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1. Introduction

1.1 A Very Brief Introduction to the Controversy

The Eucharistic controversy in Danzig (Dantzig) began in 1561, when the minister (Prediger) Erhard Sperber accused his colleague, Veit Neuber, of irreverent treatment of the remaining elements of the Lord’s Supper, and of rejecting a continuing real presence after communion. In response, Sperber was accused of a new sort of “Papism.” Anxious to avoid unrest, the city council started a process of investigation and interrogation in order to resolve the conflict. Sperber was deported, and Neuber later left the city. Among the clergy, however, the controversy over the understanding of the real presence and the practical treatment of the sacrament continued. It seems that popular opinion was in Sperber’s favor. The question of the duration of the presence evolved into questions of when and how the presence arose, and the relationship between the bread/wine and the body/blood. With regard to Eucharistic practice, the parties could agree on a complete consumption of the elements, but the disagreement on adoration of the sacrament within the Communion appears to have been unbridgeable. The council promulgated an official confessional document (die Notel) on the Eucharist in 1562. If they were to keep their offices, the ministers

1 The German terms “Abendmahl”, “Nachtmahl” appear frequently in my sources, but do not have any fully concordant synonym in English. I use several fairly equivalent English words, particularly the term “Eucharist.” This word is used by modern English-speaking Lutherans, and has the great linguistic advantage that it can be adjectivized. One should keep in mind that “Eucharist” might imply a stronger undertone of active celebration and thanksgiving than “Abendmahl,” which underlines the sacrament’s character of a meal. (Waaler: 2012, 25–26). However, the undertones of “Eucharist” seem not to have been alien to early Lutheranism, and fit the focus on the norms of practice in this work.

2 The sources show a diversity of titles denoting the clergy. The titles are at least partly used as synonyms. (See ch. 2.7.13.1). Some of the terms would be difficult to translate literally. In this work, the term “minister” is consistently used. This title seems sufficiently open to contain the different nuances of titles as a common denominator. For more on the ecclesiastical office and the Lord’s Supper, see ch. 3.5.
had to accept it, and the Neuberian majority of the local clergy approved it. However, the critique was not silenced, neither in nor outside the city. While the University of Wittenberg approved the confession, several central Lutheran theologians rejected it, such as Johannes Wigand, Matthias Flacius, and Benedict Morgenstern. It seems that the two last contributions in this controversy were published in 1567.

The furious tensions in the controversy are striking. The object of disagreement must have been regarded as something tremendously important. It was not only intellectualistic hairsplitting; it was an integral element of devotion, faith, identity, society and politics. When we study this controversy, it is natural to inquire into the background and the reason for the tensions, and the reason for the success of one of the parties. The present study hopes to shed light on central aspects of the diversity of early Lutheran tradition, and on the role of the Eucharistic controversies on the road to parallel and uniform confessions.

The Lutheran controversies in the second part of the 16th century, including those about the Lord’s Supper, were doctrinally important and consequential in general historical terms. The abhorrence and fear of idolatry and the focus on the integrity of Christ’s human nature clashed with the refusal to soften the proclamation of the “truly” real presence of the incarnate God in external means. The controversies shed light upon the early Reformation theological diversity, and on various strategies and interpretations of “true Christendom” in the context of secular and ecclesiastical challenges. The Eucharistic controversies involved doctrine and sacramental practice, connected to the ecclesiastical and to wider contexts. The belief in a sacramental real presence was connected to the question of how to deal with the divine presence. The Lutheran Eucharistic controversies were decisive factors in the development of mutually exclusive confessions and territorial states.

---

3 The term “Lutheran confession” and “Lutheranism” was first used by the Lutherans themselves from the 1560’s. (Kaufmann: 2006, 21). In this work, “Lutheran tradition” is used as a wide term denoting the tradition of the Wittenberg reformation from the beginning.

4 Dingel claims that the “decisive, crucial role of controversies that systematized and synthesized the teaching of Wittenberg theologians” has been “dismissed as unnecessary squabbles among theologians. Only recently have researchers begun to take seriously this culture of controversy as the decisive motor for the refinement of reformational teaching, as the occasion for a process of composing a variety of confessional documents, and as a determining factor in the final consolidation of the confessional churches.” Dingel: 2008, 15.

1.2 Approach and Perspectives

The controversy in Danzig was an inner-Lutheran controversy in a city outside the Empire. The sources show that Eucharistic practice was an integral part of the controversy. Lutheran Eucharistic adoration has not been frequently treated in church history, although the Danzig controversy has been presented by one scholar as a central part of “The great adoration controversy.”\(^6\) Confessionally and sacramentally conservative theologians have shown interest in the subject,\(^7\) but have focused mainly on the history of doctrine and systematic theology. Other historians have studied the controversy without much interest in the content of the discussions themselves. One example is Michael Müller, who has mentioned it as a part of the broader societal context of confessionalization and autonomy in Prussian cities.\(^8\) Müller does not go deeply into theology or sacramental practice, and the controversy covers only a small section of his work. This study is an attempt to see the controversy in a broader context, without losing sight of the depths of the thematic core: Eucharistic theology and practice.

The aim of this study is to take the Danzig Eucharistic controversy seriously as a theological dispute about the presence of Christ and Eucharistic practice, while at the same time properly acknowledging the Sacrament as a highly relevant social and political matter. The two main purposes of the following are thus:

- First, to analyze the theological content of the controversy in light of the ecclesiastical context, with particular focus on the relation between Eucharistic doctrine and norms of practice. The debate about the real presence will be understood more completely if we see it as a controversy in which doctrine and norms of worship are integrated. Bearing this in mind, the central place of the disagreement about adoration may give us a deeper understanding of the tensions about the Eucharist at that period.
- Second, to study the theological controversy in a broader context. The doctrine and practice of the Lord’s Supper were deeply related to culture, society and politics. The ecclesiastical controversy implies a sociopolitical relevance in itself, due both to the Lord’s Supper as a symbol of the unity of the Christian congregation and as a confessional marker, and to the ubiquity of religion. In addition, there are also several explicit references to the sociopolitical relevance in the doctrinal-polemical sources themselves.

I hope that these different approaches may enrich each other. A deeper understanding of the theological and ecclesiastical content of the controversy will

---

\(^7\) Cf. e.g. Hardt: 1971; Diestelmann: 1996; 2007.
\(^8\) Müller: 1997a.
strengthen the potential to find interesting connections to the broader societal context. The starting point of this study will be close readings of important printed doctrinal-polemical texts and of the council’s official confessional document. See the chapter on sources and method below.  

1.2.1 Structure

The first approach of this work (primarily the main chapters 2 and 4) consists of close readings of doctrinal-polemical texts as well as of the local confession, according to the first approach above. The sources are read in light of the theological tensions within the Lutheran ecclesiastical tradition. Eucharistic theology and norms of practice are in focus, particularly the ideas and arguments that seem to divide the parties. Some central themes are treated in depth during the close readings. Finally, in chapter 4, the controversy seen in the context of the subsequent development of Lutheranism.

The second approach (primarily the main chapter 3 and the Excursus in chapter 6) puts the controversy in a wider societal, political and cultural context. It is seen in relation to the Eucharist’s role as a symbol of the city community, its role as a confessional marker, and its relationship to secular and ecclesiastical authorities. The sacramental policy of the city council is studied in the context of strategic political interests connected to trade, and the city’s defense of their relative autonomy, as well as the potential correlation with sociopolitical tensions. The controversy is then seen in the context of the later developments of Lutheranism. Finally, the Excursus about an analogous controversy in England gives a glimpse of a wider Protestant context.

Let us now establish important research perspectives on which this book is based.

1.2.2 The Theological Context

The controversy was one of several inner-Lutheran controversies in the second part of the 16th century. It seems reasonable to consider the theological divergence between Luther (d. 1546) and Melanchthon (d. 1560), and an outside pressure from both a consolidated Reformed and a Roman tradition, as the basis for fierce inner-Lutheran controversies, which mainly concerned the doctrine of Justification, Christology and not least the Lord’s Supper.  

---

9 See ch. 1.3.
Lutheranism have traditionally been described as a division between “Philippists” and “Gnesio-Lutherans.”\footnote{11} To put it briefly: the divergence in Danzig seems to correspond to this central tension within Lutheran theology.

My description of this ecclesiastical context depends heavily on Dingel.\footnote{12} With regard to the theological understanding of other Eucharistic controversies of the 16th century, I rely heavily on Diestelmann,\footnote{13} who is highly sensitive to doctrinal nuances and Eucharistic practice. The context of ritual practices in diverse Lutheran church orders is mostly based on the work of Peters.\footnote{14} Confessional Lutheran church historians may be justly criticized in several ways, e.g. for a sometimes one-sided preoccupation with dogma, but in some regards, they have been concerned with aspects that have been overlooked or ignored by other scholars. It is my claim that some of these themes – like Lutheran Eucharistic adoration – are historically interesting and crucial because they really mattered in the 16th century. Whether they matter in the same way today is another question, and will not be answered here.

1.2.3 Ritual as Symbolization of Confessional Adherence

Bodo Nischan has showed how ritual contributed to the formation of Protestant identities.\footnote{15} The Elevation of the Host functioned as a Lutheran ritual demarcation against the Reformed in some instances,\footnote{16} while the act of breaking the bread became a Reformed ritual of demarcation.\footnote{17} Accusations of being respectively “Crypto-Papist” or “Crypto-Calvinist” were central in theological polemics. Eucharistic doctrine and practice played a major part in the symbolization of confessional adherence. The first day of distribution of Communion under both species was often celebrated as the day of introduction of the Reformation. The sacramental doctrine and form of the sacramental action became a litmus test of confessional adherence, with its deep societal relevance.

Nischan’s perspective on ritual demarcation is very relevant to the understanding of the eucharistic controversies. His concern is the practice of the ritual itself. This study acknowledges Nischan’s insights into the function of the ritual, and into ritual practice, which was connected to the theoretical polemics in Danzig. This study presupposes that although the theological controversy was

\begin{itemize}
  \item \footnote{11} See ch. 1.5.2.
  \item \footnote{12} Dingel: 2008.
  \item \footnote{13} Diestelmann: 1960; 1996; 2007.
  \item \footnote{14} Peters: 1968.
  \item \footnote{15} Nischan: 1996, 142–158.
  \item \footnote{16} Nischan: 1999, 1–27.
  \item \footnote{17} Nischan: 1984, 17–29.
\end{itemize}
about ritual norms, it carried in itself the potency and divisiveness of the ritual controversies. What was primarily a concern for the ecclesiastical elites became relevant to the broad masses, at the latest, when it was incarnated in practical ritual.

1.2.4 Confessionalization

The formation of different confessions may be seen as part of a greater societal process called confessionalization; the early modern mutual establishing of parallel territorial states (or autonomous cities) and the formation of parallel uniform confessions. The integration of early modern societies was widely based on confessional unity, and even the states’ foreign relations were heavily influenced by the states’ confessional alliances. The choice of confessional profile was a deeply politically relevant matter.

Michael Müller’s research is a central pillar for the part of my study that focuses on the societal context. Müller has studied the history of Danzig in light of the theory of confessionalization, and has shown how the confessional profile in Danzig changed from “pre-confessional” Philippism to explicit Calvinism and finally to orthodox Lutheranism. He claims that the early Lutheran confessionalization attained an even more polarizing effect in the cities of Royal Prussia than within the Empire, because the inner-urban controversies here were politicized not only by urban political and constitutional tensions, but also by the relationship to Polish Protestantism.

Danzig was one of the greatest German-dominated cities, and one of the leading cities of the Hanseatic League. It was the most important harbor in the Baltic region. The wealth of the city, primarily due to its role as a grain-exporting harbor, became the foundation for its extensive degree of autonomy as part of Royal Prussia under the Polish Crown. The first Reformation measures in Danzig in the 1520’s were connected to a sociopolitical rebellion against the ruling patrician elite that culminated in 1525. The King seized the opportunity and...

20 This process might be taken as a demonstration of the importance of the general context, and of the flexibility of theology. Alternatively, it might be a symptom of the flexibility of the relative correspondence between confessional self-presentation and central parts of the confessional ‘content’, doctrinal formulations and ecclesiastical practices. The transition from Philippism to Calvinism was not a dramatic turn. The Philippists were generally open towards broader parts of Protestantism, and they were already regarded by their opponents as ‘secret Calvinists’. With regard specifically to the Eucharist, the Philippists were more open to a moderation of the doctrine of the real presence.
intervened in 1526 to reconstitute the old order. Nevertheless, the Protestant spirit lived on unofficially until Danzig was granted religious freedom in 1557. From then on, the council tried to introduce the Reformation officially without importing the inner division and unrest they had seen elsewhere in Lutheranism. The council aimed at a “neutral” confessional status by choosing the moderate and irenic Philippist-Lutheran direction. The council tried to regulate the confessional development by a policy of active recruitment of “pious and learned” ministers from Wittenberg, but the study background was no guarantee of adherence to a specific theological direction. In addition, ministers with other backgrounds were received in the city as well. The passive and “neutral” confessional policy failed to secure local unity; on the contrary, it made room for the growth of theological divergence within the city. It resulted in three ecclesiastical controversies in Danzig between 1560 and 1573. The first was the protests against the council’s removal of the minister (Pfarrherr) Samuel Göbel (Gebel) in 1560, the second was the controversy about the Lord’s Supper from 1561, and the third about baptismal exorcism from 1569.

1.2.5 Culture

Although the theory of confessionalization has made invaluable contributions to Reformation history, it is supplemented here with other perspectives directed more specifically at the theological and cultural aspects of the controversy. Some scholars have criticized some uses of the confessionalization theory for being too functionalistic and state-oriented. Thomas Kaufmann is a central advocate for the scholarly interest in the cultural content of the confessional tradition. Like Kaufmann’s work, this study too shows a broad interest in a confessional tradition. Kaufmann has introduced the concept of “confessional culture” (Konfessionskultur) in which he combines the “hard” and specific term confession and the “soft” and wide term culture. In his opinion, the persistence and continued influence of the confessional cultures show that the confessional should not only be understood in relation to the formation of early modern territorial states.

23 Müller: 1997a, 223.
24 Müller: 1997a, 64.
27 Kaufmann: 2006.
changing historical circumstances makes it reasonable to talk about a specific Lutheran confessional culture, or in other words: a Lutheran “configuration” or “Deutungsmatrix, Symbolwelt oder Diskursform”. It is only possible to characterize the confessional culture as something “in, with and under” a diversity of manifestations. The continuous struggle between competing definitions of Lutheran doctrine is itself seen as a demonstration of Lutheran confessional culture. According to Kaufmann, the Lutherans were characterized by their “disputability,” that “both quantitatively and qualitatively” distinguished them from other confessions. He goes so far as to claim that: “from the perspective of history of theology Lutheran confessional culture should primarily be characterized as a culture of controversy and dissent.”

Thomas Kaufmann is concerned with the defense of the decisive and dynamic historical role of confessional culture, which should not simply be regarded as an instrument of the state. In the same way, I would add, it is crucial that the perspective of a “culture of controversy” does not become an excuse for a reductionist approach that will explain all Lutheran controversies exclusively as symptoms of a common propensity to quarrel. The notion of a confessional culture and “culture of controversy”, which has much to commend it, should be supplemented with an openness to the possibility of finding substantial (including cultural) differences within the one confessional culture.

This study is not concerned with the search for common features of a Lutheran confessional culture. It will, instead, elaborate the divergence within the Lutheran confessional culture in Danzig, and its wider implications. We will seek to show that the disagreement was not only about dogmatic subtleties. We may to a certain extent claim that it reveals two cultures concerning Eucharistic practice and piety, and the view of materiality, immanence and instrumentality. The focus on one inner-Lutheran controversy may contribute to the understanding of the diversity of early Lutheran tradition. My approach presupposes that the tradition of ecclesiastical theology functioned as a reservoir and as a limitation of Eucharistic theory and practice norms. The reservoir of tradition within the confessional limits was interpreted and negotiated in the local context. This also corresponds to Bridget Heal’s emphasis on the local context and thus the “ecology” of the manifestation of the confessional heritage.

31 Kaufmann: 2006, 18.
32 Kaufmann: 2006, 18–19.
I have made instrumental use of a rather eclectic range of scholarly work and perspectives where they actually contribute new insights for the understanding of the sources in a cultural context. For instance, with regard to the cultural and social meaning of the sacrament, particularly the sacrament and the symbolization of community, I rely considerably on Duffy, Rubin, and Bossy. Elwood has been used to show the symbolic implications of the Eucharistic theologies, while Poeck helps us see the connection between the city council rituals and the sacrament.

Bynum has demonstrated the medieval ambivalence about the materiality of sacred objects. Her focus was on the medieval complexity in this matter. A radically spiritual interiority was asserted and practiced, partly in opposition, and partly as a complement to the externalized religiosity in which the sacred was conveyed in matter. This paradox about material religiosity was amplified in the late Middle Ages and led to “a crisis of confidence in Christian materiality, out of which came a multitude of responses.” Although I have not made use of Bynum in the concrete analysis, this work may be seen as a contribution to the examination of Reformation diversity concerning the view of Christian materiality. The polemical writings reveal two different cultures concerning the relationship between sacred presence and materiality, to borrow the terms of cultural history. Bynum’s work shows that both the advocates of the real presence and the spiritualizing critique have their medieval precursors. However, the ambivalence toward the Eucharistic real presence in the Lutheran tradition was confessionalized in such a way that the opposing views implied different interpretations of a confessional identity, in contrast to others. This study cannot give the earlier, medieval traditions the attention they deserve, since even the closer context of Reformation tradition alone is richer than this study can possibly portray.

38 Poeck: 2003; 2009.
1.3 Sources and Method

I will prioritize a close reading of the most important printed sources to the controversy.\(^{41}\) Reading through the relevant source material revealed massive repetition and only marginal differences between most of the texts from the respective parties. I will therefore focus on the most important and representative printed texts from the beginning and the end of the controversy, in addition to the confession of the city council. The disadvantage, which should not be completely brushed aside, is that some details might be overlooked using this approach. On the other hand, more time can be spent reading the selected sources thoroughly and studying them in the light of broader contexts. If I had had more time and resources, it would have been a good idea to include, in addition to a close reading of all printed sources, all relevant archival sources in German and Polish archives and libraries. The point still remains that we must assume the printed sources to have had a much more significant effective history (\textit{Wirkungsgeschichte}). They were published, and they were most probably read, so that they had a greater impact.

The source texts are doctrinal-theological texts written by the ecclesiastical ministry. Except for the local confession, they are written against the opposite party and therefore have a certain polemical character. I presuppose that the source texts had both an explicit and an implicit relevance to society, politics and culture. At least on the ecclesiastical level, the controversy manifested itself in the production of written texts. Given my research aims, it is natural to start by reading the printed and distributed versions of these texts. The possible popular expressions of the controversy, with words or fists in the streets, at taverns and in homes, would be interesting, but is not covered by my selection of sources, although there are some references to popular reactions.\(^{42}\) Likewise, a systematic search and extensive use of German and Polish archival sources might have given more information on how the secular authorities, such as the Polish King, saw the controversy. However, the local confession at least gives a clear testimony to the stance of the city council. In short, the sources for this work are the ecclesiastical texts and the local confession, and I have to rely heavily on the research of others, especially when it comes to the broader cultural, societal and political contexts. The (almost) exclusive use of literature in English and German may have caused a ‘too German’ perspective, although a scholar like Michael Müller\(^{43}\) is really focused on the Polish context.

\(^{41}\) Archival material will be referred to only in a few cases, mainly as illustrations of themes drawn from main sources and secondary literature. See ch. 2.5.1; 2.7.10; 3.6.6.

\(^{42}\) See ch. 2.7.13.5; 3.3; Cf. ch. 3.7.

I have chosen not to use liturgical texts from Danzig. Practically speaking, small details like the treatment of consecrated materials and the expressions of adoration are mentioned in the Agendas only rarely. Such subjects are not treated in the short church order we know from Danzig of 1557. In this regard, the doctrinal polemics are probably more practical and concrete than many Agendas. Furthermore, it would be difficult and time-consuming, and perhaps impossible, to find the specific liturgy that most likely was used by the Lutheran ministers in the various churches in Danzig in this rather chaotic phase. Except for a short and not very interesting text from 1557, Danzig seems not to have had any common official Agenda in the entire 16th century.

Let us now consider which of the printed sources we should read in-depth, and why. The two confessions of the opposing parties from the beginning of the controversy were presented to the council after the council’s initiative in 1561, and they are selected as sources because of their parallel context regarding genre, time, situation, and recipient, and because they are sources from the beginning of the conflict. The Sperberian confession is printed in Benedict Morgenstern’s Refutation, while the Neuberian confession is printed in the Neuberian Apologia. There are two printed versions of the Neuberian Confession of 1561. One version is attached to the Widerlegung, and another attached to the Apologia. The latter has one subscriber more than the other. There are also other minor differences. Except for the differences in the title and the list of

44 EKO, IV, 181.
45 EKO, IV, 170.
50 The differences between the two versions are rather insignificant. Except for the difference in spelling, the version in Apologia mentions the subscribers as both “Prediger” and “Kirchendiener,” while the other version only mention the subscribers as “Kirchen Diener.” The version of the Apologia also names the Lord Jesus as “Heiland.” The most obvious difference is the description of the delivery of the confession to the Authorities. The version in the
subscribers, there are no substantial differences in the texts of the two versions. I will primarily use the version attached to the *Widerlegung*.

The Confession of the City Council from 1562,\textsuperscript{51} the Notel, has an obvious place among the central texts. The Notel is, as far as we know, the only confession produced by the civic authorities in this controversy, although the Apologia from 1567 is written with explicit support for the council and their Notel, according to the title. The Notel of 1562 was written by the council’s jurist, Dr Jacob von Barten, doctor of both civil and canon law.\textsuperscript{52} The Notel is selected as a source of the ecclesiastical policy of the urban authorities. It must be seen as part of the council’s action to govern the church and end the dispute. All of the local ministers were forced to sign it under threat of removal from office and deportation. We will also have a look at various Lutheran responses to the Notel, particularly Johannes Wigand’s judgement.\textsuperscript{53}

The Apologia from 1567\textsuperscript{54} was signed by the remaining ministers of Danzig in defense of the confession against Benedict Morgenstern’s Refutation (*Widerlegung*) from the same year. According to the title of the Apologia, it is written with “…wissen, zulass und zeugnis, eines Erbaren, Namhafften Hochweisen Raths in Druck vorferiget.”\textsuperscript{55} The ambition of the text is to be an apologia for the Notel, as the title shows, and it resembles both a polemical paper and a confession. The Apologia is not presented as a confession produced by the council; it is a final contribution from those ministers who are loyal to the council’s Eucharistic policy. The Apologia is an answer from one of the parties in a polemical dialogue, in contrast to the Notel, which appears largely to be above the polemics, and is meant to instruct all the ministers of Danzig in the true doctrine. The Apologia might therefore be regarded as one of the polemical texts, and it is chosen both because it is extensive, and because it is the last known contribution from the Neuberians during the controversy. It is useful to study this late text because it shows the Neuberian response to the arguments of their opponents, and of course, to the general situation by the end of the controversy.

The last known printed contribution from the Sperberians is the polemical text from 1567 written by the exiled minister Benedict Morgenstern, with a title

\textit{Apologia} states, “Einem Erbarn Wolweisen Rath daselbest übergeben,” while the other version states, “\textit{dem Presidenten oder Regierenden Bürgermeister Johann Brandes übergeben}.”

\textsuperscript{51} Textus Notulae. In addition, printed in Apologia, N4r–Ov, and in Hartknoch: 1686, 690–700.

\textsuperscript{52} Müller: 1997a, 67; Hartknoch: 1686, 690.

\textsuperscript{53} \textit{Von den Zwispaltungen deren zu Dantzig Censura vnd vrtheil Herrn Doctoris Johannis Wigandi Superintendenten zu Wissmar}. Printed in Benedict Morgenstern: 1567, P4r–S4r. In addition, we will have a look at the evaluations from the University of Wittenberg (Printed in Apologia, Q4r–Rv) and Joachim Mörlin (Den Ehrbaren vndt weißen Herren. HAB, Cod. Guelf. 64.33 Extrav. Nr. 5, 27r–29r).

\textsuperscript{54} Apologia.

\textsuperscript{55} Apologia, Ar.
that describes it as a refutation of the Notel.\textsuperscript{56} This was the text to which the Apologia was responding. As the latest paper from the Sperberians, it is selected on the basis of the same arguments that are used for the selection of the Apologia as a late text. The Refutation and the Apologia are related to each other, because the Apologia is a direct response to the Refutation from the same year; they are relatively parallel, and may therefore form a good basis for comparative perspectives. Both the Apologia and the Refutation contain substantial theological argumentation, historical résumés of the controversy from each perspective, and several attachments from other contributors. The Apologia and the Refutation are representative sources from the last part of the controversy.

The prioritization of two sources from the beginning and two sources from the end of the controversy provides a chronologically broad basis for our study, and may also reveal internal variation in the argumentation. Differences between texts within the same party may represent differences between individual authors and concrete contexts, or may indicate a development in theological thought. A personal continuity of subscribers must at any rate be admitted between the two selected Neuberian sources, since at least five of the ministers who signed the confession \textit{Christliche Bekentnis} in 1561 later signed the Apologia in 1567.\textsuperscript{57} On the other side, no one who had signed the Sperberian confession \textit{Bekentnis reiner Lehrer} in 1561 signed the \textit{Widerlegung} from 1567.\textsuperscript{58} The reason is obvious: Morgenstern was expelled from the town and could not sign the confession in Danzig in 1561, and the \textit{Widerlegung} from 1567 was written by him while he was living in Thorn. The other Sperberians were therefore not available as subscribers.

The following texts have been read, but are not prioritized in this study, since they contribute little additional aspects or argumentation:

- Erhard Sperber’s book of admonition to the council from 1561.\textsuperscript{59}
  - See short summary below.\textsuperscript{60}
- The Neuberians’ comment to the Sperberian confession.
  - Dated February 27, 1562.\textsuperscript{61}

\textsuperscript{56} \textit{Widerlegung der Notel}.
\textsuperscript{57} Apologia, 1567, G2r, Kk4v–Klr.
\textsuperscript{58} Benedict Morgenstern: 1567, 1567, Ar, Zr.
\textsuperscript{59} \textit{Trewe Warnung und Vermanung an die fromen Christen}. Printed in Christliche und notwendige, Lv.
\textsuperscript{60} See fn. 112, p. 33.
\textsuperscript{61} \textit{Betrachtung der Confession unsers Gegenparts, so den rechten verstand der Regel Nihil habet rationem Sacramenti extra usum diuinitus institutum angefochten, vnd fuer die Reliquias gestritten, ubergeben den 27 Februarij 1562}. Printed in Apologia, G4v. Also printed with the title: \textit{Widerlegug[sic] dadurch die Sacramentirer zu Danzig vorgehendes Bekendnis der reinen Lehrer zu widerlegen sich unterstanden haben}. [Signed by, Johannes Weidner, M. Alexander]