

17TH CENTURY : AGE OF ORTHODOXIES OR HETERODOXIES ?



Workshop organised by IHR together with Refo 500

Geneva, 14th november 2014

(classroom number and exact address to follow)

PROGRAM

Session I : Lutheran Heterodoxy and Orthodoxy.

Chair : Maria-Cristina Pitassi (IHR)

10h-10h30 — Philippe Büttgen (University of Paris I- Sorbonne), « The hazards of orthodoxy. Reflexions on the history of the *Sola Scriptura* principle from Luther to Johann Gerhard » :

This paper intends to show that the principle of *sola Scriptura* as it stands took time and several accidents of history to include the notions of unique authority, total translatability and the opening up of Scripture to all believers. Taking Luther's definition of *sola Scriptura* in 1520-1521 (date of his excommunication) as point of departure I then intend to explore Flacius' *Clavis Scripturae* of 1567, Johann Gerhard's *Tractatus de legitima interpretatione Scripturae* of 1610 and Salomon Glassius' *Philologia sacra* of 1636. I thus hope to show that the components of *sola Scriptura* as we know them, began to come together in 1570 due to two main factors : 1. increasing tendency to present a body of knowlege as a compilation and 2. enduring clerical presuppositions. Taking into consideration this clerical pressure together with a doctrinal view of exegesis helps to refute the easy solutions imposed by ready-made history of exegesis and gives clearer outlines to our image of Lutheran orthodoxy.

10h30-11h — Irena Backus (IHR, Université de Genève), « Philosophy : servant or adversary of theological orthodoxy? *Hoffmanstreit* at the University of Helmstedt (ca. 1598-1602) and the philosophical thought of Daniel Hoffman (1538-1611) » :

Taking as point of departure Markus Friedrich's book, *Die Grenzen der Vernunft* (Göttingen, 2004) and other recent works on the quarrel between Hoffman and other Helmstedt professors, I shall examine the philosophical doctrines of Daniel Hoffman (ca. 1538-1611) as sketched out in an earlier treatise of his against Goclenius, *Explicatio discriminis inter philosophicum et theologicum hominem* of 1580. It is generally well-known that, faced with propounders of Aristotelian metaphysics who were appointed by Duke Julius at Helmstedt,

Hoffman engaged in a battle against them and their « new metaphysics » which, in his view, risked seriously damaging theological purity. We often think even today that Hoffman's historical significance consists solely in the fact that he was successful in imposing and maintaining for some years Luther's distinction between philosophy and theology. Examining Hoffman's treatise against Goclenius which dates from before the Helmstedt quarrel, I should like to examine Hoffman's view of philosophy and its role in theology in greater depth. The last section of the paper will deal with Leibniz's reception of Hoffman.

11h-12h — *Discussion of the two papers.*

12h-14h — *Lunch Break.*

Session II — Roman Catholic orthodoxy and heterodoxy.

Chair : Daniela Solfaroli Camillocci (IHR)

14h-14h30h — Jean-Louis Quantin (EPHE, Paris), « Catholic Orthodoxy. Censorship and Self-Censorship in early modern France » :

In 16th and 17th century France, censorship in its traditional sense of strictures brought to bear on a text (rather than in the later sense of repression or policing) was shared by several competing institutions. Beginning with a tripartite system based on role-sharing between theology faculties, magistrates and royalty, the tendency throughout the 17th century was to reinforce the royalty's powers at the expense of the other two instances especially when it came to preventive censorship which the monarchy, resorting to the privilege mechanism, finally arrogated to itself exclusively. A posteriori censorship on the other hand continued to be shared until the Revolution. The fourth party concerned was the episcopate. It had considerable legal prerogatives while being de facto deprived of the right to use them. Even so bishops persevered with attempts to regain control of printed books via the newly instituted « Assemblées du clergé ». Roman instances were basically not recognised in France but they did command considerable moral authority which dictated Self-censorship. What was ultimately at stake here was the right to condemn, that is to fix the limits of legitimate discourse. The conflict of jurisdiction between the different authorities was an expression of rivalry of orthodoxies within France itself and between Rome and France.

14h30h-15h — Sylvio de Franceschi (EPHE, Paris), « Heterodox Thomists. Thomism as Object of Suspicions of Jansenist sympathies in the late 17th century » :

The Catholic quarrel on grace constantly oscillated, in the 17th century, between two undisputable extremes of heresy, Calvinism on the one hand and Pelagianism on the other hand. Both of those currents of thought set at question one of the two pillars of Roman Orthodoxy, that is either the principle of unalterable freedom of the will or the principle of free predestination to glory. Thomists, Molinists and even Jansenists tried to find a mid-point between these two forbidden extremes. However, the defenders of Molina finally saw Jansenist doctrines on the same level as Thomist teaching, in other words a heresy of the Calvinist type which persistently claimed to be Catholic.

15h-16h — *Discussion of the two papers.*

16h-16h30 — *Coffee Break.*

Session III. Calvinist Orthodoxy and Heterodoxy

Chair : Irena Backus (IHR)

16h30h-17h — Ueli Zahnd (University of Basel), « Beginnings of Calvinist Orthodoxy and late Mediaeval Theology » :

Modern research takes it usually for granted that the Calvinist or Reformed theologians of the late 16th and early 17th century take their style and terminology from Mediaeval Scholasticism as traces of this latter tradition are to be found in their debates with Catholic theologians, especially Roberto Bellarmino. However, it is interesting to note that despite the polemical framework of this reception, Calvinist theologians do not adopt just the Scholastic style and method but also begin to divert to their own ends the mediaeval sources of their Catholic adversaries. It is thus that a common tradition emerges from these inter-confessional disputes. In order to gain a better understanding of how this tradition is shared by the two opposing sides, my paper will focus on Amandus Polanus of Polansdorf (1561-1610), the Basel theologian who was deeply implicated in the polemics of the time : having converted to Calvinism from Lutheranism, he was the first to dispute against Bellarmino.

17h-17h30 — Herman Selderhuis (Theological University Apeldoorn, director of “Refo500”), « The development of reformed dogmatics at Heidelberg in relation to the Synod of Dordt » :

The Heidelberg theological faculty was in the years 1583-1622 one of the leading training centres for theologians. During this period a rationale and a systematisation of reformed dogmatics was developed there which resulted in a specific position taken up by the Reformed at the Synod of Dordt. I would first like to sketch the developments in Heidelberg, then the position at Dordt and, in the third section, deal with a comparison of both to partially answer the question what Dordt meant for the often proclaimed “narrowing down” of reformed orthodoxy.

17h30-18h30 — *Discussion of the two papers.*

19h — *Dinner offered by Refo 500 for the speakers and for members of the IHR.*