LUND UNIVERSITY

Confessional Knowledge

How might the History of Knowledge and the History of Confessional Europe influence each other?

Brilkman, Kajsa

Published in:
Forms of Knowledge

2020

Document Version:
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Link to publication

Citation for published version (APA):
Brilkman, K. (2020). Confessional Knowledge: How might the History of Knowledge and the History of Confessional Europe influence each other? In J. Östling, D. L. Heidenblad, & A. N. Hammar (Eds.), *Forms of Knowledge: Developing the History of Knowledge* (pp. 26-49). Nordic Academic Press.

Total number of authors:
1

Confessional knowledge

How might the history of knowledge and the history of confessional Europe influence each other?

Kajsa Brilkman

The history of knowledge understands knowledge more broadly than being equivalent to modern science.[1] Some have argued that such a wider concept of knowledge could also include religion.[2] In given historical contexts, what we speak of today as 'religion' was so structuring for people's actions and their understanding of their surroundings it assumed the same role as science in modern society. Some scholars in recent years have shown how the history of knowledge and the concept of 'religious knowledge' can breathe new life into the study of the relationship between science and religion in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.[3] Thus, the potential of the history of knowledge is found to be cross-disciplinary, transcending the boundary between the study of religious conceptions and of rational ideas.[4]

Despite the notion that religious conceptions can be an object of study in the history of knowledge, however, early modern religion has been generally overlooked. I think one reason for this is that the term 'religion' is an imprecise concept for the forms of religious conceptions current in Europe in the sixteenth to the nineteenth centuries. In this paper, therefore, I reflect on the concept of confessional knowledge as a tool for analysing the context-specific variants of Christianity that appeared in early modern Europe, and combine it with a history of knowledge perspective. I discuss what research on early modern confessions can

bring to the history of knowledge, and how the history of knowledge can contribute to research on Christian confessions.

Confessional knowledge

Western Christianity underwent a transformation in the sixteenth century, when it split into three main confessions (the Catholic, the Lutheran, and the Reformed). These confessions were what structured religious conceptions after the Reformation. The process was roughly as follows.[5] The purpose of questioning papal indulgences, as Martin Luther did, was to prompt a discussion within the Church. His criticism, however, led not to a discussion; rather, Luther was labelled a heretic. The question of indulgences, which had arisen within the framework of the new doctrine of grace, which several Wittenberg professors had helped develop, soon became a matter of the Pope's authority. As such, the conflict between the various camps could never be resolved. A very successful self-advertiser, Luther gained strong support and became increasingly radical in his views. Although two camps formed very soon, they were not defined by dogma, and they regarded themselves to be the universal Church. After a military confrontation, the conflict was temporarily resolved in the Holy Roman Empire by the Imperial Diet in Augsburg in 1555, where the followers of Confessio Augustana were granted the right to exercise their faith. This recognition had an impact on the Protestants' position in the rest of Europe.

In the mid century the conflict entered a new phase. The starting point was now that the different churches were a fact: the battle was no longer about how the universal church should be designed, but about the power relationship between competing confessions. To define one another, it became increasingly important to define (based on standardized, written confessions) which theological positions were true and which could not be accepted.[6] In the later sixteenth century, three major confessions crystallized: the Roman Catholic, the Lutheran, and the Reformed. They each maintained an absolute claim of truth and created documents where this was maintained: for the Catholic Church, the Council of Trent was crucial; for the Lutheran Church, the Formula

concordiae; and for the Reformed churches, the Confessio Helvetica, among others.[7] These in turn generated texts, practices, and concepts that together constituted a cluster, often called confessional culture.

Any history of knowledge that seeks to examine religious concepts in early modern Europe has to take into account these context-specific variants of Christianity, with parallel and competing absolute truth claims made by representatives of the various confessions. A concept such as 'religious knowledge' may not be sufficiently sensitive to this context-specific variant, while 'confessional knowledge' may capture knowledge production for the specific variant of Christianity that occurred after Reformation.[8]

The distinction between religious knowledge and confessional knowledge also fuels the discussion about how the concept of knowledge should be understood. Most scholars seem to endorse a definition of knowledge as 'what at some point is understood as knowledge'.[9] Without rejecting this definition outright, Lorraine Daston writes that it is unsatisfactory, because it tries to grasp too much. She points out that in all cultures there are:

> implicit systematics of knowledge, starting with an epistemological hierarchy (often intertwined with a social hierarchy) of which kinds of knowledge are more or less valued, by whom, and why. These hierarchies also rank knowledge and the epistemic virtues they are expected to display.[10]

She sees knowledge as systematized knowing in a historical context, given that different historical contexts hold different knowledge to be important, and that this knowledge should be systematized. She thus makes the systematization (and not the subjective understanding of historical agents) the crucial criterion when defining knowledge. The question then becomes how best to elaborate on the context in which a certain type of knowing is systematized and shaped into knowledge. The distinction between religious knowledge and confessional knowledge in the early modern period serves as an example of Daston's definition of the object of history of knowledge: confessions were a specifically early modern way of systematizing the Christian faith. Religion was systematized and

became confessional. Confessional knowledge is the systematic knowledge of creation and salvation that was developed in the framework of the early modern confessions. That salvation was only offered as a gift from God was one example of Lutheran confessional knowledge, as was the statement that the Reformers had antecedents in the Late Middle Ages who, like Martin Luther and subsequent reformers, had preached the gospel but were persecuted by the Roman Catholic Church.

Any definition of confessional knowledge necessarily begs the question of what the concept can contribute to the history of knowledge, and indeed to research on confessional Europe. I see the concept of confessional knowledge as an adaptation of the concept of kowledge to a particular historical context, and therefore a tool in the history of knowledge. One can imagine a plethora of attributes, such as 'sexual knowledge' or 'political knowledge of subsidies';[11] however, the point here is not to define separate research fields, but to make the concept of knowledge useful in a specific context.

What research on confessional Europe can offer a history of knowledge

The competing confessions generated texts, practices, and concepts that together constituted a cluster that is often referred to as confessional culture.[12] Primarily, it is the Lutheran confessional culture that has been studied.[13] In that sense, it bears clear similarities to the issues facing the history of knowledge: how did certain forms of knowing come to be regarded as knowledge (even if one does not term it knowledge, and instead speaks of it as Lutheran theology)? Which agents, institutions, and practitioners collaborated in the process? In what follows, I will look at the answers given in the research on early modern Lutheranism, at how researchers have addressed the creation of confessional norms, and which agents and institutions were involved in making those truth claims, and in the process I will chart how Lutheran confessional culture can be studied as an example of religious concepts that had the status of systematic confessional knowledge in early modern society. Thus,

Daston's definition of the subject matter of the history of knowledge is found to extend far beyond modern scientific knowledge.

The early modern confessions emerged after a long process in which certain doctrinal standards were given the status of truth—as doctrine. Examples of confessional documents have already been discussed in the text. However, attempts to standardize the various belief systems in writing, and thus fix them, never fully succeeded. For example, the Formula of Concord of 1577, the statement of faith drawn up in order to achieve Lutheran unity, was a source of bitter and prolonged strife.[14]

Lutheranism was realized in territorial churches that were unrelated to one another, and thus lacked uniform dogmatics and any real institutional centre (unlike Catholicism). The absence of central agents and shared institutions that had at least the appearance of being norm-regulated meant local agents and institutions were the more important. Above all, this was true for the professors of theology at the Lutheran territorial universities, who took on the role of chief interpreters of scripture as well as correctors, advisers, and educators.[15] The main task of this cluster of local agents and institutions was to maintain, manage, and disseminate the true doctrine. Except the professors these clusters included village schools, superintendents, and parish priests. The universities had a central role in training parish priests, who in turn were responsible for teaching parishioners about Christianity, through preaching, worship, and the catechism.

In relation to the defined confession, a canon of texts emerged that was considered to be better communicators of the confessional knowledge than others. The catechism has already been mentioned as such a text. In Lutheran territories, the canonization of text became an important instrument in preserving and disseminating confessional knowledge. Since the Protestants recognized the authority of scripture alone, and not of the Pope and the councils, in matters of doctrine, they were bereft of such norm-regulating institutions. Scripture proved intractable as a norm. Luther and the professors at the University of Wittenberg and other nearby Lutheran universities took it upon themselves to establish the norms, but Luther's death meant that this norm-regulating function halted, leaving the Lutheran leadership to rancorous division. Instead of

Luther in person, the Lutherans turned to his texts as the norm-giving authority. What followed was an intense effort to preserve, disseminate, and protect Luther's texts. This resulted in a series of florilegium, and the first editions of Luther's collected works, which were published in one edition in Wittenberg and one in Jena.[16]

This confessional knowledge was far from merely theoretical, rather it permeated society, politics, and everyday life. Systematized knowledge was made into a lived practice. In preaching and catechesis, Lutheran dogmatics became social norms and an integral part of people's life-worlds. Doctrine and life existed in close relation to each other:[17] confessional knowledge characterized the practices of marriage, household, and princely power.

The maintenance of confessional knowledge was linked to various mechanisms designed to counteract distortion or the questioning of the truth, and which included censorship and residence laws to exclude other confessions.[18] Here again the professors of theology played an important role, as they were often called in as experts to investigate whether or not certain documents were compatible with true doctrine.

These various expressions of knowledge formation and institutionalization constituted a first draft of what could be subsumed into the concept of confessional knowledge—a concept that thus clarifies how a particular form of knowledge in early modern Europe was systematized and institutionalized to have the maximum impact on society. Seen in this way, the study of confessional knowledge feeds into the history of knowledge. If the history of knowledge is more than the modern concept of knowledge, free of religious belief, and instead stretches far beyond, the concept of confessional knowledge is a way of capturing knowledge's role in the religious divisions of early modern Europe.[19] An early modern history of knowledge can thus be more than the early modern history of science.[20] Research on confessional Europe can contribute to the history of knowledge, making good on the promise that the history of knowledge is more than history of science in new clothing.

What history of knowledge can offer
research on confessional Europe

Having established what the study of confessional Europe can offer the history of knowledge, the opposite remains: what is the influence of the history of knowledge on research on confessional Europe? Although the history of knowledge can draw impetus from research on confessional Europe, the concepts of confessional culture and confessional knowledge seem to be interchangeable, and thus a history of knowledge approach would not have much to give the study of early modern confessions, since what is studied as the history of knowledge has already been studied, just by a different name. The concept of confessional knowledge trains the spotlight on the status of religious confessions as knowledge, but, one might think, offers no new perspective for the study of confessional Europe. It is not that simple, though.

In answering, however, my ambition is not to develop a new, alternative model for the study of confessional Europe, but rather to contribute to the debate in which scholars together seek new ways to solve set problems. Birgit Emich and Matthias Pohlig have recently pointed out that the concept of confessional culture is in need of further theorizing.[21] I draw inspiration from this debate, and use some of the tools from the history of knowledge to contribute to it. First, however, an overview of the concept of confessional culture, and something about its criticism.

The concept of confessional culture was developed in the late 1990s and early 2000s by Thomas Kaufmann, and, while not always explicit, has clear links to 'the cultural turn' in history. It was formulated as a criticism of the starting point of the concept of confessionalization that the different confessions had structural similarities, which made it difficult to study the specifics of the different confessions. Kaufmann used his concept to study the interpretive frameworks, symbolic worlds, worldviews, self-understandings, enemy images, and lifeworlds that were the specifics of early Lutheranism, seeking to bridge the tension implied by previous research between the theology produced by the elite and the lived world. Confessional culture arises when the written confession meets and adapts to different lifeworlds, Kaufmann writes.[22] This

means that the written confession to some extent stands as a producer of culture in Kaufmann's concept, although he emphasizes that culture is not equivalent to the confession, but takes different forms in different contexts. Confession and lifeworld are not identical, but in the lifeworld, the expression of the confession is transformed to fit the specific context.[23] The concept of confessional culture intended to capture both the specificity of Lutheranism and the plurality of expressions that this unity gave rise to. To explain the connection between the two, he uses a model of concentric circles, where the Lutheran identity is at its strongest in the centre, becoming weaker the further away from the centre one is.[24] When Pohlig summarizes this, he writes that research on confessional culture explores 'Diffusion—including the transformation—of official confessional requirements into social and cultural contexts'.[25]

Closely linked to this are Kaufmann's thoughts on central and peripheral relations in different geographical territories. He formulated a dissemination model of Lutheran confessional culture that had the Lutheran territories of the Holy Roman Empire as the centre of cultural production, and Scandinavia, among others, as the recipients.[26] Steffie Schmidt counters by pointing to some examples when the reverse was true, theologians in Scandinavia were producers of 'culture' for their German colleagues. However, as she shows, this was rather the exception than the norm.[27]

In the debate about confessional culture, Pohlig and Emich note the difficulties with the concept of confessional culture used thus far: that it is poor at analysing processes; that it is based on an essentialist understanding of confessions of faith, which means that it does not permit an analysis of how confessions were situated; and that it cannot wholly resolve the inherent tension between Lutheran unity and Lutheran plurality.[28] One way of tackling these problems—especially the question of unity or plurality—is to draw inspiration from the history of knowledge, a field where analyses of movement and changes in knowledge are central, and the starting point is that knowledge is not produced and then communicated, but rather that the relationship between production and communication is circular.[29] This can be linked to the

fact that movement and circulation have been mentioned increasingly frequently in historical investigations in the 2000s.[30]

A circular understanding of the confessional knowledge transfer processes could provide tools that could resolve some of this. Possibly, the concept of confessional knowledge could serve as a bridge between research on confessional Europe and on the history of knowledge. If confession is seen as the essence of a culture, as Kaufmann has formulated the concept, the culture is to some extent based on the confession. The unity of confessional culture is then seen as something that can be found in a core that then diffuses. By extension, this means that the production of meaning in confessional culture is seen as a contextual interpretation of the normed confession. However, the concept of circulation points to the fact that knowledge is not produced and then communicated, but that there is constant feedback which sees knowledge reinforced, clarified, or gone. Hence, the meaning-creating function does not accrue to the content as much as to the circular relationship between production and communication.

I would argue that such a circular understanding of meaning-making is difficult to reconcile with the notion that Lutheran confessional culture has certain elements that are at its core or that form a common ground and create unity. If the meaning-creating function is a circular relationship between production and communication, confessional culture cannot be understood as something that arises when that confession, which exists as the written word, operates in a lifeworld; instead, it must be studied as a constantly changing product of the circular production and communication process that was integral to early modern Lutheranism. By studying this process rather than 'culture', the history of knowledge is partially freed from the framework of cultural history.

The value of such an approach will be determined by empirical studies. I would argue it can be useful for understanding the relationship between learned theologians and the local communities. It can also be used to shed new light on the connections between different Lutheran territories. My own research on translations of Lutheran literature from German to Swedish and Danish around 1600 gives examples of the latter.[31] The translations—which accounted for a significant proportion of the

Swedish- and Danish-language publications in print at this point—have largely been seen as examples of the spread of Lutheranism from the centre of the Holy Roman Empire to the periphery of Scandinavia.[32] A closer analysis, however, problematizes this sort of linear distribution. Studies of book production show that confessional knowledge, meaning normed and systematic confessional Lutheranism, is not disseminated in straight lines. In Lutheranism, the communication of confessional knowledge is better understood as agenda setting, as certain texts or sections of text became and remained important (or were dropped) according to whether agents chose to reproduce them (or not). At the same time, each reproduction of that knowledge always meant a change, sometimes linked to the communication opportunities offered by the chosen medium.

A few examples will suffice to illustrate this. Martin Luther left behind a tremendous amount of writing in print.[33] The translations of Luther's works in the second half of the sixteenth century did not reflect the full range of his textual production, however. Some texts were the subject of translations, compilations, and new editions; the majority were not. It should be no surprise that Luther's *Small Catechism* belonged to this group of frequent reproductions, but there were others.[34] If one studies the publication of Luther's texts in Northern Europe in this period, it was common for one such print to be accompanied by another of the same text. It seems that the deciding factor in whether a text was reproduced in one territory was that it had already been printed in another.[35] This circulation of texts in the Lutheran sphere, whether in translation or as new editions, is only partially known today. Older bibliographic research tends to be national, listing works published in a defined language area, and only occasionally with notes on editions in other languages. This is compounded by the fact that the bibliographic works do not always list which texts were included in compilations, largely because the compilers had not specified which works they had excerpted.

Luther's *Ob man für dem sterben fliehen muge* can serve as an example. The Weimar edition of Luther's collected works lists nine editions in German in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, after it was first printed in 1527.[36] As early as 1534, the text was published in Danish in

Malmö, in 1577 it was included in a Danish compilation, in 1588 it was translated into Swedish, in 1619 subject to a new Danish translation, in 1623 another Swedish translation, and in 1658 it was part of a Danish compilation.[37] Luther's text was frequently referred to in texts on the medical arts.[38] The point here is that central elements of what is usually called Lutheran confessional culture—in this case, the content of a text or Luther's role as an authority—only became central because of a circular relationship between production and communication.

Consider too the many editions and translations of Girolamo Savonarola's *Miserere mei Deus.* He wrote the text shortly before his execution in Florence in 1498, and it was published soon after. In the early sixteenth century, it was published repeatedly in Latin, Italian, and German—including an edition in Latin, printed in Wittenberg in 1523, with a Latin preface by Luther.[39] In the preface, Luther emphasized that Savonarola had not put his trust in his own good deeds for his salvation, but only in the grace of God. Luther went on that Savonarola had spread the gospel among the people, but that he had been thwarted by the Pope, who had him executed.[40]

Luther's foreword and praise of Savonarola led to his inclusion in the Lutheran canon. He was portrayed in Lutheran texts as Luther's predecessor, as a martyr who died for pure doctrine, and an example of how the Pope killed those who preached the truth. Savonarola was incorporated into Lutheran historiography and subsequently made into an advocate of the Reformation. One step in this process was the translation and dissemination of Savonarola's texts, and especially *Miserere mei Deus*—duly provided with forewords that placed him in the context of the Lutheran historical writing described above. Between 1522 and 1580, 46 editions were published, mostly in Latin, followed by German and English, along with Italian, Flemish, and Spanish. It was not only Lutheran Europe that read Savonarola, then, but it was there that the translations were accompanied by the presentation of him as Luther's predecessor. However, the most successful version of Savonarola's text was not Luther's edition, but the translation into German published by Johann Spangenberg in 1542 (and published without Luther's foreword). It was also this text that was the source for the Danish translation of

1551, the Swedish translation of 1591, and probably the Dutch publication of 1548.[41]

The many editions and translations of Savonarola are by no means unknown to scholars, but in this context they confirm the importance of translations, editions, and paratexts in establishing Savonarola as an important reference point. The interpretation of Savonarola's work was decisive per se, but the same was also true of the practice of reproduction and recontextualization, and thus the circulation of his texts in Lutheranism. The idea that Savonarola was Luther's forerunner was launched by Luther himself in his foreword of 1523, and continued in successive editions, publications, and translations throughout the sixteenth century and into the seventeenth—but without Luther's own foreword.

By analysing such patterns of circulation (or partially interrupted circulation), where production and communication were intertwined, early modern Lutheranism not only appears as the sum of its cultural, confessional variants, but as a product of lasting practices. The tension between unity and plurality could possibly be resolved, to be replaced by a situated understanding of the confessions. These examples are by no means exhaustive, but indicate a possible direction for research to take.

Final reflections

I have reflected on what two different fields can learn from each other in solving the challenges both fields are facing. It is not my intention to argue that the two fields should merge, only that both can find new impulses by studying each other. The history of knowledge could fulfil its promise of being more than the history of science, for example by incorporating the study of early modern confessional knowledge. Research on early Lutheran confessional culture has largely been based on diffusion models, with a centre that is meaning-producing, which then spreads it to the periphery, transforming the meaning in the process and adapting it to the context of the periphery. The concept of circulation, which sees the production and communication of meaning as mutually dependent, offers an opportunity to think outside such a diffusion model. I have therefore drawn on examples of what a circular

understanding of meaning-making in the early modern confessions can be. It is possible that the tension between unity and plurality, which has been recently discussed and which is embedded in the concept of culture, can be resolved.

I also introduce a new concept: confessional knowledge. I would argue that as a concept it is more useful than religious knowledge when analysing the systematization of knowledge on which the early modern confessions were based, and which resulted in competing truth claims. It is for future research to determine the extent to which these reflections can be used empirically.

Notes

1 See, for example, Lorraine Daston, 'The History of Science and the History of Knowledge', *KNOW* 1/1 (2017).

2 Philipp Sarasin, 'Was ist Wissensgeschichte?', *Internationales Archiv für Sozialgeschichte der Deutschen Literatur* 36 (2011), 165; Simone Lässig, 'The History of Knowledge and the Expansion of the Historical Research Agenda', *Bulletin of the GHI* 59 (2016), 47; Johan Östling & David Larsson Heidenblad, 'Cirkulation—ett kunskapshistoriskt nyckelbegrepp', *Historisk tidskrift* 137/2 (2017), 269; see also many examples in Peter Burke, *A Social History of Knowledge: From Gutenberg to Diderot* (Cambridge: Polity, 2000).

3 See, for instance, Kerstin von der Krone, 'The Duty to Know: Nineteenth-Century Jewish Catechisms and Manuals and the Making of Jewish Religious Knowledge', History of Knowledge, 1 September 2019, https://historyofknowledge.net/2018/06/03/the-duty-to-know/; Simone Lässig, 'Religious Knowledge and Social Adaptability in the Face of Modernity', History of Knowledge, 1 September 2019, https://historyofknowledge.net/2017/07/21/religious-knowledge-and-social-adaptability-in-the-face-of-modernity/.

4 Problems that this division between religion and rational ideas create have recently been noticed in a Swedish context by Anton Jansson & Hjalmar Falk, 'Religion i det svenska idéhistorieämnet: Översikt och reflektion', *Lychnos* (2017).

5 Newer works depicting this process are Thomas Kaufmann, *Geschichte der Reformation* (Frankfurt am Main: Verlag der Weltreligionen, 2009); and Heinz Schilling, *Martin Luther: Rebell in einer Zeit des Umbruchs* (Munich: C. H. Beck Verlag, 2012).

6 Confessionalization has been much studied in recent decades. Key works include Heinz Schilling, 'Die Konfessionalisierung im Reich: Religiöser und gesellschaft-

licher Wandel in Deutschland zwischen 1555 und 1620', *Historische Zeitschrift* 246/1 (1988); Wolfgang Reinhardt, 'Was ist katholische Konfessionalisierung?', in Wolfgang Reinhard & Heinz Schilling (eds.), *Die katholische Konfessionalisierung: Wissenschaftliches Symposion der Gesellschaft zur Herausgabe des Corpus Catholicorum und des Vereins für Reformationsgeschichte 1993* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1995). A critical discussion of the concept is Anton Schindling, 'Konfessionalisierung und Grenzen von Konfessionalisierbarkeit', in Anton Schindling & Walter Ziegler (eds.), *Die Territorien des Reichs im Zeitalter der Reformation und Konfessionalisierung: Land und Konfession 1500–1650*, vii: *Bilanz – Forschungsperspektiven – Register* (Münster: Aschendorff, 1997). In English see Ute Lotz-Heumann, 'Confessionalization', in David M. Whitford (ed.), *Reformation and Early Modern Europe: A Guide to Research* (Kirksville: Truman State University Press, 2007); Heinz Schilling, 'Confessional Europe', in Thomas A. Brady, Heiko A. Oberman & James D. Tracy (eds.), *Handbook of European History. 1400–1600*, ii: *Visions, Programs and Outcomes* (Leiden: Brill, 1995).

7 For a more in-depth discussion of Lutheranism in this context, see Irene Dingel, 'The Culture of Conflict in the Controversies Leading to the Formula of Concord (1548–1580)', in Robert Kolb (ed.), *Lutheran Ecclesiastical Culture: 1550–1675* (Leiden: Brill, 2008); Irene Dingel, *Concordia controversa: Die öffentlichen Diskussionen um das lutherische Konkordienwerk am Ende des 16. Jahrhunderts* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1996).

8 Renate Dürr, Annette Gerok-Reiter, Andreas Holzem & Steffen Patzold (eds.), *Religiöses Wissen im vormodernen Europa: Schöpfung – Mutterschaft – Passion* (Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh 2019), which uses 'religious knowledge' as a tool to analyse knowledge production, consumption and practices in the premodern world. They argue that this religious knowledge was a basis for modernity. For a specific use in the early modern era I still think that 'confessional knowledge' better highlights the tensions between the confessions.

9 Martin Mulsow, 'History of Knowledge', in Marek Tamm & Peter Burke (eds.), *Debating New Approaches to History* (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2019), 160–161; Lässig, 'The History of Knowledge', 33.

10 Lorraine Daston, 'History of Knowledge: Comment', in Marek Tamm & Peter Burke (eds.), *Debating New Approches to History* (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2019), 176; see also Burke, *A Social History of Knowledge*, 11.

11 Kari Hernæs Nordberg, 'The Circulation and Commercialization of Sexual Knowledge: The Celebrity Sexologists Inge and Sten Hegeler', in Johan Östling, Erling Sandmo, David Larsson Heidenblad, Anna Nilsson Hammar & Kari Nordberg (eds.), *Circulation of Knowledge: Explorations in the History of Knowledge* (Lund: Nordic Academic Press, 2018); Erik Bodensten, 'Political Knowledge in Public

Circulation: The Case of Subsidies in Eighteenth-Century Sweden', in Östling et al. *Circulation of Knowledge.*

12 Michael Maurer, *Konfessionskulturen: Die Europäer als Protestanten und Katholiken* (Paderborn: Verlag Ferdinand Schöningh, 2019).

13 Thomas Kaufmann, *Konfession und Kultur: Lutherischer Protestantismus in der zweiten Hälfte des Reformationsjahrhunderts* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006); Thomas Kaufmann, 'What is Lutheran Confessional Culture?', in Per Ingesman (ed.), *Religion as an Agent of Change: Crusades—Reformation—Pietism* (Leiden: Brill, 2016); see also the articles in 'Themenschwerpunkt/Focal Point: Frühneuzeitliche Konfessionskultur', *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 109 (2018).

14 Dingel, *Concordia controversa.*

15 Kenneth G. Appold, 'Academic Life and Teaching in Post-Reformation Lutheranism', in Robert Kolb (ed.), *Lutheran Ecclesiastical Culture, 1550–1675* (Leiden: Brill, 2008); Thomas Kaufmann, *Universität und lutherische Konfessionalisierung: die Rostocker Theologieprofessoren und ihr Beitrag zur theologischen Bildung und kirchlichen Gestaltung im Herzogtum Mecklenburg zwischen 1550 und 1675* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1997).

16 Robert Kolb, *Martin Luther as Prophet, Teacher, and Hero: Images of the Reformer, 1520–1620* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1999); Stefan Michel, *Die Kanonisierung der Werke Martin Luthers im 16. Jahrhundert* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016); Ernst Koch, 'Lutherflorilegien zwischen 1550 und 1600: Zum Lutherbild der ersten nachreformatorischen Generation', *Theologische Versuche* 16 (1986).

17 For early modern Lutheranism, see Sabine Holtz, *Theologie und Alltag: Leben und Lehre in den Predigten der Tübinger Theologen 1550–1750* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1993); Norbert von Haag, Sabine Holtz & Wolfgang Zimmermann (eds.), *Ländliche Frömmigkeit: Konfessionskulturen und Lebenswelten 1500–1850* (Stuttgart: Thorbecke, 2002); Kolb, *Lutheran Ecclesiastical Culture.*

18 Hans-Peter Hasse, *Zensur theologischer Bücher in Kursachsen im konfessionellen Zeitalter: Studien zur kursächsischen Literatur- und Religionspolitik in den Jahren 1569 bis 1575* (Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2000).

19 Burke, *A Social History of Knowledge* gives many examples of confessionally divded Europe, but the perspective can be deepened.

20 The concept of knowledge has been used in the field of early modern science history. This research is in no way blind to the confessional, but the perspective could be deepened. See, for example, Arndt Brendecke, *Imperium und Empirie: Funktionen des Wissens in der spanischen Kolonialherrschaft* (Cologne: Böhlau, 2009).

21 Birgit Emich & Matthias Pohlig, 'Früheneuzeitliche Konfessionskultur(en): Stand und Zukunft eines Konzepts', *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 109 (2018), 373–374.

22 The most commonly used definition of the concept confessional culture is found

in Thomas Kaufmann, *Dreißigjähriger Krieg und Westfälischer Friede: Kirch-engeschichtliche Studien zur lutherischen Konfessionskultur* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), 7: 'Formungsprozeß einer bestimmten, bekenntnisgebundenen Auslegungsgestalt des christlichen Glaubens in die vielfältigen lebensweltlichen Ausprägungen und Kontexte hinein.' See also Kaufmann, *Konfession und Kultur,* 3–26.

23 Kaufmann, *Konfession und Kultur*, 10–12; Matthias Pohlig, 'Luthertum und Lebens-führung: Konfessionelle 'Prägungen' und das Konzept der Konfessionskultur', in Bernd Jochen Hilberath, Andreas Holzem & Volker Leppin (eds.), *Vielfältiges Christentum: Dogmatische Spaltung – kulturelle Formierung – ökumenische Überwindung?* (Leipzig: Evangelischer Verlagsanstalt, 2016), 76, 77.

24 Kaufmann, 'What is Lutheran Confessional Culture', 132.

25 Pohlig, 'Luthertum und Lebensführung', 75. (German original: 'Diffusion—also auch der Transformation—obrigkeitlicher Konfessionalisierungsvorgaben in soziale und kulturelle Kontexte hinein.')

26 Kaufmann, *Konfession und Kultur*, 24.

27 Steffie Schmidt, *Professoren im Norden: Lutherische Gelehrsamkeit in der Frühen Neuzeit am Beispiel der theologischen Fakultäten in Kopenhagen und Uppsala* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2018).

28 Birgit Emich, 'Konfession und Kultur, Konfession als Kultur? Vorschläge für eine kulturalistische Konfessionskultur-Forschung', *Archiv für Reformations-geschichte* 109 (2018), 379; Matthias Pohlig, 'Harter Kern und longue durée: Überlegungen zum Begriff der (lutherischen) Konfessionskultur', *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 109 (2018), 397–399.

29 Östling et al., *Circulation of Knowledge*; David Larsson Heidenblad, 'Framtids-kunskap i circulation: Gösta Ehrensvärds diagnos och den svenska framtids-debatten, 1971–1972', *Historisk tidskrift* 135/4 (2015), 618; Andreas B. Kilcher & Philipp Sarasin, 'Editorial', *Nach Feierabend: Züricher Jahrbuch für Wissens-geschichte Zirkulationen* 7 (2011) , 9–10.

30 See, for example, James Secord, 'Knowledge in Transit' *Isis* 95/4 (2004).

31 The project 'Mare Lutheranum: The Book Market and Lutheran Confessional Culture around the Baltic Sea 1570–1620' is funded by the Swedish Research Council (2016–2019).

32 Stina Hansson, '*Afsatt på svensko': 1600-talets tryckta översättningslitteratur* (Gothenburg: Litteraturvetenskapliga institutionen, 1982); Kaufmann, *Konfession und Kultur*, 24.

33 *Martin Luthers Werke. Kritische Gesamtausgabe* (Weimar: Hermann Böhlaus Nachfolger, 1883–2009) (Weimarer Ausgabe, henceforth WA).

34 Nina Javette Koefoed, 'Emotions, Obligations and Identities within the Lutheran Household: From Luther's Small Catechism to Cultural and Social Responsi-bilities in the 18th Century Household in Denmark', in H. Assel, J.A. Steiger &

A. Walter (eds.), *Reformatio Baltica: Kulturwirkungen der Reformation in den Metropolen des Ostseeraums* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2018); Stig Lindholm, *Catechismi förfremielse: Studier till catechismus-undervisningen i Svenska kyrkan 1593–1646* (Uppsala: Uppsala universitet, 1949).

35 There is currently no comprehensive overview. Such research is based on bibliographical information available through national library databases and bibliographies.

36 WA 23, 327–329.

37 *Om mand maa fly for døden oc Pestilentze: En Christelig underwisning* (Malmö, 1534); Hieronymus Weller, *En Aandelig Recept, Præservativa oc Lægedom, huorledis it christet Menniske skal skicke sig imod Døden, Oc besynderlige naar Pestilentze regerer* (Copenhagen, 1577); for the Danish editions, see Henrik Horstbøll, *Menigmands medie: Det folkelige bogtryk i Danmark, 1500–1840: En kulturhistorisk undersøgelse* (Copenhagen: Det Kongelige Bibliotek, 1999), 394; Petrus Benedicti, *Om man må fly för Dödhen eller Pestilienzien: Doctor Mårthen Luthers Berättelse eller Vnderwijsning* (Stockholm, 1588), for the Swedish editions, see Isak Collijn, *Sveriges bibliografi 1481–1600*, iii (Uppsala: Svenska litteratursällskapet, 1932–1933), 72–4; Niels Mikkelsen Aalborg, *En christelig Betænckning om mand maa flye for Døden Stillet ved Martin Luther Nu nylig paa Danske udsat aff Tydsken, den menige mand til Gaffn aff N. M. A.* (Copenhagen, 1619); Laurentius Paulinus Gothus, *L. Paulini Gothi Loimoscopia, eller Pestilentz speghel: Thet är: andeligh och naturligh vnderwijsning, om pestilentzies beskriffwelse, orsaker, præserwati-jff, läkedomar och befrijelser: stält och sammanfattadt ...; widh ändan är tilsadt, D. D. Mart. Lutheri grundrijke vnderwijsning, om pestilentziske förwarningar ...* (Stockholm, 1623); Jens Sørensen Nørnissom, *En liden Tractat, hvorledis en ret christen Soldat bør at krige imod aandelige oc legemlige Fiender, Item om nogle fornemme Aarsager til Krig; disligste om U-gudelige Tyranners Straff oc Endelig ...* (Copenhagen, 1658).

38 Examples in E. A. Oftestad, '"Slå ihjel denne syndige kropp, men bevar dog min fattige sjel": Lidelsens religiøse funksjon i Niels Palladius' dødsforberedelse (1558) og i samtidige likprekener', *Teologisk Tidsskrift* (2015), 14.

39 Tobias Daniels, 'Vom Humanismus zur Reformation: Girolamo Savonarolas Frührezeption im Deutschland des beginnenden 16. Jahrhunderts', *Archiv für Reformationgeschichte* 106 (2015), 8; WA 12, 245–246; Bruce Gordon, '"This Worthy Witness of Christ": Protestant Uses of Savonarola in the Sixteenth Century', in Bruce Gordon (ed.), *Protestant History and Identity in Sixteenth-Century Europe* (Scolar: Aldershot, 1996).

40 Gordon, "This worthy witness of Christ", 100.

41 On these translations see Kajsa Brilkman, 'Savonarola i Norden: Reception av luthersk konfessionskultur i Sverige och Danmark under andra hälften av 1500-talet', in Erik Bodensten, Kajsa Brilkman, David Larsson Heidenblad & Hanne

Sanders (eds.), *Nordens historiker: En vänbok till Harald Gustafsson* (Lund: Lund University, 2018); Gerardus Johannes Jaspers, *Savonarola (1452–1498) in de Nederlanden: een bibliografie van zijn gedrukte werken met inleidende notities omtrent zijn leven, zijn plaats in de geschiedenis en de drukkers/uitgevers van zijn werken* (Amsterdam: Buitenkant, 1998).