Paradiesgärtilen aller christlichen Tugenden* (1612) drew on this tradition in the seventeenth century.

---

At the end of his own lengthy bout of sickness, and after he had switched from studying medicine to studying theology, Johann Gerhard utilized the comparison between medicine and salvation in his *Quinginta meditationes sacrae ad veram pietatem excitandam & interioris hominis profectum promovendum accommodatae* (1607). Widely popular, Gerhard’s meditations appeared in a vernacular edition within the same year and several successive editions over the century.47 According to Gerhard, just as medicine has two goals—to conserve health, or to restore it when it is lost—so too theology concerns not just the forgiveness of sins, but learning to persevere in grace.

Successful treatment was a form of “regenerating” health. Just so, theology taught how the Holy Spirit restored the inner man to health.48 One hundred years after Gerhard, and

---


48 Johann Gerhard. *Quinginta meditationes sacrae ad veram pietatem excitandam & interioris hominis profectum promovendum accommodatae* (Jena, 1607), Sig. 1v-3v: “Qui Theologiam Medicinae conferunt, & multi sunt, & rem recte expicare videntur. Ut enim duplex Medicinae finis, sanitatem in corpore humano conservare, eademq(ue) amissam recuperare: ita Theologia, quoad animae morbos, eodem modo duplicem agnoscit finem, ostendi namque, non solum quomodo a peccatis liberemur, sed etiam quo modo in gratia conservemur. Utraq(ue) medicina tam corporis, quam animae a Deo est, dicebat Gregorius: ergo etiam in autore consentiunt. Habet Medicina certa sua principia...quae ob id cura quaedam eiusdem appellantur, cum quibus quod co(n)sonum, acceptat; quod dissonum, respuit: sic Theologia certum & immotum habet principium, verbum DEI Propheticis & Apostolicis scriptis comprehensum, cum quo quod consentit, acceptat; dissentit, respuit: Alii progradientur ulterius & ostendu(n)t, quod omnis vera Medicina ex regeneratione siquidem nihil potest regenerare, quo no(n) ipsum regeneratum: ad emundationem ergo spiritus vitalis ab impuris morborum tincturis, quae est quasi regeneratione quaedam, requiruntur corpora regenerata, id est, spiritus, qui sunt corpora spiritualia propter penetrationem & tincturam: ac nihilominus sunt etiam spiritus corporei: ita quoq(ue) verus Theologiae finis est, spiritualis illa interioris hominis.
two hundred years after Luther, the Wittenberg physician Christian Warlizt posited the same comparison in almost the same exact words that Gerhard used to compare the complimentary healing roles of medicine and theology. This was an enduringly important way of thinking for Lutherans.

Aside from employing sustained medical-theological analogies like this, Lutherans praised medicine itself, in non-metaphorical terms, starting again with Luther himself. On the rare occasions when Luther commented directly on medicine, he encouraged its use on the grounds that to reject it was to eschew one of God’s gifts. (One of his sons, Paul, became a prominent physician, who treated the Duke of Saxony and the Electors of Brandenburg and Saxony). A famous story tells of Luther confronted by an acquaintance who told him that Karlstadt encouraged the sick to trust in God’s providence alone, another aspect of Karlstadt’s wholesale critique of the material world.

regeneratione, quam ex aqua & Spiritu fieri, testatur Veritas Addunt etiam collacionem lapidis Philosophici cum Lapide benedicto in Ecclesia: sed quia haec nec omnibus nota, nec ab omnibus concessa, eis immorari nolo; sufficit instituto meo, quod ex collatione Theologiae cum Medicina, optima ratione colligere possim, Theologiam esse doctrinam practicam, ac proinde minus recte eos sentire, qui speculativam eam esse co(n)tendunt, quo in numero sunt quidam ex Scholasticis....”

Christian Warlizt, Diatribe medico-sacra, De morbis biblicis, e prava diaeta animique affectibus resultantibus (Wittenberg, 1714), Sig. B8r: “Nam ut illae medicinae duplex est: Sanitatem vel praesentem in corpore humano conservare, vel amissam recuperare: ita Theologia eodem modo agnoscit utrumque, dum non solum ostendit, quomodo a peccatis liberdemur, sed etiam quo modo in gratia conservetur.”

The life of Paul Luther published upon his death praised him above all for his fidelity to his father’s teachings. Matthaeus Dresser, De vita et morte Pauli Lutheri medici (Leipzig, 1593), Sig. A2v: “A patre in primis indolem ingenii & virtutis magnam accepit. Etsi enim non ulla lege naturali virtus ex parentibus in sobolem propagatur: singulari tamen munere Dei magnitudo paterni animi ad Paulum Lutherum translatæ, vel certe communicatæ cum eo fuit. Ut ergo in Martino patre robur quoddam animi incredibile & invictum extitit: sic in Paulo filio gravitas & Constantia admirabilis eluit.”
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Luther described his rejoinder: “... I asked him, did he eat when he was hungry? ‘Yes,’ he said. Then I said: “Likewise you may certainly use medicine since it is God’s creation just as food, drink, and so forth are, that we use for sustenance in this life.”

The Reformer’s most extensive comments on medicine come in his letter to the citizens of Breslau about whether or not it was appropriate to flee the plague. Luther informed them in no uncertain terms that to say that disease or pestilence is a divine test and thus should be endured without treatment should be seen not as trusting God, but as tempting Him. “God made medicine and gave us reason,” Luther wrote, “for the body and its care, that it may be healthy and live.” Opting not to alleviate suffering and utilize medicine could even be seen as suicide (a point that others would later repeat). Even more, in cases of plague or pestilence, electing not to care for oneself could mean the death of one’s neighbor, making one a murderer as well. It would be like watching a house burn and doing nothing, thereby letting the whole city burn.

52 Martin Luther, “Ob man vor dem sterben fliehen möge,” (1527) in Martin Luthers Werke, Kritische Gesamtausgabe, vol. 23 (Weimar: Böhlaus, 1901). “Nicht also, meine lieben freunde, das ist nicht sein gethan, Sondern brauche der ertznei, ihm zu dir, was dich helfen kan... Denn was ist die pestilentz anders den ein feur, das nicht holz und stro, sondern leib und leben auffrisset. Und dencke, also, Wolan, der feind, hat uns durch gotts verhengnis gift und todlich geschmeis herein geschikt so wil ich bitten zu Gott, das er uns gnedig sei und were. Darnach wil ich auch reuchern, die luft helfen segen, ertznei geben und da mit sie dem sterben odder Pestilentz weren solten, verachten ertznei zu nemen und meiden nicht stete und person so die Pestilentz gehabt und aufkommen sind, Sondern zechen und spielen mit ihn, wollen damit ihre freidickeit beweisen und sagen, Es sei Gotts straffe, wolle er sie behueten, so wird ers wol thun on alle ertznei und unsern vleis. Solchs heist nicht Gott trauen, sondern Gott versuchen. Denn Gott hat die ertznei geschaffen und die vernunftt gegeben, dem leibe fur zustehen und sein pflegen, das er gesund sei und lebe.
Like Luther, Melanchthon had an overwhelmingly positive view of medicine; he also wrote much more extensively on it than Luther did. Aside from his books on the soul and his introduction to natural philosophy, his comments on the practice of medicine came mostly in the form of orations delivered publicly at the University of Wittenberg. Over three decades, Melanchthon authored nineteen orations that treated medicine in some way, describing the lives and work of major figures like Hippocrates, Galen, and Avicenna. Four of these orations offered more general ruminations on the goods or uses of medicine and the abuses one might observe in it. In three orations, Melanchthon praised medicine (Laus artis medicae, 1529/30, Encomium medicinae, 1529/30, De dignitate artis medicae, 1548), while in one he commented critically on uneducated practitioners as imposters (Contra empiricos Medicos, 1531).

Just as one can trace development in Melanchthon’s thought about the freedom of the will in the successive editions of his Loci, so the three consecutive encomiums for

Wer derselbigen nicht braucht, so er wol hat und kan on seines nehesten schaden, der verwarloset seinen leib selbs und sehe zu, das er nicht sein selbs mörder erfunden werde fur Gott. Denn mit der weise mocht nemand auch essen und tricken, kleider und haus lassen anstehen und keck sein ihn glauben und sagen, Wolle ihn Gott behueten fur hunger und trost, werde ers wol on speise und kleider thun. Der selbige were freilich sein sels mörder. Zum dem ist das noch grewlicher, das ein solcher so seinen leib also verwarloset und der Pestilentz nicht hilft weren, so viel er kan, mochte damit auch viel ander beschmeissen und vergiftten, welche sonst wol lebendig bleiben, wo er seines leibs (wie er schuldig ist) hette gewartet, und wurde also auch schuldig seines nehesten todes und viel mal fur Got ein mörder. Fur war, solche leute sind gerade als wenn ein haus inn der stad brennete, dem niemand werete, sondern liesse dem fewer rahm, das die gantze stad verbrennete, und wolte sagen: Wils Gott thun, so wird er die stad wol on wasser und leschen beheuten.“ (364-365).
33 Ralf Dieter Hofheinz, Melanchthon und die Medizin im Spiegel seiner akademischen Reden (Herbolzheim: Centaurus Verlag, 2001).
medicine reveal the way in which the maturation of his views on natural philosophy
inflected his discussions of medicine. The first oration on medicine praised the creativity
and intelligence of those who investigated it, in spite of the fact that there were a few
questionable physicians. This first encomium is the work of the humanist
Melanchthon—he praised classical learning and unabashedly brandished his knowledge
of antiquity. Throughout it, he referred almost exclusively to ancient Greek authors
(Hesiod, Homer, and Cicero in addition to Hippocrates and Galen) with nary a reference
to God or the Bible. In contrast, in the second panegyric to medicine, Melanchthon
praised it as a gift of God and condemned in no uncertain terms those who might
malign it as sacrilegious. Picking up on that same theme twenty years later, his final
declaration in praise of medicine suggested that no words of praise for the art would
suffice because God made it. It was useful for encouraging the health of the body, but it


also served as a way to know God’s providence and to incite love for Him.\textsuperscript{56} This final oration bears evidence of the work Melanchthon had done in the intervening years, for it placed the practice of medicine in the framework of the natural philosophy and theology he had hammered out elsewhere.\textsuperscript{57}

The sole oration devoted to critiquing empirics made it clear that Melanchthon had in mind a particular sort of medicine when he praised it as a good gift of God and an honor to men. His concern in \textit{Contra empiricos medicos} was to describe “illiterate” physicians who lack the knowledge to treat patients effectively, to understand the body or all its signs and symptoms, and who are outside the oversight of a faculty of medicine. Because they are so dangerous, people should avoid them and magistrates

\begin{flushright}
\begin{align*}
\text{\textsuperscript{56} Philip Melanchthon, } & \text{\textit{De dignitatis artis medicinae} (1548) in \textit{Philippi Melanthonis Opera Quae Supersunt Omnia}, Vol XI, ed. Carolus Gottlieb Bretschneider (Halle, 1843). } \\
& \text{“…etsi nullius eloquentia par est amplitudini huius artis, tamen qualicunque oratione commoneferi iuniores necesse est. Non igitur instituam laudationem, cum utilitas in conspectu sit omnibus, et dignitas in consideratione naturae tanta sit, ut nullius oratione satis declarari possit…” (806-807) } \\
& \text{“…Ac in ea cogitatione non tantum diligentiam hominum aut remedia intueantur, sed bonitatem Dei agnoscant, qui et remedias condidit, et usum monstravit, ut aliqua ex parte huius vitae miserias leniret.” (807) } \\
& \text{“Cum igitur ars utilissima sit vitae ad valetudinem tuendam, et plurimum dignitatis propter maximarum rerum scientiam habeat, et laudata sit praecognitiis divinis, et de providentia monstrat illustria testimonia, expetendam, cognoscendam et venerandam esse, non dubium est.” (810) } \\
& \text{“Vos autem iuniores adhortor, ut cogitatione utilitatis et dignitatis nostrae artis, simul ad doctrinae amorem animos exuscitetis, et in aspectione naturae, vestigia Dei diligenter consideretis, quae eum, ut Paulus inquit, adeo prope adesse ostendunt, pene ut manibus contractari possit, ut et vindicem metuatis, et bona conscientia eum invocetis.” (811) } \\
\text{\textsuperscript{57} Melanchthon, } & \text{\textit{Dignitate de artis medicæ}, “Arbitror autem bonas mentes non solum propter utilitatem delectari consideratione naturae, sed magis etiam propteræa, quia tota haec naturæ varietas velut theatrum est, in quo testimonia de Deo opifice illustria conspicuuntur…. Deinde quanta ars est in tota hominis natura? Discræmen lucis et tenebrarum, discræmen noticiae et ignorantiae, fastigium in cerebro simulimum coeli, in quo et lucent noticiae, et repositæ serventur. Et insita est quædam de Deo lux, et aditæ multæ noticiae aliae, quæ sunt vitae norma, distinctionem et ordinem monstrantes, ut numeri, intellectus ordinis et consequentiae, discræmen honestorum et turpium, aeterno et immo septo distinguens facienda et fugienda.” (808) } \\
\end{align*}
\end{flushright}
should condemn them. Melanchthon made it clear that the medicine he prized was learned, based on traditional authorities and practiced with piety—a theme that Lutherans after him repeated.

In his commentary on Sirach 38, a passage central to Lutheran thought on medicine, David Chytraeus combined elements of Luther’s and Melanchthon’s thought, while also pointing to ideas that became more prominent in the second half of the sixteenth century in the work of Caspar Peucer. Chytraeus commenced by combining Luther’s main point—that neglecting to care for the body amounted to murder—with the lessons learned from Scripture and his mentor Melanchthon’s work about the body as a temple of God that revealed divine goodness and design. Caring for the body both glorified God as creator and prepared one to serve God with it. Medicine, according to Chytraeus and Melanchthon, was a part of the praiseworthy task of understanding


59 David Chytraeus, *Sentenae Jesu Syriacide* (Wittenberg, 1556), Sig. X7v-X8r: “De cura tuendae valetudinis praecipit, quae est virtus V. praeepti. Non minus sunt Homicidae, qui pro prium corpus, quod est opus & domicilium Dei, & organum actionum divinarum, crapula vel ingluvie corrumpunt & extinguunt, quam qui aliorum corporibus violentas manus inferunt. Et Deus iubet, non tantum conservare vires corporis, verumetiam honore afficere, hoc est, propter Deum autorem reverenter curare et magnificare corpus, tanquam excellens donum & organum Dei, continens plurima sapientiae & bonitatis diviniae testimonia, singularum partium, cerebril, coridis, ventriculi, oculorum, manuum &c. constructioni, situi, collocationi, figurae, functionibus impressa: & conditum ad usus divinos, ut vera Dei noticia & celebratio ac laudes Dei & omnium virtutum Deo placentium imagines in eo lucent.”
God’s work in the world and caring for His creation. Doing this properly required first mastering learned medicine (Galen and Hippocrates). But, Chytraeus went on to argue, it also entailed recognizing that disease is a result of sin, so healing must begin by prayer, and then calling on a doctor. In seeing medicine as a part of God’s work and in encouraging the healing of body and soul, a doctor acknowledged God as the true author of the art of healing and the practice of medicine became a work of praise.

Like Melanchthon, Caspar Peucer issued a series of orations on medical topics. As Roebel points out, many of these bear strong resemblances to his father-in-law’s work. Peucer’s Oratio de dignitatis arte medicinae (1562) stressed above all that medicine is God’s gift. It derived from questioning why a human body is formed as it is, how it is preserved by food and other natural remedies, and what the effects of the Fall might be.

---

60 Chytraeus, Sententiae Jesu Syriacide, Sig. X8v-Y1r: “Cum autem morbis afflicta est valetudo corporis nostri, talem curationem instituere Syracides docet, ut I. Causam morborum principalem videlicet, peccatum seria poenitentia & fide ex cordibus nostris tollamus. Deinde ardentibus votis...Filium Dei confugiamus, & ab eo auxilium & depulsionem morbidi petamus & Sacerdotes quodque: alios pios oremus, ut Deum pro nobis precentur. Tertio remedios morborum a Deo conditis, & consilio ac ope medicum utamur. Hac occasione insignem Artis Medicæe Laudatum intexit, quæ in bonis mentibus amore & reverentiam erga hanc artem hauud dubie auget. Honoræ Medicum, propter necessitatem enim Dominus Deus creavit eum, a Deo est omnis Medicina, & Reges eum honorabunt. Ars Medici exaltat caput eius, & apud Principem facit eum magnu. Altissimus de terra creavit remedia, & vir prudens utetur eis. Et dedit hominibus hanc arte altissimus, vt ipse laudetur & celebretur in mirabilibus suis, etc. Universum enim hoc theatrum naturæ rerum, coeli, aeris, animantium, plantarum, animae & corporum humanorum, quod considerat & evolvent Medici, clarissima praesentiae, sapientiae, bonitatis & providentiae divinae testimonia continent: Quæ Deus vult aspici, ut ipsum agnoscamus & remedia inde petamus ad vitae prorogationem: quæ ideo expetenda est, ut veram Dei notitiam & aliarum rerum bonarum doctrinam latius spargere & usu confirmare possimus, ut scriptum est: Non moriar, sed vivam, & narrabo opera Domini. Item: Non mortui laudabunt te Domine.”

61 Chytraeus, Sententiae Jesu Syriacide, Sig. Y1r: “Etsi igitur suæ cuiq(e); arti locus, suæ honos tribuendus est, tamen pietas Deo debita est, eam artem magnificare, in qua amplissima & gratissima de Deo fama sparsa est & quæ expressa voce divina laudatur, quod a Deo autore profecta sit.”

A certain skeptical tone crept in as Peucer admitted that doctors daily found illnesses that they could not cure. For this reason, as admirable as medicine is, God should be trusted more than any medical authority. Indeed, it is because medicine and doctors are gifts given by God on account of our frailty that Syrac advises us to honor them. Interestingly, Peucer suggested that God did not simply dispense or create medicine, but rather fitted the minds of certain individuals to consider human nature, health, and healing and assisted them in their study of it. He also went another step further than

63 Caspar Peucer, *Oratio de dignitate artis medicinae* (Wittenberg, 1562), Sig. 4v-5r: “…de qua cum dicimus, semper compectamur causas, cur homines formati simus: Unde tanta sit praestantis naturae infirmitas, quae ad aeternitatem omnibus summis & ex divinitate profectis ornamentis exculta est atq(ue) instructua? Unde tantum in ea calamitatum, tantum atroci ac saevorum morborum? Quare mors in hanc Dei imaginem grassetur? Cur nos Deus ad tempus cibo & remedii sustentet? Quomodo tandem per filium restitutum ad aeternam cum ipso vitam & consuetudinem lice, iustitia & laetitia aeterna plenam, in qua in mentibus nostris ab omni labe expurgates, refulgebit integre & viva imago Archtepi. De his maximis rebus etsi nos sola vox Evangelii erudite: Tamen remediorum consideratio & medicationes, ut causas inquiramus in doctrina Ecclesiae commonefaciunt, cum obscuras & mutilas Philosophia ostendat.

Ingentem humane naturae infirmitatem vix ulli magis norunt, quam Medici, qui pene quotidiana spectant exempla, & saepes extubius offensionibus aut erratis cernunt nasci mala immedicabilia. Saepe in tristissima incidunt spectacula saevissimorum cruciatuum, quae intueri sine ingenti animorum perturbatione & horrore corporum nequeunt.

Causas & fontem mali demonstrat vox coelestis, Ea vicissim & remedia morbis proposita & usum remediorum explicatum esse docet divinitus hanc unam & solam ob causam, quod Vult Deus ex hac quantumvis fragili & polluta colluvie generis humani in hac vita comparare aeternam haereitatem filio, a qua in omni aeternitate vera agnitione & obedientia colatur & celebratur….”

64 Peucer, *Oratio de dignitate artis medicinae*, Sig. 5v-6r: “Recte ergo affirmat Syracides, & remedia Dei opera esse & artem a Deo traditam esse. Sic enim de remediis inquit: Dominus produxit pharmae de terra, & prudens non fastidit ea… Nam & ipsum Deus creavit. Item. Honora Medicum, Quia propter necessitatem Deus eum creavit, id est, Non solum remedia genuit Deus, Sed impulit etiam mentes cerorum hominum ad remediorum considerationem & adiuuit studium inquisitionis propter necessitatem, quod natura hominum fracta & languefacta peccato, & in mortem praecipitata, medicationibus carere non posset, nisi aut cruciatibus assiduis excarnificanda, aut protinus quam primum hanc lucem aspexit, aut ex circumfuso aere hauffiset vitalim halitum pabulum, extingueda esset.

Consilium etiam & dextram medicantium divinitus regi indicat Syracides, cum creatum a Deo Medicum perhibet. Creatio enim gubernationalm etiam completam naturae ordine agentis, & non est sine Deo ulla foelix medicatio. Ipse est enim, sicut scriptum est, vita & longitudine dierum. In ipso vivimus, sumus, & movemur. Certe Deus vitae fons est, & vitales halitus corporibus ipse adflata nostris. Sed vult nos reverenter uti rebus ad hunc usum magna arte & sapientia comparatis, ut vitae flamnulas alant foventq(ue); &
Melanchthon and Chytraeus, by even more strongly pointing to the role sin plays in disease than they did. Medicine could never completely undo the damage wrought by the Fall or cure the sin that caused death; it would only ever be palliative. This should not be used as an excuse for carelessness, though. Anyone who ignores his body and neglects to care for it, and those physicians who make excuses for patients who do so, are both sinning.

Peucer saw to it that this perspective on sin and medicine became a part of university guidelines in Wittenberg. He supervised the adoption of a new statute governing instruction and academic practice for the Faculty of Medicine in 1572. Like the Oratio, it suggested that disease results not just from the physical imbalance of the

corpora laesa, velut ruinosas domos reficiant, fulciant, ac sustentent, quae quidem ita efficacies sunt, cum ipse vim tribuit, & mentem atque industrium Medici gubernat.

Magna itaq(ue); haec Artis Medicae dignitas est, quod a Deo est, & opem fert imbecillitati hominum, ac consulet incoluitatior eorumdem propter Ecclesiam, ut & singulis ad studia pie doctrinae atq(ue) asidua exercitia fidei & invocationes vires in vita longiore sufficient & exemplo multi adducantur ad Deum & ad societatem Ecclesiae.”

Peucer, Oratio de dignitate artis medicinae, Sig. 7v: “Ut enim a labe & infirmitate, quam peccatum inflixit naturae hominum, morbidi sunt, qui quod de pulcherrima harmonia naturae integrae reliquum est, paulatim dissoluunt, deformant, mutilant, destruunt, & aliae deinceps causae morbos daugent, atque exacerbant cruciatum… Sig. 8v: Quid vero medicationes nostrae sunt aliud, nisi quia cuncte… suppulullantium indies ex vicia radice, & cum aetate ingravescentium morborum, qui a primis in nos parentibus in ipso exortu propagati, & penitus insiti, alia remedia, alium artificem desiderant.”

Peucer, Oratio de dignitate artis medicinae, Sig. 13r-v: “Hanc si multi confiderarent, maiore diligentia & reverentia, consiliis & praeceptis Medicorum obtemperarunt, & pluriis facerent hanc doctrinam. Peccant omnino gravissime, qui neglecto ordine in cibo & potu, somno, laboribus, deniq(ue); in omnibus motibus animi & corporis, naturae vires affligunt, spiritus vel obtundunt ac hebetant, vel exhauriunt & dissipant, impediunt in ipsis lucem divinam permixtam spiritibus corporum, Deniq(ue); ante tempus mortem sibi ipsis consciscunt. Peccant & Medic, qui aegrotis adulantur & indulgent, aut spe lucelli ad affectus & cupiditates eorum aludunt, cum permittunt res non convenientes aut noxias etiam, vel cum exhibent remedia blandam quidem, sed perniciosa, quod quicunque faciunt, hi sciant, se homicidas esse non minus, quam sunt illi, qui artis prorfus ignari medicinam tamen facere summo cum discrimine aegrorum non verentur.”
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body’s humors, but from sin or spiritual causes. Accordingly, the most serious side effects of disease are spiritual. While doctors rightly concern themselves with practical medical therapies such as diet, proper sleep, and work, they should consider above all that disease “destroys little by little the dwelling place of God.” Illness “impedes God’s light and God’s work” because it “hinders praying to God, pious mediation, and the going of the soul to the most important and significant undertakings, the necessary works of God.”\footnote{See Ralf Bröer and Ralf Dieter Hofheinz, “Gesundheitspädagogik statt Tröstung Die theologische Bewältigung von Krankheit bei Philipp Melanchthon und Caspar Peucer” Sudhoffs Archiv 85.1 (2001): 18-44, 18.} For these reasons, a dedicated doctor must occupy himself not just with physical treatments, but with therapies aimed at the root spiritual causes of the illness so as to restore a patient’s spiritual health.\footnote{One key question all this might raise is whether the role of physician and theologian (or pastor) should be combined into one. Here, there were some significant disagreements. While, Caspar Bartholin jumped from the medical to the theological faculties, Daniel Sennert revealed some reservations about letting the two fields mix in “An liceat theologo facere medicinam” (Opera Omnia, Vol. 3, Sig. Dddd1r). Some outside Lutheran circles embraced this dual role more keenly, especially Puritans. Walsham notes that “…in the 1640s Protestant Reformers called for the radical reorganization of existing medical provision and envisaged a system centred on ordained ministers, who would also act as physicians to their parishoners.” (Alexandra Walsham, Reformation of the Landscape, Religion, Identity, and Memory in Early Modern Britain and Ireland, Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2011, 437). Indeed, in the seventeenth century, “Christus Medicus” also became a standard devotional trope for Puritan writers, especially Richard Baxter, whose own recurrent ill health seemed to make him especially receptive to and reflective about the need for divine medicine. See: Tim Cooper. “Richard Baxter and His Physicians,” Social History of Medicine 20:1 (2007): 1-19; See also: Patricia A. Watson, The Angelical Conjunction: The Preacher-Physicians of Colonial New England (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1991).} This was not a view unique to Peucer. Connections between spiritual maladies, the judgment of God for sin, and the plague were an important part of Lutheran views of epidemic disease.\footnote{Erik A. Heinrichs, The Plague Cure: Physicians, Clerics and the Reform of Healing in Germany, 1473-1650. (Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 2009).}
In discussing sin and disease in this way, Peucer and other Lutherans did not put themselves outside the bounds of standard thought about the relationship of sin and disease, confession and recovery that obtained across confessions. Catholics commonly made the connection too, and had done so for centuries. For instance Jacobus de Vorraigne mimicked medical diagnosis in a Lenten sermon *Totum hominum sanum feci in sabbato*. Starting in the Middle Ages, Catholics were encouraged to partake of the sacrament of confession before undergoing any medical treatment. Don Theophilus of Milan advised plague sufferers to do just that during the Black Death. Others repeated the same advice in later centuries, according to David Lederer. Martin Del Rio discussed confessors as a sort of physician, followed by a listing of remedies and cures in his *Disquisitiones magicarum*. One early modern Catholic pamphlet, *Geistliche Artzney in Zeit der Pest*, recommended spiritual physic as the best cure for the plague. Furthermore, a German Catholic physician, Hippolyt Guaranonius, wrote what was intended as a handy reference book *Die Grewel der Verwüstung Menschlichen Geschlects* that reached to 1330 pages. In it, he prescribed penance and faith to cure bodily afflictions. In fact, according

---

70 As Esther Cohen describes it, “The sermon draws a clear correspondence between bodily illness as defined in medical terms, and illnesses of the soul.” Eadem, *The Modulated Scream: Pain in Late Medieval Culture* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2010), 188.

71 Reportedly, he said: “Whenever one is struck down by the plague they should immediately provide themselves with a medicine like this. First let him gather as much as he can of bitter loathing towards the sins committed by him, and the same quantity of true contrition of heart, and mix the two into an ointment with the water of tears. Then let him make a vomit of frank and honest confession, by which he shall be purged of the pestilentia poison of sin, and the boil of his vice shall be totally liquefied and melt away. Then the spirit, formerly weighed down by the plague of sin, will be left all light and full of blessed joy.” As quoted in Mary Lindemann, *Medicine and Society in Early Modern Europe*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 59.
to David Lederer, the Ingolstadt theologian Martin Eisengrein went so far as to claim that “to withhold sins from the father confessor altogether might result in the retention of bodily wastes and exert actual humoral pressures within the body.”

In sum, even in the midst of concerns and polemics prevalent in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries about the merits of medicine and doctors, Lutherans defended it as a good gift of God. Their discussions ranged from drawing direct comparisons between medicine and theology, especially in discussing salvation, to extolling medicine itself as part of the creation of the world. Melanchthon’s effort to articulate a connection between natural philosophy and theology formed the intellectual basis for this.

So far, this chapter has focused primarily on establishing that medicine itself was a licit, even praiseworthy vocation. Given this, though, what about the person who practiced it? What characteristics should he have?

### 3.3 A Pious Physician’s Education and Devotional Life

Even though medicine could be vigorously defended, that does not necessarily entail that each person who practiced it was pious or commendable. That would require education and careful cultivation of spiritual life. To facilitate this, late-sixteenth and seventeenth-century Lutherans translated theoretical praise of medicine and the doctor

---

as a servant of God into advice literature and even books of reflection and prayer for physicians. Advice tractates for students of medicine and physicians proliferated in early modern Europe. In some cases, this took the form of a list of authorities that every would-be physician should know, or which authors were best to consult for particular topics, such as surgery, pharmacopeia or reading bodily signs. The level of originality in these lists was negligible. Instead, they were designed to be a handy reference for a student or colleague wondering about a particular topic. Herman Conring’s 1687 Introductio in universam artem medicam appeared with four such treatises appended. The authors of the treatises ranged from the Lutheran Caspar Bartholin to the Catholic Peter Castello, the Dutch Joannis Antonides van der Linden and Johannes Rhoii.73

The eminent Danish Lutheran physician and professor Caspar Bartholin’s De studio medico is largely comprised of a list—a bibliography cum literature review including works from over one hundred medical authors that any medical student should read. Just under one-third of these authors were Lutheran. As Fink-Jensen points out, Bartholin’s main claim to scholarly fame was that he was a successful textbook author. He wrote some of the most influential and commonly used introductions to

73 Herman Conring, In Universam artem medicam singulasq(ue); eius partes introductio ex publicis eius praecipue lectionibus olim concinnata nunc vero concinnata nunc vero additamentis necessariss aucta continuata ad nostra tempora pracciuporum scriptorium serie (Helmstedt, 1687). Appended to Conring’s book were: Caspar Bartholin, De studio medico inchoando, continuando, & absolvendo (Copenhagen, 1628); Petri Castelli Romani, Optimus Medicus in quo conditiones perfectissimi medi ci exponuntur (Messina, 1637); Joannis Antonides van der Linden, Manuductio ad medicinam. (Coenestenii (?), 1639); Johannis Rhodii Introductio ad medicinam paulo accuratorem et bibliotheca medica, ex manuscript nunc primum edita.
fields from metaphysics to physics to astrology to anatomy. (His anatomy textbook appeared in chapter one of this dissertation). He had read widely and was accustomed to distilling that extensive knowledge into advice and summaries for students.

Published in 1628 and dedicated to his six sons and nephew, the treatise made explicit the elder Bartholin’s regard for one particular book as the guide for all knowledge, including medicine: the Bible. 

Before examining the contents, it is useful to consider this short treatise in the context of Bartholin’s life, his personal faith, and lifelong commitment to Lutheranism. According to the account of his life given at his death by Caspar Brochmand, his colleague on the theology faculty in Copenhagen, Bartholin’s father was a clergyman in Malmö, a man of “rare piety and wholly venerable faith and virtue” from whom the young boy learned the basics of the faith. As Röber did with Sennert, Brochmand labored to highlight the Dane’s profound personal faith. According to Brochmand,


76 Caspar Erasmo Brochmand, Currus e quites Israels, Hoc est: Vita et mors Dn. D. Caspar Bartolini... (Copenhagen, 1629), Sig. G3r: “...homine rara pietate, & antiqua plane virtute & fide.” G3v: “Hi parentes hunc Daniae genuerunt filium: emicantibus in ipsa etiam pueritia singularis... & admirandae indolis radiis, etiam ad admirationem usque parentum & praecipitum. Nam natus tres annos, libellum, quem vocant alphabetharium & praecipius religionis Christianae partes ambitu suo comprehendentem, decursu xiv. dierum non tantum accurate legere didict; sed etiam penitus edidicit.”
Caspar was gifted even as a child. He compared Bartholin’s facility with languages from a young age to the apostles, who were given the gifts they needed to proclaim the gospel. This foreshadowed Bartholin’s spiritual greatness. He proceeded in due course to Rostock and then to Wittenberg where he studied philosophy and theology with Lutheran luminaries, before departing for Leiden, Padua, and Basel to study medicine. According to Brochmand, Bartholin enjoyed wide success and met most of the luminaries on various leading early modern European medicine faculties before returning to Copenhagen to teach medicine there. But, claimed his biographer, due to his assiduous labor, Bartholin became gravely ill and made a desperate promise to God in the midst of his illness in 1623. He would turn from medicine and devote himself to theology. Further, as he did so, Bartholin dedicated himself above all to studying the

77 Brochmand, *Vita et mors*, Sig. G4r: “…Bartolinum futurum virum Reipublicae Christianae & domui Dei singulariter utilem. Notum enim est, quomodo Deus, emissurus Apostolos in universum terrarium orbem ad praedicandum Evangelium, ad opus adeo singulara stupenda cognitione linguarum, quas non didicerant, ipsos admirabiliter praepararit.”

78 Brochmand, *Vita et mors*, Sig. H1r-v: “Vigilatae noctes, longae & difficiles peregrinationes, tenuis victus, continuae & concatenatae lucubrationes, corpus adhuc juvenile ita exhauserant, ut postquam jam factus esset vir, perpetua ipsi cum pertinacibus morbis fuerit lucta. Dolor ischiaticus ipsu affigebat; catharri graviter urgebant; calculi exquisitos Dolores excitabant. Et licet vix unquam immunis esset a morbis: attament Anno 1623. mense Augusto, varii, iiq(ue) contrarii morbi, tanto impetus ipsum adhorti sunt, ut nemo non de vita ipsius desperarit. Arthritis molestiam gravem exhibebat; febris hectica corpus urebat; exquisitissimi in lumbris, dorso, scapulis Dolores, vires prosternebant. Tanta morbi vis & valetia erat, tanta mali pertinacia, ut praestantissimi Medici Doct. Finckus, Doct. Vormius, Doct. Fyrenius frustra hic sudarent. Quocirca cum in praesidios medicis atque remedioribus humanis nihil plane praesidii superesse intelligeret Doctor Bartolinus; ad archiatrum Jesum Christum, se toto corde convertit totum, ab ipso mali sui medelam petiti, Christo & Christi curae se in solidum concredidit & commisit. Et quia experientia jam doctus erat, non esse quidquam, praeter solius Dei verbum, quod justam propugnationem & tutam consolationem praestet contra morbos & mortem: viribus exhaustus & in mortis collimino constituit D. Bartolinus, sancte promisit Deo suo, quod si vitam redederet & valetudinem, quicquid reliquum vitae forest sacrosancto Theologiae studio, isti secundum pietatem doctrinae, impensurus esset. Votum vero impendio placuisse Deo, eventus abunde comprobavit.”
Bible, eschewing scholasticism and sophistry in favor of Moses, the Prophets, and the Apostles.\(^7^9\) He joined the theological faculty in Copenhagen in 1624 after Kort Asklassøn (whose book of mosaic physics I mentioned in passing in chapter two) died. Though he had not studied theology formally, Bartholin’s interest and wide reading in it, his close relationship with an influential patron (Holger Rosenkrantz) and some theologically-pointed public addresses caught attention and praise and helped him win the post. Just four years later, near the end of his short life, and even shorter stint on the theological faculty, he ruminated on the supreme power of the Word of God and the way it manifested itself in nature, detailing his belief that physicians attempting to explain the workings of medicaments or occult forces was a mere confession of ignorance for not recognizing the will and work of God in nature.\(^8^0\)

---


\(^8^0\) Caspar Bartholin, *Benedictio Aharonis: Det er, Om Velsignelsen: Hudcken Aharon oc hans Efterkommere vaar befalet ad forkynde ofuer Guds Folck, oc endnu i den Christen Kircke er i tilbørlig Brug en kort Forklaring ofuer den fierde Mose Bogs siette Capittels fem sidste Vers forfattet af Casper Bertelszen* (Copenhagen, 1628). Because Bartholin wrote this in his native Danish, I am not able to examine the source directly. Instead, I rely for this summary on Fink-Jensen’s discussion in “The Book of Nature and the Word of God,” 94-95. For the same reason, I could not utilize Fink-Jensens’ book-length treatment of natural philosophy and theology in Reformation Denmark, but it is important to point it out: *Fornuften under troens lydighed. Naturfilosofi, medicin og teologi i Danmark (1536-1636)* (Copenhagen: Museum Tuscanulanum Press, 2004).
In the same year, his two advice treatises *De studio medico* and *De studio theologico* appeared, and both reflect this prioritization of the word of God above all else.\(^\text{81}\)

Although discussions of medicine frequently commenced with lengthy and glowing disquisitions on classical medicine, Caspar Bartholin opted for simple and straightforward advice presented with references to scriptural texts in lieu of the usual encomiums to Hippocrates and Galen, the invocation-cum-flaunting of classical knowledge and allusions. For Bartholin, the most important advice for an aspiring physician was straightforward: Pray. Read the Bible. Cultivate piety.

Though he outlined a rigorous course of reading in the subsequent outline of twenty-six subjects a medical student should master, including ancient authorities Galen and Hippocrates and contemporary “must reads” Jean Fernel and Daniel Sennert, Caspar Bartholin attempted above all to impress on would-be physicians that their practice of medicine would only be as effective as their devotional life. “First and above all I commend to you piety, a life of integrity, daily prayers, love for listening to God’s word…” Without these things, according to Bartholin, medicine was simply useless.\(^\text{82}\)

Every trouble, every annoyance, all hard labor, every trip to learn, all was futile without piety. Only the spiritual man could know in some way the mind of God; anyone who

\(^{81}\) Caspar Bartholin, *De studio theologico* (Copenhagen, 1628). Like *De studio medico*, this treatise commenced with firm instructions to cultivate personal piety and read the Bible.

\(^{82}\) Caspar Bartholin, *De studio medico*, Sig. A3r: “Primum ergo & ante omnia pietatem vobis commendo, vitae integritatem, preces cottidianas, amorem verbi Dei eiusque auditum: Ni Deus assuerit, viresque infuderit herbis, quid rogo Dictamnus quid panacea juvat?”
does not love God labors in vain to know. “Therefore,” Bartholin intoned, “anyone who is a student of this art will count it as a gain every single morning, after prayers, to read one or two chapters from Holy Scripture, not superficially, but carefully and reflectively; and in such a way that each and every year he runs through the whole Bible and completes it.”

Caspar Bartholin led by example—daily Psalm singing and Bible reading filled his house. According to Brochmand, his pious wife led these exercises whenever Caspar was called away on academic duties.

It was only after giving instructions for reading the Bible and prayer that Bartholin moved on to highlight the subjects and authors with which a physician should

---

83 Bartholin, De studio medico, Sig. A3r-v: “Frustra omnis labor suscipitur, omnis peregrinatio, omnis molestia, cura, studium, vigiliae, sine pietate. Animalis homo hanc monitionem vel neglipet, vel floccipendet, vel forte ex insanias quadrar irredebit: at spiritualis, qui omnia dijudicat, & mentem Dei tenet. 1. Cor. 2. animo perpendit, pietatem magnum lucrum esse, ad omnia esse utilem, habereque cum praesentis tum futurae reatiae promissionem; I Tim. 4. & 6. animo secum meditator, diligentibus Deum Omnia cooperari in bonum. Rom. 8. Econtra omnes creaturas ingemiscere, refractarium homini, quando huius vanitati subjecta esse cogitur, ideoque liberari exoptat, neque homini servire. Quod si ita est, uti revera ita esse spiritus Dei inculcavit, qua(m) felicitate invitis canibus quis venabitur? Qua felicitate impius stadium aliquod vel meditando tractabit, vel operando exercet? Videntur sibi quidam sine pietatis studio Medicinam, more Ethicorum & Judeorum forte velle & posse facere. Caeterum aut ad tempus duntaxat durat felicitas, vitiorum amore Omnia in mente & manu coquinandae: aut evigilans conscientia, melancholiam incurabilem progenerans, perturbat Omnia: aut eadem mentem huius morbi liberam, inquietam anxiamque in dubius percurandis, aut male percuratis reddit casibus. Quae omnia & singular preces atque ex verbo Dei solamina potissimse depellunt. Quamobrem in lucro ponet qui vis artis huius studiosus, singulis matutinis, praemissis precibus, caput unum atque alterum ex sacrosanctis Bibliis, non perfunctorie, sed attente & meditare, perlegere; atque ita uti singulis annis universa Biblia percurriendo absolverit. Nescis n. quisquis es, quia flus es evandius, dicto citius deflorescere, quid ferus vene vehat, & nemo crastinum sibi polliceri poterit: ac si vel maxime Neitoris tibi polliceberis annos, qui stamen non illa cumprimis imbui gestiet doctrina, quae in altera vita sum est habitura, omnibus alius disciplinis atq(ue): scientiis rerum seculorum sempterna oblivio sepeliendi?”

84 Brochmand, Vita et mors, Sig. H2v: “Hoc tantum dicam: exercitia pietatis in ipsius familia tanta devotione vigeuisse, ut pacem praeter spem admirabiliter rest itutam, familias isti magna parte adscribiam. Vix unquam ad ipsum ventitabant, quin Psalmos sacros in ipsius aedibus concini, Biblica Danica clara voce recitari, adhortationes ad pietatem urgeri, audirem. Et ubi maritus, occupationum publicarum mole a religiosis istis exercitis avocabatur; Uxor, religiosisissimi & sedatissimi animi faemina, partes mariti laudabiliter implebat; quippe in Biblisis sacris versatissima, & ad pietatem velut facta.”
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be acquainted: Greek and Latin; rhetoric and logic; practical philosophy (of which only a perfunctory knowledge is required, as it is more helpful for lawyers than physicians); metaphysics; physics; math; arithmetic; geometry; optics; astronomy; astrology; *physica.*

Then he proceeded to delineate the subfields of medicine: anatomy; botany; dietetics; mineralogy; surgery; pharmacopeia. The message of this individual text and Bartholin’s own life, however, was unmistakable: all this was nothing compared to striving to know God.

Bartholin was not the only early modern Lutheran physician concerned to encourage devotional life in his colleagues and students. In addition to the regular Bible reading Bartholin stressed, Jakob Horst’s book of prayers for physicians (*Precationes medicorum piae*) aptly illustrated a belief in the power and centrality of prayer, and the concern a physician should have not just for the soul of the patient, but for his own soul.  

Horst’s advice in *Precationes* echoed views he had written elsewhere.  

85 Horst’s advice in *Precationes* echoed views he had written elsewhere.  

86 Published
in Helmstedt in 1585 (and republished in Frankfurt am Main in 1666), Precationes medicorum piae outlined ideal prayers for physicians to use in any situation that might arise, from their days as medical students (including prayers to be offered before examinations); to intercessions their teachers might offer up. There were prayers to be offered in the course of practice while dealing with patients with specific diseases, including paralysis, syphilis, apoplexy, epilepsy, “phrensi,” melancholy, leprosy, and plague, as well as prayers for morning, mid-day and vespers, and prayers for the dying and dead. Horst explained his motivation for writing the book and his hopes for it in the prefatory letter to the reader. He lamented that in the thick of study and practice, physicians may often neglect truth and piety, or find them entirely elusive. 87 He recounted all the various things physicians knew and studied with a sad reflection that they often did not take the time to appreciate God’s hand in it all, notwithstanding the fact that Galen and Hippocrates would have counseled them to do so. 88 Ergo, the book of

[[87 Horst, Precationes, Sig. A2r: “…vera autem & pia, aut negligamus, aut non raro eludamus. Ac ut alias artes omittam, in medicina sane idem usui venire multis videmus.”]]

[[88 Horst, Precationes, Sig. A2v-3v: “Nam in arte tam longa & vita tam brevi non desunt, qui ornamentis artis solis, fundamentis plane neglectis inhiant: ideoq(ue), cum corporis naturam, neq(ue) commune, ne(que) proprium didicerre, prodigiosis Anatomicis observationibus, quae artificum propriae essent, operam dant, in iis gestiunt, & anteferri cupiunt: alii cum morbos usitatos eorumq(ue), differentias & causas plane ignorant, abstrusos, ac raro vel nunquam obvious scrutantur: alii cum medicamenta usualia, certaq(ue) nesciant, secreta rimantur, usitata fastidiunt, & nova paucissimis cognita, nec satis confirmata experientia captant: alii cum signa…complexionis & morbi cuiusq(ue), neq(ue) sciant, neq(ue) ad usum conferre norint, sibi signum morborum, neq(ue) Galeno, neq(ue) Hippocrati, neq(ue) aliis cognitum dari postulant: alii cum modum
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two hundred prayers, designed to encourage devout reflection upon almost any type of
person or situation a physician might encounter. Printed in *duodecimo* format, Horst
suggested that physicians should carry the small book along with them to consult as
they went about their day-to-day duties. Recognizing that it might be hard for a
physician on the run to flip through the book and find the most suitable prayer for the
moment, he proudly pointed out in his preface that a handy chart (see figure 6) outlined of all the prayers contained in the book as a guide for easy reference.

---

agendi rationale certis indicationibus, & ad morbum, tanquam scopum & ad multa alia, tanquam
circumstantias morbi, quam certissime directum, ne tantillum eiusdem cognoverint, multo minus exercere consueverint, vanis disputationibus, modo horum modo illorum practicorum confundi ac tempus consumer gaudent. Deniq(ue) recte edocti artifices, quod maxime detestandum est, in structura corporum, in mutationibus morborum admirandis, in medicamentorum efficacia, in morbis, & a natura & ab arte sanatis, ita verantur, ut numen divinum ociosum in omnibus ipso...nec uts...sum. Praeterea prestationibus paucioribus iisq(ue) promiscuis, in hoc libello contentus fuissem, nisi officia medicorum distincta; nequaquam negligenda, plures easq(ue) distinctas ordine, requirerent. De officis medicorum pauci quidem scirbunt, ac Hippocrates noster plus alius docet. Sed cum & artis hodie exercendae varias occasiones, & Christianae pietatis normam in verae Catholicae Ecclesiae religione, & mores aegrorum nostri seculi, conferrem, libellus nostrarum prectionum plus opinione crevit, & plura officia medici declaravit. Consulere enim tum mihi, tum alius, vel tyrannibus medicinae, vel artificibus, primum excentribus artem, me rectius posse putavi, si pro varietate officorum, varias prestationes ordine certo, ut tabula addita...declarabit, conscriberem.”

---


80 Horst, *Precationes*, Sig. A8v-A10r: “Etsi enim plerisq(ue) in mesi vocationibus memet probasse videor: tamen ingenue fateur, me nunquam mihi satisfecisse, nec omnia illa, quae viri vel Illustri...”
Horst frequently modeled the prayers on biblical passages, especially the Psalms, or on mediations from figures in church history popular with Lutherans, especially Augustine and Bernhard of Clairvoux. Several themes recur throughout the book. Horst included lengthy sections devoted to prayers for fortitude and justice. These included requests that the physician should not be motivated by the love of money or praise of his practice, and patience to withstand calumniators who disrespected medicine and did

---

91 Horst, Precationes, Sig. I9r-v: “Precatio Medicorum, in qua fiduciam in solo Deo implorant, & ab avaritia liberari cupiunt: Domnie Deus pater coelestis & misericors, Tu & das esca avibus & flores amoenissime vestis, & nostri curam paternam geris. Te tuamq(ue); benignitatem liberalissimam rogamus, ut animis nostris curas impias & diffidentiam omnem excutias, & fiduciam nostram in tua paterna providentia augeas, ut curam omnem in te iactemus, & in te solo confidamus, per Iesum Christum Dominum nostrum. Amen.”
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not recognize the physician’s vocation as God-given. Physicians also needed to pray for their patients, both those who were pious, and those who who were sick and sinful and who would not confess or could not be healed. The doctor should pray that his work of healing might be seen as an instrument of God’s mercy, and even lead to repentance and confession of sin. As he turned to specific applications, Horst started with a series of prayers on *theoria* and *practica*, explaining that things such as *materia medica* could remind the physician of God before he turned to prayers for specific types of disease. Throughout the work, he highlighted a physician’s inability to cure patients without God’s help, encouraged the desire to know God through the study and practice of medicine, and added concomitant pleas to God that all quacks and naysayers could be avoided, or at least identified and withstood.

---

92 Horst, *Precationes*, Sig. H11v-12r: “Precatio Medicorum contra largitiones ad impune interficiendum homines: O Aeterne Deus, iuramentu(m) sanctum meae vocationi iuravi, me nunquam ullis muneribus, aut precibus, vel maximus velle persuaderi, ut venena aut noxia medicamenta propinam, aut propinanda consulam. Memor quoq(ue); sum tui mandati. Ne occidas, cui addidisti poenam, qui sanguinem suederit, sanguine peribit. Deniq(ue); expertus didici sanguinem innocentem super homicidam clamare ad Deum palam: Nihilominus cum Diabolus tanquam leo rugiens nos circumeat, & quærat quem devoret, nec non piissimos & ipsum Christum tentaverit, oro te, ut tempore tentationis mihi divina ope adsis, animum meum constantem in repudianis precibus adeo impiis confirmes, neq(ue); ab officio meo vel minis vel largitionibus abduci finas: quod benigne mihi concedat Deus pater, Deus filius, & Deus Spiritus sanctus, Amen.”

93 For example, Horst, *Precationes*, Sig. G8v: “Prayer LVIII: Precatio medicorum, in qua petunt, ut Deus aegros, in quibus ira Dei perdurat, & gratia sanandi divinitus denegatur, vel non ad ipsos admittat, vel discernendi facultatem concedat.”

94 Horst, *Precationes*, Sig. G3r-v: LIII: “Precatio Medicorum pro iustitia servanda in curandis aegris malis agentibus poenitentiam, Iuste & misericors Deus, qui merito homines propter peccata punis, piis benigne retribuis, iustitiam tuam ubiq(ue) exerce, & tamen immensa misericordia tua propter filium tuum Iesum Christum peccata remittis, oramus te, ut Spiritu tuo sancto nostra corda foveas & regas, ut non modo piis, sed & malis, ac hostibus Ecclesiae agentibus poenitentiam, ex animo culpam condemnes, & in nostra vocacione, consilio & auxilio adsimus. Fac omnia opera medicae artis a misericordia proficisci, & animo pio & fideli in omnes aegros agentes poenitentiam conferri, Amen.”
Similarly, Samuel Haffenreffer devoted the end of his *Raphael artem medicam explanans* (1629) to a collection of prayers designed to encourage a physician to reflect on his dependence upon God. The title of the book refers to the archangel Raphael who, in the book of Tobit, arrived disguised as a human to heal Tobit’s blindness and exorcise demons from a young woman named Sarah. Haffenreffer explained in the prefatory letter to the reader that Raphael is a model for the physician. Raphael, he argued, gave Tobit basic instruction in all the aspects of medicine. Taking him as a model, this book would do no less. The introduction to the text argued that prayer is the most effective means to achieve healing, but should be combined with knowledge of nature, signs, etc. From there, Haffenreffer proceeded to give a rough overview of medicine from medical theory to advice on reading signs. Such knowledge, however, was not sufficient to imitate the angel Raphael. Thus Haffenreffer turned to discuss the behavior and

---

[95] Samuel Haffenreffer, *Raphael artem medicam explanans: cum velo temporis, & anchora precum* (Frankfurt, 1629), Sig. A2r-v: “…studii Sengerianis consecrato, delineavi, quod Raphael Medicorum Patronus ubiq(ue); celebretur; Raphael quoque Tobiam iuniorem summò prosequatur amore, Raphael eundem fideliter instruat, Raphael de Tobiae salus prospiciat, Raphael de periculo moneat, Raphael Tobiam saluum & incolarem ducat & reducat. Sed praeter omnem spem & expectationem etiam aliis placuisse, fama testatum fecit, & Exemplarium distractio comprobavit, quorum penuriam ut redintegrarem, aliquoties & instanter a viris gravibus, ut & Bibliopolis instigates, peritioni annuere tandem aequum duxi. Relectis igitur prioribus meditationibus presenter studiosis universae Medicinae Labores accuratius & auctius plurimis in Locis, depingere propisique suadis accommodandos, brevi hoc quasi Encheiridiolo, proponere placuit.”
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beliefs of practitioners. He unsparingly criticized avaricious contemporaries. Instead at the beginning of section two, on the practice of medicine, Haffenreffer gave specific instructions on how a physician should comport himself in contrast to them. A physician should make cautious promises and do everything he can to inspire confidence and hope in the patient. Only after covering all this did Haffenreffer suggest some useful prayers, with an opening reminder of the power of prayer demonstrated by Moses, Elijah, and Jonah. The prayers themselves were less extensive than Horst’s. Haffenreffer’s consisted of meditations on Johann Gerhard and Augustine as well as prayers for various hours in the day (morning, evening, etc.), along with one for blessing

97 Haffenreffer, Raphael artem medicam, Sig. C9r-v: “Horrendum quin etiam existimabit Avaritia titulo insigniri. Nam avaro homine nihil est scelestius, avarus semper eget, & tam ipsi deest quod habet; quam quod non habet, nihil eo turpius nihil absurdis, Nulla igitur in Medic0 praeter quam temporis avaritia animadvertatur. Absit quoque longissime superbia a Medico, quae Deo & hominibus abominabilis, hanc reliquum agmen victorum, tanguam pedisseque, comitantur, quae sunt, iactantia, hypocrisy, novitatum inviokentur, pertinacia, discordia, contentio, praesumptio, ambitione, Quibus plerunque accredit curiositas, arrogantia.”

98 Haffenreffer, Raphael Artem medicam, Sig. 10r-v: “Sermonis Exordium, post placidam aegri & assistentium salutationem… simulque ad patientiam exhortetur aegrum, utpote quod a Deo in morbum sit coniectus bono fine, ut scilicet probet ipsius aegri finem, & fiduciam & patientiam & si quae sunt alia, annexit tamen spem recuperanda sanitatis, quam Deus eleunter sit concessurus, si cedere debeat in nominis sui gloriam, & aegri commodum, quem in finem laudet aegrum, quod medicum tanguam medium a Deo ordinatum iusserit vocari, nihilque ex parte sua, quod aegro profuturum noverit, intermissurum promittat. Nam aegroti semper pussilameni & suspiciosi, & de suo Morbo periculosius aliquid cogitantes, unde in id incumbendum, ne quid narretur, quod aegro suspicionem graviorem excitet, sed videat Medicus, quae & qualia loquatur, quae ad aegnumt, quae ad assistentes dicere conveniat; Ad medicum enim spectat utrumque sui officii admonere, non tamen eadem utrisque significare, sed illum exhortari, ut iussis pareat, hos ut diligenter ea assequantur: Illis prospera polliceri, his certiora dicere, ipso tamen audiente aegro nunquam periculum significet, etiamsi res plane sit desperata, plurimum enim iuvat, ad maiorem medicinarum operationem, si firmam salutis spem, inifirma conciapiat mens languentis.”

99 Haffenreffer, Raphael artem medicam, Sig. F1v: “Novit enim Alitssimus antequam invocemus, quibus indiigamun; precibus Moses Mare excicavit, precibus Elia coelem reddidit ferreum: precibus Jonas ima maris tranavit, & salvus portem appullit: precibus Elisa mortuum revivificavit: precibus sumus qui sumus: precibus igitur inhaerendum tenaciter. Licet autem plures hinc inde prostet insignes formuleas, placuit huic opusculo ex plurimis paucas & quidem praesentes in usum Medic0 directas, inserere, quas devote cogitases & recitatas maximo fore commodo consido & dubito nullus.”
in practicing medicine, that enjoined God to grant understanding and guidance in diagnosing and treating patients.\footnote{Haffenreffer, 
*Raphael artem medicam*, Sig. F3r: “Tu, Domine, adesto mihi tua ope, ut ego mea his adesse possim, quibus sublevandis inventa est ars, quam profiteor. Esto director menti meae...” Sig. F4r: “Mihi da firmitatem animi, de desperem posse curari morbum, si non a me, at abs te, Deomine, Servatore hominum.”}

### 3.4 Biblically-based Discussions of Physicians and Medicine

While these advice treatises and Latinate books of devotion are useful for glimpsing how doctors themselves highlighted the role of faith in their lives and practice, considering them leaves open some key questions. How could onlookers recognize such a life? How were people outside of learned circles, those who might not have heard declamations like Melanchthon’s and Peucer’s or never caught sight of Horst’s *Precationes*, to be informed about why doctors should be honored, and what the goods of medicine might be?

To begin to address these questions, it is helpful to circle back to the place this chapter started, with Paul Röber’s funeral sermon for Daniel Sennert. In addition to conveying what the remainder of the chapter will reveal to be messages notable above all for their conventionality, the genre in which Röber’s remarks about Sennert are found is telling. It is a funeral sermon, one example selected from many. These sermons are a wide and distinctive set of sources that yield insight into how early modern Lutherans memorialized and commented on all sorts of people and occupations, from nobles to physicians to merchants to housewives. Scholars have cataloged at least 250,000 so far.
Funeral sermons are one of the richest sources of late sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Lutheran thought that come down to us, revealing reflections on how to live an exemplary and pious life in any vocation and how to die well. One expert on the genre, Cornelia Niekus Moore, argues that, “Even fleshed out with details from an individual person’s life, many of these biographies, in tandem with the sermon, personified a class, a gender, or a profession.” Funeral sermons therefore give us insight into how early modern Lutherans viewed doctors and the practice of medicine as praiseworthy, and how this message could be communicated to a wide audience.

It is true that these sermons were designed to eulogize the dead, and so one must be careful not to accept them uncritically. But in assessing their reliability, it is useful to remember that they were delivered and read by those who knew the deceased. Even if eulogies might tend to exaggeration, outright falsification would have been easily detected. Rather than turning to them for strictly reliable biography, however, these sermons, the expositions and life stories recounted in them, can also be seen as windows

---

101 Cornelia Niekus Moore, *Patterned Lives: The Lutheran Funeral Biography in Early Modern Germany* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag in Kommission, 2006), 45. Further, “The arrangement was flexible enough to allow for highlighting or downplaying certain features and events, but one tenet was immutable: individuals had to be presented as living a life of faith as though it were a journey toward an ultimate goal, its culmination being the moment in which this goal is achieved.” (42). On funeral sermons, see also: Eva-Maria Dickhaut, ed., *Leichenpredigten als Medien der Erinnerungskultur im europäischen Kontext* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 2014); Rudolf Lenz, *De mortuis nil nisi bene?: Leichenpredigten als multidisziplinäre Quelle unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der historischen Familienforschung, der Bildungsgeschichte und der Literaturgeschichte* (Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1990).

102 Moore remarks: “The composition, presentation and printing of a funeral biography was a process of interplay between preacher and audience in the furnishing of data, the correction of the material, the presentation, the audience’s reaction, and finally the supplying of and demand for devotional reading material.” (*Patterned Lives*, 82).
onto early modern Lutheran perspectives on vocations. They reveal early modern mentalités.

Like Röber’s sermon for Sennert, funeral sermons were typically published after they were delivered, and were edited and expanded in the process. It is impossible to determine precisely what was said at the service, but the published sermon gives insight into how carefully a person and a profession might be presented, and the care that went into revising the sermon when it later appeared as devotional reading. Printed editions of sermons included marginal notes referencing biblical passages or literature related to people or events mentioned in the text. As pointed out with Röber above, lengthy Latin quotes from authorities, above all Augustine, larded some published sermons, especially those delivered and printed in academic communities. A Lebenslauf, or a brief biography of the deceased and his or her family, typically accompanied the printed sermon. The more famous the person, the more detail and the more additional memorials that might be included. For instance, Sennert’s published funeral sermon also contained two Latin eulogies by Wittenberg colleagues. Röber’s harsh comments about other physicians came in a foreword tacked on to the text of the sermon. In Sennert’s case, the printed document, consisting of the introductory foreword, Röber’s sermon, the Lebenslauf, eulogies, and Latin epigraphs in honor of the deceased, reaches to approximately 120 quarto-sized pages, making it a notably lengthy contribution to the genre. It was an
homage to an influential person, as well as a reflection on a vocation and a theological argument about providence and piety.

As was typical for funeral sermons, in addition to praising the life of the deceased, Röber gave a blow-by-blown account of Sennert’s last days and hours. This account of a good death was a particularly important aspect of the funeral sermon. This good death was the natural end to a life dedicated to serving God in whatever vocation the deceased had. The life and confession of faith recounted in the rest of the sermon should naturally lead up to such a peaceful passing on to heaven. This concern with a good death made funeral sermons part of the *Ars Moriendi* tradition. In this central part of late medieval and early modern devotional life, as Susan Karant Nunn has averred, “preparation for death encompassed all of life.”

In Sennert’s case, when plague struck Wittenberg in 1637, he refused to leave, determined to stay and care for the sick. This was nothing unusual; he had done the same during all previous outbreaks of epidemic disease. Röber spared his listeners the assessment that Sennert’s choice to stay in Wittenberg during plague was in accord with Martin Luther’s century-old injunction to pastors and physicians not to abandon the sick in the plague letter to the citizens of Breslau mentioned above. Instead, Röber opted to compare, in glowing terms, Sennert to Galen and other valiant physicians, ancient and

---

contemporary, who sacrificed their lives to treat plague victims.\textsuperscript{104} Practicing medicine in an age before antiseptics and antibiotics was dangerous business. Choosing to treat patients personally thus was a mark of devotion and love, according to Röber, who acclaimed Sennert’s sacrifice as a work of charity. In this, Sennert imitated Christ, for like the Savior, he spared nothing in his devotion to curing others, up to and including his own life.

In the end, Sennert lived well because he had carefully prepared to die.

Evidence for this was the book of devotional meditations he wrote, which Röber claimed to have read in draft before it was printed.\textsuperscript{105} Here the preacher referred to Sennert’s De

\textsuperscript{104} Röber, \textit{Sennertianum Symbolum}, Sig. A3r-4r: “Von dem Vornehen Medico, Galeno wird gelesen, das er in der greulichn Pest an 170. So die Römischen Provincien und Rom angefallen, nicht habe fuss gehalnte, sondern für der Pest von Rom alldar er sich damals befand hinweg geflohen, und in sein Vaterland begeben (in vita Galeni) welcher schrecklichen Pest nicht allein Eusebius in Chronicco, sondern auch Julius Capitol. In M. Aurelio und Gelenus selbst erwehnet, wenn er sie die allergrösste und and langwierigste Pest nennet…

Nun ists je sehr kläglich zu hören und zu lessen viel kläglicher aber und schmerzlicher selbst anzusehen das Gott der Herr in sterbensleüffen auch die vornembst Medicos oder Ärzte hinwegrafft, und den Menschen nicht länger gönnen will. Erbärmlich ists zu ververnehmen, dass der tapffere Medicus, Conradus Gesnerus, welchen man Germaniae Plinium nennete, das ist den aller fürtreflichsten Naturkündiger, wie vor diesem der berümpfte Plinius gewesen, an der Pest verstorben ist, im jahr Christi 1565. Den 13. Decembris…. Eusebius lib. 7. C. 17. sagt, das ihrer viel in der Pest gestorben, so andern geholfen haben, Multi idem, dum aliis aegrotantibus curam adhibent, illis vires restituunt, ipsi aliorum mortem in se derivantes vitam amittunt. Mitleidentlich ist zu lessen, das in einem grossen sterben zu Breslau drei Medici, ja das zu Augspurg in einer Pest sieben Medici, ihren Geist auch müssen aufgeben, und mit keiner Arznei der gift sich entschütten können… Wir haben exempels g(e)nung, und mehr als g(e)nug, in diesem Jahre müssen ansehen, da wir den Vortrefliche(n), nicht in Deutschland allein, sondern Franckreich, Welschland, Dennemarck…”

\textsuperscript{105} Röber, \textit{Sennertianum Symbolum}, Sig. 4v: “Er hat sich zeitlich auf die todesfahrt bereit gemacht, wie aus seinen herrlichen Meditationibus zuersehen, welche er, ehe den sie zum druck kommen, vor vielen jahren mir gezeigt und mein gutachten darüber begehret hat.” Röber referred to Daniel Sennert, \textit{De bene vivendi beateque moriendi ratione meditaciones} (Wittenberg, 1636); The German edition appeared as \textit{Christliche Gedancken wie man Wol Leben und Selig Sterben soll} (Wittenberg, 1636); In English, the book appeared as: \textit{Daniel Sennertus his meditations: setting forth a plain method of living holly and dying happily} (London, 1694, 1704).
bene vivendi beateque moriendi ratione meditationes (1636), which appeared almost immediately in the same year in a vernacular edition translated by Sennert’s son Andreas as Christliche Gedancken wie man Wol Leben und Selig Sterben soll (1636). The younger Sennert explained how he came to translate his father’s work. Originally intended by Sennert as a Latinate meditation on how to honor Christ in any profession, certain friends suggested that it would be useful for a wide audience, so the son translated it. Like much of Sennert’s work, it was also popular outside of Germany; it appeared in at least two early modern English editions. The book offered reflections on preparing to die, either by praying at the moment of death, or by living piously from day to day. These remarks were similar to much vernacular devotional literature. For the former, Sennert offered detailed depictions of body and soul at death and how a Christian at the end of life should pray. Because Christ tasted the bitterness of death, one should pray to depart for heaven in joy and assurance of the resurrection. For the

106 Daniel Sennertus his meditations setting forth a plain method of living holily and dying happily (London, 1694); Meditations upon living holily and dying happily, with suitable prayers to each chapter (London, 1704).

107 See chapter four of this dissertation for more discussion of such devotional literature.

latter, he gave suggestions on prayer from day to day, even including a section of prayers to accompany each hour of the day or normal activity, from getting out of bed to dressing oneself. According to Sennert, delayed preparation for death was dangerous. According to Sennert, delayed preparation for death was dangerous. The author’s profession as physician revealed itself in describing how extreme end-of-life conditions could undo a patient’s mind, rendering him unable to pray or reflect appropriately in the last hours.

In all, for Röber, the combination of Sennert’s erudition, humble service, and personal faith resulted in a life that deserved respect and emulation. Other pastors and

Todes Angst geschwitzet verliehe das ich durch dieses dein Verdienst und durch dein bitter Leiden und Sterben des Todes bitterkeit dermal eins nicht empfinde.”

109 Sennert, Christliche Gedancken, Sig. M8v: “Wenn du deine Kleider anzeuchest so bedencke dass dieselben Zeichen sein der Sünden und schuld umb welcher willen du deine Scham und deinen nackenden Leib zudeckest und derowegen keine ursach mit denselben zu prangen habest; und wenn du deinen Leib bedeckest so gib zugleich auch fleissig achtung dass du vor Gott dem HERRN nicht nacket gefunden werdest sondern angezogen sehest mit dem hochzeitlichem Ehrenkleid und Rock, welcher ist die Gerechtigkeit... Christi und achte es darf für dass es unbillich und unrecht sei dass unter einen reinen und saubern oder schönen kleid ein unstetiges un(d) mit Sünden beflecktes Herz und Gemüthe stecken sol.”

110 Sennert, Christliche Gedancken, Sig. F4v-F5v: “Denn es ist keine ungelegenere zeit eben sich zum Tode zuschicken als wenn der Mensch schon mit schweren krankheiten behafftet und der Todt schon vor der Thüren ist und gleichsam anklopfet weil alsdann die kräfften teils des Leibes teils auch des Gemüthes dahin fallen und wegen allerhand schmerzen und anderer beschwerung so die krankheiten verursachen und mit sich zubringen pflegen des Menschen Gemüth also verdunkelt geschwecht und verwirret wird dass er kaum sich recht mehr besinme noch bedencken mag wie man selig sterben soll. Ja wie oft wird ein krancker oder Patient wol unversehens im haupte irre und verrücket und verlieren sich aller gebrauch der Sinnen und Vernunfft? Die erfahrung bezeuget es täglich wenn einem zum Exempel die Zeene oder die Augen oder Ohren oder sonst einander Gliedmass seines Leibes wehe tut dass als dann eine Mensch welcher ob er schon an sich selbst nach genügen from und Gottfürchtig ist je dennoch seine Gedancken und Gemüthe kaum gnugsam zu Gott den HERRN erheben kann sondern er wendet alle seine Sinne und Gedancken dahin da das empfinden un(d) der schmerze ist. Welches wenn es Gottfürchtigen und frommen Leuten so leicht wiederaufhert und zwar in schlechter v. geringer krankheit was wird den dem wol wiederfahren der da niemals sich etwa umb Gott recht bekümmert der da nicht gnugsam erkennet hat, ob oder dass er gesündiget habe auch nicht weiss was die busse sei wenn ihn auff einer seiten plaget die kranckheit auff der andern seiten die vorsorge vor Weib und kinder welche er verlassen muss, auch die sorge für sein Geld und Gut welches nutzen und frommen er jetzo sihet dass er beraubet wird?”
theologians highlighted these same qualities in sermons for physicians and commentaries on biblical passages that treated medicine. Seemingly ubiquitous praise for the lives of physicians and the practice of medicine in vernacular sermons and books thus hammered home the message found in learned treatments of the same topics, while also offering advice on how to use medicine and respond to physicians. Even a glance at the titles of some funeral sermons indicates common themes: comparison of physicians and Christ, praise of medicine, and what makes for good medicine. The titles spoke among other things of “Jesus, prince and lord of all doctors,” “The most honorable standing of medicine,” the “most blessed physician of Christians,” and a straightforward “encomium to medicine.” One offered advice “on the licit and beneficial use of physicians and medicines.”

Many of the same elements that combined in the unreserved praise of Sennert can be found in other funeral sermons. For some cases, Röber’s own influence is patent and direct; for the majority, the similarities simply reveal common understandings of

---

medicine and physicians shared by many Lutherans. In 1633, the Magdeburg pastor Caspar Andreae, formerly a student of Röber’s at Wittenberg, published a sermon for the city physician and David Heimberger that was strikingly similar in some parts to the one his former teacher would offer up just 5 years later for Wittenberg’s much more illustrious physician and professor of medicine. Andreae told listeners (and readers) of the sermon that Heimberger’s faith and piety exceed that of Pistorius, Paracelsus, Peucer, and Avicenna. It is, indeed, the very same list (minus Erastus) of notables to whom Röber compared Sennert, and Andreae confessed his dependence upon his teacher, for whom, it seems this was rhetoric frequently repeated in praise of good physicians. According to Andreae, Heimberger was an “upright, true, and god-fearing” man who took the Lord everywhere, even going so far as to write a reference to Christ at the top of the pharmaceutical prescriptions (“recepten”) he wrote.

Andreae’s self-confessed cribbing of Röber is evidence of the wide consensus and sometimes outright copying among Lutherans giving sermons on medicine. But

---

112 Caspar Andreae, Medicorum piorum et persona et corona. Das ist Einfältige doch Schriftmässige Erklärung des anmutigen Sprüchleins/ so der vernünfftige kluge Haufflehrer Syrach im 3. 4. 5. und 6. Versickel seines lehrreichen Hauffbuches auffgezeichnet/ und darinnen verfasset hat (Magdeburg, 1633), Sig. B3v: “...schreibt mein seliger in Gott ruhender Praeceptor und Wittenbergische wolverdienete Theologus an einem Orte, man hat auch sonsten vortreffliche Medicos gefunden, vor Alters und neulicher Zeit, aber sie haben den allergrössesten Hauptmangel gehabt, dass sie der wahren Erkenniss Gottes entweder gefehlet, oder auf Irthumb und schwermereien gerahen, und also rechten Schiffbruch an ihren Glabuen gelitten haben.” Andreae’s account of the other physicians stretches from folio B3v to C1r.

113 Andreae, Medicorum piorum et persona et corona, Sig. C1r: “Nicht also unter Seel. Herr Doctor Heimburger, der war bei seiner Erudition, kunst, and Erfahrenheit ein rechter treur Gottesfürchtiger Mann, der das—and das wie ers in seinen Recepten allezeit oben oben ansetze—das ist Jesum Christum wie sich der Herr selbstten also nennet Apoc. 1. V. 8. allezeit im Munde, in der Feder, und zweifels frei auch im Hertzen fuhrrete. Der hielt Gott und seine heilige Furcht von seinen Edlestern und besten Schatz, hat ihm auch mit ehren aus dieser Welt in seine Brust genommen.”
Andreae’s text for the sermon is also revealing. Considering it opens up another rich vein of Lutheran thinking about medicine. Andreae based his eulogy on Sirach 38. Even while they denied Sirach’s canonicity, Lutherans continued to regard it highly and use it frequently, as recurrent references to it both in chapter two and in the discussion here so far reveals. They turned especially to this thirty-eighth chapter, which focuses on medicine, the relationship between physicians and patients, and on understandings of the body and disease. The passage supported their interpretation of medicine as a divine gift, and the physician’s work as God-honoring. Discussions of the text reached far beyond quick mentions of it as a proof-text for the origin of medicine in scholarly works noted in chapter two of this dissertation. The text was the basis for many sermons and a number of Lutheran commentaries on the whole book offered extensive commentary on medicine.

Before proceeding to consider these discussions, naming Sirach as a key source for Lutherans demands brief comment. Claiming Lutherans used it extensively must spark questions from historians of theology and popular religion. Received wisdom has

---

114 Lutherans were not the first to comment on the practice of medicine by way of commenting on Sirach. As Joseph Ziegler contends, “The fifteen verses of Ecclesiasticus 38 which open this introduction were fundamental for questions about the place of medicine and the physician (not to forget the apothecary) in a divinely ordained world.” (Joseph Ziegler, “Introduction” in Religion and Medicine in the Middle Ages, ed. Peter Biller and Joseph Ziegler, Woodbridge, Suffolk and Rochester, NY: York Medieval Press, 2001, 5). Learned interpretations trickled down to the laity as Ecclesiastius proved a popular passage upon which to base homilies on feast days devoted to saints known for healing, such as Cosmas and Damian, as well as Luke the Evangelist. At the same time “physicians could use the text and its commentaries as a license to engage spiritual matters.” (Joseph Ziegler, Medicine and Religion c. 1300: The Case of Arnau De Vilanova, Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1998, 235).
it that Reformers of all stripes unceremoniously discarded books labeled “apocryphal” in the early sixteenth century. It seems, however, that this process was not simple or straightforward. In addition to Sirach, as seen with Haffenreffer above and, in chapter 2, with Daniel Sennert’s references to Raphael in his book on occult diseases, the story Tobit recounted of the archangel descending to teach and practice healing was also a popular text from which to discuss medicine.115 It seems that Reformed and Lutheran debates and final decisions about the books mirrors earlier debates, starting from Jerome who himself doubted the canonical status of Sirach and other books such as Tobit, Judith and Maccabees, now labeled apocryphal, while nonetheless esteeming them as a useful source of instruction for Christian life.116 For the Reformed, days of recorded controversy at the Synod of Dort over the relationship of canonical and apocryphal texts make it clear that there was no immediate unanimous decision to reject the books; and that even those who urged removing them from the list of canonical books nonetheless argued that they could provide valuable spiritual lessons.

As for Lutherans, a number of writers fulsomely praised Sirach, following in this the example of Luther himself, who in his introduction to his German translation lauded the book for its practical wisdom. According to Luther, even the “old Fathers” did not number it among the canonical books, but respected its down-to-earth wisdom.

115 There was at least one commentary on Tobit as well: Jacob Honold, TOBIAS, Das ist, Schriftmässige Erklärung des Bücherins Tobiae in 364. Predigten der Gestalt ordentlich abgehandelt (Ulm, 1653).
116 Ian Christopher Levy, Holy Scripture and the Quest for Authority at the End of the Middle Ages (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2012).
Lutherans should do the same. It was “a useful book for the common man” because it
gave advice on how to treat one’s family members, one’s neighbors, and even one’s
body. After Luther, a variety of Lutheran theologians and pastors commented on the
book including David Chytraeus, Joachim Camerarius, Caspar Huberinus, Johannes
Mathesius, Conrad Dietrich, Valerius Herberger, and Victorin Strigel. In addition to
these treatments of the book by theologians and pastors, several distilled the book’s

---

117 Martin Luther, Jesus Syrach zu Wittenberg verdeutscht (Nüremberg, 1533), Sig. A2r-v: “Und ist von den
alten Vätern nicht in der Zahl der heiligen schrift, sonder als sonst ein gut sein Buch eines weisen mans
gehalten, dabei wirs auch lassen bleiben…. Es ist ein nützlich buch für den gemeinen man. Denn auch alle
sein Fleiss ist das er einen burger oder haussvater Gottförchtig frumm und klüg mache, wie er sich gegen
Gott, Gottes wort, Priestern, Eltern, Weib, Kindern, eigen Leib, Gütern, Knechten, Nachbarn, Freunden,
Feinden, Überkeit und Jederman halten sol, das mans wol mocht nennen. Ein Büch von der Hausszucht
oder von tugenden eins frommen frommern Hausshern, welchs auch die rechte geistliche zucht ist und heissen solt.”

According to VD 16, Luther’s commentary on Sirach went through the following editions by 1600:
Wittenberg: 1535, 1537, 1540, 1542, 1554, 1557, 1558, 1566
Augsburg: 1537
Strassburg: 1537
Leipzig: 1542, 1545, 1549 1579
Lübeck: 1546
Nuremberg: 1548, 1554, 1561, 1584
Magdeburg: 1561
Erfurt: 1574
Justas Jonas translated Luther’s commentary into Latin, and it appeared in two sixteenth-century editions:
Bautzen, 1562; Frankfurt, 1575.

118 Chytraeus, Sententiae Jesu Syriacide; Joachim Camerarius, Sententiae Iesu Siracidae, Graece summa diligentia et
studio singulari editae, cum necessariis notationibus (Leipzig, 1568); Caspar Huberinus, Spiegel der Hauszucht,
sampt einer kurzten Ausslegung für die armen Hausväter...wie sie ein Gotselfig leben gegen meniglich sollen erzeigen.
(Nürenberg, 1555); Johannes Mathesius, Sýrach Mathesii, Das ist, Christliche, Lehrhaffte, Trostreiche und lustige
Erklerung und Ausslegung des schönen Hausbuchs, so der weise Mann syrach zusammen gebracht und geschrieben
(Leipzig, 1586); Bartholomäus Bernhard, LehrBuch, Himlischer Weisheit, fur allerlei Stende aus den vier Eden
Büchern Salomonis und Jhesus Syrac (Eisleben, 1575); Friedrich Rothe, Das Buch Jesus Syrac im Latein
ECCLESIASTICUS. Auf Deutsch, Die Geistliche Zucht genant. In hundert und zwei und dressig Predigten erklert,
und auff die Lere des heiligen Cathechismi gerichtet (Eisleben, 1596); Conrad Dietrich, Das Buch der Weisheit
Salomens in unterscheidenen Predigen erklärert und ausgelegt, darin so wol allerhand gemeine Lehren als auch
mancherlei sonderbare Theologische, Ethische, Politische, Physische, Elementarische Materien so sonst in popularn
Predigen nicht vorfallen begriffen. (Ulm, 1627); Valerius Herberger, Sirachs Hohe Weisheit und Sitten Schule,
Oder Jesus Sirach in In XCVII Predigten deutliche erklärert (Leipzig, 1698); Victorin Strigel, Sirach Sapientia
(Leipzig, 1569).
lessons into easily memorable rhymes or labored to show how it might sum up the Law.

Esaias Tribauern overviewed the book in a set of simple questions and answers in the pattern of a catechism. While one might argue that it is to be expected that the first Reformers who were originally trained to regard the book as canonical would continue to use it, the book’s reputation did not fade with the passing of that generation. It remained popular throughout the seventeenth century. A century later Michael Shirmer, *Das buch Jesu Sirach* set the lessons of the book to rhyme. So too Johann Hildebrand’s *In deutsche Reime übersetzter Jesus Syrach: Mit etzlichen merckwürdigen Glossen* (1662), which also featured lengthy gloss notes from Mathesius’s three-volume commentary.\footnote{Esaias Tribauer, *Das buch Jesus Syrach: nach ordnung der heubtartickel Christlicher lere, in Frage und Antwort gestellet* (Wittenberg, 1561); Michael Shirmer, *Das buch Jesu Sirach: In allerhand Reim-Arten, zu sonderbarem Nutz und Unterweisung der Christlichen Jugend abgefasset* (Berlin, 1655); Johann Hildebrand, *In deutsche Reime übersetzter Jesus Syrach: Mit etzlichen merckwürdigen Glossen* (Halle, 1662).}

As Hildebrand’s use of Mathesius indicates, commentaries on Sirach did not languish in obscurity. They were popular and widely read, especially Huberinus’s and Mathesius’s (for that reason, I prioritize those two commentaries in this chapter and the next, alongside funeral sermons based on Sirach). Luther’s German translation of the book appeared first in 1533 and went through multiple editions by the end of the seventeenth century. Similarly, Huberinus’s set of sermons was widely read and republished.\footnote{According to VD 16, Huberinus’s commentary went through the following editions by 1600: Nuremberg: 1552, 1553, 1554, 1555, 1556, 1558, 1561, 1565, 1567, 1571, 1580, 1588 Königsburg: 1555, 1567, 1570} Consider the introduction a Mansfeld church superintendent named
Hieronymus Mencelius added to the pastor Frederick Roth’s posthumously published sermons on “a very honorable and valuable book.” He placed Roth’s sermons in the context of a glowing history of Lutherans commenting and preaching on the book, including leading Lutheran thinkers David Chytraeus, Caspar Huberinus, and Johannes Mathesius, as well, of course, as Luther himself. Mencelius admitted that Lutherans were not the only authors of influential commentaries. He mentioned reading the influential Nicholas Lyra’s work on the book, but confessed himself distinctly

Frankfurt: 1569
Mathesius’s commentary had two editions: Leipzig, 1586, 1598.
121 Rothe, Das Buch Jesus Syrach, Letter to the reader, unpaginated: “Zu unsern letzten zeiten hat unser lieber Herr Gott seinen werden und lieben Rüstzeug(sic) D. Martinum Lutherum erwecket und hoch begabet das er durch reiche hilfe und bewohnung des heiligen Geistes die gantze heilige Schrift in unsere deutsche Muttersprache mit solchem hellen Lichte und verstande bracht hat das solche Dometschung wie alle Gottfürchtig Sprachkündiger und erfahren Christen zeugen müssen anstat eines Commentarii gebraucht werden kan... Dessen hat unser Syrach auch mit genossen das et frommen Christen in der deutschen Sprache bekant und lieb worden ist das sie sein Buch als ein nützliches Hausbuch zu allerlei unterweisungen haben gebrauchen können.

Nach Luthero und seiner Dometschung hat sich der treffliche gelehrte Man Caspar Huberinus herfür getan. Welcher einer aus den ersten reinen Lerern des heiligen Evangelii gewesen die Gott der Herr Luthero zu gebülssen (sic) gegeben das sie neben ihme wider das unselige Antichristische Bapsthumb ernstlich gestretten und die vielfeltigen Abgöttereien Grewel und jammerliche Verführung und Betrug des armen einseitigen Volcks aus Gottes Wort der heiligen Schrift entdecket offenbaret und gründlich widerleget haben. Dieser Herr Huberinus hat ein Comment und auflegung über dieses Buch geschrieben und in Druck aufgeben lassen. Und weil dieses bald im anfange des wider offenbarten heiligen Evangelii geschehen sind von wegen der langen zeit dieselben gedruckten Exemplar und Bücher fast alle verruckt und den Leuten so far aus den Heiden kommen das man jetzt derselben gar selten eins finden und zu sehen bekommen kan.....

Nachmals hat sich der hochgeleherte und wohlverdienete treue Man D. Doctor David Chytraeus, Hochbrümber Professor der Universitet Rostock an diesem Buche sehr wol beweiset und über dasselbe einen herrlichen Lateinischen Commentarium aufgeben lassen....

Neulich aber, als den nebst vergangenen Sommermarckt ist des alten Herrn und berümbten Lerers der Kirchen M. Johannis Mathesii weiland Pfarrherns in S. Joachimsthal Ausslegung über die Buch welcher er lenger als für zwanzig Jahren geschrieben nu erst nach seinem Tode duch den Herrn M. Georgium Lysthenium...mit einer Vorrede des Hochgelarten Herrn Doctoris Nicolai Selnecceri ans Licht und an Tag gebracht worden. Mit dieser schönen Ausslegung ist es also gethan, das es bei derselben billich bliebe und kündten ihnen auch fromme Christen daran wol genügen lassen.”
unimpressed by the medieval commentator. He grudgingly conceded that Lyra’s work had its use (“seinem brauche”), but complained that there was little “consolation and patience in the Cross” (“trost und gedult im Kreuze”) to be found in it, compared to Lutheran works.122

    Sirach was popular as a source of pious practical wisdom for life. Following Luther’s line of interpretation, there was general agreement that, as Caspar Huberinus put it, “First and above all, Sirach teaches us that we should seek the heavenly wisdom…This heavenly wisdom is God’s Son himself…”123 Nicholas Selnecker, in the forward to Johannes Mathesius’s sermons simply noted, “The Lord Christ gives us Sirach’s teaching about belief, life, prayer, the cross, and about patience and true fear of God.”124 For his part, Mathesius opined in typically Lutheran fashion that Sirach could be divided into Law and Gospel sections to teach proper duties to God and to neighbor. “Therefore it concerns true and right service of God, and what we are guilty of before God. And these two pieces, namely how one should conduct himself in relation to God

122 Rothe, Das Buch Jesus Syrach, Letter to the reader, unpaginated: “Nu habe ich zwar über dieses Buch des alten Lehres Lyrae Arbeit gesehen und gelesen. Der hat seinem brauche nach, nur den Text durch eine Lateinische paraphrasung erklärter, also das er desselben meinunge, mit andern und mehr worten gegeben hat. Aber die schönen und tröstlichen Leren, und nützliche erinnerungen, die man zum trost und gedult im Kreutze zur ermannung und Lehre und zur besterung im ganzen Leben gebrauchen könnte und sollte hat er entweder gar nicht oder iam ita wenig und kurzen worten bisweilen angebüret.”
123 Huberinus, Speigel der Hauszucht, Sig. A3r. “Syrach leret uns erstlich und fürnemlich....dass wir die himlischen weissheit sollen suchen....Solche himlische weisheit aber ist Gottes Son selber...”
124 Mathesius, Sýrach Mathesii, Selnecker’s Letter to the reader, unpaginated: “Der Herr Christus ... gebe uns Syrachs Lehre im Glauben, Leben, Gebet, Creuz, und in gedult und in warer Gottesfurcht.”
and man, are amply dealt with in this book…” It is in light of this search properly to understand duties to God, neighbor, and self that Lutherans framed discussions of the importance of medicine and the role of the physician from Sirach 38.

Like Andreae’s sermon for the Magdeburg physician Heimberger, many, though not all, funeral sermons for physicians were based on Sirach. In discussing the lives of physicians and the role of medicine, commentators successively outlined ways to understand both a doctor’s vocation and a patient’s individual responsibility for his health, principles that emphasized the importance of combining spiritual and medical care. This following will focus on what was said of physicians, while the next chapter will consider advice given to patients (and potential patients sitting in church pews). In discussing physicians, Lutherans sermons tended to highlight the same key points: (1) praise of medicine itself, (2) qualities of a good physician, and (3) physicians as imitators of Christ.

As with learned discussions and orations discussed above, the most fundamental point made in funeral sermons was that medicine was a gift of God and pious provision of care for the sick was a spiritual duty. Johannes Schreiter’s *Encomium medicinae* deployed a quote from Augustine to ground his argument that “…whoever would think correctly about medicine for the body, must know that it is no natural or human work,

---

125 Mathesius, *Sýrach Mathesii*, Sig. A1v: “Darnach handelt es auch davon dem wahren und rechten Gottesdienste und was wir Gott schuldig sein. Und diese beide stücke, nemlich, wie man sich gegen Gott und die Menschen verhalten sole werden in diesem Büchlein reichlich gehandelt…..”
and there is no one else from whom people receive help, except from God who holds the condition and welfare of all creatures in His hand.” Though disease arrived only about after the Fall, nonetheless, God prepared medicines for people in the earth and cared for their wellbeing. It was one of the tangible signs of His great love. 

A sermon for the physician Fredericus Lagus summed it up thus: “Syrach concludes that the art of medicine is not only for the good of men, but is also useful for the praise of God’s name and once again we with him rightly note that we should not despise the art but regard it

---

126 Schreiter, *Encomium medicinae*, B1r-B2r: “Augustinus sagt gar recht, auch von denen Creaturen, so noch heutiges Tages zu des Menschen Gesundheit gebraucht werden: Medicina corporis, si altius rerum originem repetas, non inventur, unde ad homines manare potuerit, nisi a Deo, cui rerum omnium status salusq(ue); tribuenda est. Das ist, wer die liebliche Arznei recht bedencket, mus bekennen dass es kein natürliches oder menschliches Werck sei, hette auch nirgends anders woher den Menschen womit eine Hülfte können zukommen, ohne von Gott, der aller Creaturen Zustand und Wolfart in seinen Händen hat. Nun ists wol an dem, dass wie aller anderer Gnad und Herrligkeit, also auch dieser der Mensch selbs mit dem kläglichen Sündenfall sich hat verlustig gemachet. Dahin Moses deutet, wenn er sagt von der Engelischen Schildwach, welcher für das Paradies gelegen worden zubewahren den Weg zu den Baum des Lebens: jedoch gleichwie Gott den schweren Fluch uff die Erden gelegen, also mitigiret, und gelindert hat, dass dieselbe nichts desto weniger jährlich ihre Frucht und Gewächs zur Nahrung und Unterhalt des Menschens wie wol mit grosser Müh und Arbeit, und im Schweis seines Angesichts herfür bringet, also hat der grundgütige Gott seine Hand nicht ganzlich abziehen wollen, in dem was zu Erhaltung und Stärckung menschlichen Lebens dienet bevoorua weil dasselbe umb der Sünde Willen so viel kranchkeiten und andern Elend mus unterworfen sein. Hier auch deutet unser ander Sprüchlein: Der Herr lest die Arznei aus der erden Wachsen, das sind die vielerlei Wurzeln, Bletter, Blumen, Kreuter, Früchte, Specereien, Säfft und Gehren, allerlei Metal und Mineralien, mit ihren sonderbaren qualitäten und Eigenschaften. Denn gleichwie Gott der Herr von Ewigkeit darauff bedacht gewesen ist, wie dem Menschen geistlicher weis, an der Seelen wiederumb möchte geholffen werden, nachdem er also allwissend den Sündenfall zuvor gesehen, also hat er auch als ein rechter Menschen Freund und Liebhaber des Leben an der leiblichen Cur keinen Mangel wollen erscheinen lassen, wiewol leicht zuerachten, dass vor dem Fall alle Gewächs viel kräftiger und besser als hernacher gewesen. Wie auch hieran kein zweifel dass durch die Sündflut die Erde noch mehr verderbet und alle deroselben Gewächs mit ihren Kräfften geschwechet worden und den Menschen nicht so dienlich haben verbleiben können. Wie man dafür halten wil, dass auch umb solcher Ursach Willen Gott der Herr nach der Sündflut den Menschen das Fleisch zu essen erlaubet, auch der Wein wo nicht zu erst erfunden, doch mehr und besser gebauet worden sei. Also wird Gottes Lieb und Leutseligkeit hiermit gepreiset: Der Herr lesset die Arznei aus der Erden wachsen...”
as the wonderful work of God.”

A number of sermons for Apotheker/Apothekerinnen that developed similar arguments suggest that all sorts of medicine were included in the praise of healing arts.

Johann Schreiter argued that a part of God’s provision for his people was that He called certain among them to be physicians. Aside from the fact that medicine in itself was good, the fact that this vocation was God-given was one reason it should be respected. In plying their art, doctors might turn to a variety of outstanding examples after which to model themselves. The saints Cosmos and Damian had long offered an example to physicians, one that it seems even some Lutherans continued to revere. The funeral for Johannes Vincent Finck, physician in the small towns Werzstrom and Allendorf happened to be held on the feast day of Cosmos and Damian. The town pastor could not help but use the stunning conjunction to praise the deceased physician as a follower of Cosmos and Damian.

Indeed, carried away in his zeal for praising the

127 Johannes Caementarius, Ein Christliche Predigt Bey der Leich des Edlen Friderici Lagi, der Artzney Doctoris, (Tübingen, 1594), Sig. C1r: “….dass die kunst der Arznei nicht allein zu des Menschen Nutzen sonder auch zu lob des Göttlichen Namens dienstlich…. ist: schleusst Syrach und wir abermal mit ihme recht und wol dass wir oftgedachte kunst nich verachten, sonder für der Wunderthaten Gottes eine halten und achten sollen.”

128 Schreiter, Encomium medicinae, Sig. B3r-v: “..und wenn ein ordentlicher Beruf an ein gewisses Ort darzu kömpt, so heist es: Gott hat einen solchen Medicum erschaffen und er hat den Trost des Beistandes und der Regierung Gottes, und bleibet billich in dem, was er gelernt hat und ihm vertrawet ist, wie S. Paulus seinen Timotheum vermahnet. Und wenn man solche Medicos hat, welche excelliren mag man wol dafür halten, das sie von Mutterleibe an von Gott zu solchen Dienste ausgesondert...”

medical profession, the pastor went on to list a number of physicians in the Bible and history, only to conclude that no physician living or dead is as worthy of honor as Christ. Similarly, Schreiter's *Encomium medicinae* enumerated outstanding examples of physicians in the Bible, with a fairly standard cast of characters, but with the notable addition of tacking on the priests in the Old Testament, because of their special knowledge of spices and oils. The *Lebenslauf* for the physician Fredericus Lagus depicted him as the ideal Christian physician because, knowing that he could not


effectively practice without fear and knowledge of God, he sat and studied Luther and Hippocrates privately every night until he fell asleep. Just as Lagus was to said to be as familiar with his Hippocrates as with his Vater Unser, funeral sermons made it clear that the praise and respect they commanded should be reserved for learned physicians. From the start of his career in a university, the physician should know that God comes first. Many sermons began by commenting wryly on Luke 4:23 (“Physician, heal thyself”), as if the fact that a physician had died would inevitably provoke doubt among hearers about the effectiveness of medicine. Caspar Joseph’s Medicus christianorum felicissimus tackled this anticipated objection with a standard reply: this simply revealed the truth that God is the one who is really in control of medicine.

As for those requiring treatment, the Braunschweig school and church superintendent Johannes Wagner emphasized that one should not accept treatment from

---

132 Caementarius, Ein Christliche Predigt, Sig. D4r: “Und weil er wol gewusst, das er mit seiner kunst ohne die Forcht Gottes wenig aussrichten konnte, hat er sich auch derselbigen beflossen, und sonderlich in seinem letzten Alter sich auff die Theologiam begeben, die Tomos Lutheri fleissig gelesen, wie auch alle Nacht, neben seinen Aphorismis Hippocratis (welche ihn so gemein gewesen, als das Vater unser) ein stuck aus dem Catechismo Lutheri mit seiner Auslegung bei ihm selber bis er entschlaffen erzehlt.”


134 Joseph, Medicus christianorum felicissimus, Sig. A4v: “…der Medicus und Arzt so wol als der patient muss sterben, dieweil Gott der Herr als dann den Kräutern und Arzneien ihre natürliche Krafft und Wirckung suspendiret…”
just anyone, but only from a learned and experienced physician.\textsuperscript{135} Even while recognizing a learned doctor’s expertise, one should never forget the basis of medicine: God made it and He alone made it effective.\textsuperscript{136} Even a well-trained and experienced physician may not always be able to heal. And when he cannot do so, it is not always his fault. A patient’s stubborn sinfulness might impede the effectiveness of the medicine. God would heal or not based on what would ultimately bring the most glory to His own name.\textsuperscript{137} Schreiter’s \textit{Encomium medicinae} made it clear that it is God who does the healing, not the physician. The doctor is merely (or wonderfully) God’s selected agent on earth. Because of that, when he arrives to treat a distressed patient, he can seem like an angel, indeed like Raphael. His coming to to a sickbed might also be compared to God himself, who deigned to descend to earth to heal people of sin.\textsuperscript{138} When treatment

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{135} Wagner, \textit{De lictio & salutari medicorum}, Sig. C2r: “Es ist aber allhie, da Syrach gebeut der Arznei und Ärzten zu gebrauchen, in acht zu nehmen, das man nicht von jedermenniglich sol Arzneien einnehmen, sondern allein von verstendigen und erfahrenen Medicis, denn einen solchen wil er verstanden haben, wenn er sagt: die kunst des Ärzten erhöhet ihn, zu solcher kunst gehöret geschickligkeit und erfarenheit…”

\textsuperscript{136} Wagner, \textit{De lictio & salutari medicorum}, Sig. C3r: “Viel Leute verlassen Gott als den Schöpfer der Arznei und machen aus dem Medico einen Gott.”

\textsuperscript{137} Wagner, \textit{De lictio & salutari medicorum}, Sig. C3v-C4r: “Non est in medico semper relevetur ut aeger. Sondern es mangelt oft an den Patienten selbst, derer Sünde so gross,… dass sie die Arznei nicht kan wircken lassen, sondern widersetet derselbigen so hart das sie keine krafft haben magt. Oder Gott hat ein bessers über einen solchen Menschen beschlossen, oder Gott siehet und weis, das er durch auffrichtung solches kranken nicht würde gepreiset werden.”

\textsuperscript{138} Schreiter, \textit{Encomium medicinae}, E4v: “…wenn sie krancke Leute sehen oder hören achzen und sich qualen, oder selbst auff das Siechbette darnieder geworffen werden, da gebe mancher, was er solte oder wol alles dahin seine Gesundheit zuerlangen. Kömm allda ein verständiger glückseliger Medicus, erbeut sich mit Rat und Hülffe allen Fleiss anzuwenden in Hoffnung nechst Gott auffzuhalten, da hat er recht faciem Angelicam, das ist, dem Patienten ist als wenn ihm Gott einen Engel vom himmel zuschikete, wie der Engel Raphael dem alten blinden Tobiae zu Trost und Hülffe erschiene. Ja est ist als käme Gott selbs, wie man sagt: Homo homini Deus und in solchen fallen sine Mediici wie Salvatores und liebliche Heiland zu achten. Denn Gott brauchet sie zur zeitlichen Hülffe an seiner Statt…wie Syrach bescheidentlich redet nicht dass die Arznei heile und vertreibe die Schmerzen sondern Gott durch die Medicin.”
\end{flushright}
works, it is because of the grace of God. And in part because of that, the work the physician does healing the body has the potential to affect the patient’s soul.\textsuperscript{139}

The primary models for this well-educated and pious physician were the first and second Adams. Here, there are echoes of the learned arguments about the Garden of Eden and perfect prelapsarian knowledge encountered in chapter two of this dissertation. “There is no doubt that Adam was the most skillful physician among all men who have ever been found in the world....” because of “how he identified all animals by their features and qualities and also after that called each one by name, so also herbs and plants on and under the Earth...”\textsuperscript{140} But in these sermons, the second Adam was far and away more important than the first.

As with Röber’s sermon for Sennert, funeral sermons portrayed physicians as imitators of the Great Physician, \textit{Christus Medicus}, by praising the physician’s personal faith, presenting his search for medical knowledge as a way of knowing God’s truth, and

\textsuperscript{139} Schreiter, \textit{Encomium medicinae}, F1r-v: “Eine grosse Gnade ist es zwar wenn Gott also durch die Arznei heilet oder die Schmerzen vertreibet aber Gottseligen herzen sonderlich die in öffentlichen Empterm sitzen, und an denselben manches mal wegen Leibesbeschwerungen gehindert werden... Von diesem Nutz der Arznei redet Augustinus also: Sicut in arbore id agit Agricultura forinsecus, ut illud proficiat, quod geritur intrinsecus: sic in homine secundum corpus, ei quod intrinsecus agit natura, servit extrinsecus Medicina. Itemq(ue) secundum animam, ut natura beatificetur intrinsecus, doctrina ministratur extrinsecus. Quod autem ad arborem colendi negligentia, hoc ad corpus medendi incuria, hoc ad animam discendi segnitia. Das ist, Gleich wie ein Gärtner von aussen an einem Baume arbeitet, damit die Natur inwendig mit der Frucht besser fortkomme also dienet die Arznei von aussen dem Leibe, damit die Seele durch die Gliedmass und organa corporis ihre Wirkungen üben möge. Und also werden wir auch äusserlich gelehret und unterrichtet, dass es der Seelen zur Seligkeit diene.”

\textsuperscript{140} Schreiter, \textit{Encomium medicinae}, Sig. C3v: “Kein zweifel ist, Adam sei der geschickteste Medicus gewesen unter allen Menschen welche jemals in der Welt gefunden worden, und wie er alle Thiere mit ihren Eigenschaffeten und qualiteten erkennen auch ein jedes mit Nahmen darnach genennet also wird an kraütern, gewächsen in und unter der Erden auch geschehen sein.”
pronouncing his practice a laudable work of Christian charity. The subtitle of one funeral sermon based on Sirach 38 announced that by commemorating the departed doctor, readers would also consider “The best doctor of body and soul, Jesus Christ, [who] most assuredly undertakes to help all believing Patients.” The preacher went on to point out that Christ perfectly fulfilled Hippocrates’ expectations for the ideal physician: virtuous, capable, and compassionate. Another confidently reminded readers that Christ was the physician who “has the most Patients” and even more importantly, that “no Patient [of his] has yet died.” Echoing this, another sermon suggested that no human physician could compare with Christ. This was evident above all in Christ’s perpetual peregrination while on earth, healing the sick throughout Israel. Indeed, based on his example, a physician must practice himself, must actively treat patients, and not rest content with merely learning and spouting medical theory.

141 Lutherans were hardly the only confession to utilize the motif of Christus Medicus. It emerged from the healing stories in the Gospels. Rudolf Arbesmann pointed out long ago that it was especially significant for Augustine. See: idem, “The Concept of ‘Christus Medicus’ in St. Augustine,” Traditio 10, (1954): 1-28. A more recent discussion of the concept in patristic sources is: Jan Nicolae ‘Christus Praedicator/Medicator’: Homiletical, Patristic and Modern Elements of Theologia Medicinalis” European Journal of Science and Theology 8.2 (2012): 15-27; See also Martin Honecker, “Christus Medicus” in Der kranke Mensch in Mittelalter und Renaissance, ed. Peter Wunderli (Düsseldorf: Droste, 1986), 27-44.

142 Johannes Vietor, Panacea Biblica, subtitle: “der beste Leibs und Seelen Medicus, Christus Jesus, allen glaubigen Patienten am sichersten zuhelfen pflegt.”

143 Vietor, Panacea biblica, Sig. B3r-v: “Von einem rechtschaffenem Medico schreibt Hippocrates in seinen Aphorismis, dab er muss drei Tugende an sich haben, dass er nemlich helffen kann, cito, tuto. Iucunde… Dessgleichen sein lieblich und anmütig. Aber diese Stück finden sich an Christo dem himmlischen Medico am aller richtigsten…”

144 “Valerius Herberger, Leichenpredigt auf Flaminius Gasto (1618)” in Steiger, Medizinische Theologie, 257ff.

145 Joseph, Medicus christianorum, Sig. C2r: “Summa, er ist der rechte himlische Archiater & Princeps Medicorum, Ober und HauptArzt, welchen alle andere ärzte mit ihere Wissenschaft, Kund (sic), Erfahrung und Cur gar weit müssen weichen, und im geringsten mit ihm nicht sind zu vergleichen, sie mögen auch gewesen sein oder noch sein, wer sie wollen.”
Based on what Christ was and did, then, sermons outlined what qualities a good physician should have. Caspar Josephs' *Medicus christianorum felicissimus* outlines six notable traits of a Christian physician: (1) pious, (2) learned, (3) a good practitioner, (4) patient, true, and loving, (5) humble and friendly, (6) lucky (a characteristic designed to instill confidence). This was the kind of physician about whom

---


149 Josephs, *Medicus christianorum*, Sig. D1v: “Ein Medicus muss aber auch Demütig wohl selig und freundlich sein, der sich auch einem arme patienten nicht zu gross düncke sondern ihm seine rath mittheile: der nicht allein herbis sed etiam verbis, nicht allein mit kräutern und Arzneien, sondern auch mit lieblich freundlichen Worten zu currire und dem patienten ein gut Hertz ein spechen könne.”


---
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encomiums like Melanchthon’s and Peucer’s were written and the sort of physician that Bartholin hoped to train and Horst and Haffenreffer encouraged their colleagues to be. By looking for these characteristics, one could identify a worthy physician, one who could be trusted to heal, not to hurt, both the body and the soul.

3.5 Conclusion

The inscription that the owner of an edition of Gregor Horst’s Medicarum institutionum compendium scribbled on the front flyleaf sums up many of the themes in this chapter. (See figure 7). “In God and Galen is my hope.” As early modern Lutherans saw it, to be an effective physician who had any hope of curing disease, one needed both great learning and God’s favor.

152 Gregor Horst, Medicarum institutionum compendium, ... editio nova, cui adjecta est methodus medendi Ferneliana enucleata, et controversiis illustrata (Wittenberg, 1630). This copy of Horst’s work is found in the Yale University Medical History Library collection. Author’s photo.
While polemical portrayals of less than salutary practitioners of medicine generated suspicion of physicians, a strong countercurrent of praise for doctors also existed. As this chapter has demonstrated, sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Lutherans who praised the healing arts founded their admiration on seeing medicine as a gift of God that, practiced by a pious and educated individual, was a way of imitating Christ and a service to the bodies and souls of Christian brothers and sisters. Melanchthon forged the intellectual basis for this approach to medicine in his natural philosophy and theology. It developed over the course of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries into an omnipresent opinion, to be shared by learned physicians and the laity alike. In the final chapter of this dissertation, I will explore further the ways in which academic discussions of bodies, souls, and medicine were translated into popular, vernacular works to provide instruction and comfort by turns to all people.
4. Patients & Piety

“And finally it is most evident that is useful not only to doctors but to all people to know basic parts of the body, which (knowledge) leads to sound morals and medicine…”¹ With these words, Philip Melanchthon urged everyone to recognize the importance of studying the body in his book the soul. It could, he enthused with a scholar’s glee, inspire “many erudite dispositions.” And so it did, as I have shown in part in chapters one and two of this dissertation. It was this view of the matter that encouraged the development of anthropologia late in the sixteenth century and early in the seventeenth. As seen in chapter one, in Wittenberg and places influenced by it under Melanchthon and his successors, Lutheran writers presented the study of body and soul as useful for future physicians, but also all other students, including budding theologians and pastors. Touching on both natural philosophical and theological questions, it could and should inform both medical and pastoral care.

But remarkable as Melanchthon’s words are, there is a large group of “all people” that they seem to leave unaddressed. That is, those who would not produce the many erudite dispositions the Preceptor Germaniae was so eager to see. What about people beyond learned circles, those who could not read the dense Latin in the Galenic-

---

Aristotelian medical and natural philosophical treatises and the theological works in which Lutheran academics hammered out the basics of anthropologia? Scholarly discussions of bodies, souls, disease, physicians, and the Bible as outlined in chapters one to three of this dissertation were by turns enlightening and entertaining, but did these ideas spread beyond circles in which the finer points of humanist hermeneutics, editions of Aristotle, debates about Greek orthography, and Galenic treatises ruled?

True, Johannes Grün’s tables (mentioned in chapter 1) broke up Melanchthon’s teaching on the soul into easily memorable categories for his grammar school students. But youngsters learned all this in Latin, and in preparation for their future as university students. Did these ideas spread any farther than that? If they did, how and to what extent? Could Lutheran notions about body, soul, and medicine really be useful for “all people”? By surveying a selection of vernacular discussions of medicine and devotion, this chapter will argue that they were. I will explore the ways in which Lutheran teaching about body, soul, and disease reached lay audiences. This demonstrates far-reaching interest in understanding body and soul and in using this understanding to encourage and to shape day-to-day practice and piety.

Widespread interest in these matters is clear from the sheer variety and number of sources to which one can point. Early modern Germany boasted a flourishing market for Hausväter literature, books in which authors distilled and purveyed practical advice on all sorts of day-to-day matters in the vernacular. This included a number of books on
medicine, volumes that for lay readers in the sixteenth and seventeenth century were the equivalents of twenty-first century internet searches for descriptions of symptoms, possible prognosis, and treatment. For instance, though Conrad Gessner and Leonhard Fuchs derided him as a shameless plagiarist, it did not hurt Walter Herman Ryff’s popularity. He produced a string of popular advice books, including one, *Versehung Leibes und Seele des Menschen* split into two sections on, respectively, piety and treatment. The first offered consolatory meditations for the sick, while the second gave advice on how to read bodily signs (pulse, urine, etc.) and when to administer treatments like phlebotomies and purges. In another book Ryff promised to disentangle disputed questions in Aristotle, Galen, Avicenna, and Albertus Magnus about differences between animal and human nature. A selection from his many other works includes a “cookbook” for the sick and an anatomy book. There were other popular contributions to this genre, including the physician Johannes Dryander’s *Practicierbüchlin Ausserlesener Artzeneistück. Wie alle leibliche Gebrechen und Kranckheiten des Menschen durch natürliche Mittel curiert und geheilt werden mögen* and the humanist and statesman Heinrich Rantzau’s *De conservanda valetudine*. The latter circulated in several vernacular German

---

2 Walter Hermann Ryff, *Versehung Leibes und Seele des Menschen* (Frankfurt, 1537); idem, *Problemata. Fragstück Aristotelis, Avicenne, Galeni und Alberti Magni. Darin menschlicher und thierlicher nature eigenschaften durch Frag und antwort* (Strassburg, 1540); idem, *Neu Köchbuchlein für Kranke* (Frankfurt, 1541); Des aller fürtrefflichten, höchsten und adelichsten geschöpffs aller Creaturen, von Gott dem Herrn, schöpffer aller ding auf erden, erschaffen, Das ist, des menschen...wahrhaftige Beschreibung oder Anatomie (Frankfurt, 1541); *Kurtz Handtbüchlin und experiment vieler Artzneyen durch den gantzen Körper des Menschen von dem Haupt biß auff die Füss* (Frankfurt, 1550).

editions, with fifty-five chapters covering topics as varied as reflection on why the body is subject to disease, advice on food, exercise, sleep, fresh air, fasts, purges, and baths, and suggestions for maintaining health while traveling, as well as on how to cope with things like nosebleeds and drunkenness. In addition to this sort of book, many books of devotion and consolation circulated, often written specifically to encourage the sick, and to share devout understandings of medicine. Others produced books based on sermons or long commentaries on relevant biblical passages. Indeed, just as preachers expatiated on the physician’s role and the dignity of medicine in sermons and commentaries, especially on Sirach 38 (as seen in chapter three), so too did they offer advice to those who were or would be patients. In all, as this chapter will demonstrate, in a variety of ways, learned ideas about bodies, souls, and medicine traced in chapters one, two, and three of this dissertation found their way to a wider audience.

In approaching this literature, the discussion in this chapter touches on long-lived debates among historians about divides between lay and elite culture. Three or four decades ago, historians focused on delineating stark divides between elite and lay culture, drawing on insights from anthropology and folklore. This view informed multiple scholars, and historiographical schools that emphasize social division, and top-

---

4 Heinrich Rantzau, *De conservanda valetudine* Das ist: Von erhaltung menschlicher gesundheit: Ein sehr nützliches handbuch allen menschen hohes and niedriges standes auch den wanders und kriegssleuten ganz dienstlichen (Leipzig, 1585).

5 Peter Burke professes his indebtedness to folklore at the outset of *Popular Culture in Early Modern Europe* (New York: Harper & Row, 1978).
down dynamics, especially some focused on debates about “Christianization” and “confessionalization.” In the first case, as they considered “Christianization,” medieval and early modern historians debated when, how, and to what extent Christian belief became embedded in a wide cross-section of the European population. More recently, Scott Hendrix tapped this term to argue that a concern shared across confessions to re- or fully Christianize all levels of society spurred the Reformation. Keith Thomas’s seminal *Religion and the Decline of Magic* traced an early modern *Entzauberung* (in Weberian terms) in which learned and Protestant critique of magic divested large segments of the population of their belief in traditional practices, especially in relation to disease, health, and faith. Scholars increasingly question this view, led in the charge by Robert Scribner’s efforts to reveal continuing widespread belief in magic. Scribner contended that depictions of the Reformation as demystification of a superstitious medieval worldview like Thomas’s were an unhelpful, vaguely anachronistic vestige of

---


7 Scott Hendrix, *Recultivating the Vineyard: The Reformation Agendas of Christianization* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2004); Anna Marie Johnson and John A. Maxfield, ed., *The Reformation as Christianization: Essays on Scott Hendrix’s Christianization Thesis* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012). Though scholars tend to agree with Hendrix’s point that Reformers were concerned to inculcate true faith in contrast to what they perceived to be false religion, the thesis has been criticized for failing to give sufficient consideration to differences between confessions.

nineteenth-century historiography concerned above all to ground values it championed (nationalism, liberalism, rationalism) in the Reformation.⁹

It is increasingly clear that, even with some differences, learned and lay conceptions of both medicine and religion overlapped in complex ways that literature emphasizing stark divides between them overlooks. Among historians of medicine, a series of studies suggest that “differences between learned and lay theories were more blurred than today. In most cases, physicians and laypeople did not hold entirely different, incommensurable views.”¹⁰ Folk remedies and popular beliefs, vernacular variants of learned ideas, and learned ideas themselves subsisted together in a mingle mangle. In contrast to scholarship emphasizing divides between elite and lay culture, and especially to Keith Thomas’s work, Alexandra Walsham argues about early modern England:

“There is, then, a risk of exaggerating the schism between the cultures of the learned and the unlearned which new scientific trends, in tandem with Protestantism, are said to have precipitated by the end of the seventeenth

---


century…The gradual relocation of the centre of intellectual gravity that relegated many assumptions about the physical environment to the realm of ‘old wives tales’ should not be allowed to eclipse the fact that early modern people from all rungs on the social ladder had the capacity to inhabit several mental worlds simultaneously.”

This ability to co-habit elite intellectual and lay mental worlds took many forms. While there was a vibrant folk culture that entertained beliefs and ideas sometimes ridiculed by the learned (seen even in the pages of this dissertation), increasing lay literacy gave a larger number of people access to the books discussed in this chapter in which versions of learned ideas circulated. In a now-classic study Gerald Strauss maintained that wide-spread education became a critical aspect of spreading reform, catechizing the converted, and encouraging pious practice in every vocation at every level of society. The drive to expand access to education resulted in the development of more Latin and German schools, regulated by over 100 new school ordinances (Schulordnungen) devised by 1600. Though Strauss underlined this process as an elite-driven process of social disciplining, the fact that basic education spread could also blur boundaries between elite and lay culture in ways for which he did not fully account by

---

12 Gerald Strauss, Luther’s House of Learning (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978). “The Reformation would have been less than the great experiment…it was had it failed to set its education goals far beyond merely teaching good Latin, sound learning, and the principles of the evangelical faith to small groups of favored young men. It did try to do more—and here the Lutheran Reformation in Germany is of particular significance because it tried to do it first. It embarked on a conscious, and for its time, remarkably systematic endeavor to develop in the young new and better impulses, to implant inclinations in consonance with the reformers’ religious and civic ideals, to fashion dispositions in which Christian ideas of right thought and action could take root…”(2)
giving more people more access to printed matter. This chapter draws on this emphasis on education and questioning stark divisions between lay and elite interests to suggest that early modern Lutherans inside and outside of university walls shared interest in and ideas about how to understand bodies, souls, and medicine in light of faith.

Educated city burghers and villagers benefiting from this educational effort are not the only ones in early modern Germany, or Europe more widely, who managed to reside simultaneously in many worlds. Several of the key learned figures discussed in this dissertation did the same, including Daniel Sennert, Thomas Bartholin, and Jakob Horst. In Sennert’s case, his work on occult diseases included gossipy stories about witchcraft and his book of devotional meditations revealed his familiarity with the popular *ars moriendi* tradition in large part because of the resemblance it bore to other books of devotion in the genre. Over the course of his career, proto-Pietist devotional and reform movements strongly influenced Caspar Bartholin; this is what drove the efforts to reform university education in Denmark that resulted in *De studio medico*. His son Thomas inserted eyebrow-raising asides in his *De morbis biblicis* that reveal his knowledge of folklore and popular belief. As for the Helmstedt professor Jakob Horst, his vernacular book on medicine, anatomy, and the natural world will be one of the cornerstones of this chapter. Horst’s example reminds us that even while participating in an international republic of Latinate letters, learned physicians and pastors did not leave behind the cultures of which they were a part. Furthermore, even as scholars
continued to write primarily in Latin, like their theologian and clerical counterparts and co-religionists, some began to embrace the vernacular, thus muddling historians’ attempts to divide elite and lay cultures too exactingly.

Moving forward, there are some provisions to be kept in mind, largely about limits to our understanding of reception. First, as the prototypical example of the miller Menocchio reminds us, simply having access to books does not mean that lay readers always interpreted learned ideas in the same way that other readers did. Absent any written or physical evidence, it is hard to say how they construed and applied what they heard and read. Second, though the goal of this chapter is to describe vernacular versions of academic conversations, and not to trace their reception or utilization, it is useful to remark on the audience for the books and sermons examined below. Just because a source is in the vernacular, one cannot assume that everyone could access it, even with expanding literacy. That said, even if a villager or rural peasant may not have owned a copy of any of these books (or even have been able to read them), others near him did. One can be somewhat more confident about ideas delivered orally (sermons), though here too, the printed version that comes down to us cannot be assumed to be exactly what a pastor told his congregation, though the main ideas and emphases are likely the same. All this does not render studying this literature futile. Though understanding reception is beyond the limits of this chapter, it is important to show how

early modern Germans accessed ideas about body, soul, and medicine in the vernacular, and how this reflected concerns in academic literature. Tracing all the ways in which they utilized this must await another study.

In exploring discussions of body, soul, and disease in popular vernacular literature, this chapter navigates among several important studies from historians of medicine and religion. Michael Stolberg’s *Experiencing Illness and the Sick Body in Early Modern Europe* painstakingly reconstructs descriptions of disease by patients and doctors in letters and autobiographical accounts, thereby offering an invaluable contribution to our understanding of early modern conceptions about disease and the body. He argues that patients and physicians operated with largely similar notions throughout the early modern period. It was only in the eighteenth century that a divide became remarkable. In addition to this, Stolberg’s central theoretical contention—that the experience of the body and disease and the way in which both are described are conditioned by social and cultural environment—is useful for this study of ideas about medicine (*mentalité*). Yet even as he acknowledges this, and even recognizes the centrality of religion to shaping early modern society and culture, Stolberg mentions but leaves largely untouched questions about how religious belief shaped these ideas, a stunning lacuna.

Among historians of early modern religion in Germany, two recent studies examine approaches to understanding pain and disease. Susan Karant-Nunn contends that Lutheran theology shifted the understanding of suffering from identification with
Christ’s passion to focus on the promise of redemption and healing from sin that could be achieved through it. In *The Reformation of Suffering: Pastoral Theology and Lay Piety in Late Medieval and Early Modern Germany*, Ron Rittgers probes Lutheran consolation literature in an effort to trace the way it addressed problems such as disease and depression. He concludes that Lutherans constructed a new theology of suffering out of Luther’s “theology of the cross.” In this schema, suffering no longer served a redemptive purpose; undergoing it could never atone for sins, either one’s own or someone else’s. But that did not render the experience meaningless. Instead, Rittgers argues, Lutheran books of consolation encouraged sufferers to recognize that there could be many possible causes of suffering, and many possible reasons God afflicts His people, including to test their devotion and to teach them to turn to Him in brokenness and in faith. While Rittgers points to an overlap in pastoral and medical care, in which the traditional concern for cure of souls (*cura animarum*) was tied up in care for bodies, he leaves it untouched.

This chapter, then, bridges divides between elite and lay culture, as well as medical and religious primary and secondary literature to argue that understandings of body, soul, medicine, and faith stretched to all levels of society among early modern Lutherans. The sources considered here follow roughly the logic of the presentation in

---

chapters one to three. Beginning with a set of sermons professing to elucidate Melanchthon’s thought on the soul in lay terms, I will then move on to consider a vernacular discussion of the Genesis account of Adam and Eve and its relationship to Lutheran debates about theological anthropology (anthropologia sacra) from one of the most prolific and influential popularizers of Matthias Flacius’s controversial theology. Then, I will turn to anatomy and disease as portrayed in a popular book of medicine. Produced by one of the key figures in this dissertation, Jakob Horst, the book was reprinted multiple times over the last quarter of the sixteenth century. Finally, the chapter will turn to consider prescriptions aimed to help the laity apply this teaching by way of medical advice offered in the course of sermons, and important messages authors of books of devotion and consolation offered to their readers, the potential and actual patients, about disease, the soul, and Christ.

4.1 Sebastian Fröschel and Melanchthon on the Soul

After a lifetime in Wittenberg, studying and working with Martin Luther and Philip Melanchthon, the aging archdeacon of the Wittenberg Stadtkirche took the pulpit in September 1562. Sebastian Fröschel’s sympathy for the rebellious monk Luther evinced itself from the start of his career. Shortly after his ordination in 1521, as Luther took his stand at Worms and was then spirited away to the Wartburg, Fröschel became the first in Leipzig to refuse to say private Masses. A year later, he came to Wittenberg and entered the circle of ministers there, attending to hospitals and prisons and devoting
his life to advancing Protestant reform. He worked closely with Johannes Bugenhagen (thereby with Luther), becoming a deacon in the Stadtkirche in 1528, and archdeacon in 1542, a post he held until he died in 1570. Though Fröschel goes mostly unremarked in scholarly literature, he gave copious thanks to God for his quiet career spent in the company of men he admired in the forward to his set of sermons Von den Heiligen Engeln. Vom Teuffel. Und des Menschen Seele. Drei Sermon mit des Herrn Philippi Melancthon Definition und erklernung Gepredigt.16

Appearing in May 1563, a few months after he delivered them, the book contained three sermons Fröschel preached on feasts of the St. Michael the Archangel (September 29), in which, among other things, he expounded on Melanchthon’s teaching on the soul. The connection between Melanchthon’s teaching on the soul and the feast day may not be immediately obvious to twenty-first century historians, but it accorded with a fairly typical approach to discussing angels. The sermon cycle centered on distinguishing between and among the various sorts of “Geist” (spirit) his hearers knew by moving from discussion of angels to devils, and then to human souls. Analyzing the various sorts of spirit in relation to one another was not unusual. The famous Marburg professor Otto Casmann, discussed in chapter one, moved in the opposite direction just

a few decades later, by first writing his seminal works on *anthropologia* and then turning his attention to angelology.

Fröschel’s letter to the reader at the beginning of the book indicates why the feast day, and the sermons delivered on it, were significant for him personally. He attributed the success of the Lutheran movement, and even the fact that the city of Wittenberg was not ravaged under bombardment during the Schmalkaldic War to the special protection of the archangel Michael.\(^{17}\) Like Fröschel, a variety of other Lutheran pastors attributed various sorts of protection and warning to the ministry of angels. Among others, Josua Opitz claimed that angels protected Magdeburg while Veit Dietrich suggested that angels protected Lutheran pastors ministering to plague victims.\(^{18}\) It was in honor of this protection, and in gratitude for his ability to learn from and serve with Luther and Melanchthon that Fröschel preached these sermons on the Feast Day of the Archangel Michael.

---


\(^{18}\) For these examples, see Rittgers, *Reformation of Suffering*, 209. According to Rittgers, “Lutheran theologians and pastors posited angels as the evangelical ersatz for the saints. In this they were following in Luther’s footsteps. Angels came to assume much of the roles ascribed to saints in traditional Christianity, or rather, their traditional functions of protection, assistance, and communication received stronger emphasis.” (*Reformation of Suffering*, 208). Though they have attracted less scholarly attention than demons, there are a few valuable studies of angels in the early modern world. See: Clare Copeland and Jan Machielsen, ed. *Angels of Light?: Sanctity and the Discernment of Spirits in the Early Modern Period* (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2013); Bruce Gordon, “Malevolent Ghosts and Ministering Angels: Apparitions and Pastoral Care in the Swiss Reformation,” in *The Place of the Dead: Death and Remembrance in Late Medieval and Early Modern Europe*, ed. Bruce Gordon and Peter Marshall (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 87-109; Peter Marshall and Alexandra Walsham, ed. *Angels in the Early Modern World* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006); Feisal G. Mohamed, *In the Anteroom of Divinity: the Reformation of the Angels from Colet to Milton* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008).
Michael. He was, he claimed, pressed to see them into print by “burgers” eager to read and reflect more carefully on the points they had heard him make.¹⁹

Fröschel connected angels, devils, and the human soul near the beginning of his treatment of angels. He pointed out that it is important to remember that none of them are “spirit” in the same sense that God is, yet all of them are spirit with various powers to act in and on the material world. Furthermore, the human soul is not the same sort of spirit that an angel (or a devil) is, because an angel is complete as a being by existing as an incorporeal Geist, while a human being needs the soul united with the body to be a “fully complete Person.”²⁰ But there are some similarities. An angel, according to Fröschel, is similar to a person in that it is a spirit with reason (“lebendiger Vernünftiger Geist”). As an extension of its reason and rectitude, an angel has perfect knowledge of the Law, and can discern good and evil. Beyond this, angels are servants of God who protect Christians.

In contrast, devils, like angels, were originally righteous, with many virtues and graces, but used their free will to rebel against God. After that rebellion, they live under God’s wrath and use lies and blasphemy as they attempt to kill and devour God’s

---

¹⁹ Fröschel, Menschen Seele, Sig. A7r: “Dieweil ich nun viel Jahr auss das Fest Michaelis mit Gottes hilfe diese Predigt getan, als von den heiligen Engeln und vom leidigen Teuffel, die ihrer viel gern gehört haben. Darumb mich viel von Bürgern und andern gebeten, dieselbige in druck lassen auszugehen, damit sie dieselbigen desto öfter und fleissiger möchten lessen.”

²⁰ Fröschel, Menschen Seele, Sig. C3v-4r: “Des Menschen Seele ist auch ein Geist aber nicht wie Gott. Auch nicht wie ein heiliger Engel welcher ein rechte warhafftige volkomene Person ist für sich selbs. Aber des Menschen Seele ist kein gantze volkomene Person für sich selbst ohne den Leib, sonder mit dem leib des menschen. Den Person ist nicht ein stuck oder ein zertrenlich ding, sonder ist etwas wesentlich nicht in vielen sondern unterschieden einig und vernünftig.”
people. Fröschel devoted the sermon to elucidating the original glory of the devils because they were angels who shared all the goods of that exalted state, their Fall, and the ways in which they threaten God’s people. The comparison between angels and devils hinged on the use or abuse of reason and will to either (1) uphold the Law and minister to God’s people, or (2) contravene the Law, pervert reason and will, and threaten the godly.

In the final sermon Fröschel discussed the human soul, explicating three major points: (1) how it is made and united with the body, (2) that it is immortal and (3) that, though it may temporarily separate from the body at death, the two will reunite at the resurrection. He professed from the outset that he received all this “from my dear master and teacher Philip Melanchthon.” Again, his discussion centered on reason and will, and the ideal of conformity to God’s righteousness. “The human soul,” according to

---


Fröschel, “is not a living creature, but a spirit which God blew into man as His image that was originally righteous, but after that first gift was lost through sin…”

The pastor’s simple definition here included several key elements of *anthropologia*: that God made the soul and implanted it directly in human beings, based on Genesis 2:7, and that they, by sinning, forfeited their original righteousness. Just a few decades later, in the same city, Meisner explicated this theology of the fall, sin, and redemption from the same passages under the rubric of *anthropologia sacra*. At the same time, by making the soul out to be simply “spirit” here, Fröschel’s definition glossed over the Aristotelian idea of “soul as principal of life” that undergirded much of his teacher Melanchthon’s work. It also avoided any of tortuous learned speculations on whether God blows this soul into each person or whether soul (as principle of life, if not eternal soul subject to sin, justification and glorification), and is handed on in any way (traducianism), or if the vegetative or animal souls may be so transmitted, but not the rational.

A bit later on in his discussion of the human soul, Fröschel circled back to touch on some key points in *anthropologia*. First, he discussed the soul’s “powers” (“Kräfte”) in relation to the body, a simplified account of *scientia de anima*. These included the

---

nutritive power, the faculties of reason and will, the senses, and the power of movement. In discussing the powers of reason and will, he, like his teacher, emphasized that men and women were originally created with free will and knowledge. Sin occludes originally perfect knowledge of the Law. But, like Melanchthon, Fröschel also belabored the point that there remained some inkling of original knowledge of the Law, so that people can recognize its demands and thus come to know their sin. Calling on Jeremiah 17, Romans 5, Ephesians 2, Psalm 51, and Isaiah

24 Föschel, Menschen Seele, Sig. M6r-7r: “Das ander Stück in der Definition und der Erklerung des Menschen Seele ist dieses, das sie sei der eine wesentliche unsterbliche Teil des Menschen, Davon der Mensch Leben Regung, Sinn, Vernunft und Willen hat.

Es sind zwei teil am Menschen, oder der Mensch hat an ihm 2. Teil Leib und Seel. Der Leib ist irdisch von den leiblichen Elementen, wie den Gott erstlich den Menschen aufs eine Erdenklos gemacht hat, und hat kein leben gehabt wie ein Töpffer aus dem gefass…das kein leben hat, also ist der Leib auch erstlich gewest ohne die Seele und ist noch also wenn er kein Seele hat und dieselbige von ihm scheidet.


Die Erste ist, Die Wirkung, … das leibliche leben mit Speise und Tranck zuerhalten.

Die Ander fünf äusserliche Sinn Sehen Hören Schmecken, Riechen Fühlen. Und drei innerliche Sinn im Hirn unterschiede eines aus dem andern zufinden und Gedächtnis.

Die dritte in der Seele, Verstand und Wissen und den äusserlichen Gliedern etwas gebieten.

Die Vierde Warhafftige begirden im hertzen und willen ohne Heuchelei.

Die Fünfte Regung und Bewegung der äusserliche Gliedemassen von einem ort zum andern, als Hende Füsse, Zungen, und Augen stille halten, oder dahin und dorthin zu wenden, etc.

Diese fünf Kräfte hat der Mensch allein von der Seel wie denn alle Menschen solches müssen bekennen. Denn so bald der eine Teil von dem andern scheidet, als die Seele von dem Leib so ist der Kraft keine mehr im Leib und muss der Leib zerfallen und versaulen wie ein Erdenklos.”

25 Fröschel, Menschen Seele, Sig. M1v: “Weiter ist dieser Wille frei gewesen, also das der Verstand welen (sic) mochte Gottes Gesetz zu halten, und das das Hertz und die äusserliche gliedem engeren laat, ohne verhinderung. Es vermochten auch der Verstand und Wille etwas anders weilen wie hernach geschehen.

Und ist also der Mensch Weis und Gerecht geschaffen und hat erstlich einen freien unverhinderten Wille gehabt vor dem Falle, wie zuvor gesagt.”

26 Fröschel, Menschen Seele, Sig. M2v-M3r: “Die Menschliche Natur aber nach dem Fall Adam und Heva ist also, das sie in Gottes zorn gefallen sind, und Gott von ihnen Adam and Heva, und von alle ihren Nachkomen gewichen ist, so aus Menschliche Samen natürlicher weise herkomen, also das die natürlicher kräfft en sehr schwach in ihnen worde sind. Das Licht im verstand ist viel tuickeler worden, wiewol noch
53, Fröschel, like Melanchthon, applied this specifically to the human ability to apprehend the natural world and the order of creation.27

The Wittenberg preacher’s pastoral emphasis is evident in all of the sermons, including the final one on the soul. His discussion of angels ended with suggested prayers for protection, and his treatment of devils concluded with exhortations to resist their wiles. His handling of the soul built up to a long concluding portion on the soul’s immortality. This formed the basis of an exhortation to his listeners to treasure the promise of blissful everlasting life, and to console themselves in temporal affliction with the promise of being reunited forever with God and with departed loved ones.

Fröschel’s sermons call attention to the sense among early modern Lutherans that a basic understanding of the soul, its constituent parts and powers, and its final goal, were all important aspects of basic understanding of one’s faith. The Wittenberg clergyman’s teaching took up many of the same topics that his teacher Melanchthon covered in the final chapters of his famous books on the soul: the workings of individual will and reason and the hope for each immortal soul, eternity with God and other

27 Fröschel, *Menschen Seele*, Sig. M4v-M5r: “Über dieses sind sie verwundet das der verstand voll zweivels und irthumbs ist von Gott und kan auch andere ding nicht also erkennen wie zuvor vor dem Fall. Da er Gott und die Ordnung der Creaturen viel anders anschauen könnte denn nach dem Fall.”
Christians in restored righteousness. These lessons were important beyond the university walls. But interest in these matters did not stop at this basic outline of Melanchthon’s teaching. Others worked to explain creation and the practical ramifications of theological debates in much more detail.

4.2 Genesis, Sin, and Christoph Irenaeus

As described in chapter one, inter-and intra-confessional debates about the Fall and justification contributed to the development of anthropologia, specifically, anthropologia sacra. As seen there, Lutheran and Reformed thinkers alike began to re-embrace Aristotelianism and scholastic theological methods in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries as part of their ongoing contest with Catholics, especially Jesuit controversialists. But another important element of this development was the strong intra-confessional divisions among Lutherans after Melanchthon. The parties sorted themselves into groups labeled “Philipist” and “Gnesio-Lutheran.” Here the core issues of disagreement concerned what the extent of the Fall’s effects were, and what (if any) powers remained to a human after sin.

These seemingly esoteric Lutheran debates about theological anthropology were not just for theologians debating in the wake of Flacius’s famous pronouncement that sin became the substance of the soul. Printing presses across German lands churned out almost countless polemical books and pamphlets on the matter. The laity took seriously debates over the nature of original sin and the extent of sin’s depravations on body and
soul. Individuals identified themselves closely with the sort of theology (Philipist or Gnesio-Lutheran) which their congregation championed. Robert Christman’s close study of the town of Mansfeld indicates that, when questioned about the effect of sin on human nature, everyone from city council members and burghers to weavers and shoemakers could give clear and unequivocally Flacian answers. People studied and debated this theology on the streets.28

Turning to the spread of this debate about an aspect of anthropologia invites consideration of a colorful work on it anchored in one of the biblical texts that I indicated in chapter two as a key passage for learned discussions of body and soul: the account of creation and Fall in Genesis 1-3. Genesis, as shown, provided raw material for much speculation in natural philosophy and medicine, as well as theology. But it also inspired many popular takes on the narrative. The lessons it contained about God, the soul, and the natural world captured the imaginations of many early modern authors across Europe. One of the most well-known pieces of early modern literature, Milton’s Paradise Lost, is a sustained meditation on the text. But that iconic work is just the start. Throughout Europe popular literary and theatrical treatments of Genesis proliferated, including, among others, Sieur Du Bartas’s wildly popular La semaine, D’Aubigne’s Création, Tasso’s Sette giornate del mondo creato, Hugo Grotius’ Adamus Exul,

and a host of dramas expatiating on particular episodes such as Abraham's (near) sacrifice of Isaac and the colorful life of Joseph. Early modern variations on the narratives of Adam and Eve were indebted to similar popular ancient and medieval tellings.

In Germany, as Kathleen Crowther points out, this flood of popular literature rehearsing and embellishing the Genesis narrative included Valthen Voith's *Ein schön Lieblich Spiel, von dem herlichen ursprung…* (1537); Jacob Ruf's *Adam und Heva* (1550); and Hans Sachs' *Tragedia von schöpfung, fal und ausstreibung Ade auss dem paradeyss* (1558). Expositions and dramatic recreations of Genesis reinforced confessional differences. In one of twenty-odd German dramas in which God visits Adam and Eve and their children and gives them a surprise quiz on the Lutheran catechism, Arnold Quitting's *Kinderzucht* (1591) suggested that only Cain could not recite it, and thus he became the

---


31 Valentin Voigt, *Ein schön lieblich, nützlich, und tröstlich spiel aus der Heiligen Schrift* (Magdeburg, 1537); Jacob Ruf, *Adam und Heva* (Zürich, 1550); Hans Sachs, *Tragedia von schöpfung, fal und ausstreibung Ade auss dem paradeyss* (Nuremberg, 1558).
forerunner of Catholicism. For their part, devotional reflections on the creation narrative often employed it as a way to reflect on the providential work of God in the world. This is how Johann Arndt used it in the fourth book of *Vier Bücher vom wahren Christentum*, his wildly popular devotional series that went through 240 printings by 1800 and found its way into almost all European languages. Others used it to stake stark claims about human bodies and souls. In this last practice, the clergyman and prolific author Christoph Irenaeus stands out. His work richly illustrates the combined significance of Flacian theology and a vivid recounting of the story of creation Fall. It shows the significance of espousing a particular theology of the Fall for views of the natural world and of the human body and soul.

The quiet, unremarkable beginning of Irenaeus’s career offered no evidence of the prolific diatribes that were to come, or the way that he would spend much of his life wandering from banishment to banishment because of his theology. Irenaeus studied at Wittenberg, where he took an M.A. in 1549 and then embarked on a career as a pastor in Luther’s own hometown, Eisleben. But in the midst of the controversy over Flacius’s pronouncements about sin as the substance of human nature, Irenaeus became convinced that the controversial Croat was right and took it upon himself to champion

---

Flacian doctrine. This earned him banishment from his post, an experience he repeated many times over in the next decades. In the midst of his perpetual peregrinations, Irenaeus penned a long list of books (over 40), attempting to discern and apply moral and theological lessons from nature including works on floods, comets, monsters, and human nature.\textsuperscript{34} He was, according to Philip Soergel, “convinced that the working of nature’s book could be freely mined as proof of his theological judgments.”\textsuperscript{35} Irenaeus became one of the most notable contributors to the established and popular genre of wonder books. Indeed, some have claimed his works as the best examples of the genre.\textsuperscript{36}

In keeping with his Flacian theology, Irenaeus’s books on nature stressed the radical consequences of sin. In writing on natural events like floods and comets, he concentrated on discerning signs of God’s judgment. In his two books on human nature, he lamented the extensive effects the Fall, evident in both human bodies and souls. His second book of wonders considered the story of Adam and Eve. In it, he detailed the pre-and post-Fall condition of Adam and Eve, in body and soul, aiming to demonstrate

\textsuperscript{34} Selections include: Christoph Irenaeus, \textit{Wasserspeigel. Ergiessung der Wasser sind anzusehen als ein 1. Zorn. 2. Creutz 3. Trost Speigel} (Eisleben, 1566); idem, \textit{Prognosticon aus Gottes Wort nötige Erinnerung} (n.p., 1578); idem, \textit{Contrafahet und Spiegel des Menschen} (Ursel, 1582); \textit{De monstris. Von seltzamen Wundergeburtten} (Oberursel, 1585).


how sin ravaged both.\textsuperscript{37} He repeated the theme twelve years later in \textit{Contrafahet und Spiegel des Menschen}, as well as exploring in the Latin theological works he continued to write.\textsuperscript{38} Though approaching the topic from his distinct theological perspective, Irenaeus shared with his theological opponents the instinct that I have repeatedly pointed to throughout this dissertation: describing human bodies and souls in the context of explaining of the traces of God’s work and spiritual truths in the natural world.

Irenaeus approached the task by showcasing the stark contrast between the original glory of creation and the horrors after the Fall. To do so, he began by carefully describing the splendor of paradise, especially Adam and Eve’s perfect physical and spiritual condition. God made man in his image, which included the ability to uphold the Law.\textsuperscript{39} Before the Fall, all human powers functioned perfectly. Human intellect had no difficulty grasping truth or clearly perceiving the world. For this reason, Adam was the perfect theologian, but also a philosopher, natural philosopher, mathematician, astronomer, physician, and jurist. He had encyclopedic knowledge.\textsuperscript{40} Human will was

\textsuperscript{37} Christoph Irenaeus, \textit{Adam und Eva, als ein fürtrefflich Geschöpf und Kunststück Gottes} (Mülhausen in Düringen, 1570).

\textsuperscript{38} Christoph Irenaeus, \textit{De homine: quis ante lapsum fuerit, et quis nunc post lapsum extra Christum sit} (n.p., 1575).

\textsuperscript{39} Irenaeus, \textit{Adam und Eva}, Sig. D1r-v: “Die groste und höchste kunst und weisheit aber hat Gott der HERR am Menschen für andern Creaturn bewiesen, das Er in nach seinem Bilde erschaffen wie er nach gehabter Deliberation und beratschlagung beschlossen und gesagt: Last uns Menschen machen, ein Bild das uns gleich sei, 2c. Und hernach widerholet wird Gott schuff den Menschen zu seinem Bilde, ja er schuff ihn zum Bilde Gottes.”

\textsuperscript{40} Irenaeus, \textit{Adam und Eva}, Sig. D5r-v: “In Summa Adam ist ein fürtrefflicher Theologus der Gott nach seinem wesen und willen erkent. Dazu auch ein hochberümbter Philosophus, Naturkündiger, Mathematicus,
free and fully capable of choosing and seeing to the performance of good, not just in exerting dominion over the world, but even in spiritual matters. The body manifested the wisdom of God’s design; it was crafted to carry out its functions ideally. All its members, both inner and outer, functioned in perfect concord.

The human position at the peak of creation was entirely contingent on God’s grace. Irenaeus starkly juxtaposed both the dignity and the fragility of human persons, on the one hand, pointing out man’s preeminent place in the order of creation as a result of the special care that God took in fashioning human beings, while at the same time,
reminding readers that, apart from God’s design and power, they would be nothing but a lump of soil. The mud and ash out of which the human body is composed highlight by contrast the grace and power of the God who fashioned it.43 The fact that human bodies were a glorified clod of dirt makes the fact that God united them to an immortal soul all the more remarkable. This is what sets human beings apart from animals. In Irenaeus’s telling, the body completely depends on the soul; the soul rules the body.44 Logically, then, human souls falling into sin also ravaged human bodies.

The deprivation and destruction Irenaeus attributed to sin stand out even more starkly when compared to his description of Paradise. This is where his theological sympathies become patent. After the Fall, all powers of intellect and will are destroyed,

43 Irenaeus, Adam und Eva, Sig. C1r: “Es hat aber Gott der Herr den Menschen aus einem Erdenkloss gemacht. Das er seine grosse kraft, macht, ja allmacht erzeigte, welcher wie er aus rot und mot, oder staub der Erden die Edle und herrliche creatur, nämlic den Menschen darinne er sich abgebildet und die in alle Ewigkeit mit und für ihm leben solte gemacht hat. Also kann er noch aus geringen unanschlichenverachten dingen was gross, Ansehnlich und herrlich machen. Wie Er diese gewaltige kunst noch beweiset Psal. 113.1. Cor: 1.”
44 Irenaeus, Adam und Eva, Sig. C8r-D1r: “Und hat Gott der Herr den Menschen leib für andern unvernunftigen theiren auch in dem gezieret und geadelt, das er ihm nicht, wie etwan einem Pferde, Ochsen oder Hirschen allein ein unvernunftige und sterbliche Seele, daher der Leib sein Leben bewegung und Natürliche wirckung hat. Sondern ein vernunftige verständige und unsterbliche Seele mitgeteilet hat. Und sind also im Menschen zwo Naturen als ein irdische und himlische, sichtliche und unsichtliche, greißliche und ungreißliche, unvernunftige und vernunftige, sterbliche und unsterbliche, als nämlich, Leib und Seele wunderlicher Weiss zusammen vereinigt. Der gestalt das nicht allein der Leib sei der Seelen hospitium und behauung, sondern die Seele ist des Leibes Dur, Regierer und Führer, welche durch des Leibes glieder als ihre Organe wunderliche und sonderliche actiones und wirckung exercirt... Also kann des Menschen Leib nicht wircken noch thun ohne die Seele die regt und bewegt den Leib, die gibt den gliedern kräfte und wirckung. Und wenn die Seele vom und nicht beim Leibe ist so leider Leib kraft und wirckloss wie ein ander truncks da, wie an Adams Leib gespüret, ehe ihm Gott einen lebendigen Odem und Seele eingeblasen hat. Und noch an Menschlichen Leiben gespüret wird wenn die Seele neue nach dem fall der Sünden halben vom Leibe durch den Todt abscheidet. Und scheidet doch also ab das sie nicht wie ein rauch in der Luftt verschwindet und in Nihilum redigirt wird sondern als ein geistlich wesen unsterblich bleibt welche Seele es afflatu Dei, aus Gottes einblasen herkomme ist.”
and the body no longer functions the way it is supposed to. Human beings have “horrific darkness in mind, or in understanding, in will.” There is almost complete intellectual decay, including in the ability to understand the natural world. Even in the books of the wisest students of nature like Pliny, “hardly a shadow or the tiniest particle” of Adam’s knowledge remains. The will is completely bound by sin. As for the body, it is because all creation was and is under the thrall of sin that doctors continue to discover so many diseases. Even more basically, all the body’s members—that once functioned in such perfect harmony—are entirely corrupted and deformed. The fact that excrement smells foul (apparently not a part of creation before sin) merely serves to confirm this.

---


46 Irenaeus, *Adam und Eva*, Sig. R3r: “Das ist auch nach dem Fall des Menschens erfolget, das das erkenntnis der Creaturen in dem Menschen nach dem Fall auch überauss sehr verducklet. Dan was in Büchern der Naturkundiger Aristotelis, Plinii, Alberti Gesneri, und wie sie Namen haben mügen von den Naturen und eigenschaften der Their, Vogel, Fische, Kräuter, und blümlein so man aus langwiriger erfahrung und fleissiger nachforschung zusammen getragen, gefunden wird ist kaum ein schatte und gering Partickel übrig von der erkenntnis so Adam für dem fall de naturis rerum, von der Creaturen eigenscharf gehabt.”


48 Irenaeus, *Adam und Eva*, Sig. Z6r-v: “Und wiewol die Medici, etliche hundert kranckheiten erzielen so finden sich doch der Menschen Sünden halben immer neue kranckheiten und nimpt immer eine kranckheit nach der andern oberhand wie den zu unsern zeiten Morbus Gallicus…und darnach auch morbus Anglicus, die Schweiss kranckheit ….Ja die erfahrung gibts das zu weilen Schlange, Kröten und andere gräuliche Würme in und bei den Menschen sunden werden sie Plagen und aufftreiben.”

49 Irenaeus, *Adam und Eva*, Sig. C7r: “Zum stank und unflat welcher von der andern speiss abgesondert wird sind die dermen, Cloaca Mist oder das Kackheusleins, und die blase um Wasser darin verordnet. Wiewol die excrementa und aussegung des Menschen wenn Adam in der unschuld blieben nicht so gestunken hetten als man leider jetzt befindet.” Sig. R3r-4r: “Zu dem sind die glieder des Menschen beide äusserlich und innerlich nun nach dem fall auch sehr Corrumpirt, deformirt und geschwecht und haben die Kraft und
In praising the structure of the body at creation, Irenaeus sounded very much like those authors noted in chapter one who pointed to anatomy as a way to understand God’s design. In some cases, like Johannes Mathesius the Younger and David Chytraeus, they even went as far as declaiming about the glories of particular organs or structures. But in detailing the effect of sin on the body and its organs, as well as on the soul, Irenaeus revealed how ramifying basic theological anthropological arguments about the extent of the Fall could be. That his books found a receptive audience reinforces the fact that such debates were not merely the preserve of polemical theologians, but also provided the framework in which people beyond academic circles struggled to understand themselves.

4.3 Jakob Horst and the Wonderful Secrets of Body and Soul

Chapters two and three of this dissertation featured the work of the physician and Helmstedt professor of medicine, Jakob Horst. His struggle to determine the cause of a young boy’s golden tooth, decision to be a physician against the warning of his older brother, and exhortations to colleagues to cultivate a life of prayer all revealed important insights from a devout doctor reflecting on the work of God in the world, and
how to serve God in his vocation as physician. But the book that Horst produced that saw the widest circulation and the most re-reprinting was the hodge-podge volume entitled \textit{Wunderbarliche Geheimnisse der Natur in des Menschen leibe und Seel} (Henceforth “Wonderful Secrets”). It first appeared in Leipzig in 1572, with multiple editions in the next three decades, and a final one a century later in Frankfurt.\footnote{Jakob Horst, \textit{Leveni Lemnii Occulta naturae Miracula. Wunderbarliche Geheimnisse der Natur in des Menschen leibe und Seel.} (Leipzig, 1572, 1575, 1579, 1580 1588, 1592, 1593, 1605; Heidelberg, 1601, 1605, 1612; Frankfurt, 1672). References here are from the 1588 Leipzig edition.} Part of the book’s popularity is due to the fact that Horst intentionally used the vernacular, arguing that it was important for a wide audience to learn and appreciate the human body and soul.\footnote{Horst, \textit{Wunderbarliche Geheimnisse}, Sig. dd3r: “bis anher von der Natur dess Menschen in Leib und Seele den Teutschen nichts rechtes geschrieben….Und was allhie in diesem achten Buch jemand zu wenig aussgeführt düncken möcht das ist doch gründlich und wahrhaftig beschrieben und kann mit der Zeit von andern oder mir selbst weitläufiger gelehret werden.”}

The book was in part a translation of Levinus Lemnus’ \textit{Occulta naturae miracula}, which itself appeared in multiple editions into the seventeenth century. Horst’s admiration and use of Leminus is an indication of his commitment to grounding medical description in Scripture from early in his career when the first edition of \textit{Wonderful Secrets} appeared, before he offered his opinion on young Christoph Mueller or wrote a wide-ranging book of prayers. Leminus’ \textit{oeuvre}, especially his book on medicinal herbs based on plants described in the Bible, prioritized Scripture as a source of medical and natural philosophical knowledge.\footnote{For more on Lemnius, See Peter Harrison, \textit{The Bible, Protestantism and the Rise of Natural Science} (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 75, 138.} Important features of Horst’s translation and edition are collections of his own letters and a history of medicine in the way of a
biography cum hagiography of Hippocrates, an excursus on the relationship of medicine and natural philosophy, and finally, an extended (though sadly unillustrated) anatomical account, including reflection on the relationship of body and soul.  

Altogether, the resulting volume can seem to the reader a compendium of the significant genres historians have come to expect since the cultural turn in the history of medicine that emphasizes how Renaissance humanism influenced the form as well as the content of medical discourse. Throughout Horst approaches topics repeatedly in different ways and genres, making it easier to speak of general themes and emphases rather than a single argument developed logically from start to finish. The intended


audience is hard to specify, for while his academic colleagues would have been most impressed with Horst’s correspondence and anatomical descriptions, the book’s wider popularity may be due to the pithy practical advice in Books 1 and 9. This includes consideration of questions ranging from whether one should sleep with one’s mouth open (no—an evil spirit might slip in) to the proper treatment of drunkenness and hangovers, how and why wine makes a person drunker than beer does, whether it is good for a man to cut his hair and shave his beard soon after being sick and in which diseases it is most helpful to wash your feet.

Given the wide variety of topics and even genres of writing collected in the volume it is impossible here to overview the whole. Instead, I focus on select places in which themes found in the learned literature traced in earlier chapters of this dissertation found their way into Horst’s work. This includes his anatomy, his use of the Bible, and his comments on the relationship of body and soul.

Horst turned to discuss body and soul in book 8, after lengthy considerations of the wonders contained in other parts of the natural world, specifically, stars, the elements of the earth, and animals. In following this outline, the book conformed to the standard structure of argument I’ve mentioned earlier in which rumination on the wonder of the human soul and body as the pinnacle of God’s creative work came only after considering God’s design in the rest of the world.
In his discussion, Horst mingled empirical descriptions of human anatomy and detailed discussions of the function of body parts and organs (physiology) with traditional questions about the place of the soul (head or heart), the significance of the relationship between soul and body, procreation and embryology, the effects of sin on the body, and the combined spiritual and physical causes and treatments of disease—all standard components of *anthropologia*. His detailed description of body parts and functions in conjunction with discussion of the soul is similar to Magirius’s meticulous commentary on Melanchthon’s work.

As he went through his anatomical discussion, Horst consistently advanced traditional Galenic-Hippocratic physiology, often fusing it with the Church Fathers most commonly adduced by early Lutherans on questions of body, soul, and medicine, especially Augustine. But throughout the book, he also drew parallels between components of his description of nature or the body with Biblical events or principles. Combining traditional medicine, anatomy and and the Bible in this way could help people understand their physical and spiritual nature and capacities better. The goal of this would both was to praise God’s love and provision and to better understand oneself.

It is worth taking a closer look at his approach in Book 8 of *Wonderful Secrets*. Horst’s anatomy included a standard Galenic framework for the body, detailing the operation of the animal and vital spirits, the elements, the humors, and the manufacture
and diffusion of blood by the liver and the heart. In the description of the faculties of the brain, Horst’s explanation of common sense, reason and memory occupying positions in the head from front to back accords with Avicenna’s similar description in the *Canon*, while also referring in passing to patristic opinion on memory, reason, and will. In this, Horst’s approach was similar to Philip Melanchthon’s combination of Galenic and Vesalian anatomy in his commentaries on Aristotle’s *de Anima*.

As he went through his anatomical outline in *Wonderful Secrets*, Horst pointed to parallels between his descriptions with Biblical events or principles, arguing in each case that the Bible offers the most helpful and reliable ways of understanding the body. For instance, his anatomy began by dividing the body into four sections, which he systematically described in chapters 2-5 of Book 8. These are: the head, the chest, the stomach and the extremities. This division corresponds, according to Horst, to the four parts of the body in the statue in Nebuchadnezzar’s dream in Daniel (the same passage he used to interpret Christoph Mueller’s tooth). Thus, he went so far as to name the head the Medes, the Chest the Persians, the Stomach the Greeks and the extremities the Romans. He proffered the rationale that this was a suitable comparison because body was a microcosm of the world, and that the image in Nebuchadnezzar’s dream summed up the history of the world.\footnote{Horst, *Wunderbarliche Geheimnisse*, Sig. dd 4r-v: “Äusserlich ist der Leib getheilet. Eins ist Caput, das haupt. Das ander ist Pectus, die Brust. Das dritte ist Venter, der Bauch. Das vierdte sind Extantes, die eussersten Glieder, Hände und Füsse. Mit welcher Abtheilung dess Leibes im Menschen, das gantze Wesen}
connection between his description of the section or organ of the body he was describing and Biblical sayings or stories, interpreted literally. For instance, in discussing the middle ventor of the body, Horst labored to reconcile a literal reading of the Biblical account of the creation of Eve from Adam’s rib with observed evidence from anatomies to account for the fact that men and women have the same number of ribs.  

Horst argued that combining traditional medicine, anatomy and Scripture in this way could help people understand their physical and spiritual nature and capacities better. The goal was to praise God’s love and provision and to better appreciate the deleterious effects of the Fall. Both divine love and human sin were both quite literally and physically manifest in every place in the body. For instance, although it may appear useless, seeing the navel should provoke not jokes but gratitude to God, as a physical  

---

36 Horst, *Wunderbarliche Geheimnisse*, Sig. ee2r: “Diese Brust ist äusserlich mit Haut, Fleisch, auch bald unter dem Fleisch etwas stärcker verwahret mit zwölf Rippen…. Es sind auch zwölf Rippen heutiges Tages bei Männern und Weibern, und ist derer Meinung falsch, die da wollen, dass die Weiher eine Rippe mehr haben als die Männer, als nämlich dreizehen. Dis aber in kein zweifel gestellet wird, und billigens die Gelehresten, dass Adam dreizehen Rippen und eine mehr als alle Männer oder Weiher heutiges Tages gehabt hat, darumb dass heilige Schriftt ausdrücklich meldet, Gott benam ihm eine Rippe und schuff darauss sein Weib die Eva. Ja es gibts auch die Bildung unserer Leibe, dass auss den Leiden dieselbe rippe Adae daraus die Eva gemacht, genommen sei. Davon die weise Gelehrten viel schöne Bedenung nemnen, als nämlich dass das umsahen der Liebe noch daselbst geschicket zur Anzeigung unserer wunderbarlichen Erschaffung…”
reminder “How wonderfully God at first provided, nourished, and preserved us with body, life, and soul through our parents by motherly love.”

Another major feature of Horst’s work is a repeated emphasis on the close connection between body and soul. This relationship further helped justify the use of biblical texts and theological principles in describing the body, because only such could one truly understand the purpose of structures and the causes and cures of disease. According to Horst, body and soul are so closely related that something affecting one evinces itself in the other. Because the relationship of body and soul was so close and the effects of the Fall profound, the words of the Apostle Paul in Romans 7 about the constant conflict between spirit and flesh applied to the relationship of body and soul.

While Horst did not, like Irenaeus, belabor a description of decay in every power and every member of body and soul, the fact that the body sometimes hindered the soul’s working (here the Platonic tones are patent) was evidence of the struggle that living with sin entailed. The close relationship of body and soul had a number of consequences, both for recognizing and properly diagnosing the cause of bodily distress.

57 Horst, Wunderbarliche Geheimnisse, Sig. ff1v: “…Umbilicus, welcher en rechtz Bundzeich zwischen uns und Gott dem Allmächtigen, auch zwischen ussren Eltern, unserer wunderbarlicher Erhaltung und Ankunft in Mutterleibe ist. Dann dadurch wenn wir auff die Welt kommen, keinen Nutz mehr haben, aber doch insonderheit gedeutet, wie wunderbarlich Gott uns mit Leib, Leben und Seele durch unsere Eltern in Mutterleibe anfänglich vorsehen ernehet und erhalten…..”

58 Horst, Wunderbarliche Geheimnisse, Sig. ll4v: “Dis obs wol scharffe Lehren sind, jedoch ists billicher dass man hierin dem heiligen Apostel Paulo recht gebe, der da darvor halt, dass dess Leibes Eigenschaft die Thaten dess Gemüths oder der Seelen hindere, und dem Geist zuvorder sei. Denn er spricht: Das Fleisch gelüstet wider den Geist, und dem Geist wider das Fleisch, dieselbigren sind wider einander dass der Menschen nicht thue was er wölle. Denn die leibliche bewohungh ist der Seelen ein grosse Last, und hinder sie, dass sie nicht vollbringen kann ihre Gedancken.”
In the first case, drawing on a traditional Augustinian argument, Horst suggested that pain in the body hurts the soul, and distress in the soul is obvious in the body.\textsuperscript{59} Indeed, the relationship between body and soul is so close that bodily signs indicate pains of the soul or thoughts in the brain. “... the face of a person is a certain display of the brain and discloses what one has in his mind.”\textsuperscript{60} For Horst, like Caspar Peucer, this underpinned his account of the uses of physiognomy.\textsuperscript{61} Again he provided biblical examples to prove his point. He pointed to God’s marking Cain’s face to serve as a

\textsuperscript{59} Horst, \textit{Wunderbarliche Geheimisse}, Sig. MM1r: “Seelen allein zugerechnet werden solten so müsste auch die Seele allein leiden und kranck werden und were der Leib keines wesges der Straffe schuldig. Augustinus aber will dass die Seele auch leibliche Schmerzer fühle und thut eine solche scharffe Ausführung. Alles was da empfindet Trawrigkeit Forcht Zorn Begierdie der Rache Schmerzen das muss was leiblichs leiden: Die Seele empfindet solche Schmerzer wenns ihr nicht nach ihrem Wunsch unnd Willen gehet. Darumb muss sie was leibliches leiden. Denn so die Seele sampt dem Leibe zusamen gefüget die leiblichen Schmerzer nicht empfinde so fühlete sie in der hellen auch nicht die Pein unnd Merter. Welchs doch gewiss das Evangelium vom reichen Manhe und armen Lazaro beweiset. DaB da der reiche Mann in dem hellischen Fewer Qual leid begeret dass er seine Zunge erfrischen und den Schmerzen zulindern was haben möchte.”

\textsuperscript{60} Horst, \textit{Wunderbarliche Geheimisse}, Sig. II4r: “… das Angesicht dess Menschen ist eine gewisse Anzeigung dess Gemüths und offenbaret was einer in dem Sinn habe.”
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warning about his soul to onlookers (Genesis 4) and Joseph in an Egyptian prison (Genesis 40) knowing the state of his compatriots’ souls from the looks on their faces.\textsuperscript{62}

As a close corollary, doctors should remember that what might at first appear to be a physical disease can be traced to a disorder in the soul.\textsuperscript{63} For Horst, the guilt and travail of body and soul is combined.\textsuperscript{64} Here, he reflected the standard medical thought I have pointed out earlier in both Protestant and Catholic circles, in which spiritual and physical cures are required for a person in whom diseases always affect both body and soul. While Horst ultimately derived this from his literal application of Romans 7, it was also a standard part of university descriptions of medicine, as noted in chapters two and three.

According to Horst, the soul is preeminent over the body. The soul can accomplish things without the body; the body, however cannot do things without the soul. Furthermore, the soul is given to each person directly by God, and is not made out of any material elements.\textsuperscript{65} Because body and soul are so intimately united that distress


\textsuperscript{63} A widely-held notion that has recently prompted Richard Sugg to exclaim that the Renaissance body is “at times all but comical in its psychosomatic interactions.” Idem, \textit{Smoke of the Soul: Medicine, Physiology and Religion in Early Modern England} (New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), 12.

\textsuperscript{64} Horst, \textit{Wunderbarliche Geheimnisse}, Sig. LL4r: “die Laster beide des Leibes und Gemüths hin und wider eins mit dem andern verbunden und eines durch des andern Schaden verwarlosset werde und Noth leide.”

\textsuperscript{65} Horst, \textit{Wunderbarliche Geheimnisse}, Sig. kk1r: “Daher wird die Seele mit mancherlei Namen genannt, wie den Augustinus sehr hübsch sagt: Wenn sie den Leib lebendig machete unnd erheilt, wird sie die Seele genannt; Wenn sie was will oder begert. das Gemüthe; wenn sie mit Weisheit gezieret und bescheidenlich
in one could cause disease in the other, Horst emphasized that people should give equal care to both. For the body, Horst followed the standard Galenic-Hippocratic line of recommending attentiveness to food and drink. The soul should be nourished by faith, something that I will turn to consider more at the end of this chapter.

urtheilet; der Verstandt: wenn sie vorgescheiene Ding widerholet und gedencket, das Gedächtnus; wenn sie allen Dingen nachrechnet und unterscheidet, die Vernunft; wenn sie mit tiefen Gedancken und Betrachtungen umgebeth, der Geist; wenn sie empfindet das äusserliche durch leibliche Glieder, die Sinne; welches alles Werck der Seelen find. Dadurch die Gewalt dess Menschen beweiset und alle Thaten vollbracht. Sie hat ihren Sitz in dem übersten Ort des Leibes und dem himmel am nechsten, breitet ihre krafft aus in alle Glieder des Leibes. Sie ist nicht in dem Blut, wird nicht von den Eltern oder dem leiblichen Saamen uns angeboren, sondern als ein unsichtbarliche Wesen, das nichts leiblichs oder irrdisch an sich hat, wenn ihre Behausung und Bewohnung, das ist der Leib, einer jeglichen Frucht in Mutter Leibe ganz zugericht ist, wie er sein soll, so wird eine neue Seele bald von Gott geschaffen, und von oben herab dem Leibe eingegossen oder mitgetheilet”.

NN4v: “Die seele des Menschen ist nicht gemacht aus den Elementen oder irgenteiner irdischen Materien, sondern hat alleine ein Göttlichn Ursprung.”


While it is impossible to cover all of the aspects of Horst’s book in detail, this brief introduction to his vernacular explanation of anatomy and the relationship of body and soul in disease demonstrates the way a learned physician provided readers an account of both in the vernacular informed by and fully in accord with learned literature, while also incorporating biblical references and stories to illustrate his points.

4.4 Medical Advice for the Laity in Sermons

As Horst’s and Ireneaus’s works make clear, the Bible provided the grounds for many different types of discussions of bodies, souls, and disease for lay audiences. “In God’s Word,” extolled one preacher in a funeral sermon, “we find that all necessary pieces of medicine, like correct physiology, belong to the Creator of Nature.”68 Lutherans derived lessons from all types of biblical passages. Robert Kolb, for instance, points to the interesting case of Martin Faber’s Deutsche Glossa (1576). Faber designed the Glossa, like the more famous Glossa ordinaria, to describe in brief the key messages of biblical texts. But Faber targeted the book for a lay audience, reproducing the German Bible with accompanying short comments. From the extended discussion of leprosy in

noch schändlicher, dann die Völleren. Derowegen soviel Speiss und Tranck allein einer zu sich nehmen soll, als die Notturfft der Natur erfordert, das ist, dass die kräffte des Leibes ernähret, oder erhalten, nicht das sie überladen und untergetruckt werden.”

68 Johannes Caementarius, Ein Christliche Predigt Bey der Leich des Edlen Friderici Lagi, der Artzney Doctoris (Tübingen, 1594), Sig. G1r: “In Gottes Wort finden wir alle notwendige Stücke zur Medicin gehörig, als die rechte Physiologiam, von dem Schöpfer der Natur...”
Leviticus 13, Faber derived the key lessons in Lutheran treatments of illness: disease should remind us of our sin and God’s healing.  

But here again, perhaps the most significant passage for early modern Lutheran commentary on medicine for the laity is Sirach 38. Just as the many Lutheran sermons and commentaries on Sirach provided instruction for physicians and general principles for medicine, as shown in chapter three, so too did pastors and theologians offer practical instruction for patients in their discussions of the book.  

The advice offered was based on the fact that one should honor one’s body and understand it to be as deeply bound up in an individual’s salvation as the soul. “The body is God’s noble creation and gift. The body is as expensively purchased and redeemed through Jesus Christ as the Soul. The Christian’s body is a temple of God the

---

69 Martin Faber, Deutsche Glossa uber die fünff Bücher Mose (Jena, 1577), Sig. Nn3v-4r: “I. Aus diesem Capitel sollen wir erstlich lernen, das wir unser Leben und Gesundheit alleine von Gott haben, muss auch von ihm erhalten werden, darumb wir ihn auch darumb anruffen sollen. Wem nun Gott gesunden Leib gibt, der dancke ihm dafür, und brauch ihn auch recht zu Gottes Ehren, und des Nehesten nutz, nach seinem Beruff.  
II. Die vielseltigen Leibs kranckheiten sollen uns erinnern unser Sünden, die ein ursachen sind alls jammers und not, darin das Menschliche Geschlecht steckt, und sonderlich Gottes Zorns wider die Sünder, Psal. 90. Das macht dein Zorn, das wir so vergehen, etc. Darumb sollen wir uns für Sünden hüten.  
III. Es wird aber durch den Auffatz bedeutet die Erbsünde. Denn gleich wie der Auffatz den ganzen Leib, das Geblüt, Lung und Leber einnimmt und vergiftet, also, das die Aussetzigen von der Gemine aussondert sein müssen (daher den die kranckheit den Namen hat Aussatz, weil diese Leute ausgefasst oder absondert werden). Also werden wir auch durch den Ausszatz der Erbsünden an Leib und Seele, durch und durch, ganz und gar verderbt, das wir für Gott nichts ander denn ein Fluch and Grewel sind, und von ihm abgesondert und verstossen, und in Bann gethan werden, bis so lang wir vom hohenpriester Christo gereinigt und durch seine Diener die Preidger durch die Tauffe, Absolution und brauch des Abendmals, solcher Reinigung versichert werden.  
Holy Ghost. The body has the hope of resurrection to eternal life...”

Comments on Sirach frequently provided a combination of traditional medical theory of complexion and Biblical prescriptions for respecting the body, as proper care for the body required each person to know himself and his own body. The listener or reader of the comments on Sirach could find a complex jumble of authorities Christian and non-Christian harmonized with the basic principle Sirach offered to honor and know the body.

Friedrich Roth, for one, summed it up thus: “For the complexion of humans is not of only one kind: one is of a wetter, the other of drier complexion; one is colder, the other warmer...” After further detailing the theory of complexions, Roth finally returned to Sirach’s direct injunction, “My child, consider what is healthy and what is unhealthy for your body...For not everything serves everyone...”

The two most popular commentators on Sirach (Caspar Huberinus and Johannes Mathesius) both proffered helpful advice that ranged from harmonizing basic principles of medicine with the text to instruction on the importance of prayer. According to

---


71 Friedrich Rothe, Das Buch Jesus Syrach im Latein ECCLESIASTICUS. Auf Deutsch, Die Geistliche Zucht genant. In hundert und zwei und dressig Predigten erklert, und auff die Lere des heiligen Cathechismi gerichtet (Eisleben, 1596), Sig. M3v-4r: “Denn die complexion der Menschen sind nicht einerlei: Einer ist Feuchter, der ander Truckener Complexion. Einer ist kalter der ander Warmer, nach demselben muss man auch unterscheiden die sechs res non naturales, wie droben ist angezeigt worden, die Lufft, Essen und Trincken Bewegung und Ruhe des Leibes, Schlaffen und Wachen, Reinigung des Leibes, Bewegung und Affect des Gemüths. Welches Syrach in diese vermanung fasset, das er spricht: Mein Kind prüfe was deinem Leibe gesund ist. Und sihe was im ungesund ist, da gibt ihm nich. Denn allerlei dienet nicht jederman. So mag auch nicht jederman allerlei.”
Huberinus, Sirach outlines a complete system of medicine, including both prophylactic and therapeutic treatments. “It therefore details a short, sacred haussapoteck, in which it prescribes to us several Preservatives and several Curatives…” Commentaries and sermons on Sirach did not shy away from dispensing practical medical advice in accord with contemporary medical theory and practice. Huberinus and Mathesius both exhorted listeners (and readers) to remember that body and soul are both under the providential care of God, but that faith must be combined with the sensible tips for diet and regimen and practical devotional advice for prayer offered in Sirach.

Both emphasized the importance of careful eating and drinking, in accord with standard medical advice to combine a good diet with a good regimen. “A person must firstly pay attention to what is useful and what harmful in eating and drinking, that he will need this knowledge with which to preserve his health.” Echoing the Galenic medical framework that, as seen in chapter two, presented health and disease as highly individualized, Huberinus noted that not all foods suit everyone. Mathesius concurred, even suggesting that the fact that some foods disagree with some people is a

---

72 Caspar Huberinus, *Spiegel der Hauszucht, sampt einer kurzen Ausslegung für die armen Hausväter...wie sie ein Gottsellig leben gegen meniglich sollen erzeigen.* (Nürnberg, 1555), Sig. PP2r: “Beschreibet also hie ein kurze geistliche haussapoteck, darinnen er uns verordnet etliche Praeservative, und etliche Curative....”

73 Huberinus, *Spiegel,* Sig. Pp2r: “Der mensch muss erstlich achtung haben was ihm nutz und schedlich ist in essen und trincken das soll er gebrauchen, seine gesundheit dardurch zuerhalten. Das ander aber muss er (nämlich was schedlich ist) meiden die kranceheit zu fürkommen, wenn er aber je krannk wird, so muss er sich der Arznei (so ihn reiniget und gesund macht) gebrauchen, sich lassen purgieren und das böse von ihm lassen treiben.”
consequence of the Fall.\textsuperscript{74} Huberinus pointed out how important it was to eat carefully. Eating very fast and greedily, and not chewing up your food properly limited the stomach’s ability to digest it properly and the liver’s ability to take nutrients from it, and would lead to sickness.\textsuperscript{75} Both emphasized the importance of moderation in food and drink. For Mathesius, simple food that does not taste good is best. And one should never not eat too much of it. “…a simple, bad dish is the healthiest and the best, and when it tastes too good, one should stop eating.”\textsuperscript{76}

Despite all best efforts, though, because sin exists, so too, does disease. Huberinus reminded readers that sin, not bodily imbalance, is the real cause of disease.\textsuperscript{77} Mathesius emphasized that it disrupted the body’s ideal functioning.\textsuperscript{78} Thus,

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{74} Huberinus, \textit{Spiegel}, Ti5r-v: “Erstlich, das wir vor allen dingen prüfen sollen in essen und trincken was unserm Leib schad oder gesund sei. Denn allerlei dienet nicht jederman. So mag auch nicht jederman allerlei. So liegt hier sonderlich wieviel daran das ein jeglich Mensch auff sich selber von jugend auf gut achtung hab was ihm zu essen nütze und zimme das er sich derselen spies beflisse und welche speise ihm seinem Magen nicht wil zimmen und nützlich sein, das er dieselbigen meide. Denn ein Mensch ist nicht wie der ander genaturt und complexioniert. Einer ist kalter, feuchter. Der ander heisset truckner natur. Einer ist alt, der ander jung.”
\item \textsuperscript{75} Huberinus, \textit{Spiegel}, Sig. Tt5v: “So bringt auch das gierig und schnell essen viel krankheit, da du die speiss nicht wol masticierst, sondern schlucks schnell durch den schlundt hinab ungekewet. Das kan den der Magen nicht verkochen und die Leber nichts guts an sich ziehen so musst du den mit Kranckheit beladen werden…”
\item \textsuperscript{76} Johannes Mathesius, \textit{Sïrach Mathesii, Das ist, Christliche, Lehrhafte, Trostreiche und lustige Erklerung und Ausslegung des schönen Hausbuchs, so der weise Mann syrach zusammen gebracht und geschrieben} (Leipzig, 1586), Sig. Zz4r: “Denn ob wol alles gut ist was Gott geschaffen, so sind doch nach dem Fall Adae und Fluch Cain und nach der Sündflut viel Kräuter süchtig und schädlich und viel Their giftiger und unartiger worden and eins bösen saftts krafts feuchtigkeit und härtern verdawung. Es sich auch alle Thier und Speise nicht den Menschen zur nahrung geschaffen. Daher hat Noah unreine Their gekennet. Und Mose verbeut zugleich wegen des vorbildes oder deutung auf die Ketzer und wegen der Gesundheit etliche Thier zu essen…”
\item \textsuperscript{77} Mathesius, \textit{Sïrach Mathesii, Sig. Zz4v: “Darumb ist eine einfeltige schlechte Speise die gesündeste und beste und wenn es auch am besten schmecket soll man aufdhoren.”}
\item \textsuperscript{78} Huberinus, \textit{Spiegel}, Sig. Vv1v: “Zum dritten, das sich der Kranck wol umbseehe und erinnere was doch die ursach solcher seiner Kranckheit sein möge, wie wol nun mancherlei ursach der kranckheit sind, auch
\end{itemize}
sickness will assuredly come. When it arrives, said Mathesius, the first thing to do is to go to God and confess. Then, consult a doctor. The sick should heed the first words of Sirach 38 “Ehre den Arzt…” and honor doctors, who are appointed by God to heal. A large part of honoring a physician is simply listening to and doing what the doctor tells you to do. (Alisha Rankin’s work on the Saxon noblewoman Elisabeth of Rochlitz reveals why this advice was necessary. Elisabeth contravened most of Mathesius’s suggestions by regularly disagreeing with her doctors and falling off her prescribed diet and regimen). Though pious doctors are honorable, Mathesius shrewdly advised patients not to consult too many physicians, and not to consult physicians who have too many patients.

But, he recognized, sometimes a treatment, even a good one, just may not work. In that case the best thing to do is not to lose hope, but to pray fervently that God will

---

79 Mathesius, Sýrach Mathesii, Sig. Aaa3v: “Aber wie die Sünde die kräftfe dess gemüts und der Seelen zerstöret und zerrüttet hat. Also sind auch die kräftfe dess Liebes, nicht in ihrer rechtmassigen temperatur, und gleichmessiger einigkeit nach dem Fall bleiben.”

78 Mathesius, Sýrach Mathesii, Sig. Bbb1r: “Derhalben wenn einer in eine Krankheit felt, oder vom Herrn gezüchtiget und gestraft wird, und Gott einen heimsuchet und strafft ihn mit Krankheit, der suche für allen dingen Gott, das ist, Er erkenne die Hand Gottes, die ihn straffet, bekenne seine Sünde und Schuld, richte strafe und klage sich selber an I Corinth am 11.”

make the treatment effective.\textsuperscript{81} Indeed, the best thing that a physician and patient can do is pray together. “A strong Our Father is a good ingredient and entrance to beginning of medicine,” Mathesius affirmed. \textsuperscript{82} Similarly the Braunschweig pastor Johannes Wagner prescribed prayer in view of the fact that sin is the cause of disease. \textsuperscript{83} One should not place one’s trust in the medicine itself, but in God who makes it effective. \textsuperscript{84} As

\textsuperscript{81} Mathesius, \textit{Sýrach Mathesii}, Sig. Bbb6r: “Dis sollen nun alle arme Christen mercken, wenn die Arznei nicht hilft, wie es denn nicht alle wege in eines Arztes macht stehen will, dass dem Kranken geholfen werde, und er genese es tragen sich viel seele zu in Krankheiten, darinnen man keine hoffnung der besserung der Arzneien gewarten darf, da soll man zu Gott schreien wie das Blutflüssige Weib und für sich beten lassen im Glauben des Sohns Gottes und glauben Gott sei Allmächtig der alleine ohne mittel und andere oder folgende ursachen und auch durch mittel helfen kann.”

\textsuperscript{82} Mathesius, \textit{Sýrach Mathesii}, Sig. Aaa1r: “Denn ein starck Vater unser ist eine sehr gute Ingredienz und Eingang zur Arznei, wenn beide der Arzt und der Patient oder kranke mit einander oder sonderlich beten wie wir unten hören werden, da ist Gott der Arzt selber.”

\textsuperscript{83} J. Johanes Wagner, \textit{De licitio & salutari medicorum & medicamentorum usu.} Das ist: Eine Christliche Lehr und Unterricht, wie man der Ärzte und der Arznei heilsam und nützlich gebrauchen möge, (Braunschweig, 1609), Sig. D2r-v: “Da muss ein Patient bedencken das von wegen der Sünde auf fallen kreuten ein fluch und gleich ein Figt sei, darumb muss er den fluch und den Gifft, mit einem Christlichen Gebet davon beten und weil alle Medicamenta allein von Gott Saftt und Krafte haben, muss er dieselbigen von dem Allmechtigen Gott Segen kraftt und gedeien erbitten. Das will Syrach allhie andeuten wenn er spricht: Mein Kind, wenn du kranck bist, verachte dass nicht, sondern bitte den HERRN, so wird er dich gesund machen, es kann die Stunde kommen das dem krancken allein durch ihnen geholfen wird, wenn sie den Herrn bitten das besser mit ihm werde und gesundheit keige lenger zu leben.

Er muss auch solches Gebet, so ferne die leibliche gesundheit dadurch zu erlangen anlaenger, nicht bloss ohne alle condition anstellen, sondern muss immerdar mit hindanhengen. Gott wolle den kräutern die gesundheit möge zu Gottes ehren, rhum und preiss und zu seiner Seeligkeit gedeich sein. Denn gleich wie wir alle zeitliche güter, davon wir keine ausstrückliche verheissung haben, das eben deiselbige Gott uns wolle geben, oder die wir nicht wissen konnen, ob sie uns werden dienlich sein, mit vorangehengten bedinge müssen bitten, also müssen wir auch derselbigen in der bitte wegen unsers leibs gesundheit angestetleicht nicht vergessen. Denn also bittet der auffzeige Matth. 8.v.3. Herr so du wilt, kanst du nicht wol reinigen. Und der einiger Geborner Sohn Gottes bittet selber im Garten am ölberge also: Vater ists möglich, so gehe dieser kelch von mir, doch nicht was ich will, sondern was du wilt, das geschehe.”

\textsuperscript{84} Wagner, \textit{De licitio & salutari medicorum}, Sig. D3r: “Zum dritten, wenn man nun also erstlich mit Gott ausgesöhnet ist und durch das Blut Ihesu Christi gereiniget ist, so soll man nach er ermanung Syrachs den Ärzten zu sich lassen. Das ist: Man soll Christliche und von Gott erleubete und gebotene Mittel nicht verachten, sondern dieselbige in Gottes furcht gebrauchen.”
Huberinus noted, praying patients and physicians together recognized that God is the real physician, and the real reason that any treatment might succeed.\textsuperscript{85} Even more, comments on Sirach repeatedly mentioned that not only the people (physicians and patients) but also the medical means used in treating disease should be understood in light of faith and God’s provision. The effective treatment comes from God alone. It is not a result of “magic” or any of the special prayers a Catholic might say over herbs and medicaments.\textsuperscript{86} “In sum, the whole earth is God’s apothecary,” argued one physician’s funeral sermon.\textsuperscript{87} Each place on earth is providentially provisioned with the herbs and minerals that the inhabitants will need to fend off the diseases endemic to the area. Huberinus explained, “The Lord God...gave to every sort of tree and seed its own special characteristics, powers and effects.”\textsuperscript{88} Therefore, per Huberinus, to honor God’s creation—vegetable and animal—is to honor God himself, as the creator and sustainer

\textsuperscript{85} Huberinus, Spiegel, Sig.Vv1r: “Zum ersten, sollen wir nach der Geistlichen und himlischen Arznei trachten, nemlich, nach dem himlischen Arzt und Apothecker. Solches, sagt Syrach, müssen wir auf drei erlei Weiss bekommen. Zum ersten, das wir vor allen dingen lauffen zu Gott dem Allmachtigen, und setzen all unser trost und hoffnung und setzen all unser trost und hoffnung allein auf ihn, der da auch allein könne und wölfe helfen und wo der nicht hilfe, das all unsere hülfe vergebens seien. Also flohe der König Ezechias zu Gott dem Herren in seiner kränckheit und wurde auch zu gnaden angenommen und der König Asa wurde mit dem todt gestraff, das er in seiner kranckheit nit zu Gott dem Allmachtigen sich wendet, sondern zu dem Abgott zu Eckron 3. Regum 1. Darumb so ist das der aller beste rat, das wir aufs aller beldest in kranckheit zu Gott dem herren fliehen.”

\textsuperscript{86} Mathesius, Sýrach Mathesii, Sig. Aaa4v: “Ich meine die Pfarrkinder behaltet des wol, dass die Kräuter aus der ersten Schöpfung an von Gott ihre kraft haben, und nicht aus den Papistischen Segnen oder Weihen in dem Creutz herumb tragen und Gefängen oder aus Zäuberei dass man, wie sie sagen, gute wort darüber spricht. So bekommen sie auch ihrer Kräften nicht von den Heiligen, wie den viel Kräuter von den Heiligen ihren Namen haben.”

\textsuperscript{87} Johannes Caementarius, Ein Christliche Predigt Bey der Leich des Edlen Friderici Lagi, der Artzney Doctoris, (Tübingen, 1594), Sig. B2r: “In summa der ganze Erdkreiss sampt Meer und Waßer ist Gottes Apothecken.”

\textsuperscript{88} Huberinus, Spiegel, Sig. Pp3v: “Gott der Herr... kann und thuts auch noch für und für in allerlei gewechs, beumen und kräuter sondere eigenschaft, kraft und wirkung geben.”
thereof. “… whoever despises creatures, despises the Creator of the same.”

Of course, as Mathesius hastened to point out, even here, sin had a profound effect, making herbs, plants, and animals less healthful and helpful than before: “Then, although all that God made is good, after the Fall of Adam and flight of Cain and sin, many herbs became harmful and many Animals handicapped and inferior/misbehaving…” Nonetheless, “We see and learn how great is the love of God for us, how deeply our Lord God loved us humans that He created and gave us means through which we can help our bodies against all sorts of sicknesses and afflictions.”

Commentaries on medicine from Sirach 38, then, provided readers (and listeners to the original sermons) with a wide range of pithy and practical advice about everything from regulating diet to consulting physicians to using herbs and medicines. These discussions prove the widespread interest in and basic knowledge about medicine, as well as how Lutheran pastors worked to teach their parishioners to trust God with the healing of their diseased bodies. In addition to practical advice, these pastors also labored to provide consolation for suffering souls.

---

89 Huberinus, Spiegel, Sig. B2r: “Darumb wer die Creaturen verachtet, der verachtet auch derselbigen schöpfer.”
80 Mathesius, Sirach Mathesii, Sig. Zz4r: “Denn ob wol alles gut ist was Gott geschaffen, so sind doch nach dem Fall Adam und Fluch Cain und nach der Sündflut viel kräuter súchtig und scheidlich und viel Thier gisstiger und unartiger worden....”
81 Mathesius, Sirach Mathesii, Sig. Bbb6v: “Wir sehen und lernen fürs andere Amoris Dei erga nos immensitatem, wie hoch unser Herr Gott uns Menschen geliebet, dass er uns Mittel gegönnet und geschaffen durch welche uns kann an unserem Leib wider allerlei krankhkeiten und Beschwerungen geholfen werden.”
4.5 Consolation and Prayer

In addition to encouraging disease prevention and treatment, Lutheran writers also delved into emotional and spiritual aspects of the experience of disease by offering advice and consolation for the sick. “Soul medicine” (seelen arznei) was as important as the medicine that ministered to the body. If sin was the root cause of disease in the world, and if an individual’s own sin could exacerbate illness, then it required proper confession and prayer to re-orient oneself spiritually. What is more, even if individual sin was not the immediate cause of illness (no one suggested a patient should systematically rifle through his conscience to identify a specific sin that caused a certain disease), the experience of disease could provoke distress and even despair. These passionate feelings could impede physical recovery, and prevent a patient from learning all the spiritual lessons she could from her sickness. At the beginning of his work on Sirach, Mathesius reflected on the “medicine” to be used against all crosses and anfechtungen. There were four ingredients in the simple recipe made up in the Holy Spirit’s apotheck: faith, hope, patience, and prayer. These together would restore health to an afflicted soul.

---

92 Mathesius, Sýrach Mathesii, Sig. A6v: “Dieweil ihr nun unterritichtet seid und gewiss wisest, dass das Creutz und die Anfechtung nicht werde bei den Christen aussen bleiben und das es keinem anders in der Christenheit gehet denn das er werde entweder ausserlich oder innerlich von Widerfachern und Verfolgern oder vom Teuffel geplaget und gefoltert werden. So lasset uns nun auch die Arznei wider allerlei Creutz und Anfechtung lernen und betrachten.”

Sig. 7v: “Die allerbeste Arznei aber sind folgende Vier Stück die man allein in des heiligen Geistes Apotecke bekommen kann nämlich: Glaube Hoffnung Gedult und Gebet.”
This, and the other consolation literature that I will point out was not just an attempt to salve or quiet the suffering by the healthy and the elite, whose recommendations for confessing sin whenever disease struck might come across to readers centuries later as unempathetic. Medical advice to confront one’s sin such as that given above and consolation literature take on a different tone when read in light of the fact that the writers themselves suffered, sometimes greatly. Consider Mathesius himself, whose injunctions to confess sin when disease stuck I mentioned above.

During his years of study in Wittenberg Mathesius became, for a short time, one of the privileged students living in Luther’s house. From this experience, he wrote the first biography of Luther and avidly contributed to the famous Table Talk collection. Beyond this, he was the beloved pastor in the thriving mining town of Joachimsthal. There, he became one of early modern Lutheranism’s most prolific preachers (current estimates of his output are: over 5000 sermons preached, 1500 of which appeared in print). Yet, he also suffered greatly. After the early death of his beloved wife, he fell prey to a mysterious, crippling disease. A bad fall injured his right arm. Eventually the pain and stiffness affected his entire body. Years of suffering brought on deep

depression, even thoughts of suicide. He consulted multiple doctors, yet for eight years their treatments brought no relief. In the forward to *Das tröstliche De Profundis, welches ist der CXXX Psalm Davids*, written after this prolonged bout of both mental and physical sickness, he confessed his own struggle with despair and gratitude for the prayers and encouragement of those who wrote encouraging letters to him, assuring him of their prayers for his physical and spiritual health.

Mathesius was similarly forthright about disbelief in the face of seemingly hopeless medical encounters in a moving set of sermons on the raising of Lazarus and the healing of the widow’s son, published just after the death of his wife. There, Mathesius frankly admitted to his parishioners that it is easy to sympathize with Mary and Martha questioning Christ. When someone becomes ill, it can be hard to avoid fearful thoughts of death because doctors often seem helpless. As Susan Karant Nunn observes, “Frank description of spiritual despair and the “alien” ways of God that were believed to cause it became one of the hallmarks of much of the evangelical consolation literature.”

But Mathesius did not allow himself or his listeners to stop at despair. Instead, he pointed to the example of Lazarus’ resurrection and the example of Christ’s compassion and experience of pain at the death of a friend. This should remind one of

---

95 Johannes Mathesius, *Das tröstliche De Profundis, welches ist der CXXX Psalm Davids* (Nuremberg, 1565).
96 Susan Karant Nunn, *Reformation of Feeling*, 139.
the way that Christ can sympathize with our pain. And even more, that Christ can
overcome what seems hopeless. “...this physician regards things differently. He sees
flourishing health in the middle of sickness, and nothing but life in the midst of death.”97

In writing of affliction, depression, and consolation, Mathesius was hardly alone.
Literature for the sick and troubled was one of the most popular forms of early modern
devotional writing across confessions. In Germany, it was variously labeled
“Trosttschriften” or “Erbauungsliteratur” (based on whether the goal was more to
console or to promote sanctification). Books of consolation and devotion were generally
printed in octavo, duodecimo, and even sextodecimo formats that were easy to carry
and consult. This consolation literature produced for the sick and suffering encouraged
readers (and listeners to the text read aloud) to see their suffering as an important
element of sanctification, and to remember that Christ understood their pain. While
written for a different audience, and with a different purpose, these books of “soul
medicine” shared similar themes, and even similar language, with other literature
examined so far. It reminded readers that curing the soul is part of caring for the body.
It stressed that, just as physicians should pray, so too should their patients. A subset of
this literature was directed to those whom Mathesius praised: those who visited the sick.

97 Johannes Mathesius, Trostpredigten aus der schönen historien vom Lazaro, (Nurnberg, 1558), Sig.C5v:
“...dieser Arzt urtheilt anders. Er siehet mitten in der krankheit lauter gesundheitund mitten im todte nichts
denn leben.”
Sickness must be approached with faith and hope, an attitude that the devotional manuals did their utmost to encourage.

Among Lutherans, titles included *Seelenärztney für gesunden und krancken*, *Trost oder SeelenArzneibüch*, and *Antidotum oder Geistliche Ertzney für die Christen so Anfechtung vnd Geistliche trübsal haben*.98 Others wrote books on specific afflictions: especially reflections during time of plague and on melancholy.99 Outside of Lutheran circles, a similar string of specialized books and pamphlets of devotion and instruction for the sick appeared in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century England including *The Physyke of the Soul*; *The Pomaunder of Prayer*; *The Solace of the Soul*; *the Sycke Mans Salve*; *The Afflicted Mans Vow*; and, *The Best of Remedies for the Worst of Maladies: or Spiritual Receipts and Antidotes for the Preservation of a Plague-Sick Sinfull Soul*. Wherein is shown, sin is the Cause, and Repentance the Cure of the Pestilence. Seasonably published by a Lover of Peace and Truth: and one that desireth that all would (though the Lord’s hand seems to be withdrawn, as to the late universally raging Pestilential Disease) forsake those Provoking sins, which call for

---

98 A few examples include: Urbanus Rhegius, *Seelenärztney für gesunden und krancken zu disen gefährlichen zeyten* (Wittenberg, 1529); Matthias Vogel, *Trost oder SeelenArzneibüch in welchem fast wider alle Anfechtungen vnd Träubsalen...Insonder heilsame und edle Recept oder Artzneytrünck...aus den färnembsten Trostsprüchen heiliger Göttlicher Schrifft als gesunden Kräutern...getrewlich zubereitet begriffen und...registirt sein.* (Frankfurt, 1571); Hieronymus Weller, *Antidotvm oder Geistliche Ertznei für die Christen so Anfechtung vnd Geistliche trübsal haben.* (Nuremberg, 1557); On this literature, see Rittgers, *Reformation of Suffering.*

Vengeance and Judgements on the Sons of Men. An Ease for a Diseased Man, a short pamphlet appeared in 1625 expressly claimed as its goal that "That a man may thankfully receive, patiently bear, and joyfully overpass the cross of sickness."

Let me turn briefly to an example of this literature. Over the course of his career, the Halle pastor Georg Walther wrote multiple books of prayer and consolation for the

---


M.M., An Ease for a Diseased Man: Published for the Instruction of Those Which Are Visited with Sickness of Body; especially those being infected with the contagious pestilence are debarred from the publike ministry of the word, and the comfortable societie of their brethren (London, 1625), 1. On the interplay of medicine and devotion in this English literature see, Richard Sugg, “Flame Into Being: Spirits, Soul, and the Physiology of Early Modern Devotion,” Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies 46.1 (2016): 141-165. It is beyond the purview of this dissertation to engage in a cross-confessional comparison of this devotional literature. That must await a separate study. But it is instructive to note the many similarities between the counsel offered in Lutheran books of consolation and some English Puritan sources. For instance, An Ease for a Diseased Man, was short and therefore terse. It was explicit about the causes and treatments of disease. Not germs, not cold, but sin caused illness. Just as there would be no sickness in the world in general if Adam and Eve had not sinned in the Garden of Eden, a person would not succumb to sickness if he did not allow sin into his life. Therefore, when the first symptoms of disease appeared, "... look not too much on the means whereby or the manner how thou art afflicted: but look especially to thy sin, as the principal cause of it. We say commonly, 'I took my sickness by such a journey...in such an infected house, etc. True, those were the outward means, but it was thy sin within thee which provoked God to offer those means to thee, and to make them strong and effectual to afflict thee." (4-5). If the symptoms worsened after this initial repentance and the sickness showed signs of persisting, An Ease for a Diseased Man enjoined the sick person to engage in yet deeper introspection to determine the specific sin that caused the disease. After this, should come fasting, prayer and repentance. A sick man's prayer should be more penitential than intercessory, because the affliction of sin is more damaging than the affliction of disease.

An Ease for a diseased Man even suggested that a person should even be thankful for sickness, considering that extent and gravity of his sin. It was gracious of God to send sickness as a warning and a chance to repent and change, when the Almighty would be justified in striking one dead. The comfort offered to the sick was always the same: it could be worse. An Ease for a Diseased Man admonished readers to consider: "Is one member grieved? God could smite all. Am I heartsick? God could enlarge my heart, and therewith all my pain sevenfold more. Am I distressed in soul? God could give me over to desperation. Am I distressed both in body and soul? God could throw both body and soul into hellfire. Thus mayst thou gather comfort in they greatest pain, by considering how much less they pain is, then God is able to inflict." (7) It did encourage Christians to consult physicians, though with the standard caveat that, "We must be careful therefore that we seek not for health by unlawful means, as by witchcraft, conjuring, charming, etc." (2)
sick, including one specifically for parents of sick and dying children.\textsuperscript{102} His books were in high demand; several appeared in multiple editions. His \textit{Trostbüchlein für kranke und sterbende Menschen} gave step-by-step considerations a Christian should have in sickness. First, he should recognize that nothing happens apart from God’s will, thus sickness is not a result of the devil having free reign to torment, but a part of God’s plan.\textsuperscript{103} Second, she should remember that all disease is a result of sin, for which point Walther provided a variety of biblical proof texts, including that of Moses’s sister Mariam being banished from the Israelite camp and the plague that struck Israel after King David’s ill-advised census.\textsuperscript{104} These examples showed that disease could be a result of personal sin, or could

\textsuperscript{102} Georg Walther, \textit{Trostbüchlein für kranke und Sterbende Menschen} (Leipzig, 1565); idem, \textit{Trost der Eltern, wenn ihre Kinder krank werden und im Herrn entschlaffen} (Wittenberg, 1559); idem, \textit{Betbüchlein für betrübte krancke und angefochtene Menschen} (Leipzig, 1569); idem, \textit{Seelengart, Darinnen Trost in Anfechtungen und Gedult in Triübsalen gefunden wird} (Bautzen, 1572); idem, \textit{Christliche Gottselige Gebet, trost und hülf von Gott zu bitten in aller trübsal} (Frankfurt, 1579); idem, \textit{Krancken Büchlein, Woher alle Kranckheiten kommen, Item warumb uns Gott damit heimsucht. Und wie man sich darinnen Christlich verhalten und in allerlei Anfechtungen trösten soll.} (Wittenberg, 1594).

\textsuperscript{103} Walther, \textit{Trostbüchlein}, Sig. E5r-E6r: “Erstlich soll der krancke bedenken dass er nicht ohne alles gefahr oder nach gefahr oder nach eigenschaft oder mangel der zeit seiner geburt, natur aus beschedigung des Teuffels, Zeuberer, oder böser menschen zu der kranckheit kommen sei. Sondern soll wissen und dafür es halten das Gott solche schwachheit ihm zugeschicket und also über verhenget habe.

Dann so spricht Gott selber, Levit. 26. Werdet ihr mir nicht gehorchen, so will ich euch heimsuchen mit schrecken schwulst und fieber etc. Und spricht Exod. 15 das er uns der kranckheit seine will aufflegen damit er Egypten gestraffet hat, wo wir ihm gehorchen. Und spricht austrücklich, Exod. 4 das er taub stumm und blindt mache. Das leret auch Paulus da er sagt, I. Cor. 10. Das wir vom Herrn gezüchtigt werden.

Wer das verstehet und gleubet der nicht wider Gottes willen in Creutz murren damit er nicht Gottes willen widerstrebe und sein Creutz gröffer mache wird auch nicht anderswo hilfe suchen sondern allein bei ihm denn wie er es zugeschicket hat, so kann er es auch alleine wider wegnemen.”

\textsuperscript{104} Walther, \textit{Trostbüchlein}, Sig. E6r-v: “Zum. 2. Soll man bedenken was die ursach sei aller krankheit, nämlich unser Sünde, wie folgende Sprüche zeugen.

Syr. 38. Wer für seinem Schöpffer sündiget, der muss dem Arzt zu teil werden.

Levit. 26. Werdet ihr mir nicht gehorchen spricht Gott und nicht tun deise Gebot alle, so will ich euch heimsuchen mit schrecken schwulst und sieber etc.

Deut. 28. Wenn du nicht der stimm des Herren gehorchen wirst, so wird der Herr dich schlagen mit drüsen Egypti mit feigwartze mit grind, fretze, wahnsinn und blindheit.
strike a community because of the sin of a single member or group. Next, the sick
person should confess his sins, in recognition that one could be freed of disease by
Christ, just as one is forgiven of sin.\textsuperscript{105} This would, fourth, give the patient the confidence
to face life or death in assurance of God’s forgiveness and love.\textsuperscript{106} Finally, a patient

\begin{quote}
Also werden Miriam und Gehasi, Elisei knecht mit Aussatze gestraft, ihrer sünden halben. Levit. 12. 2
Reg. 5.
Und Davids hoffart und misstrauen halben, das er das volck lies zielen musten 70000 menschen an der
Pestilenz sterben. 2 Samuel 24.
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{105} Walther, \textit{Trostbüchlein}, Sig. E7r-E8v: “Zum 3 soll man die Sünde darumb uns Gott mit krankheit straffet erkennen, rew und leid darüber haben und doch darumb nicht versagen sondern sich widerumb des leidens und sterbens Christi trösten, daran feste glauben und umb vergebung der sünde von herten bitten. Wo man solches tut so wird wahrhaftig alle unser Sünde vergeben, wie die folgende Sprüche zeigen.

Wo wir also durch den Glauben an Christum der sünde los worden sind als denn so werden wir von der
krankheit erlöst wie der Son Gottes am Sichtbrüchtigem zeigen, da er spricht, Matth: 9. Sei getrost mein
Son, deine Sünde sind dir vergeben, als solt er sagen, du kannst nicht ehe gesund werden. Du werdest denn
loss der Sünden. Damit du diese krankheit verdient hast darumb neheime ich erstlich die ursache der
Sünden von dir und verkündige dir vergebung aller Sünde und Gottes gnade.

Daraus leicht zuerkennen wie es kompt und was die ursache sei, das offte die beste bewerte Arznei
manchem krancken nichts hilffet, das doch andere geholfen hat, nämlich das solches darumb geschehe, das
die leute nicht von herten ihre Sünde erkennen, keine gnade begeren und den rechten Allmechtigen Arzt
Gott im himmel verachten und in ihren sünden bleiben, denn wie alle Arznei und pflaster vergeblich sind,
wo einer von einem schoss oder sich irgendein loth oder eisen noch im leibe hat bis so lange das ihm solches
ausgeschnitten wird. Also ist vergeblich beide geistliche und leibliche Arznei, es sei denn sache, das die
Sünde ausgeschnitten werde, und man davon durch den glauben absolviert werde.”

\textsuperscript{106} Walther, \textit{Trostbüchlein}, Sig. E8v-E9v: “Zum 4. Wenn sich der krancke durch den glauben an Christum mit
Gott versündet hat und vergebung der Sünden bekommen, so sol er balde abschaffen alles dasjenige damit
er Gott erzyrnet und zu solcher kranckheit verursachet hat. Es sei fressen, saufen, hoffart, hass, neid, zorn,
wucher, betrug, hurerei und unzucht und das wider erstatten, was er mit unrecht zu sich gezogen hat, wo es
sein kann. Wie der Prophet Ezechiel am 18. leret, Wenn sich der Sünder bekeret von seinen Sünden, das er
gethan hat und tut recht, der soll leben und nicht sterben.

Item, Syrach 38. Lasse ab von der Sünde und mache deine heide unstrefflich und reinige dein hertz von
aller missethat, wenn du kranck bist. Sonderlich wo du etwas hettet wider dein gewissen, das gib wider.
August: Peccatum enim non dimittitur nisi ablatum restitutur. Das ist denn die sünde wird nicht vergeben,
es sei denn das man wider erstatte, das man andern entwand hat.

Sol als denn der krancke empfahen die heilige Absolution und den warm leib und blut Jhesu Christi
damit er in seinem glauben mehr versichert und gestercket werde, sich alles guten zu Gott versehen, und
alle leibes schmerzen gedüftiger ertragen, und wol zu frieden sein möge, Wie es Gott mit seiner krankheit
schicket, es sei zum leben oder zum Tode.”

383
should pray, in the knowledge that God hears and cares.\textsuperscript{107} That said, a Christian should never try to dictate the terms or the timetable for healing to God, and should never pray to a saint for healing. Instead, she should keep in mind that God will heal when and if that is most suitable for an individual’s sanctification.\textsuperscript{108}

Books of consolation also underscored the importance of those who suffered with and could understand the sick, including both fellow Christians and Christ himself. Some wrote books specifically to encourage Christians to visit their afflicted neighbors and dispensing advice on how to offer consolation. Huberinus, for one, instructed readers that visiting the sick is a Christian duty, and a priceless gift of love. When speaking with ill neighbors, friends, and family members, one should encourage them

\textsuperscript{107} Walther, \textit{Trostbüchlein}, Sig. E9v-E10r: “Soll der krancke fleissig beten, und as Gott in ja im starcken Glauben, gedult und hoffnung erhalten und seine kranckheit gnedig wider wolle wegnemen. Wie Syrach am 38. vermanet, mein kind wenn du kranck wirst, so bitte den Herrn, so wird er dich gesund machen. Denn er ist unfer Arzt, der da kann und will von kranckheiten uns gnedig erretten, denn so spricht er ja selber, Ich bin dein Arzt. Exod. 15. Das ist, ich alleine kann die kranckheit gesund machen, darumb sollen wir den güttigen Barmhertzigen und Allmechtigen arzt oft und viel anrufen, mit tröstlicher zuversicht. Er werde uns helffen von der kranckheit, sonderlich weil er uns hat heissen darumb bitten und spricht, Psal. 50. Riffe ich an in der noth, so wil ich dich erretten.”

\textsuperscript{108} Walther, \textit{Trostbüchlein}, Sig. E11r-E12r: Aber hierbei soll man das bedencken wenn wir umb gesundheit des leibes bitten, das wir Gott nicht zeit, ziel, und masse fürschreiben sollen, sondern solches in seinem gnedigen willen stellen von hertzen sagen dein wille geschehe. Item, so du Herr wilt so kanst du mir wol helffen, sonderlich wenn es meine seligkeit ist, anders begere ichts nicht, denn er besser weis denn wir, ob es und möchte deinen zur seligkeit, da wir wider starck wurden.

Auch sollen wir mit beten nicht nachlassen wenn uns gleich nicht so bald geholffen wird, denn Gott unterweilen mit seiner Hilfe darumb verzuecht das er uns probire, ob wir auch fest glauben und mit ernst in lieben und vertrauen. Aber doch endlich erscheinet er mit seiner gnedigen hilffe, wenn es im gefehlt und uns nütze und gut ist, wie an den krancken im Evangelisten zu sehen oder schaffet, das es uns diene zum ewigen leben, wenn uns gleich leiblich nicht geholffen wird.

Sonderlich aber, sollen krancken sich hüten, das sie nicht die verstorbenen heiligen in ihrer kranckheit anruffen, wie diejenigen die böse augen hatten im Papftumb Stilim anrieffen, die solt ihnen helffen.... Denn es heist, Du sollt Gott deinen Herrn alleine anruffen, Deut. 6. Der ist unser Arzt alleine, ohne welches hilffe die Ärzte, welche seine diener sind nichts vermögen. Matth. 4.”
both to acknowledge their sin and then to turn their eyes to the place from which true help comes: God. Ron Rittgers points out that church ordinances prescribed the same course, informing ministers to enjoin the sick to remember that disease is a result of sin, to offer confession, and to remember that Christ forgives.

As noted in chapter three, Lutheran writers and preachers constantly compared physicians to Christus Medicus. In addressing the sick, Lutherans writers reminded the sick that the healing they most needed was not of the body, but of the soul. For example, a vernacular book from 1620 demonstrates this pastoral approach. It offered a detailed description of the suffering of Christ, arguing that thinking about this should

---

109 Caspar Huberinus, Trösthuchlein aus Heiliger Götlicher Schrift. Wie man die Kranken trösten sol. Wie man die Gefangenen so durch die Oberkeit zum Tod verurteilet sine unterrichten und trösten soll. (Nuremberg, 1567), Sig. A2r-A3r: “Syrach in seinen sprüchen am siebenden capitel vermane uns, das wir die krancken gern besuchen sollen. Und Christus unser Herr Matth. 25. Wil sich am Jüngsten Tag, solches werks der liebe (nämlich die Kranken besuchen) dermassen anmenen und vergelten, als wenn es ihm selber geschehen ware. Denn (spricht Christus der Herr daselbst ferner) Was ihr gethan habt einem, unter diesen meinen geringsten Brüdern, das habt ihr mir gethan. Dieweil den, freundlicher liebe Schwager, die wercke, die Kranken zubesuchen so ein hohes köstliches werck der liebe ist, und der zeichen eines sein sol, darbei uns Christus am Jüngsten tag erkennen wird, das wir seine Jünger seien. So wil uns warlich gebüren solch werck nicht allein auss hertzen grund mit lust und liebe erzeigen, sonder wir sollen auch fleissig achtung darauf haben, wie man die Kranken eigentlich und rechtschaffen besuchen soll. Solches aber geschicht fürnemlich auf zweierlei Weiss. Denn wir mit krankheit beladen wird, dem selbigen ist zweierlei hilff von nöten. Erstlich, das man ihm helff an der seelen, den wo der Seel geholfen wird, so kan hernach dem leib auch dester das geholfen werden. Sol aber erstlich der Seel des kranken geholfen werden, so muss man vor allen dingen den krancken zu einem bussfertigen leben vermanen, im seine Sünd zu erkennen geben, zu Gott umb hilff lernen ruffen, und als den sein erschrocken gewissen widerumb trösten und auffrichten, und also Christum den gnadenthron dem kranken wol förbilden.” See also: Caspar Kantz, Wie man dem kranken vnd sterbenden menschen ermanen, trösten und Gott befelhen soll, das er von dieser welt seligklich abscheide (Augsburg, 1539).

110 Rittgers, Reformation of Suffering, Chapter 7, “Pastoral Care of the Sick and Suffering in the Evangelical Church Ordinances.”
remind one of how he sympathized with bodily pain. It then moved on to directly compare Christ’s work in salvation with that of a physician healing a patient. 111


Altogether, Lutheran books of consolation for the sick encouraged sufferers to confront the fact that sin (their own, or in principle) lay at the root of disease, and to turn in faith to Christ, the only one who could forgive sin and who held the power of healing both soul and body in His hands. These works presented illness as not just a physical, but also a spiritual event. Healing thus required attention to both body and soul, with the proper medicine applied to each.

4.6 Conclusion

As this chapter shows, though Philip Melanchthon did not actually refer to the laity or to vernacular literature in commenting on the usefulness of studies of body and soul for all people, popular literature as well as scholarly discussions frequently took up the topics. Though lay readers did not parse the different sorts of Aristotelian soul, or venture (much) into the murky mysteries of traducianism, and though they may not have had access to detailed Galenic accounts of \textit{spiritus} and diseases of the soul, notions of the union of body and soul were ubiquitous. Writers and pastors, their readers and their listeners, struggled to comprehend the consequences of the Fall, including the fact that sin subjected human bodies and souls to disorder and disease. By drawing strong
connections between sin and sickness, Lutheran writers opened the way to discussing parallels between salvation and healing.
Conclusion

Early modern Christians regarded body and soul as integrally related. Based on this view, they forged intricate explanations about why both were susceptible to disease, their openness to divine and diabolic influences, and the best way to cure and care for them.

In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, Lutheran thinkers in the Wittenberg Circle, like their contemporaries in other confessions, integrated intellectual inheritances from the Aristotelian *De anima* tradition, Galenic-Hippocratic medicine, the study of anatomy, and their own theological commitments. By doing so, these Lutheran thinkers helped to cultivate a field of study called *anthropologia*. Growing out of Philip Melanchthon’s influential views on the soul, natural philosophy, medicine, and theology, this discipline endeavored to synthesize anatomical, philosophical, and theological principles to explain the nature of human bodies and souls. A part of the basic curriculum for both future physicians and pastors, it inculcated ideas about body and soul shared across disciplines. At the same time, beginning in the first decades of the seventeenth century Lutheran theologians, physicians, and natural philosophers produced specialized texts in their individual fields with the term *anthropologia* enshrined in their titles. They developed it over time to reflect contemporary medical and theological debates.
Lutheran physicians attempted to understand bodies, souls, and the diseases to which they are subject in light of these overarching theological and natural philosophical commitments. To this end, they drew on two principal sources of authority: the Bible and medical theory. In so doing, Lutheran physicians in the Wittenberg Circle evinced their understanding of medicine as a part of a broader natural philosophical quest to understand the work of God in the world—in this case, in individual human bodies. From medical theory, they derived explanations of the functions of and effective treatments for body and soul. From the Bible, Lutheran physicians highlighted the importance of understanding medicine as a gift of God and disease as the result of sin. They also stressed that any natural philosophical or medical theory must uphold fundamental principles learned from scripture about human nature and God’s goodness in creating and maintaining the world. Even when, as in the case of certain occult diseases, one might attribute the cause of disease to the devil, Lutheran physicians contended that diabolic power was ultimately constrained by the sovereign power of God. Unlike God, the devil had no power outside of the ordinary course of nature.

Based on this intellectual foundation, Lutheran writers developed a rich and extensive literature that presented physicians as healers of body and of soul, imitators of Christus Medicus (a trope dating back to Augustine); and they spread learned ideas about body and soul in vernacular literature. In the former case, Lutherans advised both physicians and patients to recognize the dignity of the medical vocation, as a way of
honoring God and practicing charity. Both Lutheran physicians and pastors encouraged doctors to develop personal piety and to understand their task of healing as one directed to both the patient’s body and soul. In order for medicine to be effective, both physician and patient were not only to follow established medical principles for the body, but also to care for the health of their souls by means of faith and prayer. Learned teaching about body and soul made its way to the laity by way of popular vernacular books of piety and medicine. In addition, through sermons, commentaries, and devotional books Lutheran clergymen enjoined listeners and readers to see their bodies and souls as God’s gifts, and to understand and cope with diseases of body and soul in light of faith in God’s providential care for both.

In all, early modern Lutheran thinkers and writers worked to describe the relationship of body and soul by way of distinct yet overlapping theological, natural philosophical, and medical explanations. To understand this system, it is vital to avoid the instinct anachronistically to divide what they regarded as unified. Different disciplines were useful to them for understanding different aspects of body and soul. Nonetheless, learned Lutherans presented these various studies as parts of one all-encompassing pursuit: to understand the work of God in the world and in body and soul in light of reason (natural philosophy and medicine) and revelation (theology). In the course of this pursuit, Lutheran intellectuals found consolation and confronted paradoxes about how to reconcile reason and faith. They struggled, and sometimes
failed, to provide answers to the questions they posed. Even as specialized histories of science and religion written in isolation from each other reveal much about individual early modern disciplines, they occlude in some ways the questions these Lutheran thinkers raised, the hopes they had, and the ways in which they understood their bodies and souls to be places in which God worked.
Appendix A: “Anthropologia” 1500-1700


28. Samuel Haworth. *Ἀνθρωπολογία, Anthropology, or that Doctrine which Treats concerning Man, may rightly be divided into Two parts, viz. Pneumatology, which gives an account of his Soul, and Somatology, which is the Anatomy of his Body*. London, 1680.
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