

Perichoresis

THE JOURNAL OF
EMANUEL UNIVERSITY OF ORADEA

VOLUME 4
ISSUE 2
2006

This issue was published by

*The Centre for Reformation Studies AND
The Seminar of Theological Research*

EMANUEL UNIVERSITY
PUBLISHING HOUSE

BOARD OF EDITORS

Prof. Dr. PAUL NEGRUȚ, The Rector of Emanuel University (Systematic Theology)
MARIUS D. CRUCERU, Editor-in-Chief (Patristics and Classical Languages)
Dr. Dr. CORNELIU C. SIMUȚ, Asst. Editor-in-Chief (Reformation Studies, Historical and Dogmatic Theology)
DAN A. BOTICA, Theological Editor (Old and New Testament Studies)
Dr. ADONIS VIDU, Theological Editor (Systematic Theology)

MANAGING EDITOR

Dr. Dr. CORNELIU C. SIMUȚ

The theological research of Emanuel University is developed mainly by The Faculty of Theology and The Brian Griffiths School of Management. The research activity of the Faculty of Theology is carried out by the following departments: The Seminary of Theological Research, The Centre for Reformation Studies, The Centre for Historical Studies, The Centre for Pastoral Counselling, and the Billy Graham Centre of Evangelism.

Perichoresis is published twice a year at the end of each academic semestre (May and September) by The Faculty of Theology and The Brian Griffiths School of Management in cooperation with colleagues and contributors from abroad. The ideas expressed in various articles may not represent the formal dogmatic confession of Emanuel University and they should be acknowledged as such.

For permission to reproduce information from *Perichoresis*, please write to the Board of Editors at Universitatea Emanuel din Oradea/Emanuel University Publishing House, Oradea, Facultatea de Teologie/The Faculty of Theology, Str. Nufărului Nr. 87, 410597 Oradea, Bihor, România/Romania, or to the Managing Editor at perichoresis@emanuel.ro.

Any aspect of the correspondence concerning subscriptions should be addressed to Editura Universității Emanuel/Emanuel University Publishing House, Str. Nufărului Nr. 87, 410597 Oradea, Bihor, România/Romania.

You can also contact us by email at perichoresis@emanuel.ro.

THE PRICE OF AN ISSUE IS EUR 20, including postage and handling charges.

© Copyright 2006 by Editura Universității Emanuel/Emanuel University Publishing House, Str. Nufărului Nr. 87, 410597 Oradea, Bihor, România/Romania

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission of the publisher.

Authorisation to publish items for personal use is granted free of charge by Editura Universității Emanuel/Emanuel University Publishing House, provided that the publisher is contacted directly at Editura Universității Emanuel/Emanuel University Publishing House, Str. Nufărului Nr. 87, 410597 Oradea, Bihor, România/Romania.

Contents

The Impact of Apocalypticism during the Puritan Revolutions JOHN COFFEY	117
Dying for the Great Commission: A Contemporary Thirteenth Century French Historiography THOMAS P. JOHNSTON	149
Holy Scripture and the Faculty of Reason in Richard Hooker: A Selection of Secondary Sources CORNELIU C. SIMUȚ	187
The Understanding of Sin in the Theology of Matthias Flacius LUKA ILIĆ	211

The Impact of Apocalypticism during the Puritan Revolutions

JOHN COFFEY

University of Leicester

The Puritan revolutions which convulsed the British Isles in the mid-seventeenth century constituted the high-water mark of apocalypticism's political impact on the English-speaking world.¹ Never before or since have Britain or America been so dominated by leaders imbued with an intensely apocalyptic mentality.² Between 1637 and 1660 the politics of Scotland and England were shaped to a remarkable degree by the fears and aspirations of "the hotter sort of Protestants", those who called each other "the godly", but were known pejoratively as "Puritans".³ Among them were such famous figures as Oliver Cromwell, John Milton, and George Fox. Almost all were convinced that they were living through the climactic years of world history, and playing a significant role in God's eschatological purpose. This article will investigate the impact of their apocalyptic beliefs on the politics and culture of mid-seventeenth century England and (to a lesser degree) Scotland.

Protestant Apocalypticism

From the early days of the Reformation, Protestants had been fascinated by the apocalyptic Scriptures. The book of Revelation seemed to answer those who argued that God would not allow his church to apostasise for hundreds of years. Martin Luther, despite his initial reservations about the canonicity of

Revelation, believed that the book had predicted the apostasy of the church. When its author wrote about the reign of the Beast (chapter 13), the Woman in the wilderness (chapter 12), and the fall of Babylon (chapter 18), he was predicting the rise of the papacy, the persecution of the true church, and the eventual triumph of Protestantism. Antichrist and the papacy were one and the same.⁴

English Protestants in the Tudor period wholeheartedly endorsed Luther's identification of the pope as Antichrist. Among theologians the doctrine was an unchallenged orthodoxy until the early seventeenth century, and politicians were at home with the apocalyptic consensus.⁵ Elizabeth I's leading minister, William Cecil (Lord Burghley), was resolute in his hostility to the "shaven priest at Rome that occupyeth the place of Antichrist". Although he is often portrayed as a *politique* guided primarily by *raison d'état*, it has recently been argued that Cecil's attitudes to both foreign policy and the English Catholics were shaped by his apocalyptic convictions. Philip II was seen as leading an Antichristian crusade against English Protestantism and the English Catholics were viewed as agents of Antichrist. Cecil resisted the temptation to indulge in specific eschatological speculation, but his fear of the popish Antichrist partially inspired the aggressive anti-Catholic policies of the late Elizabethan regime.⁶

As well as adopting Luther's view of the papacy, Tudor Protestants also accepted his *historicist* approach to Revelation. Unlike modern Protestants, who tend towards either ahistorical or futurist readings of Revelation 6-19, they believed that many of the book's prophecies had been fulfilled in specific events between the first century and the sixteenth. The seven trumpets, the seven plagues and the seven vials of wrath were repeatedly identified with particular historical events, some past, some yet to come.⁷

But if Tudor Protestants saw the world through apocalyptic spectacles, the spectacles were not particularly rose-tinted.

True, Revelation did predict the eventual downfall of the papacy and the triumph of the saints, but this was to occur right at the end of history; there was to be no future golden age on earth. Augustine had been right. The millennium mentioned briefly in Revelation 20 was not a future period of earthly bliss, but a description of all or part of the church age, in which the devil was limited and the saints could proclaim the Gospel. The Christian's hope lay beyond history.⁸

Yet from the mid-sixteenth-century, Protestant theologians in the Reformed or Calvinist tradition did begin to take a more optimistic view of the earth's future.⁹ Calvin's successor in Geneva, Theodore Beza, and the English Puritan, William Perkins, argued forcefully from Romans 11 that the Jewish people would be converted to the Reformed faith in the last days. Others developed this idea, and suggested that the fall of the papacy would not signal the end but inaugurate an era of latter-day glory on earth, characterised by peace, prosperity and the dominance of pure religion. Normally, however, this period was not identified with the millennium of Revelation 20. Most Reformed theologians were strictly speaking still amillennialists, even if their expectation of a coming age of godly rule would lead many historians to classify them as millenarian.¹⁰

Millenarianism proper only took off among Reformed thinkers in the early seventeenth century. Howard Hotson has argued that the major reason for this development may well have been the logical problems associated with the notion of a past millennium rather than any growth in Protestant optimism.¹¹ Most Protestants thought that the millennium (the binding of Satan and the rule of the saints) had run from the rise of Constantine in 300 AD until 1300 AD or from 1 AD to 1000 AD. But this belief created a major difficulty, for these years were also said to have witnessed the rise of the papal Antichrist! It seemed odd, to say the least, that Antichrist had reigned at the same time as the saints. The simplest way to

resolve this problem was by becoming millenarian; that is, by accepting that the millennium of Revelation 20 would occur at the end of history. The English Puritan, Thomas Brightman, did this in his famous commentary on Revelation, but he rather bizarrely held on to the idea of a past millennium as well. More purely millenarian works were published in 1627 by the German Calvinist, Johannes Alsted, and the Cambridge theologian, Joseph Mede. Mede argued that the era between the early church and the Reformation had witnessed not the millennial rule of the saints, but the 1260-year rule of Satan. Only now, in these last days, was the millennium approaching.¹²

Such ideas were eventually accepted by many of England's zealous Protestants. But even in the 1630s millenarianism proper was a rare bird. Many Puritans, like Richard Sibbes, expected the imminent conversion of the Jews and the downfall of Antichrist, but they were not thinking in terms of a literal future millennium. Only after 1637, when the first rumble of Puritan revolt was heard from Scotland, did explicitly millenarian ideas appear among Puritan exiles in the Netherlands and New England, where preachers like Thomas Goodwin and John Cotton began to preach excitedly about the coming reign of the saints. Even in the 1640s, when the millenarian writings of Brightman, Alsted, and Mede were published in English translations in London, the belief that the thousand years of Revelation 20 were just beginning was highly controversial.¹³

Apocalypticism and the Origins of the British Troubles

Yet if pure millenarianism was fairly rare among Puritans before 1640, a more diffuse apocalypticism was almost universal. Protestants right across Europe were convinced that they were living at the end of the age. Their conviction rested in part on their observation of contemporary politics. Since 1618 central Europe had been torn apart by a war that was only to end in 1648. To many contemporaries this Thirty Years War was primarily a confessional struggle between Catholic and

Protestant powers, and the entry of Catholic France on the “Protestant” side did little to change this perception. Protestants were filled with trepidation as they saw vital territory lost, and they placed events in an apocalyptic framework. Rome was identified with the Beast of Revelation, and its present success was both terrifying and exhilarating; Antichrist was raging because his downfall was near. The last days were coming, when the Jews would be converted and Protestantism would triumph across the continent and then throughout the world.¹⁴ The military exploits of the Swedish king Gustavus Adolphus in the early 1630s filled many British Calvinists with great hope. The Scottish divine Samuel Rutherford wrote that Christ was now on horseback, hunting and pursuing the Beast.¹⁵ The death of Gustavus near the end of 1632 dealt a vicious blow to hopes of early victory in the last great holy war, but most Calvinists continued to expect it in the long run.

It was against this apocalyptic continental backdrop that British Puritans saw domestic events. In the 1620s and 1630s their disillusionment with their kings intensified. James was a pacific king with no desire to become embroiled in European war, but his Puritan subjects thought it an outrage that he did not organise a crusade to relieve their suffering brethren on the continent. In Scotland, moreover, James had introduced legislation ordering that communicants receive the sacrament kneeling, a practice that to many Puritans was nothing less than popish idolatry.

If James was bad, his son Charles was even worse. For Charles gave enthusiastic backing to a high church reform movement in England and Scotland, a movement promoted by Archbishop Laud and usually labelled Laudianism or Arminianism. Laudians wished to make Protestant worship more dignified and decorous, to shift attention from the sermon to the sacrament, and to encourage a high Eucharistic theology. As if this was not controversial enough, they questioned Calvin’s teaching on predestination and even rejected the identification

of the Pope with Antichrist.¹⁶ Puritans who refused to conform to their liturgical innovations were not infrequently prosecuted and suspended from their ministries.¹⁷

The effect of all this on British Puritan opinion was electric. Antichrist was now not simply an external threat; he was within the Reformed churches of Britain itself. In a graphic image, Samuel Rutherford claimed that the Laudian bishops were bringing “the Pope’s foul tail first upon us (their wretched and beggarly ceremonies)”, in order that they might “thrust in after them the Antichrist’s legs and thighs, and his belly, head and shoulders”.¹⁸ For how long this would continue Rutherford could not tell, and in the mid-1630s he seriously considered following the example of other Puritans and emigrating to New England, on the grounds that Antichrist may be allowed to ravage Scotland before his eventual downfall.¹⁹

Yet as it turned out, relief for Puritans came sooner than expected. In 1637 Charles and the Laudian bishops attempted to impose a new Prayer Book on the Scottish kirk. It was to prove their greatest mistake. The Scottish nobility were already angered by the high-handed and arbitrary character of rule from London, and the decision to impose a Prayer Book without consulting either the Scottish church or Parliament was one which angered them deeply. In July, militant Puritans organised a riot against the new liturgy in Edinburgh, and before long they had succeeded in persuading much of the nobility to join their protest movement. In February 1638 the supporters of the protest movement signed a National Covenant, and henceforth they became known as Covenanters.²⁰

It would be a mistake to see the Covenanters as an apocalyptic movement *per se*. Although the Covenant had united most of the Scottish political nation in opposition to the policies of Charles I, the nobility were rarely bursting with the Puritan zeal of their ministers. They saw the Covenant as a way of restoring Scotland’s ancient constitution and their own role

in the polity after both had been undermined by government from London. Many of the ministers, moreover, were at least as much inspired by the model of Old Testament Israel as by thoughts of the end times. Scotland's covenant with God, like that of the Jews, had been violated by idolatry, but it was now being renewed.

Yet apocalyptic ideas were an important presence among the Covenanters. Rutherford, for example, fervently anticipated the conversion of the Jews and the fall of Antichrist.²¹ In August 1640, as the Covenanter army prepared to march into England and face the king's forces in battle, Rutherford allowed his apocalyptic imagination to run riot. In a sermon to the troops he speculated that God was beginning his final great work in little Scotland, "a worm of a nation" at the ends of the earth. From here reformation could be taken into England, and from there it might go all over Europe precipitating the fall of Antichrist.²² Archibald Johnston of Wariston, the lawyer who drew up the Covenant, also believed that the movement was to be "propagated from Island to Continent, until King Jesus be set down on his throne".²³

The success of the Scottish army in 1640 confirmed such transcendent hopes. It swept past the English forces and occupied Newcastle, forcing Charles into recalling the English Parliament. The Parliament that met was determined to reverse many of the policies of the 1630s, and it contained a powerful Puritan contingent who fully shared the apocalyptic sentiments of their Scottish brethren. The Scottish revolution had given new hope to the godly, leading them to focus intently on the prophecies of Daniel and Revelation.²⁴ In the weekly fast sermons before Parliament Puritan preachers like Stephen Marshall repeatedly employed the images of Revelation. They talked of Babylon, the Whore and the Beast, they insisted that Parliament was fighting a crucial battle in the final war against Antichrist.²⁵ The Irish Catholic rebellion in late 1641 simply reinforced this conviction. There were rumours that 100.000

Protestants had been massacred by Catholics who claimed to be fighting for Charles I. Puritan belief in a popish plot to undermine Protestant religion in Britain was confirmed. The king was in league with Antichrist.²⁶

It was at this point, on 1 December 1641, that the radicals in Parliament forced through the Grand Remonstrance, a 204-point indictment of the king's rule since 1625. Yet the close vote on the Remonstrance revealed a deep split within Parliament. Not everyone was convinced by the claim that the king and his government had become an agent of Antichrist. Many cautious MPs began to fear Puritan subversion more than the king's high-handedness. They were worried by the iconoclastic fervour of the godly, and started to form a substantial royalist party.

In 1642, the divide between these two parties grew steadily deeper. On the parliamentary side, Puritan preachers acted as propagandists and recruiters, whipping up fear of Catholicism and encouraging their hearers to join the crusade against popish Antichrist. On sixty separate occasions, for example, the Puritan Stephen Marshall preached his sermon "Meroz Cursed", an excoriating commentary on Judges 5:23 in which the people of Meroz are cursed for their failure to fight for the Lord. The predominant assumption in Marshall's sermon was that England was a new Israel, whose covenant with God was threatened by popish idolatry. But Marshall also assumed that this was a battle between the Lamb and the Beast, the Saviour and the whore of Babylon.²⁷ The Israel paradigm and Revelation, the language of the godly nation and of the global apocalypse were fused together in Puritan rhetoric with explosive effect. When royalists and parliamentarians finally faced each other in battle in late 1642, some parliamentarian banners bore the slogan "Antichrist must down".

Apocalypticism, therefore, was a crucial element in the lethal cocktail which produced the English civil war. In the first place, it made compromise unlikely. By definition, one did not

negotiate with Antichrist, and once such polarising rhetoric had been employed, conciliatory thoughts were hard to think. Secondly, apocalyptic preaching frightened moderates who began to fear a Puritan plot more than a popish plot and flocked to the king to form a royalist party. Thirdly, apocalyptic beliefs certainly made some men fight for parliament. When a royalist divine spoke to some captured parliamentary soldiers in 1644, they admitted that they had read Marshall and explained why they had fought against the king: "Tis prophesied in the Revelation, that the Whore of Babylon shall be destroyed with fire and sword, and what do you know, but this is the time of her ruin, and that we are the men that must help to pull her down?"²⁸ This was a view shared by the London artisan, Nehemiah Wallington, whose personal papers provide a revealing insight into the mentality of ordinary Puritans. By the summer of 1642, Wallington was convinced that the royalist cause was the same as the cause of Antichrist and his support for Parliament was consequently assured.²⁹

The centrality of apocalypticism can be exaggerated, of course. It is revealing that though the Grand Remonstrance is shot through with fear of popish idolatry and subversion it never once reaches for explicitly apocalyptic language.³⁰ Apocalyptic ideas were perhaps too speculative and controversial to find their way into official documents, though they appear often in sermons to Parliament. The exception which proves the rule is the radical Puritans' Root and Branch petition, which identifies the bishops as "members of the beast" and condemns the Laudians for maintaining "that the Pope is not Antichrist".³¹ In many cases, moreover, apocalyptic speculation takes a back seat to the Old Testament notion of a nation in covenant with God. And we do well to remember that by no means all parliamentarians were apocalyptic in mentality, or even Puritan.

Yet the core activists of the parliamentary party, as often as not, do seem to have been peculiarly zealous in their Protes-

tantism and fired by a sense that they were participating in the great end-times war with evil.³² From leaders like Pym, Vane and Cromwell, to humble foot-soldiers like Nehemiah Wallington, the parliamentarians' heads were frequently filled with apocalyptic fears and hopes. Without the book of Revelation, indeed, there may have been no English civil war.

Apocalypticism and Secular Reform

Yet as well as inspiring a bloodthirsty, holy-warrior mentality, the apocalyptic Scriptures could also foster a more constructive vision. Throughout the 1640s and 1650s an array of godly activists and intellectuals were encouraged by the thought that they were about to see the fulfilment of Daniel's prophecy that in the time of the end "many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased" (Daniel 12:4). London in 1641 attracted some of the most brilliant intellectuals in the Reformed world with the promise of millennial reform. The ecumenist Scotsman John Dury, the German scientist Samuel Hartlib, and the Czech educationalist Comenius had each been profoundly influenced by the millenarianism of Alsted and Mede, and seem to have seriously entertained the idea that London was the centre from which human knowledge and divine rule would spread.³³ None of these men were holy warriors in the mould of Samuel Rutherford or Stephen Marshall, though they were adamantly anti-Catholic. Instead their energies were focused on producing an endless stream of proposals for the improvement of human welfare and knowledge. The drift towards war in 1642 dealt a severe blow to their hopes, for war distracted attention from these constructive projects and channelled it into destruction. Discouraged by these developments, Comenius left England for Sweden.

Hartlib and Dury, however, remained in England, and attempted to establish a national research and development institution. Though this goal was never fully met, the two men were at the centre of extended networks linking various in-

ventors, reformers and scientists throughout the 1640s and 1650s. The Hartlib correspondence, now held in the University of Sheffield, reveals the breathtaking extent of their ambition. Those associated with the reformers drafted countless schemes for the advancement of chemistry, agriculture, technology, medicine, law, mathematics, social welfare, Protestant ecumenism, education and commerce. The years 1645-1660, when England was dominated by Puritan governments, witnessed a remarkable efflorescence of scientific publication. And among the ten most active early members of the Royal Society, established shortly after the Restoration, five had been connected with Hartlib's circle, including Robert Boyle and John Wilkins. For many of these men, scientific investigation carried with it the hope of reversing some of the worst effects of the Fall. In the millennium man would finally learn to be a good steward, using God's gifts to cultivate and control God's earth.³⁴

Apocalypticism and the Restoration of the Primitive Church
However, if some Puritans saw the latter-day glory or future millennium largely in terms of the recovery of man's dominion over nature, the majority thought primarily in terms of the church. They were convinced that in the last days the Spirit would shine new light on the ancient Word, dispelling the mists of apostasy and false tradition and enabling the godly to restore the glory of the primitive church. Protestantism had always been a primitivist or restorationist movement, of course, deeply concerned to recover the teachings of the New Testament and imitate the original models of church and state laid down in Scripture. But apocalyptic hope intensified such impulses. It lies behind the famous statement of the Pilgrim Father, John Robinson, that "The Lord has more truth and light yet to break forth out of his holy word".³⁵

Millenarian-fuelled primitivism, however, was profoundly destabilising. Church tradition was called into question right across the board. For if it was true that the church had been

allowed to lapse into apostasy only to be restored to purity in the last days, then even the most basic of traditional teachings could not be taken for granted. Take baptism, for example. For over a thousand years the church had baptised infants into the Christian community, and the magisterial Reformers had seen no reason to question such a well-established tradition. But according to Baptists, Luther and Calvin had been too complacent. The Reformers had underestimated the extent of Anti-christ's success in leading the church astray and consequently minimised the scope of its latter-day restoration. In the last days God was restoring the primitive ordinance of believer's baptism to the church.³⁶

A similar argument could be applied to the hoary tradition of male clerical leadership, which prescribed that all preaching should be by ordained men. The Quaker leader, Margaret Fell, was in no doubt that the opposition to "women's speaking" had "risen out of the Bottomless Pit", during "these many hundred Years together in this Night of Apostacy, since the Revelations have ceased and been hid". But she was also convinced that the long dark night was drawing to a close: "blessed be the Lord, [the Beast's] time is over, which was above Twelve hundred Years, and the Darknesse is past, and the Night of Apostacy draws to an end". In these climactic days, Fell believed, the Spirit was being "poured out upon all flesh, both Sons and Daughters", just as the prophet Joel had predicted. Now was the time for the apocalyptic restoration of women's voices within the church.³⁷

The same logic could be turned against persecution. One of the most controversial books published during the English Revolution was Roger Williams' *The Bloudy Tenent of Persecution* (1644). Williams was a devout Puritan, but he believed that the church's collective apostasy was much deeper than most Protestants recognised. Christianity had fallen asleep "in Constantine's bosom", and many of the godly still had not awoken, for they were still prepared to follow the Beast by using violence

against religious dissenters. Yet Williams was imbued with apocalyptic hope. God was restoring his church, reawakening it, showing it the folly of persecution. As Williams wrote in 1652, “in these late years God hath made it evident, that all Civil Magistracie in the World is meerly and essentially Civil”. Radical Puritans were once again looking to the primitive church, a voluntary body separated from the state and advanced only by the preaching of the Gospel not by persecution. For Williams, the latter days were bringing the restoration of primitive Christianity.³⁸

John Milton’s famous defence of the liberty of the press, *Areopagitica* (1644), argued along the same lines against press censorship. Milton claimed that though in the apostolic age Truth was “a perfect shape most glorious to look on”, she was later hewed “into a thousand pieces” during the church’s apostasy. Yet God was now “decreeing to begin some new and great period in his church, even to the reforming of the Reformation itself”. If the pieces of Truth were to be recovered and joined together again in these last days, the long tradition of censorship must be ended, and people must be free to publish their ideas, for only in this way could “new light” be shed.³⁹

The expectation of new light in the last days also encouraged the growth of doctrinal heresies. This is made abundantly clear by the title of Paul Best’s anti-Trinitarian tract of 1647: *Mysteries Discovered, Or a Mercuriall Picture pointing out the way from Babylon to the Holy City, for the good of all such as during that night of generall Errour and Apostasie, 2 Thess. 2. 3. Revel. 3. 10. have been so long misled with Romes hobgoblins*. Best was unafraid to assault the traditional Christian teaching that the Son and the Spirit were coequall with the Father, because he believed that the church had been in the hands of Antichrist for 1260 years. The doctrine of the Trinity was one of the first corruptions that had crept in after the Church had been taken over by “semi-pagan Christians”, beginning with Constantine. Best had the confidence to trumpet his own Socinianism because he

was convinced that history was on his side, that the reign of Antichrist was coming to an end: "God be thanked, the time of this generall Apostasie is expired, the mystery discovered, and the unity of God, Zachariah 14:9 come upon the stage".⁴⁰

Other early modern anti-trinitarians shared Best's apocalyptic view of church history. Michael Servetus was executed under Calvin in Geneva because he had attacked orthodox belief in a book significantly entitled *Christianismi restitutio* (1553).⁴¹ The apocalyptic tale of the corruption and latter-day purification of Christian doctrine can also be found in the writings of John Biddle, the leading English Socinian during the Puritan revolution,⁴² and in the work of Sir Isaac Newton, who linked the rise of Antichrist to the persecution of the Arians.⁴³ Finally, John Milton's rejection of orthodox Trinitarianism was intimately connected to his belief that he was participating in "the process of restoring religion to something of its pure original state, after it had been defiled with impurities for more than thirteen hundred years".⁴⁴

Apocalyptic primitivism or restorationism, therefore, allowed radical Protestants to launch iconoclastic critiques of Christian tradition in good faith. Unlike modern liberal theologians, who criticise tradition mainly from the standpoint of rationalism or modernity, these biblicist Protestants broke with the past by claiming that in the last days the Spirit was restoring an even more ancient past, one the church had abandoned. Theirs was an extraordinarily disruptive impulse, one which shattered the theological and ecclesiastical unity of Puritanism. The glue of tradition was melted by restorationist zeal. By 1649, Puritans were deeply divided over many issues, a fact which contributed decisively to the ultimate failure of the Puritan revolution.

Apocalypticism and the Execution of Charles I

From the late 1640s Puritan divisions were acted out on the political stage. With the support of the New Model Army and

powerful commanders like Oliver Cromwell, the Independents gradually superseded the Presbyterians as the dominant force in English politics, and in January 1649, after purging Parliament of Presbyterians, they took the momentous step of executing the king.

The reasoning behind the regicide is fairly clear. After having defeated the royalists in the first civil war, Parliament had been forced to fight a second because Charles I had managed to ally himself with the moderate Scots. Although the result was another parliamentary victory, the war had drained away any remaining sympathy the parliamentarians retained for the king. In their eyes he had betrayed trust when they thought he was negotiating a settlement, and plunged the country into another bitter war. At a prayer meeting of the New Model Army in April 1648, the officers and men resolved “that it was our duty, if ever the Lord brought us back to peace, to call Charles Stuart, that man of blood, to an account for the blood he had shed”. Their resolution was built on the Old Testament conviction that the shedding of innocent blood defiled the land and could only be expiated by the execution of the “bloodguilty” (Numbers 35:33).⁴⁵

Yet besides this Old Testament argument, there was also an apocalyptic logic behind the regicide of January 1649. Puritan preachers in the late 1640s proclaimed that kings and monarchies must fall before Christ ruled. The Psalms had promised that God would strike kings and that the saints would bind them (Psalm 110, 149); Daniel had declared that after the four worldly monarchies collapsed, a fifth godly monarchy would flourish (Daniel 7); and Revelation had predicted the destruction of Antichristian kings (Revelation 17). For many Puritans Charles I was one of these bloodthirsty, persecuting kings. His death indicated that the fall of the Beast and the rule of the saints was imminent.⁴⁶

Such beliefs were not entertained by sectarian extremists alone, but also by learned Independent clergymen like John

Owen, Thomas Brooks, Nathaniel Homes and Peter Sterry. These men did not condemn monarchy *per se*, but they emphasised that kings would be toppled insofar as they were tyrants, persecutors of the saints, and adherents of the Beast. Homes and Sterry used the apocalyptic statistics of Daniel and Revelation to calculate that the fall of Antichrist was due to happen in the 1650s. Owen was more circumspect, and refused to commit himself to dates, but it has been said that his sermons provide more examples of the apocalyptic argument against kings than those of any other preacher.⁴⁷

In April 1649, for example, less than three months after the execution of the king, Owen preached on Hebrews 12, a text which speaks of the shaking of heaven and earth. With Cromwell and other regicides in his audience, Owen argued that the earth signified “the multitudes” and the heaven the “political heights and glory” of nations. In the last days, he declared, God would shake the government of the nations, dissolving “antichristian tyranny”. Kings in particular could expect to be shaken from their thrones, for over the past seven hundred years they had shed the blood of countless saints: Lollards, Waldensians, Albigensians and Hussites. “Show me seven kings that ever yet laboured sincerely to enhance the kingdom of the Lord Jesus”, Owen demanded. Yet he emphasised that God’s purpose was not to destroy government itself, but to “translate” and remould it so that it promoted the rule of Christ. Indeed, the new godly nations would be instrumental in the destruction of Babylon. Finally, with government transformed, the godly would flourish, the Jews would be converted, and Christ would usher in his “peaceable kingdom”.⁴⁸

Owen’s sermon reminds us that Puritan preachers were neither anarchists nor opponents of the established government of England after the regicide. They all clearly believed that God would establish his fifth monarchy through the agency of godly earthly powers. Apocalyptic and millenarian ideas, therefore, provided much needed legitimation for the new re-

gime. The Rump Parliament (as the purged institution was called) was portrayed as an important instrument in God's end-time work. However, as well as legitimating the Rump, apocalyptic rhetoric also exhorted and threatened it. Since God had raised it up to do a great apocalyptic work, it must fulfil its duty and promote the millennial rule of Christ in every sphere of life; if it failed, it would itself become one of the Antichristian powers. Apocalypticism was an inherently destabilising ideology which generated great expectations that were most difficult to fulfil. If Hartlib's millenarianism was remarkably constructive, most apocalyptic thought tended to be iconoclastic. In the long run it was unlikely to foster a conservative acceptance of the status quo. Before 1653, however, apocalyptic rhetoric was rarely turned against the new regime. Instead, the general mood among radical Puritans was one of intense expectation.

Cromwell versus the Fifth Monarchists

The millenarian hopes of the early 1650s exercised a powerful influence on both foreign and domestic policy. Stephen Pincus has made a powerful case for seeing the Anglo-Dutch war of 1652-54 as a conflict inspired by apocalypticism. Whereas the war has traditionally been regarded as a trade war, Pincus maintains that it was launched under pressure from religious radicals who wanted a latter-day crusade against Antichrist. Dutch hostility to the new regime in England had led many of its supporters to conclude that the Protestant Dutch were an apostate people whose devotion to mammon and royalty had driven them into alliance with the Beast. Among those who took this line, the Independents (such as Owen) believed that a war was necessary to restore the Dutch to pure faith, whilst the more radical sectarians (such as Major-General Harrison) were convinced that "the Netherlands could only serve as the first stop on the road to Rome to destroy the Whore of Baby-

lon". Together these two parties, so dominant in English politics at this time, prodded the country into war.⁴⁹

It is possible that Pincus underplays the economic origins of the Anglo-Dutch war, particularly the role of the protectionist Navigation Act passed by the English regime in 1651.⁵⁰ However, there can be little doubt that he has demonstrated the power and pervasiveness of apocalyptic belief in the 1650s. With the levers of power in the hands of Protestant zealots, millenarianism was not mere theoretical speculation; it was practical politics.

The sectarian millenarians who were most fiercely hostile to the Dutch also managed to change the course of domestic policy. In early 1653 they campaigned vociferously for the dissolution of the Rump, and the establishment of a more godly Parliament. Swayed by their arguments, Cromwell agreed. In April he staged a military coup and ended the thirteen years of power enjoyed by the Long Parliament. In July a new assembly met. It was nick-named the Barebones Parliament after one of its many godly members, "Praise-God" Barebones.⁵¹

Great hopes were riding on this Parliament, and Cromwell himself opened it with a speech which has been seen as marking "the apogee of his millenarian rhetoric of power".⁵² Cromwell reminded his audience of famous apocalyptic scriptures like Daniel and Psalm 68 and hinted that they might be witnessing "the day of thy power" prophesied in Psalm 110, a psalm which predicted that the Lord "shall strike through kings in the day of his wrath". Cromwell also alluded to "the war with the Lamb against his enemies" and speculated on the conversion of the Jews.⁵³

Yet the optimism with which the Parliament began was quickly shattered. It soon became clear that there was an ideological divide between a moderate majority and a vociferous radical minority, a divide that mirrored the different attitudes towards the Dutch. In December 1653, the moderate majority – worried that the radicals' attempts to abolish tithes signalled

an attack on the traditional social order – returned their power to Cromwell.

To the millenarian extremists Cromwell's willingness to accept the dissolution of the assembly constituted an intolerable betrayal of the revolution. The Welsh preacher Vavasour Powell saw the situation in the sharpest terms: "Lord, wilt thou have Oliver Cromwell or Jesus Christ to reign over us?" Like another preacher, Christopher Feake, Powell identified Cromwell as the little horn of the Beast mentioned in Revelation. These preachers, together with their army supporters led by Thomas Harrison, soon became known as the Fifth Monarchy Men.⁵⁴ Their distinctiveness lay not in their belief that the fifth monarchy of Christ was due to be established imminently (a belief shared by many Puritans), but in their political position. Whereas most millenarians emphasised that God would establish his millennial rule through the powers of the earth (the Rump, the army, the Protectorate), Fifth Monarchy Men believed that it would be done through the direct agency of the saints. Whereas most millenarian Puritans supported the Protectorate, the Fifth Monarchists formed an opposition movement, implacably opposed to Cromwell's regime.⁵⁵ Throughout the 1650s they constituted a constant headache for the regime, though the only Fifth Monarchist rebellion in this period, led by Thomas Venner in 1657, was a farcical failure, despite being timed to coincide with the rising of the witnesses three-and-a-half years after the dissolution of the Barebones Parliament.

Cromwell's refusal to dance to the radical millenarians' tune is hardly surprising.⁵⁶ Throughout his career, he had been somewhat reticent in his use of apocalyptic language. His letters and speeches contain relatively little in the way of apocalyptic rhetoric, despite the claim of one historian that they are "suffused with scriptural allusions to the millennium".⁵⁷ Cromwell was certainly convinced that God was fighting on the side of the parliamentary armies, just as he had fought for

ancient Israel. Yet he was cautious about investing events with eschatological significance. Indeed, on reading through his writings and speeches I can only find a handful of passages in which he employed explicitly apocalyptic language or spoke clearly about the last days.⁵⁸ Even when writing about his battles with the Catholic Irish he did not invoke the image of the Beast or the Whore of Babylon. Although he sometimes spoke about foreign policy in terms of a struggle of the Protestant interest against the papal Antichrist, he was – like William Cecil – unwilling to go into further detail.⁵⁹ In his famous speech to the Barebone's Parliament, he deliberately drew back when he felt himself straying too far in his speculations: "But I may appear to be beyond my line", he remarked, "these things are dark".⁶⁰

By contrast, Cromwell felt no such hesitation about the manifestations of providence in political events. His Barebone's speech referred repeatedly to God's "appearances", and his listeners could have been in doubt as to the events of which he was thinking; the great military victories at Naseby, Preston, Dunbar, and Worcester. God, declared Cromwell, had been "so eminently visible" that even "our enemies" had been forced to confess that he was against them.⁶¹ But Cromwell was less certain about how these particular appearances fitted into God's eschatological timetable. He probably suspected that they were indeed part of the Lord's latter-day plan to dethrone Antichrist, convert the Gentiles and restore the Jews; his enthusiasm for the 1655 Whitehall conference on the readmission of the Jews to England was partly inspired by his expectation of their imminent conversion.⁶² Yet Cromwell was notably undogmatic about the apocalyptic reading of contemporary events. What really mattered, what he was sure about, was that God had providentially demonstrated his approval of the army and Puritan rule in quite unmistakeable terms. Providence, not the apocalypse, was his guiding light.

The gulf between Cromwell and the Fifth Monarchists was confirmed by his moves to make peace with the Dutch. Cromwell had genuinely believed that God was using the English to punish the Dutch for their sins, but unlike the Fifth Monarchists he did not conceive of the Dutch war as the opening gambit in the final struggle against Antichrist. Instead, he had supported the war in the belief that it would bring the Dutch to their senses, and re-establish them as a godly people in alliance with the English. When the Republican Party began to regain the upper hand in the Netherlands, Cromwell was satisfied and threw himself behind the negotiations which led to peace in 1654. The defence of international Protestantism continued to be a central goal, but “the rejection of apocalyptic foreign policy” was unmistakable.⁶³

With hindsight, therefore, 1653 was an important turning point. When Cromwell spoke of the “last days” to the first Protectorate Parliament in 1654, it was not to raise hopes of the imminent destruction of Antichrist, but to remind his hearers that according to Paul “perilous times” would come in the last days; men would depart from the faith and follow “seducing spirits and doctrines of demons”. “The mistaken notion of the Fifth Monarchy” was a striking example of end-times delusion.⁶⁴ Cromwell’s earlier optimism had been displaced by a more pessimistic eschatology. Although he retained his passionate concern for “the people of God” and the cause of the Puritan Gospel, he now displayed more willingness to be pragmatic and compromise with less godly sections of the population. Under the new constitution, the Instrument of Government, he was made the Lord Protector. He established a court and began to adopt some of the trappings of monarchy. The Puritan austerity and simplicity were not abandoned, but the tone of Cromwell’s later letters and speeches was world-weary rather than exultant.

The politically subversive use to which millenarianism was put in the 1650s led other Puritans to retreat from their earlier

enthusiasms. Thomas Goodwin, whose 1640s sermon on the fifth monarchy was published by the Fifth Monarchists in 1654, distanced himself from his earlier radicalism. The Baptist Thomas Collier, whose millenarian sermons to the New Model Army in the late 1640s had envisaged the rule of the saints, now condemned the Fifth Monarchists without reservation. He taught an austere pre-millennialism, according to which the saints would be in a suffering-state until Christ returned to rule personally on earth. The Fifth Monarchist assumption that the saints had to undertake “a smiting, subduing, conquering work” to prepare for the coming kingdom of Christ was mistaken. The saints were simply to submit to the magistrate, even if he was evil, just as Paul and Peter had submitted to the Roman Empire. Because “the heart of man is deceitful above all things and desperately wicked”, the saints should not strive “to be uppermost”, for “rule makes men worse rather than better”.⁶⁵ Quietism like Collier’s became fairly common in the 1650s. Disillusioned by attempts to establish the New Jerusalem through politics many of the godly seem to have turned inwards.

Quakers, Diggers and Ranters

The greatest beneficiaries of this change were the Quakers, who made approximately 30,000 converts in the 1650s.⁶⁶ Led by charismatic figures like George Fox and James Nayler, the early Quakers bore little resemblance to the respectable and liberal Quakers of today. Like other radical Puritans, the new sect warned of the imminent apocalyptic destruction of the Beast. In 1655, for example, Fox wrote that the Lord was coming to judge:

and before him the hills shall move and the mountains shall melt, and the rocks shall cleave... great earth quakes shall be, the terrible day of the Lord draws near, the Beast shall be taken, and false prophets into the fire shall go... now is the sword drawn... to

hew down Baal's priests, corrupt judges, corrupt justices, corrupt lawyers, fruitless trees which cumber the ground.⁶⁷

What made Quakers distinctive, however, was not their ferocious denunciation of the antichristian establishment, but their spiritualisation or internalisation of the millennium. Whereas most Puritans expected God to set up his rule in new political and ecclesiastical institutions, Quakers stood in a radical Puritan tradition that had little interest in forms. Christ, they preached, would come to rule in the hearts of the godly. When a person responded to the movement of the Spirit and to the inner light, the kingdom of God had been set up within them.⁶⁸

Quaker subjectivism appalled more orthodox Puritans who saw it as undercutting the traditional protestant stress on the objective authority of the Bible and the historical reality of Christ's atoning death on the Cross. Yet Quakers were simply taking to an extreme the Puritan emphasis on the imminent apocalypse and on intense experience of the Spirit. They provide another illustration of how the stability and unity of zealous Protestantism was damaged by its millenarian and "charismatic" impulses.

Beyond the Quakers lay other even more unconventional sects and individuals inspired by millenarian dreams: "Diggers" who anticipated the imminent establishment of a peaceful, communist society; "Ranters" who believed that Christ was setting the saints free from the moral law, and who blasphemed and fornicated just to prove the point; individual visionaries convinced that they were the Messiah, or Elijah, or one of the Two Witnesses.⁶⁹ Yet the followers of these extremists were few in number. Much of the population remained wedded to a traditional Prayer Book Anglicanism far removed from apocalyptic enthusiasms. The Puritan crusade to make the English people godly was widely resented and resisted.⁷⁰

After Cromwell

Among Puritans themselves, however, apocalyptic expectation remained strong, even after the death of Oliver Cromwell in September 1658. Indeed, Cromwell's passing may well have generated new hopes. For many Puritans, the Protector had become an obstacle to the millennium. To those who supported the Commonwealth Cromwell's dissolution of the Rump was a betrayal of the Good Old Cause, whilst to Fifth Monarchists his dissolution of the Barebone's Parliament was unforgivable. With the collapse of the Protectorate of Cromwell's son Richard, these groups saw a new window of opportunity. In the fluid political situation of 1659-1660, millenarian hopes thrived.

A clear indication of this fact can be found in the writings of one of the leading Commonwealthsmen, Sir Henry Vane Jr. Vane was a devout Puritan and had been one of the most powerful politicians in Britain until 1653, when his close friendship with Oliver Cromwell had been destroyed by the latter's expulsion of the Rump. In the five years following that event, Vane had sniped from the sidelines. But in 1659 he saw the chance to establish a commonwealth run by godly men who supported the good old cause and liberty of conscience for all non-subversive groups. Like Rutherford in 1640 and Owen in 1649, Vane dared to speculate that the new political regime would play a key role in crushing Babylon and ushering in Christ's rule. Was it not possible, he asked, that

the beginnings of such a Government as this, as small as they may be at first... may not, however, through the mighty and universal pouring out of the Spirit upon all flesh, so grow and increase, as at last to come up unto a perfect day... to the setting up of Christ as King throughout the whole earth, and causing the Nations and Kingdomes of this world to become the Kingdomes of our Lord and of his Christ, in a visible manner here below, for the space of a thousand years?⁷¹

Vane's great expectation that a new republican government might deliver the millennium was shared by his close friend, John Milton.⁷² Predictably, however, their hopes were to prove far wide of the mark. The confusion of 1659-60 resulted not in the restoration of Christ's rule but in the restoration of the Stuarts. In 1662, Sir Henry Vane was executed.

Before Vane died, however, he penned his final thoughts on the millennium. His imminent death had only led him to make some minor adjustments to his eschatology. He now realised that the parable of the sleeping virgins in Matthew 25 indicated that after the 1260 years of the Beast's reign had ended, believers would complacently assume that the kingdom of Christ had finally arrived. Yet this would not happen, taught Vane, until the final three-and-a-half years of persecution predicted in Revelation 11 had run their course. Only after these terrible years, when the witnesses of Christ had been executed, would God raise them to life and usher in his kingdom by the personal return of Christ to earth. Although it was not spelt out explicitly, the assumption was clear: Vane's death and those of other revolutionary Puritans had eschatological significance. The godly were in the midst of the final fierce burst of persecution, but soon they would rule the earth with Christ.⁷³

Conclusion

It used to be assumed that apocalypticism more or less died out after the Puritan revolutions. With the accession of Charles II, the "Merrie Monarch", such modes of thought were out of fashion. The historian, Hugh Trevor-Roper, summarised this view in an index entry for "Antichrist" in one of his books: "Antichrist: due to fall in 1639, 248; or at least thereabouts, 251; perhaps 1655?, 286; retreats from Scotland to England 1643, 315-16; evaporates 1660, 293".⁷⁴

However, the example of Henry Vane reminds us of the tenacity of apocalyptic hope, of the ability of millenarians to adapt their eschatological systems to altered circumstances.

Recent historians have emphasised the continuity of ideas and beliefs across the 1660 divide and demonstrated just how much the experience of the 1640s and 1650s continued to haunt Restoration England. Fears of popish plots were as intense as they had been in the earlier period, and apocalyptic ideas continued to circulate and attract attention.⁷⁵ Even after the Glorious Revolution, eschatological speculation was widespread. No less a figure than Sir Isaac Newton devoted many of his later years to deciphering the prophecies of Daniel and Revelation.⁷⁶

Yet the truth remains that apocalyptic conviction was never as politically important as during the Puritan revolution. Whilst it was certainly not a sufficient factor in the causation of events, it was arguably a necessary one. Without apocalyptic convictions the outbreak of the British troubles, the splintering of Puritanism, the execution of the king, the Anglo-Dutch war, and the Barebone's Parliament may never have occurred.

Notes

¹ I am grateful to Warren Johnston of Clare Hall, Cambridge, for his comments on this paper. His own research on apocalypticism during the Restoration should fill in a major gap in our knowledge of the subject.

² Only Elizabethan England and colonial New England stand as serious rivals to mid-seventeenth century Britain in this regard. Yet in the former apocalypticism was relatively restrained and sober in tone, whilst the latter was hardly representative of the rest of colonial America. The only modern parallel which comes even remotely close is Ronald Reagan's America, where the president and some of his advisors seem to have contemplated the possibility of an imminent Armageddon and identified the USSR as the Gog of Ezekiel 38-39. See P. Boyer, *When Time Shall be no More: Prophecy Belief in Modern American Culture* (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1992), 142-146, 162; G. Vidal, "Armageddon", in his *Armageddon: Essays, 1983-87* (London, 1987), 101-114.

³ For a recent discussion of the definition of Puritanism see P. Lake, "Defining Puritanism: Again?", in F. Bremer (ed.), *Puritanism: Transatlantic Perspectives on a Seventeenth-Century Anglo-American Faith* (Boston, 1993), 3-29.

⁴ On Luther's attitude to Revelation see J. Pelikan, "The magisterial Reformers", in C. A. Patrides and J. Wittreich (eds), *The Apocalypse in English Renaissance Thought and Literature* (Manchester, 1984), 74-92; and R. B. Barnes, *Prophecy and Gnosis: Apocalypticism in the Wake of the Lutheran Reformation* (Stanford, 1988), 36-53.

⁵ See C. Hill, *Antichrist in Seventeenth-Century England* (Oxford, 1971), chapter 1; R. Bauckham, *Tudor Apocalypse* (Abingdon, 1978); P. Christianson, *Reformers and Babylon: English Apocalyptic Visions from the Reformation to the Eve of the Civil War* (Toronto, 1978), chapter 1; K. Firth, *The Apocalyptic Tradition in Reformation Britain, 1530-1645* (Oxford, 1979); P. Lake, "The significance of the Elizabethan identification of the pope as Antichrist", *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 31 (1980), 161-178; A. Milton, *Catholic and Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought 1600-40* (Cambridge, 1995), 93-110.

⁶ M. Thorp, "William Cecil and the Antichrist: a study in anti-Catholic ideology", in M. A. Thorp and A. J. Slavin (eds), *Politics, Religion and Diplomacy in Early Modern Europe* (Kirkville, Miss., 1994), 289-304;

⁷ On the dominance of historicist interpretations of Revelation among early English Protestants see B. W. Ball, *A Great Expectation: Eschatological Thought in English Protestantism to 1660* (Leiden, 1975), 71-75; and especially Firth, *The Apocalyptic Tradition*.

⁸ See Ball, *A Great Expectation*, 159-163.

⁹ Within Lutheranism, by contrast, there developed a polarisation between the orthodox (who retained a pessimistic apocalypticism and did not anticipate an earthly golden age) and heterodox enthusiasts (who displayed great millenarian fervour in the 1610s and 1620s). See Barnes, *Prophecy and Gnosis*, chapter 6.

¹⁰ On these developments see P. Toon, *Puritans, the Millennium and the Future of Israel: Puritan Eschatology 1600-1660* (Cambridge, 1970), chapter 2; I. Murray, *The Puritan Hope* (Edinburgh, 1971), chapter 3.

¹¹ H. Hotson, "The Historiographical Origins of Calvinist Millenarianism", in B. Gordon (ed.), *Protestant History and Identity in Sixteenth-Century Europe*, 2 vols (Aldershot, 1996), II, 159-181.

¹² On the rebirth of millenarianism see Toon, *Puritans, the Millennium and the Future of Israel*, chapter 3; Ball, *A Great Expectation*, chapter 5; P. Christianson, *Reformers and Babylon*, chapter 3.

¹³ On the rarity of millenarianism in English-speaking Puritanism before 1640 see T. Bozeman, *To Live Ancient Lives: The Primitivist Dimension in Puritanism* (Chapel Hill, NC, 1988), chapter 6.

¹⁴ The apocalyptic outlook of "the generation of the 1620s" has been particularly emphasised by H. Trevor-Roper, "Three foreigners: the philoso-

phers of the Puritan revolution", in his *Religion, the Reformation and Social Change* (London, 1967), chapter 5.

¹⁵ *Letters of Samuel Rutherford*, ed. A. Bonar (Edinburgh, 1891), 577.

¹⁶ See Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, 110-127.

¹⁷ The best introduction to the ecclesiastical policies of James and Charles is K. Fincham (ed.), *The Early Stuart Church, 1603-1642* (London, 1993).

¹⁸ Rutherford, *Letters*, 544.

¹⁹ See J. Coffey, *Politics, Religion and the British Revolutions: The Mind of Samuel Rutherford* (Cambridge, 1997), 241-243.

²⁰ See D. Stevenson, *The Scottish Revolution: The Triumph of the Covenanters, 1637-1644* (Newton Abbott, 1973), chapter 2.

²¹ See A. Williamson, "The Jewish dimension of the Scottish Apocalypse: climate, covenant and world renewal", in Y. Kaplan, H. Mechoulam and R. Popkin (eds), *Menasseh ben Israel and his World* (Leiden, 1989), 7-30.

²² Samuel Rutherford, *Quaint Sermons*, ed. A. Bonar (1885), 36.

²³ *Diary of Sir Archibald Johnston of Wariston, 1632-39*, ed. G. M. Paul (Edinburgh, 1911), 347-348.

²⁴ On the role of the Scottish revolt in stimulating apocalypticism among English and New English Puritans see Hill, *The English Bible*, 302; Bozeman, *To Live Ancient Lives*, 217, 229-31.

²⁵ See Christianson, *Reformers and Babylon*, chapter 5.

²⁶ See C. Hibbard, *Charles I and the Popish Plot* (Chapel Hill, NC, 1983).

²⁷ Stephen Marshall, *Meroz Cursed* (1642), 8, 11-12, 33.

²⁸ W. Hunt, *The Puritan Moment: The Coming of Revolution in an English County* (Cambridge, Mass., 1983), 310.

²⁹ See P. Seaver, *Wallington's World: A Puritan Artisan in Seventeenth-Century London* (London, 1985), 166-167.

³⁰ The Grand Remonstrance is reprinted in S. R. Gardiner (ed.), *Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution 1625-60* (Oxford, 1979 edn), 202-232. Similarly, Samuel Rutherford, who repeatedly employed apocalyptic language in his letters and sermons, did not do so in his more formal political treatise *Lex, Rex*, though like the Grand Remonstrance the book railed against popish idolatry.

³¹ Gardiner, *Constitutional Documents*, 140.

³² This is the argument of J. Morrill, *The Nature of the English Revolution* (Harlow, 1993), 45-68. The religious origins of the Civil War are also highlighted by A. Fletcher, *The Outbreak of the English Civil War* (London, 1981), 415-418; W. Hunt, *The Puritan Moment*; P. Collinson, *The Birthpangs of Protestant England* (London, 1988), chapter 5; C. Russell, *The Causes of the English Civil War* (Oxford, 1990), chapters 2-5; and M. Stoye, *Loyalty and Locality: Popular Allegiance in Devon during the English Civil War* (Exeter, 1994).

³³ See Trevor-Roper, "Three foreigners", in his *Religion, the Reformation and Social Change*, chapter 5.

³⁴ For a full account of the enterprises of Hartlib, Dury and their associates see C. Webster, *The Great Instauration: Science, Medicine and Reform 1626-60* (London, 1975); and M. Greengrass, M. Leslie, T. Taylor (eds), *Samuel Hartlib and Universal Reformation: Studies in Intellectual Communication* (Cambridge, 1994).

³⁵ See G. F. Nuttall, *The Holy Spirit in Puritan Faith and Experience* (2nd edn: Chicago, 1992), 24, 107-113.

³⁶ See for example, Christopher Blackwood's significantly-titled *The Storming of Antichrist, in his two last and strongest garrisons; of compulsion of conscience, and infant baptism* (London, 1644), esp. 6.

³⁷ Margaret Fell, *Womens Speaking Justified, Proved and Allowed of by the Scriptures*, in *A Brief Collection of... Margaret Fell* (London, 1710), 340-343.

³⁸ [Roger Williams], *The Bloudy Tenent of Persecution*, ed. E. B. Underhill (London, 1848), 154; R. W., *The Fourth Paper* (London, 1652), 133.

³⁹ *Complete Prose Works of John Milton*, 8 vols (New Haven, 1953-82), II: 549-553.

⁴⁰ Paul Best, *Mysteries Discovered* (1647), 10-12.

⁴¹ For an account of Servetus's trial and execution and the furore which followed, see J. Lecler, *Toleration and the Reformation*, 2 vols, trans. T. L. Westow (London, 1960), I: 325-364.

⁴² See his *A Confession of Faith Touching the Holy Trinity* [London, 1648], D4, E3.

⁴³ See R. Iliffe, "Making a shew: apocalyptic hermeneutics and the sociology of Christian idolatry in the work of Isaac Newton and Henry More", in J. E. Force and R. H. Popkin (eds), *The Books of Nature and Scripture* (Dordrecht, 1994), 55-88.

⁴⁴ *Complete Prose Works of John Milton*, VI:117. The quotation is from the epistle at the beginning of Milton's *Christian Doctrine*, a work which was largely completed by 1660 but not published until 1825.

⁴⁵ See P. Crawford, "Charles Stuart, That Man of Blood", *Journal of British Studies* 16 (1977), 41-61.

⁴⁶ The best study on apocalypticism and the regicide is J. P. Laydon, "The kingdom of Christ and the powers of the earth: the political uses of apocalyptic and millenarian ideas in England 1648-53", unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Cambridge (1976), chapter 4.

⁴⁷ Laydon, "The kingdom of Christ and the powers of the earth", 238.

⁴⁸ John Owen, "The shaking and translating of heaven and earth", in *The Works of John Owen*, ed. W. H. Goold, 16 vols (1850-53), VIII: 243-279.

⁴⁹ S. Pincus, *Protestantism and Patriotism: Ideologies and the Making of English Foreign Policy, 1650-68* (Cambridge, 1996), 11-100.

⁵⁰ See B. Worden, "Conviction on the high seas", *London Review of Books* 6 (February 1997), 12-13.

⁵¹ The fullest discussion of the origins and course of this parliament is A. Woolrych, *Commonwealth to Protectorate* (Oxford, 1982).

⁵² Adamson, "Oliver Cromwell and the Long Parliament", in J. S. Morrill (ed.), *Oliver Cromwell and the English Revolution* (Harlow, 1990), 88.

⁵³ W. C. Abbott (ed.), *The Writings and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell*, 4 vols (Cambridge, Mass., 1637-47), III: 63-65.

⁵⁴ The fullest study of this movement is B. Capp, *The Fifth Monarchy Men: A Study in Seventeenth-Century English Millenarianism* (Oxford, 1972).

⁵⁵ My understanding of the Fifth Monarchists follows that of Laydon, "The kingdom of Christ and the powers of the earth", chapter 7.

⁵⁶ Cromwell's attitude to the Fifth Monarchists is clearly revealed in his lengthy debate with one of their leaders, John Rogers. See Abbott, III: 606-616.

⁵⁷ J. S. A. Adamson, "Oliver Cromwell and the Long Parliament", 85.

⁵⁸ The only such passages I have found are in Abbott, I: 430, 543; III: 63-65, 436; 860; IV: 51-53, 264.

⁵⁹ Abbott, III: 860; IV: 264.

⁶⁰ Abbott, III: 64.

⁶¹ Abbott, III: 53-54, 60-61.

⁶² See Abbott, IV: 51-53. On the apocalyptic origins of the campaign for the readmission see D. Katz, *Philo-Semitism and the Readmission of the Jews to England, 1603-55* (Oxford, 1982).

⁶³ Pincus, *Protestantism and Patriotism*, 101-191.

⁶⁴ Abbott, III: 436-438. The pessimistic eschatological outlook of Cromwell in 1654 is confirmed in *The Correspondence of Roger Williams*, 2 vols, ed. G. W. LaFantasie (Hanover, 1988), II: 391-392.

⁶⁵ T. Collier, *The Personal Appearing and Reign of Christs Kingdom upon the Earth* (London, 1657), 8-31.

⁶⁶ H. L. Ingle, *First Among Friends: George Fox and the Creation of Quakerism* (New York, 1994), 328 n.60.

⁶⁷ Quoted in H. L. Ingle, *First Among Friends*, 77-78.

⁶⁸ See Nuttall, *The Holy Spirit*. There are striking parallels here with the mystical, inward and individualising turn taken by some Anabaptists in the wake of the Munster catastrophe and by radical Lutherans after the outbreak of the Thirty Years War. See J. Lecler, *Toleration and the Reformation*, I: 216-220; and Barnes, *Prophecy and Gnosis*, chapter 6.

⁶⁹ See C. Hill, *The World Turned Upside Down* (London, 1972); and J. F. McGregor and B. Reay, *Radical Religion in the English Revolution* (Oxford, 1984). For a thorough, if unconventional, exploration of the mentality of an individual prophet, see A. Hessayon, "'Gold tried in the fire': the prophet Theauraujohn Tany and the Puritan revolution", unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Cambridge (1996).

⁷⁰ See Morrill, *The Nature of the English Revolution*, chapter 7; C. Durston, "Puritan rule and the failure of cultural revolution", in Durston and J. Eales, *The Culture of English Puritanism, 1560-1700* (London, 1996), chapter 7.

⁷¹ Henry Vane, *A Needful Corrective or Ballance in Popular Government* (London, 1660), 10-11.

⁷² See H. Trevor-Roper, *Catholics, Anglicans and Puritans* (London, 1987), 276.

⁷³ Henry Vane, *A Pilgrimage into the Land of Promise* (London, 1664), 104-109.

⁷⁴ H. Trevor-Roper, *Religion, the Reformation and Social Change*, 469. A similar verdict can be found in W. Lamont, *Godly Rule*, 172.

⁷⁵ See especially T. Harris, P. Seaward and M. Goldie (eds), *The Politics of Religion in Restoration England* (Oxford, 1990).

⁷⁶ See M. Z. Kochavi, "One prophet interprets another: Sir Isaac Newton and Daniel", in Force and Popkin (eds), *The Books of Nature and Scripture*, 105-122.

Dying for the Great Commission: A Contemporary Thirteenth Century French Historiography

THOMAS P. JOHNSTON

Midwestern Baptist Theological Seminary

When my uncle Raymond of Grimoard went to Corbarieu to be heretiqued there, me myself, William Faure of Pêche-Hernier, Bertrand of Saint-Andrew, Hugo and John of Cavalsaut and Peter Béraut accompanied this Raymond up to Corbarieu in order that he might be heretiqued there. But I did not attend the heretication. It was about twenty years ago.¹

Hence reads the testimony of Pons Grimoard of Castelsarrasin before his inquisitors in the infamous *Cahiers de Bernard de Caux*, written from 1243 to 1248. Herein we find Southern France in a precarious social situation. The inquisitors were burning people at the stake, interring them within walls as in a prison, confiscating all their goods, and condemning anyone who had any association with them.

What led to such a surge of animosity by the Roman Church? Who were these inquisitors who so ruthlessly interrogated and condemned to the secular sword, both old and young, men and women? And more importantly for this paper, why did the inquisitors view their primary mission to be the extirpating of heretics? In order to evaluate these questions, we will look at numerous sources, primarily in French. The use of contemporary French resources is for several rea-

sons. First, the disagreement over the Great Commission in the thirteenth century largely took place in Southern France: “The South of France is *par excellence* the territory of the heretics.”² Second, there is emerging a new historiography of the time period based on the scientific research of historians largely due to the “Cahiers de Fanjeaux.” Through this paper, I hope to introduce this new historiography. Third, because the books are published in French, those unfamiliar with the language may not be cognizant of the discussions taking place. Therefore, I will make significant use of French resources throughout this paper.

The paper will be divided into three main sections. In the first section I will introduce the *Sitz im Leben* of thirteenth century Southern France, primarily through use of the recently published inquisition records from the National Library in Paris, the Municipal Library of Toulouse, and other libraries. The original Latin text, and in some cases a French translation of these texts, have been made available online by Jean Duvernoy, professor at the University of Toulouse, France.³ After a look at the religious context of Southern France, we will consider the shift of focus from theology to ecclesiology as regards heresy. Lastly we will analyze issues related to conversion and the Great Commission of various major groups in the bloody disagreement over mission. These groups or individuals are the Waldenses, the Albigenses, Bernard of Clairvaux (and the Cistercians), Peter the Venerable (of Cluny), Francis of Assisi (and the Franciscans), and Dominic (and the Dominicans).

According to Anne Brenon, there has been a seismic shift in the French historiography of the Cathars in Southern France in the past fifty years. “Catharism,” wrote Brenon, “appeared in the 1950s as a solved problem.”⁴ She explained that the historians of that time were unanimous in their affirmation that the Cathars were heretical, because the historians received their information from one source, that of their victors:⁵

Founding themselves upon this one-sided Medieval documentation, the modern theologians (from Döllinger to Father Dondaine, OP), the historians of religion (from Söderberg to Run-ciman), and the historians (from Arno Post to Christine Thou-zellier) who studied and wrote on the subject up to the middle of the twentieth century, ended quite naturally to one consensual opinion, leaving the phenomena of the Cathars as a well-ordered question: catharism was a foreign body in Western Christianity and, as such, it was given over to failure. Heirs of Persian Mani-chaeanism and of the intervening *Mazdéism* of the Paulicians and Bogomils, it was characterized by a dualist doctrine of Oriental origin which it taught. Unrealistic, pessimistic, fundamentally anti-social, it had no chance of surviving in Western Christianity and very understandable repression of which it was the object, crusade and Inquisition, had only but accelerated the process of internal degeneration which would have without a doubt led to its disappearing. Paradoxically, it was in the publication and study of the inquisition archives that opened the first flaw of this wall of certainty.⁶

Brenon continued with a timeline of events which has led to the complete reversal of the opinion that the Cathars (including Waldenses and Albigenses) were heretics:

1959, the publication of texts that are original with the Cathars, *Écritures Cathares* (Cathar Writings), by René Nelli.

1965, Jean Duvernoy's publishing of the "Register of Inquisition of Jacques Fournier."⁷

1976-1978, and the publication of Jean Duvernoy's *Le Catharisme: la religion des Cathares* (Catharism: Religion of the Cathars),⁸ and *Le Catharisme: l'histoire des Cathares* (Catharism: History of the Cathars).⁹

In these last two works of Duvernoy, according to Brenon, a whole new field of inquiry opened to scholars as they allowed the Cathars to speak for themselves. Based on the research of Nelli, Brenon wrote that the dualism of the Cathars was no-

thing more than what is taught in the Scriptures (“notably in the Gospel and the first book of John”).¹⁰

1991, the French translation of Robert Ian Moore’s *The Formation of a Persecuting Society* as *La persécution: Sa formation en Europe (Xe-XIIIe siècle)*.¹¹

Moore’s book seemed to shock the scholarly minds of the French as to the role of the Catholic Church in the persecution of the Cathars. Rather than suppression, crusade, and inquisition being regrettable but necessary,¹² the Cathars heresy was invented by the church that could not accept a rival church which was growing and expanding. Hence...

1998, Monique Zerner’s book, *Inventer l’hérésie?* (Inventing Heresy?).¹³

In this book, Zerner and associates discussed the new data that seemed to point to the fact that the Catholic Church “invented” the heresy of the Albigenses in order to regain that land for the Catholic Church, and the “Very Christian King of France.” It is helpful to remember chronologically that 1208-1209, 1224-1225 are about 100 years prior to the Avignon papacy (1305-1375), and about 200 years prior to the Pisan papacy (1409-1415).

How can it be that the scholarly world was duped for so long? What are the ramifications for the current time? Because evangelism was the focal issue in the thirteenth century dividing the Cathars from the Cistercians, Franciscans, and Dominicans, are there lessons to be learned from the perspective of a theology of evangelism and a definition of the Great Commission? To answer some of these questions, let us once again enter into the inquisition room of Pons Grimoard, and experience the thirteenth century *Sitz im Leben*.

Context

Following the aforementioned testimony of Pons Grimoard of Castelsarrasin, the inquisitors were listed as follows: “Witnesses Brothers Pons, superior [*prieur* or “pray-er”] for the Preaching Brothers of Cahors [Order of Preachers, or Dominican] and Peter Sellan of the same order, and Bernard of Ladinhaac.”¹⁴ Although denied and revised out of history by some,¹⁵ it is a well-known fact that the ruthless inquisitors in the thirteenth century were Dominicans,¹⁶ a newly founded order headed by Dominic under the tutelage of the Vicar of Christ, Innocent III. According to Anne Brenon, the Cistercians (founded by Bernard of Clairvaux) were the promoters of the crusade against the Albigenses, whereas the Dominicans took up where they left off and became the chief inquisitors.¹⁷

In a few circumstances the witness or inquisitor was Franciscan. For example, the “Letter of Penitence and Absolution of the same Pons Grimoard” began as follows:

To all the faithful of Christ who will see the present letter, Brother Stephen of the Order of Minor Brothers, and Brother William Arnaud of the Order of Preaching Brothers, judges constituted by the venerable Father John, by the grace of God archbishop of the holy Church of Vienna, Legate of the Apostolic Seat for inquisition of the entire diocese of Toulouse, greetings in Him who is the true salvation of all the true faithful.¹⁸

In this quote the “Order of Minor Brothers” (O.F.M., *Ordinis Fratrum Minorum*) delineated a Franciscan, whereas “Order of Preaching Brothers” (O.F.P., *Ordinis Fratrum Praedicatorum*, or O.P., *Ordo Praedicatorum*) referred to a Dominican. While virtually every deposition included a Dominican as a witness, only certain ones clearly identified a Franciscan witness. For example, it was unusual to find a deposition of a Franciscan against another Franciscan suspect of heresy. Such was the case with William Gougot testifying against Peter Gracias of Bourget-Nau of Toulouse:

In the name of our Lord Jesus Christ the crucified Amen. The year of our Lord 1247, the 11th of the *kalentes* of September (22 August 1247) Brother William Gougot of the order of Minors required to tell the truth pure and simple on the crime of heresy, witness having sworn by oath said.¹⁹

This deposition was followed by the depositions of three other Franciscans: Deodat of Rodez, William Garcias, Peter Raymond of Saint Bart, and then by a deposition of Raymond of Ferrières parish priest of Holy Mary of the Daurade. The short testimony of William of Montouty was as follows:

In the year and day hitherto, William of Montouty, requisitioned... said: I think Peter Garcias of Bourget-Nau suspect of heresy, because he has that reputation, that he made penitence for heresy, after what I have heard said, that his father was a heretic believer, and that his mother was a Waldensian believer, because he has had association with suspects and with believers from among the heretics, and it has been two years since he has treated his wife as a husband, after what I have heard. He deposed these things at Toulouse before the Brothers Bernard and John, inquisitors. Witnesses Raymond, parish priest of the Daurade, and Peter Aribert.²⁰

So here we learn of who was deposed, and against whom, and how. Notice that the mother was Waldensian and the father heretical (probably Albigensian). Therefore, although their order is not listed in this final quote, the primary inquisitors during this period were the Preaching Brothers (Dominicans), the Minor Brothers (Franciscans), with parish priests assisting at times. Yet the main people they were inquisiting was not their own, but heretical movements outside the Catholic Church.

As to how people were inquisited, several sentences will have to suffice. The sentence comes from a 1285 letter written by the town counsel of Bourg, France, to the Pope, the head of the Dominicans of Paris, and to the King of France. It ex-

plained the unseemly arrests and coercive measures that were used by Jean Galand, inquisitor of Carcassonne, France from 1279-1286. The counsel explained:

You hold them as prisoners in a rigorous and terrifying cell until they admit, as much in fear of torture and of the cell, as is inflicted by the grace that is promised to them upon penitence... These admissions, once they are liberated from the cell and the torture, almost all of them proclaim and say that they made them only for fear of torture. From this torture and this cell a number are dead who were not guilty.²¹

Therefore as the Dominicans inquisited individuals in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, terror and coercion combined to turn the whole social fabric into unrest.²² There was no freedom of speech, no due process, and no protection from self-incrimination and the seizure of property, which the United States Constitution gives as a right to all Americans.²³

The main targets of the inquisition were described by Innocent III in the Fourth Lateran Council (1215):

We excommunicate and anathematize every heresy raising itself up against this holy, orthodox and catholic faith which we have expounded above. We condemn all heretics, whatever names they may go under. They have different faces indeed but their tails are tied together inasmuch as they are alike in their pride. Let those condemned be handed over to the secular authorities present, or to their bailiffs, for due punishment. Clerics are first to be degraded from their orders. The goods of the condemned are to be confiscated, if they are lay persons, and if clerics they are to be applied to the churches from which they received their stipends. Those who are only found suspect of heresy are to be struck with the sword of anathema, unless they prove their innocence by an appropriate purgation, having regard to the reasons for suspicion and the character of the person. Let such persons be avoided by all until they have made adequate satisfaction. If they

persist in the excommunication for a year, they are to be condemned as heretics.²⁴

And who were they inquisiting? Innocent stated, “every heresy raising itself up against this holy, orthodox and catholic faith.” Not only were heretics subject to the secular authorities, but their properties were to be confiscated. Even the suspicion of heresy was enough for the death penalty, unless they proved their innocence, “Those who are only found suspect of heresy are to be struck with the sword of anathema” (i.e. “Guilty until proven innocent”). In fact, if Catholics lived in a land controlled by a ruler who did not work with the inquisitors, namely to expel all heretics from their land, they were to rebel against that insubordinate ruler. Therefore, according to Jacques Dalarun, former director of Medieval Studies at the French School of Rome and director of the Institute for Research and History of Texts (I.R.H.T.), rulers would accuse one another of heresy for political reasons beginning in the twelfth century. Those that wanted to listen to these accusations listened.²⁵ He explained a political motive was the desire to gain territory, as was the case for the territory of the Albigenses. Dalarun explained further:

It had to be that the country tempting the appetite of the *Capétien* become heretical in order to be conquered. “Albigensian” became synonymous to heretical and a crusade followed, legitimizing the conquest. Today the preferred nomenclature for this country is “Country of the Cathars,” which is nothing more than the latent but zealous echo of the propaganda for crusade. Thus the identity constructs itself by looking at the other.²⁶

Because the Count of Toulouse and the surrounding region did not submit to Rome, their territory became a target of the King of France.

The litmus test for heresy move from theological issues to lack of submission to Rome. Insubordination to the Pope be-

came the cardinal heresy for thirteenth century inquisitors, which same litmus test was used against the sixteenth century Protestants. For example, note the words of Reinerius Sacho, inquisitor of the Waldensians:

The Waldenses lead *a righteous life* before men, and believe as regards God all that there is to believe. They accept *all the articles and symbols of the apostles*, only they blaspheme against the Roman Church and the clergy.²⁷

Sacho was incensed with the Waldenses because they blasphemed against the Roman Church; blasphemy against the church, its seven Sacraments, and/or its belief in purgatory, the saints, etc. was tantamount to the unpardonable sin, blasphemy against the Holy Spirit!²⁸ Similarly today, the only persons who lose their salvation in the 1993 *Catechism of the Catholic Church* are those who leave the Church once inside, “Even though incorporated into the Church, one who does not however persevere in charity is not saved.”²⁹

In Southern France the objects of inquisition were the Albigenses (whose sympathizers controlled territories) and the Waldenses (who controlled no region), both of whom evangelized and were growing. In the 1273-1280 *Registre de l’Inquisition de Toulouse*, inquisition record of Pons de Parnac, the standard first question asked was as follows: “Have you seen any heretics, the Waldenses, heard them or eaten with them?”³⁰ Herein we have the word Waldenses used in parallel with the word heretic.³¹ Another deposition exemplified the use of the word Waldensize (as a verb) rather than Waldenses (as a proper noun):

In the year of our Lord 1246, the fourth of the *kalendes* of July (28 June 1246) the horseman William-Raymond of Castlar, requisitioned to tell the truth on himself and on others dead or alive on the crime of heresy and Waldensizing [*vaudoisie*] testifying under oath said.³²

Therefore it is clear from these texts and many others, that the early thirteenth century inquisitors were extirpating both Albigenses and Waldenses.

Herein lies the irony of contemporary French historiography. French scholars have shown that the Waldenses *were not heretics*. Jean Duvernoy, stated the same in a round table discussion printed in the book *Évangile et évangélisme (XIIe-XIIIe siècle)*:

The Waldenses of the high period were not heretics, but they were schismatics, and not even that: they were simply disobedient. They wanted to stay in the Church but did not want to obey the prohibition against preaching without authorization.³³

Michel Rubellin, professor at the University of Lyon II, France, followed suit:

3. Finally, the history of Waldo in Lyons appears exemplary as regards the invention of the heresy and the establishment of the "Society of Persecution" that Robert Ian Moore described. Waldensianism as a heresy is not born in Lyon with Waldo, as the same, if my hypothesis is correct, collaborates with the Archbishop. It is outside of Lyon that it is born from the moment where this collaboration is rejected, and that Waldo and his followers have become not only useless but more so dangerous, and as a consequence they are condemned and chassed out of Lyon.³⁴

Also Jean-Louis Biget, professor emeritus, École Normale Supérieure, Fontenay/St. Cloud, France, used even stronger language:

He [Michel Rubellin] showed that at their origin they [the Waldenses] were not-at-all heretical [*nullement hérétiques*]. During the six years, between 1173 and 1179, Waldo and his own were utilized by the Archbishop, Guichard of Pontigny, a Cistercian, to wrestle against the Cathedral Chapter of Lyons. After John of

Bellesmains ascended to the Episcopal seat, the Waldenses were defined as heretical because they refused to obey the rule that prohibited preaching by the laity.³⁵

Hence it is clear from recent French scholarship that the Waldenses were *not* heretical. They were therefore not inquisited for theological reasons, but rather because they did not submit to the absolute ecclesial authority of Rome. Similarly on 7 May 1318, four Franciscan friars were burned in Marseille for not obeying the orders of Pope John XXII.³⁶ By the way, lack of submission to Rome continues as an important issue to Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger (now Benedict XVI) as exemplified in 2000.³⁷

So there was a time that the Waldenses were not heretical. But how did they suddenly become Gnostic or Manichaean? Biget in a nutshell explained that Waldo and his followers became heretics when they were kicked out of town by the new Archbishop of Lyon, John of Bellesmains. Their reason for becoming heretical was that they practiced lay preaching, or what we call today lay evangelism.

That the Albigenses were heretics for the same reason is likely the case. Their inquisitors were wise to the need for valid accusations to condemn people. Therefore Augustine's *Contra Manichaeum* provided the theoretical model from which they could frame the questions to and the answers of the Albigenses in order to deem them heretical. Hinnebusch in his *The History of the Dominican Order* explained that Innocent III had attempted to send preachers into the Albigenses area (Montpelier), and their efforts had failed: "The primary objective of Innocent III was pastoral; he aimed to eradicate the Catharism by converting its converts."³⁸ Their orders were:

First they should expound the faith, then should admonish. If these proved fruitless, the legates might resort to excommunication, and ultimately call upon the assistance of the civil powers.³⁹

In the county of Toulouse, however, there was a problem. The nobility had been exposed to and favored the Cathar teaching. Therefore the Catholic Church had no civil powers upon whom to rely. The use of the civil powers to Christianize (Catholicize) and dehereticize their populace was demanded by the Third Lateran council of 1179. The next citation provides the content and tenor of the document as regards heretics:

27. As St. Leo says, though the discipline of the church should be satisfied with the judgment of the priest and should not cause the shedding of blood, yet it is helped by the laws of catholic princes so that people often seek a salutary remedy when they fear that a corporal punishment will overtake them. For this reason, since in Gascony and the regions of Albi and Toulouse and in other places the loathsome heresy of those whom some call the Cathars, others the Patarenes, others the Publicani, and others by different names, has grown so strong that they no longer practise their wickedness in secret, as others do, but proclaim their error publicly and draw the simple and weak to join them, we declare that they and their defenders and those who receive them are under anathema, and we forbid under pain of anathema that anyone should keep or support them in their houses or lands or should trade with them. [see footnote] they should not be received into the communion of the church, unless they abjure their pernicious society and heresy. As long as such people persist in their wickedness, let all who are bound to them by any pact know that they are free from all obligations of loyalty, homage or any obedience. On these [princes] and on all the faithful we enjoin, for the remission of sins, that they oppose this scourge with all their might and by arms protect the Christian people against them. Their goods are to be confiscated and princes free to subject them to *slavery*.⁴⁰

It must be noted that Gascony, Albi, and Toulouse (all in Southern France) were cited as problematic areas by this the Eleventh Ecumenical Council of the Catholic Church. Therefore when Bishop Diego and Dominic stopped in Toulouse in 1206,

twenty-seven years later, they knew what they were getting into. Dominic's first converted Albigensian gave him hope, while it showed him his apologetic challenge.⁴¹ Emboldened by this spiritual victory, empowered by the Third Lateran Council, and encouraged by Innocent III, Dominic led the charge of extirpating this heresy from Southern France. His official mandate was as follows:

By an official document, which is still extant, Bishop Foulques constituted Brother Dominic and his companions preachers in the diocese of Toulouse. They were to (1) extirpate heresy, (2) combat vice, (3) teach the faith, and (4) train men in good morals.⁴²

To complete his mission meant that the non-Catholic rule of the Count of Toulouse needed to be taken from him and given to a Catholic prince. Hence Innocent III devised the crusade against the Albigenses with the full cooperation and approbation of Dominic, founder of the Order of Preaching Brothers; even the name of this order is rather odd as they do not believe in the necessity of preaching for salvation, but rather rightly receiving the grace-giving sacraments of the Roman-Catholic Church.

As noted above, French scholars in a book titled *Inventing Heresy?* discussed the problem of historiography and posited that Rome and Paris seemed to team together to invent the Albigensian heresy in order to regain control of those lands (for the Church of Rome) and to seize control of those lands for a Catholic King (hence the French crown). In this case, Innocent III teamed up with Philip II August of France to extirpate Albigensian control of the Albi region. However, the extreme to which the Catholic Church went to regain control was the result of a long development of persecution within Catholicism.

Orthodoxy Moves from Theology to Institutionalism

This *Sitz im Leben*, which Robert Ian Moore calls "A Persecuting Society," leads us to our next question: what were the

reasons for such harsh measures taken against groups that upheld the “Three Symbols” of orthodox theology: the Apostles Creed, the Nicene Creed, and the Creed of Athanasius?⁴³

In order to understand the theological basis for persecution, a brief history of persecution is in order. Moore began his analysis with the spiritual repression under Emperor Constantine of Rome:

After his conversion the Emperor Constantine made it clear that the privilege which he conferred on Christians “must benefit only adherents of the Catholic faith”, that is, adherents of the Nicæan Creed and of the bishop of Rome, while “heretics and schismatics shall not only be alien from these privileges but shall be bound and subjugated to various compulsory public services.”⁴⁴

The persecution by Roman Emperors increased to prohibiting meetings and confiscating churches. Under Theodosius I heretics were prohibited from holding public office, “purges to exclude them were conducted in 395 and again in 408.”⁴⁵ It would seem that Augustine of Hippo provided Rome with its theological justification for the persecution of heretics with his *Contra Donatisten* and *Contra Manichæan*. Moore continued:

These measures were invoked from time to time against other sects, notably in the years after 405 against the Donatists in North Africa, as a part of the great drive to force their reconversion to Catholicism in defence of which Augustine composed the first substantial Christian justification of religious coercion and of the forced persecution it implied.⁴⁶

Probably the most often quoted portion of Augustine’s *Contra Donatisten* is that there is no salvation outside the Catholic Church.⁴⁷ Gregory I reorganized the Roman-Catholic Church according to the secular model of the monastery, which gave to the Abbott complete autocratic authority,⁴⁸ and used various administrative ploys to bring “heresy” under control. For

example, his letter "To All the Bishops of Numibia" suppressed the opportunity of Donatists to rise to the rank of Bishop:

With respect to those who attain to the episcopate from among the Donatists, we by all means forbid them to be advanced to the dignity of primacy, even though their standing should denote them for that position.⁴⁹

Gregory's efforts led to his sending bishops to deal with the Visigoth King Leogivild's successor Reccared to assure that the latter remained in the Catholic faith (he abjured his Arianism after coming to the throne, "and induced many bishops to do the same"⁵⁰). Gregory also sent a bishop to negotiate with the princess of Lombardy: "With the assistance of the Princess Theodelinda and by the zeal of the Italian bishops they [the Lombards] were presently converted from Arianism to orthodoxy."⁵¹ Hence Gregory established the precedent for the combination of political means to convert heretics, as well as administrative suppression if they would not convert.

The first known case of burning Manichaeans at the stake is by the King Robert the Pious in Orleans, France in 1022.⁵² It would seem that the practice of burning at the stake was borrowed from Frankish Kings. In 1157, according to a provincial council in Rheims, France, heretics who converted were to be branded on the face. In 1167 in Vezelai, seven were condemned and burned at the stake, and the practice picked up fervour during the inquisition of the thirteenth century.⁵³

By the time of the Great Schism (1054), theology had less to do with anathematizing churches or movements as did control. Rome and Constantinople had so evolved in their desire for primacy, that they mutually excommunicated one another. Although the Council of Chalcedon and the iconoclastic controversy provided theological cloaks for the split, the main issue was that of primacy, whose church constituted the "Kingdom of God." Here was the primary problem, the Albi-

genses: (1) did not feel that popes had authority to forgive sins; (2) did not agree with the Mass; and (3) preached against the Roman church.⁵⁴ On top of this they were aggressive in their evangelism and they were spreading throughout Southern France. When Bernard of Clairvaux first learned of the heretics in Southern France in 1143, he responded with a series of sermons on the little foxes that spoil the vine, the one true Church. In 1145 he led a preaching crusade through the Albi and Toulouse area described as a “raid of anti-heretical counter-preaching”⁵⁵ directed particularly against the preaching of the said-heretic Henry of Lausanne. When Innocent III became pope, Catharism was his primary domestic problem. He took care of this problem by use of the secular powers to crush the heresy, using a Cistercian-led crusade and a Dominican-led inquisition.

Paradoxically, however, by the time that Rome accepted the sacramental system of salvation, following the “Sentences” of Peter the Lombard, they no longer truly held to the Athanasian Creed. The eighth century Athanasian Creed began as follows:

1. Whosoever will be saved, before all things it is necessary that he hold the Catholic [true Christian] faith,
2. Which Faith except every one do keep whole and undefiled, without doubt he shall perish everlastingly.
3. And the Catholic [true Christian] faith is this: that we worship one God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity;
4. Neither confounding the Persons; nor dividing the Substance.⁵⁶

By the thirteenth century the Catholic Church had added more to the faith-alone in the “Three Symbols” as a prerequisite for orthodoxy. They had added submission to papal authority to the list. Hence the Athanasian Creed should have been amended to include several sentences on submission to Peter and his successors, promotion of his right alone to provide absolution of sins, the efficacy of the seven sacraments as defined by

Rome, and all the other Medieval encrustations placed on faith alone.

Nevertheless, the unorthodox Roman Church was wise enough to accuse the Cathars of Manichaeism, which provided them the theological stature of Augustine as they began to develop their “Society of Persecution.” But let’s think for a minute. If they accepted all the symbols of the apostles, as Sacho confirmed,⁵⁷ then how could they be at the same time Manichaeism? There is a lot of smoke somewhere! Then it only follows to ask: can that much of a theological distinction be made between the so-called Albigenses (which name never existed until a crusade was called against them by Jacques de Vitry)⁵⁸ and the Waldenses (who became heretical when they were kicked out of Lyons)? Or was it a bogus accusation, somewhat similar to Mark Noll’s 1994 accusation that United States Evangelicals have a Manichaean tendency in his *Scandal of the Evangelical Mind*.⁵⁹

Outside of the theology of the Three Symbols, the sacramental system provided Rome system of salvation that was not taught in the New Testament. Thus as the Bible was translated and read in the language of the people, they would quickly and readily see the difference. Hence in these centuries lay reading of the Bible was also repressed.⁶⁰ But more important for this paper was the fact that a different system of conversion meant a different approach to evangelism. Are persons saved merely by believing? If so, the mission is to go, tell, and urge belief in the Gospel. If persons are saved through the sacraments, then the mission changes to sending duly appointed priests who can offer the sacraments of the Church to bring them salvation. Method and message are inextricably intertwined. Because of their unbelief in the sacramental system of the Roman church, the Albigenses and Waldenses were hereticized.⁶¹ And as the preaching of the Gospel was concomitant with their view of salvation, their view of mission was divergent from that of the Roman Church.

Mission

It would seem that meditating on Peter the Lombard's *Sentences* (d. 1164) framed the sacramental system of salvation into the fabric of the Catholic Church. This led to two very divergent methods of salvation: (1) the sacraments (or if you will, works); and (2) through hearing and believing (thus, faith alone), outside of the sacraments of the church. With a differing view of salvation ensues a different view of mission. If the sacraments are salvific, then the church must focus on getting the masses to participate in these. However, if salvation comes through faith in the Gospel, then Christians must go out and proclaim the same. By the thirteenth century the Catholic Church had become so sacramental that: (1) those who did not accept the sacraments spoke out against them; and (2) Rome therefore could not tolerate those who believed in New Testament evangelism. Thus it became a persecutor of the same.

This section will begin to look into the divergent views of mission that existed in the thirteenth century. On a grand scale this shift is noted to be a move from *vita apostolica* to *vita evangelica*. However, Jacques Dalarun described it in even greater detail as follows:

With much care, we can therefore herein more clearly indicate these inflections: from *vita apostolica* to *vita evangelica*, from *sequela Christi* to *imitatio Christi*, being from *identificatio Christi*, of the *Christus triumphans* to the *Christus patiens*. Evolutions that are decisive in their totality, but often very difficult to focalize with precision, where the role of the stigmatized of the Alverne was not narrow. But where the will to respond to the heresy was not narrow either.⁶²

Seeking to initiate renewal among the monastic orders (not through theology, but through practice) and preaching for the Second Crusade, Bernard of Clairvaux had travelled to Toulouse, France, and found the heresy too well established to be

dislodged (i.e. they did not support Rome or Bernard's crusading efforts).⁶³ "He cursed the cities that refused him a hearing."⁶⁴ Hence, it was Bernard, as well as Peter the Venerable [both Frenchmen], who marked the South of France as heretical, "In the middle of the twelfth century, it was under the fire of the cross of Bernard of Clairvaux and Peter the Venerable that the South [of France] was assigned its heresy."⁶⁵ Peter the Venerable of Cluny wrote a treatise against Henry of Lausanne, in which he refuted Henry's five points of heresy. Dominique Iogna-Prat, professor at the University of Bourgogne, France, translated the summary of Peter the Venerable's treatise (from 1135-1140) as to the five heretical propositions of Henry of Lausanne (a.k.a. *Henri le Moine*):

1. Refusal to baptize infants, under the pretext that it is faith that saves and that a young infant could not have sufficient conscience to believe.
2. Rejection of holy places; the Church of God does not consist of an assemblage of stones but of a spiritual reality, the communion of the faithful.
3. The cross is not an object of adoration; it is on the contrary a detestable object, as the instrument of the torture and suffering of Christ.
4. Priests and bishops dispense a lying teaching as to the matter of the Eucharist. The body of Christ was consumed only one time and only by the disciples, during the communion that preceded the Passion. All other later consumption is only vain fiction.
5. The funeral liturgy in its whole (offerings, prayers, Masses, and alms) is useless; the dead can hope in nothing more than what they received when they were alive.⁶⁶

Bernard's preaching for the Second Crusade and his hereticizing of the Albigenses, among other things, tarnished his reputation for such scholars as the Huguenot Pierre Bayle in his *Dictionnaire historique et critique* (1802). Bayle wrote that Bernard blamed the failure of the Second Crusade upon the sin of the crusaders.⁶⁷

As to conversion, Bernard seemed obsessed with and enslaved to following Benedict's *Regula*.⁶⁸ Obedience of these rules seemed to become his passion *and* his salvation. Was Bernard jealous of the freedom of the Albigenses [and the later Waldensians] who were married and worked with their hands? We shall see that Bernard had a philosophical view of sin and salvation. Because of the fall of man, man has lost his freedom of counsel and pleasure:

By participating in the sin of Adam, humans have lost their freedom of counsel and pleasure; humans have lost their likeness to God; without freedom of choice they would cease to be human. The primary effect of sin, then, is the will misdirected...⁶⁹

Thus since the freedom of choice remains untainted, man must choose to follow the example of Christ and apply the proper effort to attain salvation or perfection:

Thanks to the help of him who called me, I have built a ladder to take me to it [perfection]. This is my road to God's salvation (Psalm 49:23). Already I see God resting on the top of the ladder (Genesis 28:12-13); already I have the joy of hearing the voice of Truth. He calls to me, and I reply to him: "stretch out your right hand to the work of your hands" (Job 14:15). You have number my steps, O Lord (Job 14:15).⁷⁰

With a generous view of his own efforts, it is not surprising to find that Bernard believed that humans were capable of sinless perfection: "Humans are thus capable of perfection, '...capable of ascending from strength right up the summit'."⁷¹

Similarly, Francis of Assisi came along almost a century later continuing in a similar vein as regards conversion theology, mission, and the heretics. Francis' view of salvation was the imitation of Christ (*imitatio Christi*), "Christian discipleship," or in our own day, "Personal Spiritual Disciplines":

The most holy father was unwilling that his friars should be desirous of knowledge or books, but he willed and preached to them that they should desire to be founded on holy *Humility*, and to imitate pure *Simplicity*, holy *Prayer*, and our Lady *Poverty*, on which the saints and friars did build. And this, he used to say, was the only safe way to one's salvation and the edification of others, since Christ, to whose imitation we are called, showed and taught us this alone by word and example alike.⁷²

Salvation for Francis of Assisi was, therefore, an issue of lifestyle. From which can be derived lifestyle evangelism, not only salvation through one's life, but witness through one's life. In fact, according to Francois Lambert d'Avignon, each new order outdid the austerities of the prior orders to show their increased piety.⁷³ Their theology and methodology directly countered the Evangelical methods of the Waldensians. The vanity and arrogance of Francis' approach to salvation was explained by Lambert d'Avignon in 1523 one year after he left the Minors to join up with Luther in Wittenberg:

I tell you only, dear reader, a few of the reasons that constrained me to leave the *minorites*... but it must suffice that I told you only summarily. In a few days, you will receive a commentary concerning the rule of their order, that will help you understand the totality. In the meantime, in order that all the world may know what to wait for as far as my resolutions and convictions, I will say these three things: 1st Hitherto fore seduced and ignorant of what I was doing, I pronounced vows contrary to the Christian profession of faith. Oh well! I renounce to all these inventions of the *minorites* and recognize that the holy Gospel is my rule and should be that of all Christians; 2nd I retract what I have preached that does not conform to Christian truth. I pray all those who have heard me preach or who read my writings to reject all that is contrary to the Holy Books. I have confidence in Him who removed me from a captivity more difficult than that of Egypt, that I will repair with His divine help by my words and by my books my numerous errors; 3rd As no one can come to the knowledge of

the truth without being in disagreement with the Pope, I renounce him and all his decrees, and I no longer want to be a part of his reign of apostasy. I desire rather to be excommunicated by him, knowing that his reign is excommunicated and accursed of God... In another book, we will speak of these things in greater detail; we will do so for the name of Jesus Christ to whom be honour and glory.⁷⁴

Without going into lengthy detail, it must be clear to the reader that we are discussing two completely opposed views of salvation, one by lifestyle and the other by faith. This distinction was crystallizing as Pope Innocent III called the minor orders into existence. In order to persecute those who held to the Three Symbols of the Faith (and therefore could not have been heretics as they were accused), an attractive alternative had to replace faith. In the *imitatio Christi* of Francis of Assisi that alternative was found.⁷⁵ The ultimate imitation of Christ (hence complete incarnational theology) was confirmed when Francis received the *Stigmata*, whereby he miraculously received the actual wounds that Christ had on his hands and feet.⁷⁶

How about the Dominicans? According to their histories, they had four purposes, which we have cited before: “to (1) extirpate heresy, (2) combat vice, (3) teach the faith, and (4) train men in good morals.”⁷⁷ The first purpose included searching out heretics and gaining confessions from them. Combating vice was to be accomplished through intense stoicism. Teaching the faith in this context meant inoculating Catholics against heretical teaching. And training in good morals included founding schools which the Dominicans faithfully accomplished.⁷⁸

In order to accomplish this strategy, the Dominicans had to use the methods of their “enemy.” Hinnebusch explained:

Bishop Diego, borrowing from the enemy, recommended to the legates a new type of apostolate. They should give up their other

business and devote themselves zealously to preaching. They should send away their followers, travel on foot without money and beg their bread from door to door, imitating the way of life and preaching of the apostles. This was a startling suggestion and the legates were unwilling to accept it. But if someone in authority, a bishop, would go before them, they would gladly follow. Diego was as good as his word. He dismissed his servants, sending them with his horses and baggage back to Osma. He kept at his side only Dominic, his subprior... Catholic itinerant missionaries, beginning with Robert of Arbissel at the opening of the twelfth century and ending with Fulk of Neuilly at its close, preached apostolic poverty. Diego's merit lies in seizing upon it now as a method in the Catholic campaign against the Albigenses.⁷⁹

Hence we have a combination of methods used by the Dominicans: door-to-door begging, preaching poverty, tracking down Albigensian evangelists and sympathizers, running prison houses, and inquisiting whomever they suspected.

Figure 1, "Thirteenth Century Medieval Mission," seeks to place in chart form the three Catholic methods of mission: Cistercian, Franciscan, and Dominican, as well as compare this with the two Dissenting methods of the Waldensians. It is more difficult to construct the method or message of the Albigenses. The message is almost completely blurred by the sources,⁸⁰ although Duvernoy has reconstructed a detailed account of many aspects of the teaching and history of the Cathars. In the past, the main source for the evangelism methods of the Albigenses were provided to us by the Dominican imitation noted above,⁸¹ with the exception to begging for bread, as the Albigenses believed in hard work and were not allowed to beg individually, as Duvernoy has made clear.⁸² Again Duvernoy has written a series of articles rebuilding the lifestyle of the Cathars preachers in the middle of the thirteenth century, or in the middle of the inquisition period.⁸³ So far this author has not seen these articles, though they are of great interest to him.

Figure 1. Thirteenth Century Medieval Mission

	Waldensian	Albigensian	Franciscan/ Cistercian	Dominican
Latin Terms	<i>Vita Apostolica Sequela Christi</i>		<i>Vita Evangelica Imitatio Christi Identificatio Christi</i>	
View of Rome's Supremacy and Sacraments	Against Rome		For Rome	
Interpretation of Bible	Literal	Literal	Figurative	Allegorical
Interpretation of Councils	Ignored	Ignored	Literal	Literalistic
Mission	Preaching the Gospel	Preaching the Gospel	Combating heresy and teaching the proper way;	Extirpating heresy from Southern France;
Lifestyle	Obedience to the rules of Christ	Obedience to the rules of Christ	Establishing homes for the friars to live their lifestyle;	Door-to-door begging and "preaching";
Method	Preaching the Gospel, door-to-door and in the market-place	Preaching the Gospel, door-to-door and in the market-place	Preaching love and good works	Inquisiting persons; Eliciting recantations and conversions

On the other hand, the Waldensian method and message is more clear. They did believe the apostolic symbols of the faith. Their great heresy was not obeying Rome's prohibition against preaching the Gospel without proper authorization. For this reason, according to Duvernoy, many were hunted and killed. The main problem of the Waldenses, according to Duvernoy, was their literal interpretation of Scripture. They took the regulations of Christ as their rule.⁸⁴

In this paper I have shown that current French scholarship is developing as historiography that delineates that the Catholic Church likely invented the heretical nature of some groups

for political, territorial, or ecclesial gain. In so doing, they persecuted some orthodox Christians, termed Evangelical movements by the French scholars, while they themselves moved further away from orthodoxy. Of special concern today is current Evangelical fascination with Bernard of Clairvaux and Francis of Assisi,⁸⁵ two men who were thoroughly involved in the crusades and/or inquisition of these same Evangelical Christians.

Notes

¹ *Cahiers de Bernard de Caux: Bas-Quercy, Toulousain*. Text and translation by Jean Duvernoy (Ms Doat XXII, bibliothèque nationale de Paris, 1243; 1988); (online) accessed 8 Sept 2004; from <http://jean.duvernoy.free.fr/text/pdf/bdecaux.pdf> (p 59); Internet. Translation mine.

² In French, the phrase reads, "Le Midi est par excellence la terre des hérétiques" (Michel Lauwers, "*Sub Evangelica Regula*" – Jacques de Vitry, témoins de l'évangélisme de son temps," in *Évangile et évangélisme (XIIe-XIIIe siècle)*, Cahiers de Fanjeaux 34 (Toulouse, France: Éditions Privat, 1999), 173.

³ Perhaps Jean Duvernoy's most famous translation is not currently available online; it entails his French translation of the Latin *Registre d'Inquisition de Jacques Fournier*, 3 vols (Toulouse: Éditions Privat, 1965, 1966; Paris: Mouton, 1977, 1978; Paris: Bibliothèque des introuvables, 2004). Bishop Jacques Fournier went on to become Pope Benedict XII (1334-1342).

⁴ Anne Brenon, *Les Archipels Cathares* (Cahors, France: Dire, 2000), 13. Translation mine.

⁵ Listen for example to this explanation of the issues: "Something, then, of this love of exact science drove the heretics always to perfect honesty of judgment, so that they never shirked any consequences of their beliefs. The Catholics were equally logical and, believing in prayer, respected contemplative life as the highest activity of the soul; and, believing in God's omnipotence, saw no difficulty in miracles; and, believing God had become man, could not feel any objection to the possibility of his coming as bread. The heretics equally had courage of their convictions; they were that to us unknown thing, a logical and organised theosophy, and consequently taught an exaggerated and compulsory monasticism." Bede Jarrett, OP, *Life of Saint Dominic* (London: Burns Oates and Washbourne, 1934), 21.

⁶ Anne Brenon, *Les Archipels Cathares*, 13. Translation mine.

⁷ Jean Duvernoy, *Registre d'Inquisition de Jacques Fournier, évêque de Pamiers, 1318-1325* (Toulouse: Privat, 1965).

⁸ Jean Duvernoy, *Le Catharisme: la religion des Cathares* (Toulouse, France: Privat, 1976).

⁹ Jean Duvernoy, *Le Catharisme: l'histoire des Cathares* (Toulouse, France: Privat, 1979).

¹⁰ Brenon, *Les Archipels Cathares*, 15. Duvernoy himself affirmed that in 1956 those who wrote on the Cathars wrote whatever they wanted, which led him to see the need for further research in this area: "Quinze ans après [1956], je me suis trouvé à Toulouse et j'ai entendu parler des cathares, qui commençaient à être à la mode et sur lesquels on disait et écrivait n'importe quoi. Je me suis rendu compte qu'un très important *corpus*, dont l'existence était pourtant bien connue, était à peine déchiffré." See "Entretien avec Jean Duvernoy," accessed 20 April 2006; from <http://www.theo-makarios.info/article-355617.html>; Internet).

¹¹ Robert Ian Moore, *La persécution: Sa formation en Europe (Xe-XIIIe siècle)* (Paris, 1991). This edition was a translation of his *The Formation of a Persecuting Society* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1987, 1990, 1992, 1993, 1994, 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000).

¹² For example, Harold O. J. Brown mimicks the view of Catholic scholars toward the Albigenses: "No matter how dreadful the use of violence against the dualistic Albigenses was, it must be acknowledged that their heresy is incompatible with Christianity, indeed with biblical religion as such. If they had prevailed, Christianity would have ceased to exist." Harold O. J. Brown, *Heresies: Heresy and Orthodoxy in the History of the Church* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1984), 261. The real issue was that the Roman Catholic brand of Christianity was being threatened, much like it was in the twentieth century by the ecumenical movement, until Rome changed their position in 1938.

¹³ Monique Zerner (ed.), *Inventer l'hérésie? Discours polémiques et pouvoirs avant l'inquisition*, Collection du centre d'études médiévales de Nice, vol. 2 (Paris: C. I. D., 1998).

¹⁴ *Cahiers de Bernard de Caux*, p. 59. Translation mine.

¹⁵ Even this fact was dismissed or mellowed by the future sons or relatives of the Dominicans. For example, a Jesuit discounts accounts of the Inquisition as exaggerated: "Long did old-fashioned English Protestants and other anti-Catholics put their attention upon words like "jesuitical," "popish," "jansenistic," and "inquisitorial" in their polemics. But possibly the most odious, and the most successfully promoted, is the idea of the hated Inquisition as the cruel tool of the Catholic Church to crush its enemies. ...Most often with no elucidating context, the Inquisition is assumed to be the wea-

pon of the Catholic Church against all heretics, in whatever age, even though its somewhat mild ecclesiastical form was originally set up after 1232 to deal with the Cathars or Albigensians in later medieval France.” Brian van Hove, SJ, “Beyond the Myth of the Inquisition: Ours Is ‘The Golden Age’” [online]; accessed 10 Nov 2005; from <http://www.catholic-education.org/articles/history/world/wh0027.html>. Internet. Van Hove may need to be reminded of the burning of six Lutherans in six city squares of Paris during six Masses said by the Archbishop of Paris and taken by King Francis I of France (21 Jan 1535), the complete massacre of the Waldensians living in Gabrières and Merindol (April 1545), the Cardinal Charles de Guise and the Duke Francois de Guise and the massacres (called *Les Dragonnades*) which began the wars of religion (1562-1570), the St. Bartholomew Day Massacre the night of the marriage of Catherine de Medici’s sister-in-law to the Huguenot Henry de Navarre in Paris (23-24 Aug 1572) which resulted in the slaying of most of the Protestant nobility and between 30.000 to 100.000 Huguenots in three days, the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes (1685) with the terrors that preceded and followed it, the fathers sent to row on boats for the king of France for the rest of their lives, and the wives in the tower who scratched “RÉSISTER” in the rock. The bloodshed in France is almost incalculable. From the Crusade against Albi, the Inquisition, the Massacres of the Huguenots, easily 300,000 could be counted as killed, tortured, and imprisoned by the Roman-Catholic Church in France beginning from the Third Lateran Council of 1179. This number is far greater than the 300 of “Bloody Mary” (daughter of Catherine of Aragon) in England. See Jules-Marcel Nicole, *Précis d’histoire de l’Église* (Nogent-sur-Marne, France: Éditions de l’Institut Bibliquies, 1982); Reuben Saillens, *The Soul of France* (London: Morgan & Scott, 1917), and Franck Puaux, *Histoire de la Réformation Française* (Paris: Michel Lévy Frères, 1859), vol. 1 of 6.

¹⁶ “By an official document, which is still extant, Bishop Foulques constituted Brother Dominic and his companions preachers in the diocese of Toulouse. They were to (1) extirpate heresy, (2) combat vice, (3) teach the faith, and (4) train men in good morals.” See Pierre Mandonnet, OP, *St. Dominic and His Work*, transl. by Mary Benedicta Larkin, OP (St. Louis: B. Herder, 1948), 27.

¹⁷ Brenon, 232.

¹⁸ *Ibid.* See *Cahiers de Bernard de Caux*, 61.

¹⁹ *Ibid.* 153.

²⁰ *Ibid.* 162. Notice that this deposition included little more than hearsay.

²¹ The complete quotation reads as follows: “You are arresting persons of good reputation and from Catholic families of longstanding, without a

prior summons. You hold them as prisoners in a rigorous and terrifying cell until they admit, as much in fear of torture and of the cell, as is inflicted by the grace that is promised to them upon penitence... These admissions, once they are liberated from the cell and the torture, almost all of them proclaim and say that they made them only for fear of torture. From this torture and this cell a number are dead who were not guilty. Against the method and the usual habits of your predecessors, you have made a prison, which is called the Wall, and which it would be better to call hell. You have constructed tiny rooms to torture and abuse people. There are some [rooms] that are so obscure and without ventilation, that those that find themselves cannot discern if it is night time or day: there they completely lack fresh air and light. In other cells the sorry folks remain in chains, and cannot move. They do and urinate under themselves, and they cannot lay except on their backs on the cold earth, and they remain long in this torture, night and day. In the other areas of the prison, not only does one lack air and light, but also food, except the bread and water of suffering which is given to them only rarely. Certain ones are placed on the rack; many of them lose the use of their limbs because of the harshness of the torture and are rendered completely disabled. There are those who, unable to handle the pain, put an end to their days..." Jean Duvernoy, Preface, in Bernard Hauréau, *Bernard Délicieux et l'inquisition Albigeoise 1300-1320*, reprint (1877; Portet-sur-Garonne, France: Loubatieres, 1992), ii-iii; translation mine.

²² Note the tortures were used for interrogation by the Tormentor of Paris: "The ropes: soon they brought an old man with white hair, but strong and vigorous. During the first degree of tension (being hung by the hands with his hands tied behind his back and his feet tied to the ground) the judge questioned him, and exhorted him to confess his crime. The old man responded with curses and blasphemies. Additional tension, greater curses, greater blasphemes, but he persisted in his answers; he was acquitted. A *barbier* (a professional who ties with ropes) who is always there in one turn of the arm relocates the dislocations, and the old man leaves the prison menacing a law suit in order to repay him for his tortures." F. Puaux, "Note: Le tourmenteur de Paris [sixteenth century]," *Histoire de la Réformation Française*, 1:430; from Alexis Monteil, *Histoire des Français de divers états aux cinq derniers siècles*, vol. 6, station 68, 320; translation mine.

²³ Note some of the early Amendments of the Constitution of the United States of America: "1st: Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances... 4th:

The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no Warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by Oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized. 5th: No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a Grand Jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the Militia, when in actual service in time of War or public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offence to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation. 6th: In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favour, and to have the Assistance of Counsel for his defence. 7th: In Suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed twenty dollars, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved, and no fact tried by a jury, shall be otherwise re-examined in any Court of the United States, than according to the rules of the common law. 8th: Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted.” See “Amendments to the Constitution” (online); accessed 11 Nov 2005; from <http://www.house.gov/Constitution/Amend.html>; Internet).

²⁴ “Fourth Lateran Council (1215),” part 3; (online) accessed 28 June 2003; available from <http://www.dailycatholic.org/history/12ecume1.htm>; Internet.

²⁵ “Les prince locaux avaient commencé à jouer avec le feu dès le XII^e siècle, en s’accusant réciproquement d’hérésie comme on se passe le mistigri: le Trencavel l’eurent plus souvent en main que les autres.” Jacques Dalaurun, “Conclusion,” in *Évangile et évangélisme (XII^e-XIII^e siècle)*, 335.

²⁶ “Il fallait que ce pays tenant les appétits du Capétien soit hérétique pour être conquis. «Albigéois» devint synonyme d’hérétique et la Croisade s’ensuivit, légitimant la conquête. On préfère dire aujourd’hui ce pays «Pays cathares», ce qui n’est jamais que l’écho tardif mais zélé d’une propagande de croisade. Ainsi l’identité se construit-elle au regard de l’autre.” See *ibid.* 336.

²⁷ The entire text of Puaux on Sacho reveals the beliefs of the Waldensians at that time (which did not differ much from Henry of Lausanne): “The

inquisitor, Reinerius Sacho, after having spent his early youth in the midst of the Waldenses, abandoned them and became their persecutor; the force of the truth constrained this man of blood to bear to his victims a most beautiful testimony. 'The primary [or first] error of the heretics,' says he in his *Summa de hæreticis*, 'is their contempt for the power of clerics (*ecclésiastique*)... They affirm that they alone are the Church of Christ, the successors of the apostles; they have the apostolic authority, and the keys to bind and to unbind. They view Rome as the prostitute in Revelation, chapter 17... They completely reject feasts, the orders, fasts, blessings, the offices of the Church and other similar things. They speak against the consecrated churches, cemeteries, and other things of the same nature, signalling these are the inventions of greedy priests who want to increase their revenues, and swindle people out of offerings and money. Some from among them hold that baptism is without any advantage for children, because they cannot believe... They say that the bishops, the clergy, and other religious orders, amount to nothing more than the scribes, the Pharisees, and other persecutors of the apostles. They think that the body and the blood of Christ are the real sacrament, and pretend that it is figurative that the bread is called the body of Christ, in the same way as it is said: *The rock was Christ*... They celebrate the Eucharist in their assemblies, repeating the words of the Gospel, and participating together in this ordinance, imitating the Last Supper [lit holy scene] of the Lord... They reject extreme unction. Even though they praise continence, they satisfy nevertheless their carnal lusts by the most dirty means, explaining in this way the words of the Apostle: *It is better to be married than to burn*. Better to satisfy one lust by a shameful act than to conserve temptation in one's heart. But they hide these things as much as they can, for fear of incurring blame. There is no purgatory, say they, and all those who die pass immediately to heaven or hell; hence, the prayers in the Church for the dead are without use; those who are in heaven have no need for them, and those who are in hell cannot be relieved. If we believe them, the saints in the heaven do not hear the prayers of the faithful, their bodies rest lying in the earth, and their spirits are so far from us that they would not be able either to listen to our prayers, nor to see the honours that we accord them... Since then the Waldenses mock all of our feasts that we celebrate in honour of the saints, and all the acts by which we testify to them our veneration.' The force of the truth extracted a testimony no less honourable for them, when it caused Reinerius to say: 'Of all the sects that have been or that are still, there has never been one more pernicious for the church as that of the Waldenses, and this for three reasons. First she is the oldest of all, some find her to go back to the pope Sylvester [contemporary of Augustin of Hippo], and others back to the time of

the Apostles. Next, she is more extended than any other, for there is barely a place on earth that she has not penetrated. Finally, quite different from the other sects, who inspire at first horror among those who hear their pernicious doctrines, by the horrible blasphemes that they vomit, this one seduces the world *by the appearance of great piety*. The Waldenses lead a *righteous life* before men, and believe as regards God all that there is to believe. They accept *all the articles and symbols of the apostles*, only they blaspheme against the Roman Church and the clergy.' The author adds a note of clarification on sexual relations among the heretics, as it is often discussed. Reinerius slanders the Waldenses and seems to strong in his feelings. One passage in their apology relative to this accusation of being libertines, will suffice to refute him. It is this odious vice, say the Waldenses, that enticed David to kill his faithful servant, that pushed Amnon to corrupt his sister Tamar, and that consumed the inheritance of the prodigal son. Balaam chose it to make the children of Israel sin, which occasioned the death of twenty-four thousand persons. It is the same sin which occasioned the blinding of Samson and the fall of Solomon. The beauty of the woman has made a number perish. Fasting, prayer, and distance, such are the only remedy to oppose this evil. We can win over other vices by battling, but this one we can only surmount through fleeing... Joseph provides us an example." Reinerius Sacho, "Témoignage rendu aux vaudois par un inquisiteur" [testimony given of the Waldenses by an inquisitor], in Franck Puaux, *Histoire de la Réformation Française* (Paris: Michel Lévy Frères, 1859), 1:424-25; taken from Bossuet, *Histoire des variations*, 11:55-54 [sic]; translation mine.

²⁸ Cf. Matt 12:31-32; Luke 12:10.

²⁹ Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger (ed.), *Catechism of the Catholic Church* (Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1994), 837, 222.

³⁰ Complete sentence is as follows: "L'an du Seigneur 1273, veille des kalendes de juin Guillaume de Molières, prêtre, témoin ayant prêté serment, interrogé s'il avait vu des hérétiques, des vaudois, en avait entendus ou avait mangé avec eux, dit." See "Registre de Pons de Parnac et autres inquisiteurs de Toulouse" (Lauragais 1273-1282) [Doat XXV et XXVI ff 1-79]; ed. and partial transl. by Jean Duvernoy; [online] accessed 8 Sept 2004; from <http://jean.duvernoy.free.fr/text/pdf/Parnactrad.pdf> [2]; internet); translation mine.

³¹ I am translating the French *Vaudois* as Waldenses. Heretic is a translation of the Latin *hereticos*, which Duvernoy was fond to translate *parfait*, which in English could be rendered "perfect" (or Puritan or Pietist).

³² *Ibid.* 121.

³³ Jean Duvernoy, "Table Ronde," in *Évangile et évangélisme (XIIe-XIIIe siècle)*, 235; translation mine.

³⁴ "3. Enfin, l'histoire lyonnaise de Valdès apparaît exemplaire quant à l'invention de l'hérésie et à la mise en place de la 'société de persécution' que décrit Robert Ian Moore, *La persécution: Sa formation en Europe, Xe-XIIIe siècle*, (Paris, 1991). Le valdéisme en tant qu'hérésie ne naît pas à Lyon avec Valdès, puisque celui-ci, si mon hypothèse est la bonne, collabore alors avec l'archevêque. Il naît hors de Lyon à partir du moment où cette collaboration est rejetée, et que Valdès et ses partisans sont devenus non seulement inutiles mais encore dangereux, et qu'en conséquence on les condamne et on les chasse de Lyon." See Michel Rubellin, "Au temps où Valdès n'était pas hérétique: hypothèses sur le rôle de Valdès à Lyon," in Monique Zerner (ed.), *Inventer l'hérésie? Discours polémiques et pouvoirs avant l'inquisition*, Collection du centre d'études médiévales de Nice, vol. 2 (Paris: C. I. D., 1998), 217.

³⁵ "Il [Michel Rubellin] a montré qu'à l'origine ils [les vaudois] ne sont nullement hérétiques. Durant six ans, entre 1173 et 1179, Valdo et les siens sont utilisés par l'archevêque, Guichard de Pontigny, un cistercien, pour lutter contre le chapitre cathédral de Lyon. Après que Jean de Bellesmains a succédé au siège épiscopal, les vaudois sont définis hérétiques parce qu'ils refusent d'obéir à la règle faisant aux laïcs interdiction de prêcher." Jean-Louis Biget, Round Table Discussion, *Évangile et évangélisme*, 246.

³⁶ John Moorman, *A History of the Franciscan Order: From Its Origins to the Year 1517* (Chicago: Franciscan Herald, 1968), 311.

³⁷ 1782. "On the other hand, the ecclesial communities which have not preserved the valid Episcopate and the genuine and integral substance of the Eucharistic mystery, are not Churches in the proper sense; however, those who are baptized in these communities are, by Baptism, incorporated in Christ and thus are in a certain communion, albeit imperfect, with the Church. Baptism in fact tends per se toward the full development of life in Christ, through the integral profession of faith, the Eucharist, and full communion in the Church." Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger, *Dominus Iesus* (6 Aug 2000) [online]; accessed 21 Mar 2001; available at http://search.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc_con_cfaith_doc_20000806_dominus-iesus_en.html; Internet.

³⁸ William A. Hinnebusch, OP, *The History of the Dominican Order: Origins and Growth to 1500* (Staten Island, NY: Alba House, 1965), 1:22.

³⁹ *Ibid.* 1:22.

⁴⁰ Portion omitted in text: "If anyone dies in this sin, then neither under cover of our privileges granted to anyone, nor for any other reason, is mass to be offered for them or are they to receive burial among Christians. With

regard to the Brabanters, Aragonese, Navarrese, Basques, Coterelli and Triaverdini, who practise such cruelty upon Christians that they respect neither churches nor monasteries, and spare neither widows, orphans, old or young nor any age or sex, but like pagans destroy and lay everything waste, we likewise decree that those who hire, keep or support them, in the districts where they rage around, should be denounced publicly on Sundays and other solemn days in the churches, that they should be subject in every way to the same sentence and penalty as the above-mentioned heretics and that." See "Third Lateran Council" (1179), part 27 [online]; accessed 28 June 2003; from: <http://www.dailycatholic.org/history/11ecume1.htm>; Internet).

⁴¹ "But in reality the question is of little moment, for the embassy was important rather for what happened on the way than for the matter negotiated, since it led the Bishop and his Prior [Dominic] through the district of Toulouse, then the seat of a powerful Gnostic heresy. The very evening of their arrival at the first house in Toulouse at which they put up they came in contact with it, for their host had himself lapsed from the faith. Dominic and he discussed religion at once and vehemently. The arguments on both sides were prolonged into the night, and it was only when the morning light streamed through the windows that the penitent innkeeper found himself on his knees, reconciled to the teaching of the Church." Bede Jarrett, *Life of Saint Dominic*, 17-18.

⁴² Pierre Mandonnet, OP, *St. Dominic and His Work*, transl. by Mary Benedicta Larkin, OP (St. Louis: B. Herder, 1948), 27.

⁴³ "They accept *all the articles and symbols of the apostles*, only they blaspheme against the Roman Church and the clergy." See Sacho, "Testimony of Inquisitor," in Puaux, *Histoire de la Réformation Française*, 1:425; from Bossuet, *Histoire des variations*, 11:55-54 [sic].

⁴⁴ Moore, *The Formation of a Persecuting Society*, 12.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.* 12.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.* 12.

⁴⁷ Here are some quotes of Augustine found online (accessed 15 Nov 2005; available from: http://www.catholic.com/library/Salvation_Outside_the_Church.asp; Internet): "[J]ust as baptism is of no profit to the man who renounces the world in words and not in deeds, so it is of no profit to him who is baptized in heresy or schism; but each of them, when he amends his ways, begins to receive profit from that which before was not profitable, but was yet already in him." *On Baptism, Against the Donatists* 4:4[6] A.D. 400. "Whoever is separated from this Catholic Church, by this single sin of being separated from the unity of Christ, no matter how estimable a life he

may imagine he is living, shall not have life, but the wrath of God rests upon him" (*Letters*, 141:5).

⁴⁸ For example: "The Friars Minor are not linked primarily to a definite locale or house; rather they are bound into a community with their ministers in a relationship of strict obedience. Acceptance into the Order is therefore very fittingly described in both Rules as 'to receive into obedience' (*recipere ad obedientiam*), or conversely, as 'to promise obedience' (*promittere obedientiam*)." Cajetan Esser, *Origins of the Franciscan Order* (Chicago: Franciscan Herald, 1970), 70.

⁴⁹ The context is also revealing: "Gregory to all the Bishops of Numidia. (1) If ever, most dear brethren in Christ, a troublesome mixture of tares intrudes itself among green corn, it is necessary for the hand of the husbandman to root it up entirely, lest the future fruit of the fertile corn should be obstructed. Wherefore let us too, who, however unworthy, have undertaken the cultivation of the field of the Lord, hasten to render the corn pure from all offence of tares that the field of the Lord may fructify with more abundant increase. Now you requested through Hilarus our chartulary (2) from our predecessor of blessed memory that you might retain all the customs of past time, which, from the beginnings of the ordinances of the blessed Peter, Prince of the apostles, long antiquity has so far retained. And we, indeed, according to the tenor of your representation, allow your custom (so long as it clearly makes no claim to the prejudice of the catholic faith) to remain undisturbed, whether as to constituting primates or as to other points; save that with respect to those who attain to the episcopate from among the Donatists, we by all means forbid them to be advanced to the dignity of primacy, even though their standing should denote them for that position. (3) But let it suffice them to take care of the people committed to them, without aiming at the topmost place of the primacy in preference to those prelates whom the Catholic faith hath both taught and engendered in the bosom of the Church. Do you, therefore, most dear brethren, anticipate our admonitions in the zeal of the charity of the Lord, knowing that the strict Judge will bring into examination all we do, and will approve every one of us with regard not to the prerogative of a higher rank, but to the merits of our works. I beseech you, therefore, love ye one another mutually, having peace among yourselves in Christ, and with one purpose of heart oppose ye heretics and enemies of the Church. Be ye solicitous for the souls of your neighbours: persuade all ye can to faith by the preaching of charity, holding before them also the terror of the future judgment; inasmuch as ye are appointed to be shepherds and the Lord of the docks expects from the shepherds to whom He has committed them the fruit of a multiplied flock. And if He should foresee an augmentation of His own

flock through your bestowal of more diligent care upon it, He will assuredly adorn you with manifold gifts of the heavenly kingdom. Furthermore, addressing to you the greeting of fraternal love, I pray the Lord that He would make you, whom He has chosen to be shepherds of souls, worthy in His sight, and Himself so order our deeds here that He may accept them as they deserve in the future life." See Gregory I, Pope, *Epistle LXXVII*, "To All the Bishops of Numidia"; accessed: 8 September 1997; from: www.ccel.wheaton.edu/Gregory/Register/E24.htm.

⁵⁰ Sir Henry H. Howorth, *Gregory the Great* (London, England: John Murray, 1912), 134.

⁵¹ *Ibid.* 110.

⁵² Jean Duvernoy, *Cathares, Vaudois et Beguins: Dissidents du Pays d'Oc* (Toulouse, France: Privat, 1994), 243.

⁵³ *Ibid.* 244-45.

⁵⁴ Jean Duvernoy, *Le Catharisme: La Religion des Cathares*, 227-33.

⁵⁵ Brenon, 238.

⁵⁶ "The Creed of Athanasius" (online); accessed September 28 2004; available from <http://www.rca.org/aboutus/beliefs/athanasian.php>; Internet.

⁵⁷ Sacho, "Testimony of Inquisitor," in Puaux, *Histoire de la Réformation Française*, 1:425; from Bossuet, *Histoire des variations*, 11:55-54 [sic], quoted above.

⁵⁸ "Jacques de Vitry... from 1210 to 1213 he was one of the most noted preachers of the crusade against the Albigenses" ("Jacques de Vitry," in *Catholic Encyclopedia*; accessed: 17 May 2006; from: http://www.catholicity.com/encyclopedia/j/jacques_de_vitry.html; Internet).

⁵⁹ "To make room for Christian thought, evangelicals must also abandon the false disjunctions that their distinctives have historically encouraged... Modifying the evangelical tendency toward Manichaeism may cost some of the single-minded enthusiasm of activism [evangelism and conversionism], but it would be worth it in order to be able to worship God with the mind." Mark A. Noll, *The Scandal of the Evangelical Mind* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994), 245.

⁶⁰ See Daniel Lortsch, *Histoire de la Bible en France* (1910) (online); accessed 4 March 2005; available from: http://www.bibliquest.org/Lortsch/Lortsch-Histoire_Bible_France-1.htm.

⁶¹ "L'Eglise Catholique n'est pas l'Eglise dépeinte par les textes néo-testamentaires. Il lui en manque, et l'héritage, et le caractère." Jean Duvernoy, *Le Catharisme: La Religion des Cathares*, 225. The next nine pages elucidate this statement.

⁶² "Avec beaucoup de prudence, on peut donc ici plus clairement indiquer des inflexions: de la *vita apostolica* à la *vita evangelica*, de la *sequela Christi* à

l'imitatio Christi, voire à *l'identificatio Christi*, du *Christus triumphans* au *Christus patiens*. Évolutions décisives au total, mais souvent difficiles à fixer avec précision, où le rôle du stigmatisé de l'Alverne n'a certainement pas été mince. Mais où la volonté de répliquer à l'hérésie ne l'était pas moins". See Jacques Dalarun, "Conclusion," *Évangile et évangélisme [XIIe-XIIIe siècle]*, 333; translation in text mine.

⁶³ "Bernard soon discovered that although he could inspire kings and knights to 'take the cross' and embark on a Crusade, he could not persuade the dualistic heretics to return to the church." Harold O. J. Brown, *Heresies: Heresy and Orthodoxy in the History of the Church*, 256.

⁶⁴ From Bede Jarrett, *Life of Saint Dominic*, 23-24; from O'Leary, *Life and Times of St Dominic* (London 1912), 45

⁶⁵ Dalarun, "Conclusion," 336.

⁶⁶ Dominique Iogna-Prat, "L'argumentation défensive: de la Polémique grégorienne au 'Contra Petrobrusianos' de Pierre le Vénérable" *Inventer l'hérésie*, 88; translation mine. Other similar lists from that era described the teaching of Peter de Bruis and Henry the Monk [of Lausanne]. See Jean Duvernoy, *Le Catharisme: l'histoire des cathares*, 201, 203, 210-11.

⁶⁷ M. Basil Pennington, OSCO, *Saint Bernard of Clairvaux: Studies Commemorating the Eighth Centenary of His Canonization* (Kalamazoo, MI: Cistercian, 1977).

⁶⁸ Bernard's interpretation of the Benedictine vows led to significant disagreement between he and Peter the Venerable of the Cluny. *Bernard of Clairvaux* (Washington: Consortium, 1973), 49.

⁶⁹ John R. Sommerfeldt, *The Spiritual Teaching of St. Bernard* (Kalamazoo, MI: Cistercian), 21-22.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.* 50.

⁷¹ *Ibid.* 30.

⁷² *Speculum Perfectionis*, ed. P. Sabatier in "Collections d'études et de documents sur l'histoire religieuse et littéraire du moyen âge (Paris, 1898), 1:72; quoted in John Moorman, *A History of the Franciscan Order*, 3.

⁷³ "Such are the men who proudly call themselves observant, when Jesus Christ, in the seventeenth chapter of Saint Luke [17:10, verse numbers came later], says: 'When you have done all the things that are commanded you say, "We are your useless servants!"' But these men, dear reader, in order that you might know it, despise the Holy Word even in the name that they carry [observants]. They have placed in their rules all the statutes of the other monks, in order to be able to, better than their brothers, call themselves observants, – but none do better than they wrong to the Church. – For how can men, who do not know their own rules or that do not want to understand them, can they sincerely follow them?" François Lambert d'A-

vignon, "Histoire du moine racontée par lui-même, traduite du latin," from Gerdesius, *Historia christianismi renovati*, vol. IV; quoted from Puaux, *Histoire de la Réformation Française*, 1:417; translation mine.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.* 1:417.

⁷⁵ "As Francis knotted this rope round his waist he probably realized that he was girding himself for a very formidable task, for it was nothing less than an 'imitation of Christ', conscious, literal, and uncompromising." John Moorman, *A History of the Franciscan Order*, 9.

⁷⁶ "When at last the light waned and the vision faded, Francis discovered, in his hands and his side, wounds like those of the crucified Christ whom he loved so dearly and whose passion he had longed to share." Moorman, *A History of the Franciscan Order*, 60; "He [brother Elias] forthwith set himself to compose a letter which would make known that the Poverello was now dead. A copy of this letter, addressed to Gregory of Naples and the friars in France, has survived. It begins by announcing the death of the saint, and then goes on to describe in detail the Stigmata which, for two years, had been kept as a secret. ...He lays great emphasis on the Stigmata, which he describes in detail. He himself had long regarded Francis as a saint, and he intended the world to do the same. Elias was hoping for an early canonization, and the majestic miracle of the Stigmata would incite a popular demand." *Ibid.* 83; see also Cajetan Esser, *Origins of the Franciscan Order*, 232.

⁷⁷ Pierre Mandonnet, OP, *St. Dominic and His Work*, transl. by Mary Benedicta Larkin, OP (St. Louis: B. Herder, 1948), 27.

⁷⁸ William A. Hinnebusch, *The History of the Dominican Order: Intellectual and Cultural Life to 1500* (New York: Alba House, 1973), 2:11.

⁷⁹ Hinnebusch, *The History of the Dominican Order*, 1:23.

⁸⁰ This author is convinced that the majority of those groups in the Middle Ages that were called "dualistic" and "Manichaeian" were nothing more than Evangelicals who believed "You must be born again!" This view of conversion alone, along with the correlating total depravity, poured through the rubric of Augustine's *Contra Manichaeian* and *Contra Donatisten*, was enough to prove their dualistic views.

⁸¹ Interestingly, it was reported that Pope John Paul II encouraged the Catholic faithful to go "door-to-door" to regain lost sheep for the Catholic Church: "On his visit to Mexico in May [1990], the Pope spoke out against groups he termed 'sects,' and encouraged the faithful to use the door-to-door method to bring the wanderers back to the fold." *Rio Grande Intercessor* of the Rio Grande Bible Institute, Edinburg, TX (Sep/Oct 1990), 1.

⁸² Duvernoy, *La Religion des Cathares*, 248-249.

⁸³ Jean Duvernoy, “La vie des prédicateurs cathares en Laurageais et dans l’Albigeois vers le milieu du XIII^e siècle, d’après un registre d’Inquisition consacré aux aveux des parfaits convertis” (Ms 124 and 202 of the departmental archives of the Haute-Garonne), *Revue du Tarn* (1986): 121:25-54; 122:256-77; 123:454-506.

⁸⁴ Notice that the main problem with the “Fundamentalist” interpretation was literal interpretation of the Bible according to the 1993 Pontifical Commission on Biblical Interpretation. See Commission biblique pontificale, Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger (now Pope Benedict XVI), president, président, *L’interprétation de la Bible dans l’Église* (Quebec/Québec: Éditions Fides, 1994). All the scientific methods of higher criticism of the Bible have had their place. *Ibid.* 9, 12, 16, 25, 27. No one method has had unique value apart from the others. This theme is repeated after every analysis of each method in chapter one, with the exception of the “fundamentalist” style of interpretation that is deemed “dangerous” and leads to “intellectual suicide.” See *Ibid.* 48-50.

⁸⁵ For example, Lewis Drummond affirmed Francis of Assisi as a historical precedent for Graham’s “holistic evangelism.” See Lewis A. Drummond, *The Canvas Cathedral: Billy Graham’s Ministry Seen through the History of Evangelism* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2003), 211.

Holy Scripture and the Faculty of Reason in Richard Hooker: A Selection of Secondary Sources

CORNELIU C. SIMUȚ

Emanuel University of Oradea

This article is just a selective introduction to the debate concerning the relationship between Scripture and reason in Richard Hooker's thought.¹ Given the range of interpretations which try to place Hooker in various theological traditions (for instance, Anglican, Reformed, crypto-Catholic or even none of the above), my brief study is intended to be a challenge that all contemporary scholars interested in Hooker should not firstly push Hooker towards certain theological traditions but carefully research his entire theology which will naturally place the English Reformer in the theological line to which he belongs. I realize this could sound pretty naïve but, in the worst of cases, Richard Hooker scholarship will be strengthened by at least some new and solid scholarly research contributions.

Resuming the purpose of this article, it should be said that Hooker is very careful when he talks about the methodology of approaching Holy Scripture. Thus, Christians should not look in Scripture for the things that belong to reason, and whatever they discover by reason, which does not contradict Scripture, must be trusted. Hooker himself writes that Holy Scripture contains the teaching of salvation or the way by which man can obtain eternal life:

So it is in our spirituall Christian communitye, I do not nowe meane that body misticall whereof Christe is the onely hed, that buyldinge undiscernable by morall eyes wherein *Christe is the cheif corner stone*, but I speake of the visible Church, *the foundation* whereof is the doctryne *of the prophettes and Apostles* profeste. The marke whereunto theire doctrine tendeth is pointed att in those wordes of Paul unto Christe *thou haste the wordes of eternall life*. In those of Paule to Tymothy. *Holy Scriptures are able to make thee wise unto salvation.*²

Hooker advocated the use of reason as a God-given mental faculty but not to the detriment of Scripture.³ Reason is able to understand the precepts of natural law, which are given by God and recognized universally by Christian society in general, and by its members in particular.⁴ As part of the human being, reason is corrupted by sin and thus is unable to function properly. In other words, the use of reason has its limits.⁵ In Hooker's thought, Scripture enlightens reason, which means reason may be effective as a means of knowledge, but needs help from Scripture which completes its investigative capacities. Accordingly, reason is valid as a theological method, but it can only be used within certain limits.⁶ Reason is necessary for natural knowledge, to authenticate Scripture, and to apprehend truths above reason, namely to interpret revelation. Nevertheless, although it is able to understand revelation, reason cannot discover the truths of revelation or Scripture by its own devices.⁷ Alfred Barry correctly notes that it is Scripture that aids reason, not vice versa. In this respect, Holy Scripture is superior to any form of unwritten and written tradition.⁸ Both forms of tradition must be according to Scripture in order to be valid.⁹ According to John Hunt, Hooker defends reason and the light of nature as proper means of knowledge but not as ultimate means of knowledge. God did not give man reason that is able to investigate all the mysteries of salvation. The use of reason then cannot lead to the full knowledge of salvation. Hooker is aware of the limits of reason in demonstrating the

ultimate mystery of God's work. The blessings of God cannot be fully understood, even though they are communicated by palpable means.¹⁰ The ultimate truth of God's salvation can be found only by means of supernatural revelation, namely by Scripture. Reason and the light of nature are able to give us instruction about our duty, but they cannot provide us with the wisdom of salvation.¹¹ Only the special grace of the Holy Spirit is able to enlighten our minds and give us the proper knowledge of salvation. The testimony of the Spirit in the believer, however, must be conformed to reason.¹² On the other hand, it appears that from the viewpoint of human chronology, it is possible to know that Scripture is the Word of God by reason. Epistemologically too, reason comes first, and Scripture second. Man uses his reason to begin the investigation of Scripture. For Hooker, there is no Gospel without reason.¹³ Hunt is also aware that, in Hooker, reason is very important for what he calls "private judgment". Thus, private judgment works through our reason and conscience. For a Christian, however, private judgment is not only aided by reason and conscience but also completed by the work of the Holy Spirit. Private judgment is able to decide whether we should study the natural law written in our hearts or the supernatural law written in Holy Scripture or both.¹⁴

When he interprets the relationship between Scripture and reason in Hooker's thought, Christopher Morris takes a slightly different approach, which makes reason a little more important, and places Hooker in the tradition of Thomism. Thus, according to Morris, Hooker advocated the idea that we should not rely on Scripture alone because there are other means of knowledge and of discovering God's law and will. The authority of Scripture seems to be completed by the necessity of the authority of reason.¹⁵ If these means of knowledge do not contradict reason, they should be used in theological enterprise. Reason was given by God to help at a better understanding of his revelation.¹⁶ Some of the Church practices were

kept through history, because they conformed to reason.¹⁷ Thornton writes that faith is rational (in the sense that reason has the capacity to investigate supernatural things) and so must be the reading of Scripture.¹⁸ Thus, because rational faith may be found even in Scripture, nobody can easily deny the power of human reason.¹⁹

An even stronger position in favour of the role of reason to the detriment of Scripture in Hooker's views on authority is taken by W. K. Jordan. He argues that, for Hooker, the Bible is not the only source for knowing the divine truth; there are other sources as well, for instance, reason. Jordan supports the omnipotence of reason in Hooker's theology, although the general picture of Hooker's use of reason does not back up such an interpretation. Reason is the foundation of the essential truths of Christianity. The authority of Scripture is restricted to doctrine only, but reason may be employed in assisting and interpreting that doctrine. At this point, Jordan adopts a milder tone and asserts that, in matters of doctrine, the Holy Spirit must not be silent, otherwise reason is of no help at all.²⁰ His discourse recovers its stronger attitude in favour of reason when he writes that reason is the basis for the preaching of Scripture and for the spreading of faith among unbelievers. Thus, the light of reason leads to the instinctive perception of God's will. In the realm of Christianity, Scripture was added to reason in order that God's will might be scrutinized more easily. This means that the Christian faith is nothing else but the application of reason to the divine truths revealed by the Bible. Reason is the defender of faith and the revealer of error, which leaves no room for the Bible in spiritual matters.²¹ Jordan's interpretation of Hooker seems inconsistent because he supports both the autonomy of reason as well as asserting that reason needs support from the Holy Spirit. Accordingly, Jordan writes that reason must be assisted by the Holy Spirit in order to show us that Scriptures are the Word of God. He then immediately asserts that reason alone is able to show us any-

way that Scripture is the Word of God. And again, reason does not enable us to obtain salvation, so it needs the aid of the Holy Spirit. The same reason, however, can teach us the duty we have as Christians and how we should live a Christ-oriented life.²²

Following the same line, Alessandro d'Entrèves believes that Hooker introduced the concept of reason in the very nature of God, under the influence of Thomas Aquinas. Thus reason is the bridge between man's limitation and God's infinity. Reason, however, is nothing else but the law of nature. The law expresses the very nature of God.²³ By reason, man can see the things of God and the will of God, which certifies the epistemological role of reason. So, there is a certain degree of harmony between the natural and the supernatural, but it seems that the natural is the most important aspect. Hooker's theory is not purely rational because he sets certain limits to the independence and autonomy of human reason.²⁴

F. J. Shirley writes that, in Hooker, the authority of reason is the cornerstone of judgment. Reason must be placed beside the Bible in matters of judgment but in a position of equality with the Bible. Reason must always be subject to God. Shirley believes that by granting reason an obvious importance in his theology, Hooker ascribes dignity to man, not depravity as the continental Reformers. Thus, Hooker promotes a fairly optimistic view of man in comparison with the main magisterial Reformers.²⁵ This is why, for Shirley, Hooker was influenced by the medieval scholastics providing a reassessment of scholastic medieval theology.²⁶

Such a reading of Hooker establishes the idea that his anthropology is based on a Thomistic view of man.²⁷ Elizabeth Tebeaux argues that, if man was created in God's image, he possesses divine capabilities and is able to find spiritual truth. The result is supposedly that Hooker justifies the existence of a meaningful natural theology. He also justifies the reliability of human reason which emanates from the eternal law of God. In

addition, God expects man to use his reason to discern the will of God. Reason is then a reliable tool to be used in the natural and spiritual life.²⁸ The result is that Hooker's view of man creates the possibility of man to realize his potential on earth. Thus, it is obvious that man can know God by nature and grace.²⁹ A similar view is held by W. Speed Hill, who writes that, in Hooker, reason is the *locus* in which ideal human values find their realization in the imperfect world of men. One may easily notice that, according to Speed Hill, Hooker's concept of reason is essentially public, as, for instance, in the humanist tradition that promotes the authority and validity of human reason.³⁰

For E. T. Davies, Hooker's view of Scripture advises us not to look in Scripture for things that belong to reason and the things we discover by reason must be trusted.³¹ It is true that Scripture teaches theology and reveals to men the supernatural law of God. The law of God, however, is not completely revealed in Scripture. Consequently, man needs nature for the complete revelation of God. In Davies' view of Hooker, Scripture does not teach everything and it does not reveal the basis of its own authority. Thus, Christians accept the authority of Scripture because they have been taught so in the Church. This is a clear invitation to use reason apart from Scripture because nothing dishonours God except sin, and nothing is irrelevant to man's salvation, not even reason.³²

One of the most fervent positions in favour of Hooker's part in the Thomistic tradition is taken by Peter Munz. His starting point is the connection he establishes between Hooker and Thomas Aquinas by means of Aristotle,³³ rather than Augustine.³⁴ For Munz, Augustine thought that human nature was totally depraved and could be saved only by a special act of divine grace. Augustinian philosophy denies the efficacy of second causes and makes man and nature dependent on divine grace. Thus, man and nature do not have any causal or rational efficacy. Munz argues that Aquinas attacked this position

on the grounds that it was too platonic, too much supernaturally oriented.³⁵ Following Aquinas, Munz contends, Hooker also rejected Augustinianism. Thus, for Hooker, faith is something natural, which pertains to the realm of reason, something which human conscience or reason can accept or reject. According to Munz, Hooker thought the Universe was governed by reason and could be understood by human rational faculties. Nature and reason are instruments of God.³⁶ The Christian learns about God by nature and reason. God has endowed every human being with reason, which means that man can learn the will of God by using his reason. To use reason means to consult God directly.³⁷ Likewise, David Little writes that Hooker's theology represents "one of the last attempts to incarnate the Platonic vision of transcendent order." Little also believes that Hooker is following the classical tradition of Aquinas, who bound together the orders of existence, like, for instance, time and eternity, reason and faith, transcendence and immanence.³⁸

Terrell T. Kirk continues this lineage and writes that, in centering his interest on reason and the conceptual, Hooker stands in the medieval tradition of Thomas Aquinas, as distinct from modern thinkers (i.e., the Protestant Reformers), whose concern was primarily with perception. According to Kirk, reason is the basis of every voluntary action, because reason informs the will "not only as to the relative goodness of an object, but also of its possibility. Reason, the discursive or conceptual faculty, is here to be distinguished from the understanding, the perceptive faculty."³⁹ It appears that, for Terrell, understanding should be interpreted as faith, which he contrasts with reason as means of knowledge. Thus, in Hooker, grace supposedly works for the salvation of humanity as the basis for reason. So, grace is helped by reason, not reason by grace. The next conclusion is that reason is the interpreter of Scripture and experience, not faith. All these are true, in Terrell's view, because Hooker "asserts the unity without confusion of God

and the creation.”⁴⁰ Likewise, Marco Orrù considers that, in Hooker, the basis of justification is reason. Thus, human reason is the centre of Hooker’s entire theology and all his major theological themes like salvation, justification and Church order are based on reason. Reason alone is able to offer suitable answers to the much debated connection between sin, free will, and justification.⁴¹

A recent position in favour of Hooker as part of the Thomistic tradition which underlines the primary importance of reason in Hooker’s theology is that of Arthur P. Monahan. Actually, Monahan is convinced Hooker was a Counter-Reformation thinker. To support his understanding of Hooker, Monahan produces the following arguments. Firstly, the fact that reason is the characteristic *par excellence* of human nature; reason is the essence of moral and legal behaviour. Thus, reason is God’s greatest gift to humanity. Secondly, reason enables man to understand God’s plan and to place himself within the plan of God in order to act accordingly. Although Monahan admits Hooker subscribed to the “orthodox doctrine of original sin”, he still maintains that Hooker’s general attitude towards the fallen human condition “is much less dramatically expressed” than that “of the Lutheran and Calvinist Reformers, who tended to picture humans as wallowing in sin and perverted in their natural judgments.”⁴²

This line of thought has at least three problems. Firstly, it is one thing to notice that Hooker uses some Catholic ideas to build his theology and it is quite another thing, radically different, to insist that because of these Catholic ideas his theology is more Catholic than Protestant. Secondly, if Scripture is not the only source for God’s law, nature and reason are available to the Church, which may choose to use them as she pleases. Accordingly, the Church is able to discern that certain scriptural interdictions cannot be extended to all human actions. The Church can also determine that Scripture is silent on certain matters. If this is true, then man can, and indeed must,

turn to the authority of reason. Furthermore, men must not be afraid that they could commit a serious sin by doing so.⁴³ Thirdly, this interpretation of Hooker loses sight of his doctrine of original sin and of man's depravity. Hooker advocates the use of reason because reason is evidently a faculty given by God and made available to us. Sin, however, has affected the entire human being, including reason. Thus, Robert Orr is right to notice that in Hooker sin is so powerful that it hinders man from correctly perceiving the law of reason.⁴⁴ Natural duties may be discovered by reason, but supernatural duties, due to man's fall in sin, are beyond the reach of reason and must be found in Scripture. Thus, Hooker is rather part of the Augustinian and Anselmian tradition of reason, which promotes the faith seeking understanding, not the medieval scholastic (and specifically Thomistic) view of reason.⁴⁵ This places reason under the final judgment of a higher authority, and for Hooker, this authority is obviously Holy Scripture.⁴⁶ To be sure, for Hooker, Holy Scripture is not the only authority by which man should determine his actions. Reason and tradition (the Church Fathers, the Church councils, Christian tradition and practice) are other authorities in theology beside Scripture.⁴⁷ Human decision, reflected in the application of reason, should not be downplayed or ignored. Even Scripture should be read giving a good deal of consideration to our reasonable capacity of interpretation. So reason may be an authority in spiritual matters.⁴⁸ Holy Scripture, however, is the final authority in matters concerning human salvation.⁴⁹

D. H. Marot, for instance, defends the final authority of Scripture over reason in Hooker's thought. Marot believes that doctrinal affirmations are necessary for one's entire life and therefore deduced from Scriptures. Scripture is the main source of revelation in matters of faith.⁵⁰ Such teachings which cannot be conceived or totally explained by reason, include the unity of God, the Trinity, the salvation by Christ, the resurrection of the body, eternal life, and the final judgment.⁵¹ All

the things which are necessary to salvation are to be found in Scripture, though Scripture may not mention them expressly but rather through the comparison of various biblical texts. What is ultimately important for man is not his own reason, but the precepts of Scripture.⁵² Hooker takes Scripture word for word, and he is very much preoccupied with the accuracy of the biblical text as applied to the Church.⁵³

Hillerdal seems convinced that, for Hooker, Scripture is the only true source of knowledge in comparison with traditions, although Hooker underlines constantly that we ought to learn from the interpretation of the Fathers and medieval theologians. Nevertheless, Scripture is the final authority. Despite this appreciative view of Scripture in Hooker, Hillerdal still writes that "he [Hooker] was violently fighting against all tendencies to regard Scripture as the self-evident illuminative Word of God which does not need reason for its proper understanding and interpretation."⁵⁴ Hillerdal is trying to maintain a valid balance between reason and Scripture, so he sounds appreciative of both, though it appears that Scripture is above reason from the standpoint of its ultimate importance for knowledge of spiritual realities. According to Hillerdal, Hooker wrote that God had given reason to man as a priceless tool to be used with utmost care. The neglect of reason would imply a disregard towards this wonderful gift of God, and revelation cannot change this situation. Reason is a most necessary instrument for the correct understanding of Scripture. Hillerdal explains that, for Hooker, reason cannot "reach to the wisdom given by revelation", but it may underscore "the necessity of God's action on mankind when sending his son." So, reason may, at least partially, understand the mystery of Christ's incarnation. According to Hillerdal, this is the influence of Thomas Aquinas. But Hooker is also influenced by Luther, so Hillerdal writes that reason is not enough, and it must be accompanied by revelation. What follows is an obvious dialectic of reason and revelation.⁵⁵ Thus, revelation is always

complemented by reason, as the gift of God. On the other hand, revelation helps men to understand the things that reason should be able to understand, but reason fails to do this because of sin. Reason may give a valuable support for a better understanding of God's law, but Hooker's entire corpus of "metaphysical views", Hillerdal contends, "make revelation necessary."⁵⁶ Without divine intervention, man is totally unable to save himself since he cannot attain the proper knowledge of God by means of his natural talents. This is why the divine law must complement the information missing because of sin, which affected the entire human being. Scripture, seen as revelation, always offers "additional knowledge" to the conclusions of reason.⁵⁷

Another position which ascribes final authority to Scripture, and implicitly to God's grace, is that of Robert Hoopes. Writing about the same dialectic between reason and Scripture or grace, Hoopes slightly inclines the balance in favour of grace. His starting point is the concept of right reason, which Hooker supposedly uses in order to assert the "ontological reality and harmony of nature, reason, and morality."⁵⁸ Hooker's concept of right reason is made up of three main aspects. Firstly, the essential rationality of God; secondly, the essential rationality of man; and thirdly, the ability of human reason to know natural and supernatural things. Although he does not say so explicitly, it appears that the ability of human reason to know supernatural things is limited.⁵⁹ Hoopes contrasts Hooker with Calvin. According to Hoopes, Calvin talks about a God of absolute will,⁶⁰ while Hooker describes a God of absolute reason. Hooker affirms the rational character of God, something which he borrowed from Thomas Aquinas. Thus, salvation is conditioned by the acceptance of right reason. Hoopes does not intend to condition salvation to the acceptance of right reason alone, but of right reason as part of justifying faith. The certainty of faith must be accompanied by the assent of reason.⁶¹ The importance of reason in this scheme becomes evident

when Hoopes writes that the light of reason must accompany the revealed Word of God. Thus, if the Word of God, which is rational (in the sense that it is not irrational), is accepted by faith, it means that faith is at least partially rational. This is not to say that the remaining aspects of faith are irrational, but rather super-rational because reason needs to be completed by grace. Actually, in Hoopes' words, "nature needs grace, and grace uses nature." As already mentioned, the acceptance of grace is by faith, which is essentially trust in the truth of salvation. This truth, however, must be confirmed and fortified by the revealed Word of God, i.e. by grace, not by reason.⁶²

The concept of rational faith, so dear to Thornton, was refuted by Phillip Harth on the basis of Hooker's double concept of certainty. Because the understanding of science is a matter of reason which offers the certainty of evidence, belief, which is a matter of faith and offers the certainty of adherence, cannot be part of reason. It is true that reason complements faith, and faith reason, but the two remain distinct. This is why, in Harth's views, the concept of rational reason as described in Hooker is impossible.⁶³ Harth admits that reason is necessary in the interpretation of Scripture, but only because man has a supernatural end which can only be fulfilled by biblical revelation. In the end, Harth is undecided, and claims Hooker is ambiguous. Either revelation has disclosed things impossible to be fathomed by reason, or reason has the power to penetrate into God's transcendence and at least have a perception of it. It seems, however, that Harth is slightly more comfortable with the first possibility.⁶⁴ For Hooker, natural religion is inferior to revealed religion. It is obvious that religious knowledge acquired by reason is seriously flawed and limited. The revelation of God must help reason step beyond its limits so that man can have a correct knowledge of God.⁶⁵

The reading of Hooker proposed by Egil Grislis is another attempt to maintain a fair balance between Scripture and reason.⁶⁶ Thus, according to Grislis, Hooker's theological system

is neither exclusively biblical, nor merely rational. Hooker is evidently interested in the methodology of biblical interpretation, which includes the use of reason, but he repeatedly underscores the absolute perfection of Scripture.⁶⁷ However, the extra-biblical Christian heritage, or tradition, must not be avoided.⁶⁸ As Allchin suggests, Hooker “can maintain that God does not speak to us only through Scripture, but in a great variety of ways, through reason, law, the tradition of the Church and the experience of the nations.”⁶⁹ Nevertheless, Scripture is a supernaturally given revelation, which settles Hooker’s main hermeneutical presuppositions. Firstly, Scripture is the Word of God and absolutely necessary to salvation. Secondly, Scripture does not consist exclusively of supernatural laws. Thirdly, God is the author of Scripture.⁷⁰ This sort of balance between Scripture and reason is extremely feeble, especially because of the role of reason. John Booty, for instance, writes that reason is not a critical faculty of the mind. Rather reason is what receives the divine truth so, to use Booty’s expression, “reason is not unbridled.”⁷¹

The consequence of this assertion is revealed by Peter Lake, who writes that reason is a *sine qua non* of conversion, though reason is transcended by the message of the Gospel. Lake believes that the message of Scripture was conceived in such a way that human beings, who are rational creatures, could understand it. In Lake’s word, Scripture was “encoded” only to such extent that reason is able to grasp its meaning. This means that reason is able to decode the message of Scripture by means of its autonomous power and action. But reason should not be thought of as a human instrument alone because the power of reason was created by God. Defined in this manner, reason becomes a way to a better understanding of God’s will. By its own natural powers, reason could never have understood anything more than the laws of nature and, at best, the doctrine of salvation by good works. The message of the Gospel is given to humanity to complete man’s knowledge

about his surrounding reality. Accordingly, the reality of nature is supplemented by the reality of God and of God's good news. Thus, to a certain extent, reason is able to understand the reality of God as expressed in the Gospel. For Lake, Hooker promotes a view of an autonomous reason, which must also be defined as an instrument of God.⁷² So God works in man through reason but this is not the work of reason; it is the work of grace. Hooker understands the fundamental importance of grace in the life of man, but he cannot ignore the capacity of man as God's creature. Though distorted by sin, reason is able to distinguish at least some aspects of God's reality. Reason may very well be unable to offer a soteriological knowledge of God but it does offer a natural knowledge of God. This is why Hooker insisted that there is a solid interdependence of reason and Scripture, nature and grace.⁷³

In Hooker, reason and Scripture are always closely connected, but the intent of Scripture is to deliver the laws which pertain to the supernatural dimension of reality, namely to God. By itself, i.e. without Scripture, reason cannot glorify God as Saviour. Nobody is denying the importance of reason and, to be sure, reason is not destroyed by sin. Sin, however, clouds or corrupts reason, which makes reason unable to help man for his salvation as final authority.⁷⁴ Indeed, for Hooker, Holy Scripture is the only authority in matters pertaining to salvation, because the knowledge of God's plan of redemption cannot be attained by means of natural reason.⁷⁵ Scripture alone contains the knowledge of salvation.⁷⁶ However, once justification is granted, man begins his new life in Christ and continues his redemption in sanctification. Though guiding himself in accordance with the normative prescriptions of Scripture, man has the obligation, as God's creature, to use his God-given reason to order his decision in life and redeem his way of thinking and use the knowledge of salvation.⁷⁷ Thus, although Scripture has the final word, reason is also of use for shaping one's proper living in the world.⁷⁸ In order of importance, the

authority of the Bible is first, then comes the authority of reason.⁷⁹ This is to say that salvation cannot be achieved without the guidance of Scripture, which, of course, is understood also by means of the faculty of reason, but only under the supreme illumination of the Holy Spirit.⁸⁰ From this perspective, McGrade is drawing attention to the fact that Hooker was a scholar deeply steeped in Renaissance humanism and his primary goal was to understand what God is saying to us in the Bible. In order to do this, the Christian must engage himself in a committed study of Scripture, which is an ongoing process that should last throughout his entire life. The same life, however, should also be informed by reason. Man lives in history and living in history means striving for scientific progress, which is attained by reason. For McGrade, in terms of his use of reason, Hooker is an Aristotelian but not a narrow-minded one. Hooker uses the concept of reason to urge the Christians to live according to their remarkably natural gifts which God bestowed upon them by creation. The reality is that the people of God cannot use Scripture apart from reason. Nevertheless, only Scripture contains all things necessary to salvation and the authorized interpretation is given by the Holy Spirit.⁸¹ Thus, man is able to understand reality by reason but God's revelation is understood essentially by Scripture alone with the help of the Spirit.⁸² Scripture and the help of the Spirit are practical manifestations of God's grace and, compared to reason, they have an enormous importance. Grace encompasses everything. Without grace, nothing functions properly. For instance, Douglas Crerar notices that Hooker does not give credit to reason alone; not even to understand the laws of nature. Only grace is able to help our incapacity. This is why Crerar writes that "without grace, we would not even use our reason."⁸³

The fact that Scripture has the final authority in matters of salvation is not necessarily the result of a highly analytical process based on reason, but rather a conclusion based on com-

mon-sense, as W. Speed Hill seems to infer. Without getting overly entangled in theological speculation, Speed Hill makes some remarks about the ultimate importance of Scripture in Hooker's theology. Scripture is good for the reader, it nourishes him spiritually and provides him with social, emotional, ethical and aesthetical benefits. The, Scripture is comprehensive and may be investigated by reason; whatever Scripture says, the reader understands and may use for his own situation. In Speed Hill's words, "distant though in time and place, Scripture still speaks to the human condition."⁸⁴ Scripture is a unified corpus of writings and is complete in terms of its designated purpose. Finally, Scripture is permanently relevant as contains the promise of salvation, which every fallen human being needs for his or her life.⁸⁵

Unlike Speed Hill, who tried to avoid theological intricacies in his assessment of Hooker's view about Scripture and reason, Atkinson tackles both Scripture and reason theologically. Due to the doctrine of total depravity, which he attaches to Hooker's theology, reason does not have the power to penetrate the supernatural kingdom of God. Reason is limited in searching the depths of truth in the heavenly realm. In fact, the presence of sin in man causes him to be fundamentally insensitive to the work and Word of God.⁸⁶ This leads Atkinson to an important characteristic of Hooker's theology: the distinction between natural and supernatural or the "way of nature" and the "way of grace".⁸⁷ According to Atkinson, Hooker defends the full sufficiency and authority of Scripture. Thus, we must give credit and exercise obedience towards Scripture as the primary source of authority even if the Church says otherwise.⁸⁸ In Atkinson's words, "Hooker was most concerned to protect the supreme and final authority of Scripture."⁸⁹ Like Allison, Atkinson underlines Hooker's pastoral concern; this time, however, in matters pertaining to Holy Scripture. Hooker's doctrine of Scripture has a pastoral end, namely the consciences of weaker people. Thus, Scripture can easily become

an instrument of psychological and spiritual torture should it be thought to contain all things one *must* do in earthly life. Atkinson writes that, for Hooker, Scripture should be read spiritually, not legalistically. Scripture was not given to us as a list of compulsory ordinances but to provide us with the proper knowledge of salvation. In Hooker, Scripture has primarily a soteriological purpose, so it must be read christologically.⁹⁰ In Atkinson's view, Hooker clearly places Scripture above nature. Thus, Scripture teaches things that reason cannot perceive unaided by God's grace.⁹¹

In line with Atkinson's interpretation is that of Bruce Kaye, who notices that, for Hooker, reason has continuity with the revelation of Scripture.⁹² This means that Hooker accepted the authority of providence above the authority of reason especially in matters pertaining to salvation.⁹³ Kaye correctly writes that, in Hooker, the supreme authority of Scripture is not only related to natural reason but to a "more specific and demarcated purpose in pointing us to salvation."⁹⁴ Thus, Scripture is a direct witness of the incarnation of Christ, which stands in the centre of the revelatory truth of Christianity.⁹⁵ Hooker, however, points to the fact that Scripture does not operate in an empty realm, but in the community of men and women. The authority of Scripture is not only theoretical, but indeed practical as it transforms society by transforming individual lives. Kaye draws attention to the fact that the community of men and women, which he names the community of humanity, is not the community of the Church as a distinct sub-group of humanity. The implication of Kaye's observation is crucial, because for Hooker, Scripture has authority over the whole of humanity and is capable of transforming it in its entirety. Consequently, because the authority of Scripture as the revelation of God extends towards the whole of humanity, the salvation of the incarnate Christ is effective for the whole of society, not only the smaller community of the Church.⁹⁶

Notes

¹ See also my *Richard Hooker and his Early Doctrine of Justification. A Study of his Discourse of Justification* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005), 120-129.

² Hooker, *Justification* (*Works* V, 132.12-19).

³ Hooker's view of reason is one of the things which, among others, Travers disliked. Knox suggests that it is possible that Hooker made reference to divine reason, and Travers took it for human reason. Regardless whether this is true or not, Knox is convinced that Hooker's theology is based on Scripture, reason, and tradition. For a detailed view, cf. Knox, *Walter Travers*, 84, 87. For details about Hooker's use of reason, see also Don H. Compier, "Hooker and the Authority of Scripture in Matters of Morality", in McGrade (ed.), *Richard Hooker*, 253.

⁴ Orr, "Chillingworth Versus Hooker", 130.

⁵ See also Davis, "'For Conformities Sake': How Richard Hooker Used Fuzzy Logic and Legal Rhetoric against Political Extremes", 339.

⁶ William P. Haugaard, "The Scriptural Hermeneutics of Richard Hooker. Historical Contextualization and Teleology", in Donald S. Armentrout (ed.), *This Sacred History. Anglican Reflections for John Booty* (Cambridge, Mass.: Cowley Publications, 1990), 161-174.

⁷ S. L. Bethell, *The Cultural Revolution of the Seventeenth Century* (London: Dennis Dobson, 1963), 22.

⁸ For a detailed analysis of Hooker's view of tradition, see John K. Louma, "Who Owns the Fathers? Hooker and Cartwright on the Authority of the Primitive Church", *The Sixteenth Century Journal* VIII/3 (1977), 45-60.

⁹ One of the most important characteristics of Hooker's theology of Scripture (which is fundamentally Bucerian) is the distinction between the transitory and the permanent in Holy Scripture. Hooker warns that attention should be given to the progressiveness of God's revelation in history. Thus, in the Church there are essential things, which must be permanent, and secondary things, which may be changed. For more details, see Barry, *Masters in English Theology*, 29-30.

¹⁰ J. R. Parris, "Hooker's Doctrine of the Eucharist", *Scottish Journal of Theology* XVI (1963), 163.

¹¹ Hunt, *Religious Thought in England*, 60.

¹² Bethell, *The Cultural Revolution of the Seventeenth Century*, 23.

¹³ Hunt, *Religious Thought in England*, 61.

¹⁴ Private judgment is only one part of the process of learning, which Hooker connects to the knowledge of God. The second part of the process of learning about the reality of God is social knowledge, according to which humans are led by the authority of mankind. Social knowledge operates in secular society to affirm the right of the natural law. It also operates in

spiritual society to apply the truth of Holy Scripture by authorised interpretation. Hooker is concerned to maintain a true balance between the two societies because the claims of both must be maintained. For more details, see Barry, *Masters in English Theology*, 25-26.

¹⁵ For more details about the authority of Scripture in Hooker's theology, cf. Francis Paget, *An Introduction to the Fifth Book of Hooker's Treatise of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1907), 119-120.

¹⁶ Rowse, *The England of Elizabeth*, 485.

¹⁷ Hooker, *Of the Laws*, Introduction by Christopher Morris, viii.

¹⁸ Thornton, *Richard Hooker*, 26-29.

¹⁹ d'Entrèves, *Richard Hooker*, 46.

²⁰ Jordan, *The Development of Religious Toleration in England*, 228.

²¹ *Ibid.* 229.

²² *Ibid.* 230-232. An interesting view is that of George Sabine. The interpretation of George Sabine directs reason to the realm of social and political affairs. Reason reportedly enables men to perceive the good and leads them to follow this good. Further on, Sabine explains that the basis of human society is the rational awareness which informs humanity of the unsatisfied desires of men and women. In order that these necessities be fulfilled, men and women must live together in an orderly society. Of course, society must be governed, and the government must be characterized by order, which is based upon reason. For further details, see Sabine, *A History of the Political Theory*, 440-441.

²³ Sedgwick, "The New Shape of Anglican Identity", *Anglican Theological Review* 77/2 (1995), 190.

²⁴ d'Entrèves, *The Medieval Contribution to Political Thought*, 120.

²⁵ Shirley, *Richard Hooker and Contemporary Political Ideas*, 88.

²⁶ *Ibid.* 90. Booty disagrees and writes that Hooker's anthropology is pessimistic because affections always dominate reason and tend to defend error instead of maintaining the truth. John Booty, "The Law of Proportion: William Meade and Richard Hooker", *St. Luke's Journal of Theology* XXXIV/2 (1991), 26. For more details about the tendency of human nature to allow itself to be ruled by affections, see Rudolph P. Almasy, "The Are and Are Not Elymas: The 1641 'Causes' Notes as Postscript to Richard Hooker's *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*", in McGrade (ed.), *Richard Hooker and the Construction of Christian Community*, 200.

²⁷ Details about the theory that Hooker's anthropology is Thomist may be found in Martyn Percy, *Introducing Richard Hooker and the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity* (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1999), 24. For instance, Linwood Urban is convinced that on the meaning of "good" or in moral theology, Hooker is very close to Aquinas. For details, Linwood Urban, "A

Revolution in English Moral Theology", *Anglican Theological Review* LIII/1 (1971), 6-7. Likewise, Loyer is convinced that the anthropology of Hooker was influenced by the philosophy of Aquinas. See O. Loyer, "Contrat social et consentement chez Richard Hooker", *Revue des Sciences Philosophiques et Théologiques* 59/3 (1975), 380-381, 386.

²⁸ Elizabeth Tebeaux, "Donne and Hooker on the Nature of Man: The Diverging 'Middle Way'", *Restoration Quarterly*, 31.

²⁹ *Ibid.* 44.

³⁰ Speed Hill, "The Evolution of Hooker's *Laws of the Ecclesiastical Polity*", in Speed Hill, *Studies in Richard Hooker*, 117-158.

³¹ Davies, *Episcopacy and the Royal Supremacy in the Church of England*, 42.

³² For more information about Davies's interpretation of Hooker's doctrine of Scripture and reason, see *ibid.* 47-49.

³³ For more recent assessments of Aristotle's importance in Hooker's theology (and also in the theology of Philip Melanchthon and Pierre Ramus), see Tod Moore, "Recycling Aristotle: The Sovereignty Theory of Richard Hooker", *History of Political Thought* XIV/3 (1993), 345-359, and Bouwsma, "Hooker in the Context of European Cultural History", 144.

³⁴ See also Veatch, "The Idea of a Christian Science and Scholarship: Sense or Nonsense?", *Faith and Philosophy* 1/1 (1984), 102.

³⁵ See also Booty, "The English Reformation", 31.

³⁶ Torrance Kirby, "Richard Hooker's Theory of the Natural Law in the Context of Reformation Theology", 690.

³⁷ Munz, *The Place of Hooker in the History of Thought*, 48.

³⁸ David Little, *Religion, Order, and Law: A Study in Pre-Revolutionary England* (New York: Harper and Row, 1969), 4. See also Edwin B. Heaven, "The Transcendence of Order", in Darrol M. Bryant (ed.), *The Future of Anglican Theology* (New York and Toronto: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1984), 120.

³⁹ Terrel T. Kirk, "The Meaning and Application of Reason in the Works of Richard Hooker", *The Saint Luke's Journal* IV/1 (1961), 24-25.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.* 26-29.

⁴¹ Marco Orrù, "Anomy and Reason in the English Renaissance", *Journal of the History of Ideas* XLVII/2 (1986), 186-187.

⁴² Monahan, "Richard Hooker: Counter-Reformation Political Thinker", 208.

⁴³ For more details, see Rudolph Almas, "The Purpose of Richard Hooker's Polemic", 258.

⁴⁴ Orr, *Reason and Authority*, 180.

⁴⁵ Micks, "Richard Hooker as Theologian", 562.

⁴⁶ See also Strauss and Cropsey (eds), *History of Political Philosophy*, 318.

⁴⁷ In other words, Scripture must not be interpreted in an absolutist way. Scripture is the highest authority for Christians, but not the only authority. See John Walton, "Tradition of the Middle Way: The Anglican Contribution to the American Character", *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church* XLIV/5 (1975), 31. See also D.R.G. Owen, "Is There an Anglican Theology?", in Darrol M. Bryant (ed.), *The Future of Anglican Theology* (New York and Toronto: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1984), 4.

⁴⁸ John N. Wall, "Hooker's 'Faire Speeches': Rhetorical Strategies in the *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*", in Armentrout (ed.), *This Sacred History*, 133.

⁴⁹ Patrick McGrath, *Papists and Puritans under Elizabeth I* (London: Bradford Press, 1967), 319.

⁵⁰ Florence Higham, *Catholic and Reformed. A Study of the Anglican Church, 1559-1662* (London: SPCK, 1962), 27.

⁵¹ D. H. Marot, "Aux origines de la théologie anglicane. Écriture et tradition chez Richard Hooker", *Irénikon* 33 (1960), 324.

⁵² *Ibid.* 331-332.

⁵³ George, *The Protestant Mind of the English Reformation*, 323.

⁵⁴ Hillerdal, *Reason and Revelation in Richard Hooker*, 23.

⁵⁵ Not everybody was happy about Hooker's dialectic of reason and revelation. For instance, Ernst Troeltsch wrote that Hooker was not able to reconcile reason with revelation and could not define the grace of God; so he finally ended up in "a kind of mysticism". Ernst Troeltsch, *The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches*, Olive Wyon, trans., 2 vol. (London, 1931), in McGrade, "The Public and the Religious in Hooker's *Polity*", 404. Likewise, not everybody was happy about Hillerdal's understanding of Hooker's dialectic of reason and revelation. For instance, Nigel Atkinson is very critical of Hillerdal, and writes he was "frustrated" by Hooker's distinction between "the way of nature" and "the way of grace". For details, see Atkinson, *Richard Hooker and the Authority of Scripture, Tradition and Reason*, 32.

⁵⁶ Hillerdal, *Reason and Revelation in Richard Hooker*, 71-75.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.* 75.

⁵⁸ Hoopes, *Right Reason in the English Renaissance*, 123.

⁵⁹ For more information about the limited character of Scripture, see McAdoo, *The Spirit of Anglicanism*, 6-10.

⁶⁰ Knox suggests that predestination is not the result of the absolute will of God, but of the conditional will of God. Knox, *Walter Travers*, 75.

⁶¹ In Hooker, there is a close connection between reason, the certainty of faith in the elect, and justification by faith. This is why he proposed the idea, abhorrent to the Puritans, that the Church of Rome is a true Church of God in spite of its faults. In this way, on the basis of reason, one may easily reach the conclusion that the Catholics who believe in Christ but still agree

with justification by works do not deny directly the foundation of Christianity, which is salvation in Christ alone. Cf. Peter Milward, *Religious Controversies of the Elizabethan Age. A Survey of Printed Sources* (London: Scholar Press, 1977), 105.

⁶² Hoopes, *Right Reason in the English Renaissance*, 127-131.

⁶³ Harth, *Swift and Anglican Rationalism. The Religious Background of A Tale of a Tub* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1969), 41-43.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.* 26. Harth starts his argument by writing that, in Hooker, reason and revelation/Scripture provide the foundation of religion. Hooker makes a clear distinction between the natural religion and the divine revelation. Natural religion can be discovered by reason, namely the existence and attributes of God, the immortality of the soul, and the natural law. However, the necessity of God's revelation to mankind resides in the fact that reason is not equally strong in all men. For details, see *ibid.* 23-25.

⁶⁵ See also Nicholas Hudson, "Three Steps to Perfection: *Rasselas* and the Philosophy of Richard Hooker", *Eighteenth Century Life* 14/3 (1990), 35-36.

⁶⁶ A similar view is held by A.S. McGrade, "Hooker's *Polity* and the Establishment of the English Church", in Richard Hooker, *Of the Laws of the Ecclesiastical Polity*, A. S. McGrade and Brian Vickers eds. (London: Sidgwick and Jackson, 1975), 21.

⁶⁷ See also, Henry McAdoo, "Richard Hooker", in Geoffrey Rowell (ed.), *The English Religious Tradition and the Genius of Anglicanism* (Ikon, 1992), 116.

⁶⁸ Grislis, "The Hermeneutical Problem in Richard Hooker", 182.

⁶⁹ Allchin, "The Theology of Nature", 151.

⁷⁰ Grislis, "The Hermeneutical Problem in Richard Hooker in the Eastern Fathers and among Anglican Theologians", in Hugh Montefiore (ed.), *Man and Nature*, 186-187.

⁷¹ Booty, "Hooker and Anglicanism", 233. See also Booty, "The Judicious Mr. Hooker and Authority in the Elizabethan Church", 99.

⁷² Lake, *Anglicans and Puritans?*, 152.

⁷³ *Ibid.* 152.

⁷⁴ Wolf, *The Spirit of Anglicanism*, 28.

⁷⁵ See also Joan Lockwood O'Donovan, *Theology of Law and Authority in the English Reformation* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991), 143.

⁷⁶ See also Jaroslav Pelikan, *The Christian Tradition. A History of the Development of Doctrine*, vol. 4, *Reformation of Church and Dogma 1300-1700* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1985), 348.

⁷⁷ See also Haugaard, "Richard Hooker", 434.

⁷⁸ William Haugaard, "The Bible in the Anglican Reformation", in Frederick H. Borsch (ed.), *Anglicanism and the Bible* (Wilton: Morehouse-Barlow, 1984), 73-75.

⁷⁹ Owen, "Is There", 4.

⁸⁰ See also Charles W. Brockwell, "Answering 'the Known Men': Bishop Reginald Peacock and Mr. Richard Hooker", in Jerald C. Brauer, Robert M. Grant, and Martin Marty (eds), *Church History*, vol. 49 (The American Society of Church History, 1980), 142.

⁸¹ John Michael Christopher Bryan, "The Judicious Mr. Hooker and the Early Christians. The Relationship of Scripture and Reason in the First Century of the Christian Era", in Armentrout (ed.), *This Sacred History*, 144-145.

⁸² Stephen McGrade, "Richard Hooker. Apologist for All Seasons", *St. Mark's Review* 141 (1990), 16. For more details about reason aided by the Holy Spirit, see also Stephen Sykes, "Richard Hooker and the Ordination of Women to the Priesthood", *Sewanee Theological Review* 36/2 (1993), 200-214, and Stephen Sykes, "Richard Hooker and the Ordination of Women to the Priesthood", in Janet M. Soskice (ed.), *After Eve* (Collins, 1990), 119-137.

⁸³ Crerar, *Positive Negatives*, 174.

⁸⁴ W. Speed Hill, "Editing Richard Hooker: A Retrospective", *Sewanee Theological Review* 36/2 (1993), 196.

⁸⁵ "Its relevance is permanent; Scripture is the classic of classics, although this permanence is relative only to created time, because at the Last Judgment its 'appointed end' ends too. Still, we cannot imagine a situation in which fallen humans would not need the promise of salvation Scripture offers." For details, see Speed Hill, "Editing Richard Hooker: A Retrospective", 197.

⁸⁶ For more information, see Christopher Haigh, "The Church of England, The Catholics, and the People", in Peter Marshall (ed.), *The Impact of the English Reformation 1500-1640* (London: Arnold, 1997), 235-255.

⁸⁷ Atkinson, *Richard Hooker and the Authority of Scripture, Tradition and Reason*, 27-31.

⁸⁸ For more details about Scripture as source of negative criticism within the Church, see Kenneth A. Locke, "Equal Ministries: Richard Hooker and Non-Episcopalian Ordinations", *Anvil* 14/3 (1997), 176.

⁸⁹ Atkinson, *Richard Hooker and the Authority of Scripture, Tradition and Reason*, 99. See also Atkinson, "Hooker's Theological Method and Modern Anglicanism", 50.

⁹⁰ Atkinson, *Richard Hooker and the Authority of Scripture, Tradition and Reason*, 129. See also Atkinson, "Hooker's Theological Method and Modern Anglicanism", 54.

⁹¹ Atkinson, *Richard Hooker and the Authority of Scripture, Tradition and Reason*, 100-101.

⁹² For recent details on Hooker's relationship between Scripture and reason, see Patrick Collinson, "Hooker and the Elizabethan Settlement", in McGrade (ed.), *Richard Hooker and the Construction of Christian Community*, 168.

⁹³ For more information about the final authority of Scripture in Hooker, see also Torrance Kirby, "Richard Hooker as an Apologist", in McGrade (ed.), *Richard Hooker and the Construction of Christian Community*, 227-230.

⁹⁴ Kaye, "Authority and the Shaping of Tradition", 88.

⁹⁵ For Scripture as revelation of Christ, see Alan Bartlett, "What Has Richard Hooker to Say to Modern Evangelical Anglicanism?", *Anvil* 15/3 (1998), 198.

⁹⁶ Kaye, "Authority and the Shaping of Tradition", 88.

The Understanding of Sin in the Theology of Matthias Flacius

LUKA ILIĆ

Lutheran Theological Seminary

Matthias Flacius's understanding of sin needs to be looked at in the context of his spiritual conversion, his humanist educational background and in the debates during the 1550s over good works that he had with Pffefinger and Strigel, as well as the debate about the free will with Melanchthon. It was only toward the late 1560's that a full blown hamartiology of Flacius arose for which he was accused of being heretical (Manichean), and which the Lutheran Formula of Concord partly rejected some five years after Flacius had died.

In this article I will present Flacius's hamartiology chronologically. I will begin with Flacius's first verbal articulation of his beliefs concerning original sin at the Weimar Disputation in 1560 and will look at the historical circumstances that led to this event. I will then briefly mention the influence of philosophical thought upon Flacius. Next will follow an examination of his evolved view in written form in 1567 which was attacked by many of his contemporaries. Finally, I will discuss a work of his from 1570, in which Flacius developed his doctrine further, as a response to the growing controversy around him, ending with a conclusion.

During Easter in 1557, Flacius moved from Magdeburg to Jena in order to help start a new faculty of theology. He had been asked by the dukes of Weimar to participate in establish-

ing a university that would match the one in Wittenberg. Apart from having professorial responsibilities, Flacius also became a general superintendent for the churches in the whole of Thuringia. It was while Flacius was in Jena that a meeting of German princes took place in Frankfurt in March of 1558 in order to secure an agreement within the evangelical camp. Unhappy with the result of the so-called Frankfurt Rezess, Flacius advised Duke John Frederick the Middle to write up the book containing a theological and doctrinal norm which all pastors in Thuringia should have to sign. The result was the controversial *Konfutationsbuch* of 28 November 1558 and pastors were required to read it from their pulpits. The book stirred much opposition from other princes and theologians and deepened the strife within Ducal Saxony. The culmination was the arrest by soldiers of Strigel and Hängel, both of whom refused to accept the *Konfutationsbuch*, as well as a student riot in Jena which was put down by one hundred soldiers occupying the city. Flacius was accused of being behind the arrest but he denied the charges and instead showed willingness to meet his opponents in public. When Strigel and Hängel were released from prison in September 1559, Flacius offered them an open disputation, so that they could publicly debate the issues of disagreement. After some negotiations between them a meeting was finally arranged to be held in the old castle of Weimar.

Disputatio Vinariensis/Confutatio Saxonica (1560)

It is important to begin tracing Flacius's explanation and understanding of original sin from its first articulation in Weimar. Even though at this stage Flacius did not fully formulate his teaching on that matter, he later mentioned exactly this colloquium for helping him to think through all the implications of this doctrine and pushing him to make his own definition.

The colloquium at Weimar was a direct result of the heated debates between the Philippists and the Gnesio-Lutherans. Its purpose was to confer about the role of man's free will in sal-

vation. Flacius and his co-workers Wigand, Matthaeus Judex (1528-1564), and Musaeus saw the synergism of Melanchthon and his followers as a direct attack on the central article of the Lutheran faith, namely the doctrine of justification by faith (*sola fide*) and therefore wanted to settle this issue once and for all. Little did they know that they would not only be able to resolve this question, but instead they would split and become bitter opponents and cause a big storm within the Lutheran Church.

In preparation for the debate each participant wrote seven theses about free will ahead of time¹. Those theses were approved by the Chancellor Brück who then wrote rules of conduct for the public disputation and decided on the form it would take. The Saxon disputation lasted thirteen sessions which were spread during seven days in morning and afternoon (with the exception of Sunday morning) from August 2 to 8, 1560.

At the first session Flacius began to make a case for a relationship between free will and original sin. He stated that natural man had lost all his powers to do good because original sin had corrupted man's free will to such an extent that man had no choice left to him in matters of conversion. He presented this in a form of syllogism:

Major: Something that has lost its positive energy cannot produce any good (as an example Flacius used a biblical story of a bad tree which cannot give birth to good fruit).

Minor: Following the testimony of the Holy Scriptures, humankind did not only lose its God given power toward good works, but on the contrary they received powers inclined toward evil.

Conclusio: Therefore it is impossible that natural man can contribute to his salvation through his good works. Can a man get figs from the thorns?, he asked.²

Strigel replied with an analogy of a man robbed by thieves, who not only stole their victim's possessions but left him sore-

ly injured. He wanted to explain that even though man was left without his good powers because the devil robbed him, he was still alive and had his intellect, heart and will. Flacius immediately attacked this analogy by saying:

I know that those individuals who defend human powers (just as you are now doing) are in the habit of fleeing to this comparison of the wound, as if it meant that human nature was ruined in its entirety; but that is not it at all. For that poor man, even if he was critically wounded by the thieves, nevertheless he did not lose all sparks and flashes of life, nor was he completely killed. Otherwise he could not have been revived and healed. Therefore, I assert that man in the original fall was not only wounded but (as Scripture confirms) was completely killed, extinguished and incapacitated to do good in all spiritual things. And in its place was added animation and activity inclined toward evil. I believe that you wish to demonstrate by this comparison the gravely wounded human nature. But if any help or medicine is administered to him then that synergy is able to be healed and convalesce.³

In the second session after lunch on the first day Strigel rejected this explanation of Flacius but admitted that humankind was affected by the fall to such an extent that man's body and soul had become polluted. However, according to him man's powers were only injured by sin and the original substance which man possessed at the creation was not destroyed, transformed or removed, but only incapacitated (he was mainly thinking of will becoming incapacitated). Strigel's main argument was that the substance of the species must remain because if it would be transformed than the created species would become something completely different that originally intended. At that point, Strigel declared that original sin is a quality (*accidens*) that is combined with free will (actual substance of the human intellect and of the will).

After Flacius had refuted this statement, Strigel felt that now he had a chance to attack Flacius with the direct question,

“An negas peccatum originis esse accident?” Do you deny that the original sin is an accident (quality)? Flacius’s answer was: “Luther eloquently denied it to be an accident. Scripture too testifies that man in his intellect is not only dead, killed and removed as regards divine things, but is also transformed into the image of Satan.”⁴

Flacius’s line of thinking was that sin has depraved and corrupted man so that he has become an enemy of God. In his understanding, the Scripture teaches that the change that took place after the fall was that sin became the substance and the very essence of man and because of it man’s ability to know God has been lost.

Flacius’s declaration that sin is a substance of man is only a small chapter in the long development of the doctrine of hamartiology in the Western church⁵. Even though Flacius lost his professorship in Jena as a result of his statements at the Disputation and was banished from Thuringia by the Duke John Frederick in December 1561, the actual controversy began only after he published his very detailed understanding of sin in 1567 in a tract entitled “On the Appellations and Essence of Original Sin or the Old Adam.”⁶ Since the discussion with Strigel was based on a philosophical framework that Flacius believed was not appropriate for resolving spiritual matters, he felt compelled to issue forth his doctrine of man in print. The tract was actually appended to the second part of *Clavis Scripturae*, where he defined original sin as the very corruption of man. For him corruption as a concept means a total perversion or depravity, resulting in an evil heart and mind, and he fought against minimizing original sin as a mere attribute of man.

Flacius and Philosophy

It is impossible to understand the theological thought of Flacius without looking at his humanistic background and interests. During his education he studied under Egnatio Cipelli,

Simon Grynaeus, and Melanchthon, who were all interested in dialectics and in Aristotle's methods of logic and rhetoric. His early formal training was within the circles of Italian Renaissance humanism in Venice.⁷ His studies continued in Basel, where he lived in the house of his teacher Grynaeus, who was a translator and publisher of classics and especially of Aristotle⁸. Taking into account that later on Flacius privately tutored students on Aristotle in Wittenberg⁹ and in 1558 published his philosophical work *Paralipomena dialectices* (Additions to Dialectics) there is no doubt that his teachers had played a significant role in shaping his beliefs and the ways in which he interpreted Scriptures.

During the disputation with Strigel, philosophical language was used and there were various meanings to the terms which were employed. Strigel used the terms accident and substance according to Melanchthon's definition of them in his *Erotemata Dialectices* of 1548, which was a third version of his logic, and in which he states that substance is "a being which truly has its own existence and does not exist in another thing from which it has its existence as from a subject."¹⁰ The definition which Melanchthon gave for the term "accident" was "that which does not subsist of itself, is not a part of the substance, but is in another in a changeable condition."¹¹

Flacius agreed that the substance of an object cannot be changed and that only an accident is capable of change. Therefore, he declared that original sin is not an accident. He quoted Luther extensively from his commentary on Genesis 3, especially passages where Luther described original sin as man's nature, essence and substantial sin. Flacius's claim was that Luther did not teach anything else, in fact he used his words directly: "the divine image and the original sin are not accidents but substance of the human essence itself."¹² However, Luther disliked Aristotle very much and opposed a return to his philosophy, which he believed will come close to synergism,¹³ and even when he used his terminology, he meant it

only in a figurative sense, while Flacius interpreted it in a literal sense.

Flacius also made a distinction between man's formal and material substance, which was his own invention. He explained that formal substance of man was his original essence which was made up of his unique righteousness and holiness, really free and in the right relationship with God. In other words, the image of God is the formal essence of man, which has been changed by the original sin into a contrary image, namely the image of Satan himself. Other gifts which God bestowed upon humanity in creation were not lost in the fall and those gifts Flacius described as material substance. Only the best part of man has been corrupted, namely his soul. Thus the distinction he made was between the sinless condition of Adam and Eve in the garden before they sinned, which he called formal substance, and their state after committing the original sin, which is material substance or sinful nature.

It is also important to understand the context in which Flacius made his statements. It was during a theological debate, which was concerned with the issue of man's free will and its possibility of cooperating in salvation. In order to stress his point strongly, Flacius emphasized the fact that original sin has completely spoiled mankind, taking away all spiritual powers and leaving human will capable of only sinning and without any ability to assist in conversion. Putting in writing several years later the words which he spoke at the Weimar colloquium, he said:

I believe and assert that original sin is a substance, because the rational soul (as united with God) and especially its noblest substantial powers, namely, the intellect and will, which before had been formed so gloriously that they were the true image of God and the fountain of all justice, uprightness, and piety, and altogether essentially like unto gold and gems, are now, by deceit of Satan, so utterly perverted that they are the true and living image of Satan, and, as it were, filthy or rather consisting of infernal flame,

not otherwise than when the sweetest and purest mass, infected with the most venomous ferment, is altogether and substantially changed and transformed into a lump of the same ferment.¹⁴

Flacius's View of *Peccatum Originale* in *Clavis Scripturae* (1567)

Man's Nature

Flacius definitely belongs to a group of theologians in church history who has been criticized for a pessimistic and misanthropic view of man. He believed that the study of mankind should be a subject of all sciences, i.e. medicine, politics, philosophy and other arts need to research his physical, social and moral life, but the task of theology is to understand his religious being. As a Protestant theologian he used the Bible to prove his observation about the radical evil in man, but often when he talked about the diabolical characteristics of man he wrote out of his own personal experience. Because he was often disappointed in his own life, hurt and treated poorly, we can not escape seeing that his conclusions about the corruption of the image of God in man are tied to what he privately tasted in interpersonal relationships.

It has already been stated that during the Weimar debate Flacius said that original sin is man's substance. In *Clavis* he tried to distinguish between the lower and the higher formal substance. For him "forma substantialis" represented the basic form to which belongs the difference between body and soul, our senses (hearing, smell, taste, sight and touch) as well as the ability to think. The higher form he termed "substantia formalis [nobilissima] in summo gradu" (substantial form in its highest grade), which consists of our reason and will and they were part of our original divine image before the fall. Here is how he explained the nature of humankind as it was originally created out of nothing (*creatio ex nihilo*),

But I speak concerning the most noble substantial form according to which especially the heart, or rather the rational soul, had been formed, so that this same essence would represent the image of God, and that as man's substantial powers, the reason, will, and disposition, would be conformed toward the properties of God, and would then represent Him, and would then truly know Him.¹⁵

Flacius insisted that the substantial form in its highest grade was the component of humankind's substance that made man into what his creator desired him to be.¹⁶ That higher substantial form, which is only one part of us, is completely destroyed and transformed into the image of Satan, according to Flacius. On the other hand, the lower form remains the same as our principal created matter (in the body). Even though with the higher substantial corruption of our soul, the lower part is affected as well, still in that part something of the original perfection and order is left.¹⁷ In this way, Flacius tried to answer his critics who were accusing him of making man a creature of Satan. His reply was that the transformation that took place, where the highest part of the form is changed completely, does not prove that Satan is the maker of the new man, but it only shows that he is the one who has fully corrupted the God-given substance and therefore responsible for the total depravity in humankind.

Therefore, this inverted substantial form or formal substance in the highest grade, which provides man chiefly with that thing that the creator desired him to be, that now changes him according to his formal cause so that he is the image and son of the devil, and provides him that horrible fate to become the old Adam – this thing, which we call original sin, I assert to be the true and sole font of sin.¹⁸

Flacius's division of substantiality is the best way to portray his understanding of anthropology. He describes man as the

being that possesses the lower form as earthly (carnal) and philosophical man that is different from the spiritual and theological man, who can only stand in the presence of God (*coram Deo*). At this point he introduces the term *imago* which is in some sense similar to the term *forma* and from which his whole theology of man is derived. Because our image has been changed from that of God to that of Satan, he develops a *triplex status hominis* (threefold standing of man) based on: *imago Dei*, *imago Satanae* and a new birth *ex nihilo* in Jesus Christ. The ground for this threefold partition of man is found in five domains: 1. God; 2. Adam; 3. Christ; 4. Antichrist; 5. End-time, where two and four, as well as three and five, belong together.¹⁹

	<i>Libertas</i>		<i>Integri</i>
<i>Triples status</i>	<i>Servitus</i>	<i>Hominis</i>	<i>Lapsi</i>
	<i>Liberatio</i>		<i>Redempti</i>

Hominis integri is he who is free from unrighteousness and punishment, *Lapsi* is a servant of guilt and punishment, while *Redempti* has been set free from unrighteousness and punishment, which is death.²⁰

Original Sin

In the quote below Flacius is describing the terrible effect of sin, which attacked man's being and nature and changed it in such a way that man has become dehumanized or demonized, i.e. man does not anymore portray the image given to him by his Creator.

In this manner, therefore, I have recently realized and asserted that original sin, in its first rank, is a substance because the rational soul and especially its most noble and substantial powers, namely reason and will (which were created so wondrously that they were the true image of God, the fount of all justice, honesty and piety and clearly, essentially, just as gold or gems) are now,

by the trick of Satan, precisely and utterly inverted. Thus they have become the true and living image of Satan and are like manure or rather the unchanging hellish flames. [This transformation] is as if some completely sweet and pure mass is infected by a most venomous leaven and is deeply and substantially changed and transformed through the fermentation of that mass.²¹

In my opinion, Flacius only described the results that the original sin produced, but failed to define the sin itself and then moved directly to Luther to prove his position, quoting him:

Regarding Psalm 51: In fact, if you wish to define sin according to the psalm, you must say that sin is everything that is born from father and mother, before man is old enough to speak, act, or think anything. Behold it is so true that I am a sinner before you, that also sin is my nature, my original nature, and my conception, not to mention the word, deed, thought, and life that follows. I am an evil tree... and therefore as long as this same nature and essence remains in and on us, so long are we sinners, until the body dies and deteriorates.²²

In these passages Luther states that sin is the inborn nature of man. He also uses the illustration of man being a bad tree, which can only bear bad fruits. Flacius later took this imagery and used it in his detailed descriptions of man's fallen nature.

Liberum Arbitrium

"Free will is the intellect and will of man as far as it applies to religion and the mandates of God, furthermore, it is man's rational soul. Therefore, free will, at the point it was created in the beginning, was the principal part of the image of God and the cause of all good."²³ It is clear from this definition of Flacius that he taught that the image of God resided in man. The word *arbitrium* signifies also the ability and power by which man had to do everything that intellect and will decide (either good or bad). That means that man can *de facto* and not only *de*

jure give himself over to good or to evil, or to the middle road, whenever he likes it.

Flacius extends his definition of the term *liberum arbitrium* as it is applied in what he calls common usage. In this sense, it is the power, ability or strength of the intellect, will and actions, with which man leads his intellectual life, especially as it relates to religion.

Man does not have power to use these things, as he is carnal. Matter, body and flesh impact his decisions, and because of them, man is always more ready to do evil than to do good. As we are all born of Adam's seed, on the one hand we are dead. This means that we are not able to do anything that is acceptable by God: good things that are thought of, spoken and done from the heart. Because of that no one will, by his own strength, i.e. his own free will, or through good deeds (either great or small), be able to justify himself before God.

The Original Evil

In view of the fact that one of the main purposes of the tract *De Peccati originalis aut veteris Adami appellationibus et essentia* was to refute the opinion held by many Philippists that original sin is an accident, Flacius returned to the Weimar Colloquium for a moment, recounting his opponent's position:

Therefore, according to [Strigel], man was not killed in the original fall, much less substantially transformed from the image of God into the image of Satan, but only polluted with a certain evil accident. If, therefore, that accident is wiped away, man will perfectly practice those first powers, just like Adam in the beginning. He will, therefore, not need resurrection from the dead, regeneration, the creation of a new heart so that he might be restored as a new creature. Rather he will exercise his innate powers as prior to the fall and he will do so happily.²⁴

In order to make his point and to probably also caricaturize the Synergists' beliefs, Flacius used very strong language here.

He did this to make clear for his readers that original evil was not just a temporary and reversible thing, to be understood lightly, but affected the very part of human nature. By this, he emphasized man's need for dependence on God. He went on describing the makeup of man:

Finally, what else is man except a completely corrupt body and soul – even if a third thing were added to him? I do not truly believe anybody is so crazy as to assert differently. When, indeed, too much of a second evil and completely depraved component exists in man, everything else necessarily becomes that innate evil that fights against God. Those who will not concede this, claim another, third part of man or something existing in man, which is as powerful and elaborate as that original evil.²⁵

Others disagree, insisting there are still many good and excellent things remaining in man from God's creation. I respond: Even in the devil there are still many excellent characteristics of creation and indeed many more excellent than in this carnal man, but nevertheless, because all fight against God, all are evil and pure sin. For what else are they than weapons of unrighteousness?²⁶

Since the body and soul of postlapsarian humankind are ruled by sin this makes them one and inseparable, claimed Flacius. Here he is coming against the contention that humankind needs to be distinguished from sin. His argument is that in the original creation man was of God, but after the horrible transformation (*horrendus metamorphosis*), man came under the dominion of the devil. In this way, God's words to Adam, "You shall surely die," (Genesis 1:17) were fulfilled and man as a whole became a servant of sin. Flacius insisted that man's God-instilled good characteristics were not enough by themselves to redeem him.

For there is nothing in man distinct from that evil mind or heart of stone that destroys him spiritually, as sickness kills him bodily. Rather, it was all his ruined and devastated nature. The original

malice is not infused in Adam from outside, as many now think, in such a way as if someone would pour poison or some other bad substance into good liquor, so that due to added bad substance, what remained became itself harmful. But it is as if someone transmuted the same good liquor or food, so that by its own means, it became evil and poisonous or simply poison itself.²⁷

Original sin did not enter man from the outside but corrupted his very substance itself from within. Therefore, it is not a removable element or part but is a non-detachable ingredient of human nature, which leads man toward death and destruction.

Flacius's Defence of his Doctrine concerning Sin (1570)

The Context of the Writing

While living in Strasbourg between November 1567 and June 1573, Flacius experienced antagonism from the city senate, who wanted to expel him because of his controversial doctrine of sin.²⁸ Originally Emperor Maximilian II stirred the city authorities by complaining to them in 1568 that they had given an asylum to Flacius. In 1570 Elector August of Saxony together with the Palatine Elector Frederick III asked the city to banish the Flacius family.²⁹ This was the reason for Flacius to write his doctrinal defence in September of that year.³⁰ The book was dedicated to four men from Lindau³¹, the city where he hoped to find asylum in case that Strasbourg decided to deny him a staying permit. The Strasbourg superintendent Marbach was also from Lindau as well as a young professor of Hebrew at Strasbourg Academy, Johannes Pappus (1549-1610), who was greatly influenced by Flacius. Because of this strong lobby in the small city at the Bodensee, Flacius had high hopes that his evacuation plan would work.

The purpose of his book was to establish once again, as he says in the title, "sound doctrine about original justice and unrighteousness, i.e. sin," and to gain support among Lindau's

leading clergy. Even though Flacius never moved to live in Lindau (except for a few weeks during the summer of 1570)³², the city preachers remained loyal to his theology even after his death and they opposed Jakob Andreae's plans for the formula of Concord.³³ The formula was an attempt to find a middle ground between the quarrelling groups of Lutheran theologians, namely Philippists, Flacians and Gnesio-Lutherans (those who distanced themselves from the teaching and leadership of Flacius). One of the Lindau preachers also made sure that the details of Flacius's last days before his earthly departure were recorded and published the account of his last words and the funeral oration held in Frankfurt am Main.³⁴

The Style of Writing

In this 32-page work Flacius sets out to defend his understanding of the doctrine concerning original sin. He places his own beliefs within the framework of other authors and sources, including the book of Isaiah, the Gospels of Matthew and John, some of Paul's epistles, Augustine (354-430), Luther, Bucer, Chemnitz, Peter Martyr Vermigli (1499-1562) and Melancthon. He frequently refers to Greek mythological figures (for example the Hydra of Lerna and Glaukos) and mentions persons from antiquity, such as Thucydides (c. 460-c. 400 BC). Occasionally Flacius includes original quotes in Greek, which shows his wide-ranging and thorough knowledge of that language, culture, and philosophy; he also refers to Plato and seems to follow Aristotelian logic in his argumentation.

As an author, he seems to have been knowledgeable about his audience. His choice of words, references, and even languages point to this. Judging by the number of quotes in Greek, he obviously knew that his readers would understand that language. Sometimes even a few phrases in German appear in the middle of the text. In this work, however, he does not use Hebrew at all, a language he was considered to be an

expert at, and one he frequently employed in his other writings.

Flacius also quotes his own three previous works on the same theme, namely *Gnothi seauton* (Know Yourself),³⁵ *De occasionibus errandi*³⁶ and *Demonstrationes*³⁷. He either presupposes that his readership already knows them, or he is actually encouraging them this way to read them and become familiar with his argumentative defence: Or is this just a hint of self-promotion?

His impeccable knowledge of scholarly Latin is clear from the text, which is rhetorically complex: his writing style is full of metaphors and vivid descriptions, for example when he talks about the nature and consequences of sin.

It is also evident from the text that Flacius was a deep thinker, who had carefully thought through establishing his line of reasoning in this particular disputation. He sets out by describing the issue, then moves on to discuss the consequences of such a statement, while drawing on a wide range of disciplines to illustrate his points.

Remarks on the Content of Flacius's Writing

Flacius begins with a lengthy introduction, in which he refers to his previous works, and then repeats one of the foundational points of his argumentation, saying, "I have already shown with the three principal causes that the heart or ratio of man and free will itself can be called, and is sin, original unrighteousness or the devil's image, according to the efficient, formal and final cause."³⁸

Firstly, he says, because of the efficient cause, depraved man is named after the father devil and man's seed comes from the progeny of the old serpent.³⁹ This is because the devil transformed man, in the first fall from the best into the worst, as a result of man's own fault and disobedience to God's command not to eat of the fruit of the tree (Genesis 2:17).⁴⁰

Secondly, Flacius explains what he means by formal cause concerning man he says: "He is completely flesh, the old and animal-like Adam, who has a blind mind, and a particularly perverse heart of stone as hard as steel, and that man is full of darkness and all kinds of evil."⁴¹ "His whole mass and his image," he continues, "is only evil, conceived and formed in the mother's womb in sin or a sinner, or, as Luther states, conception itself and mass is sin. Finally, he is some horrible, smelly and abominable spiritual corpse."⁴²

As a third point, Flacius elaborates on the final cause. He states that man is an enemy of God by intention and is not able to do otherwise because, "From the worst and most abundant treasure of his heart come forth sins of all kinds. It is a grave full of corpses and rottenness. From here all kinds of the most poisonous smells are evaporating abundantly, which corrupt and pollute earth, air and sky."⁴³

As a conclusion to this three-fold line of philosophical reasoning, Flacius sums up his position in the following way: "God's law and strict justice detests above all this worst and saddest form, or essence of our soul, or this most wicked tree, weed and the planting by Satan, as extremely incompatible with Him, certainly much more than individual fruits, or as leaves or effect of this worst tree."⁴⁴

From the way Illyricus writes about the ugliness of sin, its consequences and man's polluted nature, just as he did in the work previously discussed, we can see that he has not changed his position. He continues to represent the understanding that original sin has infected man completely, and by this he opposes those who wish to diminish the fallenness of man and the depraved state of his nature. After all, it seems that Flacius is convinced more than ever that his doctrinal position is right and therefore it is worth the price (in his eyes) of being excommunicated and even being called heretical for the sake of confessing and defending this emphasis until death.

After having defined the three causes why man is sin, Flacius continues his writing with an exposition of the role of God's law in relation to sin. The right relationship of God's law to grace as represented in the Gospels was a frequent theme in all Lutheran writings in sixteenth century. However, Flacius here does not deal with the different usages of the law, nor does he mention Melanchthon's concept of the "third use of the law", with which he disagreed. Instead, he describes where the two spheres of law and sin interact and guides his readers to the Scriptures. "It is not in vain that Paul says that through the law itself there is or comes recognition of sin. Therefore, it is from this [the law] and not from human dreams, fantasies or fallacies that we must learn and become acquainted with the true nature and essence of sin."⁴⁵

Flacius enumerates four different types of people or ways of thinking about God's law. Firstly, he writes, "some people think that God's moral law demands only proper outer works and forbids misbehaviour, just as many understand civil law, according to the saying: Thoughts are exempt from censorship. The Church does not judge secret things: no one is punished for his thoughts."⁴⁶ Among those holding such a view he lists the Pharisees and monks, who think of themselves as righteous if only they follow external rituals and do not break the law by committing murder, stealing or behaving promiscuously.

Describing the second group he says, "Some go one step further, establishing that God's law judges even the internal evil thoughts, actions and emotions, especially if the will approves of it."⁴⁷ Flacius then claims that these people mostly considered only the second table of God's Ten Commandments (numbers four through ten), and that without respecting their author, his word, and not giving him the full honour. Those in the third camp "concede that the law itself judges even both the good and the evil accidents of the soul, especially its characteristics, and it examines the good and consi-

ders it justice and good works, but rejects evil, considering it sins or unrighteousness.”⁴⁸ It is apparent that this group goes the furthest in its understanding of the function of the law and believe that thoughts and habits of the mind are also subject to God’s scrutiny. However, the only correct way of thinking is that of the Scriptures, according to Flacius, and he portrays this understanding extensively on the following several pages. He sets out by establishing the details and implications of the fact that the totality of man, including especially his reason, was created in God’s image and reflected His character:

Finally, the last and correct opinion is that of the sacred Scriptures and of those who follow it, that God and his law describe and depict man in his entirety and demand his being together with his accidents for himself, his inclinations with all movements and internal as well as external deeds: he wants all this to be perfect as it was in the beginning, especially man himself in his being (substance) and accident, and foremost his spirit or rational soul in its highest grade or free choice, by which he has been forced to manifest itself the strongest and express itself as a certain living image, and drives itself, conducts itself and serves itself, has formed it very brightly and shaped it thoroughly after himself.⁴⁹

From here Flacius launches into a discussion of sin and its consequences on man, moving somewhat circularly towards establishing his case regarding original sin. He brings in the concept of sin and how it has affected the nature of man, then goes back to elaborate on further details of the original creation of man by God. He then summarizes what God wants from man and what man’s attitude should be towards his Maker:

For when the law and God himself asserts, putting forward the purpose and sum of his entire will: “Be holy just as I am holy” and “Love God with all your heart and all your soul, and from all your strength”, he does not only require good fruit and external

and internal deeds as some guess from the sole sound of the words but above all he requires the cause itself and the good tree or root and the primary source, so that she would be the best according to her own nature and essence as she was in the beginning when God created her and looked at with the greatest delight and she was very good according to his judgment.⁵⁰

Flacius goes into great length to explain and assert that God is the creator of man. He formed man's soul to be eternal and breathed into him from his own image at the beginning of creation, to be in harmony and agreement with Him. It is God himself who implanted in us a clear and consecrated mind (*puram sanctamque mentem inspiravit*), which is our best part (substance), especially in its highest grade, namely our free will. Since Flacius's opponents were accusing him of teaching that Satan created and made man, or that the devil is man's potter, implying that God is the author of evil, he probably took great pains to prove in this work that this was not what he meant and that he had been misunderstood. Although man was made to reflect God's original righteousness, at the same time he falls short of the glory of God.

When God and his law do not find in us this greatest good and dignity of the best essence, which is in conformity to God and his law, or original or inborn righteousness, so much aspired to, then He gets exceedingly angry, and is furious and shouts, saying everything contrary to [what was said] before about us: "You are the brood of vipers, the seed of the serpent, from the father devil, sons of the devil, sons of inferior stock: You are devils, flesh, an old and animal-like man, body of sin, the worst and venomous trees, Satan's planting, weed, wild vine, Sodom's vine, dross, alienated from me and my enemies: You have a heart of stone, hard as steel, perverse, blind and hardened, which is a treasury of all evil."⁵¹

Illyricus connects these dramatic images of the worst of human nature with the passages found in Romans 3. I think that

he is trying to assert that the best in man turns into the worst in him. As man falls short of fulfilling God's law, he becomes the antithesis (as Flacius refers to it) of all of the Ten Commandments and this can be best seen in light of the law itself, which Flacius calls the only standard of justice and all holiness. Although man lives with this inner dichotomy, God requires more from him: He wants his whole being, his full devotion. Using the analogy of a lord and his tenants, the author describes how God has placed man as overseer of His property and has entrusted man with land in order to produce good and abundant fruit. He wants man to reflect the image of his lord: whom he belongs to and whom he serves. Continuing with the analogy, Flacius states that keeping our end of the lord-tenant contract means that we owe service and accountability to God. "God and his entire law require in us and from us only the best essence of a good tree, far more than leaves and fruits."⁵²

The explanation and practical application follow in the text, as Flacius refers to Scripture verses, Greek mythology and God's law in order to describe what God expects from man and how he can be of His image. He first quotes the Old Testament passages which call us to love Him and praise Him with all our heart, mind, and soul. He also emphasises that God above all wants us to have a good and solid foundation, from which good fruit can spring up: "When requiring good fruit, He will surely always ask above all for a good tree and root."⁵³ The importance of a good and healthy base for a person so that he can bear good fruit appears several more times in the text, as do the levels of importance in the eyes of God, which begin on the inside and move toward man's outer appearance and behaviour. The same way, Flacius says, God is more concerned about sin present in man's inner being.

If He detests or condemns these individual quasi-leaves and fruits just as some sorrowful sins or unrighteousness, surely

much more does He condemn that most evil essence itself of the bad tree or the worst treasure or scum of all filthiness as the worst sin and unrighteousness.⁵⁴

It is only after establishing his arguments regarding man's created nature and the characteristics and consequences of sin that Flacius begins discussing the concepts of free will and original sin, in light of God's law:

Likewise, on the other hand He hates above all else the hostile perverse essence of the internal man as truly original unrighteousness, from where all unrighteousness and actual sin gushes forth, shouting: "Inside you are ravenous wolves, from the outside you are whited tombs (within) full of corpses: the Lord knows your hearts: whatever is lofty in you is an abomination before (in the presence of) God."⁵⁵

Using a dramatic imagery and sharp words echoing Matthew 23:27-28, Flacius describes man's internal rottenness, the completely perverted condition of his very substance. This is one of the key passages of this work, in which he provides a summary of his beliefs, to which he holds on relentlessly. He goes on to address the issue of the human will: "The will, together with all the desires of the heart according to its nature as it is now, with all its feelings is total hostility towards God, Romans 8. Rightly therefore, Scripture calls this work and this restoration of man a new creation in Christ, also a New person, indeed a new Man."⁵⁶ In this passage Flacius describes man's nature after the fall, stressing its sinfulness and the conflict in which he finds himself with God. In light of such a state, Christ's redemptive work indeed gains an added emphasis of creating something entirely new from man.

Having finally reached the main theme of his work, Flacius discusses it on the last few pages. He addresses those whose stance on the question of original sin differs from his and criticises them heavily: "In fact they always contend that this origi-

nal evil is something totally different from nature poured into or stuck onto man by Satan, and in all ways should be separated from man's good nature itself, which has been made by God alone."⁵⁷

He then turns to the Scriptures and his theological predecessor Augustine to prove his own understanding: "However, Scripture asserts otherwise, that man's nature by itself, by means of its changeability, is already perverted and transformed, that it is evil in itself, from where all evil comes, just as Augustine discusses it against the Manicheans."⁵⁸ In other words, man is corrupted from the inside out, not as a result of an infusion from the outside.

A Final Appeal by Flacius

At the end of the work Flacius appeals to be heard before an impartial church synod, saying that he never had any affiliation with any sect that held beliefs contrary to the Augsburg Confession and denies the false accusations of his opponents that he desires to establish a new faction within Lutheranism. He challenges those who think differently from him to settle their differing theological opinions on an intellectual level, with arguments from the Scripture. Stating that his conscience is clean, he is willing to face confrontation in order to defend himself. In this way he wishes to honestly prove that his life and teaching were dedicated to the Lutheran church stating: "I am saying, testifying and declaring now only this: that I have always presented myself to the legitimate inquiries of our Churches... I also offer myself to a political investigation, if anyone has an outward crime or case against me and does not want to or cannot dismiss me."⁵⁹

In a similar manner and tone in one of his previous works Flacius wrote about himself: "How much care, seriousness and labour I have invested against all kinds of false beliefs and their followers for God's honour, for the true religion and church and for dear Germany, as well as for the sake of all

Christianity, my writings and this booklet will testify about sufficiently.”⁶⁰

Although Flacius is ready and willing to face his adversaries and to have a dialogue with them, it is clear from the text that he is very convinced that his position is true to the Scriptures and to Luther’s understanding, and is not prepared to compromise them and change his mind.

While possibly driven by the fact that he did not want to die branded as a heretic, Flacius nevertheless does not show any signs of relinquishing his position and his conviction that he is right. It seems that he is not too interested in unity among his fellow Lutherans as much as he is concerned about holding on to orthodox doctrines.

This showed a year later (in 1571) when Jakob Andreae came to Strasbourg to have a colloquium with Flacius and when Flacius refused to sign the draft of what was later to become the Formula of Concord. Apart from the above mentioned colloquium Flacius had a few more public debates before his death concerning original sin but was never given a chance to present his views before the general Lutheran synod. Even today Flacius is mostly remembered for fiercely defending the idea of the total depravity of man and there is still no general consensus among Lutheran and other theologians whether he was right or wrong.

Conclusion

Flacius seemed to have aimed his work more at other theologians than the masses, which is evident from the writing style he used and from the fact that he spent a lot of his time and energy fighting others. Unfortunately, Flacius was often exclusive towards those that he thought had wandered away from the truth and was unwilling to soften his stance against them. In a sense we can say Flacius was a man of his times, which often did not separate the individual person from the ideas that he represented, but nevertheless he should not be excused for

his heard-headedness, which at times had far-reaching negative ecclesiastical and political consequences.⁶¹

In his quest to uproot synergism and its emphasis on the co-operation of human will in salvation, Flacius never tired of proclaiming that we as human beings are fully depraved and evil, and therefore are unable to contribute to our conversion, which should come only by grace (*sola gratia*). However, Flacius went one step further and stated that sin has so completely corrupted our being that our original *imago Dei* has been changed and now we are nothing else than the image of the devil. Because of such sharp formulation, Flacius was accused of Manichean heresy. Commenting on this accusation, the late professor of the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Berkouwer, said: “though Flacius did not intend to uphold a Manichean sort of psychic metamorphosis, he nevertheless, in his attack on the term “accident,” spoke of sin as man’s essence, and he spoke of a transformation.”⁶²

Being fully aware that all analogies are at least partially flawed, nevertheless the following illustration may help us understand what Flacius meant by “transformation”. The Roman Catholic teaching of transubstantiation basically states that the substance of bread and wine are changed during the celebration of the sacrament of Eucharist in such a way that their nature becomes altered, i.e. elements are not anymore mere bread and wine but they become the true body and blood of Christ. Describing a similar process of transformation, Flacius taught that sin changes our substance and therefore it becomes “our substance” in such a way that our nature or essence changes.

In 1580 a doctrinal document of the Lutheran church, the Formula of Concord was published. Its purpose was to bring peace to a heavily divided second generation of Lutherans and to settle theological disputes, which arose after Luther’s death. In it both Melancthon’s and Flacius’s views were rejected (even though their names were not explicitly mentioned) as the

Formula tried to find a middle ground between the two extremes of Philippism and Flacianism.

In my opinion Flacius's understanding of *imago Dei* and *imago diaboli* was not more radical than Luther's. In contrast to the fate that Flacius's anthropology suffered within Lutheranism, Calvinism, especially after the synod of Dordrecht in 1618, embraced the doctrine of total depravity, which corresponded to the exact same concern that Flacius had, namely that if original sin is not properly understood it will have detrimental consequences regarding the doctrine of justification by faith. Thus, although in a different form, Flacius's emphasis on the corruption as a result of the fall of man was kept alive.

Notes

¹ Simon Museaus composed his theses together with Flacius, while Strigel wrote his own. All fourteen theses are reprinted in Eduard Schmid, "Des Flacius Erbsünde-Streit: Historisch-literarisch dargestellt", *Zeitschrift für die Historische Theologie* 19 (1849), 1-78 and 218-279, here 24-25.

² Simon Museaus (ed.), *Disputatio de originali peccato et libero arbitrio, inter Matthiam Flacium Illyricum et Victorinum Strigelium, publice Vinariae per integram hebdomadam, praesentibus Illustriss. Saxoniae Princibus, Anno 1560. Initio Mensis Augusti* (1562), 10. See Schmid, "Des Flacius Erbsünde-Streit", 28.

³ Museaus (ed.), *Disputatio de originali peccato et libero arbitrio*, 19: "Scio eo confugere solere illos, qui vires humanas defendunt, (ut & tu iam id facis) ad illam similitudinem de sauciato, tanquam prorsus res ita se haberet in ruina humanae naturae: cum plurimum differat. Ille enim miser, etsi fuerat a latronibus sauciatus horribiliter, non tamen prorsus omnes scintillas ac micras vitae amiserat: nec erat totaliter extinctus alioqui non potuisset reviviscere & sanari. Ego vero affero hominem originali lapsu non tantum sauciatum, sed (ut Scriptura affirmat) est penitus mortuum, extinctum & interfectum ad bonum in spiritualibus: & contra insuper vivum ac vigentem, ad malum. Illud igitur desidero, quod hoc simili vis ostendere, esse quidem graviter sauciatam naturam humanam: sed si addatur ei aliquid opis & medicaminis, tum posse synergiam illam convalescere & sanari." Quoted in Robert J. Christman, *Heretics in Luther's Homeland: The Controversy over Original Sin in Late Sixteenth-Century Mansfeld* (PhD Diss., The University of Arizona, 2004), 78.

⁴ *Ibid.* 32. Quoted in Heinrich J. Vogel, "The Flacian Controversy on Original Sin," in Arnold J. Koelpin (ed.), *No Other Gospel: Essays in Commemoration of the 400th Anniversary of the Formula of Concord 1580-1980* (Milwaukee, WI: Northwestern Publishing House, 1980), 1-15, here 4.

⁵ See Robert Schultz, who traces the development of the doctrine from Augustine and Pelagius through Aquinas and medieval theologians in "Original Sin: Accident or Substance: The Paradoxical Significance of FC I, 53-62 in Historical Context" in Lewis W. Spitz and Wenzel Lohff (eds), *Discord, Dialogue, and Concord* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977), 38-57.

⁶ Matthias Flacius, "Tractatus VI. De Peccati originalis aut veteris Adami appellationibus et essentia", in *Clavis Scripturae, seu de Sermonibus Sacrarum litterarum, plurimas generales Regulas continens. Altera pars. Authore Matthia Flacio Illyrico Albonesi. Huius Operis multiplicem necessariumque usum ac rationem, Lector, ex Praefatione intelliges. Accessit quoque Rerum & verborum toto Opera praecipue memorabilium Index*. (Basileae: Ioannes Oporinus & Eusebius Episcopus, 1567), 2: 479-98.

⁷ See Robert Kolb, "Philipp's Foes, but Followers Nonetheless: Late Humanism among the Gnesio-Lutherans", in Manfred P. Fleischer (ed.), *The Harvest of humanism in Central Europe: essays in honour of Lewis W. Spitz* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1992), 162.

⁸ Josip Talanga, in foreword to Flacius's *Paralipomena Dialectices* (Zagreb: August Šenoa, 1994), x-xv.

⁹ In the National Library in Vienna exists a manuscript of 768 pages, which are notes taken during the lectures by G. Tanner, who was Flacius's student, under the title *Scholia in Aristotelis librum II. Posteriorum in libros Topicorum, Elenchorum et Rhetoricorum a G. Tannero collecta 1547*. See Mijo Mirko-
vić, *Matija Vlačić Ilirik* [Djela JAZU 50], (Zagreb: Izdavački zavod Jugoslovenske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti, 1960), 61.

¹⁰ *Corpus Reformatorum* 13, in Carolus Gottlieb Bretschneider (ed.), *Philippi Melanthonis Opera quae Supersunt Omnia* (Halle/Braunschweig: Schwetschke, 1834 ff.), 528. See also Jaroslav Pelikan, *From Luther to Kierkegaard. A Study in the History of Theology* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1950), 40.

¹¹ *CR* Mel, 13, 522. Pelikan, *From Luther to Kierkegaard*, 40.

¹² Matthias Flacius, *Clavis Scripturae Sacrae*, 484: "das göttliche Ebenbild und die Erbsünde seiten nicht Accidentien, sondern von der Substanz und dem Wezen des Menschen selbst." Quote taken from Wilhelm Preger, *Matthias Flacius Illyricus und seine Zeit*, 2 vols. (Erlangen: Theodor Blässing, 1859 and 1861 [reprint Hildesheim: Georg Olms and Nieuwkoop: B. de Graaf, 1964]), 2: 318. In the following footnotes I will be using the reprinted edition of Preger's work.

¹³ See Wilhelm H. Neuser, "Luther und Melanchthon – Ein Herr, verschiedene Gaben", *Luther Digest: An Annual Abridgment of Luther Studies* 3 (1995), 60-64, here 62.

¹⁴ Matthias Flacius, *Clavis Scripturae Sacrae*, 482: "Hoc igitur modo sentio et assero, primum peccatum originale esse substantiam, quia anima rationalis et praesertim eius nobilissimae substantialesque potentiae, nempe intellectus et voluntas, quae antea erant ita praeclare formatae, ut essent vera imago Dei, fonsque omnis iustitiae honestatis ac pietatis et plane essentialiter veluti stercorae aut potius ex gehennali flamma constantes, non aliter ac si dulcissima ac sincerissima quaeque massa, venenatissimo fermento infecta, in eiusdem fermenti molem penitus substantialiterque immutata ac transformata esset." Quote taken from Johann Gieseler, *Church History* 3/2 (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1868), 254.

¹⁵ Matthias Flacius, *Clavis Scripturae Sacrae*, 482: "sed loquor de ea nobilissima substantiali forma, ad quam praecipue ipsum cor aut potius anima rationalis formata erat, ita ut ipsa sua essentia Dei imago eumque repraesentaret, utque suae substantiales potentiae intellectus ac voluntas affectusque ad Dei proprietates essent conformatae eumque tum repraesentarent, tum vere agnoscerent."

¹⁶ *Ibid.* 482: "Forma substantialis summa gradus, qui praecipue dat homini esse eius rei, quam esse eum suus creator voluit."

¹⁷ See Ante Bilokapić, "Die Erbsünde in der Lehre des M. Flacius Illyricus", in Josip Matešić (ed.), *Matthias Flacius Illyricus: Leben & Werk* [Internationales Symposium, Mannheim, Februar 1991; Südosteuropa-Studien 53] (München: Südosteuropa-Gesellschaft, 1993), 43-52, here 48.

¹⁸ Matthias Flacius, *Clavis Scripturae Sacrae*, 482: "Hanc igitur inversam substantiam formalem aut formam substantialem summi gradus (qui praecipue dat homini esse eius rei, quam esse eum creator voluit), quae jam eum ut causa formalis facit imaginem et filium diaboli et dat ei illud horrendum esse veteris Adami: statuo esse verum et quasi unicum fontem omnis peccati et id ipsum quod vocamus originale peccatum."

¹⁹ This illustration is taken from Bilokapić, "Die Erbsünde in der Lehre des M. Flacius Illyricus", 47.

²⁰ See Günter Moldaenke, *Schriftverständnis und Schriftdeutung im Zeitalter der Reformation*, Teil I: *Matthias Flacius Illyricus* [Forschungen zur Kirchen- und Geistesgeschichte 9] (Stuttgart: Verlag von W. Kohlhammer, 1936), 88.

²¹ Matthias Flacius, *Clavis Scripturae Sacrae*, 482: "Hoc igitur modo sentio et assero, primum peccatum originale esse substantiam, quia anima rationalis et praesertim eius nobilissimae substantialesque potentiae, nempe intellectus et voluntas, quae antea erant ita praeclare formatae, ut essent vera imago Dei, fonsque omnis iustitiae honestatis ac pietatis et plane essentialiter

liter veluti stercorae aut potius ex gehennali flamma constantes, non aliter ac si dulcissima ac sincerissima quaequam massa, venenatissimo fermento infecta, in eiusdem fermenti molem penitus substantialiterque immutata ac transformatata esset.”

²² *Ibid.* 484-485: Zu Ps. 51: “Quin tu sic definias secundum hunc Psalmum: peccatum esse hoc totum, quod natum est ex patre et matre, antequam homo per aetatem aliquid possit dicere, facere aut cogitare.” Tom. I, 29 (die Jenaer Ausgabe): “Sihe so war ists, das ich für dir ein sündler bin, das auch sünd mein natur, mein anhebendes wesen, und mein empfangnuß ist, schweige dann die wort, werck und gedanken, und nachfolgendt leben. Ein böser baum bin ich... und darumb so lang als dieselb natur und wesen in und an uns, bleibt, also lang sind wir sündler, biß das der leichnam sterbe und undergehe.”

²³ *Ibid.* 486: “Liberum arbitrium est ipsemet intellectus ac voluntas hominis, quatenus circa religionem et mandata Dei versatur, seu etiam est ipsamet anima rationalis. Id igitur liberum arbitrium, quatenus olim sanum conditum est, fuit potissima pars imaginis Dei et causa omnis boni.”

²⁴ *Ibid.* 490: “Sic igitur secundum istos homo in primo lapsu non est mortuus, multo minus substantialiter transformatus ex imagine Dei in imaginem Satanae, se tantum malo quodam accidente conspurcatus. Si igitur illud accidens extergatur, homo illas primas vires exercebit perfecte, sicut initio Adamus. Non ergo indigebit resurrectione ex mortuis, regeneratione, creatione novi cordis et ut in novam creaturam condatur, sed illa prima suas nativas vires exercet et feliciter exercebit.”

²⁵ *Ibid.* 490: “Quid vero aliud tandem in homine est, praeter corpus et animam corruptissimam. Num etiam aliquid tertium illis assidet? Non credo sane quonquam esse tam vercorderum qui id asserat. Cum igitur tantum istae duae pessimae et depravatissimae partes in homine sint, necesse est, eas ipsas esse illud nativum malum, quod cum Deo pugnat etc. Qui hoc non concedunt, illi monstrent aliquam tertiam partem hominis aut in homine existentem et quae insuper sit tam potens ac operosa, ut est istud originarium malum.”

²⁶ *Ibid.* 495: “Objiciunt aliqui: multa esse in homine adhuc bona et praestantia ex reliquiis creationis Dei. Respondeo: Etiam in diabolis sunt adhuc multae praestantes creationis dotes et quidem multo excellentiores quam in hoc carnali homine, sed tamen, quia omnes contra Deum militant, ideo sunt mala et mera peccata. Quid enim aliud sunt, quam iniustitia armata?”

²⁷ *Ibid.* 495: “Non est in homine aliquid diversum ab ipsa mala mente aut lapideo corde, quod eum spiritualiter destruat, sicut morbus eum corporaliter conficit, sed est tantum ipsa perditissima et jam destructissima natura. Originalis malicia non est ita ab extra infusa Adamo, ut multi nunc sen-

tiunt, sicut si quis in bonum liquorem venenum aut aliquid aliquod malum injiciat aut infundat, ut propter illud affusum malum etiam reliquum sit noxium, sed ita, sicut si quis ipsum bonum liquorem aut cibum invertat, ut illud per se jam malum ac venenatum aut potius venenum sit.”

²⁸ See Alcuin Hollaender, “Der Theologe Matthias Flacius Illyricus in Strassburg in den Jahren 1567-1573”, *Deutsche Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft*, Neue Folge II (1898), 203-224.

²⁹ See Flacius's letter of 6 June 1570 to the city senate of Lindau in F. Wilhelm E. Roth, “Des M. Flacius Illyricus Beziehungen zu den Städten Straßburg und Lindau. 1570-1572. Nach Briefwechsel in der Ulmer Stadtbibliothek bearbeitet”, *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie* 54 (1912), 244-255, here 245.

³⁰ Matthias Flacius Illyricus, *Defensio sanae doctrinae de originali iustitia ac iniustitia, aut peccato* (Basileae, 1570), sigs. A1a-B8b.

³¹ The dedication on page A2a reads: “Clarissimis eruditione ac pietate viris, d.d. Achili Gassar, Matthiae Rot, Georgio Neckero, & Thobiae Rupio, suis dominis, ac in Christo fratribus...” Achilles Gasser (1505 Lindau – 1577 Augsburg) was a renowned doctor of medicine (surgeon) and historian, while Roth, Necker and Rupp were Lindau preachers, who were all good friends of Flacius and ardent supporters of his teachings. Roth was ordained in Wittenberg by Luther in 1545, when Flacius was a professor there, while Rupp was Flacius's student in Jena and lived in his house.

³² See G. Karo, “Das Lindauer Gespräch. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Concordienformel”, *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie* 45 (1902), 513-564. According to Karo, 519, Flacius stayed in the house of George Necker during the summer of 1570.

³³ In August of 1575 a colloquium was held in Lindau, where Tobias Rupp and other Lindau Lutherans supported Flacius's rendering of the doctrine of sin against Dr. Jakob Andreae and Dr. Ludwig Rabus (1524-1592), superintendent of Ulm. For the details of the colloquium see Karo, “Das Lindauer Gespräch” (see above, note 4). Robert Kolb states that Andreae failed to grasp the central concern of the Flacians, see “Andreae, Jakob”, in Hans J. Hillerbrand (ed.), *The Oxford Encyclopedia of the Reformation*, 4 vols. (Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), 1: 36-38, here 37.

³⁴ Kaspar Heldelin, *Eine Christliche predigt uber der Leiche des Ehrnwürdigen und hochgelerten Herrn M. Matthiae Flacij Illyrici, Weiland getrewen Dieners und bestendigen Merterers Jesu Christi Fromen Hertzen zu gut gestellet* (Ursel: Nikolaus Henricus, 1575).

³⁵ Matthias Flacius, *Gnothi seauton. De essentia originalis iustitiae et iniustitiae seu Imaginis Dei et contrariae* (Basileae: Petrus Pernas, 1568). For this work,

see Ivan Kordić, "Vlačićev Gnothi seauton", *Prilozi za istraživanje hrvatske filozofske baštine* 39-40 (1994), 137-155.

³⁶ Matthias Flacius, *De occasionibus vitandi errorem in essentia iniustitiae originalis. Item de eximia virtute summaque necessitate doctrinae de essentia imaginis Dei ac diaboli, iustitiaeque ac iniustitiae originalis* (Basileae: Petrus Pernas, 1569).

³⁷ Matthias Flacius, *Demonstrationes evidentissimae doctrinae de essentia imaginis Dei et Diaboli, iustitiaeque ac iniustitiae originalis, una cum testimoniis veterum ac recentium theologorum* (Basileae: Petrus Pernas, Praefatio dated 1 January 1570).

³⁸ Matthias Flacius, *Defensio sanae doctrinae de originali iustitia ac iniustitia, aut peccato*, A4b-5a: "Ostendi igitur ibi tribus potissimum de causis, cor aut rationem hominis ipsumque liberum arbitrium dici & esse peccatum iniustitiamve originale, aut imaginem diaboli, ratione causae efficientis, formalis, ac finalis."

³⁹ *Ibid.* A5a: "Primum quidem ratione efficientis, quia homo corruptus dicitur ex patre diabolo, & semen eius ac genimen illius antiqui serpentis."

⁴⁰ *Ibid.* A5a: "Ille enim eum illae horrenda primi lapsus caede in hoc triste foetidumque ac detestandum cadaver sic transformavit, ipsius sane propria culpa, non tamen sine iustissima ira, poena ac maledictione Dei, illam horribilem sententiam ferentis: Quaecunque die comederis, morte morieris: quae maledictio, teste Lutero, de hac ipsa re agente, res optimas in pessimas transformat."

⁴¹ *Ibid.* A5a: "Totus est caro, vetus animalisque Adamus, habens mentem coecam et cor lapideum ac plane adamantinum perversumque: plenus est tenebris & omni malitia."

⁴² *Ibid.* A5a: "Ipsamet massa figmentumque, eius est tantum malum, conceptus formatusque est in utero matris in peccatis seu peccator, seu, ut Lutherus pronunciat, ipsa conceptio ipsaque massa est peccatum. Est denique horrendum quoddam foetidumque & abominabile cadaver spirituale."

⁴³ *Ibid.* A5b: "Ex cordis eius pessimo & copiosissimo thesauro omnis generis peccata prodeunt. Est sepulchrum plenum cadaveribus & putredinibus. Unde sine intermissione omnis generis venenatissimi foetores terram, aërem, coelumque spiritualiter inficientes ac conspurcantes, ubertim exhalant."

⁴⁴ *Ibid.* A5b-A6a: "Hanc igitur pessimam tristissimamque formam, aut essentiam cordis nostri, seu hanc pessimam arborem, zizania & plantationem Satanae, & omnium maxime detestatur lex et severa Dei iustitia, tanquam sibi extreme in conformem, multo certe magis quam singulos fructus, aut quasi folia seu effectus huius pessimae arboris."

⁴⁵ *Ibid.* A6a: “Non enim frustra dicit Paulus per legem ipsam esse, aut fieri cognitionem peccati. Ex ipsa igitur, non ex humanis somniis, phantasiis aut sophismatibus veram naturam essentiamque, peccati discere cognoscereque debemus.”

⁴⁶ *Ibid.* A7a: “Quadruplices autem homines, aut opiniones de lege sunt: Alii putant legem Dei moralem tantum externa recta opera postulare, & prava prohibere: sicut plaerique de civilibus legibus sentiunt, iuxta dictum: Gedanchen seindt zolfrey: De occultis non iudicat Ecclesia: nemo de cogitationibus punitur.”

⁴⁷ *Ibid.* A7a: “Alii paulo longius progrediuntur, statuantes legem Dei etiam internas pravas cogitationes & motus affectusque damnare, praesertim si assensus voluntatis accedat.”

⁴⁸ *Ibid.* A7a-b: “Tertio alii concedunt, quod lex etiam ipsa bona malaque accidentia animae, praesertim autem qualitates iudicet, & bonas exigat, habeatque pro iustitia ac bonis operibus, pravas autem vetet habeatque pro peccatis vel iniustitia.”

⁴⁹ *Ibid.* A7b: “Denique ultima ac vera sententia est Scripturae sacrae, eorumque qui eam sequuntur, quod Deus eiusque lex totum hominem describat & depingat, sibi que poscat essentiam eius cum accidentibus, inclinationes cum omnibus motibus actionibusque internis & externis: eaque omnia prorsus & perfecte talia esse velit, ut initio ipse ea, praesertim autem ipsum hominem in substantia & accidentibus, in primisque ipsam mentem seu animam rationalem, in suo summo gradu seu libero arbitrio, quo potissimum se repraesentare, ac tanquam viva quaedam imago exprimere, secumque agere, & sibi servire debuit, praeclarissime formavit, finxit ac sibi met penitus conformavit.”

⁵⁰ *Ibid.* B1b: “Cum enim lex & Deus ipse dicit, scopum summamque totius suae voluntatis proponens, Sancti estote, sicut & ego sanctus sum, & Diligite Deum ex toto corde totaque anima, & omnibus viribus vestris: non tantum bonos fructus effectusve externos & internos postulat, ut aliqui ex solo verborum sono divinant: sed ante omnia ipsammet causam arboremque bonam aut radicem scaturiginemque primariam flagitat, ut illa sit per sese suaque natura ac essentia optima, ut fuit initio cum Deus eam condidit, viditque eam cum summo gaudio, & erat iudicio ipsius valde bona.”

⁵¹ Matthias Flacius, *Defensio sanae doctrinae de originali iustitia ac iniustitia, aut peccato*, B3a: “Hoc ipsum summum bonum aut decus optimae, Deoque ac legi eius conformis essentiae, seu iustitiam originariam aut innatam, tantopere expetitam, cum Deus & eius lex in nobis non reperiatur, vehementer irascitur, & furit clamatque, omnia contraria praecedentibus de nobis dicens, Vos estis genimina viperarum, semen serpentis, ex patre diabolo, filii diaboli, filii generes: Vos estis Satanae, caro, vetus animalisque homo,

corpus peccati, pessimae veneniferaeque arbores, plantations Satanae, zizania, labrusque, vites Sodomiticae, scoria, alieni a me, ac hostes mei: Habetis cor lapideum, adamantinum, perversum, coecum, induratum, quodque est thesaurus omnis mali.”

⁵² *Ibid.* B3a-b: “Multo profecto magis Deus & tota eius lex flagitat exigitque in nobis & a nobis ipsam optimam essentiam bonae arboris, quam foliorum ac fructuum.”

⁵³ *Ibid.* B4a-b: “Semper certe ille flagitando bonos fructus, ante omnia ipsam bonam arborem radicemque flagitat.”

⁵⁴ *Ibid.* B4b: “Sin ille haec singula quasi folia aut fructus idem pervenientes detestatur aut damnat, tanquam quaedam tristia peccata, aut iniustitiam, multo certe magis damnat illam ipsam pessimam essentiam malae arboris aut pessimi thesauri vel sentinae omnium spurcitiarum, tanquam summum quoddam peccatum & iniustitiam.”

⁵⁵ *Ibid.* B5a: “Idem quoque vicissim contrariam pravam essentiam interni hominis omnium maxime odit, tanquam vere originalem iniustitiam, unde scaturiat omnis iniustitia aut peccatum actuale, clamans: Intus estis lupi rapaces, estis sepulchra foris dealbata, intus plenae cadaveribus: Dominus novit corda vestra: nam quod est sublime in vobis, abominatio est coram Deo.”

⁵⁶ *Ibid.* B6b: “Voluntas cum omnibus suis appetitionibus cordis secundum naturam suam, qualis nunc est, tota cum omnibus sensibus est inimicitia adversus Deum, Rom. 8. Recte igitur vocat Scriptura hoc opus & hanc reparationem hominis novam in Christo creationem, Novam item creaturam, Hominem denique novum.”

⁵⁷ *Ibid.* B6b: “Semper enim isti contendunt, originale illud malum esse quiddam plane a natura diversum, a Satana homini affusum aut agglutinatum, & omnibus modis separandum ab ipsa bona hominis natura, quae sit a solo Deo condita.”

⁵⁸ *Ibid.* B6b-B7a: “Sed Scriptura contra contendit, ipsammet naturam hominis iam ita esse per suam mutabilitatem inversam & transformatam, ut sit illud ipsum malum, unde omne malum veniat, sicut & Augustin, contra Manicheos disserit.”

⁵⁹ *Ibid.* B7a: “nunc illud unum solum dico, testor & protestor, me semper obtulisse me ad legitimam cognitionem nostrarum Ecclesiarum... Offero etiam me ad politicum iudicium, si quis quod externum crimen causamve contra me habet, nec me missum facere vult aut potest.”

⁶⁰ Matthias Flacius Illyricus, “Foreword to Maximilian II”, in *Von Ankunfft des Römischen Keiserthumb an die Deutschen* (Ursel: Nikolaus Henricus, 1567), in *Zbornik radova trinaestog znanstvenog skupa „Susreti na dragom*

kamenu“ (Pula: Viša ekonomska škola “Dr Mijo Mirković”, 1985), 3-18, here 17.

⁶¹ In 1557 a religious colloquium was held in Worms between Lutheran and Catholic theologians in an attempt at bringing religious and ecclesiastical unity. Negotiations broke down because Flacians and Philippists started disagreeing in front of the Catholics. The Flacian delegation from Thuringia had instructions written by Flacius himself and approved by Duke Johann Friedrich II, which set out a long list of conditions Philippists would have had to agree to in order to secure a united Lutheran front.

⁶² G. C. Berkouwer, *Man: The Image of God* [Studies in Dogmatics Series], (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975 [fifth printing]), 131.

NOTES FOR CONTRIBUTORS

Articles for *Perichoresis* can be submitted on disk and in hardcopy to the Board of Editors. However, we advise all contributors to send their articles by email to the Managing Editor at perichoresis@emanuel.ro. Each submission will be acknowledged in this format.

The average length of articles should be 5.000-8.000 words. We are willing, however, to consider articles in excess of 8.000 words should such a length be absolutely necessary. All articles should be written at a single line spacing with endnotes (not footnotes), which must be typed at a single line spacing and must be justified entirely. For instance, we suggest the following format: Philip E. Hughes, *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977), 140-141. Endnotes should not contain a single tab between the endnote marker and the text. Terms like *idem*, *ibidem* (*ibid.*), and *op. cit.* can be used but not exceedingly. Double quotation marks should be used for quotation, and single quotation marks for quotation within a quotation. Greek and Hebrew words need not be transliterated and they should not be used very often. Transliteration is accepted only if performed in accordance with current academic rules.

The Board of Editors will assess every submission and all contributors will be informed in due course on whether their articles are considered for publication or not.

PERICHORESIS

is

PUBLISHED BY

Editura Universității Emanuel/
Emanuel University Publishing House
Str. Nufărului Nr. 87
410597 Oradea, Bihor
România/Romania

and

PRINTED FOR EMANUEL UNIVERSITY PUBLISHING HOUSE BY

S.C. ROPRINT S.R.L.
Str. Horea Nr. 82
400275 Cluj-Napoca, Cluj
Tel/Fax: +40-264-432384
Email: roprintcluj@xnet.ro
România/Romania

PERICHORESIS
THE JOURNAL OF EMANUEL UNIVERSITY OF ORADEA

Editura Universității Emanuel/
Emanuel University Publishing House
Str. Nufărului Nr. 87
410597 Oradea, Bihor
România/Romania
Email: perichoresis@emanuel.ro
www.emanuel.ro

ISSN 1224-984X