



Durham E-Theses

The relationship between the pastoral and doctoral offices in Calvin's thought and practice

Montgomery, John R.

How to cite:

Montgomery, John R. (1984) *The relationship between the pastoral and doctoral offices in Calvin's thought and practice*, Durham theses, Durham University. Available at Durham E-Theses Online: <http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/7154/>

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a [link](#) is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

John R. Montgomery,

The Relationship Between the Pastoral and Doctoral
Offices in Calvin's Thought and Practice

This thesis aims to define John Calvin's understanding of the relationship between the pastoral and doctoral offices in the Church. The method of inquiry is guided by the proposition that his thinking on this matter is conditioned by the Patristic and Medieval traditions. Hence, Part One attempts to survey the development of the teaching office in the pre-Reformation Church, giving particular attention to the way in which certain writers deal with this question.

Part Two examines the Reformer's doctrine of orders. It is maintained, in opposition to the traditional view of a fourfold division, that Calvin (in line with Patristic and Medieval thinking) consistently taught a threefold division of ecclesiastical orders whereby the doctor ecclesiae is not regarded as holding a separate ordo in the Church's government, but simply a specific function (i.e. "office") within the pastoral order.

Part Three delineates what, for Calvin, this doctoral function entailed. Again we find the Reformer following his Medieval predecessors in strictly identifying the doctor ecclesiae with the doctor theologiae (i.e. scriptural interpretation) and not the university doctorate in general (i.e. "all branches of knowledge") as so often supposed.

The final section is concerned with demonstrating that even though the Reformer regarded pastors and doctors as comprising only one ordo, he still saw an important difference in their respective teaching ministries in terms of aim, method and authority, as attested to by the distinction he makes between "preaching" the Word and "teaching" the Word.

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE PASTORAL AND DOCTORAL
OFFICES IN CALVIN'S THOUGHT AND PRACTICE

by

JOHN RICHARD MONTGOMERY

A THESIS SUBMITTED FOR THE Ph.D DEGREE IN THE
FACULTY OF DIVINITY, THE UNIVERSITY OF DURHAM,
ENGLAND

1984



-1. MAY 1985

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
PREFACE.....	1
INTRODUCTION.....	4

PART ONE

THE HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE TEACHING OFFICE
IN THE PRE-REFORMATION CHURCH

Chapter One: The Teaching Office in the Patristic Age.....	10
I. Justin Martyr.....	13
II. Clement of Alexandria.....	15
III. Tertullian.....	19
IV. Origen.....	24
V. The Later Christian Fathers.....	28
VI. Church and School.....	33
Chapter Two: The Influence of the University on the Definition of <u>doctor ecclesiae</u>	41
I. The First Christian Schools.....	42
a. Monastic Schools.....	42
b. Episcopal Schools.....	44
II. The Medieval <u>doctor</u>	46
III. The Ecclesiastical Status of the <u>doctor theologiae</u> in the Middle Ages.....	56
a. <u>Magister in sacra pagina</u>	59
b. <u>Lectio</u>	62
c. <u>Quaestio</u>	63
d. The Authority of the <u>doctor theologiae</u>	65
i) Thomas Aquinas.....	68
ii) Pierre d'Ailly.....	73
iii) John Wyclif.....	80
iv) Martin Luther.....	86

PART TWO

CALVIN'S DISTINCTION BETWEEN THE PASTORAL AND DOCTORAL
"OFFICES"

INTRODUCTION.....	100
-------------------	-----

Chapter One: The Fourfold Division of Offices in <u>Les Ordonnances Ecclésiastiques</u>	104
Chapter Two: Calvin's Concept of Ecclesiastical "Office".....	111
I. Terminology.....	111
II. The Definition of Ecclesiastical Office	113
III. The Spiritual Nature of Ecclesiastical Office:Ordination.....	119
Chapter Three: The Division of Offices in Calvin's Dogmatic, Exegetical and Other Writings...	125

PART THREE

THE DOCTOR ECCLESIAE IN CALVIN'S GENEVA

Chapter One: The Spiritual and Political Governments.....	150
I. The "Two Kingdoms".....	154
II. <u>res caelestes</u> and <u>res terrenas</u>	160
III. The Church-State Relationship in Geneva.....	164
Chapter Two: Education in Geneva.....	172
I. The <u>Collège de Versonnex</u> : 1428-1536.....	173
II. The <u>Collège de Rive</u> (1536-1538): <u>L'Ordre et Maniere d'Enseigner</u>	175
III. The College During Calvin's Exile.....	185
IV. Calvin and the College: 1541-1559.....	187
V. The Geneva Academy.....	192
Chapter Three: The Doctors of the Genevan Church.....	208
I. Calvin's Understanding of the Doctoral Function in the Church : His Writings.....	208
II. The Status of the Teaching Staff at the College and Academy.....	212

PART FOUR

THE MINISTRY OF THE WORD : CALVIN'S DISTINCTION BETWEEN PREACHING AND TEACHING

INTRODUCTION.....	233
-------------------	-----

Chapter One: Calvin as Preacher and Teacher :	
The Sermons and Lectures.....	235
I. The Sermons.....	235
II. The Lectures.....	237
a. Early Genevan Lectures (1536-1538).....	237
b. In Strasbourg.....	239
c. In Geneva (1541-1564).....	243
d. Old Testament Lectures.....	245
Chapter Two: "Preaching" and "Teaching" the Word.....	250
I. Preaching and Teaching	
as Separate Gifts.....	250
II. Revelation and Knowledge.....	255
a. Preaching as Exhortation.....	262
b. Preaching and <u>pietas</u>	265
CONCLUSION.....	270
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	281
NOTES.....	281
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	343

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author. No quotation from it should be published without his prior written consent and information derived from it should be acknowledged.

PREFACE

The impetus for this study was born out of a pastoral concern. In my Church, the United Church of Canada, it is evident that there is a great deal of uncertainty and confusion about the nature of Christian ministry. From its inception in 1925, the United Church has been struggling with this issue and continues to do so.¹ In 1977, the year before I began my doctoral studies, our latest attempt at dealing with this doctrine was published under the title: Report of the Task Force on Ministry. The Moderator at that time noted in the Preface to this report: "Questions relating to our understanding of ministry have lately been high on the agenda of the United Church of Canada".²

Indeed, many questions still remain in the wake of the task force's report as evidenced by the fact that one of its own members - W.O. Fennell, former principal of Emmanuel College (University of Toronto) - found it necessary to issue a formal statement of dissent,³ in which he writes: "I cannot encourage the Church to receive this Report as a rationale for its doctrine of ministry in the Church. Nor can I view with anything but alarm the long-term consequences for the Church that would flow from its adoption."⁴

-
1. cf. Statement Concerning Ordination to Ministry (Toronto, 1926)
 2. Report of the Task Force on Ministry, authorized for study in the Church by the 27th General Council of the United Church of Canada, August, 1977, p.iii.
 3. This statement is included at the back of the Report, cf. Appendix G
 4. ibid, 47.

It was largely out of a desire to enter into this on-going debate in our Church that I chose this particular area of John Calvin's teaching on which to concentrate my research. I believe that as the United Church of Canada continues to grapple with the question of ministry, we would do well to consider more carefully what our Reformed heritage has to say to us about this important issue. It seems to me that in our desire to examine this matter from an "ecumenical perspective", we have, to some degree, lost sight of our own denominational roots.

I would like to thank a number of people whose assistance was invaluable to me in producing this dissertation. The inspired teaching of the late Dr. Allan L. Farris, principal of Knox College (University of Toronto) first kindled my interest in Calviniana. Under Dr. Farris' guidance and encouragement, I pursued my graduate studies with Dr. T.H.L. Parker, who graciously accepted me as one of his doctoral students. Dr. Parker's supervision was tremendously beneficial in terms of developing my scholarship and directing the course of my thesis. I am also grateful to Dr. Jenkins of the Classics Department (University of Durham) for so generously giving up her time to help me with my Latin studies, and to Dr. John Stephenson (Concordia College) for his assistance in translating some German passages.

Every student knows how important it is to have the cooperation of the library staff. I would like to thank in particular the inter-library loans department of the University of Durham for the exceedingly efficient manner in which they obtained for me what seemed to be an endless quantity of books and articles. My sincere thanks go as well to

Mrs. Irene McNeil, who is responsible for doing such a fine job in producing the final typed draft of the thesis, which in itself was an exercise in patience and endurance.

Without the dedicated concern of those closest to me, my family, this study would neither have been started nor completed. To my parents I owe an eternal debt of gratitude for nurturing my academic interests over the years and for being an ever present source of encouragement. And to my wife Jan, I extend my deepest appreciation, not only for the many sacrifices she made to allow me to undertake this project, but also for her steadfast and loving support.

J.R.M.

INTRODUCTION

Calvin's views concerning the pastoral office have always been well defined. The same cannot be said, however, about his understanding of the doctor ecclesiae. Perhaps, this is the result of the fact that very little serious attention has been given to this particular aspect of the Reformer's doctrine of ministry by Calvin scholars. Several writers have touched indirectly upon this subject;¹ a few have given it greater consideration in its own right;² but there has been only one major work on this topic to date: R.W. Henderson's, The Teaching Office in the Reformed Tradition.³ Yet even in this book, the author only begins with Calvin and spends the bulk of his attention on an in depth survey of the doctoral office in later Reformed ecclesiologies.

The controversial nature of this dimension of the Reformer's thought is demonstrated by the fact that our study has arrived at very different conclusions concerning Calvin's understanding of the nature and function of the Church's doctoral office than those of Dr. Henderson who shares, for the most part, what appears to be the prevailing position in this regard among Calvin scholars.⁴

-
1. cf. various authors listed in the bibliography under "secondary sources:books" and "secondary sources:articles".
 2. W.F. Dankbarr, "L'Office des Docteurs chez Calvin", Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses, 44 (1964) 364-388; H. Bavinck, Het Doctorenambt (Kampen, 1899); M. Bouttier, "Les diverses formes du ministre de docteur", Foi et Vie, (1957) 419-429
 3. This book originally took the form of a doctoral thesis: The Doctoral Ministry in the Reformed Tradition: A Study of the History of the Second of the Four Ministries Recognized by John Calvin (Harvard University, 1959).
 4. For this reason we have critiqued Dr. Henderson's book at several points in our study.

The vast majority of the writers we have looked at understand Les Ordonnances Ecclésiastiques of 1541 to represent the Reformer's definitive position on this matter. They therefore maintain that Calvin viewed the doctor as a separate "order" of ecclesiastical government, and that he understood the doctoral function of the Church to extend to "all branches of knowledge".¹

-
1. H.Y. Reyburn, John Calvin: His Life, Letters and Work (London, 1914) 114. cf. also, for instance: G.A. Taylor, John Calvin, The Teacher : The Correlation Between Instruction and Nurture within Calvin's Concept of Communion (unpublished doctoral thesis, Duke Univ., 1953), 171: "Only the ordinary schoolmasters presiding over the secular instruction of the young appear in the historical records of Geneva [sic!] . But this is precisely the point. Calvin, when speaking of the 'teacher' is speaking of the schoolmaster, for to the Reformer, education was never secular as the term is generally understood today".
- W.Pauck, The Heritage of the Reformation (N.Y.1961), 124: "The teachers also were officers of the church. Their chief responsibility was the Academy, a humanistic and theological institution for the training of young men for the ministry."
- A. Ganoczy, Calvin, Theologien de l'Eglise et du Ministère (Paris,1964), 371: "We think that in practice the Reformer had reduced it [the doctoral office] to the 'order of schools'."
- J. Cadier, "Calvin éducateur", Foi-Education, 25 (1965), 119:"According to Calvin, the doctors are those charged with teaching the young, not only for religious instruction, but in all areas."
- F. Wendel, Calvin, The Origins and Development of His Religious Thought, (London,1973),77: "As for the teachers ...Calvin includes in that calling all 'the order of the schools'...".
- R.W. Henderson, op.cit., slightly modifies the position taken by the above authors in that he is not sure whether Calvin identified all teachers in Geneva's educational system with the Church's doctoral office (p.48). Yet he maintains that the Reformer equated the doctor ecclesiae with "the most important positions in the educative system" (p.241), by which he means those teaching in the university (p.240). Hence, Henderson concludes that not only the professors of Theology but also the professors of Hebrew, Greek and Arts were doctors of the Church in Calvin's Geneva (p.245). One wonders if Dr. Henderson also included the professor of law (p.66-7).

The aim of this study, from a negative perspective, is to demonstrate that this commonly held view is a misinterpretation of Calvin. More positively, we intend to present what we consider to be a more accurate description of the Reformer's definition of the doctor ecclesiae. In so doing, we have taken the position that this can only be properly achieved when one studies the doctoral office in relationship with the pastoral office.

The body of the dissertation is divided into four main parts. We have initiated our investigation (Part I) by attempting a survey of the history of the doctoral office in the pre-Reformation Church. The purpose of this is to place Calvin in the context of his theological environs with respect to this question, and thus determine where he stood in relation to his predecessors. This survey was also undertaken in the hope that it might help us to understand and define better Calvin's own position on the matter, in view of the fact that previous scholarship has already established the major influence which Patristic and Medieval thought had on other aspects of his teaching.

Obviously, we have had to be highly selective in such a survey, and it therefore does not aim to be comprehensive or definitive in any sense. Rather, we have simply chosen to examine the views of some of the more well-known figures from these ages who had something to say on the topic in question and to whose writings we had access. Our selection also took into consideration the likelihood of Calvin being familiar with their work and/or the representative nature of their position in the tradition. For instance, Aquinas

seems to represent the orthodox position on this matter in the Middle Ages, while D'Ailly, who also stands generally in the same tradition, promulgates somewhat modified ideas on the questions which interest us. Wyclif, on the other hand, represents the unorthodox position. We have included Luther in this section for the sake of convenience and easy ordering of the material.

The remaining three parts are devoted to delineating the various aspects of Calvin's teaching regarding the definition of the Church's doctoral office and its relationship to the pastoral order, within the context of the actual practice in Geneva. To accomplish this, we have made a thorough examination of the Reformer's dogmatic, exegetical and other writings, as well as a number of historical documents pertaining to the contemporary ecclesiastical and educational situation.

Part II is concerned first with outlining, what we consider to be, the essential flaw in the traditional interpretation of Calvin's doctrine of orders, and then giving our own analysis of this issue. On the basis of the evidence presented, it is argued that the fourfold division of ministerial offices in Les Ordonnances Ecclésiastiques, whereby the doctorate is depicted as a separate and distinct "order" from that of the pastorate, does not reflect Calvin's true and mature position on the matter. We maintain that the distinction the Reformer makes between the pastor and the doctor is not based on ordo but strictly on "office" (i.e. in the sense of function), so that, in line with the Patristic and Medieval traditions, he envisaged the doctor ecclesiae as performing a special ministry within the

pastoral order.

In Part III, our aim is to determine how Calvin defined the scope of this doctoral ministry and to discover who exactly were considered to be doctores ecclesiae in Geneva during the Reformer's day. In order to accomplish this, we have juxtaposed Calvin's teaching on the relationship between Church and State (particularly as it applies to the question of education) and the Church's pedagogical mission, with the practical situation in Geneva as it pertains to these areas of concern. The conclusions we reach indicate that the Reformer again followed his Medieval predecessors in identifying the doctor ecclesiae, not with the university doctorate in general, but specifically with the doctor theologiae, that is, the one who interprets Scripture within an academic as opposed to a pastoral milieu.

Having established that Calvin i) regarded the pastor and doctor as constituting only one ordo in the ecclesiastical government, and ii) insisted that the scope of their teaching ministry was exactly the same (i.e. scriptural interpretation), we go on in Part IV to consider the way in which the Reformer differentiates these offices. We maintain that this has to do most fundamentally with the nature of their respective scriptural instruction in terms of aim, method and authority. Our argument revolves around the assertion that Calvin makes an important distinction between "preaching" the Word (sermo) and "teaching" the Word (lectio). Once again, we are able to detect some close parallels in this area of the Reformer's thinking with the views of certain Medieval writers we have examined.

Finally, it should be noted that no attempt has been made to examine the whole question of the New Testament understanding of the nature and function of the doctoral "office"¹ or its relationship to the pastorate, except insofar as Calvin and certain Patristic and Medieval authors deal with these issues in their writings. Having surveyed the modern scholarship in this area during the course of our research,² it was decided that the inclusion of this material would be extraneous to our study and would serve no purpose other than to indicate the disparity among scholars in this particular area of NT studies.

-
1. Some scholars question whether it is appropriate to speak of "office" at all when dealing with the NT concept of ministry (cf. infra, 10).
 2. cf. the references in NOTES, PART I, N.2.

PART ONE

THE HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE TEACHING OFFICE
IN THE PRE-REFORMATION CHURCH

CHAPTER ONE

THE TEACHING OFFICE IN THE PATRISTIC AGE

There does not appear to be any doubt that a recognized and authoritative group of men, who were responsible for performing a "teaching" function, existed in the Church from her earliest days. References from the New Testament and other early Christian literature makes this quite certain.¹ But the precise nature of this teaching function in the 1st century Church is a matter of considerable debate among scholars.² In addition, owing to the paucity of evidence, it is also difficult to determine exactly what the relationship was between the "pastor", "teacher", and "prophet" in the primitive Church. Whether the "teacher" constituted a separate and distinct "office" or simply possessed a "charisma" is a matter of some controversy.³ In later centuries we find the teacher and the teaching function becoming a well-defined ordo doctorum in the Church, but in the process of this development several questions arise regarding the authority and ecclesiastical status of the "doctor" and his relationship to the clerical office.

It was during the 2nd and 3rd centuries that both the form and content of the ecclesiastical teaching office became clarified and normalized, one of the major factors for this being the critical situation in which the Church found herself with regard to false teachers and heresy in general as the Christian faith came into contact with pagan culture. The struggle for orthodoxy had a catalytic effect on the development of official authority in the Church;

hence we find the question of "office" a vital concern in this period. Initially the concern is not with "office" as such, that is, not the idea of office, or its place in the theology of the Church as a legal and institutional fact. It is not until the 3rd century that it takes on the strict sacral-hierarchical definition which becomes normative in the Catholic Church. What matters above everything else is the body of truth which the office is called upon to serve and defend. The teacher has a prominent role in the propagation and preservation of this truth, a role which takes on new and varied dimensions in the wake of faith's encounter with paganism.

Unlike the prophet, a term which is rarely used in the 2nd century,⁴ the "teacher" retains a position of importance and influence in the Church during this era. It seems probable that the sphere of the teaching function included catechesis during this century when we find catechetical schools flourishing. In addition, it is also probable that the teacher was active in the liturgical service of the local Church fulfilling, perhaps, the function of "reader", whose duties are described in the Apostolic Canons (circa A.D.140-180).⁵ At the same time one must bear in mind that persons already holding clerical office in the Church also functioned as teachers: Polycarp, for instance, was both a "bishop" and an apostolic and prophetic "διδάσκαλος".

We find that the fixed constitutional framework of the presbyterial-episcopal system with its well-defined "offices" is taken for granted in most orthodox congregations during the 2nd century. But we also find that there still exists

an independent, "free-lance" teacher who continues to work alongside the established office-holders of a local congregation with apparently little conflict.⁶ It is important to realize that, although a distinction is made between office-holders and non-office-holders, the concept of office had not at this time taken on the strict hierarchial character which it developed in later centuries. This was an age of ecclesiastical history when instruction was still largely uncontrolled, making it very difficult to draw sharp dividing lines between the various teaching bodies in the Church. Consequently, we find that a contrast in authority between the free-lance teachers and those in official positions, so long at least as the former were orthodox, is nowhere discernible in this era.⁷

The document known as the Didache⁸ distinguishes several categories among the ministers of the Word: apostles, prophets, and doctors, as well as bishops and deacons. Only the latter two, however, are described as regular and permanent offices:

The Didache seems to present the bishops and deacons as the substitutes for the prophets and teachers, and it is by analogy with the latter that it describes their function.⁹

The "teachers" mentioned in the Didache may be referring to these free-lance teachers. Whether or not this is in fact the case is debatable, but in any event it is certain that such teachers did exist. The three best known from the 2nd century were Justin Martyr, Clement of Alexandria, and Tertullian. Such was the nature of their teaching that although decidedly Biblical in content, it may be regarded as "philosophy", and the teacher himself as a "philosopher".

This would be more true of Justin and Clement, however, than it would be of Tertullian. All, it seems, were laymen, independent of the local clergy, and outside the ranks of regular office-holders, yet highly respected by these officials, and able to exert considerable influence within the Church at large. Regarding the status of these teachers van den Eynde writes:

The place of the teacher in the Church [i.e. of the 2nd century] is rather badly defined. A point appears which we cannot avoid: though their influence may have been great, these teachers were not official personage; none seems to have received a community mission of instruction to believers; each teacher is responsible to himself and teaches at his own risk and peril. 10

As the century progresses heresy flourishes, and it becomes evident that teaching can no longer rest content with merely imparting the simplest and most essential knowledge to believers. Answers must be given to the new and difficult problems which arise. The sophisticated theologies of heresiarchs like Marcion have to be combated convincingly. In order to meet the needs of this situation, we find Christian teachers developing a new and, so to speak, "academic" attitude to Christian teaching.¹¹

I. JUSTIN MARTYR

Concerning Justin's work as a teacher Eusebius writes:

Justin was the most noted of those that flourished in those times, who in the guise of a Christian philosopher, preached the truth of God, and contended for the faith, also, in his writings. 12

It would not be accurate to describe Justin as a theologian despite the fact that his interest in doctrine was greater

than other Apologists of his day. He was a moralist and Christian philosopher more than anything else.¹³ Though keenly interested in pagan philosophies, especially Middle Platonism, Justin wrote primarily and above all as a Christian. What is more, and this should be underscored, he understood his essential task as a "Christian philosopher" to be the interpretation and teaching of Holy Scripture - it is for this reason, and this reason alone, he says, that he has received "divine grace".¹⁴ It is important to take seriously, in this regard, his personal insistence that he has received his understanding of the Christian faith from the Church of the preceding age, making him a representative of the true body of Christians.¹⁵

Justin obviously considered himself a Christian teacher, and was regarded as such by others, yet his school was not established solely to teach Christian converts or the children of believers. Rather, he allowed anyone to attend his classes who was interested in the truth - it did not matter if he was a Christian, Jew, or pagan. His school was definitely not a catechetical school run under the auspices of the Church. L.W. Barnard writes: "Such schools [i.e. Justin's type] were only indirectly subject to the discipline of the Church".¹⁶ But even this may be going too far, since we really have no idea about the exact nature of the relationship between the schools of these free-lance teachers and the local ecclesiastical authorities. All we know is that they appeared to function in peaceful co-existence. There is no indication of them ever having come into conflict with one another over a point of doctrine, at least not during the 2nd century. What we can say with

a fair amount of certainty is that Justin, a layman all his life, was not considered, nor considered himself, an office-holder in the sense that a bishop or a deacon of a local Church would be regarded as office-holders. His authority to teach is derived exclusively from his own personal competence as a scholar, and not from any official ecclesiastical appointment by a congregation.

II. CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA

Clement of Alexandria is another 2nd century teacher about whose life and work more is known, although much obscurity still surrounds him. One point of contention concerns an area in which we are particularly interested, that is, his position and status in the Church as a teacher of Christian truth. It has been a long held assumption that Clement succeeded Pantaenus as the head of the catechetical school at Alexandria - a school established by the local Church and run under the close supervision of the bishop for the express purpose of instructing Christian converts in the faith.¹⁷ If this was the case, then Clement would have held a recognized position in the Church as a catechist. But G. Bardy has argued very convincingly that neither Pantaenus nor his student, Clement, should be regarded as catechetical instructors whose aim was simply to prepare converts for baptism.¹⁸ Rather, he regards Clement and his teacher as free-lance Christian philosophers, like Justin, who had disciples in their classrooms from all areas of society, not just the Church:

We do not believe that Pantaenus had been charged with catechetical teaching and that his teaching had ever received official authorization. He had done at Alexandria what Justin had done before him at Rome. He received all those who came to him, whether pagan, Jew, or Christian, and he explained to them his philosophy... The same conclusions apply to Clement. 19

Bardy's and von Campenhausen's claim that Clement's "didaskaleion" was not an official ecclesiastical institution, a catechetical school, appears to be confirmed by the very nature of Clement's teaching.²⁰ It was a school which Clement opened at his own "risk and peril", and on his own authority, in order to carry on the teaching traditions of his master, Pantaenus. As a free-lance teacher, it appears that he was not directly responsible to the bishop or any other official of the local Church. Hence, we find that the school ceased to exist as soon as Clement decided to leave Alexandria during the persecutions in A.D. 202.²¹ The evidence would indeed seem to indicate that Clement did not hold an official position in the Alexandrian Church as a catechist. Some have maintained, however, that he was ordained "presbyter".²² But this too is not a view shared by Bardy and von Campenhausen, both of whom are convinced that Clement remained a layman throughout his life.²³

For Clement the teaching function is essential to the life of the Church: "There is no faith without teaching"²⁴... "Out of instruction grow both understanding and knowledge".²⁵ He regards his own teaching function as a true mission, the object of a divine calling. The content of his teaching has at its centre the interpretation of Scripture, for only the Bible is capable of yielding real certainty.²⁶

As well as a philosopher, Clement is a scriptural theologian. It is his unqualified loyalty to Scripture that clearly separates him from the heretical gnosis.²⁷ Yet at the same time he also continues to teach the Hellenistic disciplines, and commends the use of all profane sciences to his followers,²⁸ not, however, without warning against the abuses of such studies, and stressing the subsidiary nature of this kind of knowledge in relation to the truth of Christ's revelation:

While truth is one, in geometry there is the truth of geometry; in music, that of music; and in the right philosophy, there will be Hellenistic truth. But that is the only truth, unassailable, in which we are instructed by the Son of God... Hellenistic truth is distinct from that held by us both in respect of extent of knowledge, demonstration, divine power and the like...Philosophy is a concurrent and co-operating cause of true apprehension, being the search for truth, then we shall avow it to be a preparatory training for the enlightened man; not assigning as the cause that which is but the joint-cause; nor as the upholding cause, what is merely co-operative; nor giving to philosophy the place of sine quo non.²⁹

Clearly, the study of secular sciences, in Clement's mind, is never a goal in itself, but strictly a preparation, an aid or tool, which is useful for the study of the higher knowledge revealed in Christ.³⁰

The true gnostic teacher is not a mere dispenser of theoretical knowledge - an intellectual guru who stands aloof from his disciples while issuing forth his wisdom. For Clement, the teacher is better described as a "shepherd" who is personally involved with each of his "sheep"³¹ In the manner of a "preacher and pastor", the gnostic

teacher brings his pupils into the sphere of the divine Spirit by putting them into contact with the living Word. "We here catch a glimpse of a conscious practice of individual pastoral care", says von Campenhausen, "which the gnostic must undertake toward his pupils and other Christians under his instruction."³² It is, perhaps, significant to note in this regard, that Clement links the authority and function of the gnostic teacher not, as one might suspect, with the Pauline prophets or teachers, but directly with the apostolate.³³ Von Campenhausen finds this to be rather inappropriate, since the teacher lacks precisely that thing which, in Paul's view, distinguishes the apostles from other ministries within the Church, namely, "the unambiguous call and the public authority which he claims by virtue of this."³⁴

While it is true to say that nowhere in Clement's writings or his own ministry is the authority of the gnostic teacher based on official recognition, it must be added that this does not necessarily mean he rejected, or bore any hostility toward, the hierarchy of the Church. The fact that Clement was entrusted with missions on the Church's behalf, and was highly respected by ecclesiastical officials, seems to suggest that there was a mutuality of understanding and co-operation between them.³⁵ It is not until the next generation, with Origen, that problems begin to emerge more clearly with regard to the authority of the free-lance teacher and that of the recognized office-holders. But before we turn to Origen, we shall look briefly at Tertullian in order to show how differently the concept of office had evolved in the Western Church

during the 2nd century, and also to examine this Father's understanding of the ecclesiastical teaching function.

III. TERTULLIAN

From about the middle of the 2nd century there arose in the West a general uncertainty regarding the meaning and administration of penance. It was essentially within the context of this situation that the authority of "office" took on unprecedented proportions:

The claim to decide whether a sinner should be excommunicated or readmitted was from now on based essentially not on the concrete authority of spiritual power or direct illumination, but simply on the possession of a spiritual office to which one had been regularly appointed. The stress is on the office as such. 36

To this extent the concept of authority was beginning to acquire the character of privilege, a development which Tertullian does not support, indeed, warns against. Yet at the same time, this deepening desire in the West to base spiritual authority on office as such was to a large degree assimilated by Tertullian. For him, in marked contrast to Clement, office occupies a definite position in his concept of the Church. He holds the bishop, for the most part, in high respect, and takes for granted his headship in the local congregation as its supreme governing and teaching authority. External authority in the Church is normative for Tertullian. But it is crucial to understand how Tertullian viewed the nature of office if we are not to distort his position on this matter.

In opposition to what appears to be the growing attitude towards the meaning of office during this period, Tertullian

is of the opinion that office as such has absolutely no intrinsic spiritual authority.³⁷ When he underscores the importance of office, he is not so much referring to the question of hierarchy as to the preservation and defense of doctrine. At the same time, however, it must be admitted that proper Church order was indissolubly linked with this matter in Tertullian's mind. Office is, indeed, for him an indispensable institution, but the mediation of salvation is not essentially bound up with it. Thus we find that Tertullian regards the bishops as "leaders" who have been "set over" the congregation with a mandate "to teach". They therefore have a "permanent higher rank" in the Church.³⁸ Yet at the same time he also regards them as men who are capable of making errors in their teaching.³⁹ Moreover, he considers the laity as real and true priests who ought to exercise their priestly rights if no clergy are available: "Tertullian is the first Christian theologian to play off the idea of the 'priesthood of all believers' against the 'usurped' rights of a particular office".⁴⁰

More importantly for us, his notion of office allows him to maintain that the teaching function (i.e. the teaching of doctrine) is not a priori a clerical preserve subject to episcopal supervision. Tertullian sees a distinctive place "in" the Church for lay teachers who held no "office" - he himself, in fact, is such a teacher. As non-office-holders, they are under no authority except the rule of faith.⁴¹

As a lay teacher who works in close association with the Church while holding no official position in it,

Tertullian falls into the same category as Justin and Clement. But he differs significantly from them with regard to both the aim and content of his teaching. All three firmly believe that truth is found above all in Holy Scripture, but whereas Justin and Clement understand Scripture to contain first and foremost "higher knowledge" and "mysteries", Tertullian views this truth more as sacred norms and commandments which must be obeyed. What is more, he believes that the observation of these "laws" must occur strictly within the context of the Church.

Justin and Clement view Christianity as the fulfillment of the philosophic quest - for them, Christ did not come to destroy the Academy, the Lyceum and the Stoa.⁴² Tertullian, on the other hand, is highly suspicious, to say the least, of the philosophers' schools. He accuses them of being the breeding grounds for the many heresies which he sees everywhere about him,⁴³ and would have deplored the attempts made by Justin and Clement to reconcile Christianity with classical culture.⁴⁴ "What has Athens to do with Jerusalem?", he exclaims, "or the Academy with the Church?"⁴⁵ The implication is clear - the Church has nothing to do with the Academy. Yet this is not to imply that "secular knowledge" is to be shunned by the clergy or Christians generally. In De Corona, for instance, Tertullian actually commends the study and use of secular disciplines.⁴⁶ It may be true, he goes on to say, that these sciences and arts have been invented, so to speak, by the pagan gods, yet they have been "sanctified" by the saints and prophets of the Old Testament,

so that we need not reject them out of hand.⁴⁷ Furthermore, Tertullian has no qualms about allowing children of believers to attend pagan schools of grammar and rhetoric, even though he is aware of the dangers involved in this.⁴⁸

That Tertullian willingly accepts the use of pagan secular studies is symbolized by the fact that, like Justin, he too continues to wear the philosopher's cloak after his conversion to Christianity.⁴⁹ The main thrust of his work, De Pallio, is intended to show that the Christian can take his pagan intellectual inheritance with him to his new faith. The antithesis between the Academy and the Church, has been resolved. But it is extremely important to understand that this resolution fundamentally implies a radical transformation in the way a Christian, and particularly a Christian teacher, makes use of this intellectual heritage in his teaching, and the place and value he attaches to it in relation to Scripture. The secular disciplines are now regarded as purely preparatory to the Christian faith, and entirely subordinate to and separate from the revelation in the Bible. No longer can profane sciences be studied for themselves. Moreover, and this is a point which needs to be emphasized, Tertullian does not believe that secular "arts" and "sciences" are proper subjects of instruction for the doctor ecclesiae.⁵⁰ This kind of study, he says, is best left to the schools. The Christian teacher must not concern himself (as Justin and Clement did) with instructing his audience in the wisdom of the world, as embodied in Greek philosophy and other secular subjects.

He now restricts his teaching solely to the explication of Scripture and the Christian tradition.⁵¹ His task is not to proclaim the truth of a new religion to the world, or to convince unbelievers that they should believe, but to nurture the faithful by making known to them in a fuller and deeper way the truth which they already possess. Hence, we see that Tertullian does not set up his own private "didaskaleion", but carries out his teaching activities within the milieu of the Carthaginian congregation.⁵² Since he was a layman, we may assume this did not take place in the liturgical services - but then, where? T.D.Barnes suggests that a custom of the day, described by Tertullian himself, may give us some indication of the manner in which his influence as a teacher exerted itself. It was apparently the practice after the common meal, to have certain capable believers, "either recite something from the Scriptures or according to each man's capabilities".⁵³ This, of course, does not mean that all Tertullian's extant writings were necessarily delivered in this manner, although it has been maintained that most of his works were actually "sermons"⁵⁴ (lectures?). There are, in fact, several treatises in our possession which have been drafted in the form of "sermons" (i.e. De Spectaculis, and De Cultu Feminarum II) and several others whose structure would strongly suggest that they had been delivered orally (i.e. De Oratione, De Baptismo, De Patientia, De Paenitentia).⁵⁵

In Tertullian's thought and practice then, there is still room in the Church for a free-lance teacher who is

distinct from the teaching body of the regular clergy, while continuing to be recognized as a member of the Christian community who speaks with authority, though entirely unofficial. And it appears, at least in the case of Tertullian, that this authority does not come into conflict with the authority exercised by the office-holders, even though the teaching of both deals strictly with the same subject matter, namely, Scripture and the scriptural tradition.

IV. ORIGEN

The very life and thought of Origen - the "Father of the scientific study of the Bible" - exemplifies in a most vivid fashion the major transformation which we find taking place in the Church's concept of "teaching" and the teaching office during the 3rd century. The changes which are effected in this era become more or less normative for the life of the Church right up until the 12th century, at which time another important transformation takes place in the nature of the teaching office occasioned by the growth of the studium generale. The peaceful co-existence which existed between "official" and "private" education within one Church during the 2nd century could not be maintained. By the end of this century one finds the bishops becoming more and more concerned about the "schools" of the free-lance teachers, especially those whose orthodoxy was open to some question.⁵⁶

Excommunicating the heretical "masters" such as Marcion did not solve the basic problem. These masters continued

to teach and spread their views in their own private schools thereby jeopardizing the purity of the faith. No longer could the bishops remain indifferent to the rapidly expanding "didaskaleions". From about the 3rd century we find a fundamental change in their attitude which manifests itself in a desire to bring the *διδασκαλοὶ* under their own supervision and authority, thus turning these independent schools into official institutions of the Church. It is not possible to say precisely when and in what circumstances this transition occurred, since the situation of each congregation varied greatly. But we are able to gain considerable insight into the essential nature of this transition, and the way in which it affected the scope and function of the teaching office, by examining Origen's relationship with the Church of Alexandria.

At the young age of 18, Origen was asked by the Bishop of Alexandria to become head of the catechetical school in that city.⁵⁷ We may assume that his function was to teach new converts basic doctrines of the Christian faith through the explication of Scripture.⁵⁸ His appointment to the Alexandrian school meant that Origen, unlike Justin and Clement, and perhaps Tertullian, received an "official mission" in the Church as a catechist, having been commissioned by the bishop and placed under his authority.⁵⁹ This did not mean, however, that he was now considered part of the Church hierarchy. Origen was not ordained in order to fulfill this "mission" and therefore remained outside the ranks of the professional clergy.⁶⁰

For about the next ten years, Origen devoted his pedagogical talents strictly to catechesis, but then, in A.D. 212-215, we find a dramatic change taking place in his attitude toward secular studies which significantly alters the nature and scope of his teaching, and manifests a corresponding transformation in the character of the catechetical school itself. Eusebius has left us his own account of this major turning-point in the life of both Origen and the school:

Origen saw he could no longer manage to study theology adequately or work at Scripture and expound it if he went on teaching the people who came to him for catechetical instruction, as they left him no time to breathe...He therefore divided his crowd of disciples into two classes and chose Heraclas to help him with the catechetical work...Heraclas was devoted to the things of God; he was an excellent speaker, too, and had some knowledge of philosophy. Origen appointed him to give the beginners their first introduction to Christian doctrine, and kept the more advanced teaching for himself. 61

After several years of teaching just the elements of the faith, it seems that Origen simply came to the conclusion that a more thorough and advanced study of the Bible was necessary in order to deal adequately with the questions posed by pagan philosophies. He gives his reasons for this decision in one of his letters which Eusebius has preserved:

After I had begun to deal with Scripture exclusively, I was sometimes approached by heretics and people educated after the Greek model, particularly in philosophy. I therefore thought it advisable to make a thorough study both of heretical doctrine and of the philosophers' views about the truth. In this I was imitating Pantaenus, who before my time had acquired no small store of such knowledge and had benefited many people by it. 62

There can be no doubt that Origen's attitude towards

secular learning has undergone a profound change. Only ten years before he had destroyed all his books on the pagan sciences, but now he was convinced that Christians, even the newly converted, should be acquainted with this subject matter.

In addition to this, we should also assume that he started to expound Scripture at this time in a different manner, that is, using the allegorical method of exegesis for which he is so famous and the discussion of controversial theological questions, instead of simply explicating the basic doctrines found in the Bible.⁶³ As R.Cadiou puts it, the school of Alexandria became "une véritable université chrétienne" where, for the first time, "la théologie s'affirmait comme un institution distincte".⁶⁴ This fundamental change in the scope and depth of the teaching offered at the Alexandrian school under Origen is symbolic of the direction Christian education was moving in the Church at large, a direction which it would follow for many centuries thereafter.

The idea of a special ecclesiastical "order of teachers" with a status of their own independent of the clergy is not to be found in Origen's writings. He fully accepts the visible hierarchy of bishops, priests, and deacons as being normative for the Church's existence.⁶⁵ Moreover this threefold division is taken for granted in Origen's writings - the teacher has become part of the priesthood. His concept of the gnostic teacher has become radically ecclesiasticised, and projected - at least in normal situations, on to the holder of Church office. As van der Eynde notes: "the office of doctor (in Origen)

belongs to the bishops and presbyters".⁶⁶ This development, however, so far as Origen is concerned, does not preclude the possibility of other lay Christians teaching doctrine in a private capacity. There were in fact, free-lance teachers still in existence during the 3rd and 4th centuries, but in the long run they were unable, or unwilling, to work alongside the clergy in a congregational setting.

Origen's great achievement was to make the scientific study of the Bible an integral part of Christian education, which meant that for the first time in the Church's short history, theology became a fundamental task of the ecclesial teaching office, an office which was now firmly in the hands of the clergy.

V. THE LATER CHRISTIAN FATHERS

Any notion of "doctors" forming a separate and distinct "order" in the Church seems to be totally absent in the life and work of the Later Fathers. The threefold division of ecclesiastical ministry - bishop, priest, and deacon - in which the office of teaching is indistinguishable from the priestly office, becomes more or less normative as early as Origen's own century, and is certainly firmly established by the 4th century. The terms "pastor" and "doctor" are used synonymously by the Fathers in their description of the clerical office (particularly the episcopate), since, for them, both the task of preaching and that of teaching are conjoined in the ministry of the priest.

Cyprian, a younger contemporary of Origen, is highly representative of the direction the Church was taking with regard to the teaching office during the latter part of the Patristic Age. For him, the bishop is the "doctor" in the Church, and although the rest of the clergy may share in this teaching activity - whether this involves biblical interpretation, catechesis, dogmatics, or practical morality - they do so only upon his commission and under his authority. Nowhere in Cyprian's writings does he make reference to any free-lance class of teachers outside the clerical ranks against which he might have to defend the rights of the episcopal teaching office.⁶⁷

In his particular environment, individual charismatic gifts which might set themselves up in rivalry to office are now almost unknown. We also detect a significant development regarding the concept of office in Cyprian, insofar as it now takes on a sacral character by virtue of ordination. This is not to say, however, that his understanding is totally analogous to the formalized concept of later Catholicism which would appear to give office a "sacramental character". Cyprian insists that priesthood as such has no effectual power independent of its official position and function in the congregation. In his mind the "office" and the gift or duty are absolutely impossible to separate. Cyprian has developed the concept of office beyond any of his predecessors, including the one with which his views in this matter are closest - Tertullian. Clerical authority is now confirmed by the act of sacramental ordination which, for the first time in recorded history makes the priest truly a priest.⁶⁸

Cyprian takes for granted the threefold division of ministry, though he also speaks of the four minor orders: subdeacons, acolytes, exorcists, and readers (lectores).⁶⁹ But never, as we have said, does he recognize a distinct order of "doctors".

The same holds true for the Fathers of the 4th century. Everywhere in their writings the bishop alone is said to hold the cathedra⁷⁰ which enables one to teach in the Church. Basil of Caesarea, for instance, quite explicitly says that only the "bishop"⁷¹ is entrusted with the responsibility of teaching, interpretation, and the ministry of the Word.⁷² He does, however, recognize the possibility that the bishop may have to delegate others with a mission to teach in his stead when circumstances require it, but those chosen for such a mission were normally members of the clergy, or at least in training for the priestly office. It is highly probable that Basil himself, while still a "reader", preached and interpreted the Scriptures to the people.⁷³ We find the same kind of situation existing in Cyril of Jerusalem's milieu. Although catechetical instruction was ordinarily in the hands of the local bishop during the 4th century,⁷⁴ Cyril was commissioned by his bishop to fulfill this function - a mission he accepted with much alacrity and performed with great skill - yet we note that at this time Cyril was already an ordained priest: part of the clerical hierarchy. Neither in Basil nor Cyril do we find any reference to a separate order of "doctors".

This is also true for Jerome and Augustine. It is highly significant that both of these Fathers interpret the reference to "pastores et doctores" in Ephesians 4:11 as

referring to one order: "non enim ait: alios autem pastores et alios magistros, ut qui pastor est esse debeat et magister".⁷⁵ There was no distinction in their minds between the "pastor" and the "doctor". Moreover, for both men the pastoral-doctoral office belonged especially to the successors of the Apostles, that is, the bishops. Augustine emphasized with particular vigour the doctoral mission of the episcopate - the bishop, he said, ought to be at the same time both "pastor and doctor".⁷⁶ The same idea had already been expressed by Jerome who insisted that it was not sufficient for a leader of a Church to be holy; it was also necessary that he be capable of edifying his congregation - he must be a "doctor" as well as a pastor.⁷⁷

In Gregory the Great we find the same interpretation prevailing in the Church. Commenting on Ephesians 4:11, Gregory writes that the teaching office of the Church is historically tied to four groups. In the beginning, he says, there were only "apostles" and "prophets". Later they were replaced by "evangelists" and "doctors", the latter being indistinguishable from the pastors:

Sancta Ecclesia ad eruditionem fidelium quatuor regentium ordines accipit, quos Paulus ... enumerat. Pastores vero et doctores unum regentium ordinem nominat, quia gregem Dei ipse veraciter pascit qui docet...In exordiis suis sancta Ecclesia apostolos et prophetas habuit... Posteriori tempore, quod nunc est, habet evangelistas et doctores...Apostoli vero et prophetae de hoc tempore praesenti sublatis sunt. 78

As this quotation clearly illustrates Gregory, like Jerome and Augustine before him, links "pastors and teachers" together - the two terms for him are absolutely synonymous. Throughout Gregory's writings, the "doctors" preach and

the "pastors" teach; the doctor and the praedicator cannot be distinguished.⁷⁹ The pastor and doctor in Gregory's mind represent one and the same office. He is also in accordance with his predecessors in maintaining that the functions of preaching and teaching, so essential to the life of the Church, belong to the bishop alone, who may, if he so desires, appoint others to aid him in this task.⁸⁰

The doctoral office has become indissolubly linked with the priesthood in general and the bishop in particular during the 4th and 5th centuries, a development which had already occurred in some areas during the 3rd century as attested to by the life and writings of Origen and Cyprian. No longer do we find lay theologians who exercise a teaching authority in the Church independent of the clergy. The great theologians of this age are the bishops. One should not, however, infer from this that the laity were now totally alienated from all theological matters. H.I.Marrou reminds us that the distinction between a religious culture reserved to the clergy alone and a profane culture allowable to the laity is a modern idea which is foreign to the Patristic Age.⁸¹ Many of the Fathers themselves - Basil, Gregory of Nazianzus, Jerome, and Augustine - wrote on theological issues while still not ordained. One is able to recognize in the Church during this era distinguished groups of intellectual laymen whose work in the community earned them the title: Servi Dei , "servants of God". Augustine, for instance, appears to have held this status for several years before his ordination to the priesthood in A.D. 391.⁸² Although the exact function of these Servi Dei is extremely vague, it is quite certain that they did

not have an official "mission" in the Church, that is to say, they were not office-holders. Certainly, as highly educated and dedicated laymen, they would be the natural choice of the bishop to assist him with his teaching responsibilities, particularly in the absence of qualified priests, but their teaching activities within the Church environment - if, indeed, this was the kind of task they were called upon to fulfill - should be considered *occasional* and unofficial, and entirely dependent upon the consent of the local bishop, the only true doctor ecclesiae .

VI. CHURCH AND SCHOOL

Of particular interest to our study of the doctoral office during the Patristic Age is the attitude of the Church to the pagan schools, since the relationship between the two sheds much light on our understanding of the nature and function of the doctor ecclesiae . We find that there was a clear-cut distinction between religious and secular education during this age. Hence, when one speaks of the bishop as the "teacher" or "doctor", and of the "teaching office" becoming part of the priestly function, it must be understood that the reference is strictly to the ecclesiastical "teacher" and "teaching office". The doctor ecclesiae was of a totally different order from that of the academic school master. Even though both might technically be described as "Christian teachers" simply because of the fact that both were Christian believers, only the former was a teacher "in

the Church" and held "ecclesiastical office". As we have already pointed out, the doctor ecclesiae is the bishop or priest. The "teacher" in the academic schools, on the other hand, was regarded as being in a profession like any other secular profession - he had no more ecclesiastical status than a builder or a merchant.

The Christian school at Alexandria organized under the leadership of Origen, with its combined curriculum of liberal arts, philosophy, and advanced theological studies, was an anomaly in the Patristic Age. It was, so to speak, an institution several centuries ahead of its time, for it was not really until the Middle Ages that "Christian schools", teaching both secular and religious subjects, actually came into existence.⁸³ Origen's desire to bring academic studies under the wing of the Church, whether occasioned by strong principles or by simple expediency, was alien to most Christians of this era. There was no attempt by the Church during the first four centuries A.D. to set up her own special schools for the purpose of giving Christian children and adolescents a general education. She simply saw no need to do so. Christian leaders and parents were perfectly content to let their children study secular subjects in the already established classical schools at the hands of pagan masters who were, for the most part, the best qualified for this task.⁸⁴

The early Church saw nothing wrong in allowing Christian children to be educated in the classical schools; neither did it make any attempt, for the most part, to restrict believers from teaching in them.⁸⁵ Not only did the Church fail to heed Tertullian's advice to disallow

the faithful from making a career out of teaching in these secular institutions, it actually recognized the teaching of secular subjects in the pagan educational system as a well respected Christian vocation. By the 4th century, Christians were teaching at all levels in these schools, from grammar in the elementary classrooms, to rhetoric and philosophy in the auditories of higher learning. There are several such "teachers" (academic schoolmasters) from this century about whose life and work quite a lot is known.⁸⁶ The extent to which Christians had become involved in this profession is indicated by the decree of Emperor Julian issued on 17 June 362, which banned all members of the Christian Church from teaching in the schools because of their lack of "morality" - i.e. their failure to believe in the pagan gods.⁸⁷ But the point we wish to underscore is that this Christian "teacher" worked in a secular establishment which had no connection with the Church.

In this era it is absolutely clear that such academic teachers held no ecclesiastical office or status by virtue of their work in the schools. The Church was aware of the great benefits accrued from a good classical education, but it did not deem it necessary to bring these schools under its own jurisdiction, or create its own separate Christian institutions. The liberal arts were recognized as being an important part of a Christian's, especially a Christian leaders's, education; such knowledge, however, was fundamentally extraneous to the knowledge of faith revealed in Holy Scripture. Although bonae litterae might serve as a "preparation" for a better

understanding of the latter, it was not altogether vital or essential.⁸⁸ Hence, the Church was willing simply to use the existing facilities - comprised largely of pagan teachers - for the intellectual formation of its future leaders. Those Christian teachers who taught in the schools were considered to be fulfilling a respectable function, but they were certainly not regarded as fulfilling an ecclesiastical function.

The doctor ecclesiae is therefore distinguished from other teachers by the content of his teaching; the former alone instructs the faithful in the biblical revelation through the preaching and the teaching of the Word of God. The doctor "in the Church" is the pastor (bishop/priest) and the pastor is the doctor.

Of course, one cannot make hard and fast rules about this. Jerome, for instance, found it necessary to teach several children the classics when he was living in Bethlehem;⁸⁹ this, however, was an exceptional situation, not something he did as a regular practice. Jerome's work as a doctor centered upon the translation, interpretation, and preaching of the Bible. More typical of his pedagogical function were the lessons he gave to at least one young nun, Paula, who was placed under his care in Bethlehem. Her education under Jerome was exclusively biblical, all secular subjects being completely excluded. The only other books besides the Bible which she read in the course of her ecclesiastical tuition were those by the Church Fathers.⁹⁰

The life and work of Augustine, probably one of the most brilliant of all the Fathers, demonstrates even more clearly that the teaching function of the doctor ecclesiae was

strictly concerned with instructing believers, or potential believers, in Christian doctrine and nothing else. In his famous treatise, De Doctrina Christiana, Augustine refers often to the doctor in ecclesia.⁹¹ This writing is described in his Preface as a kind of technical manual which attempts to outline the basic principles of biblical exegesis for "students of the Word", although as one reads through the text it becomes clear that the tract is directed especially to the doctor ecclesiasticus.⁹² In sections of Book II he acknowledges that some, though not all, secular knowledge is useful for helping one interpret Scripture correctly.⁹³ All profane learning which can aid a Christian, particularly a Christian teacher, in this way ought not to be shunned; however, since not everything taught in the pagan schools is appropriate for believers, one needs to discriminate carefully between that which is beneficial and that which is not. And so he suggests by implication that special Christian schools may have to be established to ensure that the material studied helps rather than hinders one in the pursuit of Christian truth. Yet the fact remains, as we have noted above, that Augustine did not set up, or even attempt to set up, a separate Christian school for secular studies at Hippo. This is quite crucial for an understanding of his attitude regarding the teaching role of the Church. Clearly, he did not think that instruction in the liberal arts and sciences was part of the mission of the Church - highly important, perhaps, but not part of its mission. In his mind the ecclesiastical teaching office is concerned only with the explication and proclamation of Scripture. Secular knowledge may be employed in this pursuit,

but it is not in itself a part of the Church's essential teaching responsibility. The instruction given by the doctor ecclesiae, says Augustine, has a very specific content: it deals with "ecclesiasticis quaestionibus", questions, which "ought to have reference to men's salvation, and that not their temporal but their eternal salvation".⁹⁴ Elsewhere he states plainly that the duty of the doctor ecclesiae is "to defend the true faith and oppose error, to teach what is right and refute what is wrong, and in the performance of this task to conciliate the hostile, to rouse the careless, and to tell the ignorant both what is occurring at present and what is probable in the future".⁹⁵

Augustine's own career as a doctor in the Church exemplifies these views in a concrete manner. Prior to his conversion (A.D. 386), he had been a professor in local secular university schools at Carthage, Rome, and Milan. Upon becoming a Christian he gave up this profession and began devoting himself to defending Christianity and "laying open the secrets of the sacred writings".⁹⁶ Like Tertullian before him, he apparently saw some ambiguity between teaching in the secular schools and his newly acquired faith. Whatever the reason, he never involved himself with teaching rhetoric or any other of the liberal arts again. More and more his centre of interest revolved around theological matters, and by the time he was ordained in A.D. 391, every aspect of his teaching was scripturally based.⁹⁷ When he comes to discuss the benefits of rhetoric and the other liberal arts and sciences at the beginning of Book IV of the De Doctrina Christiana, he makes it very plain that as

a doctor ecclesiae his office does not involve giving instruction in these subjects:

I wish by this preamble to put a stop to the expectations of readers who may think that I am about to lay down rules of rhetoric such as I have learnt, and taught too, in the secular schools, and to warn them that they need not look for any such from me. Not that I think such rules of no use, but that whatever use they have is to be learnt elsewhere; and if any good man should happen to have leisure time for learning them, he is not to ask me to teach them either in this work or any other. 98

Augustine's conversion did not stop him from teaching, but it fundamentally altered the content of his teaching.

The Church and school were entirely separate and autonomous entities in the Patristic Age, each one having its own distinct culture and governed by its own authorities. Throughout this era the centres of secular education remained completely dependent on the State and local government. Although the pagan character of these schools caused some Christians such as Tertullian and Augustine to forsake any involvement in them, generally speaking the Church recognized the teaching of profane arts and sciences as a legitimate vocation. Such teachers, however, were not regarded as holding ecclesiastical office or status of any kind. They were appointed and paid by secular administrators, and were responsible to them alone.

Christian doctors like Origen, whose subject matter went beyond the Bible to include the liberal arts, were not characteristic of the Patristic Age. The doctor ecclesiae confined his instruction to doctrina, both on an elementary level, and on a level more theologically advanced. In this regard, Augustine was the exemplar. Moreover, as the

Patristic Age progresses, the category of a separate group of "free-lance" doctors (i.e. Justin, Clement, Tertullian) eventually disappears. Yet even during the time when such doctors existed, it does not appear that they formed a distinct "order" of ecclesiastical government. In the Patristic Age, the doctor ecclesiae is synonymous with the clerical (i.e. pastoral) office.

CHAPTER TWO
THE INFLUENCE OF THE UNIVERSITY ON THE
DEFINITION OF "DOCTOR ECCLESIAE"

So complete was the dependence of the schools on the secular authorities, that the collapse of the Roman Empire around the beginning of the 5th century also brought an end to the classical system of education. By the 6th century most public schools had virtually disappeared leaving an educational vacuum in the conquered Empire, which was now cast into the intellectual gloom of the Dark Ages. Christianity had long since realized how important it was to provide believers, especially the clergy, with secular learning, and so with the dissolution of the old schools the Church was compelled by force of circumstances to take upon itself the responsibility of insuring that its members received an adequate education. It performed this task with great efficiency, for by the beginning of the 11th century there was established a system of schools rivalling the one which it had replaced.

The school had become an adjunct of the Church. For the next 1,000 years - from the 5th century to the late Middle Ages - education, both secular and religious, was, for the most part, a clerical preserve. The close connection between literary learning and religious instruction during this age is made manifest in the figure of the priest, who is now at once both academic schoolmaster and spiritual teacher, a development which, perhaps, more than anything else, distinguishes medieval from classical education.⁹⁹ This turn of events had important implications on the

Church's understanding of its teaching mission. Most importantly for our study is the fact that the rise of the Medieval university occasions a new breed of doctor ecclesiae - the doctor theologiae - whose teaching is distinct from the episcopate and the clerical office generally. At the same time, one has to also distinguish between the ecclesiastical status of this new doctor ecclesiae and other doctores in the various faculties of the university who do not share this status.

I. THE FIRST CHRISTIAN SCHOOLS

a. Monastic Schools

As early as the 4th century we find monks and certain bishops gathering together small groups of children and adolescents called "novices" in order to educate them for the monastic life within the isolation of the community. Some of these classrooms could be regarded as the first Christian schools in the proper sense of the term, that is, schools combining academic and religious training. We have seen that Jerome, for instance, was not averse to teaching the classics alongside the Bible in his community at Bethlehem; and Cassiodorus' monastery appears to have encouraged the scholarly side of the monastic life in addition to religious instruction, although it is much debated whether provision was made here for the teaching of the liberal arts.¹⁰⁰ Generally speaking, however, the monks of the 4th to 7th centuries harboured a rather antagonistic attitude towards secular learning, a point which is best illustrated by the educational policy of Pope Gregory the Great, who was strongly

influenced by his own monastic background. He gives air to his views on higher learning at the end of the letter prefaced to his Magna Moralia: "I take no trouble to avoid barbarisms. I do not condescend to pay any attention to the place, or force of prepositions and inflections. I am full of indignation at the thought of bringing the words of the heavenly oracle into subjection to the rules of Donatus".¹⁰¹ When Gregory learned that Desiderius, bishop of Vienne, was attempting to establish a school of secular studies, he wrote him a pointed letter which makes quite clear his views concerning the Church's involvement in educational matters:

We are almost ashamed to refer to the fact that a report has come to us that our brotherhood is teaching grammar to certain people. This grieves us all the more because it makes a deplorable change in our opinion of you. The same mouth cannot sing the praise of Christ and the praise of Jupiter. Just consider what a disgraceful thing it is for a bishop to speak of what would be unseemly even for a pious layman. If it should be clearly proved hereafter that the report we have heard is false and that you are not devoting yourself to the vanities of worldly learning, we shall render thanks to God for keeping your heart from defilement. 102

Notable exceptions to this strictly religious educational policy may be seen in Isidore, Bishop of Seville (570-636), and the Irish monasteries, but in the main this negative attitude to scholarship and higher learning expressed by Gregory seems to have pervaded the monastic schools until well into the 8th century. Be that as it may, monastic education in general had a very limited influence during this period, for the instruction provided by the monasteries was strictly limited to young monks, a practice sanctioned by the Council of Chalcedon (451) which forbade these communities to undertake the education of any children who intended to return to secular life. This ruling was never

relaxed in the East.¹⁰³

b. Episcopal Schools

The real successors of the pagan schools were not those of the monks,¹⁰⁴ but the schools established by local bishops. Personal contact with the bishop had for centuries been the only way a future priest could receive his theological training, and so there had always been groups of aspiring clerics gathered around him. They would come to him at a relatively young age, after having received their basic grammar instruction at the old secular schools. When these schools vanished, it became necessary for the bishop to extend the scope of his teaching to a more general education. Desiderius' school in Vienne was probably one of the first to attempt this transformation, and as we have seen it met with considerable opposition from Gregory. But the transformation from the civic to the Church schools of grammar, whereby the bishop or another priest took on the task of providing both secular and religious instruction, gradually became the normal practice.¹⁰⁵ This is clearly indicated by a long series of enactments drawn up by various Church councils. A council at Rome, for instance, held under Pope Eugenius II in 826, ordered that "in bishops' sees and in other places where necessary, care and diligence should be exhibited in the appointment of masters and doctors to teach faithfully grammar and liberal arts..."¹⁰⁶ Another council, held by Leo IV at Rome in 853, stipulated that this office of teaching in episcopal schools should be given to "clerks".¹⁰⁷ Such decrees presuppose the existence of Church schools, and there is in fact ample evidence to show that by the end of the 8th century virtually all

cathedrals did indeed have a grammar school associated with them, where both clergy and laity (usually from the professional classes) received a general education.¹⁰⁸ These grammar schools were not, however, linked only with cathedral churches. As early as the 6th century, rural parishes were rapidly being organized to produce remedial education for local clerics who, upon the demise of the pagan schools, had been deprived of even the most rudimentary grammar instruction. In 529 the Second Council of Vaison enjoined "all parish priests to gather some boys round them as lectors, so that they may give them a Christian upbringing, teach them the Psalms and the lessons of Scripture, and the whole law of the Lord and so prepare worthy successors to themselves".¹⁰⁹ As Marrou points out, this decision should be regarded as a memorable one, "for it signified the birth of the modern school, the ordinary village school - which not even antiquity had known in any general, systematic form".¹¹⁰

These first "Christian schools" then - monastic, episcopal, and parish - took over the task of providing believers, particularly the clergy, with a general education, a task which had formerly been carried out by the pagan schools. We should, however, note in passing that the Church was not absolutely alone in this endeavour. Royal patrons of learning were not entirely lacking in this age, as attested to by the Palace school and the grand educational reforms of Charles the Great (A.D. 768-814). And as we shall soon see, State involvement in education became even more pronounced as the Dark Ages passed. But the Church had undoubtedly become the primary medium of learning at this

time, although it should be pointed out that the level of education which it provided was rudimentary, involving only the necessary grammar to enable one to read the Bible and learn the elementary doctrinal and liturgical tenets of the faith. Clearly the "Christian school" existed only in seed-like form, but it was destined to grow into a complex institution which would wield a power and authority rivalling that of the State, and even the Church itself. The effects which this development had on the definition of the ecclesiastical teaching office were monumental.

II. THE MEDIEVAL "DOCTOR"

The birth of that unique Medieval institution which came to be known as the "university" was responsible for bringing about important changes in Christendom's understanding of the term "doctor". Prior to the appearance of these intellectual corporations, at least from about the 3rd century onwards, Christianity used the terms "pastor" and "doctor" synonymously in reference to the bishop, who was the sole embodiment of these titles during these centuries. This was the commonly held view among all the later Fathers to the time of Gregory the Great. The same holds true, as Father Mandonnet has shown, for numerous ecclesiastical writers in the succeeding generations, that is, up until the 12th century:

There is in nearly every work that we have noted and discussed in this chapter a truth which comes openly and bluntly to light - the equality of the two concepts of "praedicator" and "doctor". It is for the Fathers as well as for the writers of the 12th century a truth

so clear that none among them feel the need to treat it separately. They are content to use one expression for the other...

The texts themselves show us again and again that by "doctor" one means the preacher of Holy Scripture, the preacher of the faith, the preacher to whom the Church has entrusted the mission of instructing the faithful in the truths of faith. 111

The official preacher - doctor was always the bishop who alone was given the authority to expound the faith to the Church, and although it became increasingly common for him to delegate this vital teaching responsibility to learned (and sometimes not so learned) priests, it nevertheless remained the case throughout these centuries that when one referred to the doctor one was referring to the episcopal office of the ecclesiastical hierarchy. But after the establishment of the great universities of Western Europe in the 13th century, one can no longer automatically make this assumption, for within the milieu of these intellectual corporations a new academic usage of the term doctor becomes firmly established.

The simple cathedral school with its limited educational scope had been transformed by the 13th century into an international centre of universal learning, employing a highly complex and systematic method of teaching known as "scholasticism", which was marked by speculative analysis and new methodologies, techniques and formularies that were altogether alien to the popular mode of instruction which characterized the Patristic and early Middle Ages. Along with this elaborate scholastic pedagogy, came a new regime of teachers, professionals in their field of study, who devoted their lives to developing a science. The practice arose within the universities of conferring the title

"doctor" on those who demonstrated outstanding personal competence in a particular area of study. One holding this title was regarded as being capable of teaching others. This academic usage of the term doctor was true to its original use by the ancient Greeks for whom "διδάσκαλος" specifically meant a "master of instruction", not just in a general sense, but one who teaches a definite skill.¹¹²

The granting of the doctoral title for academic excellence was first established in the faculties of civil law (doctores legum) during the 12th century, and then later in the faculties of canon law (doctores decretorum).¹¹³ Those licensed to teach theology in the developing studia during this century were simply referred to as magistri. It was not until the following century that they too began to receive the doctorate, and the same was true for those in other disciplines such as logic, philosophy, letters, and medicine.¹¹⁴

Those holding doctoral status in the universities were held in high esteem by Medieval society. It has been said that they had "un prestige celeste".¹¹⁵ By certifying ones aptitude to teach, the doctorate bestowed on the recipient an office ; not an office in the sense of an "ecclesiastical office", but an office in the sense of a "dignity".¹¹⁶ As the universities grew and developed into a social power on par with that of the Church and State, these doctors became a firmly constituted body or college, a universitas magistrorum, well defined by their own lex privata. By virtue of their doctorate, they were not only regarded with great esteem, but also given special civic privileges. They were, for instance, exempt from taxes; sheltered from

arrest, imprisonment, torture, and capital punishment; unaccountable for debts in the event of personal bankruptcy; eligible for large benefices and gifts; given the right to travel by vehicles within the town and automatically made citizens of the town in which they taught. In addition, they were given special disciplinary powers which allowed them to whip, chain up, and enforce fasting regulations.¹¹⁷ All doctors, regardless of faculty, shared in these privileges equally.¹¹⁸ In sum, the university doctors enjoyed a status analogous to that of the clergy, which established them as a proper ordo in medieval society with rights and privileges pursuant to charters granted by authority of both Church and State which they meant to serve.¹¹⁹

In addition to this academic use of the term doctor, which officially designated, for the first time, the office of the university professor, there was also established in the 13th century the practice of bestowing the honorific title of doctor ecclesiae on certain great Christians. This practice, which is still carried out in the Roman Catholic Church today, was initiated by Pope Boniface VIII in 1298, when in a solemn ceremony he formally declared Ambrose, Augustine, Jerome, and Gregory the Great to be doctores ecclesiae. This list was not added to until 1568 when Pius V gave Chrysostom, Basil the Great, Gregory of Nazianzus, and Athanasius the same title.¹²⁰ The doctoral status of these "great doctors" signified something different from the doctoral status of ordinary bishops and university professors of theology or canon law. As we have noted, this was purely an honorific title

which was bestowed in order to elevate one to a special level of recognition in the Church owing to the holder's outstanding contributions and character. One could be honored in this way only by direct decree from a pope or an ecumenical council, thus making it strictly an ecclesiastical appellation. There were, and still are, specific criteria used when considering a candidate for this dignity. First, it should be noted that these doctors could be selected from any period in the Church's history. This distinguishes them from the Fathers who all come from the Church's age of antiquity. Of course, one man can, and often does, carry both titles. The central and most prominent characteristic of this doctor ecclesiae is his eminent learning and singular achievements in the edification of the Church. It is, therefore, often the case, at least for those living post-13th century, that one elevated to this dignity also first held doctoral status in the academic sense of the title.¹²¹ But this characteristic alone was not sufficient. One also had to display great sanctity during one's lifetime; in fact, only those who had been proclaimed canonized saints could receive this title. This explains why Origen, perhaps the most learned of all the Fathers, was never officially made a doctor ecclesiae in this honorific sense, even though nobody would dispute the outstanding contributions his teaching ministry made to the Church.

Having distinguished the three different ways in which the terms doctor and ordo doctorum were used in the Middle Ages, we must now make a further distinction with regard to the academic usage of the doctoral title. Clearly, when

applied to bishops and those canonized saints of outstanding learning, the term doctor connotes an ecclesiastical status, that is, it indicates that he is part of the ecclesiastical magisterium, since these men must necessarily already be part of the Church's hierarchy. But the same does not always apply when this term is used in its academic sense. The bestowal of a doctorate by a Medieval university did not, in every case, mean that the recipient acquired ecclesiastical status or participated in the Church's magisterium. While this was true (as we shall see) for the doctor theologiae and doctor decretorum, it was not the case for doctores of the so-called secular sciences (i.e. doctors of civil law, medicine, logic, letters, philosophy).¹²²

All doctores, as we have seen, holding teaching rights in a university, were equal in respect to civic privileges and dignity, and, as a readily defineable corporate body, belonged as a whole to a distinct ordo in Medieval society. Hence, when Rashdall asserts that "the Doctorate became an order of intellectual nobility with as distinct and definite a place in the hierarchial system of Medieval Christendom as the Priesthood or the Knighthood",¹²³ there is no need to distinguish (and Rashdall does not do so) between the doctors in the various faculties. All were on the same level from this perspective. But when one seeks to define their relationship with the institutional Church, and their place in the ecclesiastical hierarchy, then a distinction must be made. Not all those acquiring the doctoral title by virtue of their place in the university were, ipso facto, doctores ecclesiae. The doctor

theologiae, in this regard, stood in a position apart from the doctors in the other faculties.¹²⁴ He alone was part of the ecclesiastical magisterium, giving him a unique position within the broad hierarchy of the Church.¹²⁵

The University of Paris was indebted to the Church for its birth and regulation, especially during the first century of its existence. But as time goes on, we witness the ever increasing autonomy of this intellectual corporation, with respect to Rome and the local ecclesiastical authorities, culminating in the nationalization of this institution in the 15th century. Under Louis XI, the University of Paris became "more a wheel of the State than an organ of the Church".¹²⁶ Whereas in the 13th century this studium was universally acknowledged to be the "first school of the Church", by the later Middle Ages we find prominent ecclesiastical figures like Jean Gerson referring to it as filia regis - the daughter of the King.¹²⁷ The decreasing influence of the Church over the Parisian school was symptomatic of the declining role of ecclesiastical authority in higher education throughout Europe generally. It becomes more and more common for secular heads of state to found faculties of natural science and to create doctores in these disciplines by their own authority.¹²⁸ For centuries doctors in the faculties of civil law and medicine in Southern European universities (i.e. Bologna and Salerno) had been licensed and ratified almost totally independently of ecclesiastical involvement.¹²⁹

But this was never the case in the theological faculties. The doctor theologiae could never receive legitimate doctoral status, that is, doctoral status that carried with it

canonical recognition, unless his doctorate was conferred, either directly or indirectly, by pontifical authorization.¹³⁰ This was why throughout the 13th and part of the 14th centuries, the Italian conventual schools of theology remained totally independent of the universities, even though they were often located in close proximity. Since no pope would establish a theological faculty in any southern studia during these centuries, all intended doctors of theology had to go to a northern European university (i.e. Paris) in order to receive the doctorate. It was not until 1352 that a Faculty of Theology was created at the University of Bologna on the authorization of Pope Innocent VI. That this faculty stood in a special relationship with the Church is indicated by the fact that all doctors of theology had to be licensed and admitted to the magisterium by the Bishop of Bologna, whereas those in other faculties required only the "authorization" of the archbishop.¹³¹

Even at the University of Paris where all faculties were from the start much more closely linked with the ecclesiastical authorities, it is evident that the Faculty of Theology not only was held in the highest honour, but also was distinguished from other faculties by its peculiar relationship with the Church. In view of the history of the university's birth, one can readily understand why the doctors in all the faculties established close relations with each other, and why, from the perspective of the constitutional struggle, they formed a united magisterial body - a universitas magistrorum. This was, in the beginning, particularly true of the faculties of theology and arts, since all theologians had to pass through the latter

faculty before engaging in theological study. But very early in the university's history one perceives a distinct rift between these two faculties brought about by the artist's desire to gain independence from the ecclesiastical authorities. As a result of pressure brought to bear by the powerful arts faculty, the statutes of the university drawn up in 1213 stipulated that each faculty - theology, canon law, arts and medicine - had the right to testify to the qualification of candidates for the licentia docendi in its own department. This right also involved the regulation of studies and examinations, as well as the discipline of the students.¹³² One finds the theologians holding all their meetings separately, and no artists or any doctor from another faculty could participate in the "inception" of a doctor theologiae.¹³³ Thus, by the end of the 13th century, it is perfectly true to say the "en tout ce qui ne touchait pas à la théologie, la Faculté des arts était complètement indépendante de l'auctorité ecclésiastique".¹³⁴

Another indication that the theological faculty held a position apart from the other faculties in relation to the Church may be discerned from the procedure employed for granting the doctorate. Here the distinction between the "license" and the "magisterium" is vital. All future doctors at the University of Paris had to receive the licentia docendi from the Chancellor,¹³⁵ but the central and most important element in the acquisition of doctoral status was the conferring of the magisterium. This was carried out in a ceremony known as the aulatio. In every faculty except theology (and canon law), this ceremony took place

in one of the schools, and was performed by the Regent acting as representative for the other doctors in the particular guild. It is important to note that the Chancellor (who was not a member of the university but a representative of the Church) took no part in the aulatio, except in the faculty of theology. All doctors of theology received the magisterium from the Chancellor, the ceremony being performed in the Bishop's Hall. This distinguishing characteristic of the theological doctorate stems from the close relationship between the doctors in this faculty and the Church. The Chancellor had originally been the chief theological teacher of the cathedral school. Even after the formation of the university and the new regime of theological doctors, the Chancellor, as well as the canons of Paris, continued to retain the right of teaching theology and canon law without authorization from the university. The Chancellor was therefore the natural head of the theology faculty, not in respect to the university (this was the function of the Dean), but in its relations with the bishop and the papacy, who alone could grant theologians recognition.

The unique position of this faculty in the eyes of the Church is further demonstrated by the fact that only the doctor theologiae acted as assessor of the bishop in heresy trials and in rulings involving disputed doctrinal issues in the Church.¹³⁶ And what is more, they were the only representatives from the University allowed to participate in the great Councils.

In this section we have endeavoured to show that during the Middle Ages the term doctor took on new dimensions of meaning so that it no longer always referred to a doctor

ecclesiae. This title was now also used in a way which denoted simply an academic status, referring to one's ability to teach in any number of university disciplines. At the same time we noted the peculiar status of the doctor theologiae, who is distinguished from doctors in other faculties by his close and unique relationship to the Church's hierarchial magisterium, which allows him to participate in ecclesiastical matters in a way not afforded to other members of the university. Only the doctor theologiae would appear to be at once a member of the intellectual corporation and "part" of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, establishing him as a new kind of authority in the Church - a new breed of doctor ecclesiae.

IV. THE ECCLESIASTICAL STATUS OF THE DOCTOR THEOLOGIAE IN THE MIDDLE AGES

Having recognized that the doctor theologiae had a special relationship with the Church not shared by other doctors, we must now attempt to define more clearly what exactly this relationship was, that is, try and determine the "status"¹³⁷ of the theologian qua theologian, and the nature and function of his office vis-à-vis the traditional hierarchy of the Church.

The appearance of the doctor theologiae and the gradual growth of his influence and authority in ecclesiastical matters which came to a peak in the Conciliar period, can be accounted for by essentially two factors. The first had to do with the role of the papacy in making the Faculty of Theology at Paris (and accredited theologians in general)

a kind of permanent consilium generale - a standing committee of experts, who are able to give authoritative rulings on disputed matters of doctrine, and who even shared in the very process of doctrinal definition (i.e. at the Councils). The second factor, equally important, was the triumph of scholasticism.

The intellectual renaissance of the 12th and 13th centuries not only gave birth to the studium generale and a new regime of doctores, but also to a new "scholastic method" of education which cut across all disciplines including theology. In previous centuries, the "theological" instruction given in the monastic, episcopal and parish schools was on a very elementary level, involving little more than the reading and memorizing of biblical texts. Theology had not yet developed into a system, much less a science. One is not able to discern any technical distinctions during this early age between the act of "preaching" and that of "teaching". The lectio and the praedicatio in this era were simply different aspects of the same process - that of laying open the true meaning of Scripture through exegesis. As B. Smalley puts it: "exegesis is teaching and preaching. Teaching and preaching is exegesis."¹³⁸ It is true that distinctions were made as to the form of exposition. Jerome, for instance, distinguished between the homily, which was normally given orally; the tome or commentary, which was a penned exposition of a fuller and more thorough nature; and the scholia, which were short written notes on some particularly difficult biblical passage. But all these forms of exposition, whether given on behalf of a group of young

clerics or before a congregation of believers at worship, involved the same process - exegesis of Holy Scripture.

However, with the advent of scholasticism, the study of the Bible passes from simple exegesis into a full-blown theological science which utilizes new and varied pedagogical techniques. We find, for instance, that the lectio, in the hands of the doctor theologiae, is transformed from a pastorally oriented mode of teaching revolving strictly around textual analysis, into a scientific method of instruction based upon scholastic exegesis, which goes beyond the text into the realm of speculative elaboration (quaestiones). For the first time, a clear-cut distinction can be made between a "doctoral-scientific" kind of teaching and a "pastoral" kind of teaching.¹³⁹ This distinction was alluded to as early as the 12th century by Innocent III, when he wrote to Peter of Compostella regarding a Christological question: "Therefore we answer you these things in the scholastic way, but if we must answer in an apostolic manner then we shall reply indeed more simply but more cautiously."¹⁴⁰ We shall be dealing more fully with this distinction when we come to look at the views of certain prominent Medieval doctors regarding the role of the theologian in the Church.

Within the milieu of the university, theology for the first time becomes a true science - a scholastic theology - employing specialized methodologies and formularies in its all-consuming quest for rationes. The main concern of the doctor theologiae is not the soul but the intellect. His audience is not a cloistered community or a congregation at worship, but a group of academically minded scholares, who

study Scripture, not primarily for the purpose of spiritual devotion, but to acquire knowledge just as they would for any other subject studied at the studium. In this section we intend to show that the theologians who teach in the universities represent a new regime of doctores in the Church called into existence by the demands of the scientific study of Scripture. Of particular concern will be the relationship of these doctors to the traditional ecclesiastical hierarchy (especially bishops), the nature and function of their teaching office, and the scope of their authority.

a. Magister in sacra pagina

In the 12th and 13th centuries, before it became the established practice to refer to the theologians in the studia as "doctors", they were given the title magistri sacrae paginae or magistri sacrae scripturae.¹⁴¹ All the evidence indicates that these titles should be understood to describe literally the task of the theologian, not only during these centuries, but throughout the Middle Ages. It was the accustomed practice among Medieval writers to use terms theologia, sacra pagina, scriptura, and Bible synonymously.¹⁴² Everywhere one finds that the teaching of the doctor theologiae is understood to revolve strictly around the text of Holy Scripture.¹⁴³ So widespread was this view that Father Mandonnet can write: "Au XIIe siècle et pendant les deux siècles suivants...dans toutes les écoles de théologie, grandes ou petites, celui qui en a la direction, sous le nom de maître ou docteur..., a pour mission première et essentielle de lire et interpreter le texte de la sainte Écriture."¹⁴⁴

The preparation which one was required to go through in

order to gain the doctoral status that gave one the authority to interpret Scripture had greatly increased by the 12th century. Previously, Scripture itself was practically the only text used to teach future clerics the basic grammatical and literary skills. But now many other texts became standard reading in the various disciplines which made up the Faculty of Arts through which all future priests had to pass. Pedagogy in the Medieval universities had from the start been based entirely on the "reading" of texts. Each faculty would have one or two basic books which the students would study in detail. In grammar, for instance, the standard text was Donatus' Ars Minor and Ars Major, and Priscian's Institutiones; for rhetoric, Cicero's De Inventione was the usual choice; in philosophy, the works of Porphyry or Boethius. In the Faculty of Theology itself, two books dominated, indeed, monopolized theological instruction throughout the Middle Ages: Peter Lombard's Sententiae and the Bible.

In the career of a student of theology at Paris (and all other universities followed the modus parisiensis in this), there were two distinct stages through which one had to pass before becoming a doctor theologiae. First one had to become a bachalarius biblici, and then a bachalarius sententiarii. The former status would last from two to three years, during which time the young bachelor would actively engage in lecturing on biblical texts, usually concentrating on two or three specific books which were assigned to him. These lectures, delivered before his peers, allowed the future cleric to practice his teaching skills in an authentic situation. However, the bachalarius biblici was not properly "teaching" at this stage, since he was not allowed to

interpret Scripture in his lectures, but had to content himself with expounding the glosses of the Fathers. Moreover, he was restricted to the comments on the literal sense of the passage. Hence, the bachalarius biblici was said to lecture cursorie, or percurrendo - glancing through the text on a very elementary and literal level.¹⁴⁵ One might describe this as simple exegesis.¹⁴⁶ The object of this exercise was to allow the student to become better acquainted with the text of the Bible and thus prepare him for the study of the Sentences.

As bachalarius sententiarii, a status held for two years after his term as biblici, the scholar's main preoccupation was with Lombard's Sentences. His lectures were no longer biblical expositions, but in-depth reflections on theological issues and problems arising out of the great doctor's comments. It was, perhaps, predictable that the prestige of the bachalarius sententiarii would grow quickly in the university, owing to the widespread desire to develop theology into an organized science.¹⁴⁷ After several more years of study, the scholar could finally be admitted into the doctoral ranks.¹⁴⁸ Once again, his teaching responsibilities centred around the interpretation of the text of Scripture. Just how strictly this requirement was enforced is illustrated by a much publicized incident in the 14th century. One Aymé Dubreuil, later to become archbishop of Tours, insisted on "reading" from the Sentences in his classes even though he was a full doctor theologiae. The case ended up on trial in the Faculty of Law in 1386, the outcome being a ruling which supported the theological faculty: "We insist that, in theology, the doctors read

the Bible, and the bachalarius sententiarii read the Sentences, and even if a doctor wants to read the Sentences it is not permitted."¹⁴⁹

Although the bachalarius biblici and the doctor theologiae have as their object of study the same book, namely, the text of Holy Scripture, their teaching is quite obviously different. The lectio of the doctor goes beyond elementary exegesis into a full-blown scholastic commentary on the text, which includes discussion on the glosses of the Fathers and other doctors, as well as relevant heretical interpretations. Moreover, the doctor may deal with the different senses of the text (not just the literal), and indulge in speculative elaboration on theological issues which arise from the passages before ending with his own "determination". Hence, the lectures by the doctor were referred to as lectiones ordinariae. It will be useful at this point to go into somewhat more depth regarding the teaching procedures employed by the doctor theologiae at the university in order to prepare for our study of the relationship between his teaching office and that of the bishop and lower clergy.

b. Lectio

From the days of the ancient monastic schools, the technique employed for instructing others in the Bible was, as we have noted, simple exegesis - the reading aloud of a text followed by a commentary on the literal meaning of the words. The technical term given to this procedure of exposition was lectio, which was universally understood to refer to the process of acquiring knowledge by means of the reading of a text. To "teach" meant to read, that is, to

"read" in the technical sense. The doctor was said to "read" his text. The course he gave was a lectio, and he himself was often referred to as the lector. The lectio remained the basic procedure of exposition in the universities, but in this new environment its old monastic form was radically transformed into a highly technical academic exercise which, as we have mentioned, was given the name lectio ordinarie.¹⁵⁰ This lectio was comprised of three basic elements: littera, sensus, and sententia. Having chosen his text, the doctor would read the passage aloud and then give a simple, literal explanation of the words and phrases (littera), in a manner similar to that of the lectio cursorie. Then the meaning of the various elements of the passage were analyzed in greater depth by bringing in the opinions of different authorities, after which the important ideas were reformulated by the doctor in clear language (sensus). Finally, the doctor would go beyond the plain meaning of the text, and attempt to speculate about a deeper level of meaning (sententia).¹⁵¹ A lectio comprising all three of these elements was referred to as an expositio or lectura, that is, a uniform and continuous commentary on a given passage from Scripture. If this procedure was written down by the doctor himself, then it would be an expositio; but if it was given orally, then it was usually referred to as a lectura. The lectio, then, was a thoroughly analytical procedure which studied a biblical passage by breaking down, dividing, and subdividing its contents.

c. Quaestio

The second main procedure of biblical exposition employed

by the doctor theologiae during the Middle Ages was the quaestio. This refers to the practice of applying extended commentary on some difficult thought or word in the text being studied in the lectio. Originally, the quaestiones were interspersed within the lectio itself,¹⁵² but gradually these two exercises underwent a process of differentiation,¹⁵³ so that by the 13th century the quaestio was a distinct pedagogical technique, quite separate from the lectio.¹⁵⁴ In the quaestio, the traditional theological doctrines and teaching being discussed in the classrooms of the doctors were literally speaking, "called into question". Not because there was any real doubt about their truth, but because the very essence of the teaching office of the doctor theologiae was to engage the minds of his audience in a deeper understanding of the doctrines. This was done by going beyond the magisterial sayings of past authorities in order to discover rationes.¹⁵⁵ In the quaestio, the doctor now begins to define words and concepts more elaborately, and to classify them within "categories". It becomes a common practice in this form of exposition to present and analyze a biblical passage by means of the Aristotelian concept of the four causes: efficient, material, formal, and final. In his search for rationes, the doctor has passed through the doors of simple exegesis into the realm of theological speculation. Thus, with the quaestio scholastic theology reaches its peak of development. Biblical teaching is no longer strictly bound up with the text of Scripture (lectio), that is to say, it no longer stops there, but now also involves speculative elaboration (quaestiones). The theologian is not just concerned with

expounding the literal meaning of the words. He now seeks after rationes through detailed doctrinal research, argumentation, refutation and speculation. Exegesis has evolved from a pastoral type of biblical paraphrasing into a scientific discipline - a scholastic theology - wherein the object is no longer the spiritual edification of a congregation, but the objective analysis of a text by means of highly technical procedures of exposition. This evolution can be clearly detected by comparing the sermones of say, Bernard, with the lecturae (expositiones) of the 13th century doctors. Here we have two distinct genres of teaching, each one having its own structure, and each one directed to quite different audiences and intending to produce very different results. Instruction in Holy Scripture, once confined to the solitude of a cloistered community or a congregation at worship, has now become part of the public curriculum of the university. This teaching no longer aims at spiritual edification but the acquisition of knowledge just like any other subject studied in the studia. And what is more, the teaching itself has become highly academic insofar as the study of Scripture has moved beyond the exegetical lectio or sermo, and developed into a science in which biblical instruction has become detached from the pastoral office and handed over to a university regime of doctores whose primary office is not the cure of souls, but the cultivation of the intellect through theological explanation (rationes et quaestiones).¹⁵⁶

d. The Authority of the Doctor Theologiae

The practice of referring to past "authorities" to bear witness to any step taken in an argument of a writer, whatever

the discipline, was standard procedure during the Middle Ages. This practice had been well established in the realm of biblical commentary from the early centuries of the Church's existence, with citations from the works of the Fathers being the principal source of authority in the process of interpretation. But after the establishment of the university, and the ensuing growth of speculation in theological matters, one finds, from about the end of the 12th century, that it becomes customary to cite alongside the "authentic" sayings of the Fathers the works of modern doctors of theology (sententiae modernorum magistrorum) in order to prove or disprove a particular point or argument. All theologians in the university were clearly understood to hold a particular authority in the vital ecclesiastical function of scriptural interpretation, although, of course, some were more eminent than others.

We find, for instance, in John of Cornwall's Eulogium, a book about the various explanations of the incarnation, that the author quotes concurrently from both the Fathers and the modern theologians, "in order that the lighter armour of the Doctors of these times be a prelude to the mighty wedged formations of the Saints".¹⁵⁷ Throughout this work he often refers to the auctoritates sanctorum (the Fathers) and the auctoritates magistrorum (the Doctors). Later we find Thomas Aquinas making a similar reference to the teaching of the doctores theologiae as a parallel source of authority with the Fathers: "According to the exposition of the ancient saints, according also to the magisterial exposition, the sin against the Holy Spirit may be said to be..."¹⁵⁸ Everywhere in the works of

Medieval commentators it becomes customary to speak of a sententia magistralis, a definitio magistralis, a glossa magistralis, and an auctoritas magistralis.¹⁵⁹ Yet it is important to note that while the work of the modern doctors was quoted alongside that of the Fathers, the two were not considered to be equal authorities. The auctoritas of the Fathers was, in a sense, a law in itself insofar as it had to be accepted. Their words could, of course, be interpreted differently, but they could not be dismissed as being non-authoritative on some particular issue. The auctoritas of the doctors, on the other hand, had no constraining value, and it could therefore be rejected at any point. In Thomas' Expositio on I Timothy, for instance, he writes: "This is a magisterial gloss and it is of little value".¹⁶⁰ And on another occasion he makes this point again: "Although the sayings of Hugh of Saint Victor are magisterial and do NOT have the cogent power of an authority, nevertheless...".¹⁶¹ Even the teaching of Peter Lombard did not escape such restrictions.¹⁶²

By virtue of his doctoral status in the Faculty of Theology, the doctor theologiae officially received a canonical mission which allowed him (and not the bachalarius) to participate in the ecclesiastical function of biblical interpretation. And it would appear that he participated in this function with a certain auctoritas which, while not equal to that of the Fathers, was something more than that of a simple priest. This would seem to indicate that the doctor theologiae held an ecclesiastical "office" (i.e. function), and that he could legitimately receive the title of doctor ecclesiae along with

the bishops. But as a member of the university, was he properly a part of the essential hierarchy of the Church? And where did the auctoritas of his teaching stand in relation to that of the episcopate? In order to examine this whole question more closely we shall look briefly at the views of a few prominent Churchmen in the Middle Ages.¹⁶³

i) Thomas Aquinas

Thomas was typical of all theologians of this age in understanding the primary task of a doctor theologiae to be the elucidation and communication of divine revelation set forth in the text of Holy Scripture.¹⁶⁴ As an interpreter of biblical truths, the doctor, in Thomas' mind, was part of the general hierarchical order established by God for continuing the transmission of revelation per modum cuiusdam doctrinae.¹⁶⁵ This revealed knowledge, or to use the term Thomas uses most frequently, sacra doctrina,¹⁶⁶ has been committed by God to certain individuals who receive it in a descending order of perfection. At the top of this teaching hierarchy is Christ, who as God is Truth itself, and as man possesses all revelation in the highest degree. Hence, Thomas refers to Jesus as fidei primus et principalis Doctor (the first and chief Doctor of the faith).¹⁶⁷ Christ hands this doctrina down to his Apostles through personal instruction, that is, through a locutio exterior, by which Thomas clearly means oral rather than written teaching. He regards the former mode of instruction as the most perfect, which explains why Christ never wrote anything down.¹⁶⁸ The normal way of passing on revealed knowledge in the Church is through a locutio exterior, but there are some individuals who receive revelation directly from God by a locutio

interior.¹⁶⁹ The latter are referred to in the New Testament as prophets.¹⁷⁰ Because the Apostles have been taught directly by Christ himself, they have received a manifestior revelatio than any other human being.¹⁷¹ Their commission to "Go preach", which they carried out in both oral and written form,¹⁷² has been passed on to their successors, who in the first instance are the bishops. They alone are said to hold properly the function of teaching and expounding the Gospel: "docere, id est exponere evangelium, pertinet proprie ad episcopum".¹⁷³ But there are others in the Church who have been called upon to participate in the apostolic and episcopal office, namely, the "prophets" and "doctors":

And although the teaching office pertains chiefly to the apostles [and therefore the bishops] to whom it is said in Matthew-"go and teach all the nations"-yet others participate in this office, of whom some receive on their own revelation from God, who are called prophets; but there are some who instruct the people from these things which have been revealed to other men, and they are called doctors. 174

Thomas believes that the doctor theologiae, who teaches in the university, is part of the continuous line of doctors which extends back to New Testament times, because he shares the same task as all previous teachers in the Church: the exposition of Holy Scripture. Since, for Thomas, all theological instruction is based on the biblical text, he can refer to it as doctrina secundum revelationem divinam, thus indicating his conception of its integral relationship with revelation. This means that the doctor theologiae, by virtue of the kind of teaching he gives, has a systematic place within the broad conception of salvation and, hence, the teaching ministry of the Church.¹⁷⁵

At this point, that is, from the perspective of content, there is no distinction in Thomas' mind between "preaching" and "teaching". He uses the terms synonymously when speaking of the way in which the revealed knowledge of God found in the Bible is transmitted in the Church. It is, therefore, quite common to find him referring to praedicatio vel doctrina.¹⁷⁶ Both acts describe the same essential process of instruction in revealed truth.¹⁷⁷

From the perspective of auctoritas, however, Thomas makes a clear distinction between the teaching of the magisterium cathedrae pastoralis (also referred to as the "episcopal magisterium") which is defined primarily by the public function of praelatio, and the teaching given by the magisterium cathedrae magistralis (i.e. the doctores sacrae Scripturae) which is identified with the lectio and quaestio.¹⁷⁸ Thomas accepts the distinction that Peter the Chanter (d. 1197) made between the three basic types of teaching given by the magistri in sacra pagina:

The practice of Bible study consists in three things: reading (legere), disputation (disputare), and preaching (praedicare)... Reading is, as it were, the foundation and substrate of those following it, for through it the other two procedures are prepared for. Disputation is, as it were, the wall in this building of study, since nothing is fully understood nor faithfully preached unless it is first chewed up by the tooth of disputation. Preaching, on the other hand, which is supported by the former, is, as it were, the roof protecting the faithful from the heat and wind of temptation. We should preach after, not before, the reading of Holy Scripture and the investigation of doubtful matters by disputation. 179

The Chanter clearly understands these exercises to be related, but he nevertheless views them as separate and

distinct modes of instruction, each one having its own specific purpose. By the time of Thomas, the three functions of legere, disputare (quaestio), and praedicare became even more differentiated as theology developed into a science.

Although the Medieval doctors like Thomas continued to preach,¹⁸⁰ and Thomas himself seems to have been especially active in this pursuit,¹⁸¹ this was not their usual procedure of exposition. The theologian's main pedagogical tools in the classroom were the lectio and quaestio (disputatio) which, as we have seen, gradually emerged as separate educational techniques in the universities due to the nature and aims of the doctor's teaching function. Thomas understands this function to be quite different from that of the bishop and parish clergy. The theologian's task, he says, is to build the faith into a "science" through the use of rationes, and not just by references to "bare authorities":

Whether theological determinations should be made by authority or by reason:...Then there is the magisterial type of disputation in the schools, whose goal is not the removal of error, but rather the instruction of the listeners so that they may be led to understand the truth that the master intends to bring out. In this latter case, recourse should be had to reasons (rationibus) that search to the root of the truth and show the thing which is said to be true is actually so. Otherwise, if the master determines the question by appeal to bare authorities (nudis auctoritatibus) the listener will have a certainty (certificabitur¹⁸²) that the thing is so, but he will have acquired no science (scientiae) or understanding (intellectus) and will go away with an empty head. ¹⁸³

The theologian always begins with the articles of faith, and his teaching must be based on these, but his task is to

go beyond the simple exegesis of Scripture in order to provide the listeners with new theological insights (rationes) which will clarify the truth of the text being studied. The expositio fidei provided by the doctor is, therefore, not to be understood as a completion or fulfilment of what has been given in Scripture, but simply as clarification, interpretation or explanation. Thomas makes it clear that the teaching given by the doctor theologiae, and theological instruction in general, is not the product of revelation. Rather it is to be understood as purely a human exercise which employs all the resources of natural reason (illuminated by faith) for the purpose of reflecting on biblical truth per modum cognitionis (through a cognitive process).¹⁸⁴

It is at this point that Thomas makes a crucial distinction between auctoritates doctorum and auctoritates canonici scripturae.¹⁸⁵ Since the former is derived from the "scientific" competence of an individual, it can be used only probabiliter.¹⁸⁶ Thus, when Thomas writes about the auctoritas of the doctor (magisterium cathedrae magistralis) in relation to that of the bishop (magisterium cathedrae pastoralis), he describes the former as an eminentia scientiae, and the latter as eminentia potestatis.¹⁸⁷ The teaching of the doctor theologiae possesses no binding or jurisdictional authority, since it officially represents only the individual's personal views. This is why Thomas, and any other doctor ecclesiae, can reject or uphold the teaching of a particular theologian depending on whether or not his views conform to Scripture.¹⁸⁸ But the teaching of the episcopal magisterium carries with it an authority of

"power" (eminentia potestatis) because it is derived from "certain knowledge" (scire per certitudinem).¹⁸⁹ The episcopacy communicates this knowledge primarily through praelatio,¹⁹⁰ and this teaching is regarded as authoritative, that is, it has a jurisdictional power which is binding, because it is considered to be the official teaching of the Church, not simply the personal views of an individual.¹⁹¹

Thomas was of the opinion that the pope, as the supreme bishop, holds a special prominence and power in the Church's teaching ministry. He possesses the authority sententialiter determinare ea quae sunt fidei (to decide matters of faith finally).¹⁹² Thus, his decisions on disputed questions of biblical interpretation are to be preferred over all other members of the Church which, of course, includes bishops and doctors.¹⁹³ But whereas the bishops share in the pope's power to sententialiter determinare, the doctors, as we have seen, do not.

We therefore find in Thomas a well-defined hierarchical order of teaching authority in which the doctor theologiae plays a very important role. Along with the episcopal magisterium, he is to be regarded as a true doctor ecclesiae. However, the clear distinction which Thomas made between the intrinsic authority of the theologian's teaching and that of the bishop who is said to hold the "pastoral magisterium", would seem to indicate that the doctor theologiae, whose juridical status was founded on his place within the university corporation, was not considered by Aquinas to be part of the essential hierarchy of the Church.

ii) Pierre d'Ailly

This whole issue which we are considering is discussed

in a fairly systematic way by Pierre d'Ailly who wrote about a century after Thomas. Given the historical context in which d'Ailly lived, namely the period of the Great Schism and Conciliarism, it is, perhaps, not too surprising to find that this writer, himself a theologian and outspoken supporter of the conciliar cause, greatly elevates the ecclesiastical status and authority of the doctor theologiae.

D'Ailly was granted the doctorate in theology from the University of Paris in 1381, and three years later obtained the Headship of the College of Navarre. In 1389 he was made Chancellor of Paris, after which he became Bishop of le Puy (1395) and later Cardinal of San Chrysogona (1411). It was during his days as a young theologian at Paris that he most clearly and systematically promulgated his views on the matter which now concerns us. And more particularly, he made these views known publicly during the presentation of two scholastic quaestiones¹⁹⁴ which he personally conducted when, as the representative of the theological faculty of Paris, he was charged with the task of prosecuting the present Chancellor, one John Blanchard, who had been accused of extorting money in exchange for the licentia docendi.¹⁹⁵

D'Ailly developed his case against Blanchard, who had been formally charged with simony (defined by d'Ailly as "the selling of spiritual things"), in four propositions:

- i) "Theology is a spiritual gift of God".
- ii) "The teaching or preaching of theology is spiritual".
- iii) "The license, power, or authority to teach or preach theology is spiritual".
- iv) "The power to grant the license is spiritual".¹⁹⁶

Blanchard argued in his defense that he could not be charged

with simony because theology was not a spiritual gift, but simply a natural intellectual habit like any other academic discipline. It followed from this, he argued, that even a non-Christian could teach this subject: "Whoever knows theology should be permitted to preach and teach it without any special authorization".¹⁹⁷ In his reply, d'Ailly agreed that any learned person could expound theology on a general level by discussing the "sense of Scripture" with proofs from the text. However, to teach theology properly, he claimed, requires belief in the truths of Scripture. Moreover, he maintained that all true theological instruction is ultimately dependent upon revelation, and must therefore be regarded as "spiritual".¹⁹⁸ The fact that theology can have a dual nature ("natural" and "supernatural") does not detract from its essentially spiritual character. For just as the sacraments are corporal and natural as regards the material with which they are performed, but are spiritual and supernatural because they confer sacramental grace and were divinely instituted; so teaching and preaching theology, although corporal acts, are also spiritual and supernatural, because they are related to the divinely inspired sacred Scriptures.¹⁹⁹

Having demonstrated the spiritual nature of theology, d'Ailly then goes on to show that not only theology itself, but also the preaching and teaching of theology is spiritual: secunda propositio, scilicet quod doctrina seu praedicatio theologie est res spiritualis...²⁰⁰ It is important to note that in the remainder of his presentation (i.e. Radix), d'Ailly recognizes that teaching and preaching are distinct Church functions, but in the course of his argument regarding

this second proposition, he insists that they are essentially the same. As Bernstein notes, with only one exception the biblical texts d'Ailly quotes to support his reasoning (i.e. that the two are the same) refer only to preaching, "but without citing any authority or precedent for doing so or explicitly stating what he was doing, he treated them as applying equally to teaching".²⁰¹ We must concur with Bernstein when he expresses "surprise" at d'Ailly's "relentless insistence on the close connection between teaching and preaching" in view of "the extensive institutional evolution (i.e. of the university and the doctoral teaching regime)²⁰² and the divergent testimony of the scriptural texts".²⁰³ From a tactical point of view one can see why it was essential for d'Ailly to equate the two (teaching and preaching), because only by such an equation could he justify his opinion that the role of the doctor theologiae held an office in the Church which was parallel to that of the bishop. And so we find d'Ailly doing just this in his second proposition.²⁰⁴

Quoting from Romans 10:15: "How shall they preach unless they are sent", d'Ailly argues that nobody can preach or teach publicly unless he has specifically been "sent" or "licensed".²⁰⁵ He then goes on to explain more fully the ways in which God "sends" men into the world to fulfill this preaching or teaching mission. Some may be sent directly by God himself (i.e. Moses and John the Baptist). Others receive authorization from God through the agency of men (i.e. Moses sent Joshua; Paul sent the disciples). Then there are those who are sent by God through the Church.

"Ordinarily" these are the bishops (who are the successors of the Apostles), and the parish priests (who are the successors of the disciples). Later, archdeacons and arch-priests were added as opitulaciones (i.e. those who help their superiors). In addition to these "ordinary" orders, some are sent "extraordinarily" by the bishops to help them in their dioceses. Finally, there are those who are sent "extraordinarily" by the pope, and it is in this way that the doctor theologiae is sent on his spiritual mission of teaching.²⁰⁶

This whole description of the various orders and ways of being "sent" comes directly from William of St.-Amour's Collectiones Catholicae et Canonicae Scripturae.²⁰⁷ But it is significant that William did not make any reference to the doctores in his work. In the section regarding the extraordinary mission of those sent specially by the pope, d'Ailly's inclusion of "those licensed to teach theology" is an interpolation into the text he is quoting.²⁰⁸ Commenting on this point Bernstein writes: "His remark may be more a grudging concession to the legality of the licentia bullata than a description of the status of all those licensed in theology, though the latter interpretation could also be defended".²⁰⁹ But where exactly did the doctor theologiae stand, according to d'Ailly, in relation to the "ordinary" ecclesiastical hierarchy?

D'Ailly interprets Christ's charge to the Apostles - "Go therefore and preach" - as referring to the "teaching and preaching of theological wisdom".²¹⁰ He then goes on to quote William of Auxerre who stated: "Preaching is spiritual and also connected to the spiritual. It is

spiritual because the Holy Spirit is given through it. It is connected to the spiritual, that is to the order [of priesthood], because preaching pertains to the priests, or at least to those ordained".²¹¹ D'Ailly then comments on this quotation as follows: "And I understand 'ordained' to mean not only those ordained in Holy orders, but also those in the hierarchial order, that is [the order] of those sent and approved to preach by apostolic authority on behalf of the Universal Church, according to the saying of the Apostle, 'How shall they preach unless they be sent?'. "²¹² It is evident from the rest of the text that d'Ailly's purpose in broadening the definition of "those ordained" was to include in this category the teaching activities of the doctor theologiae.

Thus, theologians who teach in the university are to be considered part of the ecclesiastical teaching mission, but it is important to note that he describes them as being sent "extraordinarily" by the pope. This would seem to indicate that they did not constitute a separate and definite "ordo" in the essential hierarchy of the Church. Nevertheless, their authority to teach is to be understood as a "spiritual power": "And therefore it appears that a mission of this sort to preach, which is nothing other than the license to teach, is a spiritual power (potestas spiritalis)".²¹³ Whereas Thomas had quite deliberately differentiated between the bishop's authority as eminentia potestatis and the doctor's as eminentia scientiae, d'Ailly, at this level, has equated the two. He has elevated the status of the doctor theologiae to the point where it is comparable with that of the bishop, since both offices are understood

to have a teaching mission which carries with it a spiritual power .

Thus, with regard to the spiritual nature of the teaching given by the doctor, there is no distinction in d'Ailly's mind between it and the preaching of the bishops. On this level, the status of the doctor was parallel with that of the "ordinary" episcopal office. There can be no denying that d'Ailly holds the doctor theologiae in high esteem and that he considers him to be a true doctor ecclesiae. But with regard to his actual authority in matters of scriptural interpretation, we learn that this parallel with the bishop does not apply. Though both teach by virtue of a "spiritual power", the implementation and effectiveness of this power is quite different in each case.

We find that d'Ailly distinguishes between two forms of scriptural definition: the first is the official formulation per modum auctoritatis which belongs only to the bishops (and supremely the pope); the second is the establishment of truth by the interpretation of Holy Scripture, per modum doctrinae, to which the doctors are confined when fulfilling their teaching office.²¹⁴ The former mode of teaching includes the latter, but it is highly significant that the instruction given per modum auctoritatis does not depend entirely on the interpretation of Holy Scripture, only "as much as possible": Doctrinalis determinatio vel definitio fidei maxime innititur scripturae sacrae.²¹⁵ The definition of doctrine offered by the doctor theologiae is not authoritative or binding because the Church is not limited in its decisions to the one source of Holy Scripture, but also takes into consideration extra-scriptural tradition.²¹⁶

Hence, the doctrinal formulations of the bishops draw "as much as possible" from the teaching of the theologians, but they also depend on the doctores decretorum (i.e. canon law).²¹⁷ The bishops (pope) alone make the definitive doctrinal decisions in the Church per modum auctoritatis. Therefore the role of the doctors in the successio fidei, although an important one, is nevertheless only a partial and secondary role. Moreover, they do not appear to be considered by d'Ailly as part of the "ordinary" hierarchy having been "sent extraordinarily". D'Ailly stands in the tradition which elevates the authority of the Church (bishops) over the authority of Holy Scripture (doctors), and which acknowledges the existence of an extra-scriptural oral tradition alongside the written biblical testimony.²¹⁸

iii) John Wyclif

In addition to the tradition represented by writers like Aquinas, d'Ailly, Occam, Gerson and Biel which stresses the authority of the bishops over that of the doctors, we also find an "unorthodox" tradition which insists that teaching per modum auctoritatis must totally coincide with the exposition of Scripture per modum doctrinae. For those who adhere to this latter view,²¹⁹ there is no such thing as an oral extra-scriptural source in the Church alongside Holy Scripture. All authoritative teaching and preaching must rest finally and exclusively on the Bible, which is to say that the principle of sola scriptura is interpreted by these men in a strict sense. One is not bound by anything which falls outside the Sacred Canon. This is not to say that the authority of "Tradition" is denied, only that it is now understood, not as something "outside" or "beyond" the

biblical text, but as the ongoing interpretation of Scripture itself. For writers like d'Ailly, the authoritative teaching of the bishops and pope relies only "as much as possible" or "chiefly" (Occam) on the written source. But for Wyclif, this source is absolute. Not surprisingly then, we find that this English theologian, like others in his tradition, (i.e. Hus, Gansfort) understands the successio fidei to be preserved by successio doctorum rather than by episcopal succession.²²⁰ For the doctor is defined as an expert in biblical interpretation, or at least this is what he ought to be. As such, his role in the teaching mission of the Church is vital, and his authority is subservient to none. The same does not apply to the doctor decretorum. While d'Ailly and Occam could be caustic in their attacks upon the canonists, they by no means wanted to see their abolition. But for men like Wyclif, the canon lawyers were considered a "poison" that the Church could well do without. To elevate the authority of their decretals over that of the Scriptures as these doctors often did, was an abomination which was responsible for all kinds of false teaching.

Wyclif's strict adherence to the principle of sola scriptura, in the sense of it being absolutely "sufficient", is found everywhere in his writings.²²¹ This teaching was undoubtedly one of the points which separated him from most of his contemporaries and established him as a harbinger of the 16th century Reformation.²²² This strong belief that anything beyond Christ's word and work was superfluous and profane was decisive in moulding Wyclif's ecclesiological views. The need to reform the Church, he maintains, became particularly acute after the "donation of Constantine".²²³

One of the outcomes of the widespread corruption stemming from the wealth and power bequeathed to the Church by this "donation" was the concept of "jurisdiction". As we have seen, this teaching formed an important part in both Aquinas' and d'Ailly's thought regarding the relationship between the authority of bishops and doctors. Wyclif is of the opinion that the "power of jurisdiction" stems not from the authority of Christ, but from "Caesar Constantine".²²⁴ He describes it as a "poisonous" teaching which has been introduced into the Church "by the devil's craft". For it has been on the basis of this concept of jurisdiction, says Wyclif, that bishops have been elevated above priests and the pope above the bishops. He argues that there is no biblical authority to support the view that there is a distinction in "spiritual power" among members of the hierarchy, or even between the hierarchy and the laity.²²⁵ The pope may be accorded a special "dignity" or "character", but this is not derived from any power of jurisdiction; rather it comes from his "closeness" to Christ, due to the holiness of life which all priests must exhibit, and especially the pope.²²⁶ However, since even Peter was capable of error, so indeed is the bishop of Rome, and thus, whenever he deviates from the path of Christ, either in his actions or his teaching, he is not to be heeded.²²⁷ Moreover, Wyclif is convinced that the contemporary Church's understanding of the whole concept of hierarchy is severely misguided, based as it is on the doctrine of jurisdiction. There is, to be sure, a form of hierarchy in the Church, but this is purely a functional hierarchy. This hierarchy manifests itself, says Wyclif, in three orders: the clergy, "who are called the

priests of Christ"; the temporal lords (i.e. King), "who ought to be vicars of deity"; and the laity, "who are divided up into workers, merchants and stewards".²²⁸ What we have here is essentially a priesthood of all believers, wherein the distinction between clergy and laity loses its basic ecclesiological significance. All believers, both lay and clerical, are said to have a spiritual status, and all are called upon to participate in the redemptive work of the Church in a positive way. So insistent was Wyclif on this point that he can see no objection why a layman could not serve as pope or be involved in priestly functions.²²⁹ Within this radically reformed religious polity, the theologian plays an extremely important role.

Since, for Wyclif, all truth is ultimately derived from Scripture, he views the science of theology as vital, not only for the life of the Church, but also for the State. He can write that without the continuation of the "faculty of theology" the "realm cannot possibly stand".²³⁰ He therefore calls for the extension, defense, and reform of this faculty. The Parisian decision to ban civil law in the universities should, he says, be copied in England. Moreover, canon law must be abolished as well. He even goes so far as to suggest that universities should have no subjects on their curriculum other than philosophy and theology.²³¹

To qualify as a "doctor" in the Church does not necessarily involve formal training in a university and the acquisition of a doctoral title. All that is required is that one has the gift for truly understanding and teaching Scripture; hence, even the laity are eligible for this office.²³² He later goes on to suggest that "all Christians are theologians"

or ought to be.²³³ Here he seems to be using the term in a broad sense to stress the importance of all believers knowing the Bible thoroughly. Elsewhere he points out that there are various levels of comprehension in theological study, and only men who devote themselves entirely to the knowledge and love of God as revealed in his law can "properly" be called theologians. Again, this does not necessarily exclude laymen from this activity, but such a task was becoming increasingly difficult for one not formally trained owing to the great profusion and subtlety of false and heretical teaching.²³⁴

Once Christ's law becomes the governing standard of all else in society, as it does with Wyclif, then theological knowledge and understanding becomes obligatory for everyone. Not just the clerical order, but temporal lords as well, especially the King, must be governed in their actions and decisions by theological principles as revealed in Scripture. Wyclif therefore assigns to the theologians as one of their foremost duties the task of counselling and advising the heads of state who have been charged with defending true faith from heresy by means of the secular sword.²³⁵ Since the theologian "alone knows what is contrary to Scripture", it is his responsibility to insure that the King recognizes the existence of false teaching.²³⁶ Each royal court should have an "interpreter", so that the King may be "regulated" not only through his own knowledge of Christ's law, but also "through the wisdom of theologians".²³⁷ The doctors are to instruct the secular authorities in the defense of the faith against heresy on every level, but especially with respect to the "blasphemous excesses" of

the Roman papacy.²³⁸ So important is this function that Wyclif can assert: "It is clear that a theologian is necessary for the governance of the realm".²³⁹ And on another occasion he again stresses the essentiality of this office "because it is incumbent upon these [theologians] to destroy errors and protect the King and realm from such danger [heresy]".²⁴⁰

It would appear that the work of the theologians in Wyclif's ecclesiology is more closely tied with what he calls the second order, that is, the temporal lords, than with the clergy. The theologian is a doctor ecclesiae but he does not seem to be part of the essential ecclesiastical hierarchy, that is, not a separate and distinct ordo of Church government. Wyclif takes for granted their teaching responsibilities in the universities, and is more interested in emphasizing their role as advisors to the secular arm of power. For Wyclif, this was where they could be most effective in the process of reforming the Church. His frequent references to the possibility of unordained men becoming theologians indicates that he did not consider this task as being a strictly clerical preserve. Indeed, one might even say that he wanted to secularize the theologian's status. For surely he was alluding to the theologians when he refers to the "literate laymen" who are "so necessary to the office of the King and the administration of the realm"; laymen who should, he says, be employed and supported by the King so the realm would not have to rely on ecclesiastics for its administration.²⁴¹ Wyclif does not raise the question of the relationship between the authority of the theologian and that of the

bishop. One can only say that, for him, the truthfulness of a teaching was totally dependent upon its faithfulness to Scripture, and since the skilled theologian is more proficient in the task of biblical interpretation than anyone else, then he must be held in high regard.

iv) Martin Luther

We have seen that prior to the Protestant Reformation, from the first century to the late Middle Ages, the doctor played an important role in the Church's ministry of the Word. During certain stages of the Church's history, however, the actual function of the doctor was difficult to define, and at times his work was indistinguishable from that of the bishop.²⁴² In fact, for several centuries the doctor was the bishop. The emergence of the great universities of Western Europe and the advent of scholasticism marked the appearance of a new kind of doctor ecclesiae - the doctor of theology, whose teaching function was clearly distinguished from that of the bishop and parish priest by the fact that his sphere of didactic activity was not a congregation or a cloistered monastery, but an intellectual corporation that had partly secular and partly ecclesiastical ties. This meant that his authority to teach was based upon both these sources as attested to by the distinction between the licentia docendi and the magisterium. Yet the theologian's teaching, though clearly different in form from the sermons of the parochial clergy, had exactly the same content, namely, the exposition of Holy Scripture. All this made it difficult to define the exact ecclesiastical status of this new regime of doctors and their relationship to the episcopate in matters of doctrinal

interpretation. But despite the lack of clarity on these questions, there is no doubt that the doctor theologiae performed a vital teaching function "in the Church" which was quite distinct from the pedagogical intention of the pastorale magisterium, even though he did not appear to constitute a separate order in the essential hierarchy.

We find that the doctoral office continued to play a significant role in the thought and practice of the early Protestant Reformers of the 16th century.²⁴³ Martin Luther, for instance, speaks frequently and with great solemnity of his own status as a doctor, using this title to justify his teaching authority and reformatory work in the Church. In fact, it is probably true to say that he understood his doctoral office to define more adequately than any other, including his ordination to the priesthood, the vocation and mission to which he was called.²⁴⁴ When this Reformer uses the term doctor in connection with the special ministry of the Church, he follows the Medieval tradition in understanding this office to refer specifically to the doctor of theology in the university whose task it is to interpret and expound Holy Scripture.

At the instigation of Staupitz,²⁴⁵ Luther applied for and received doctoral status from the Faculty of Theology at Wittenberg on October 19, 1512, after having done all the preliminary course work traditionally required by the Medieval Church and university.²⁴⁶ The high importance which the Reformer attached to his doctorate can be discerned throughout his writings, especially his letters. In one addressed to the Archbishop of Mayence, for instance, dated October, 1517, Luther signs himself: "Martinus Luther,

Augustin. Doctor S. Theol. vocatus".²⁴⁷ Between the years 1517 - 1520, there are numerous references in Luther's writings to his doctoral title as a source of authority to teach.²⁴⁸ But then, for about the next four years, we find that he ceases to use this title as a personal appellation. When put under the ban of the Empire in 1520, Luther's doctorate was officially revoked by the papal authorities. For a time he seemed content to disassociate himself entirely from this status, since, for him, the doctoral office was synonymous with the "Roman doctors" who abused their title by failing to fulfill the essential requirements of this ministry, that is, the exposition of God's Word:

If we hear the name and title doctors of Holy Scripture, then by this criterion we ought to be compelled to teach Holy Scripture and nothing else...But nowadays, the Sentences alone dominate the situation in such a way that we find among the theologians more humanistic darkness than we find the holy and certain doctrine of Scripture. ²⁴⁹

For several years Luther preferred to refer to himself as "ecclesiastic by the grace of God" or "apostle and evangelist in the German land".²⁵⁰ But then, from about 1524, he once again claims the doctoral title as his own, and places much importance on it as a source of his teaching authority.²⁵¹ This reversal was, it seems, a result of his new understanding of the way in which doctors were truly "created". He no longer believed that the doctorate was simply an academic title bestowed by a pope or intellectual institution. This is not to say that he now minimized the importance of formal education and academic degrees; far from it.²⁵² Rather, his intention is to stress that the authority to interpret and expound Holy Scripture is first

and foremost a gift of the Holy Spirit which requires a "calling" from God,²⁵³ and that this alone is determinative of whether or not one is a true doctor ecclesiae. These vital factors, to Luther's way of thinking, clearly set the theologian apart from all other doctors in the university:

I know of nothing else to do than to pray humbly to God to give us such real Doctors of Theology as we have in mind. Pope, emperor, and universities may make Doctors of Arts, Medicine, Laws and Sciences; but be assured that no man can make a Doctor of Holy Scripture except the Holy Spirit from heaven. 254

It was, therefore, both the content of the teaching given by the doctor theologiae and the spiritual source of his authority which placed him in a unique category among all other university doctors. Like the "preacher" or "pastor", the theologian is charged with the task of expounding the Word of God, a function which the Reformer considers to be the "highest and chief office" in society.²⁵⁵ Thus, the didactic activity of the doctor theologiae belongs to the "Kingdom of Christ" in contra-distinction to the "jurists" and other "scholars" whose pedagogical work falls within the "worldly kingdom".²⁵⁶ This is a crucial distinction, for in the former case, "Christ does the whole thing, by his Spirit, but in the worldly kingdom men must act on the basis of reason - wherein the laws also have their origin - for God has subjected temporal rule and all physical life to reason. He has not sent the Holy Spirit from heaven for this purpose".²⁵⁷

Having been duly called to the doctoral office, Luther insists that this cannot be taken away from him by a heretical pope or his minions, and so he continues to possess legitimately a "commission and charge as preacher and doctor

to see to it that no one is misled".²⁵⁸ Once Luther had worked out this important modification in his understanding of the essential nature of the doctoral office, he again began using this title with ever increasing regularity as the basis, not only of his teaching authority as he had done in the years previous to 1520, but now, even more importantly, for his reformatory work in opposition to the Roman hierarchy.²⁵⁹

Judging from the way in which Luther used the doctorate to justify his personal ecclesiastical vocation, it would appear that he recognized the duly called doctor theologiae as holding an important function in the special ministry of the Church. But did the Reformer understand the doctor to hold a separate "office" from that of the pastor? Some writers think not. H. Strohl, for instance, maintains that "pour Luther, il n'y a qu'une seule fonction [i.e. in the Church]: le pasteur fait tout".²⁶⁰ And E.H. Harbison writes: "For him [Luther] the duties of the doctorate included both preaching and teaching, and he never separated the two".²⁶¹ It is true that Luther nowhere sets forth a definite division of ministerial "offices" or "orders" in the manner of the Ordonnances ecclésiastiques de l'Eglise de Genève (1541). For the Wittenberger, there is essentially only one ministerial order, and although he recognizes that there are various "functions" within this order, he is clearly of the opinion that the division of these functions into set offices does not belong to the esse of the Church. Hence his lack of preciseness on this matter.

When Luther uses the term "office" (Amt) in connection with the ministry, it meant something quite different from

the traditional teaching in the Medieval Church. Office, for him, was synonymous with "work", "function", or "ministry". He completely rejects the Roman concept of office as a sacrament which bestows a certain characteres indelebiles on the recipient.²⁶² Thus, for the Reformer, ordination does not confer a special spiritual "state" that separates the officeholder from the laity. Rather, it simply refers to one's "calling", that is, the outward call of the Church which charges the individual with the public performance of a certain function. This means that no spiritual differentiation (i.e. gradus) can be made among the members of "clergy", or even between the clergy and the laity. All believers are considered part of the "spiritual estate" (der geistliche Stand) of the Church.²⁶³ Luther has, therefore, effectively removed the Medieval dichotomy between "clergy" and "laity".

But there is another line of thought in the Reformer, occasioned by different historical circumstances,²⁶⁴ which tends to uphold the traditional distinction between clerical and lay status in the Church. Here one finds that Luther stresses the divinely instituted nature of the special ministry of "clergy" (Pfarher) which is distinguished from the "laity" (Leyen).²⁶⁵ He now makes the basis for ministry not just a matter of sociological concern for order in the Church, but also the institution of Christ himself is emphasized. In his treatise On the Councils and the Church, he tells us that we must have pastors and preachers to minister both publicly and individually "for the sake, and in the name of, the Church, but still more (viel mehr aber) because of the institution of Christ".²⁶⁶ It is evident

that there is a certain amount of ambiguity in Luther on this point, but it nevertheless remains true, whether the ministry rests on the common priesthood ("from below") or on a direct divine institution ("from above"), that "office" in the Church refers strictly to a functional distinction. It is in this way that the Reformer distinguishes between pastors and doctors .

Luther was clearly of the opinion that not all ministries were equally important to the spiritual welfare of the congregation. The office of "preaching the Word" should be the first and foremost concern of the ministerium because it is by this means that "God brings and bestows eternal righteousness, eternal peace, and eternal life and makes sinners saints, dead men live, damned men saved, and the devil's children God's children".²⁶⁷ In his Commentary on Psalms, the Reformer gives a full account of his "high" doctrine of preaching :

Here we also see the power of this preaching of the Gospel. Beyond all the might and power of the world and of all creatures, Christ proves his ability to draw the hearts of men to himself through the Word alone and to bring them to his obedience without any compulsion or external force at all. Apart from Christ, all men are everlasting subjects and captives in the power of the devil, of sin, and of death; but he rescues them for an eternal, divine freedom, righteousness, and life. This great and marvelous thing is accomplished entirely through the office of preaching the Gospel. Viewed superficially, this looks like a trifling thing, without any power, like any ordinary man's speech and word. But when such preaching is heard, His invisible divine power is at work in the hearts of men through the Holy Spirit". 268

In this description of the nature and power of preaching , there are three points which should be noted: i) the content of preaching is strictly "the Word alone", by which Luther meant essentially the exposition of Holy Scripture;²⁶⁹

ii) this office has an oral character - "preaching is heard"; iii) the role of the Holy Spirit is decisive.

Though the office of preaching is "common to all Christians", and "all have the right and power to preach", yet it is also true that "not all are able to serve and preach publicly, nor should we if we could".²⁷⁰ Certain individuals called pastors or preachers are commissioned by the Church in order to fulfill this preaching function which includes within it various other duties.²⁷¹ They may also be called doctors, and Luther often refers to them as such, because they do in fact teach by their preaching. But the Church also calls doctors to the ministerium of the Church who may or may not be pastors or preachers. The difference between the two is this: A preacher (or pastor), he says, has no right to intrude upon a parish where he has not been called to preach, even if the parish is in the hands of "papistic and heretical pastor". It is of the very essence of this office that a pastor has had a specific parish (Kirchspiel) committed to him, and it is to this one particular community then, that he must confine his preaching activity. The doctor, on the other hand, is given the charge to preach and teach on a much larger scale, for his "parish" is, so to speak, the "world". He is not limited to a specific congregation; rather, he performs his duties within an international forum: the university. Hence, if someone were to ask Luther, "Why do you, by your books, teach throughout the world, when you are only a preacher in Wittenberg?", he would answer:

I have never wanted to do it and do not want to do it now. I was forced and driven into this position in the first place, when I had to become a Doctor of Holy Scripture against my will. Then, as a Doctor in a general free university, I began, at the command of pope and emperor, to do what such a Doctor is sworn

to do: expounding Scripture for all the world and teaching everybody. Once in this position, I have had to stay in it, and I cannot give it up or leave it yet with a good conscience, even though both pope and emperor were to put me under the ban for not doing so. For what I began as a Doctor, made and called at their command, I must truly confess to the end of my life. I cannot keep silent or cease to teach, though I would like to do so and am weary and unhappy because of the great and unendurable ingratitude of the people. 272

The content of the teaching given by the doctor ecclesiae was, therefore, the same as that of the pastor - both were charged with the exposition of Holy Scripture. The former, however, performed this function in the "schools of higher learning" and not in a congregational setting.²⁷³ Even though Luther himself was officially both pastor and doctor in Wittenberg, it was not necessary to hold both these offices. One could evidently be a doctor in the Church without having been ordained into the pastorate. This was the case for Melancthon.²⁷⁴ Although he never received ordination, the Praeceptor expounded Holy Scripture alongside Luther in the lecture halls of Wittenberg University's Faculty of Theology during most of his career in this city, in addition to writing numerous theological books and treatises. And he was recognized by Luther as a "doctor above all doctors" even though he never received a doctoral degree in theology.²⁷⁵ This, again, underlines Luther's belief that the true doctor ecclesiae is created, above all else, by God alone. Like Wyclif, he was apparently of the opinion that any Christian, ordained or not, could be called to the doctoral office of the Church provided that he had been given the gift of expounding Scripture.

The Word of God was most effective, according to Luther,

when preached or taught orally, that is, by means of the "physical voice": "The Gospel was not meant to be reduced to writing only, but it is rather to be proclaimed with the physical voice. Thus it will be disseminated and prosper, and come to life among the people."²⁷⁶ Again: "The lips are the public reservoirs of the Church. In them alone is kept the Word of God. You see, unless the Word is preached publicly, it slips away. The more it is preached, the more firmly it is retained. Reading it is not as profitable as hearing it, for the live voice teaches, exhorts, defends and resists the spirit of error".²⁷⁷

Throughout his works, we find the Reformer contrasting the oral exposition of Scripture with its written counterpart: "The Church", he says, "is not a pen-house but a mouth-house".²⁷⁸ For "Christ did not command the Apostles to write, but only to preach".²⁷⁹ Like Aquinas before him, Luther found it significant that "Christ did not write anything, but he spoke it all"; and even the Apostles "wrote only a little, but they spoke a lot".²⁸⁰ The contemporary ministerium should follow the example of the Lord and his disciples, he maintains, in this method of expounding the Word.

Both pastors and doctors are principally engaged in the oral exposition of Scripture: the former preaches his sermo from the pulpit; the latter delivers his lectio in the lecture hall. Luther understands the term lectio ("reading") in basically the same way as the Medieval Church and university, although certain modifications in form and style are, of course, evident.²⁸¹ "To read", he says, "is nothing else than proclaiming from books". In the Church,

this proclamation involves instruction in Holy Scripture. "Reading" (lectio) does not mean simply speaking the words of the Bible verbatim; rather it refers to the actual process of teaching: "Reading ought not to be cold and obscure. Rather teaching ought to be added to it when I explain a reading and draw in a passage because I am teaching faith and Christ...Therefore reading is useful and necessary. Whatever you teach, present it, impress it, foster it, follow it up, lest it grow cold. Use proof texts and examples with which you admonish the conscience of your hearers. Then this conscience has learned and understood".²⁸²

The Reformer draws no real distinction between the sermo and the lectio. In fact, he describes "reading" as a "kind of preaching".²⁸³ As Harbison points out: "Luther's sermons tended to be lectures and his lectures sermons".²⁸⁴ Certainly there is no indication that he regarded "preaching" by means of the sermon to be any more spiritually edifying or authoritative than "teaching" by means of a lecture, that is, providing both modes of instruction dealt strictly with the exposition of Scripture, and were performed by a duly called pastor or doctor. Just like the proclamation of the Word in the sermo, "the oral reading of Scripture is useful in the Church...It is useful in this respect, that the Holy Spirit and salvation can come thereby".²⁸⁵

Luther identifies the Spirit so closely with the oral Word that he regards the lectio of the doctor to be just as certainly the Word of God as the sermo of the pastor. In both instances the Holy Spirit is working in the spoken Word - whether "preached" or "lectured" - in an ex opere operato fashion. That is to say, he teaches that the Word

of God is not only automatically present when Scripture is expounded by duly called ministers, but ipso facto effective.²⁸⁶ His concept of the inherent power of the Spirit in the spoken Word closely parallels his views on the Lord's Supper. In fact, it has been maintained by some Luther scholars that the Reformer "made the proclamation of the Word a sacrament alongside the other sacraments".²⁸⁷ As R. Prenter puts it: "The connection between the preaching of the Gospel and the Sacrament does not mean a spiritualizing of the idea of the Sacrament but a sacramentalization of the message".²⁸⁸ Of course, there is no question here of Luther following the traditional Medieval teaching on ex opere operato in the sense that grace is imparted simply by virtue of an act being performed, without reference to any faith on the part of the recipient. Whether or not the listener recognizes the words of the pastor or doctor to be the Word of God depends on his faith, but this does not alter the fact that the Word is objectively present in both the sermon and the lecture:

A Christian, however, should certainly hold and say: God's Word is the same Word and just as much God's Word which is preached and read to prodigals, hypocrites, and the godless as to truly pious Christians and the godly... Thus, I am certain that whenever I enter the pulpit to preach or stand at the lectern to read, it is not my word, but my tongue is the pen of a ready writer, as the 45th Psalm says... So God and man must not be separated from one another, nor be distinguished according to the understanding and judgment of human reason; but we must say: What this man, prophet, apostle or honest preacher and teacher says and does at God's command and word, that says and does God himself, for he is God's mouthpiece or tool..."²⁸⁹

H.A. Oberman appears to limit Luther's understanding of the ex opere operato presence of the Word to "preaching" by which

he specifically means the "sermon".²⁹⁰ But as we have just seen, the Reformer clearly applies this concept as much to the doctor's lectio as he does to the pastor's sermo.

One notices the close parallel between Luther and Pierre d'Ailly on this point (supra, 75-6). Although the Wittenberger was highly critical of this Schoolman,²⁹¹ it seems that this did not prevent him from reading his works thoroughly; in fact, if we are to believe Melanchthon, he practically committed them to memory.²⁹² It is therefore not inconceivable that d'Ailly may have influenced his thinking on this particular matter. Luther certainly elevated the prominence of the doctor theologiae in the teaching ministry of the Church in a way not unlike d'Ailly and his Medieval counter-parts who shared similar conciliar sympathies.²⁹³ We have already seen how the Reformer used his doctoral status, even more than his ordination to the priesthood, as a means of justifying his reformatory work. And it is evident that he regarded the doctor theologiae who expounds Scripture in the lecture hall to be revealing God's Word just as authoritatively as the pastor in the pulpit - both are considered by Luther to be "God's mouth-piece". This is precisely why he attached such great authority to the "school" (i.e. the University of Wittenberg):

But whosoever after my death despises the authority of the school - so long as the Church and school remain as they are - is a heretic and an evil man. For in the school, God has revealed his Word. 294

When Luther says that "God has revealed his Word" in the school, he means this literally. The reference, as we have noted, is to the lectures of the doctors of theology who

expound Scripture in this institution. It is certainly not accurate to maintain, as Father Congar does, that the Reformer replaced the "magisterium of bishops" with a "magisterium of doctors" as the final arbitrator in matters of doctrinal interpretation.²⁹⁵ But neither is it accurate to maintain, as Professor Oberman seems to do, that Luther made the "sermon" alone the particular and unique locus of this authority.²⁹⁶ We have noted two characteristics of the Wittenberger's theology which, we believe, militate against accepting this conclusion expressed by Dr. Oberman:

i) Luther's failure to lay down an unambiguous theological foundation for his doctrine of ministry, and particularly, the spiritual nature of ecclesiastical office ; and, more importantly, ii) his failure to distinguish adequately between the pastoral and doctoral offices (i.e. "preaching" and "teaching").

PART TWO

CALVIN'S DISTINCTION BETWEEN
THE PASTORAL AND DOCTORAL "OFFICES"

Having learned something about the way in which Patristic and Medieval writers defined the office and function of the doctor ecclesiae, we can now begin our examination of Calvin's views on the matter with a better understanding of the various issues involved - issues that were undoubtedly well known to the Reformer owing to his great depth of knowledge in the fields of biblical theology and Church history. Calvin has quite rightly been assessed by several writers as being more a systematizer of doctrine than a creative theologian, so that one might expect to find greater lucidity in his treatment of this topic than in, say, Luther's writings. And, indeed, this seems to be the case. But Calvin himself has been charged with ambiguity in his treatment of the doctoral office.¹ This is certainly a legitimate criticism with respect to the number of ecclesiastical offices. Clearly, Calvin's thinking on this particular matter underwent a certain amount of evolution. More perplexing, however, seems to be the question of the Reformer's understanding of the nature and scope of the doctoral function in the Church and its relationship to the pastoral office.

In R.W. Henderson's book, The Teaching Ministry in the Reformed Tradition, the author maintains that the doctoral office gradually disappeared in later Reformed ecclesiologies, having been subsumed by the pastoral office. One of the major points of Dr. Henderson's thesis is that this occurrence was a departure from Calvin's position.² He is of the opinion that the Reformer held unreservedly to a fourfold division of ministry which included a "separate, peculiar, yet integral teaching office" that was entirely distinct from the pastorate.³ In fact, the fourfold division of

offices: pastor, doctor, elder, deacon, as set forth in Les Ordonnances ecclésiastiques de l'Eglise de Genève (1541), has been regarded by most writers as the definitive teaching of the Reformer on this matter.⁴ But we intend to show in the following chapters that such a view is not in accord with Calvin's true position. The difficulty, as we have said, revolves around his understanding of the relationship between the pastoral and doctoral "offices". Who exactly did he consider to be a doctor ecclesiae? How did the doctor's function differ from that of the pastor? Did Calvin consider pastors and doctors as two distinct "orders" of ecclesiastical government, or was the doctor simply performing a particular function (i.e. "office") within the one pastoral order?

As we have seen, such questions are not easily answered as we look at the situation in the Patristic, and especially, the Medieval Church. We should not suppose, therefore, that the answers to these questions become cut and dry when we arrive in the 16th century. John Calvin's thoughts on these matters are by no means altogether unique. In fact, in many ways it is clear that, with regard to these issues, he was very much a product of the Patristic and Medieval tradition, yet not in the sense of a servile imitator. The influence is certainly there, so much so that it would be easy to misconstrue the Reformer's position on these questions if one were not aware of this tradition. Still, Calvin has his own distinct contribution to make.

The "external order" of the Church, says Calvin, is divided into various ministries according to "the order and that form of polity (politae formam) which he [Christ] has prescribed".⁵



That is to say, the theological foundation of ministerial offices is the institutio Christi. To put it another way, the essential structure of the ministerial order is a matter of the ordinatio Dei or Dei iussum: "The whole government of the Church depends so much entirely upon his decree (decreto), that men are not permitted to interfere with it".⁶ Again, "No government is to be set up in the Church by the will of men, but...we are to wait for the command of God".⁷ Moreover, Christ has not only decreed that an external ministerial order should exist, but he has also decreed that this order should be divided into distinct offices: "The Lord (Paul says) is in us all, according to the measure of grace which he has bestowed upon each member. Therefore he has appointed some to be Apostolos, some true Pastores, some Evangelistas, some Doctores etc."⁸

At the same time, however, Calvin recognizes that the exact nature of the division of "offices" in the Church is not something which Christ himself has undertaken:

For we know that every Church has the freedom to frame for itself a form of government (politae formam) that is apt and useful for it, because the Lord has not prescribed anything definite.⁹

Thus, when Calvin maintains that "all Churches and each one in particular have powers to make laws and statutes for their common guidance",¹⁰ it is evident that he had in mind, among other things, Church polity. We also find the Reformer freely admitting that "it is difficult to make up one's mind about gifts and offices, of which the Church has been deprived for so long".¹¹ This did not mean, however, that Calvin relegated this question to the realm of adiaphora:

This much all concede, that order in the Church ought not be disturbed. The whole question [of

the Reformation] depends on the definition of order. Order requires that there be distinct functions (functiones), and this we concede: true conjunction is not repugnant to distinction. 12

There is no contradiction in Calvin here. His position is that Scripture does not provide us with detailed formulations about Church polity,¹³ but it does give us general principles which we must apply in order to insure that "in the sacred assembly of believers all things are done decently and with becoming dignity".¹⁴ The generality of these scriptural "rules" (regulae) allows for a certain amount of manoeuvrability, hence: "There is nothing to prevent those who hold different offices from accomplishing many things by common exertions ... nothing to prevent one, in any urgent necessity, from sometimes taking the place of another".¹⁵ But this does not mean that the polity of a Church should be indecisive or in a state of flux, for "no organization is sufficiently strong unless constituted with definite laws; nor can any procedure be maintained without some set form".¹⁶ To discover what "form" of polity Calvin envisaged for the Church of his day, we must examine his various dogmatic and exegetical works, as well as the relevant ecclesiastical documents of 16th century Geneva which the Reformer had a hand in drawing up.¹⁷

CHAPTER ONE

THE FOURFOLD DIVISION OF OFFICES IN

LES ORDONNANCES ECCLESIASTIQUES DE L'EGLISE DE GENEVE OF 1541

On 20 November, 1541, the General Council in Geneva promulgated a set of ordinances concerning the constitution of the Church in this city. It was not until some years later that these ordinances received the official title: Projet d'ordonnances sur les offices ecclésiastiques.¹⁸ Here, for the first time in the Reformed Church of Geneva's short history, a fourfold division of ministry was clearly set forth:

Ilya quartę ordres d'offices que nostre seigneur a instituté pour le gouvernement de son église. Premièrement les pasteurs, puis les docteurs, après les anciens, quartement les diacres. 19

There is no doubt that Calvin was the guiding light in the drafting of this document. Just over a month earlier, on 13 September, the Reformer arrived back in Geneva after having spent three years in Strasbourg.²⁰ Upon his return, Calvin made it known to the civic authorities that he would remain only on the condition that the Church would be substantially reorganized. His request was granted and the outcome was the Ordonnances ecclésiastiques.

The decision to structure the Church's ministry under four distinct "offices" or "orders" was certainly the work of the Reformer. He was undoubtedly influenced on this point by Martin Bucer, who had delineated a fourfold division of ministry in his Commentary on Romans (chapter 12) published in 1536.²¹ But one should also be aware that Bucer by no means treated this as an invariable form. In his famous work, De vera animarum cura, as well as the Ratio examinationis

canonicae, he speaks of only three offices.²² Elsewhere he maintains that "presbyters" and "deacons" are the two ministerial orders in the Church.²³ If Calvin was in fact responsible for the fourfold division in the Ordonnances, this was not the only way he expressed himself on this issue. Like Bucer, he exhibited a rather fluid attitude regarding the number of ecclesiastical offices during the early part of his career as a theologian (cf. infra, 125ff). However, from 1543 onwards, Calvin expresses his definitive position on this matter, having had time to formulate more clearly his views in light of, not only the Strasbourg experience, but also his experience as chief pastor in Geneva (cf. infra, 133ff). In the 1543 edition of the Institutio, and in each successive edition, the Reformer binds the doctoral function so closely with the pastoral office that he now envisages the Church's ministry as consisting of "three orders".²⁴ But before dealing with this question, we shall first look more closely at the Ordonnances.

We must bear in mind that, while Calvin was undoubtedly a dominant influence in drawing up these statutes, he was by no means the only one involved. In addition to other ministers in the city, six civil councillors also participated in this project.²⁵ Moreover, this document, having been prepared in a mere twenty days,²⁶ underwent considerable editorial work at the hands of various political Councils before finally being ratified. One should not, therefore, automatically assume that this work represents the definitive position of Calvin himself on this matter of polity.²⁷

The first order, the pasteurs, receives the fullest treatment. Among the issues dealt with were i) the method

of examining candidates for this important post; ii) the requirements for proper institution into office; iii) disciplinary measures; and iv) the frequency, place, and time of preaching the Word. In addition, a brief account of the duties and responsibilities of the pastor was given:

With regard to pastors, whom Scripture also sometimes calls overseers (surveillans), elders (anciens), and ministers (ministres), their office is to proclaim the Word of God for the purpose of instructing, admonishing, exhorting, and reproving, both in public and in private, to administer the sacraments, and to exercise fraternal discipline together with the elders (anciens) or delegates (commis). 28

The Ordonnances also stipulated that "if any difference over doctrine should arise, the ministers are to meet together to discuss the matter".²⁹ If a situation arises where no consensus of opinion can be reached, then the elders are to be invited to give their opinions on the matter. As a final resort, in order to maintain peace within the community, the magistrate should cast the deciding vote in the event of a deadlock. To encourage understanding and agreement over the interpretation of Scripture, "it will be expedient for them [the pastors] to meet together on one particular day of the week for discussion of scriptural passages, and no one shall be exempted from this without legitimate excuse".³⁰ These weekly meetings were later referred to as congrégations.³¹

The docteurs, according to the Ordonnances, comprised the second ordre in the Church. From the opening line of this section, it would appear that they shared one of the main functions of the pastor, for we read: "The proper office of docteurs is to instruct the faithful in sound doctrine in order that the purity of the Gospel may not be corrupted either by ignorance or by false opinions".³² One immediately

wonders why in the previous passage detailing the procedure for insuring doctrinal regulation in Geneva the docteurs were not mentioned.

The teaching of theology, however, was not the only item included under this order:

At the same time, as things are disposed today, we comprehend in this title [i.e. docteurs] the aids and instruments for preserving the doctrine of God and ensuring that the church is not desolated through the fault of pastors and ministers. 33

These "aids and instruments" are described in the following paragraph as langues et sciences humaines, that is, general education. This was something which was obviously considered essential for the well-being of the Genevan Church. For this reason, the statutes continue, "it will be necessary to build a college for the purpose of instructing them [children], with a view to preparing them both for the ministry and for the civil government".³⁴ This will require the services of men capable of teaching langues and dialectique. It is significant that the Ordonnances refer to these men, not as docteurs, but as lecteurs. Similarly, those who will be charged with "teaching little children" are given the title bacheliers.³⁵

Taken at face value, it might appear that not only the theologians, but all teachers in the projected college³⁶ were considered to be part of the doctoral ministry of the Church in Geneva. This, in fact, is the interpretation of most writers who, moreover, understand this to represent Calvin's own definitive position on the matter.³⁷ Such an interpretation may seem to be warranted by the statement that this second ordre should be associated with "the order of schools" (lordre des escolles).³⁸ But when we come to examine the Reformer's teaching on the nature and function of the doctoral

office in his exegetical and dogmatic writings (which, unlike the Ordonnances, were purely his own work), we find that such an interpretation cannot be attributed to him.³⁹ When Calvin speaks of the doctor ecclesiae, he is always referring to the one who expounds Holy Scripture and nothing else. In this regard he is in complete continuity with his Medieval predecessors. It is this writer's contention that the other teachers in the college (i.e. lecteurs and bacheliers), including the "professors" of languages and philosophy in the future Academy (1559), were not considered by the Reformer to be officeholders in the Church. This becomes clear when we examine the whole corpus of his writings on this subject in conjunction with the important question of the interrelationship between Church, School, and State.⁴⁰

Even Professor Henderson is forced to admit, when he comes to deal with the educational situation in Geneva (1541-1559), that "there is a real question as to which of them (i.e. the "masters" in the college) were entitled to the description of doctor".⁴¹ But why should there be any question at all if, as he had previously stated, the Ordonnances clearly "identify the term 'lordre des escolles' (l'ordre des escolles) as the common term for the doctoral office"?⁴² If his latter statement is really a correct interpretation of the Ordonnances, then one must regard all those employed in the college as "doctors of the Church" - as true officeholders in the spiritual ministry. But clearly, Henderson's reading of the historical data will not allow him to draw this conclusion. Indeed, there is irrefutable historical evidence that, in Calvin's mind at least, not all teachers in the college were

considered holders of ecclesiastical office (cf. infra, 218-220, re: Castellio). In this whole matter, one needs to be aware of Calvin's belief that the title "doctor" can be used in different ways (cf. infra, 139). In light of the historical evidence (cf. infra, PT.III) and Calvin's post-1541 writings dealing with this area of concern (cf. infra, 208ff.), one has to question whether the Ordonnances actually meant to identify the ecclesiastical "office" of doctor with the "order of schools".

The fact that all teachers in the college were under ecclesiastical discipline (la discipline ecclesiastiques)⁴³ does not ipso facto mean that they were also officeholders in the Church. There was, as we shall see, a particularly close relationship between the Church, School and State in Geneva during Calvin's day. The educational system in this city was run under the direction of the civic authorities, but since the school was the nursery for future ecclesiastical leaders, it was necessary that the spiritual government keep a watchful eye on all the teachers who were engaged in forming the childrens' minds. For this reason, the Church was given the authority to discipline morally those employed in the educational institutions.⁴⁴ The ecclesiastical government, in the form of the deacons, was also charged with managing the general hospital in Geneva. But this did not mean that all the staff in this institution (i.e. the surgeon, etc.) were officeholders in the Church. In the same way, we should say that not all the teachers in the college were considered "doctors of the Church".

Full weight must be given to the opening statement on the second ordre where it says that the function of the docteur

is to instruct the faithful in sound "doctrine".⁴⁵ This office is defined essentially, not by the general act of teaching, but by the content of this teaching, namely, doctrinal instruction in Holy Scripture. This is why the statutes go on to say that "le degre plus prochain au ministre et plus conioinct au gouvernement de lesglise est la lecture de theologie, dont il sera bon qu'il y en ait au vieil et nouveau testaments".⁴⁶

It is within the context of the college - an academic arena as opposed to a pastoral one - that the theologian normally performs his teaching function; hence, the reference to the "order of schools". Since the schoolmasters who were needed to instruct children in "langues et sciences humaines" also worked within the same milieu, and since this too was a pressing need in Geneva at this time - i.e. "as things are disposed today", then it was natural that the framers of the Ordonnances would include the question of general education at this point in the document. But this should not lead us to obscure the distinction made here, albeit none too clearly, between the theologian who alone was the true doctor ecclesiae, and the teacher of "secular" subjects (cf. infra, 161-2) who was not properly speaking an officeholder in the Church's spiritual government. We shall see that Calvin does in fact make this distinction, but before dealing with this important issue, we must first look more closely at a question we raised at the beginning of this section, that is, the question of whether or not the Reformer views "pastors and doctors" as one order and two distinct "offices", or as separate orders of ecclesiastical government.

CHAPTER TWO

CALVIN'S CONCEPT OF ECCLESIASTICAL "OFFICE"

In order to comprehend properly Calvin's understanding of the relationship between the pastoral and doctoral offices, it is first necessary to be aware of i) the way in which he understood and used the terms "office" and "order" and ii) how these terms are applied in his doctrine of ministry.

I. TERMINOLOGY

To express the idea of "work", "service", or "task" in his theological writings, the Reformer often uses the word functio, but just as frequently he will employ the terms officium and munus.⁴⁷ We find, for instance, that he can speak of regeneration and forgiveness as "two offices (officia) of Christ".⁴⁸ Elsewhere he distinguishes between the "proper office (officium) of the Gospel" and "its accidental [office]" (ab accidental).⁴⁹ Again, he writes: "All those to whom the office (munus) of teaching was enjoined they called presbyters".⁵⁰ And on another occasion: "For we are not concerned about some hereditary honour which can be given to men while they are sleeping, but about the office (munus) of preaching, from which they so strenuously flee".⁵¹

In addition to "work" or "task", the terms officium and munus can also be used by Calvin to convey the idea of "position" or "public status" which carries with it the notion of an established and formal recognition. This meaning is brought out clearly in the following passage:

But the Romanists today do not create their deacons for that purpose; for they charge them

only with ministering at the altar, reading or chanting the gospel, and goodness knows what trifles. There is nothing of alms, nothing of the care of the poor, nothing of that whole function (functio) which they once performed. I am speaking of the institution itself. For if we look at what they are doing it is not really an office (munus) for them, but only a step toward the priesthood. 52

Here the term munus is not just referring to a function or task, but specifically to the idea of public position or standing in the Church government. Sometimes this word is used in the same sentence to convey both these meanings: "Paul is not taking from women the munus of instructing their family, but is only excluding them from the teaching office (a munere docendi) which God has committed exclusively to men".⁵³ We should also note that the term officium is used interchangeably with munus when the Reformer is expressing the idea of "station" or "position": "The prophetic office (propheticum munus) was more eminent on account of the singular gift of revelation in which they excelled. But the doctoral office (doctorum officium) is very similar in character".⁵⁴

The twofold meaning given to the term "office" is referred to briefly in Calvin's Commentary on II Corinthians 9:11 where he writes: "The word that we render 'service' is in Greek λειτουργία, which sometimes means sacrificium [i.e. work or task] and sometimes a publicly assigned office (munus publice iniunctum)".⁵⁵ He then goes on to explain that almsgiving, for instance, is regarded as an "office" (officium) in the former sense of "sacrifice", because it is a work that everyone in the Church is engaged in.⁵⁶ There are several such offices which each member of the community has the responsibility to carry out on a day to day basis:

i.e. prayers, thanksgiving, witnessing, admonishing, consoling etc.

But office, as we have just seen, can also be used by Calvin to refer to a public position in the government of the Church that has been specifically instituted by Christ to ensure this institution's well-being. In the Medieval tradition, the term ordo is used to signify such an office and Calvin also uses this term in the same way (cf. infra, //4ff). Not every Christian holds "office" (ordo) in this sense. When we come to examine Calvin's teaching on the number and nature of ecclesiastical offices in his various writings, we shall find that it is often difficult to determine which of these meanings he is intending to convey when he employs the terms munus and officium. In each instance, one has to take into account the context in which these words are used.

II. THE DEFINITION OF "ECCLESIASTICAL OFFICE"

We must now ask what, to Calvin's way of thinking, constitutes a proper "ecclesiastical office" (i.e. ordo). How does he determine whether or not one should be considered a member of the "spiritual government" (spiritualis regimen) - a true officeholder in the Church? Calvin is very specific about this matter and treats it with great seriousness. One has to distinguish, he maintains, between those functions which are so-to-speak preparatory, rudimentary or non-essential and those which are regarded as "true ministries of the Church" (veris ministeriis Ecclesiae).⁵⁷ He is highly critical of the "Romanists" for turning certain "exercises" and "preparations" into "definite offices" (certa munera).⁵⁸ For one of

the fundamental characteristics of ecclesiastical office is that it is "not temporal, as if it were a preparatory school (paedagogia), but constant, so long as we live in the world".⁵⁹ This is why Calvin does not regard "readers", "acolytes" and other similar functionaries in the Roman Catholic Church as true "officeholders".⁶⁰ The functions these men perform may be a valuable asset to the community of faith, but it is entirely wrong to regard them as proper ecclesiastical "orders" (ordines).⁶¹

Calvin identifies the term "order" with public office. He can speak of one Church ordo in reference to the whole spiritual government,⁶² but he also refers to the various ministerial "orders" (pl.ordines) of the Church.⁶³ An "order", he says, "is the calling itself".⁶⁴ For Calvin, that which fundamentally distinguishes ecclesiastical orders from simple offices (i.e. functions, works) performed in the Church is this element of public recognition through the process of the "call" (cf. infra, 119ff). The "calling" (i.e. ordination) sets the individual "apart" in the sense that it gives the officeholder a position of authority in the Church that allows him (and not others) to perform a specific ministry.

Now the question is: How does one determine what constitutes a proper ordo of Church government? Calvin is insistent that it is not simply a matter of pragmatic efficacy. "The government of the Church...", he says, "is not contrived by men, but set up by the Son of God".⁶⁵ In fact, we should say that the Reformer bases his delineation of Church orders primarily on God's Word, while at the same time giving a certain authority to the writings of the Fathers (cf. especially

Institutio, Bk. IV, chapters IV and V). Thus, in his criticism of the Medieval Church's recognition of certain "chapter dignities" as proper orders of ecclesiastical government, he writes:

Assuredly, Christ's Word and the observance of the ancient Church exclude them from the office of presbyter...All such orders, by whatever titles they are designated, are innovations, surely not of God's institution, nor supported by ancient Church observance. Consequently, they ought to have no place in the description of spiritual government, which, when it was consecrated by the Lord's own words, the Church received. 66

Hence, to the question : Are "doorkeepers", "readers", "acolytes", "exorcists", "subdeacons", "canons", "deans", etc. entitled to be ordained into the spiritual government of the Church and thus receive public office, Calvin's answer is emphatic: "They have utterly nothing to do with true Church government".⁶⁷

And so, while upholding the Reformation principle of the "priesthood of all believers", Calvin maintains the biblical teaching that within this general ministry of the whole Church, the Lord himself calls forth a unique form of ordered ministry "to serve as his ambassadors in the world, to be interpreters of his secret will and, in short, to represent his person".⁶⁸ Not all Christians are called to participate in this special ministerial order. Moreover, as we have just seen, not every function or task performed in (or in association with) the Church - no matter how beneficial it may be to the community of faith - is to be regarded as an order of ecclesiastical government. For the ordered ministry consists of a specific "mode of governing" which has been "established by God forever".⁶⁹ This mode of governing extends to three specific areas of concern: i) the ministry of "Word and Sacrament",

ii) the "exercise of discipline", and iii) the "care of the poor".⁷⁰ All true and proper orders of Church government must fall under one of these categories. Since those so-called Roman orders listed above do not fully participate in these ministries, then "they ought to have no place in the description of spiritual government".⁷¹ To view them as "orders", says Calvin, "violates Christ's holy institution" (sanctam Christi institutionem violent).⁷²

The problem of true and false ecclesiastical offices or orders was not something the Church could take lightly. It was certainly not just a matter of semantics for the Reformer. This comes out clearly in his treatment of the biblical concept of "bishop". Calvin was not pedantic about the title given to the person charged with the ministry of the Word in the Church. He could refer to the holder of this office as "minister", "bishop", "pastor", "doctor", "elder", and "presbyter".⁷³ But this diversity of nomenclature must not, he asseverates, lead to a diversity of orders. He is willing to allow, even encourage, a certain "grading" or "ranking" among ministers because his exegesis clearly reveals that "although all ministers of the Word have the same office (commune idemque officium), yet there are degrees of honour among them".⁷⁴ And by honoris gradus he did not simply have in mind an honorary figure-head type of set up that lacked any real "power" of leadership, for this "ranking" was intended to ensure that one individual would have "authority and judgement over others" (unus aliquis auctoritate et consilio praeesset).⁷⁵

It is absolutely crucial to realize, however, that this auctoritate was not bestowed by the ordinatio Dei, not a

condition of ministerial order instituted by Christ, but strictly an authority delegated by men for the sake of organization and stability in the Church. Thus, this "ranking" among ministers of the Word had no spiritual basis, but was simply a politica distinctio dictated by the realities of nature.⁷⁶ Moreover, the "authority and judgment" exercised by the moderatores was under no circumstances to be used as a pretext for domination and imposition of one's own views. Rather it should always be employed in such a way "that it will neither obscure Christ's glory nor serve ambition or tyranny", nor prevent all ministers from cultivating mutual fraternity which implies "equal rights" and "liberties".⁷⁷

Calvin regarded "hierarchy" as an "improper term" to describe the relationship between ministers and offices because it tended to convey the idea of "lordship" and "principality" within the government of the Church.⁷⁸ And so, while the Reformer has nothing against the practice of ministers mutually appointing one man from among their numbers to act as an authoritative leader, he insists that this position in no way constitutes a separate and distinct ecclesiastical office or order:

For my own part, I do not find fault with the custom which has existed from the very beginning of the Church, that each assembly of bishops shall have one moderator; but that the name of office (officii) which God had given to all [the bishops] shall be conveyed to one alone, and that all the rest shall be deprived of it is both unreasonable and absurd.⁷⁹

No pastor (bishop) can be part of the spiritual government by virtue of his "moderation" alone, for this is not in itself a separate ecclesiastical order or office. It is

simply a specialized functio within the "ministry of the Word".

Thus, in addition to the elements of permanency, (i.e. having been instituted by Christ) and formal "calling", the other essential characteristic of Calvin's concept of ecclesiastical office (ordo) is that there is a specific and well-defined content to the services performed by each order. The civil magistrates were referred to by the Reformer as "vicars of God" (Dei vicarios), and he assigns to them "a most holy office" (sanctissimo munere).⁸⁰ Moreover, their office was essential for the well-being of the Church and of permanent validity. But he did not regard this "office" (as did L uther, Zwingli, and Bullinger) as part of the spiritual government. Magistrates did not perform a "sacred function" in the Church,⁸¹ and therefore were not part of the ecclesiastical order:

And are over you in the Lord: This appears to have been added to denote spiritual government (spiritualis regimen). Although kings and magistrates are also appointed by God to govern, yet because the Lord would have the government of the Church to be especially acknowledged as His own, those who govern the Church in the name and by the commandment of Christ are for this reason expressly described as being over in the Lord. 82

Consequently, Calvin sees a "clear distinction ... between the spiritual and civil government".⁸³ Similarly, while he regards anyone whose work benefits society - whether it be "ruling one's family, administering public or private business, giving counsel or teaching" - as having a true vocation,⁸⁴ such work is not to be included within the spiritual government, and not to be regarded as "sacred" functions. We must bear this in mind when we come to determine whether or not the various schoolmasters and professors teaching in the

Genevan Academy were understood by Calvin to be holders of ecclesiastical office.⁸⁵

III. THE SPIRITUAL NATURE OF ECCLESIASTICAL OFFICE : ORDINATION

Ministerial offices or orders in the Church are, as we have noted, inextricably linked with "calling": "No one shall assume a public office (publicam munus) in the Church without a call".⁸⁶ This is necessary for the very practical purpose of ensuring that "all things are done decently and in order".⁸⁷ Equating ecclesiastical office with the "call" eliminates the possibility of "noisy and troublesome men taking it upon themselves to teach and to rule".⁸⁸ However, the calling has much more than a sociological purpose for Calvin. By this act the officeholder is empowered, not just in a political sense, but also, and more importantly, in a spiritual sense - through ordination, to fulfill his ministerial responsibilities.

The calling has both an "internal" and "external" aspect to it.⁸⁹ Calvin sometimes refers to the former aspect as the "secret call" because it takes place in the consciousness of the intended minister and therefore cannot be "surely discerned" by others.⁹⁰ Nevertheless, the Church can use certain criteria for making a legitimate judgement on whether or not the candidate has truly received a calling from God:

How, then, shall we judge that any man has been sent by God, and is guided by the Spirit? By 'anointing', that is, if he is endued with the gifts which are necessary for that office. ⁹¹

This inner calling must always precede the external call of the Church, and the two can never be separated.⁹² The latter, therefore, is just as important as the former for proper ministerial order. The "outward and solemn" call consists of three parts: i) examination, ii) election, and iii) ordination. All prospective ministers must first be examined to see if they possess the two essential requirements necessary for membership in the spiritual government: "sound doctrine and holiness of life".⁹³

The final phase of the call is ordination. Here Calvin's views on the spiritual nature of ecclesiastical office become readily apparent. He criticizes several aspects of Rome's teaching on this matter which he feels to be entirely unscriptural, including the notion that through this act itself the Church can "confer the Holy Spirit".⁹⁴ And yet he is willing to agree with Rome that ordination can be regarded as a "sacrament":

Two sacraments were instituted at his [Christ's] coming which the Christian Church now uses, Baptism and the Lord's Supper. I am speaking of those which were established for the use of the whole Church. I would not go against calling the laying on the hands, by which ministers of the Church are initiated into their office (munus), a sacrament, but I do not include it among the ordinary sacraments. 95

Ordination is not one of the ordinari sacramentum because it pertains only to those who become officeholders in the Church. Yet the Reformer is nevertheless willing to refer to ordination as a sacrament because it is his opinion that this act, when administered and received properly, is made efficacious by the inward working of the Holy Spirit as in the case of Baptism and the Supper. It is, like the latter

two, a sign of an inner grace, for when one is "ordained to it [ministry] by a solemn rite, [he is] at the same time endued by the Holy Spirit with grace for the discharge of his task (functio). From this we gather that the ceremony was not in vain, since God by his Spirit effected that consecration which men symbolized by the laying on of hands".⁹⁶ Thus, the "grace" received at ordination "was not given in virtue of the outward sign", but by the work of the Holy Spirit. Nevertheless, this "sign" is not "uselessly or unprofitably employed, since it is a sure pledge of that grace which [ministers] receive from God's own hand".⁹⁷

This does not mean, however, that one can assume that all those who have been ordained are "true ministers of God".⁹⁸ Experience shows that not everyone who receives this "sacrament" faithfully discharges his office.⁹⁹ Moreover, it is theologically intolerable to bind the Holy Spirit to external signs in such a way so as to limit the Spirit's freedom. As in the case of the two ordinary sacraments, one must distinguish between the "sign" and the thing signified when considering the spiritual nature of ecclesiastical office through ordination.¹⁰⁰ Yet at the same time, one must give full weight to Calvin's contention that it is normal for ordination to be a "faithful symbol of spiritual grace".¹⁰²

One must bear in mind that when the Reformer speaks of the "grace" bestowed at ordination, he does not mean that by this act the recipient is given a spiritually superior "state" which places him in a relationship with God that is different from the layman. His concept of ecclesiastical office rules out completely the Roman understanding of it as characteres indelebiles that is stamped, so-to-speak, on the ordinand

irregardless of his personal faith and the actions he performs. The "grace" conferred by the Spirit at ordination refers strictly to the spiritual "gifts" which enable the minister to successfully "engage in and maintain the government of the Church"¹⁰³:

Those ordained are not to think of themselves promoted to an honour but charged with an office (munus) which they are with solemn attestation delegated to discharge. 104

When one ceases to fulfill the responsibilities of the order to which he has been called, then the grace - the ability to minister conferred at ordination ceases to exist, for this grace resides, not in the officeholder per se, but in the office:

Accordingly, we must here remember that whatever authority and dignity the Spirit in Scripture accords to either priests or prophets, or apostles, or successors of apostles, it is wholly given not to the men personally (non proprie hominibus ipsis), but to the ministry (ministerio) to which they have been appointed. 105

Officeholders in the Church are regarded by Calvin as "assistants" or "instruments" of God through which he accomplishes his purposes. Unless the power of the Holy Spirit accompanies "the planting and watering" they do, then the work of ministers will come to naught.¹⁰⁶ We should say, then, that the Reformer holds firmly to a sacramental view of ministry.

Having said this, one must at the same time attach equal importance to the fact that only certain individuals are "called" to participate in the spiritual government, and that this calling itself, that is, ordination, is not without real spiritual efficacy. Only those who hold "office" in the Church are fully qualified and prepared to engage in the great

and noble tasks of the Christian ministry, because only through the sacrament of ordination is one given, in full measure, the means by which to accomplish these activities:

If it was only at his ordination that Timothy obtained the grace needed to discharge his office (munus) as a minister, what is to be made of the election of a man not yet fit or qualified, but still lacking God's gift? I answer that its being given to him then did not exclude his having it before. It is certain that he excelled both in doctrine and in other gifts before Paul appointed him to the ministry. But there is no inconsistency in holding that when God purposed to use him in His work and called him to it, he then fitted and enriched him even more with new gifts and gave him a double portion of those He had given before. Thus it does not follow that Timothy had no gift before his ordination, but rather that it shone forth more brightly when the teaching [office] (docendi) was laid upon him. 107

This is why Calvin was willing to retain the Roman Catholic *terminology describing* ordination as a sacrament. He believed that the holders of ecclesiastical offices themselves, because of the "spiritual" and "sacred" nature of their work, that is, precisely because ministry was sacramental, must be accorded a degree of authority which other members of the congregation were not allotted:

It is the singular dignity of ministers of the Gospel to be sent by God to us with a mandate to be the messengers and in a manner the pledges of His good will towards us ... Ministers are given authority to declare this good news to us to increase our assurance of God's fatherly love towards us. It is true that any other person can also bear witness to us of God's grace, but Paul teaches that this task (functio) is laid specially upon ministers. Thus when a duly ordained minister (minister rite ordinatus) declares from the Gospel that God has been made propitious to us he should be heard as God's ambassador, carrying out a public office as God's representative, and endowed with rightful authority to make this declaration to us". 108

Such authority, however, must never be used as a pretext for "lording over" or "tyrannizing". Time and time again,

Calvin stresses that the essence of ecclesiastical office is "ministry" and "service" in the true pastoral sense of these terms.¹⁰⁹ It is for this very reason that the dignity and authority of ministers must be upheld.¹¹⁰ Hence, the Reformer maintains the medieval distinction between "clergy" (clericos) and "laity" (plebs).¹¹¹ All Christians who work for the benefit of society have a worthy calling, but those who are ordained to the spiritual government of the Church have a "higher calling".¹¹²

Having examined Calvin's use of the terms munus, officium and ordo as they relate to ministry, and his teaching on the definition and general nature of ecclesiastical office, we can now look more carefully at his doctrine of ministerial orders.

CHAPTER THREE
THE DIVISION OF OFFICES IN CALVIN'S
DOGMATIC, EXEGETICAL, AND OTHER WRITINGS

We have noted above that in the Ordonnances ecclésiastiques of 1541, a separate "order" (ordre) of docteurs, distinct from the order of pastors, was clearly set forth. We must now try to determine if this represented Calvin's definitive position.

Institutio : 1536 Edition

In the Reformer's 1536 edition of the Institutio, he speaks of only two public offices in the ecclesiastical government: "presbyters" (bishops, pastors) and "deacons".¹¹³ He is aware that a doctoral function exists in the Church (although he does not specifically mention what this entails), but he clearly understands this task to be carried out by the holder of the pastoral office.¹¹⁴

Letter to Sadoletto : 1539

Writing to Cardinal Sadoletto in 1539, Calvin comments: "Doctor primum, deinde pastoris munere in ecclesia illa functus sum".¹¹⁵ He now clearly makes some kind of distinction between the function of the doctor and that of the pastor. He began his career in Geneva, he says, not in the "pastoral office", but as a "doctor". He wrote these words during his sojourn in Strasbourg where, under the influence of the reformatory work of Martin Bucer, "doctors" were regarded as a separate ecclesiastical order.¹¹⁶ It seems quite reasonable to suppose that Calvin's thoughts regarding ministerial offices, like his views on other aspects of Christian doctrine, were influenced by the Strasbourg reformer. This would

certainly explain why, only three years after publishing his Institutio where no mention was made of doctors per se, he now, in his letter to Sadoleto (and also, as we shall see, in his Commentary on Romans), draws a distinction between the work of a doctor and that of a pastor. But Calvin was no servile imitator, even of those whom he held in high esteem. His usual pattern was to mull over thoroughly and digest what he learned at the hands of others, and then formulate his own understanding of the matter in accordance with Scripture. This is what he did with regard to his doctrine of ecclesiastical offices.

When Calvin mentioned in his letter to Sadoleto that he was first a doctor in Geneva, but not in the pastoral office, what kind of distinction was he making? Was this referring simply to the fact that he did not take on the parochial responsibilities of a pastoral charge? The Reformer's ecclesiastical status and the extent of his duties during the first months of his residence in this city have been something of a mystery to writers owing to the paucity of documentary evidence pertaining to this early stage in Calvin's career. Some believe that he was from the very start a "preacher", delivering "sermons" during services of worship.¹¹⁷ Others insist that he held no regular post at all.¹¹⁸ Both these views must be rejected. Despite the meagre amount of evidence, one can still affirm with a fair amount of certainty that the Reformer began his work in Geneva, not in the pulpit but at the lectern, and that this was an officially recognized post for which he was paid by the civic authorities.

Colladon and Beza

In his short biography of Calvin, Nicholas Colladon

specifically notes that the Reformer "accorda de demeurer (in Geneva), non pas pour prescher, mais lire en Theologie".¹¹⁹ And in Theodore Beza's Life of Calvin, he remarks that Calvin "delectus non concionator tantum (hoc autem primum recusarat), sed etiam sacraram literarum doctor, quod unum admittebat, est designatus anno Domini MDXXXVI mense Augusto".¹²⁰ Both these references support Calvin's remark to Sadoleto that he began his career in Geneva as a doctor and not as a pastor. Are we to assume that he did not preach at all during these first few months in Geneva? We must answer in the affirmative. There is, it is true, some evidence that Calvin was "preaching" before coming to this city. While studying law at Bourges (1529-1530)¹²¹ under the famous Italian jurist, Andreas Alciati, it was reported that Calvin often used "to preach" in the surrounding villages.¹²² But even, if this was an accurate description of the kind of exposition he was engaged in, all the evidence compels us to admit that the Reformer did not pursue this activity when he initially came to Geneva. In the first place, there is no extant account of his ever having preached a sermon during this early period. But more importantly, we have the reliable testimonies of Colladon and Beza. Colladon, as we have seen, quite specifically contrasts Calvin's first post - "reader in theology", with the function he refused to perform, namely, "preaching" (prescher). And Beza plainly states that the Reformer at first would not agree to be a "preacher" (concionator).

It would seem, then, that it was not just the parochial duties of a pastor that Calvin at first refused to discharge, but also the most essential function of this office, namely, "preaching". We may conjecture that even at this early stage

in his theological career, he held a very "high" doctrine of preaching, an activity which he regarded as being at the very centre of the pastoral office. Not being certain at this point of his calling, he at first resisted all attempts to induct him too hastily into the preaching order of the Church. It is therefore not surprising to find that the first mention of Calvin in the Registre du Conseil de Genève is made in reference, not to his sermons, but his lecturae. The Council minutes of 5 September, 1536, record that Guillaume Farel appeared before the councillors to commend the need of the theology lectures begun by Calvin, and to ask for a stipend towards his support: "Mag. Farellus exponit sicuti sit necessaria illa lectura qualem initiavit ille Gallus in S. Petro".¹²³ The tense of the verb initiavit would seem to indicate that these lectures had already been started by Calvin. The Registres do not mention the Reformer again until 13 February, 1537, when, still not having received any remuneration for the lectures he had given for more than five months, the Council finally ordered that six écus be paid.¹²⁴

Although he refused to preach, Calvin did allow himself to accept the post of doctor (lecteur; professor),¹²⁵ which required him to deliver theological lectures in a classroom situation. But why was he willing to fulfill the latter function and not the former? We should assume that the answer lies in the fact that he could perform the duties of a doctor without becoming part of the spiritual government of the Church. In order to preach, he would have had to accept ecclesiastical office and all the implications that this involved, particularly preaching. But he could apparently take

on the responsibilities of a doctor without having to commit himself to an ecclesiastical vocation. This is surely what he was referring to when, writing about his first months in Geneva in his introduction to the Commentary on Psalms, he says: "... Conscious as I was of the bashfulness and timidity of my nature, I would not bind myself to any definite office (certum munus)".¹²⁶ Not wanting to be ordained into the pastoral office at this point in his life, he limited himself to lecturing in the school, an activity which he clearly did not regard as a "definite office" in the Church.

There are two tentative conclusions we can draw from all this regarding Calvin's early understanding of the relationship between pastors and doctors. First, the doctoral function, even the teaching of theology, though part of the Church's ministry of the Word, was not in and of itself a proper ecclesiastical order. Secondly, he apparently regarded the teaching of Scripture by means of lectura as being distinct from preaching, although he does not yet make it clear what exactly this distinction implied.

Commentary on Romans : 1540

The Reformer's position on this matter is made somewhat more clear in his Commentary on Romans (1540).¹²⁷ Here Calvin again refers briefly to the doctor in the Church during his exposition of chapter 12:6-8, where the Apostle Paul is talking about certain "gifts" given to believers:

Thus under the term teaching (doctrina) he commends sound edification to doctors (doctores), and means: Let him that excels in teaching know that his object is that the Church should be truly taught, and let him have this one study only, to render the Church more learned by his teaching. A doctor is one who forms and instructs the Church by the Word of truth. 128

The Reformer therefore links the doctor with the gift of "teaching". Immediately after doctrina, the Apostle lists the gift of "exhorting". Now, had Calvin wanted to set forth a distinction between doctors and pastors as two separate public offices or orders in the Church government, this would have been the place to do it. However, neither here, nor anywhere else in this section of exegesis does he refer to the pastor. He goes on to link the gift of "giving" with the deacons, "who are charged with the distribution of the public property of the Church", and he links the gift of "ruling" with the elders (seniores), "who preside over and rule the other members and exercise discipline".¹²⁹ But nowhere does he use the term pastor. It is not that he has neglected to mention the pastoral office (i.e. "presbyters", "bishops", "pastors"), but he has equated it here with the term doctor. In this context, the doctor is the pastor. As we shall see, there are many instances in the Reformer's writings where he uses these two terms synonymously. This is one such case.

At the same time, Calvin is intent on preserving the distinction, made by Paul himself, between the functions of "teaching" and "exhorting":

These functions (officia) have a close relationship to and connection with each other. They do not, however, cease on this account to be different. No one can exhort without teaching (doctrina); yet he who teaches is not at once endowed with the gift of exhortation.

Calvin does not explain here what exactly he meant by "exhortation", but an examination of his other writings clearly reveals that he equated this term with "preaching".¹³⁰ There is, then, a sharp distinction in his mind between the

functions of preaching (exhortation) and teaching, and, as we shall see, he maintains this distinction throughout his writings.

In the passage cited above, he refers to these functions as officia. Here we have an instance where Calvin employs this term not to signify public position or office, but simply the idea of task or function. He is not saying here that the one who teaches holds a separate public "order" in the Church from the one who preaches (exhorts). Had he meant to say this, then he would have made reference to pastors as well as doctors. But in this passage he refers only to three officeholders: "doctors", "deacons", and "elders". It is of some significance that within the order of deacons Calvin finds two separate functions: "The functions (functiones)¹³¹ of providing what is necessary for the poor, and of devoting care to their attention, are different".¹³² In the same way, "teaching" and "exhorting" (preaching) are depicted here as two distinct functions within the one public office or order of the Church, which is referred to in this passage as the "doctoral office". His choice of terminology (i.e. "doctoral" instead of "pastoral") would seem to be a result of his close association at this time with Bucer who, as we have seen, placed much importance on the office of doctor.

Institutio : 1539 Edition and 1541 French Translation

In the 1539 Latin edition of the Institutio and its French equivalent published in 1541,¹³³ we once again find no separate doctoral office which is distinct from the pastoral office. It is true that the Reformer now employs both the term "pastor" and "doctor",¹³⁴ but nowhere does he make these into two public orders of Church government. Rather, we find that

his position on this matter is the same in these dogmatic works as in his Commentary on Romans. Here too he refers to the "deacons",¹³⁵ the "elders",¹³⁶ and the Docteurs de l'Eglise.¹³⁷ Regarding the latter, he writes: "Il est nécessaire que ceux qui sont ordonnez Docteurs de l'Eglise ayent des excellens dons [of Christ's grace] singulièrement par dessus les autres".¹³⁸ By itself, this passage tells us nothing about who Calvin had in mind when he used the term docteur. But it is evident from the rest of the chapter (i.e. chapter XV: De la puissance ecclésiastique) that he was using this term to refer, as he did in his Commentary on Romans, to the ministry of the Word in general, for he goes on to explain that "doctors", like "bishops" and "prophets", fall within the same ecclesiastical office as pastors:

It is necessary for us to be aware that their (pasteurs) entire office (office) is limited to ministration in the Word of God, all their wisdom to the understanding of that Word, and all their eloquence in the preaching of it (la prédication d'icelle). If they wish to decline, they are false in their sentiments, traitors and infideles in all their office (en tout leur office), whether they be Prophètes, Evesques, Docteurs, or be established in a greater dignity. 139

The only other significant place where docteurs are mentioned is in the foregoing paragraph where, commenting on II Peter 2:1 - "But there will be false prophets among the people (of Israel) just as there will be false teachers among you", Calvin writes: "Voyezvous comment il advertit que le danger ne sera point des idiotz d'entre le populaire, mais de ceux qui se tiendront fiers de tiltre de Docteurs et de Pasteurs".¹⁴⁰ It is important to note that he refers to the tiltre of Doctors and Pastors and not office. Different "titles", as we have seen (i.e. in the case of

bishops), do not necessarily imply for Calvin different offices or orders. There is nothing here to suggest that he was establishing a separate order of doctors, and when taken in conjunction with the paragraph quoted above, we should say that this is surely the right conclusion to draw.

We have already noted above (supra, 104.) that in the same year as this French edition of the Institutio was published, a fourfold division of offices was set forth in the Ordonnances ecclésiastiques where pastors and doctors were depicted as two separate "orders". Does this represent a further development in Calvin's thinking, or is it better understood as an anomaly? If the former, then one would expect to find this fourfold division preserved in the Reformer's later writings, but in fact this is not the case.

Institutio : 1543 Edition

In the new 1543 Latin edition of the Institutio, Calvin goes into considerably more detail regarding the nature and division of ecclesiastical offices. It is with the latter aspect that we are primarily concerned in this section. All the relevant material on this question found in the 1543 Institutio is preserved unaltered in each successive edition, including the definitive edition of 1559.¹⁴¹ By 1543 then, Calvin's views on ministerial offices, at least as expressed in his dogmatic work, had reached their final development.

The Reformer begins the section on ecclesiastical offices thus¹⁴²:

Those who preside over the government of the Church (ecclesiae regimen) in accordance with Christ's institution are called by Paul as follows: first Apostles, then Prophets, thirdly Evangelists, fourthly Pastors, and finally Doctors. Of these only the last two have an ordinary office in the Church (ordinarium in Ecclesia munus habent). 143

We must first point out that the elders and deacons are not dealt with until a few sections later.¹⁴⁴ Paul does not mention these offices in Ephesians 4:11, says Calvin, because he is only concerned with describing at this point the various functions pertaining to the "ministry of the Word".¹⁴⁵ Calvin chooses to start here because this is the most important order in the spiritual government.¹⁴⁶ Now in the above quotation, he has stated that only pastors and doctors have an "ordinary office" when it comes to the ministry of the Word in the Church. We are faced with the problem of deciding whether to interpret the term munus to mean public office (implying two separate ecclesiastical orders), or understanding it simply in the sense of task or function.

We note that in this same section, Calvin goes on to speak of apostles, evangelists, and prophets as "three functions" (tres functiones) which "were established in the Church as permanent ones but only for that time during which Churches were to be erected where none existed before, or where they were to be carried over from Moses to Christ".¹⁴⁷ One might think that, because he used the term munus in connection with pastors and doctors, and the term functio with apostles, evangelists, and prophets, it would be reasonable to assume that the former term referred to a public office rather than simply a function. But this reasoning does not hold, for a few lines later Calvin also refers to the apostolic function as munus.¹⁴⁸ Hence, we should not automatically assume merely from the fact that he uses the term munus in connection with doctors that he meant this in the sense of a separate and distinct ecclesiastical order.

Yet he obviously made some kind of distinction between

pastors and doctors because he continued to use these two terms. This is made clear in the concluding paragraph of the section:

Next come Pastors and Doctors, whom the Church can never go without. There is, I believe, this difference between them: Doctors are not put in charge of discipline, or administering the sacraments, or warnings and exhortations, but only scriptural interpretation (Scripturae interpretationi) - to keep doctrine whole and pure among believers. But the pastoral office (pastorale munus) contains in itself all these things. 149

That Calvin is intent on differentiating between pastors and doctors is also reinforced in the next section where he makes the following formulation:

If we group Evangelists and Apostles together, we shall then have two pairs that some how correspond with each other (duo paria quodammodo inter se respondentia). For as Doctors correspond to the ancient Prophets, so do our Pastors to the Apostles. The prophetic office (propheticum munus) was more eminent on account of the singular gift of revelation in which they excelled. But the office of Doctors (Doctorum officia) is very similar in character and has exactly the same purpose. 150

We should not press Calvin too far on this innovative bit of exegesis, since we find elsewhere (cf. infra, 140 and Part IV, 257) that he more closely associates the prophetic office with the pastoral office by actually distinguishing between "Prophets" and "Doctors" and equating "prophecy" with "preaching". This should warn us against using this passage as proof that Calvin regarded "Pastors and Doctors" as two separate orders of Church government.

If he was not establishing here a formulation of public offices, he did at least envisage a corps of men responsible for interpreting Scripture in the Church of his day (N.B. the reference to "our Doctors"), who could not properly be called pastors since they were not responsible for certain

pastoral duties. But at the same time it is essential to realize that the function of scriptural interpretation was not confined to the doctors. This was not a separate task laid upon the doctor alone, but a particular kind of scriptural interpretation within the pastoral office, a point which Calvin appears to make when he writes later in this passage: "Pastorale autem munus haec omnia in se continet".¹⁵¹

It was a primary duty of the pastor "to proclaim the Gospel" which also involved him in "giving instruction in sound doctrine (exhortari per doctrinam sanam), and also to confute those who contradict it".¹⁵² Both pastors and doctors then, were charged with scriptural interpretation. However, in addition to this, the pastor was also responsible for two other essential tasks not shared by the doctor: "administering the sacred mysteries and keeping and exercising upright discipline" (eg. "warnings and exhortations").¹⁵³ The distinction, therefore, between pastors and doctors was not that they held separate public offices in the Church, but that each was allotted different functions within the one order - the "ministry of the Word". This interpretation is born out by what follows.

Having distinguished the permanent functions in the ministry of the Word from the temporary ones, Calvin then goes on to discuss the nature of all the orders in the government of the Church. We find that he first deals with pastors (Inst. IV.3.6-7, OS, V:47-50); then with elders (Inst. IV.3.8, OS,V:50); and finally with deacons (Inst. IV.3.9,OS,V:50-51). One immediately notices that doctors are not mentioned. We understand why when Calvin comes to summarize these sections:

We have stated that Scripture sets before us three kinds of ministers (triplices ministros). Similarly, whatever ministers the ancient Church had it divided into three orders (in tres ordines). For from the order of presbyters (ex ordine presbyterorum) part were chosen pastors and doctors (Pastores ac Doctores); the remaining part were charged with the censure and correction of morals [elders]; the care of the poor and the distribution of alms were committed to the deacons. 154

This makes it quite clear that the Reformer recognizes only three orders in the contemporary Church. Doctors are not mentioned in the discussion of the nature of ecclesiastical offices (Inst. IV.6-9) because they perform a task which is an integral part of the pastoral order (i.e. scriptural interpretation). This is apparently the reason why Calvin does not regard doctors by themselves as constituting a separate and distinct Church order. Rather, they are depicted as performing a particular function within the one order of ministering the Word. By binding doctors so closely with the pastoral office, we believe that Calvin is saying something very important about the nature and scope of the Church's teaching ministry - a point we shall be discussing in the following section.

Commentary on I Corinthians : 1546

The Reformer once again touches upon the question of "offices" in his Commentary on I Corinthians (1546), chapter 12:28 where we read: "And in the Church God has appointed first Apostles, secondly Prophets, thirdly Doctors, then miracles, then gifts of healing, helps, governments, diverse kinds of tongues". Calvin is of the opinion that Paul is speaking specifically here about public offices or orders in Church government and not simply facultates: "At the beginning of the chapter Paul has spoken about facultatibus; now

he takes up the discussion of offices (officia)".¹⁵⁵ By the term facultates Calvin has in mind the idea of "works" or "functions". It is his Latin translation for the Greek word ἐνεργήματα which comes from the verb ἐνεργεῖν (to work).¹⁵⁶ More accurately, the term facultates connotes for Calvin the notion of "gifts" (dona) or "abilities" that are bestowed on various individuals in the Church. "Gifts" (dona, facultates) are not to be equated with public offices or orders (officia, muneri, ordines).

Of course, nobody can be called and inducted into public office unless God has first provided him with the requisite gifts.¹⁵⁷ However, not every particular gift constitutes a separate order of spiritual government. Similarly, not everyone who has received a "gift" is necessarily an officeholder.¹⁵⁸ This is why Calvin, when discussing the question of offices in the passage we are presently examining, passes over "miracles and the gifts of healing", instructing the reader to consult a previous section where he deals specifically with the question of gifts.¹⁵⁹ When he comes to expound the meaning of Paul's reference to "helps", he interprets this in such a way so as to make it apply to the order of deacons:

Because the Apostle is detailing offices (officia) here, I do not accept Chrysostom's view that the word ἀντιλήμψεις (i.e. "supports" or "helps") means upholding the weak. What does it mean, then? Surely either it refers to something which has both an office (munus) and a gift (donum) in the Church of long ago, but of which we have no knowledge now; or it has to do with the work of the diaconate, that is to say, the care of the poor. I prefer the second explanation. ¹⁶⁰

He also takes the term "governments" (gubernationes) to mean the office of elders (seniores) who were responsible for discipline.¹⁶¹

Regarding the other offices listed by Paul in this passage -

Apostles, Prophets, and Doctors, Calvin first notes that this is only a partial list. A fuller enumeration of offices (munerum) is found in Paul's letter to the Ephesians (4:11), "although not even there does he mention all of them".¹⁶² With respect to the "office of doctor" (officium doctoris), we are once again informed that, unlike the apostles and prophets, this is a "permanent" office. Calvin then makes it quite clear that by the term officium doctoris he understands Paul to mean the "pastor".¹⁶³ The fact that the Reformer makes this identification gives further support to the argument that he nowhere, in his exegetical or dogmatic works to date, tries to establish a separate and distinct order of doctors. Since the Apostle has not included pastors in his list, the Reformer has assumed that by the term doctor he was referring to the pastoral office.

Calvin then goes on to explain that the "title" (nomen), "Doctor", can be used in different ways.¹⁶⁴ It is not insignificant that he uses the word nomen here and not officium or munus. The title "Doctor", he says, can refer to those men whose function in the Church consists entirely in "preserving and propagating sound doctrines (sana dogmata)".¹⁶⁵ But it can also refer to the "Pastor",¹⁶⁶ and, as we have just seen, this is how Calvin himself interprets Paul's reference to doctores in the text we are now examining. In addition to these two meanings, the title "Doctor", he says, can be taken in a "general sense" (generaliter) to mean "all those who are equipped with the gift of teaching" (pro omnibus qui docendi facultate sunt instructi).¹⁶⁷

This multiple usage of the term doctor explains why Calvin can at times draw a sharp line of distinction between prophets

and doctors, and at other times see them as synonymous. In this particular passage, for instance, he is intent on pointing out that prophets refer to those men who "were blessed with the unique gift of dealing with Scripture, not only by interpreting it, but also by the wisdom they showed in making it meet the needs of the hour".¹⁶⁸ He wants to stress the point that prophets (like the pastors) were not only concerned with interpreting Scripture, but also with applying it to the practical exigences of the day (i.e. by foretelling future events, warnings, threats, consolations, and exhortations).¹⁶⁹ The function of doctors, on the other hand, that is, the doctors who were not pastors, consists only in the first part of the prophetic office - scriptural interpretation. They are not involved with the "application" of this teaching and all that this implied. Prophets and doctors are therefore sharply distinguished here. But when Luke speaks of doctors in Acts 13:1 - "In the Church at Antioch there were prophets and doctors", Calvin feels that in this context one should understand these terms to be synonymous.¹⁷⁰ In the same way, as we have already noted, the Reformer will often use the word doctor when he is specifically referring to the pastoral office.¹⁷¹ Quite clearly this is what Calvin has done in his exegesis of I Corinthians 12:28, where the Apostle refers to the "office of doctors". The Reformer makes no attempt here to establish a separate order of doctors distinct from that of pastors.

Commentary on Ephesians : 1548

In his Commentary on Ephesians (1548), Calvin goes into more detail regarding his understanding of the relationship between pastors and doctors. In order to extract his true

position on this matter as expressed here, one must pay special attention to his wording. Calvin's discussion of offices is found in his comments on chapter 4 verse 11 where he expounds Paul's statement that Christ "gave some to be Apostles; and some Prophets; and some Evangelists; and some pastors and doctors". He has already mentioned that this is not a complete list of ecclesiastical offices in the ancient Church, but pertains only to the "ministry of the Word". This is why Paul does not mention here elders or deacons.

Calvin begins his exegesis of this passage by noting that Paul is writing about the various public offices of Church government: "Now, we might be surprised that, when he is speaking of the gifts of the Spirit, Paul should enumerate offices (officia) instead of gifts (donorum). I reply, whenever men are called by God, gifts are necessarily connected with offices".¹⁷² However, it is crucial to realize that when he comes to discuss the relationship of pastors and doctors, his terminology changes, and he now speaks of functiones instead of officia or muneris: "Five sorts of functions (functionum) are mentioned, though at this point, I am aware that there is diversity of opinions; for some considered that the last two make one [i.e. functio]"¹⁷³

Chrysostom and Augustine, he says, are examples of two prominent theologians who make no distinction whatsoever between pastors and doctors. They base their judgment on the fact that there is no disjunctive particle, as in the other parts of the verse, to distinguish them. Calvin cannot agree with them that there is no difference at all between doctors and pastors, a point he has already touched upon briefly in his commentary on I Corinthians 12:28. Pastors are, indeed,

doctors, he says, but there is also "another kind of doctor":

Teaching is the duty of all pastors, but there is a particular gift (donum) of interpreting Scripture, so that sound doctrine (ut dogmatum sanitas) may be kept, and a man may be a doctor (doctor) who is not fitted to preach (concionando). Pastors, to my mind, are those to whom is committed the charge of a particular flock (gregis). I have no objection to their receiving the name of doctors (doctorum), if we realize that there is another kind (alterum genus) of doctor, who superintends both the formation of pastors and the instruction of the whole Church. Sometimes he can be a pastor who is also a doctor, but the facultates [NB. not officia or muneris] are different. 174

Clearly, Calvin is attempting here to underscore the distinction he sees between pastors and doctors. But this distinction does not imply two separate public offices or orders of Church government. What distinguishes pastors from doctors is the nature of their respective functions - the kind of work (facultates) they perform. They are distinguished, not by virtue of "office", but by virtue of their "gifts". Thus, when Calvin writes: "Verum ratio illa me non movet, ut duo haec confundam quae video inter se differe", we should translate thus: "But this does not move me to confound the two [i.e. the two kinds of functions - not two public offices] which I see to differ from each other".¹⁷⁵ On account of Chrysostom's and Augustine's failure to differentiate between the function of the pastor proper, and the more specialized doctoral function, he finds it necessary to disagree with them. But it is essential to notice that a few sentences later he does agree with these two Fathers on another point: "That Paul speaks indiscriminately of pastors and doctors as if they are one and the same order (ordo)".¹⁷⁶ In other words, while the particular functions ("gifts") of the pastor and doctor differ and are not to be confused, they both belong

to the same order of spiritual government. Thus, Calvin continues to regard pastors and doctors as constituting one ecclesiastical office just as he had done in his commentaries on Romans and Corinthians, as well as in every edition of the Institutio.

The interesting aspect of the Reformer's description here of the relationship between pastors and doctors is that, although they constitute only one order in the Church, there is a division of labour within this order which is so marked that different titles must be assigned to each functionary in order to indicate this difference. That is to say, within the one order, pastors and doctors have different "offices" (i.e. functions). One of the distinguishing features of the pastoral function is that it is carried out within a particular "flock" and involves all the responsibilities which the cura animarum entails. Doctors, on the other hand, are not charged with a specific congregation but perform their task within the context of the Church as a whole. Again, Calvin does not indicate where exactly this doctoral function takes place, but given the historical situation in Geneva (cf. infra 208ff.), we may assume that the doctor interpreted Scripture in an academic arena, that is, a "university", as opposed to a pastoral milieu.

This brings us to the second distinguishing feature between pastors and doctors which is only touched upon briefly here by Calvin. He ascribes to the doctor a special ability (facultas) or gift (donum) for "scriptural interpretation". The Reformer viewed this particular function of the doctor as being distinct from "preaching", for he says, "a man may be a doctor [i.e. able to teach by interpreting Scripture]

who is not fitted to preach (concionando)".¹⁷⁷ The distinction between a doctor's "teaching" and a pastor's "preaching" appears, therefore, to be one of Calvin's basic criteria for insisting, in opposition to Chrysostom and Augustine, upon a division of labour within the ministry of the Word that results in two quite separate functions.¹⁷⁸ We shall be discussing the implications of this in Part Four.

Letter to the King of Poland : 1554

In Calvin's letter to the King of Poland,¹⁷⁹ we find further evidence that he did not envisage a separate order of doctors in the regular government of the Church, and at the same time we learn about another important characteristic of the doctoral function. The Reformer discusses this matter within the context of his advice to the Polish King concerning the reformation of the Church in his country which, as Calvin sees it, has been thoroughly corrupted by "Popery". The means he suggests for initiating this reformation hinges on the appointment of "fitting and upright doctors" (idoneos et probos doctores)¹⁸⁰ whose charge it would be "to spread the seeds of the gospel (evangelii semen) far and wide".¹⁸¹ These doctors, having first shown evidence of being "divinely called" (divinitus vocati),¹⁸² are able, according to Calvin, to be justifiably appointed by royal authority alone:

Because wolves now occupy the shepherds place, and since it might be thought too violent a remedy if pastors (pastores) had no other calling than being created by royal authority alone, then the method I would suggest is that your majesty should only institute doctors (tantum doctores institueret) to spread the seeds of the gospel far and wide. However, this should be a temporary office (temporale munus), lasting only as long as things should remain in their present unsettled and precarious state. For it is not possible that the public government of the Church (publica ecclesiae gubernatio) can

be immediately changed. 183

It is highly significant that Calvin will not sanction the appointment of pastors solely by royal authority, but that he is willing to allow doctors to be elected in this way. Hitherto, the Reformer has been writing in some detail about the logistics of establishing a properly constituted ministry (ordinarium ministerium).¹⁸⁴ He makes it plain to the King that all true officeholders in the spiritual government must be inducted into office by the following procedure: i) selection by the judgment of the pastors (ut pastorum iudicio electus) who have already been ordained; ii) presentation of the candidate to the whole congregation for approval; and finally, iii) "the solemn imposition of hands, which is called ordination" (Huc accedet solemnis manuum impositio, quam ordinationem vocant).¹⁸⁵

By allowing for the possibility of these doctors to be appointed simply on the authority of the King alone, without having to go through the above procedure, Calvin demonstrates that he does not regard such doctors, in and of themselves, as constituting a proper order in Church government. This is why he describes them as having a "temporary office". A few lines earlier he refers to them as holding an "extraordinary office" (extraordinarium munus).¹⁸⁶ When Calvin uses the term munus here, we should interpret it in the sense of a public office or order of spiritual government. He is not saying that the function of "spreading the seeds of the gospel" is temporary, but that the doctor by himself does not constitute a true and regular public office.

There are special circumstances, as in the case of Poland, when doctors - learned theologians, should be appointed to

help rid the Church of abuses as a "preliminary step" in the process of reformation.¹⁸⁷ In this regard, there appears to be a close parallel in Calvin with Wyclif's concept of the doctoral office (cf. infra, 84 -85). Such men can be elected by the King alone, without contravening the precepts of Scripture regarding the required procedure for the "external call" to ecclesiastical office, precisely because the doctor is not a proper order in the Church. We are not presented with a new interpretation of the doctor in this letter. What the Reformer has written here is perfectly consonant with what he has been saying all along about the doctoral office. In fact, we should say that this describes the status Calvin himself held when he first came to Geneva. His initial months in this city, he says, were spent, not as a pastor, but as a doctor (cf. supra, 125 ; Letter to Sadoleto). This latter function he later described, in the preface to his Commentary on Psalms, as "not a definite office". It would appear, then, that the Reformer was alluding to his own work as a doctor during this early stage in his career when, in the letter to the Polish King, he writes:

But God himself brings the remedy in raising up fitting and upright doctors to build up the Church, now lying deformed among the ruins of Popery. And this was a wholly extraordinary office which the Lord laid upon us (nobis) when he made use of our (nostra) works in gathering Churches. 188

The doctor which Calvin is describing in this letter was, it seems, the "extraordinary office" he himself held when he first came to Geneva. As a doctor, he was not properly a member of the regular spiritual government of the Church (i.e. not holding a "definite office"), since he had been appointed to this post, not by the approbation of a congregation and

the "sacrament" of ordination, but simply on the authority of the civic rulers. He was performing a valuable service in the Church, yet his status was not that of an ecclesiastical officeholder.

Here Calvin is setting forth a view of the doctor ecclesiae that is very similar to that of the Medieval Church. In this institution, as we have seen, there was no separate and distinct "order of doctors" in the essential ecclesiastical hierarchy who were distinguished from the order of bishops or priests. Yet at the same time we have noted that a distinctive doctoral function existed in the Medieval Church - a function carried out within the milieu of the university, which was quite different from the parochial task of the priesthood. However, Calvin's doctor, unlike his Medieval counterpart, was not necessarily drawn from the ranks of the ordained ministry. At least, this was true for Calvin in theory, although in practice, as we shall see, the doctor ecclesiae in Geneva was invariably a pastor or soon became one after attaining doctoral status (cf. infra, 212ff.). Since doctors per se were not part of the spiritual government - not a distinct ecclesiastical order, then they could, under certain conditions, according to Calvin, be appointed by the secular authorities to function in the place of pastors. In other words, the Reformer regarded the establishment of "lay" doctors as a legitimate practice, just as Wyclif had done in the 14th century. In normal circumstances, doctors are not dispensed with, but they no longer constitute an independent order of Church government. They are replaced by the regularly called pastoral order, and are thereby relegated to the position of specialized functionaries within the ministry of the Word,

a task which Calvin deems particularly important as we have seen from his comments on Ephesians 4:11. We might ask whether, under normal conditions, doctors could still be appointed by the secular authorities alone, and whether the "lay" theologian was still a possibility. Calvin does not deal with these questions in this letter. We must withhold discussion of these matters until we come to deal with the actual practice in Geneva.¹⁸⁹

Confession De Foi : 1559

In 1559, Calvin, possibly in consultation with Viret and Beza, drew up a Confession of Faith at the request of the French Reformed Churches for use in their congregations.¹⁹⁰ Given our foregoing analysis of the Reformer's writings to date, it comes as no surprise to find in the Confession de foi l'Eglise de Paris that a threefold division of offices is clearly laid down:

We believe that no person should undertake to govern the Church upon his own authority, but that this should be done through election (par election), as far as possible, and as God allows. We make this notable exception because sometimes, and even in our own day, when the state of the Church has been interrupted, it has been necessary for God to raise men in an extraordinary manner (d'une facon extraordinaire) to restore the Church. But be that as it may, we believe that one ought always to conform to this rule (nous croyons qu'on se doit tousiours conformer a ceste regle): that all Pastors (Pasteurs), Elders (Surveillans) and Deacons (Diacres) should have evidence of being called to their office (office).¹⁹¹

In an earlier section (article 25), the Confession again refers to the government (la police) of the Church and here too we find that the doctor is notably absent from the three orders listed: Pastors, Elders, and Deacons.

Institutio : 1559 Edition

Calvin's definitive edition of the Institutio was published in the same year as this Confession. Here again we find, as we have already noted, that the threefold division of offices - pastor, elder, deacon, continued to be promulgated by the Reformer. One wonders why, in the revision of the Ordonnances ecclésiastiques undertaken in 1561, Calvin did not alter the fourfold division of offices set forth in the original draft to conform to the position he consistently takes in his dogmatic, exegetical and other writings.¹⁹²

We have seen that throughout Calvin's works he refuses to make the doctor a separate order of Church government. The Ordonnances should not, therefore, be regarded as his definitive position on this matter. At the same time, the Reformer insisted on distinguishing between the pastoral and doctoral functions (i.e. "offices") within the ministry of the Word. We have noted in passing that one of the essential grounds for maintaining this difference had to do with Calvin's distinction between "preaching" the Word and "teaching" the Word. Before dealing with this important issue, we shall first consider the equally important question of the nature of the doctor's task. Who exactly was regarded as a doctor ecclesiae in Geneva? What was the scope of his concern?

PART THREE

THE DOCTOR ECCLESIAE IN CALVIN'S GENEVA

CHAPTER ONE

THE SPIRITUAL AND POLITICAL GOVERNMENTS

We have seen in the foregoing section that Calvin recognized a doctoral function in the regular ministry of the Church which was distinct from the pastoral function. According to the Reformer, the doctor ecclesiae did not confine his teaching activities to a local congregation as the pastor did, but was responsible for "instructing the whole Church". This meant that his didactic duties were carried out within an academic milieu; that is, the doctor, under normal circumstances, taught in a classroom as opposed to a service of worship. That this was Calvin's own understanding is demonstrated by his letter to Sadoleto (cf. supra, 125; also 172ff) where he says that he first functioned in the Genevan Church as a "doctor". Since we know that he began his career in this city, not as a preacher, but as a lecturer in the Collège de Rive, then we can conclude that the Reformer himself, regarded such academic institutions as being a proper context in which to carry out the Church's doctoral function.

This is confirmed by the Ordonnances where the doctor is clearly associated with "l'ordre des escoles". However, an important question we must now attempt to answer is whether Calvin regarded all teachers in the schools of Geneva as holders of ecclesiastical office, that is, as participants in the Church's doctoral ministry. It seems that the consensus among scholars is that he did.¹ H.Y. Reyburn, for instance, writes: "The second order of officials is the teachers. Calvin distinguished the ministers from the teachers by saying that teachers have no concern with discipline or the

administration of the sacraments, nor with preaching. They are to teach all branches of knowledge, but especially the truths of Scripture. Their sphere of duty lies among the youth, whether they be children attending the primary school or students at the university".² G.A. Taylor takes the same view: "A certain mystery has surrounded the office of 'teacher'...Only the ordinary schoolmasters, presiding over the secular instruction of the young, appear in the historical records of Geneva. But this is precisely the point. Calvin, when speaking of the 'teacher', is speaking of the schoolmaster, for to the Reformer, education was never secular as the term is generally understood today".³

In a similar vein, R.W. Henderson maintains that the Ordonnances "identify the term 'l'ordre de escolles' (l'ordre des écoles) as the common term for the doctoral office".⁴ In the end, however, this author claims that only the professors of higher learning teaching in the schola publica are to be regarded as true doctors of the Church⁵:

We believe ... that the chair of philosophy (i.e. Arts) at the Academy of Geneva was regarded as a fit occupation for a doctor of the Church, and furthermore, that the occupant of the chair was picked with an eye to his acceptability in the public ministry of the Church, and even more to the point, that by induction into this office he became a doctor and thereby took his place along with the pastors of the Church in the Compagnie or classe de ministres as it exercised episcopal functions and responsibilities in the Reformed Church of Geneva.⁶

Elsewhere Dr. Henderson asserts: "The close relationship of the academic staff with the ecclesiastical centre of the Genevan Church (i.e. the Compagnie) gives us warrant, we believe, to look upon the public professors of the Academy as participating in the doctoral office that Calvin had conceived

as the second ministry of the Church".⁷ Apparently this meant, according to Henderson, that not only the professors of Greek, Hebrew, and Arts (Artium) were considered ecclesial doctores, but also the professor of Law.⁸ He does not mention the professor of Medicine who was teaching regularly (though unpaid) at the Academy since 1559.⁹ Was he too regarded by the Reformer as a doctor of the Church? And what of the "singing master"?

The point is, what criteria does Dr. Henderson use to determine whether or not one actually held the doctoral office in the Genevan Church? As we have already noted, he is not willing to state categorically that every teacher in "l'ordre des escoles" held this office:

There is no doubt that according to the Ordonnances of 1541, those who instructed the youth were to be under the same discipline as the pastors, but there is a real question as to which of them were entitled to this designation of doctor. Was Castellio, were his undermasters, was Enoch, or were his undermasters entitled to this designation by virtue of their employment in the school (and Church) of Geneva? To these questions, we cannot at this time return a definitive answer. 10

If participation in "l'ordre des escoles" did not necessarily mean that one held the doctoral office in the Church, then how does Henderson conclude that the professors in the schola publica qualify for this status? His assumption is based essentially on one point: the fact that professors of Hebrew, Greek, and Arts, who were not ordained to the pastorate, were included, along with the pastors, in the doctrinal discussions and general ecclesiastical business carried out in the in the congrégation.¹¹ Thus, one of Henderson's fundamental conclusions is that Calvin meant to include in the ecclesiastical ministry (i.e. under the doctoral office) "the most

important positions in the educative system".¹²

Such a view, if it were true, would have, as Henderson notes, important implications for the Reformer's understanding of the sphere of ecclesiastical authority and the Church's ministerial responsibilities. It would mean, in the words of this author, that for Calvin, "there is a place within the Church's public ministry for an office dedicated to a sound knowledge of the many-faceted manner in which God has accommodated himself to the finite understanding of men".¹³ But Dr. Henderson's arguments are not convincing. His assessment of the historical situation in Geneva does not do justice to the complex inter-relationship between Church, School, and State. Moreover, he does not adequately consider what the Reformer himself has to say in his writings about the nature and function of the Church's doctoral ministry.

It is our opinion that all the above writers (and many more) have misrepresented or misunderstood Calvin's understanding and definition of the doctor ecclesiae. In line with the Medieval tradition, the Reformer, we believe, equated this title exclusively with the doctor theologiae and not with the university doctorate in general. For him, the doctor was concerned with teaching only one subject: Holy Scripture. This is precisely why, throughout his writings, Calvin constantly binds the doctoral function with that of the pastorate to form just one order in the ecclesiastical government - the ministry of the Word. The doctor ecclesiae was distinguished from all other academic doctors in the university by the unique content of his teaching. Since he was dealing with the knowledge of God, the doctor ecclesiae was performing a "spiritual" function. His teaching pertained

to "spiritual things", whereas the secular teachers were concerned with "earthly" or "inferior things" (cf. infra 161). This differentiation was based on Calvin's belief that the means of knowing, with respect to the knowledge of God, was radically different from general epistemology. Contrary to Taylor's assertion, Calvin does distinguish between "sacred" and "secular" learning. The Reformer's position on this whole matter can be properly grasped only by examining the historical situation in Geneva, that is, the relationship between Church, School, and State, in conjunction with Calvin's own views expressed in his writings.

I. THE "TWO KINGDOMS"

The Christian's life, says Calvin, is governed and conditioned by two authorities: iurisdictio spiritualis et temporalis.¹⁴ A two-fold government is necessary because man himself has basically two kinds of needs which are quite different in nature. On the one hand, there are the "spiritual" concerns of life which pertain to the soul (anima). On the other hand, man has "temporal" needs that are more directly associated with the physical requirements of the present world. The spiritual well-being of man is dependent primarily upon the state of his "inner mind" (animus interior) which is nurtured and cared for, not by food and water, but by instructing the conscientia in pietas.¹⁵ The temporal kingdom has reference to man's outward behaviour, that is, the material necessities of life and all those things which have a bearing on one's physical health such as the establishment of social order and justice.

These two aspects of man's existence - the spiritual and temporal kingdoms - are regulated and ministered to by "different kings and different laws".¹⁶ God has ordained that the "ecclesiastical government" should preside over man's spiritual concerns while the "civil government" is limited to governing and regulating the temporal concerns of life.¹⁷ This is not to say that the ecclesiastical ministry has nothing to do with man's bodily appetites. As we shall see, Calvin's understanding of the diaconate firmly rules out this assumption. Likewise, the civic powers are called upon by the Reformer to take an active part in safeguarding the believer against spiritual and moral corruption. But in both instances, these tasks are to be regarded as extraneous to the primary and essential function of each government.

Calvin feels it is extremely important for the Christian to be aware of the "great difference and unlikeness" between these two governments.¹⁸ Since each has "a completely different nature",¹⁹ it is imperative that they "must always be examined separately".²⁰ For the Church's realm of authority is as different from the State as the soul is from the body. We must therefore conclude that "Christ's spiritual government and the civil jurisdiction are things completely distinct".²¹ One of the most fundamental distinguishing characteristics of the ecclesiastical government is that it never resorts to physical restraint, either through fines, imprisonment or bodily punishment.²² Rather, the Church's power resides entirely in its ability "to preach the doctrine of Christ".²³ God has deposited this "treasure" in the hands of the ecclesiastical government to serve as the means for accomplishing

the spiritual renewal of man:

We see how God, who could in a moment perfect his own, nevertheless desires them to grow up into manhood solely under the education of the Church. We see the way set for it: the preaching of the heavenly doctrine has been enjoined upon the pastors...All those who spurn the spiritual food, divinely extended to them through the hand of the Church, deserve to perish in famine and hunger. God breathes faith into us only by the instrument of his gospel, as Paul points out that 'faith comes from hearing'. 24

The spiritual renewal of man, says Calvin, involves two things: the knowledge of God and holiness of life.²⁵ These two areas of our lives are therefore the first and foremost concern of the ecclesiastical government. Both are normally attained only through "hearing" pure doctrine.²⁶ This is why the Reformer insists that doctrina is the "soul" and "foundation" of the Church.²⁸ Moreover, through this same ministry, the Christian is preserved and protected from the corrupting influences which might jeopardize his spiritual well-being.²⁹ Those who have been called to be ministers of the Word are, therefore, performing the most important function in the Church. The discipline of morals (elders) and care of the poor (deacons) are vital offices in the ecclesiastical government, but "there is nothing more notable or glorious in the Church than the ministry of the Gospel, since it is the administration of the Spirit, of righteousness, and of eternal life".³⁰

Since it is through the preaching and teaching of God's Word that men's souls are renewed, nurtured, and protected, and since this treasure has been deposited in the Church alone, then it follows that the spiritual government must have the power "to lay down articles of faith and the authority to explain them".³¹ The spiritual powers of the Church can be

categorized under three areas of authority: i) the authority to define doctrine; ii) the legislative power to make ecclesiastical laws and constitutions; iii) the right of "jurisdiction" which involves the "discipline of morals".³²

These powers, as we have noted, are regarded by Calvin as being completely distinct from those of the temporal government. But this is not to say that civil polity is any less an ordinatio Dei: "Magistrates were appointed by God for the protection of religion as well as for the peace and decency of society, in exactly the same way that the earth is appointed to produce food".³³ This is why the Reformer often speaks of the civic administrators in high terms. They should, he says, be regarded as "deputies" or "vicars" of God who have been "ordained to a most holy office".³⁴ We have already seen that such language is not meant to imply that the magistrate was part of the ecclesiastical or spiritual government. Unlike Luther, Calvin did not view him as praecipuum membrum ecclesiae. Rather, the Reformer used this terminology to impress upon the reader the magistrate's great importance and close relationship to the Church:

Civil government has as its appointed end, so long as we live among men, to cherish and protect the outward worship of God, to defend sound doctrine of piety and the position of the Church, to adjust our life to the society of men, to form our social behaviour to civil righteousness, to reconcile us with one another, and to promote general peace and tranquillity. ³⁵

It does not merely see to it...that men breathe, eat, drink and are kept warm...but also prevents idolatry, sacrilege against God's name, blasphemies against his truth, and other public offences against religion from arising and spreading among the people; it prevents the public peace from being disturbed; it provides that each man keep his property safe and sound (suum cuique); that men may carry on blameless intercourse among themselves; that honesty and

modesty may be preserved among men. In short, it provides that a public manifestation of religion may exist among Christians, and that humanity be maintained among men. 36

Thus, far from being at variance, the spiritual and political governments should always complement one another.

To carry out these important responsibilities, the civic authorities wield the temporal sword of power which, unlike the spiritual sword, involves imprisonment, fines, physical deterrent and other forceful means.³⁷ Moreover, the political authorities have been given the power to establish and enforce juridical laws: "Next to the magistracy in the civil state come the laws, stoutest sinews of the commonwealth, or, as Cicero, after Plato, calls them, the souls, without which the magistracy cannot stand, even as they themselves have no force apart from the magistracy. Accordingly, nothing truer could be said than that the law is a silent magistrate; the magistrate a living law".³⁸ These laws which govern the temporal kingdom, that is, the ordo politicus,³⁹ are of an entirely different nature from the ecclesiastical laws which are established by the spiritual government. The former pertain to the outward activities of man in interaction with other members of society; the latter pertain to the "soul", the "worship of God", and, ultimately, to "eternal life".⁴⁰ Most importantly for Calvin, true spiritual laws promulgated by the Church, because they have been instituted by Christ, bind the consciences of men.⁴¹ Civil laws, like the false "human traditions" of the Roman Catholic Church, have no such effect.

The political authorities and their judicial laws, however, ought to be held in "honour" which, for Calvin, means in

reality that even wicked and unjust kings must be obeyed,⁴² for "it is better to live under the cruel tyranny than without any government at all".⁴³ More importantly, it is by God's will that a ruler takes office, no matter how, in human terms, this comes about. Hence, Calvin can maintain, in line with what Paul says in Romans 13:5, that Christians must obey the political authorities "for conscience' sake" (conscientia causa).⁴⁴ But by this he does not mean to imply that individual civil laws are binding on the Christian's conscience⁴⁵:

If we must obey rulers not only because of punishment but for conscience' sake, it seems to follow from this that the ruler's laws also have dominion over the conscience. Now, if this were true, the same also will have to be said of Church laws. I reply: we must first distinguish genus and species. For even though individual laws may not apply to the conscience, we are still held by God's general command, which commends to us the authority of the magistrates. And Paul's discussion turns on this point: the magistrates, since they have been ordained by God, ought to be held in honour. But he does not teach that the laws framed by them apply to the inward governing of the soul, since he everywhere extols, above any decrees of men, both the worship of God and the spiritual rule of right living.⁴⁶

Thus, obedience to the temporal powers is not an absolute principle for the Reformer. If an earthly prince tries to force a Christian, either through civil laws or physical force, to act in a way which would cause him to contravene the will of God, then Calvin counsels that one must scorn the political authorities: "For earthly princes lay aside their power when they rise up against God, and are unworthy to be reckoned among the number of mankind. We ought, rather, to spit on their heads (conspuere in ipsorum capita) than to obey them".⁴⁷

Therefore, when considering the authority and domain of ecclesiastical and political government, Calvin makes it a

matter of paramount importance to distinguish sharply between the "forum of the conscience" (conscientiae forum) and the "outer forum" (externum forum),⁴⁸ that is, between man's spiritual and carnal nature. These two aspects of humanity, though intimately connected, are nevertheless like "two worlds", each one being under the authority of "different kings and different laws". The spiritual concerns and needs of men have been entrusted, by God, to the ministry of the Church, while those things pertaining to his outward or physical well-being are more the concern of the State. We have already noted, in a general way, the respective spheres of power and competence of these two divinely appointed institutions. Let us now look more carefully at the way in which Calvin categorizes the various areas of human activity.

II. RES CAELESTES AND RES TERRENAS

Just as man himself is composed of a soul and a body, so all aspects of life may be categorized either under the spiritual or the temporal kingdom. The things of life which pertain to the former realm are referred to by Calvin as res caelestes.⁴⁹ "Heavenly things" are to be regarded as "supernatural" or "spiritual" gifts.⁵⁰ By this he means that they "cannot be attained otherwise than by the guidance of the Spirit".⁵¹ The res caelestes then, refer, specifically to "all qualities belonging to the blessed life of the soul"⁵²: "I call 'heavenly things' the pure knowledge of God (Dei notitiam), the nature of true righteousness, and the mysteries of the heavenly kingdom".⁵³ This includes "faith, love of God, charity toward neighbour, zeal for holiness and for

righteousness". These spiritual gifts, therefore, pertain to man's soul and inner mind, that is, to the spiritual kingdom. They are, as we have seen, the components of true spiritual renewal in man. One receives these gifts only through the grace of God, but they are distributed by means of the Church's ministry which was instituted by the Lord for this very purpose. Thus, the res caelestes are the concern of the ecclesiastical government.

Then there are the res terrenas which refer to the "natural gifts" in man.⁵⁴ Reason is regarded by the Reformer as man's foremost natural gift. Calvin makes a point of emphasizing that "earthly things", sometimes referred to as "inferior things", "do not pertain to God or his Kingdom, to true justice or to the blessedness of the future life, but have their significance and relationship with regard to the present life and are, in a sense, confined within its bounds".⁵⁵ We therefore see that the res terrenas fall within the temporal kingdom and are thus the concern primarily of the political government. Under this category Calvin includes: "economy, all mechanical skills" and, most importantly for our purposes- "the liberal arts".⁵⁶ Thus, it should be emphasized that the Reformer draws a sharp distinction between theological knowledge and general education. The former, he says, is a "supernatural gift" given only to the regenerate; the latter, a "natural gift" which is "bestowed indiscriminately upon pious and impious".⁵⁷

This does not mean, however, that the Church should have nothing to do with general or secular education. Just as the ecclesiastical authorities utilize and support the work of the civil powers and the products of manual skills, so too

should it do the same with the liberal arts:

Shall we say that the philosophers were blind in their fine observation and artful description of nature? Shall we say that those men were devoid of understanding who conceived the art of disputation and taught us to speak reasonably? Shall we say that they are insane who developed medicine, devoting their labour to our benefit? What shall we say of all the mathematical sciences? Shall we consider them the ravings of madmen? No, we cannot read the writings of the ancients on these subjects without great admiration... Those men whom Scripture calls 'natural men' were, indeed, sharp and penetrating in their investigation of inferior things (in rerum inferiorum). Let us, accordingly, learn by their example how many gifts the Lord left to human nature even after it was despoiled of its true good. 58

Since all useful and beneficial knowledge, no matter what the field, is necessarily derived from the "Spirit of God", then such knowledge should not be despised by the Church.⁵⁹ Thus, "if the Lord has willed that we be helped in physics, dialectic, mathematics and other like disciplines, by the work and ministry of the ungodly, let us use their assistance".⁶⁰ But to teach such knowledge is not part of the Church's ministerial duties; it is not within the realm of spiritual government. Ecclesiastical ministers, and Christians generally may, indeed, must certainly utilize the liberal arts in all kinds of ways, but it is not part of Church's divine calling to teach these secular disciplines:

Let this be a firm principle: No other word is to be held as the Word of God, and given place as such in the Church, than what is contained first in the Law and the Prophets, then in the writings of the Apostles; and the only authorized way of teaching in the Church (rite docendi in Ecclesia) is by the prescription and standard of the Word". 61

The knowledge of God, like the knowledge of all spiritual things, is not, for Calvin, part of general epistemology. It

differs from other branches of knowledge because the uniqueness of its content means that the act of knowing is fundamentally different from general knowing. The Reformer takes great care to distinguish between "natural" and "supernatural" gifts precisely because he wants to draw the reader's attention to the fact that the way in which man arrives at a cognitio Dei is entirely different from the manner in which he apprehends all other knowledge. One can truly know God, says Calvin, only through the "illumination of the Holy Spirit", that is, only by an act of revelation which produces faith.⁶²

Commenting on John 17:8, he writes: "And we have believed. Let it be observed, also, he employs the verb know, and now he uses the verb believe; for thus he shows that nothing which relates to God can be known aright but by faith, but that in faith there is such certainty that it is justly called knowledge".⁶³ T.H.L. Parker summarizes Calvin's position on this matter as follows:

Knowing God is a unique activity in man's experience, having its own categories. It runs the risk, if it borrows from the categories of general epistemology, of destroying itself by turning its direction from its true object, God, to an idol fabricated by itself. For this reason (following Calvin) we cannot deal with knowledge either psychologically or philosophically, or rather we should say, that we cannot deal with knowledge according to the psychological or philosophical methods appropriate to the general branches of epistemology. Calvin approaches the knowledge of God by way of the knowledge of God in Jesus Christ by means of the Holy Spirit; and his concept of this knowledge is conditioned through and through by his insistence on the primary and utter necessity of revelation. 64

The believer can obtain a full and complete understanding of the secular sciences such as physics, philosophy, languages etc. by the unaided reason alone.⁶⁵ But when it comes to

spiritual truths, like the knowledge of God, then even the "greatest geniuses are blinder than moles".⁶⁶

It is the specific task of the ecclesiastical government to restore man's spiritual insight, to lead him to a true knowledge of God, through the ministry of the Word. Again, we must stress that this spiritual ministry did not include, according to Calvin, instruction in the liberal arts. While potentially beneficial to Christians, such knowledge was not the concern of the Church's teaching ministry. This is why the Reformer describes the secular sciences as res terrenae and not as res caelestes. We ought to bear this in mind as we come to examine the inter-relationship between Church, School, and State in Geneva.

III. THE CHURCH-STATE RELATIONSHIP IN GENEVA

In the previous section we have seen that Calvin wanted to "distinguish sharply" between ecclesiastical and political government so that their respective realms of authority and areas of ministry would be clearly defined. At the same time, however, he insisted that these two "kingdoms" were in no way antithetical. We might describe this as a symbiotic relationship. One could illustrate this relationship graphically by two concentric circles. The Church and State were envisaged by the Reformer as two "different worlds", but worlds which were in constant and intimate interaction, the one with the other, providing mutual support and benefit. However, he soon discovered that what works well in theory does not always do the same in practice. Moreover, he also quickly learned that the civil authorities in Geneva

did not see eye to eye with him in respect to the actual dividing lines between the spiritual and temporal spheres of authority. This was especially apparent in the early years of his career in this city.

On November 10, 1536, just about three months after Calvin first arrived in Geneva, Guillaume Farel, representing the Reformed pastors in the city, submitted several articles to the Council concerning certain ecclesiastical matters, viz., the Lord's Supper, congregational singing, religious instruction for children, and marriage.⁶⁷ It was not until January of the following year that these articles were ratified by the civic authorities, and not without their first making certain significant modifications to the pastors' proposals.⁶⁸ The ministers suggested that the Supper should be celebrated every month, but the Council insisted that four times a year would be sufficient. Moreover, the Syndics also demanded that their jurisdiction in matrimonial disputes should be extended beyond what the pastors deemed appropriate. This was just one early instance where the civil powers in Geneva were able to exert their influence in matters which Calvin believed should be left to the discretion of the spiritual leaders.

Just over a year later, in April, 1538, another stormy controversy blew up between Church and State which was once again occasioned by the lack of agreement over the theoretical dividing line limiting the temporal government's authority in ecclesiastical affairs. Without bothering to receive the consent of the pastors, the Council, after consultations with Berne and Lausanne, decreed that henceforth the Genevan Church would, in accordance with other neighbouring Reformed

Churches, follow the Bernese liturgy.⁶⁹ When Farel and Calvin objected to the cavalier manner in which this decision was made, they were told that if they did not comply they would be prohibited from preaching in any Genevan Church.⁷⁰ Both men refused to accept the Council's authority in this issue, and therefore were given three days in which to leave Geneva, thus initiating Calvin's three year sojourn in Strasbourg.⁷¹

It would be quite inaccurate, however, to think that the spiritual and political governments were always at odds during these years. Often the Council worked in close association with the pastors in a way which Calvin heartily supported. We find, for instance, that when, in March, 1537, a group of Anabaptists arrived in Geneva teaching "false doctrine", the Council ordered that they should give up their views on baptism and the Church, or else leave the city.⁷² And on another occasion it fully supported Calvin, even in the face of adverse popular opinion, when the Reformer insisted that each citizen should make an individual confession of faith.⁷³ The Council went so far as to order 1500 copies of the Confession and had them circulated throughout the various districts of the city.

Perhaps the best illustration of the way in which the State and Church in Calvin's Geneva were able to work together in close interaction is found in the two ecclesiastical offices known as the eldership and the diaconate. Calvin regarded the "elder"⁷⁴ as a regular office-holder in the ecclesiastical government. As such, his ministry and authority should be seen as spiritual rather than political in nature:

As no city or township can function without a magistrate or polity, so the Church of God (as I have already taught but am now compelled to repeat) needs a spiritual polity. This is, however, quite distinct from the civil polity, yet does not hinder or threaten it but rather greatly helps and furthers it. Therefore, this power of jurisdiction will be nothing, in short, but an order framed for the preservation of the spiritual polity. For this purpose courts of judgment were established in the Church from the beginning to deal with the censure of morals, to investigate vices, and to be charged with the exercise of the office of the keys. Paul designates this order (ordo) in his letter to the Corinthians when he mentions offices of ruling. Likewise, in Romans, when he says: 'Let him who rules, rule with diligence'. For he is not addressing the magistrates (not any of whom were then Christians) but those who were joined with the pastors in the spiritual rule of the Church (ad spirituale Ecclesiae regimen). 75

In order to take on the spiritual charge of correcting morals, the elder had to be a person of proven quality and ability, "endowed with gifts more than the ordinary" and "in whom the power and grace of the Holy Spirit more particularly appeared".⁷⁶ For these reasons it was necessary that the elders should be elected to office by the congregation which they served.⁷⁷ But it seems that Calvin was not able to persuade the civic authorities to accept his views on this matter, for we read in the Ordonnances that the anciens or commis were to be appointed principally by the Little Council. What is more, they had to be chosen only from the ranks of officials who were already holding political office:

As this Church is now placed, it will be desirable to elect two from the Little Council, four from the Council of Sixty, and six from the Council of Two Hundred...We have decided that the manner of their election should be as follows: The Little Council shall consult with a view to nominating the most suitable and competent men that can be found; and, in order to effect this, it shall summon the ministers for the purpose of conferring with them. 78

Hence, the elders in Calvin's Geneva have been rightly described as "civil functionaries in the first place and ecclesiastical officials in the second. Nominally they were a court of the Church. Really they were a Committee of the Councils".⁷⁹ This is yet another indication that the Ordonnances were not altogether representative of the Reformer's own thoughts. He would have wanted things arranged differently, but was forced to compromise with the powerful political forces, even on important issues like the election of ecclesiastical officeholders. We should note, however, that the one thing he would not negotiate was the nature and function of the eldership as described in Scripture.

When the people of Geneva first secured their independence from the Roman Catholic Church by deposing the bishop in 1535, the city Councils immediately assumed control of those functions and properties, both secular and religious, which hitherto had been in the hands of the local episcopacy and chapter. For many years prior to the overthrow of papal control in Geneva, there had been a gradual move toward laicization of certain public institutions, viz., welfare and educational, not only in this city, but throughout Europe generally.⁸⁰ Quite naturally, this movement gained considerable impetus with the spread of the Protestant Reformation. During the pre-Reformation years in Geneva, five out of the seven "hospitals" in this city were under the control of the religious authorities.⁸¹ The remaining two were managed by concerned lay citizens. But upon the advent of the Reformation and the exile of the bishop, the civic Council immediately took over the management of all these hospitals. In 1535, it decided that they should be consolidated to form one general Hospital

to serve the whole city, although it seems a special building was set aside for victims of the plague.⁸² It was primarily in this general Hospital that the deacons carried out their ministry.⁸³

In his writings, Calvin makes it quite clear that he regarded the diaconate, not as "secular management" (profanam villicationem),⁸⁴ but as "a spiritual function dedicated to God" (spiritualem et Deo dicatam functionem).⁸⁵ Consequently, deacons should be inducted into office by the "sacrament" of ordination in the same way as "pastors and doctors".⁸⁶ But once again we find that the practice in Geneva was not entirely in accord with the Reformer's views. The Ordonnances state that there should be five persons elected to this order of ecclesiastical ministry: one hospitaller and four procureurs. We find that the former was a full-time resident at the Hospital, whereas the procureurs resided at their own homes and usually continued working in their secular trades and professions.

We know that, during Calvin's day, at least three men served as deacons while at the same time functioning as Syndics of the city.⁸⁷ After 1541, the deacons were elected to office in the same way as the elders. That is, they were usually chosen from the ranks of the three Councils, and the choice of election, carried out annually, was ultimately in the hands of the ruling Little Council. R.M. Kingdon, who has made a detailed study of the diaconate in Geneva, reaches the following conclusion: "The procureurs of the Hospital thus came to constitute a kind of standing committee or department of the city government and were fully equivalent, legally and constitutionally, to the standing committees that supervised

the city's accounts, served as courts for adjudicating civil and criminal cases, and oversaw the city's defenses...".⁸⁸

He continues: "In spite of the fact that the deacons were technically ministers of the Church, they still seem to have been elected in the same way as the supervisors of the fortresses and the members of the chamber of accounts".⁸⁹

Calvin could not have been happy with this electoral procedure, but he wholeheartedly supported the involvement of the Church's diaconal order in the Hospital. In one of his sermons he speaks highly of the deacons' work as "hospitalers and procureurs of the poor".⁹⁰ When the Reformer first came to Geneva he expressed his great concern about the amount of poverty and hunger in the city, and throughout his writings he continually made it known that the diaconate should centre their ministry above all else on caring for the physical needs of the poor and sick.⁹¹ Yet the rather detailed documentary evidence shows quite plainly that the pastors themselves, including Calvin, were not involved in the operation of the Hospital in any significant way.⁹² Given the above, we are bound to conclude that this institution was more closely linked to the State than the Church, although both were equally concerned about its maintenance and survival.

In addition to the social welfare programs associated with the Hospital, the Church and State were also both very anxious to provide the people of Geneva with good academic training. Just as the spiritual and political governments combined forces to direct the Hospital, so too did they work together in building and managing the city's educational system. It would be quite wrong to view the "Collège de Genève" simply as a theological seminary. It was this, of course, but it

was just as concerned with nurturing future civil servants and statesmen as it was pastors and theologians. The Ordonnances themselves make this quite clear: "It will be necessary to build a College for the purpose of instructing [children] with a view to preparing them both for the ministry and for civil government".⁹³ It was therefore only natural that the ecclesiastical authorities, as much as the State, should take an active interest in this institution just as it did the Hospital.

Not surprisingly then, we find that all teachers involved in the education of children and young people were subject to ecclesiastical discipline.⁹⁴ But as we intend to show, this should not lead one to conclude, as a certain author did, that "l'Ecole est placéé sous l'entière dépendance de l'Eglise".⁹⁵ In fact, several writers have reached just such a conclusion, especially those who regard the doctoral office in Geneva as being synonymous with "l'ordre des escoles". This, we believe, is not a correct interpretation of the facts, and cannot be supported either by the historical evidence or by Calvin's own words.

CHAPTER TWO
EDUCATION IN GENEVA

Higher education in Geneva dates back to the 13th century. As early as 1213, teachers were appointed to educate the young at the cathedral Church in this city as stipulated by the Fourth Lateran Council (canon 81). There is some discrepancy as to whether or not the tuition was gratuitous.⁹⁶ Instruction in the liberal arts continued to be given in Geneva throughout the 13th and 14th centuries but with little consistency. In 1365, the Emperor Charles IV issued a bull for the establishment of a university, but political factors soon stifled any progress in these plans.⁹⁷ The first real impetus to public education was given by a local bishop, one Jean de Brogny (d. 1426), who was later elected to the College of Cardinals at Rome.

It was while serving at Rome that de Brogny successfully persuaded Pope Martin V to issue a university charter for his beloved place of birth. However, the Cardinal met with strong opposition to his plan from the civil authorities in Geneva. Not that they were against the establishment of a university, far from it, but they perceived that, if built by the Church, this institution would be completely under the domination of the local episcopate. As we have noted above, in connection with the Hospital (cf. supra, 168), there was at this time a gradual movement in Europe towards laicization of public institutions, and here we have one such example of this trend. The Genevan officials realized that the only way to insure their School's future independence

was to found it themselves and so this is exactly what they did. In fact, the majority of European grammar schools and universities established in the 14th and 15th centuries were under the direct control of local civic authorities or secular rulers.⁹⁸ It was quite predictable then, and in keeping with the spirit of the age, that the Councils of Geneva would thwart Cardinal de Brogny's attempts to found a university in their city, even though they were very anxious to have such an institution. Only two years after the Cardinal's death (1426), the general Council decreed that a public school should be constructed which would be organized and directed totally independent of the Church.⁹⁹

I. THE COLLEGE DE VERSONNEX : 1428-1536

There had never been a special school building in Geneva; the education of the children had, up until now, always been conducted in empty buildings originally constructed for some other purpose. On occasion, especially in the earlier years, the Church buildings were used.¹⁰⁰ But when the city finally decided that it was time to have a proper educational site, a wealthy merchant by the name of François Versonnex agreed to finance the construction of a new school.¹⁰¹ The building was already completed by the time the charter was drawn up on 30 January, 1429, which officially named the institution "Collège de Versonnex" in honour of its benefactor.¹⁰² This charter specified that "grammar, logic, and the other liberal arts" should be taught at the College.¹⁰³ Jules Vuy infers from this that the school "was at this time a college and an academy".¹⁰⁴ But Charles Borgeaud maintains that it is going

too far to regard the College as an academy for superior studies. It is Borgeaud's opinion that, during this early period at least, this institution was essentially a traditional grammar school. It was also stipulated by the charter that all education at the College, whatever the standard offered, would be gratuitous, and that the salary of the teaching staff should be paid by the State.¹⁰⁵

On 8 April, 1502, the statutes of the College were revised in order to establish the basic educational principles of the school.¹⁰⁶ W.S. Reid maintains that even after this reorganization (as well as before), "little real attention was paid to purely academic training. About the only thing which was taught was Latin...Altogether, education was neither highly valued nor highly paid in the materialistic and dissolute city of Geneva".¹⁰⁷ Throughout his article, Reid is highly critical of the standard of education in Geneva before Calvin's arrival. But this would appear to be a rather extreme interpretation of the actual situation, for we know that in 1513 the regent of the College, one Claude Exerton, was teaching grammar, logic, rhetoric, and poetry,¹⁰⁸ indicating that public instruction in this city had reached a fairly high degree of development.¹⁰⁹

As the 16th century progressed, the city-state of Geneva became embroiled in a series of political and ecclesiastical struggles. By the 1530's it was in the midst of both a political revolution and a religious reformation. On the one hand it was endeavouring to gain its political independence from the Duke of Savoy, and at the same time it sought to rid itself of the bishop of Geneva and the ecclesiastical domination he represented. For several years it looked as

though things could swing either way, but finally, in 1536, its campaigns on both the political and ecclesiastical fronts proved successful.¹¹⁰ In February of that year, Geneva emerged from some very heated disputes with her ally, Berne, as a totally independent State, and on 25 May the general Council unanimously voted "to live henceforth according to the law of the Gospel and the Word of God, and to abolish all papal abuses".¹¹¹

II. THE COLLEGE DE RIVE (1536-1538) :

"L'ORDRE ET MANIERE D'ENSEIGNER"

The religious and political upheaval obviously had a pronounced effect on everyday life in Genevan society, and one of the areas to be most visibly affected was education. On 1 January, 1531, the Collège de Versonnex, or as it was now more commonly called, the "grande école", had to be closed down until a regent could be found.¹¹² When a candidate was finally appointed (Claude Bigothier), he was soon dismissed (June, 1532) by the Council because of his strong Lutheran leanings.¹¹³ Instruction in the College continued to be given between the years 1532-1534, but it seems that the classes were very irregular.¹¹⁴ Jean Martel became the new rector in July, 1534, and continued at this post until 1536. This would appear to indicate that the school was still functioning during these years, but at what level of consistency we cannot say.

On 27 August, 1535, Martel complained to the Council that the old school building was "unhealthy" and not at all suitable for the instruction of children.¹¹⁵ A few weeks later,

on 10 September, heeding Martel's words, the Council decided to transfer the school to "le couvent de Rive". Everyone agreed that this old Dominican convent, with its "several rooms and a great hall" was an ideal location for the school, now appropriately named "Collège de Rive". Antoine Saunier¹¹⁶ was appointed rector (directeur) of the "new" College on 21 May, 1536, becoming the first man of declared Reformed principles to hold this post.¹¹⁷ Under Saunier's rectorship, the "Collège de Rive", with the aid of Calvin, was transformed into an active educational institution; but progress was slow, and often difficult, owing to a number of political and financial complications, and it would be more than 20 years before the high quality of education desired by the Reformers was attained in Geneva.

As we noted above, Calvin came to Geneva probably sometime in July, 1536, and by August he was engaged in giving lectures on the New Testament. Not long after this, perhaps in late 1536 or early 1537¹¹⁸, Maturin Cordier agreed to come to Geneva (likely at Calvin's request) in order to teach at the College. The city was extremely fortunate to acquire an educator of Cordier's calibre. Unlike Calvin, he was, by 1536, already famous throughout northern Europe as a skilled and learned pioneer of educational reform. Prior to his arrival in Geneva, Cordier had taught at a number of Colleges in Paris such as St. Barbe, Lisieux, and "Collège de la March",¹¹⁹ and his most recent post before coming to join Calvin was at "Collège de Guyenne" in Bordeaux where he spent two years reorganizing the educational system in the lower grades.¹²⁰

It was during his tenure at the "Collège de la Marche" in Paris that he had the young Calvin as a pupil. Initially Cordier had been appointed professor of rhetoric at this College, however, after perceiving that his students knew nothing of the rudiments of the Latin language, he gave up this post in order to take over the instruction of the students in the 4th class. It was here that Calvin had the good fortune of having Cordier as his teacher. During this period of tuition under the great master, the future Reformer was introduced to a new method of teaching which would profoundly influence his own pedagogy in future years. Calvin acknowledged this fact in a dedicatory epistle to his old teacher placed at the front of his commentary on I Thessalonians:

I received such help afterwards from your instruction that it was with good reason that I acknowledge such progress as I have made to be due to you. It was my desire to testify to posterity that, if they derive any profit from my writings, they should know that to some extent you are responsible for them. 121

Cordier's pedagogical method has been described by Le Coultre as "une méthode rigoureuse qui n'admet aucun à peu près, aucun échappatoire, c'est la loyauté à l'égard des textes".¹²² He notes that it was the great master's principle aim to teach his students "à joindre la piété et les bonnes moeurs avec l'étude des humanités".¹²³ This was because Cordier firmly believed, as he points out in his Sermonis Emendatione Libellus, that "without pietas there can be no true progress in learning".¹²⁴ His influence on Calvin in this regard is quite apparent, as we shall see in the following section.¹²⁵

We would have known very little about the teaching method and the educational program at the "Collège de Rive" during the early years when both Calvin and Cordier were teaching in Geneva, had it not been for a document printed by Jean Gérard on 12 January, 1538, entitled: L'Ordre et Maniere d'Enseigner en la Ville de Geneue au College.¹²⁶ The authorship of this document has been disputed. Borgeaud claims that Saunier is responsible,¹²⁷ and Doumergue agrees.¹²⁸ Herminjard believes that it was originally written by Saunier and then revised by Calvin and Cordier,¹²⁹ but Le Coultre contends that, on account of the elegant style of the original Latin text, Cordier must have been the author.¹³⁰ Cadier is of the opinion that Calvin, Cordier, and Saunier all had a hand in writing it up.¹³¹

From this document we learn that the instruction given at the College proper at this period in its history, was on the same level as a typical grammar school of that era. We say "College proper" because there were also more advanced lectures in theology delivered not, as we might expect, in the school building where the other lecons were given, but at the grand temple - Saint Pierre. By the end of 1537, and probably ever since he was first hired to teach in Geneva, Calvin was giving lectures on the NT in this cathedral Church, five days a week, from 2-3 in the afternoon.¹³² Guillaume Farel, the other doctor theologiae at this time, lectured on the OT each morning from 9-10. Assisting Farel was a reader (lecteur) whose task it was to expound literally each Hebrew word of the text under discussion. After this had been done, it was Farel's duty "s'appliquer du tout a declairer le vray sens et doctrine spirituelle qui s'en peut tirer".¹³³ It

seems Calvin had no such assistant, perhaps because he was more proficient in the Greek language than his colleague was in the Hebrew.

Although it was the declared intention of the educational authorities to instruct the students "as much in the knowledge of languages as the liberal arts", it appears that the curriculum at the College was centered mainly around language study. At this time (1538) two of the most basic subjects of the traditional liberal arts program - rhetoric and dialectic - were not being offered at the College. In fact, the only other subject taught at this institution other than grammar was arithmetic, and even in this course only "les premiers fondemes" were studied.¹³⁴ The teaching of Greek, Latin, Hebrew, and French was the paramount concern of the staff at the College. That French was included in this list was something of a novelty, as most contemporary grammar schools either excluded the study of the vernacular, or minimized its importance.¹³⁵ The students were taught Hebrew and Greek from the Old and New Testaments respectively, and they learned to read and speak Latin by studying the work of three principal authors: Terence, Virgil, and Cicero.¹³⁶

It is of particular importance for our study to note that no doctrinal instruction was offered at the College proper. It is true that according to L'Ordre et Maniere..., Antoine Saunier gave some kind of instruction in the Christian faith: "Antoine Sonier principal dudict college, une foys le iour instruit familierement en la Foy Chretienne toute la multitude".¹³⁷ But what was the nature of this instruction?

R.W. Henderson, appealing to this reference in the 1538 prospectus to help substantiate his claim that the teaching

staff at the College were engaged in a "ministerial" function, concludes that this passage refers to catechetical instruction. He is of the opinion that in Geneva at this time "the responsibility for religious instruction was placed on the parents and the school".¹³⁸ It is astonishing that he does not seem to contemplate the possibility of religious (i.e. catechetical) instruction being part of the parochial task of the pastorate, especially in view of the later practice in Geneva with regard to catechesis.

The Leges Academiae (1559), for instance, state that each Sunday the children should be brought to the "Temples" to hear two sermons, morning and afternoon, et hora Catechismi.¹³⁹ The role of the teachers at the College was limited, it seems, to preparing the students to receive this religious instruction. We find that each Saturday, from 3-4 in the afternoon, all classes except the two most advanced would "recite what is going to be dealt with the following day in Catechism, and the meaning of it is to be explained clearly to the scholar's capacity."¹⁴⁰ This probably meant simply going over the grammatical construction of the biblical passage scheduled for discussion at the Sunday catechetical class, for it would have been a redundant exercise for the schoolmaster to teach the same thing that was going to be taught by the pastors the very next day. The Ordonnances of 1541 also make it clear that catechesis was not the task of the College but the Church: "At noon the catechism, that is to say, instruction of little children, shall be conducted in all three Churches, namely, St. Pierre, La Madeleine, and St. Gervais; and also at three o'clock in all three parishes."¹⁴¹

In view of this later practice, it would seem highly unlikely that the instruction Saunier was giving every day at the College was catechetical instruction. There is no reason to assume with Henderson that the College must have been responsible for this kind of teaching simply because the Articles Concerning the Organization of the Church and Worship at Geneva (1537) did not envisage a specific corps of ecclesiastical catechists.¹⁴² It would be much more reasonable to assume that the religious instruction of children was being carried out by the pastors in their Churches on Sunday as was the practice in later years.

If this daily instruction given by Saunier - and we must emphasize that the prospectus specifically stipulates that only Saunier carried out this teaching and not the other members of the staff, if this instruction, we say, was not catechesis, then what was it? We suggest that it was no more than a brief homily or devotional exercise, with the emphasis on exhortation and admonition rather than the systematic teaching of doctrine. We are not told at what time of day Saunier gave this instruction, but we note that the author of the document inserts this sentence after the paragraph dealing with the daily closing ceremonies. At 2:30 in the afternoon, the students broke off into their individual groups to discuss the day's lessons, after which they would gather in the "great hall" where one of the children would recite (in French) the ten commandments, the Lord's prayer, and the articles of faith as part of the closing ceremony. It is at this point that the prospectus mentions, in a very cursory fashion: "Et ne fault icy oublier que Antoine Sonier principal dudict college, une foys le iour instruit familierement en la Foy

Chretienne toute la multitude".

The use of the phrase "toute la multitude" suggests that Saunier was addressing the whole of the assembled student body when he gave this instruction rather than going around to individual groups. If this was the case, then it would appear even more unlikely that this instruction would have dealt with doctrinal matters as his audience would have been comprised of children of all ages with greatly varied capacities of comprehension. Our position is further supported by the fact that the document makes no mention of proper classes for religious instruction when it describes, in some detail, the typical school day. Moreover, the author describes the scope of the College curriculum as langues and ars liberaux. If doctrinal or catechetical instruction was also given in a formal way, then it surely would have been mentioned as well. All this leads us to conclude that the "teaching in the Christian faith" which Saunier gave in the College was simply a brief exhortatory homily that was part of the daily closing ceremonies.

It was a cardinal educational principle of the College that "nothing was to be taught in either Latin or French, or in the other two languages if it is not able to be done plainly". And we are also told that "in the lecture...when the subject requires it, it is the custom to point out the important point...in order that the children understand the thing more easily".¹⁴³ This desire to ensure that the young student was really understanding what he heard in the classroom, so common in our own day, was not a real concern of 16th century educators who had followed their Medieval counterparts in this regard. Calvin himself recognized the inadequacies

of his own early grammar studies at Paris.¹⁴⁴ It is a well documented fact that one of the principal causes of the state of decay that the European universities found themselves in by the beginning of the 16th century was the long absence of good preparatory teaching in the grammar schools.¹⁴⁵ At Geneva, this pedagogical abuse was recognized and eradicated in the "Collège de Rive" when Cordier and Calvin brought about these reforms in educational methodology.

Although it seems there were no set classes established at this time as there were in 1559, perhaps because the small number of students in 1538 did not make this necessary, there was nevertheless a distinction made between advanced students and those less advanced with the standard of instruction being adjusted accordingly. We are not told at what age the children began their education at the College, but we may assume that it would have been about the same as the children attending Jean Sturm's gymnasium in Strasbourg during the same period. Here the students began their grammar instruction at 5 or 6 years of age, and continued until the age of about 16, at which time they would decide if they wanted to continue their education at the Haute-Ecole where more advanced instruction was given.¹⁴⁶

The two main modes of teaching at the Genevan College were the lectio and the disputatio, but secondary methods such as grammatical drill and memorization through frequent repetition were also employed. The lectures began at 5 a.m. and continued until 10 a.m. at which time the students took a long break. They would assemble again in the early afternoon to discuss the morning's lectures with particular attention being given to the grammar that had been covered.

At 2:30 p.m. of each school day, the disputations were held in the various classrooms. We can, perhaps, get some idea of what these disputations were like by examining the ones that Cordier supervised while teaching at Paris. Here the master would select two students to dispute with one of their colleagues, or sometimes it would be two against two. Cordier was always present to preside over the disputes and judge the appropriateness of the questions and answers proffered by the students involved. The disputation usually dealt with concrete questions such as definitions of words or points of grammar. One of Cordier's students at Paris left us with a partial account of a dispute that he had participated in:

I asked him (the student he was disputing with): What verb is sum? A substantive verb, he answered. I added: How does one conjugate it? Since he did not know the answer he gave the question to his partner who conjugated it accurately. After that I asked: How many sum can you compose? Eleven, he says, and he enumerates them in order. I ask finally: How many constructions of sum are there? As my opponents do not know the answer, they return the question to me and I give the solution to my own question. 147

Education in Geneva during the first few years of the city's independence had greatly advanced owing largely to the work of Farel, Calvin, and Cordier, but it still had a long way to go before it even approached the high standards set by neighbouring institutions such as the one in Strasbourg. Geneva's College was, as we have seen, a product, not of the Church, but of lay initiative supported by the State authorities. In the ensuing years, the Reformed ecclesiastical government, led by Calvin, would become increasingly involved in the organization of this educational institution, but the civil powers continued to maintain a tight rein on its direction.

III. THE COLLEGE DURING CALVIN'S EXILE

During the three years which Calvin spent in exile (1538-1541), the "Collège de Rive" underwent some rather trying times, but it did not completely close down operations as some writers have mistakenly suggested.¹⁴⁸ Sometime between April and December, 1538, after Farel and Calvin had left the city, two of Saunier's undermasters at the College, Pichon and Gaspard (Cordier remained), were also forced by the Council to leave Geneva when they refused to conduct services at the Church in place of the recently exiled pastors.¹⁴⁹ Saunier, who was allowed to stay at his post for some time even though he also refused to perform the Church services, was fortunate enough to secure replacements (Jerome Vindons and Claude Vaultier) not long after their dismissal. These four members of the teaching staff, however, soon found themselves in trouble when they were ordered by the Council to celebrate the Lord's Supper on Christmas, 1538, because of the shortage of qualified pastors. When they refused, all four of them were told to leave the city.¹⁵⁰

Not long after their departure, the Council, on 17 January, 1539, hired one Vignerii de Thiez as a new sous-maitre for the College.¹⁵¹ Two months later Vignerii presented one of his colleagues to the Council - "un pedagogue de Roan en Lorrene" - who was subsequently hired as a second teacher at the school.¹⁵² At the end of April, 1539, an elderly ex-priest by the name of John Christin became the new rector of the College, but apparently he did not prove satisfactory, for just three months later the Council began to make inquiries for the purpose of securing a replacement for him.¹⁵³

Nobody could be found until December, at which time Agnet Bussier, a former curé at Pranguins near Noyon in France, took over the principalship on 22 December, 1539.¹⁵⁴ Then, on 10 January, 1541, Bussier asked to be relieved of his duties on account of ill health,¹⁵⁵ but the Council requested that he stay at his post until Pierre Viret arrived from Lausanne.¹⁵⁶ Viret, however, was not coming to Geneva to replace Bussier as principal. The authorities of Lausanne, where he had been both pastor and doctor since 1537,¹⁵⁷ agreed to let him go to Geneva to help relieve the many problems the city was faced with in the wake of the exile of Calvin and his colleagues, but this was to be only a temporary arrangement. There is no indication that Viret ever taught at the Genevan College during his stay (January, 1541-July, 1542), although this seems quite probable, since we know that he took an active part, along with the Council, in this institution's management and direction. His official status was that of pastor.¹⁵⁸

The Council had hoped to obtain Charles de Sainte-Marthe, a former professor of theology at the University of Poitiers, as their new maître d'eschole to replace the ailing Bussier. Not long after being imprisoned at Grenoble for his evangelical views, Sainte-Marthe went to Geneva where he was asked to take over the principalship of the school on 14 February, 1541.¹⁵⁹ He accepted, and then went to France in order to bring back his fiancée. However, for some unknown reason he never returned. Matters became worse for the College when one of the under-masters, Vignerii, was dismissed for his undue severity towards the students.¹⁶⁰ In the meantime, Bussier, more than ever desirous to relinquish his office,

once again petitioned the Council for his release on 28 February, but because the plan to appoint Sainte-Marthe as his replacement had fallen through, he was again urged to stay on. Attempts were made to entice Claude Budin from Bordeaux but to no avail. Bussier could not yet retire.

Viret succeeded in obtaining a sous-maître to replace Vignerii on 17 March, 1541, who was "assez suffisant pour lire la grammaire". However, a principal was still needed.¹⁶¹ The Council wrote to Cordier in the hopes that he might return to fill this position, but he wrote back on 9 June making it quite clear that he was content at Neuchatel. Finally, on 20 June, 1541, two more teachers were appointed by the Council: Sebastian Chateillon (Castellio) and Etienne Rolph (Rolph).¹⁶² Castellio was hired on the condition that he would temporarily be placed in charge of the College as Rector while the authorities looked for a permanent appointment to this office.¹⁶³ But after another unsuccessful attempt to get Cordier (8 November, 1541), and with no more likely candidates on the horizon, the Council decided to make Castellio the permanent principal and he was officially inducted into office on 7 April, 1542.¹⁶⁴

IV. CALVIN AND THE COLLEGE: 1541 - 1559

Regular correspondence with friends in Geneva had kept Calvin well aware of the situation of the Church and College during his absence, so that, even before his return, he knew that a thorough reorganization of both these institutions was imperative. On the day of his arrival in Geneva (13 September, 1541), he went before the Council and made it known

that he would remain only on the condition that such a re-organization would be carried out in the near future. The result was the Ordonnances ecclésiastiques which, among other things, called for the establishment of a new College with an extended curriculum and increased teaching staff. This document, as we have already noted (c.f. supra, 105), was drawn up by a committee consisting of both civic and ecclesiastical officials. Henceforth, we find the Church, led by Calvin, taking an ever increasing role in Geneva's educational system.

The Reformer, like many prominent Christians before him, was convinced that the ecclesiastical government should be closely involved in the operation of the centers of general learning, since it was here that the future leaders of the Church were educated. He expresses this concern in a letter to King Edward VI of England where he writes: "Inasmuch as the schools contain the seeds of the ministry, there is much need to keep them pure and thoroughly free from all ill weeds".¹⁶⁵ Calvin personally took the initiative in bringing about educational reform in Geneva, but political factors led to long delays in achieving his desired results. When factions like the Libertine party, who were opposed to the Reformer's religious policies, were in power, they often blocked progress in this direction as a letter to Calvin from one of his friends makes clear: "I see from your letter that your city magistrates will take no great care or thought for setting up a College for the arts (Gymnasium literarum), and I see also that this negligence is very distressing to you".¹⁶⁶

As a consequence of these and other problems and conflicts, it was not until 1559 that Calvin's educational aims for Geneva were realized. During the intervening eighteen years (1541 - 1559), the pedagogical program and organization in this city remained virtually the same as it had been during the Reformer's first Genevan ministry. The rector and his two under-masters continued to give their lessons at the "Collège de Rive", while the lectures in theology were still given in the auditoire of Saint Pierre cathedral. Sebastian Castellio had been the acting principal of the College since 20 June, 1541. Working with him were his two bacheliers, Pierre Mussard and Etienne Rolph.¹⁶⁷ We may assume that the scope of the teaching program during this period was limited to basic grammar instruction as it had been in earlier years, but with Cordier no longer on the staff, the quality of this instruction no doubt suffered greatly. Calvin acknowledges the importance of Cordier's presence at the College in a letter to Farel written in December, 1541: "There is no hope of establishing the school unless Cordier will serve the Lord here".¹⁶⁸ As it turned out, Calvin's words were prophetic, for the College remained largely disestablished until Cordier returned to Geneva in 1559.

One cause of the disruption at the College was the constant quarrelling among the teaching staff. This began in 1542 when Castellio and Mussard became embroiled in a fierce and lengthy dispute which threatened to bring disgrace upon the school.¹⁶⁹ The fact that they were brothers-in-law did not help matters. Then Castellio came into conflict with Calvin himself over certain doctrinal opinions which he held and did not hesitate to make public.¹⁷⁰ These doctrinal

differences between the two men came to a head in January, 1544, when Castellio asked to be admitted into the pastoral ranks.¹⁷¹ Calvin staunchly opposed this request before the Council on the grounds that Castellio's heterodoxy made him unfit to occupy a pastoral post: "Registre du Conseil, January, 1544: S. Chateillon, regent. Calvin represents to the Council that it is very right...to employ the regent, but not in the office of the ministry, on account of certain peculiar opinions which he entertains".¹⁷² Being refused this office, Castellio resigned from the principalship of the College on 17 February, 1544, and made plans to go to Basle where he had been offered a teaching post.¹⁷³

He was replaced by Charles Damont, a former professor at Orleans, but it was soon apparent that the new principal would not last long at his post. He argued incessantly with his two under-masters and was unable to assert any authority over them. When he showed himself incapable of maintaining discipline in the College at large, he was discharged from his office. Again the Council made a desperate appeal to Cordier for his services, but the aging professor was still not ready to return to the city that had treated him so disrespectfully in 1538.

For several months during the year 1545, the two bacheliers, Mussard and Rolph, were in charge of running the College on a day to day basis while Calvin and the Council looked for a new rector.¹⁷⁴ After making inquiries at Strasbourg and Lausanne, Calvin finally was able to secure Erasmus Cornier who was officially appointed "maître de l'eschole" early in 1546.¹⁷⁵ During Cornier's tenure, the College ran much more efficiently simply because he was able to assume authority

over his bacheliers.¹⁷⁶ He let it be known in no uncertain terms that the under-masters were precisely what their title implied - "petits magisters" - whose sole duty was to act as "une aide pour apprendre a lire et ecrire aux enfants".¹⁷⁷ As such, they were inferior in status and authority to the principal.

For the next four years Cornier was able to maintain complete control over the school. When he died in April, 1550, Louis Enoch was appointed as his successor, assuming office in May of this year. Enoch inherited the perennial problem of insubordinate under-masters which his predecessor had managed to curtail but not totally eliminate. The constant turn over in the office of principal had allowed the bacheliers to take control of the College for long periods of time. Furthermore, the disruptive circumstances in the school had made it necessary for the Council itself to elect every new under-master since 1541 because it just so happened that at the time of each new appointment there was no acting principal.¹⁷⁸ As a consequence, the bacheliers had grown to regard themselves as independent of the principal (the one who would have normally hired them). Cornier had managed to set things right for a time, but with the appointment of yet another new rector, the under-masters once again tried to assert their independence. This internal bickering continued for several years until Enoch finally told the Council that either his radical bacheliers went or he did. The two under-masters (Mussard and Colinet) were dismissed in 1553. In their place Enoch appointed Jean Barbier and Jean du Perril. The following year (1554) one Pierre Duc (M. Ductz) was hired as a third bachelier to teach Hebrew at the College.¹⁷⁹

We should mention at this point that in addition to grammar instruction which was the primary concern of the College from its inception, music lessons had also regularly been given at this institution since 1543. In this year Guillaume Franc of Rouen was appointed master of the "leçon de chant au Collège" and was allotted 100 florins per year plus lodging by the Council for his services. Franc was succeeded by Guillaume Fabri in 1545; the famous Louis Bourgeois in 1547; Pierre Dagues in 1556; and Pierre Grenade in 1559.¹⁸⁰ The latter, we are told, was "presented" to the Council for appointment by Calvin "au nom de la Compagnie".¹⁸¹ The Council also encouraged drama productions at the College by financing several plays put on by the students. On 17 March, 1546, 2 écus were allotted for a school play honouring the history of the city. On 7 June, 1546, the students acted out, in Latin, the biblical story of Joseph and his brothers; and on 1 April, 1549, they produced a comedy based on Terence. Another "history" was performed on 29 August, 1542.¹⁸²

Louis Enoch resigned from his post as principal and stopped teaching at the College on 24 April, 1556 at which time he was elected "minister of the Word".¹⁸³ His successor was one of the under-masters, Jean Barbier, who was still principal when the new Academy opened in 1559.

V. THE GENEVAN ACADEMY

With the founding of the Academy, the old "Collège de Rive" was transformed from a basic grammar school into a university of higher learning. It had taken eighteen years for this to transpire, and probably would have taken a lot

longer had it not been for the work and perseverance of Calvin. For several years the Libertine party, led by Ami Perrin, had mounted considerable opposition to the Reformer's ecclesiastical and civil policies. The pro-Calvin forces were not able to gain governmental control until the February elections of 1555, when the citizens of Geneva elected four of the Reformer's supporters to be their Syndics. These Syndics made sure that the Libertines held no power in either of the three governing Councils ("Little", "Sixty", and "Two-hundred"), thus ensuring that the new regime would be sympathetic to Calvin's ideas. He was therefore in a much better position to persuade the governing powers to implement his educational plans for the city. And yet, when he approached the Council on 17 March, 1556, suggesting that the College should be expanded to meet the needs of the growing number of students, his suggestion was not immediately acted upon.¹⁸⁴ This was not on account of any political opposition to the Reformer's plans, but simply a result of a difference of opinion between Calvin and the Council regarding what issues should be given priority. The Council was in the midst of difficult negotiations with Berne, and was not prepared at this particular time to get involved in launching a major project like the building of a new Academy.

On 28 March, 1558, a building committee was finally set up. It consisted of the four Syndics, four civic councillors, two lay secretaries, Calvin and Enoch (representing the Church), M. Tissot (sautier), and M. Dusetour (charpentier).¹⁸⁵ That evening, after supper, the committee went to inspect a prospective site, suggested by Calvin, for the new Academy. It was located in the upper part of

a vineyard referred to as the "garden of Bolomier" which was adjoined to the land on which the Hospital stood.¹⁸⁶ The committee all agreed that this would make a fine location for the Academy, and construction began a few months later, at the end of the year (1558). It was soon realized that the building costs were going to exceed the budget, and so extraordinary tactics had to be employed in order to bring more money into the coffers. The Council decreed that fines imposed on criminal offenders should be partially channelled into the building fund; an appeal was made asking for voluntary contributions; and lawyers, at the request of the civic authorities, encouraged their clients to bequeath a portion of their estates to the project.

By 1562, regular classes were being held in the new building even though it was not yet complete. By the following year there was still no heating facilities and the windows, because they had no glass, were covered only with oiled paper.¹⁸⁷ Up until June, 1562, the leçons publiques, that is, the advanced lectures of the schola publica (cf. infra, 200), were given in this new building along with the seven elementary classes of the schola privata (cf. infra, 197). Then, in the middle of this month (June 15), it was decided that the leçons publiques should be moved to Notre-Dame-la-Neuve, probably because the new building was not large enough to accommodate the growing number of students.¹⁸⁸ Notre-Dame-la-Neuve was one of the earliest Churches built in Geneva (1213) which eventually fell into disuse as other more modern ones were erected (i.e. La Madeleine, Saint Pierre, Saint Gervais). From 1562 then, this old Church, conveniently situated right across from Saint Pierre, became

the new auditoire, not only for Calvin's theology lectures, but also for all the advanced leçons of the Academy.

The teaching staff of the Academy was secured mainly by Calvin's initiative. Knowing that the opening of this new institution was imminent, the Reformer wrote, in 1558, to Jean Mercier, one of the outstanding Hebraists of the day, offering him a chair at Geneva, but for some reason unknown, he was unwilling to accept it.¹⁸⁹ Calvin then tried to obtain Emmanuel Tremellius, another Hebrew scholar, but he too was unavailable.¹⁹⁰ At last, Calvin was able that same year to acquire the services of Theodore Beza who had recently resigned his post as professor of New Testament at the Lausanne Academy after disputes with his employer, the Council of Berne. This was the break that the Genevan Academy needed, for Beza, whose recently published Latin translation of the New Testament (1557) made him one of the foremost NT scholars of the 16th century, would greatly enhance the institution's reputation. He arrived in Geneva on 10 October, 1558, and was immediately employed as professor of Greek at a salary of 300 florins a year.¹⁹¹ However, the Register indicates that at the time of his hiring it was hoped that he would eventually become a ministere de la parole de Dieu.¹⁹² This is, in fact, what actually transpired, for on 16 March, 1559, he was "elected minister of the holy Gospel, to officiate in the place of our late brother, M. Claude de Pont".¹⁹³

Beza was not the only one to leave Lausanne over disputes with the Bernese Council. Within a few months of his arrival in Geneva, the entire staff at Lausanne joined him at the Academy. In March, 1559, François Bérauld¹⁹⁴ was officially

appointed professor of Greek to replace Beza (now pastor and doctor theologiae, cf, infra, 203ff); Antoine Chevalier¹⁹⁵ became professor of Hebrew; and Jean Tagaut¹⁹⁶, professor of Arts, which included mathematics, dialectic, rhetoric, and physics. Jean Randon¹⁹⁷ another colleague, taught the first class of the schola privata. Maturin Cordier, who had been teaching at Lausanne since 8 October, 1545, at first refused invitations to teach at Geneva, but changed his mind in 1559, arriving in this city in October of that year.¹⁹⁸ On 16 February, 1562, now very advanced in years, he was appointed regent of the 5th class in the lower school.¹⁹⁹

The Academy was officially opened on 5 June, 1559, in a formal public assembly at Saint Pierre cathedral. The ceremony included an opening address by Beza, now officially Recteur du Collège,²⁰⁰ and a closing speech by Calvin, but the central part of the celebration was the promulgation of the Leges Academiae Genevensis. These regulations had been drafted by the ministers (with Calvin no doubt acting as the guiding light), and then presented to the city Council for ratification on 22 May, 1559.²⁰¹ The preamble to the Leges announced the names of the public professors,²⁰² the seven secondary instructors, and the singing master.²⁰³

According to these statutes,²⁰⁴ the new educational institution was divided into two parts: the schola privata, for children between the ages of 6/7 to about 12/13 years of age; and the schola publica, where more advanced training was given by the public professors. The original Latin text of the Leges consistently spoke of the schola privata and the schola publica within the larger context of the Academia. In 1561 and 1562,²⁰⁵ the Leges were translated into French

under the title: L'Ordre du Collège de Geneve, and in these editions we find greater differentiation between the two scholae. The schola privata is now referred to as the "Collège" or the "Collège pour les enfans",²⁰⁶ and the schola publica as the "grande escole publique" or the "Université".²⁰⁷ In the former, the teachers were called Maistres or Regens; in the latter, Lecteurs or Professeurs publiques.²⁰⁸ It is highly significant that only the professors of theology (Calvin and Beza), were given the title "Doctor": "Theologiam enim D. Iohannes Calvinus multis iam ante annis profitebatur, cui nunc D. Theodorus Beza, qui alternis hebdomadibus idem munus obeat, collega adiunctus est".²⁰⁹ The administrative authority for the entire institution was the Rector to whom all the teachers were ultimately responsible, but in the schola privata the Masters and Regents were directly responsible to the Principal (Ludimagister).²¹⁰

The academic year for the schola privata began on 1 May and continued for the full 12 months, except for a 3 week break at the time of the grape harvest.²¹¹ The students were divided into 7 classes according to age and breadth of knowledge, the first class being the most advanced. The first three years (7th, 6th and 5th classes) were devoted to learning to read and write, both in Latin and French, using the Latin-French catechism (printed in 1554) as the basic reader. In the 5th class the student was introduced to the Bucolics or Eclogues of Virgil in order to learn the rudimentary principles of syntax. In the 4th class, more advanced principles of syntax were mastered by studying the Letters of Cicero, as well as the Elegies of Ovid. The young

scholar also began to study elementary Greek at this time, and by the end of the year he would have been able to read simple sentences and conjugate certain verbs. Upon entering the 3rd class at about the age of 11,²¹² the student intensified his study of Greek grammar and began to work on his Latin writing style by reading such books as De Amicitia, De Senectute, and the Aeneid of Virgil, the Commentaries of Caesar, and the Hortatory Speeches of Isocrates. In the 2nd class, he was taught history and the basics of dialectic for the first time while continuing with his language studies. For the final year at the schola privata, the student received advanced instruction in dialectic and began learning the elements of rhetoric. He was also given the chance to utilize his dialectical and rhetorical skills by giving speeches twice a month, on Wednesday afternoons, in front of his teachers and comrades.²¹³

Classes were conducted every Monday, Tuesday, Thursday, and Friday, starting at 6 a.m. in the summer, and 7 a.m. in the winter.²¹⁴ On Wednesday mornings the students went to their local Churches to hear a sermon. After this they had breakfast and then were divided up into groups of 10, according to their academic standing, and for one hour (11-12 noon) they were questioned regarding what had been said in the sermon. Neither the Leges Academiae nor L'Ordre du Collège mention who carried out this exercise, but we may infer that it was the pastors themselves, since we are told that there was only one teacher from the schola privata present at each Church and he was responsible only for ensuring that the students were in attendance and behaved themselves.²¹⁵ The younger students spent Wednesday afternoons at play, but the

students in the 1st and 2nd classes, as we said above, were required to give speeches twice a month during this period. On the other two Wednesday afternoons, they had to write compositions which were handed in and graded on the following day.

Although there were no regular classes on Saturday, all the students still went to the Academy where they spent the morning going over the week's lessons.²¹⁶ After lunch the older students (1st and 2nd classes) would debate for an hour and then take a break until 3 o'clock. From 3-4 p.m. the pupils of the 2nd class would "read" the Gospel of Luke "in Greek"; those in the 1st class would do the same with some Epistle of the Apostles.²¹⁷ It would appear that, since no mention is made of theological instruction being given, this "reading" of the New Testament did not involve doctrinal teaching, but was done strictly for the purpose of language (grammar) training.²¹⁸ Included in every student's education (at least, those who were old enough) was regular attendance at the Sunday sermons given in the morning and afternoon. They were not only expected to listen attentively to these sermons and "meditate" upon them, but they were also required to take notes, just as they would at an academic lecture.²¹⁹ It is significant for our study to be aware that the masters and regents in the schola privata did not engage in religious teaching per se. They may have led devotional exercises, and used biblical texts for linguistic and grammatical purposes, but they were not responsible for doctrinal instruction in the faith. The students received this instruction from the pastors at the sermons and the question period after the one given on Wednesday mornings, and during

the catechetical classes held in the various Churches.²²⁰

After the student had completed the 1st class of the schola privata, he could continue his education at the schola publica, although this was not mandatory. By this stage of his life, he was regarded as a mature and responsible adult, and so the schola publica was run with a minimum of regulations. One registered in the "University" simply by signing the Confession of Faith.²²¹ There were 27 hours of lectures each week at the schola publica, each lecture being one or two hours in length. The professor of arts lectured 8 hours per week, 3 on the physical sciences, that is, physics and mathematics, and 5 on advanced dialectic and rhetoric. The professor of Greek also gave 8 hours of lectures every week, 3 on moral philosophy (ethics) and 5 on the interpretation of the work of various writers including poets, orators, and historians. Similarly, the professor of Hebrew gave a total of 8 hours of lectures weekly, 2 were spent on Hebrew grammar, and the remaining 6 were devoted to "explaining" (exposer; in Latin, interpretari) some book in the Old Testament.²²²

We should pause for a moment to try and determine what this "explanation" involved. Did it refer to doctrinal instruction, that is, commenting on the "spiritual" meaning of the text? Was the professor of Hebrew charged with expounding the Word of God? In other words, were these proper theological lectures parallel to those given by Calvin? Several authors believe that this is, indeed, the case and therefore translate the words exposer and interpretari literally.²²³ Perhaps they are led to this conclusion by the fact that the two documents use the same verbs to describe

the function of the professors of theology;²²⁴ or because the documents go on to indicate that this "explanation" should be carried out with the aid of the Hebrew commentaries: "Que le professeur expose le matin incontinent après le sermon quelque livre du Vieil testament avec les commentaires des Hebreux".²²⁵ More likely they have simply followed Borgeaud's monumental work where, in reference to Antoine Chevalier's function at the Academy, he writes:

A Genève, où il professa de 1559 à 1566, son programme exigeait qu'il interprêtât les livres de l'Ancien Testament... Ces leçons d'exégèse biblique, fixées de suite après le culte, remontaient évidemment à l'enseignement donné autrefois par Farel, avec l'aide du 'lecteur en Ebrieu' du Collège de Rive, et correspondaient, comme déjà cet enseignement, aux trois leçons que Calvin faisait l'après-midi sur le Nouveau Testament. 226

There is good reason, however, to question Borgeaud's interpretation of this particular point. His claim that Chevalier's three morning lectures on the Old Testament correspond to Farel's theology lectures given during the years 1536-1538 cannot be correct because we know that from 1547 Calvin himself became the professor of OT theology and continued to lecture exclusively on the OT books until his death. Furthermore, there is no indication in the relevant historical documents that anyone other than Calvin was responsible for OT exegesis during these years. We also know that by 1559 there was no "lecteur en Ebrieu" in the schola privata as there had been during Farel's day (cf. supra, 178), for the Leges make no mention of this subject being taught (i.e. post-1559) in the lower classes. Thus, Chevalier's lectures in the schola publica were the first formal instruction that the students received in this language.

On the basis of these two facts, then: i) Calvin himself was responsible for OT exegesis, and ii) the lectures in the schola publica were the only instruction in the Hebrew language offered at the Academy, we maintain that Chevalier's three morning lectures employed OT texts solely for the purpose of language instruction, and did not involve theological exegesis or the teaching of doctrine. Since this was an introductory course, it is not surprising that the students were put through an intensive program of study involving eight hours of lectures each week. Two of these, as we have said, were spent on grammar. But we know that language study (Latin and Greek) at the Academy did not only include the study of grammar; the translation of various well-known classical works was also part of the program. It is reasonable to suppose then, that the same method would have been employed to teach Hebrew.

We may therefore conjecture that the professor of Hebrew used the Old Testament books as a means of familiarizing the students with the grammatical and linguistic style of the biblical authors, and to show in a practical way how the language was used, just as had been done in the Latin and Greek classes. We suggest that the professor used the Hebrew commentaries, not to help with doctrinal interpretation, but simply for linguistic commentary and to ensure that he was translating the words correctly in their theological context. Perhaps a better translation of the verb interpretari would be "translate": "The professor of Hebrew shall translate in the morning, immediately after the sermon, some book of the Old Testament".²²⁷

If we understand that the professor of Hebrew used the books of the OT in his lectures strictly for the purpose of language instruction, then it is not at all "strange" to learn that the professor of Greek did not deal with the New Testament in his courses.²²⁸ For if our interpretation of the situation is correct, then the only reason why the professor of Greek would utilize the NT books would also be for the purpose of language study. But the Greek course at the schola publica, unlike the course in Hebrew, was not an elementary language course. The students had already been well trained in Greek during their years in the schola privata (cf. supra, 198). Therefore it should come as no surprise to find that the NT was not studied in the Greek lectures at the schola publica. The fact that the professor of Hebrew used Scripture in his lectures and the professor of Greek did not, would seem to lend further support to our claim that the OT books were used by the former solely for the purpose of teaching his students the Hebrew language.

In addition to the public professors of Greek, Hebrew, and Arts, L'Ordre du Collège also included two professors of Theology - Calvin and Beza - who were charged with expounding the books of Holy Scripture. The theology lectures were given every Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday, from 2-3 in the afternoon, and it was stipulated that each man would lecture in alternate weeks.²²⁹ The prospectus does not say how this theological instruction was divided between Calvin and Beza, but since we know that the former lectured entirely on the OT during these years, then one would assume that Beza was responsible for NT exegesis. H.M. Baird, quoting an article by J.E. Cellerier, conjectures that the two Reformers at

first confined themselves to the "simple interpretation of the books of the Bible", but then, "at a later time" (he does not say when) one of the two began to lecture on the "common places" while his colleague continued to devote himself to exegesis.²³⁰ If this were true, and neither author gives any evidence for this theory, then it must have been Beza who dealt with systematic theology, which means that nobody would be lecturing on the NT, unless, of course, Beza incorporated this into his "systematics" lectures.

In July, 1560,²³¹ Beza was sent to Nerac "in order to instruct the King of Navarre in the Word of God", and he returned to Geneva in November of that year. Then in August, 1561,²³² he left the city again to attend the Colloquy of Poissy, but this time he was absent for many more months than he had expected, having been detained by the civil war, so that he did not return until September, 1562.²³³ During both these periods, no one was appointed to take over Beza's teaching post, so Calvin, with not a little inconvenience, was required to give his absent colleague's lectures as well as his own:

Beza's absence, besides the extraordinary burden of lecturing which it imposes on me, is for many other reasons annoying to me. ²³⁴
It is not without great regret that we are still to be deprived for some time of the presence of our brother, M. Beza, for the Church incurs a great loss by it, and the students who are here for the purpose of following a course of theology, have their studies retarded, inasmuch as I cannot satisfy all the demands that are made on my time. ²³⁵

It is significant that neither Calvin nor Beza were formally appointed public professors in title. L'Ordre du Collège says that only the professors of Hebrew, Greek and Arts "soyent esleus et confermez ainsi qu'il a este des

autres" (i.e. the masters and regents in the schola privata).²³⁶ Nor were they given any special remuneration for their theology lectures. The professors of Greek, Hebrew, and Arts were paid 280 florins per year at the time they were hired in 1559.²³⁷ This was increased to 300 florins in April, 1562, making their salary commensurate to that of the pastors in the country, but 100 florins less than the city pastors' annual wage.²³⁸ When Beza was ordained and then assumed the joint chair in theology with Calvin (1559), he continued to receive the same amount that was allotted to him when he first came to Geneva as professor of Greek in 1558, that is, 300 florins per year.²³⁹ Calvin was receiving 500 florins for his services, the very same salary that was given to him when he returned to Geneva from Strasbourg in 1541.²⁴⁰ It would therefore appear that these theology lectures were considered to be an extension of Beza's and Calvin's pastoral office, a point which we will be referring to again at the end of this section.²⁴¹

Not all the students enrolled in the schola publica studied theology, but those who did were required to register separately by entering their names in a special catalogue in addition to the mandatory procedure of signing the Confession of Faith.²⁴² The three weekly lectures given by Calvin and Beza formed the basis of theological instruction at the Academy. Every Saturday afternoon, from 2-3 o'clock, the theology students were given the opportunity of applying their theological knowledge and pedagogical skills by expounding a passage from Scripture in front of their colleagues and some of the pastors.²⁴³ After the student had delivered his exposition, the ministers, and anyone else present,

could criticize what he had said as long as this criticism was given "modestly and in the fear of God". In addition, all students, in their turn, were required to write each month an essay on some theological proposition. Before turning it into the professor for marking, the student had to read his paper publicly and then defend it against anyone in the audience who wanted to argue a point. At least one of the professors of theology was always present to preside in the dispute.

This, then was the official program of courses offered at the Genevan Academy from its inception in 1559, although other subjects were soon to be added. In his inaugural address, Beza had looked forward to the day when "law and medicine" would be included in the curriculum. By 26 September, 1559, just a few months after the new school opened, a doctor of medicine, one Blaisse Hollier, was granted permission to give public lectures,²⁴⁴ but he was not paid for this instruction.²⁴⁵ Nevertheless, lectures in medicine continued to be offered, and in 1564 the Council authorized les anatomies - the dissection of human bodies obtained from the nearby hospital, for demonstration purposes in the medical classes.²⁴⁶ The study of medicine was given official sanction in 1567, when Simon Simoni, professor of philosophy at the Academy since 1565,²⁴⁷ was paid to give lectures on medicine, although no separate chair was created.²⁴⁸

On 14, May, 1564, the Council decreed, probably at Beza's instigation, that one or two professors of law should be hired to teach at the Academy, and on 15 April, 1566, Pierre Charpentier, from Paris, was appointed to this position.²⁴⁹ We may assume that the law lectures commenced shortly after

his appointment.

Johann Haller, in a letter to Bullinger written on 9 October, 1559, expressed what was probably a very common opinion at the time when he forecasted the failure of the Genevan Academy, but it was not long before Haller's prediction was proved wrong. When the Academy first opened there were 280 pupils in the 7th class of the schola privata alone, and in the course of the next three years, 167 students registered in the schola publica. By 1564, these numbers had risen considerably. There was now a total of about 1200 students in the "College", and about 300 in the "University" drawn from all over Western Europe. Among some of the more eminent students who signed their names to the Confession of Faith during the early years of the Academy's existence were: Jean de Serres, a Huguenot historian and future rector of the Academy at Nîmes; Oléviannus de Trèves, a contributor to the Heidelberg Catechism and appointed professor at the université palatine in 1561; Florent Chrestien, the private tutor of Henri IV; and Thomas Bodley, the founder of the university library at Oxford.²⁵⁰ Within a matter of a few years, the Academy at Geneva had become one of the major academic centers in Protestant Europe.

CHAPTER THREE
THE DOCTORS OF THE GENEVAN CHURCH

Having examined Calvin's views on the nature of ecclesiastical office, and having surveyed the history and structure of education in Geneva, we can now come to some conclusions about who in particular were recognized as doctores ecclesiae by the Reformer and his contemporaries in this city. We have seen that Calvin spoke often of the doctoral function in the Church. But what exactly did this function involve? Did it include the teaching of "all branches of knowledge", both on the elementary and advanced level,²⁵¹ or were only the "public professors" in the schola publica considered proper ecclesiastical officeholders?²⁵² Neither of these commonly held opinions, we believe, are faithful to Calvin's position. Nor do they accurately represent the situation in Geneva during his lifetime. The Reformer consistently described the doctoral function of the Church as involving only one thing, namely, the interpretation and exposition of Scripture. The evidence we are about to examine suggests that the same holds true for the actual practice in Geneva. That is to say, the only men in this city's educational system who held ecclesiastical office were the professors of theology who expounded the biblical books in the auditoire.

I. CALVIN'S UNDERSTANDING OF THE DOCTORAL FUNCTION
IN THE CHURCH : HIS WRITINGS

We should begin by pointing out that this author has not found a single instance in any of Calvin's commentaries,

sermons, lectures, letters, tracts, or dogmatic works indicating that the doctor ecclesiae was involved with teaching anything other than doctrina. Nowhere does Calvin suggest that it is part of the Church's public ministry to provide instruction in any of the liberal arts subjects. It would be inconceivable that, had the Reformer actually regarded the bacheliers and/or the publici professores of Hebrew, Greek, and Arts as an integral part of the doctoral office of the Church, he would have neglected to mention them in his numerous references to this ecclesiastical office. What is more, Calvin explicitly says, when distinguishing between res caelestae and res terrenae (cf. supra, 161-2), that the teaching of liberal arts (disciplinae que liberales) is not to be regarded as a "sacred" function because it was not a "spiritual" but a "natural" gift. This meant that the non-Christian could be a perfectly competent doctor of philosophy, languages, etc.²⁵³

The implication is that the Church has neither been called nor empowered to deal with these "earthly" matters. Not that it is to neglect them, but such knowledge is not specifically the domain of the spiritual kingdom and is therefore extraneous to the Church's public ministry. The teaching of theology, on the other hand, was an entirely different matter. Since the knowledge of God is a "supernatural gift", the doctor theologiae is by necessity a Christian believer who has been especially endowed with this gift to serve the Church. We find throughout his writings that Calvin consistently and unequivocally describes the doctor ecclesiae as the one who has been given this particular donum of dealing

with the knowledge of God by expounding Scripture.

In his commentary on Romans (1540), the Reformer writes that "the doctor is one who informs and instructs the Church by the Word of truth".²⁵⁴ Elsewhere he tells us what he means by the "Word of truth" on which the doctor bases the content of his instruction: "It is the Law, the Prophets, and the Gospel. Those who wonder beyond these limits of revelation, find nothing but the impostures of Satan and his delusions instead of the Word of the Lord".²⁵⁵ A few years later, in the 1543 edition of the Institutio, he makes his position on this matter more explicit when he writes that the doctor's function has to do strictly with "the interpretation of Scripture to keep doctrine whole and pure among believers".²⁵⁶ In this same work he notes that the Doctorum officia has "exactly the same purpose" as the propheticum munus.²⁵⁷ In his commentary on Romans, the Reformer had described the prophet as one who "performs the office of interpreter with skill and dexterity in expounding the will of God. In the Christian Church, therefore, prophecy at the present day is simply the right understanding of Scripture and the particular gift of expounding it".²⁵⁸

Even when Calvin discusses the different ways in which the title "Doctor" is used in relation to the Church's ministry in his commentary on I Corinthians, he never suggests that this term could have reference to anything else but the interpretation of Scripture: "The task of doctors consists in preserving and propagating sana dogmata so that the purity of religion may remain in the Church".²⁵⁹ "These are indeed the chief things required of a doctor", writes Calvin in his commentary on I Timothy, "that he should hold to the pure

truth of the Gospel, and that he should minister it with a good conscience and honest zeal".²⁶⁰ Again, in his commentary on I Peter, the Reformer remarks that those who have been rightly appointed by public authority to be doctors in the Church are truly representatives of Christ by virtue of the fact that they "teach the oracles of God".²⁶¹ And so, "the proper office of a doctor is not to produce some novel thing out of his own head, but to adapt Scripture to the people's immediate need".²⁶² Commenting on Matthew 13:51, the Reformer writes: "The doctors of the Church should be taught by long meditation, so that as need arises they may minister doctrine to the Church from God's Word as from a store-house".²⁶³ Later in this same commentary, he says that "a true doctor must be reckoned as one who does not introduce human constructions, who does not step aside from the genuine Word of God, who hands out (so to speak) what he has taken from the mouth of God. Finally, one who has a sincere desire for edification, and suits his lesson to the use and salvation of the people, without of course any artificial colouring".²⁶⁴

Calvin quite often links the Church's doctoral function with the term aedificatio.²⁶⁵ If one's teaching is not "edifying", then it is not to be given in the Church. It is possible that men may be "edified" in the wrong things, thus causing them to "delight in their vain imaginations".²⁶⁶ Calvin therefore insists that the aedificatio ecclesiae consists of teaching that has a specific content:

To speak to edification is to give teaching (doctrina) suitable for upbuilding (aedificando). For I take this term to mean teaching (doctrina) which trains us in piety, in faith, in the worship and fear of God, and in the duties of holiness and righteousness. ²⁶⁷

The teaching ministry of the Church is not called upon to provide believers with a general education in "secular" knowledge. This is not its mission in the world. Calvin reminds us that "the power of the Church is not infinite but subject to the Lord's Word and, as it were, enclosed within it".²⁶⁸ For these reasons he avers: "Let this be a firm principle: ...The only proper way of teaching in the Church (rite docendi in Ecclesia modum) is by the prescription and standard of his Word".²⁶⁹

Nowhere in Calvin's writings, as was noted above, have we found any instance of the Reformer connecting the "schools" or the "liberal arts" with the function of the doctor ecclesiae. Now we must determine whether or not the actual practice in Geneva was consistent with this position. Is there any evidence in the historical records to indicate that the Reformer or his contemporaries regarded the teaching staff at the College and Academy as ecclesiastical office-holders?

II. THE STATUS OF THE TEACHING STAFF

AT THE COLLEGE AND ACADEMY

We should recall that our examination of the history and structure of the "Collège de Rive" and the Academy revealed these institutions to be more closely associated with the State than the Church. This was particularly true before the city declared its adherence to Reformed principles, but even after the arrival of Calvin, the civic Councils continued to play the primary role in managing and maintaining the educational system. That the Academy was regarded more as a State than an ecclesiastical institution in the eyes of

the Reformers themselves is attested to by Beza's inaugural address delivered on 5 June, 1559. Here Beza indicates that it was not so much the Church but the political authorities which should be given credit for the educational progress in the city when he refers to "des loix que les magnifiques Seigneurs du Conseil ont établies pour ordonner et maintenir l'estat de ceste escole", and "le magnifiques Conseil de ceste cite...a eu en souveraine recommandation de dresser une escole".²⁷⁰ Beza then goes on to make it clear that he views the scholastic heritage of the Genevan Academy to be in line with other great academic centres of the past - from the time of the ancient Greeks, through the age of Charles the Great, to Medieval Europe - which had been founded by divinely guided temporal authorities.²⁷¹ It is quite evident, then, that in Beza's mind the Academy was principally a State institution, and we can hardly doubt that in this historic address he was expressing, not just his own views, but also those of Calvin and the other pastors.

It is highly significant in this regard that in the statutes themselves (L'Ordre des escoles de Genève), under the "Oath for the Rector", we find that the Rector had to promise to exhort all the students in the schola publica "de se maintenir sous la suietton et obeissance de nos seigneurs et superieurs". More importantly, this oath goes on to stipulate that if the Rector is not able to maintain discipline among the scholars by friendly admonition, then he is to notify the Council (Messieurs) so that this civil authority could deal with the problem.²⁷² We should also bear in mind that the teachers in the College and later the Academy had, from the start, been paid directly by the Council.²⁷³

It would be quite erroneous, however, to conclude from this that the educational institutions in Geneva were completely independent of the Church. Calvin, as we have seen played a crucial role in getting the Council actually to build a new Academy, and he was also responsible for securing suitable staff, both for the "Collège de Rive" and the Academy.²⁷⁴ Moreover, the theology lectures he had been giving since 1536 formed a basic ingredient of the academic curriculum. And the fact that Beza, a pastor and doctor ecclesiae, was appointed as the first Rector of the Academy also testifies to the Church's involvement in this realm. Given the rather ambivalent nature of the College and Academy, founded and governed, principally by the State but aided by the Church, we must now try and discern the status of the individual members of staff at these educational institutions. We will begin by attempting to determine who exactly were given the title "Doctor" during Calvin's career in this city.

An examination of the relevant documents reveals that there is no record of the Regent or his under-masters at the Reformed "Collège de Rive" (1536-1559) ever having been referred to as doctors. L'Ordre et maniere d'enseigner en la ville de Geneue au College and Ordo et Ratio Docendi describe the teachers as lecteurs and maistres (magistri); Antoine Saunier is designated principal (praefectus), but Calvin and Farel are not given any title in this prospectus. In the Ordonnances ecclésiastiques, the second order of Church government is the docteurs. It is significant that in the actual text describing this "order", the title doctor is associated only with those individuals who were involved

with the interpretation of Scripture: "L'office propre de docteurs est d'enseigner les fidèles en saine doctrine, afin que la pureté de l'évangile ne soit corrompue ou par ignorance ou par mauvaises opinions".²⁷⁵ The document then goes on to describe those who are to teach "languages" and "dialectics" in the proposed new College as lecteurs, and the ones responsible for teaching "petit enfans" as bacheliers.

A study of the Registre du Conseil during these years (1536-1559) reveals that the various teachers at the "Collège de Rive" (i.e. Pichon, Gaspard, Vindons, Vaultiers, Vignerii, Mussard, Rolph, etc.) were most often described as bacheliers, and less frequently as sous-maîtres or magistri. But never are they given the title docteur or doctor. The successors of Saunier as director of the College (i.e. Castellio, Cornier, Enoch, Barbier) were usually given the title regent or maître de l'école. Again, nowhere do we find them described as doctors.

In fact, the Registre du Conseil refers explicitly only to two men as docteurs: Calvin and one of his colleagues by the name of Matthieu de Geneston. On 16 July, 1542, two new predicans (P. Osias and P. Blanchet) and two new dyacres (M. de Geneston and T. Treppereau), were ordained into the ministry of the Genevan Church.²⁷⁶ For their services the preachers were paid 220 florins and Treppereau, as deacon, was given 140 florins; but de Geneston, although also ordained deacon, received 200 florins on account of his "extra duties".²⁷⁷ What these duties were, we are not told. About a year later, in April, 1543, de Geneston's salary was raised from 200 florins to 220 florins (the same as a pastor's wage), once again because of his added responsibilities.

Now we know that he was not ordained pastor or preacher at this time, for the Registre states that from 1543-1544, the pastoral order in the city consisted of Calvin, Ecclesia (i.e. Osias), Blanchet, Henri, and Champereau.²⁷⁸ In fact, it is not until 1544 that de Geneston was admitted to the pastorate, although no official record of a ceremony taking place was entered in the Registre.²⁷⁹ We also know that he was not serving as a bachelier in the College at this time.²⁸⁰ What then was he doing in order to receive this very substantial supplement to the normal stipend of a deacon? We find the answer in the entry for 2 June, 1543 and 5 June, 1543, where the Registre refers to de Geneston and Calvin as docteurs of the Genevan Church: "Ce sont presentes M. Calvin et M. de Geneston docteurs, M. Philippe de Eglesia, M. Abel et M. Loys Treppereaulx, ministres et predicans de Geneue".²⁸¹ ... "Messieurs les ministres assavoyer M. Jehan Calvin et M. de Geneston docteurs, Ayme Champereau, Philippe de Eglesia, Abel Popin et Loys Champereaulx predicans en Geneue".²⁸²

We will recall that before Calvin's exile he, along with Farel, gave the theology lectures "at" the College (i.e. in the auditoire of Saint Pierre cathedral) and took the leading role in dealing with matters relating to doctrine and the faith.²⁸³ But when Calvin returned to Geneva in September, 1541, Farel did not return with him. Someone would have had to take his place, and it appears that de Geneston was chosen as the one to do this. We know for certain that Calvin lectured on the New Testament from 1536-1538, and on the Old Testament from 1547/1548 until his death in 1564.²⁸⁴ It seems most likely, then, that he would have continued with his lectures on the New Testament for some time after

returning to Geneva in 1541. We can therefore assume that de Geneston was probably expounding the Old Testament during his term as docteur. That he did in fact function in this capacity appears to be confirmed by an entry in the Registre for 18 August, 1542. Just one month after being ordained to the diaconate, we find that he was giving "sermons" at Saint Pierre cathedral "in the mornings":

M. Calvin a expose quil seroyt bien convenable par ung temps fere changement de ministres affin que le peuple soyt tant mieulx ediffie et entre eulx hont advise qui lui et Champereaulx fero-yent leur debvoyer a la Magdeleine, M. Henry et M. de Geneston auroyent a fere les sermons a S. Pierre le matin et de Eglesia et M. Pierre a S. Gervex ce que luy a este accorde. 285

Since de Geneston had not yet been ordained predicans, we should assume that this entry is referring to his work as a docteur, that is, to the academic lectures on the Bible which had traditionally been given at the cathedral Church. (We note that Farel had given his OT lectures in the mornings, from 9-10, at the grand-temple).²⁸⁶

As docteurs of the Church, de Geneston and Calvin were not just responsible for expounding Scripture in the auditoire. They also, to use the language of the Ordonnances ecclésiastiques, had the task of "ensuring that the purity of the Gospel was not corrupted either by ignorance or by false teaching". Thus, we find the two docteurs presiding over doctrinal disputes and various matters pertaining to the faith. In the entry for 3 December, 1543, for instance, we read the following:

Sur ce quil este ordonne de fere revision des ordonnances du droyct a este resoluz que lon doybge a cella vacquer et hont estes deutes les Srs. Girardin de la Rive consindicque, Claude Pertemps, Cl. Roset, Domene Arlo, M. Calvin, M. de Geneston, et le Secretaire Beguin. 287

At a Friday congrégation held on 30 May, 1554, Sebastian Castellio levelled a cutting attack against the ministers in Geneva. During the question period which followed the exposition of II Corinthians 6:4 - "in all things approving ourselves as ministers of God", Castellio stood up and proceeded to accuse the pastors of being self-serving, impatient, and unfair. The following day we read that "M. Calvin et M. de Geneston" were called upon to refute Castellio's claims and bring charges against him.²⁸⁸

During this period, Calvin himself was both a pastor and a doctor, but we have seen that de Geneston was functioning as a docteur for about a year before being officially received into the pastoral ranks. This fully accords with what Calvin had to say about the nature of the doctoral office in his writings. He was of the opinion that one could be a doctor ecclesiae without being a pastor, or having the gift of preaching.²⁸⁹ It turned out that de Geneston was recognized as having both gifts, and so he too eventually ended up functioning as both a pastor and a doctor of the Genevan Church.

We have noted above that neither the régent of the College, nor his bacheliers, were ever described by the title docteur. Moreover, we have also seen that none of these teachers were involved with scriptural interpretation.²⁹⁰ A certain incident, recorded in the Registre, concerning Castellio, who was the acting régent at the time, lends further support to our contention that the maître d'école (and by implication his under-masters) was not regarded as a doctor ecclesiae. When Castellio was inducted into office as régent in April, 1542, he was at the same time either asked by the Council,

or given permission by it, to "prêcher à Vandoeuvre", even though he was not an ordained pastor.²⁹¹ It is important to be aware that the decision to let Castellio preach was taken by the civil Council, and was made while Calvin was out of the city.²⁹² In a letter written to Viret, the Reformer expresses his misgivings about this turn of events (and explains to his colleague that he was absent from the city), but he apparently felt it unwise to challenge the Council on this issue.²⁹³ It was a different story, however, when in June, 1544, Castellio approached the Council and asked to be officially inducted into the pastoral office, presumably to supplement his academic wage (apparently he was not paid for his work at Vandoeuvre). Calvin, who was in the city this time, vigorously opposed Castellio's request. It was not that he begrudged him the extra money, for he suggested that his salary be increased, and he even praised the regent's work in the College.²⁹⁴ But the Reformer insisted that it was not possible for Castellio to serve in "le ministre" because of certain doctrinal views he held.²⁹⁵

Now this tells us something very important about Calvin's understanding of the regent's status. Even though Castellio's theology was not in accord with the Genevan Church, the Reformer was still willing to allow him to teach at the College. Had Castellio's post as régent made him an ecclesiastical officeholder, then Calvin's position would have been blatantly inconsistent and even hypocritical. But quite obviously the régent was not regarded by him as part of the Church's doctoral ministry. It would have gone against all of Calvin's principles, expressed in his writings, if he

had allowed someone to serve as doctor ecclesiae whom he knew to hold, and publicly express, doctrinal opinions which were in opposition to the teaching of the Church. Castellio's work as a régent at the College, then, was not, in Calvin's mind at least, considered part of "le ministre" of the Church. That the Council was at one with the Reformer in this regard appears to be confirmed by the fact that they upheld his arguments and turned down Castellio's request, thus prompting him to resign his post at the College and leave Geneva.

De Geneston served alongside Calvin as docteur of the Genevan Church, lecturing on Scripture and ensuring sound doctrine was maintained in the city, until he died on 11 August, 1545.²⁹⁶ We cannot be absolutely certain who replaced de Geneston as docteur, for the Registre never again refers to anyone by this title, not even Calvin himself. But it seems quite likely that one of the senior ministers, one Abel Poupin, who had been an ordained pastor in Geneva since 1543, took over this function.²⁹⁷ We find that shortly after de Geneston's death, Poupin became Calvin's right-hand man. Numerous entries can be found in both the Registre du Conseil and the Registres de la compagnie de Pasteurs (1546-1564) where "M. Calvin et M. Abel" represent the Church in various issues concerning doctrine and discipline.²⁹⁸

We should note in passing Professor Rodolphe Peter's claim that Louis Budé, an accomplished hebraist who settled in Geneva around the end of June, 1549, was engaged in "expounding the Old Testament at the Collège de Rive" right to his death on 25 May, 1551.²⁹⁹ If this were true, then Budé would also have to be regarded as one of the Genevan

docteurs. But although he was teaching at the College, there is no evidence that he was expounding the Old Testament. In fact, Calvin himself had been lecturing exclusively on this part of the Bible since 1547/1548, thus making it extremely unlikely that Budé would have been doing the same thing.³⁰⁰ One is bound to conclude therefore, that Budé was not charged with the interpretation of Scripture, but functioned at the College as a bachelier who was involved strictly with teaching the Hebrew language.

It is not at all clear who succeeded Poupin as docteur when he died on 5 March, 1556.³⁰¹ There are a couple of individuals, however, who might be considered possible candidates. In March, 1555, we find Raymond Chauvet, a pastor in Geneva since August, 1545, accompanying Calvin to Bern in order to discuss important doctrinal matters with the ministers of that city.³⁰² Poupin was still alive at this time, but was probably unable to fulfill his doctoral commitments on account of illness. In January, 1553, he had to stop preaching because he could not be heard by the congregation.³⁰³ His death notice in the Registres de la compagnie de Pasteurs noted that Poupin had died "after a long and painful illness and numerous relapses". It is quite likely then, that someone had to take over his duties as a doctor ecclesiae long before he died. It is possible that Chauvet was functioning in this capacity when he went with Calvin to Bern. But if he did replace Poupin as docteur on this particular mission, we very rarely find him mentioned again in the Registre.

Another possibility was Louis Enoch who had been régent of the College since March, 1550, and who was a recognized

Latin and Greek scholar, described by the Registre as "un homme scavans propice et ydoine par la grace Dieu".³⁰⁴

Among the books written by Enoch while living in Geneva was a Latin grammar book and a more elementary Greek grammar book.³⁰⁵ It is, perhaps, significant that just about two months after Poupin died, Enoch relinquished his office as régent of the College and was ordained to "the ministry of the Word" in May, 1556.³⁰⁶ We also note that it was Enoch who (along with Calvin) sat as an ecclesiastical representative on the building committee for the proposed new academy (cf. supra, 193).

If we cannot be certain who assumed the office of doctor ecclesiae alongside Calvin during these years, we do know that Theodore Beza held this post in 1558. Beza first arrived in Geneva from Lausanne on 10 October of this year.³⁰⁷ On 24 October, he was charged with giving lectures on Greek grammar, but this was to last only "pour un temps", as the authorities had other plans for this biblical scholar.³⁰⁸ A month later, on 24 November, Calvin proposed, on behalf of the Company, that "M. de Beza" should be appointed to serve as "ministre de la parole de Dieu". It was probably at this time that he commenced his "lectures on Holy Scripture". Calvin was seriously ill during this month and likely needed someone to lessen his academic burden.³⁰⁹ We find in the Registre that, on 15 December, 1558, Beza was "unanimously appointed by the brethren to serve in the ministry of the Gospel as a preacher as well as continuing his lectures in Holy Scripture".³¹⁰ Thus, for a very brief time before being officially inducted into the pastorate and beginning his preaching responsibilities, he was functioning

as a doctor, probably, as we have suggested, since November of this year. It was not until 16 March, 1559, that Beza was confirmed in the pastoral office, at which time he took over the ministry of a recently deceased member of the Company, one Claude de Pont.³¹¹

Here again, then, we have another example of a man serving as a doctor ecclesiae by teaching Scripture in an academic setting before assuming the pastorate. As we said above, this situation is in accord with Calvin's own understanding of the relationship between the pastoral and doctoral offices.³¹² Yet here too, as in the case of de Geneston, it seems that this was intended to be only a temporary situation, for it turned out that Beza was soon elected preacher. Thus, during Calvin's career as chief pastor and doctor of the Genevan Church, it was always the case that the doctor ecclesiae eventually ended up in the pastorate. For a very short period of time, Beza functioned as a "lay" doctor, but even then he was, as it were, in the process of being inducted into the pastoral ranks. Technically then, Calvin could envisage the possibility of a doctor ecclesiae who was not at once a pastor, but it seems that in practice these two offices were always conjoined.

The Registre informs us that on 1 June, 1559, Beza participated in the meeting of the Consistory for the first time.³¹³ Taking up this point, G.A. Taylor wrongly concludes: "At least one teacher, Beza, while holding no other position in the city than that of rector in the College, was admitted as a member of the Consistory".³¹⁴ As we have just noted, Beza had been ordained pastor and received a regular charge about 2½ months before this date, so that he was not participating

in the Consistory by virtue of his rectorship alone. But this raises an important point about the status of the teaching staff in the schola publica. Thus far we have been examining the status of the teachers in the "Collège de Rive" prior to the establishment of the Academy in 1559. We have seen that there is no evidence whatsoever to indicate that the régent or his bacheliers were considered doctores ecclesiae. None of these individuals were given the title "doctor",³¹⁵ and they did not engage in any ecclesiastical duties, particularly the function of scriptural interpretation which, for Calvin, was the fundamental responsibility of a doctor in the Church. But what about the publici professores in the advanced schola? Were they regarded as ecclesiastical officeholders?

We find several references in the Registre du Conseil and Registres de la compagnie de Pasteurs (post 1559) to the "compagnie des pasteurs et professeurs". The reason why these two groups are linked together in this way had to do with the fact that one of the duties of the public professors was to attend the Friday congrégations where the pastors would expound Scripture and discuss various aspects of doctrine and general ecclesiastical matters. It is Professor Henderson's belief that the presence of the publice professeurs at these assemblies is proof that they were regarded as true doctores ecclesiae.³¹⁶ Before commenting upon Henderson's conclusion, we must first examine more closely the nature and structure of these Friday congrégations.

The congrégations were alluded to in the Ordonnances ecclésiastiques where it was stipulated that there should be a weekly assembly of "tous les Ministres" for discussion of

the Scriptures, but it was not until later that the term congrégation was used to describe these meetings. This gathering of ministers to discuss doctrinal matters was not a new thing in Protestant Geneva for there were similar conferences being held as early as 1536.³¹⁷ It was the Ordonnances of 1541, however, which officially sanctioned these meetings and made them a regular occurrence.

Neither the 1541 nor the 1561 editions of the Ordonnances ecclésiastiques make any explicit mention of laymen attending these gatherings. But we learn from Calvin's correspondence that there were, in fact, others present at the congrégations in addition to the ministers. In a letter to Farel (30 May, 1544) Calvin describes how Sebastian Castellio had levelled a cutting attack on the teaching and lifestyle of the pastors during the Friday congrégation of 30 May, 1544.³¹⁸ At this time Castellio held no public office in Geneva, having resigned from the principalship of the College on 17 February, 1544. He therefore participated in this congrégation as a layman. Another instance of a layman participating in these meetings is recorded in some detail in the Registres de la compagnie de Pasteurs. One Jerome Bolsec, a physician, came into conflict with the Company when he put forth his "false propositions concerning election and reprobation" at the congrégation held on 16 October, 1551.³¹⁹

In the letter to Farel cited above, Calvin remarks that during the particular congrégation in which Castellio was involved, there were about 60 people present.³²⁰ We know that by May, 1544, Calvin had six fellow pastors in the city (Champereau, de Geneston, de Ecclesia, Treppereau, Poupin,

Ferron) and six in the surrounding countryside (Bernard, de la Mare, Chareraux, Petit, de l'Ecluse, and Cugnier). On 30 May, three more were hired making a total of 16 pastors.³²¹ This means that there must have been about 44 other people attending this particular congrégation. We may suppose that the 12 elders were present, and perhaps the deacons as well. (From 1559, the publici professores were also expected to attend these congrégations "if possible": "Le Vendredi, qu'il [the public professors of Hebrew, Greek, and Arts] se trouvent, tant qu'il leur sera possible, a la congregation et au Colloque des Ministres".³²²) The rest of this particular congrégation must have been made up of civic officials, students and other interested laymen.

The congrégation was divided into two parts. Every Friday morning at 7 o'clock, all those attending would gather in the auditoire of Saint Pierre. Neither the Ordonnances nor the Registre give any details regarding the order of service at these meetings. There is, however, a fuller description of the congrégations held at the English Church of Geneva, found in the Form of Common-Prayer.³²³ This document, approved by Calvin himself in February, 1556, closely follows the Ordonnances ecclésiastiques in all other matters of Church discipline, so we may conjecture that the structure of the congrégations described here was modelled after the ones held by the Genevan Church. We learn from the Form of Common-Prayer that the pastor assigned to lead the congrégation began with a "confession of our sins" in which he exhorted the people to examine diligently themselves. This was followed by the singing of a Psalm "in a plain tune",

after which the minister would begin his "sermon".

The fundamental aim of the Friday congrégations in the Genevan Church was to ensure that doctrinal orthodoxy was maintained among the ministers of the Company, and thus each pastor, including Calvin, was required to take his turn expounding Scripture in the presence of his colleagues. A main feature of these assemblies came after the minister had completed his exposition, when all those present, pastors and laymen alike, were given the opportunity of putting questions to the one who had just finished giving the "sermon". The Ordonnances make no mention of this open discussion period, but as we have noted above (i.e. the case of Castellio and Bolsec), this was indeed part of the Genevan congrégations. Moreover, the Form of Common-Prayer makes reference to this practice:

Once every week the Congregation assembles to hear some place of the Scriptures orderly expounded. At which time it is lawful for every man to speak or enquire as God shall move his heart, and the text minister occasion, so it to be without pertinacity or distain, as one that rather seeketh to profit than contend. [sic] And if so be any contention arise, then such as are appointed Moderators either satisfy the party, or else if he seems to cavil, exhort him to keep silence; referring to judgement there of to the Ministers and Elders to be determined in their Assembly before mentioned [i.e. the Consistory]. 324

Thus the congrégation, in addition to acting as a means of ensuring doctrinal orthodoxy among the ministers, was also intended to provide mutual edification for pastors and laymen alike.

The second part of the congrégation was limited to the pastors and the publici professores (i.e. post 1559) who, after the question period, adjourned to another room where

they would discuss in more depth the various doctrinal issues touched upon in the exposition, and, if necessary, "censure" their colleague who gave it.³²⁵ At this point they would also deal with practical matters relating to the Company itself, or the Church in general, such as the election of new ministers, personal grievances or requests, allocation of pastoral charges in Geneva and abroad, and testimonials for departing colleagues. It should be noted that several of the public professors who participated in this part of the congrégation during Calvin's lifetime had previously been ordained pastors (i.e. Chevalier, Tagaut, Baduel), but it is also true that some, that is, as far as we know, had never held this office (i.e. Francois Berauld, Jacques des Bordes, Henry Scrimger). The presence of these unordained professors at the congrégations leads Henderson to conclude that "their office in the school was regarded as entitling them to a place in the public ministry of the Church".³²⁶ To draw such a conclusion on the basis of this one fact alone seems unwarrantable, and it appears even more dubious when one considers other evidence pertaining to this issue.

As we have noted, nowhere in the official documents do we ever find any of these public professors given the title doctor. They are always referred to as "professor" or "lecteur". Moreover, it is significant that the Leges Academiae state that the tres publici professores in Hebrew, Greek, and Arts, should be elected and confirmed in the same way as the bacheliers in the schola privata.³²⁷ The "professors of theology", although mentioned later in the paragraph, are not included in this stipulation. Now we know that Calvin himself believed that all doctors in the

Church were normally ordained to office as were the pastors and deacons.³²⁸ But here in the Leges Academiae we find that these three professors, like the bacheliers and principal of the schola privata, did not have to go through any process of ordination. They were simply selected by the existing "company of pastors and professors", and then presented to the "Syndics and Council to be accepted and confirmed according to their [the Syndics and Council] good pleasure".³²⁹

That the teachers at the Academy were more closely associated with the State than the Church seems to be confirmed by what the Leges Academiae have to say about the office of Rector who was in charge of "superintending the whole Academy, of admonishing and reprovng the Principal, the regents and the public professors".³³⁰ The Rector was also selected by the Company, and after this selection he was then presented to the Messieurs (i.e. the Syndics and Councillors). The Leges then go on to make the important statement that the office of Rector was established by civic authority: "...lequel estant presente a Messieurs soit establi par leur autorite".³³¹ This makes it clear that the Rector, and by implication all those directly under his jurisdiction, were regarded as holding a civil appointment.

We have also seen (cf. supra, 201-03) that the regular didactic responsibilities of the professors of Hebrew, Greek, and Arts did not involve the interpretation of Scripture. And there is no extant evidence that they were ever called upon to expound biblical passages at the congrégations.³³² Given the above facts, it would seem that the presence of the public professors at these Friday assemblies had nothing

to do with ecclesiastical status. Rather, they attended simply as secondary consultants whom the pastors could call upon to help settle grammatical problems. We note in this regard that the attendance of these professors at the congrégations was not imperative. They were to attend "if possible". However, it was mandatory for the pastors. We should say that they functioned in the congrégations in a way analogous to that of the lecteur who assisted Farel when he was OT professor from 1536-1538. The task of this lecteur was "exposer litteralement ung chacun mot, une chacune locution et la propriete du langage", but it was Farel, as doctor ecclesiae, who "s'applique du tout a declarer le vray sens et doctrine spirituelle".³³³

To try and work out who exactly were regarded as office-holders in the ecclesiastical government from the Genevan records alone is a difficult task owing to the paucity and ambiguity of the relevant documentation. It was our intention in this chapter only to try and determine whether or not there is any indication from the historical evidence that Calvin's understanding of the doctoral office was realized in Geneva. Such a study must, of course, allow for the possibility that the secretaries who penned the Registre du Conseil, the Registres de la compagnie de Pasteurs and other relevant documents, may not have been using terms consistently or in accordance with Calvin's own usage. Nevertheless, we can say that the doctor ecclesiae, as described in the Reformer's writings, was indeed a reality in Geneva. He was the doctor theologiae who expounded the books of the Bible in an academic milieu, that is, at the "Collège de Rive" which was later transformed into the

Academy. There is no evidence, either in Calvin's own writings, or in the historical documents, to indicate that the bacheliers or the professors of Hebrew, Greek, and Arts, were considered part of the Church's doctoral ministry. On the other hand, there is every indication that their office in the schola was regarded as a civil appointment, and that their teaching, although important for the Church's welfare, was not a concern of the spiritual but the temporal kingdom.

We have been able to identify certain individuals who functioned as doctors of the Genevan Church. Calvin himself held this post from the time he arrived in Geneva in 1536, until his death in 1564. Guillaume Farel also served in this capacity (1536-1538), as did Matthieu de Geneston (1542-1545), followed most likely by Abel Poupin (1544-1553?). If we cannot be certain who succeeded Poupin (Chauvet?, Enoch?), we know that Theodore Beza became a doctor ecclesiae in 1558. In each instance, those who functioned as doctors in the Church were either already ordained pastors (Farel, Poupin, Chauvet, Enoch) or became one soon after assuming the doctoral office (Calvin, de Geneston, Beza). This is in accord with what Calvin had to say in his writings about the relationship between the office of pastor and that of doctor.

As we have noted in another chapter (cf. supra, Part III, Ch.III), the Reformer did not regard the doctor ecclesiae as a separate and distinct ordo of Church government, for he envisaged the Church's doctoral function as being one particular task within the wider ministry of the pastorate. All pastors are in a real sense doctors because they are fully involved in this doctoral function, namely, the exposition of Scripture. But not all doctors are necessarily

pastors. Moreover, the doctor ecclesiae has a "particular gift" for expounding the Bible which he normally exercises, not in a congregation at worship, but in an academic setting. Pastors and doctors, however, are not distinguished simply by the kind of setting in which they teach. They are fundamentally distinguished, according to Calvin, not on the basis of ordo (for they together form one order in the Church), and not by the content of their didactic activity (for both are exclusively concerned with Scripture), but by the nature of their exposition, that is, by their "particular gift" of explicating the biblical text. Both the pastor and doctor were charged with expounding the books of the Bible, but this ministry was accomplished in different ways: by "preaching" the Word and by "teaching" the Word. It is Calvin's distinction between preaching and teaching which we must now examine.

PART FOUR

THE MINISTRY OF THE WORD :

CALVIN'S DISTINCTION BETWEEN PREACHING AND TEACHING

In the previous sections we reached several conclusions concerning Calvin's definition of the doctoral office in the Church and its relationship to the pastorate. Throughout his writings, the Reformer spoke invariably of a three-fold division of ecclesiastical orders in which "pastors and doctors" were linked together to form one of these orders, namely, the ministry of the Word. This, we said, indicated something very important about his understanding of the nature of the doctoral office. Calvin did not envisage the doctor ecclesiae as holding a separate and distinct order in Church government precisely because his function was so similar to the essential task of the pastor, that is, both were engaged in the exposition of Holy Scripture. In his writings, the Reformer consistently confined the teaching of the doctor ecclesiae to the interpretation of the Bible and instruction in doctrine. Not surprisingly, then, we found no indication either in Calvin's own works or in the historical documents of Geneva, that the masters and professors teaching grammar and liberal arts courses at the College and University were considered ecclesiastical officeholders (i.e. doctores ecclesiae).

But while the content of the didactic activity pursued by the pastor and doctor was the very same, we shall now see that the Reformer insisted on making a distinction between their respective gifts of instruction. Some writers, however, would not share this view. G.A. Taylor, for instance, maintains: "It would be technically incorrect to say that Calvin spoke of preaching and teaching as distinguishable functions of the ministerial office. Preaching

the gospel meant teaching the gospel".¹ Such a view, we believe, by misinterpreting the Reformer's understanding of the nature of the doctoral office and its relationship to the pastorate, has obscured the distinction which Calvin makes between preaching and teaching. But what exactly did he mean by preaching the Word, and how, in fact, did he distinguish this from teaching the Word?

Calvin's ministry in Geneva took on several dimensions: preacher, spiritual counsellor, systematic theologian, Bible commentator, and university lecturer. Although all these functions were, in a sense, part of his ministry of the Word, it is with the first and last functions that we are primarily concerned with as we seek to establish the Reformer's distinction between preaching and teaching. More specifically, it is the intention of this section to show that Calvin viewed preaching (i.e. the sermon) as a unique category of the ministry of the Word, quite distinct (although not always clearly so) from teaching the Word, whether that be by writing systematic theology, penning commentaries, or delivering oral lectures.

CHAPTER ONE
 CALVIN AS PREACHER AND TEACHER :
 THE SERMONS AND LECTURES

I. THE SERMONS²

There is some evidence that Calvin was engaged in preaching even before coming to Geneva, and within a short time after his arrival in this city sermons became one of his dominant concerns. It appears that from the start of his regular preaching ministry in Geneva (probably in 1537 or perhaps late 1536³), the Reformer preached at least once every Sunday and every Monday, Wednesday and Friday.⁴ In autumn of 1542, having returned to Geneva after a three year exile, Calvin was asked to preach even more often, which he did:

Therefore, those who desire to make progress wish, at the same time, that I would preach more often than usual, which I have already commenced, and shall continue to do until the others have acquired more acceptance with the people. 5

It seems, however, that this proved too great a burden, for only two months later we find the following entry in the council minutes: "Resolved...that the said Seigneur Calvin should be excused from preaching more than once a Sunday."⁶

In October, 1549, by order of the Council the weekday sermons were increased from once every other day to once a day.⁷ Calvin, along with his fellow pastors, shared the burden of this rigorous preaching schedule, and it was probably at this time that the Reformer's basic routine was established: Colladon tells us that Calvin "ordinarily

preached every day every other week".⁸ We also know that it was his custom to expound the Old Testament books during the week, and the New Testament on Sundays, although he would sometimes preach on the Psalms on the sabbath. Starting in 1549, well over 2,000 of these sermons were meticulously transcribed by the Reformer's secretary, Denis Raguenier, most of which can be found today in the archives of Geneva.⁹

It was Calvin's practice to preach through entire books of the Bible, sentence by sentence, which would often take him several years of Sunday sermons to complete. For instance, he preached 189 sermons on the book of Acts between 1549 and 1554; 65 sermons on the Harmony of the Gospels (1559-1564); 174 sermons on Ezekiel (1552-1554); 159 sermons on Job (1554-1555); 200 sermons on Deuteronomy (1555-1556); 342 sermons on Isaiah (1556-1559) and 123 sermons on Genesis (1559-1561). The Reformer preached extemporaneously from the pulpit with only his Hebrew Old Testament and Greek New Testament before him with, perhaps, a few notes jotted down. He would, however, always take time to prepare his sermons beforehand.¹⁰ Regarding the form of his sermons, T.H.L. Parker writes:

The form of his sermons is determined by the exposition. In theory it follows the pattern of explanation of a clause or sentence and its application to the people, sometimes in the context of an immediate situation. In practice, the form is flexible, even loose. It is saved from being rambling by his capacity for keeping to the point and breaking the material up into short sections, usually with some such formula as "So much for that point", or "So you see what the prophet (or apostles) meant to say". His manner of delivery was lively, passionate, intimate, direct, and clear... He could be furiously and coarsely angry and he could be gentle and compassionate... His language was clear and easy. He spoke in a way that the Genevese could understand...

To clarity of sense and direction he paid great attention, carefully explaining unusual or technical words in the Biblical text. 11

II. THE LECTURES

In addition to preaching sermons from the pulpit of Saint Pierre cathedral church, Calvin was simultaneously engaged in giving lectures at the auditoire. As we have indicated previously,¹² it appears that the Reformer began his ministry in Geneva, not as a preacher, but as a lecturer - an activity which he continued throughout his career. The lectures which Calvin was called upon to give when he first came to Geneva in 1536 formed an integral part of the educational program at the "Collège de Rive".¹³

a. Early Genevan Lectures (1536-1538)

Can we say with any certainty which New Testament book Calvin selected to begin his lectures in this city? There is no direct evidence, but the few clues we have seem to point us to Romans. His first published commentary on the Bible was this book. It is hardly likely that this young theologian would have written a commentary on this popular epistle had he not first pondered it at some length. Indeed, in the dedicatory epistle he expressed his initial apprehension about publishing a commentary on a book which had already been dealt with extensively by eminent scholars, both "ancient" and "modern". This consideration, he says, "held me back" from writing on Romans, indicating that he did in fact have some reservations. That he had this New

Testament book on his mind for quite some time is confirmed by Calvin himself, when he mentions that he had discussed this epistle with Simon Grynée while living in Basle (1535-1536).¹⁴

Now we know that prior to 25 March 1537, the Reformer was lecturing in Saint Pierre on "the Epistles of Paul", for in a letter to Calvin from Oporinus, a printer in Basle, the latter remarks: "I hear you are lecturing with great applause and usefulness on St. Paul's epistle".¹⁵ It would seem reasonable to assume that Romans was one of these epistles, on the grounds that these lectures would have provided the opportunity to mull thoroughly over this book and build up the confidence that Calvin apparently required in order to publish yet another commentary on this well worked-over epistle. But even if we grant that Calvin lectured on Romans before writing up the commentary, this still does not mean that his first lectures in Geneva were on this book, only that they were delivered sometime between 1536 and 1539.¹⁶

Calvin may have lectured on a random book before beginning "St. Paul's epistles", but it seems more probable that he decided from the start to deal with the Pauline corpus. If we allow this, then it is very likely that the epistle to the Romans would have been the book which Calvin chose to begin his lectures in Geneva. Being the first epistle in the canon, it would have been the logical one to choose; but more significantly, Calvin believed that, from a pedagogical point of view, Romans was the best book to begin with when studying the Bible: "If we understand this epistle, we have a passage opened to us to the understanding of the whole Scripture".¹⁷ Romans would have therefore been the obvious

choice to begin his exegetical lectures on the New Testament.

There is some question as to whether Calvin lectured on Romans while living in Strasbourg.¹⁸ If we are correct in assuming he began his lectures in Geneva with Romans sometime in August, 1536, then he surely would have finished it by the time of his exile in April, 1538. Lecturing five times a week (allowing for illness and travel¹⁹), Calvin would have given approximately 400 lectures (each one hour in length) during the 21 months of his first Genevan ministry. Now we know that Calvin's method of lecturing was like his sermons insofar as, in both cases, he would select a biblical book and then lecture or preach on it, day by day, until he had gone through the entire text.²⁰ Once he had started lecturing on Romans then, he would have continued with this book until its completion. If he began in August 1536, he would have had more than enough time to finish this epistle, and possibly one or two more before leaving Geneva. It is, of course, possible that he gave occasional lectures on Romans while teaching in Strasbourg, but as we shall see, even this seems rather doubtful.

b. The Lectures in Strasbourg (1539-1541)

Having been exiled from Geneva over a dispute with the civil authorities regarding the Bernese liturgy, Calvin went to Basle where he stayed for several months before receiving a letter from Bucer, Capito, and Sturm, asking him to become the pastor of the French refugee congregation in Strasbourg. With not a little apprehension, the Reformer agreed to their request, and by 8 September, 1538, he was preaching his first

sermon in Strasbourg at the church of Saint-Nicolas-aux-Ondes.²¹ For the next four months Calvin was exclusively a pastor, concerned with the various duties normally associated with this office. But then, in the second half of January 1539, he began to give lectures on the New Testament in the "Haute-Ecole", while at the same time continuing to fulfill his pastoral obligations.²²

The Faculty of Theology had originally comprised Bucer and Capito who lectured on the New Testament and Old Testament respectively; however, prior to 1532, these lectures were given on a very irregular basis. Bucer's first office in Strasbourg had been that of a lecturer, to which he had been inducted in December, 1523.²³ Upon taking office, he started to lecture on the Gospel of John, but was soon ordered by the magistrates to stop. It was not until 1532 that the regular lectures in theology were being offered;²⁴ yet even by this date there was still no over-all supervision or organization of education in general. The situation was quickly remedied upon the arrival of Jean Sturm (1537), who had been called to Strasbourg from Paris specifically to deal with this problem. Under Sturm's leadership, public instruction was organized at three levels: elementary, secondary, and superior.²⁵

The "Haute-Ecole" was the centre for superior studies, where, from about the age of 16, the young scholar would study Greek, Hebrew, philosophy (logic, ethics, mathematics and physics), history, law, and theology. It was at this level that Calvin was engaged to teach in Strasbourg. A special chair was created in the theology faculty, making a total of four: Bucer and Capito lecturing on the Old

Testament; Calvin and Hedion on the New Testament. Here, for the next one and a half years, Calvin lectured to a student audience comprised of scholars from such countries as Germany, France, and Italy.

Calvin, it seems, gave more lectures than at least two of his colleagues in the faculty, for a total of eight lectures were given weekly by the four teachers, and of these the Reformer gave three.²⁶ This had been his regular practice from the time he first began to lecture in January, even though at his date he was not lecturing in an official capacity. Calvin's professorial appointment had been ratified by the "scholarques"²⁷ on 1 February 1539, but it was stipulated that his contract, lasting for one year, was not to take effect until 1 May, at which time he would receive one florin per week for giving lectures on the New Testament.²⁸

The first book to be lectured on by Calvin in Strasbourg was the Gospel of John, which he began, as we noted above, sometime in late January, 1539.²⁹ About three months later, on 12 May, he started his official lectures with the epistles to the Corinthians.³⁰ It is highly unlikely that there would have been enough time for him to lecture on another book in between John's gospel and I Corinthians, especially since he had been at Frankfurt for several weeks during the months of March and April.³¹

The only other documentation regarding the Reformer's lectures in Strasbourg is found in the Leges Gymnasii of that city, which indicate that Calvin was lecturing on Philippians sometime in 1539.³² We are not told the exact date, but if Calvin started Corinthians in May, we can surmise that he would not have been able to begin his lectures

on Philippians until the end of that year. This would appear to invalidate the notion that the Reformer was lecturing on the Pauline epistles in the order which they appear in the canon, for it would not have been possible to lecture on I and II Corinthians, Galatians, and Ephesians, and then begin Philippians, all between 12 May and the end of 1539.

If Calvin lectured on Romans in Strasbourg, it appears very doubtful that he did so in 1539. It is possible that he could have given these lectures during the first nine months of 1540,³³ but this would not seem likely, since Calvin had already finished writing his commentary on this book and had it published in this year. Moreover, by 1540 he had lectured on at least two other Pauline epistles. Having planned to begin his official lecture course with Corinthians in May, one might have thought that, had he wanted to lecture on Romans, the most opportune time to do so would have been during the previous months. That he chose instead to lecture on John's gospel leads us to suspect that the Reformer never did lecture on this epistle while residing in Strasbourg.

Calvin was able to lecture regularly with little interruption, from January to October of 1540. We are unable to ascertain, however, what New Testament books he dealt with during these months.³⁴ In October he had to leave Strasbourg to attend a conference at Worms.³⁵ From this point on the pressure of public office greatly restricted his opportunities to lecture. No sooner had he returned from Worms (probably sometime in late December, 1540 or early January 1541) than he was called upon to attend the Colloquy at

Ratisbon. He left in late February 1541, thus allowing only two months at most in which to lecture. This time he was absent for about four months, and would have been even longer (the Colloquy had not ended by the time he left Ratisbon) had it not been for his concern over the welfare of the Church and School in Strasbourg.³⁶ He arrived back in this city about the end of June, but once again his lectures were interrupted after only a few weeks when, in the latter half of August, he left for Geneva.

This marked the end of Calvin's ministry in the city he had called home for the last three years. Lecturing in the "Haute-Ecole" had not been his only preoccupation in Strasbourg, nor could one claim it was his dominant concern. The Reformer's pastoral activities, and his theological and exegetical work were, to be sure, important aspects of his ministry which must not be overlooked. Pannier and Borgeaud are therefore quite right in maintaining that Calvin left this Rhineland city a more mature theologian and a better pastor, but we should also add that he returned to Geneva a more experienced lecturer.

c. The Lectures in Geneva: 1541-1564

Calvin arrived back in Geneva, after almost three and a half years in exile, on Tuesday, 13 September 1541. The following Sunday found him back in the pulpit of Saint Pierre cathedral, preaching on the very place in the text where he had left off at the time of his banishment.³⁷ We may assume that Calvin would have also resumed his lectures at the auditoire shortly after his return, although we have

no indication of when this might have been or what biblical book he chose to lecture on. In fact, we are left entirely in the dark with regard to the Reformer's lecturing program during the next six or seven years. We know for certain, however, that after 1549 he lectured exclusively on the Old Testament until he stopped giving lectures on 2 February, 1564.³⁸ It is difficult to imagine that Calvin would have spent almost 17 years lecturing on the Old Testament had he not already completed the New Testament.³⁹ It would not be unreasonable to suppose then, that from 1541-1549 Calvin was lecturing on those New Testament books which hitherto he had not dealt with, but more than this we cannot say with any certainty. Happily we know a great deal more about his Old Testament lectures.

Since returning to Geneva in 1541, Calvin had to cut back his lectures from 5 to 3 per week, probably because of the added responsibilities placed on him now that he was senior pastor and doctor in the Genevan Church.⁴⁰ After having lectured for some 6 or 7 years, three French refugees in the city, who had been sitting in on Calvin's "leçons",⁴¹ decided that these lectures (along with his sermons) should be copied down for posterity.⁴² The Reformer was not at first agreeable to this suggestion, for he regarded his "leçons" as an "extemporaneous kind of teaching", intended specifically for his audience in the auditoire.⁴³ Moreover, since it had been his usual practice to spend no more than half an hour before each lecture preparing what he was going to say, Calvin was not at all satisfied that enough attention had been given to these "leçons" to warrant them

being distributed to the public at large.⁴⁴ But so great was the demand for their publication that he capitulated, and allowed his lectures to be taken down and printed.

Jean Crispin, the printer, gives an illuminating account of the technique employed by the secretaries for transcribing these lectures just as Calvin delivered them:

In copying they followed this plan. Each had his paper ready in the most convenient form, and each separately wrote down with the greatest speed. If some word escaped the one (which sometimes happened, especially on disputed points and on those parts that were delivered with some fervour) it was taken down by another...Immediately after the lecture, de Jonviller took the papers from the other two, placed them before him, consulted his own, and, comparing them all, dictated to someone else to copy down what they had written hastily. At the end he read it all through so as to be able to read it back to M. Calvin at home the following day. When any little word was missing, it was added or if anything seemed insufficiently explained it was easily made clearer.⁴⁵

The precision of these transcriptions prompted Calvin to remark that, had he not seen them for himself, he would never have thought it possible to perform such a task.⁴⁶ And for those who were in any doubt about their accuracy, he testifies that "no additions" were made by the secretaries, and they "did not allow themselves to change a single word for the better", so that Calvin could say with no hesitation: "They have taken down what they have heard from my lips with so much fidelity that I perceive no change".⁴⁷

d. Old Testament Lectures

Colladon informs us that Calvin began to lecture on Isaiah sometime ("de plus long temps") prior to 1549.⁴⁸ This was, in all probability, the first book in the Old Testament to be dealt with by the Reformer in his "leçons".⁴⁹

Judging from the length of Isaiah, and the amount Calvin wrote on it in his commentary, we might conjecture that these lectures were started late in 1547 or, perhaps, early 1548. (As was noted above, we do not know for certain what he was lecturing on during the previous 6 or 7 years). The lectures on Isaiah were the first ones which the secretaries attempted to copy down word for word. They had tried to do this some years earlier, but only succeeded in collecting the principal parts.⁵⁰ It seems that their transcriptions on Isaiah, though still not precise, were more successful than their initial attempts, for des Gallars used them to help compose "Calvin's" commentary on this book.⁵¹

Calvin completed his lectures on Isaiah in 1550. Sometime during this year, probably not long after finishing this book, he began to lecture on Genesis. These "leçons" continued until 1552, but Colladon does not mention whether any attempt was made to transcribe them.⁵² The book of Psalms was started next in 1552, right after the completion of Genesis. Once again an attempt was made to take down the lectures as they were spoken. This time the task was undertaken by Jean Budé (who had been a regular auditeur at the auditoire) and two of his zealous brethren - des Gallars and Bourgoing (or Cousin). Within a short while they became quite proficient at this venture, so much so that, when Calvin had at first declined to write a full commentary on this book "in reverence to Bucer", it was decided to publish the lectures, as recorded by the stenographers.⁵³ But then the Reformer had a change of mind, perhaps occasioned by his dissatisfaction with the "leçons", and ended up writing a

commentary on Psalms.⁵⁴ Consequently, his lectures on this book were never published.

Colladon does not tell us how long Calvin spent lecturing on Psalms, one of his favourites, but we are able to work out a fairly reliable estimation. We know that the next book expounded by the Reformer in the auditoire was Hosea.⁵⁵ Although it is not known exactly when he began these lectures, we do know that he completed them on 13 February, 1557.⁵⁶ Since we also know that he gave 38 lectures on this book, the approximate date of the initiation of his "leçons" on Hosea can be calculated to be the beginning of November, 1556, assuming that he was still giving three lectures weekly. The "leçons" on Psalms were probably concluded shortly before this date which means Calvin spent about 4 years lecturing on this book (Psalms).

The lectures on Hosea were the first ones to be published. By now the stenographers, after several years of practice, had become so adept at their art of transcription that Calvin had no reservations at all about their accuracy. Moreover, the Reformer was finding it increasingly difficult to take the time to write out or even dictate commentaries (he had found the writing of his commentary on Psalms to be a "long and difficult task"⁵⁷), and so he decided to let his published lectures serve as a kind of substitute for a proper commentary.⁵⁸ Henceforth, from the publication of Hosea,⁵⁹ until the end of his lecturing ministry, all Calvin's "leçons" were printed.

Having finished Hosea in February, 1557, the Reformer began his lectures on the rest of the minor prophets - Joel,

Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi. Again, Colladon does not mention when these lectures commenced, but we can assume that it would have been hard on the heels of Hosea because just 19 months later, in September, 1558, all the lectures on the minor prophets had been completed except for 2 or 3 on Malachi. Calvin had come down with a bad fever, and in order to get the complete set of these "leçons" to the publisher on time, he had to deliver these last few lectures from his bed.⁶⁰ The fever became progressively worse and created other bodily complications in the aging Reformer, prohibiting him from giving any more lectures for several months. He finally recovered in May, 1559, and in June of that year he resumed his "leçons" at the auditoire with the prophet Daniel.⁶¹ These lectures were completed about 9 months later, in April, 1560.⁶² The "leçons" on Jeremiah were next (15 April, 1560-9 September, 1562), followed by Lamentations (20 September, 1562-19 January, 1563).⁶³

Sensing that his days were numbered, and wanting to finish his exposition on the Prophets, Calvin began Ezekiel on 20 January, 1563, the day after finishing Lamentations. This was the last book he lectured on, for in the midst of these "leçons" Calvin was inflicted with more illness, this time gout, which at times became so painful that he had to be carried to his lectures and sermons, sometimes on a horse, at other times in a chair.⁶⁴ His last lecture, on Ezekiel 20:40-44, was delivered on 2 February, 1564, at two o'clock in the afternoon.⁶⁵

All Calvin's lectures were given in Latin, unlike his sermons which were preached in French. Each lecture was

usually a "full hour" in length and was delivered extemporaneously. Budé describes the Reformer's style of lecturing as "a simple though not uncultured mode of speaking", ... "much like that which was used in lectures in former days".⁶⁶ Such a style, Budé insists, was well suited for achieving Calvin's aim of bringing out the "true" and "plain" meaning of the passage under discussion. It should be noted that all of Calvin's lectures were expositions of Scripture—all dogmatic theology was confined to the Institutio and his theological treatises. The method he employed was similar to that of his sermons insofar as, for both, he would select a book and go through the entire text until it was completed. Each lecture would begin with the same short Latin prayer: "May the Lord grant, that we may engage in contemplating the mysteries of His heavenly wisdom with ever increasing devotion, to His glory and to our edification".⁶⁷ At the close of the lecture, he would give a much longer prayer (based on the subject of the text), which was, of course, extemporaneous, or to use Budé's words: "given to him by the Holy Spirit".⁶⁸ Having said the opening prayer, Calvin would then read aloud, in the original Hebrew, the scriptural verses which he was about to expound, and then translate them into Latin. A perusal of the lectures shows that he worked closely with the Hebrew text throughout his expositions.

Quite clearly, preaching sermons and delivering lectures were distinct activities within Calvin's total ministry of the Word, carried out at different times and before different audiences. It is now left for us to look more closely at the relationship between these two modes of edification.

CHAPTER TWO

"PREACHING" AND "TEACHING" THE WORD

We have seen in the preceding chapter that there was an obvious practical distinction between Calvin's preaching ministry and his lectures in that the former took place within the context of a worship service and was directed to a congregation, while the latter were delivered to students in a classroom situation. Yet the content of the sermons and lectures was exactly the same, namely, the exposition of Holy Scripture. Can we say that there was more than a practical distinction between these two kinds of exposition? Was there a functional distinction as well? As we have already noted, some authors think not.⁶⁹ Certainly it is true to say that for Calvin, preaching always included teaching. He was well aware that every time there was true preaching, teaching was also given. This is why we often find him using these terms interchangeably.⁷⁰ But this should not lead us to take the position that the Reformer made no real distinction between the two. On the contrary, Calvin continually differentiates between the office of the pastor and that of the doctor throughout his writings (as we have seen in previous chapters) precisely because he does in fact make a functional distinction between "preaching" and "teaching" the Word of God.

I. PREACHING AND TEACHING AS SEPARATE GIFTS

The Reformer is aware of this distinction from an early point in his own ministry as evidenced by his commentary on

Romans 12:4-8... "Let us prophesy according to the proportion of our faith; or ministry, let us give ourselves to our ministry; or he that teacheth, to his teaching; or he that exhorteth, to his exhorting...". Commenting on this passage he writes:

A teacher (doctor) is one who forms and instructs the church by the Word of truth. Let him that excels in the gift of exhortation regard it as his object to exhort with efficacy. These offices [i.e. "teaching" and "exhorting"] have a close relationship to and connection with each other. They do not, however, cease on this account to be different. No one can exhort without doctrine; yet he who teaches is not at once endowed with the gift of exhortation. 71

The first thing we need to be aware of is that the term "exhortation" as used here by Calvin should be understood as being equivalent to preaching. He defines exhortation in this way:

Now exhortation does not exclude teaching. But it seems that this word was accepted by common use among them, because the proper office of a teacher is not to produce some novel thing out of his own head, but to adapt Scripture to the peoples immediate need...In this way they are not so much teaching, as adapting teaching taken from another source, for the edification of the Church; and that, I think, is what is meant by the word exhortation. 72

The link between preaching and exhortation is seen more clearly in his comments on 1 Thessalonians 2:12 -

exhorting you: He shows how genuinely he was concerned about their well-being and says that when he preached about reverence for God and the duties of the Christian life, it was in no half-hearted manner, but he employed exhortations and earnest requests...73

And in his Institutio, the Reformer writes that one of the basic differences between pastors and teachers is that the latter is not put in charge of "warnings and exhortations".⁷⁴

Of course, correctly speaking, exhortation is but one of

several elements of preaching (i.e. teaching, admonishing, consoling, rebuking, encouraging).⁷⁵ Yet in the context of his comments on Romans 12:4-8, Calvin clearly uses the term exhortation to signify preaching. This exhortation or preaching, which is one of the spiritual gifts of the Church's ministry, is "different", he says, from teaching. Moreover, one who has the gift of teaching may not have the gift of preaching.

He makes the same point in his commentary on Ephesians 4:11, where he says that one of the main distinguishing features between pastors and teachers is "the kind of teaching" they engage in. "Teaching", the Reformer maintains, "is the duty of all pastors, but there is a particular gift of interpreting Scripture so that sound doctrine may be kept". This "particular gift" has been given to the doctor. Then he goes on to say that a doctor who is able to teach, may "not be fitted to preach".⁷⁶

Clearly, the Reformer understands preaching and teaching to be separate gifts, and the implication is that they also have separate functions. This is why he insisted - in opposition to Chrysostom and Augustine - that pastors and doctors held separate "offices" in the Church.⁷⁷ For Calvin, then, preaching was a "type of teaching" (doctrinae genus).⁷⁸ It was distinguished from other forms of teaching by certain unique characteristics which we shall now examine.

When Calvin uses the term praedicatio or prêcher what exactly does he have in mind? First we should say that the content is primary. One does not "preach" on the Hortatory Speeches of Isocrates, the natural sciences or the liberal

arts. Neither would the Reformer consider it preaching if a pastor stood in the pulpit expounding on some current event or on some special concern of his own: "When we enter the pulpit, it is not to bring there our dreams and fancies".⁷⁹ Again, "Preachers must not put forth their own dreams and fancies, but what they have received they must pass on faithfully without any additions."⁸⁰ And, of course, "what they have received" refers to the message of the Holy Scripture:

Let this be a firm principle: No other word is to be held as the Word of God, and given place as such in the Church, than what is contained first in the Law and the Prophets, and then in the writings of the Apostles; and the only authorized way of teaching in the Church is by the prescription and standard of His Word. 81

"To sum up, ministers of the Church are ambassadors for testifying and proclaiming the blessing of reconciliation, only on condition that they speak from the Gospel".⁸²

Secondly, we find that "calling" is essential in Calvin's doctrine of preaching. Any Christian can expound Scripture (with varying competence), at any time, in any place; but only when he has been "called" by God to perform this function and "sent" to carry out this office does his words constitute preaching:

There is no preacher of the Gospel who has not been raised up by God in His special providence. 83

For as the preaching of the Gospel is the cause of faith among them, so the mission of God...is the cause of preaching. 84

Again,

It is the singular dignity of ministers of the Gospel to be sent by God to us with a

mandate to be the messengers and in a manner the pledges of His good will towards us... Ministers are given authority to declare the good news to us...It is true that any person can also bear witness to us of God's grace, but Paul teaches that this duty is laid specially on ministers. 85

The calling is crucial to true preaching because only one who has received such a call is given the necessary gifts to carry out faithfully this mission:

We may understand that those who are sent out by God to preach the Gospel are equipped with the necessary endowments first, as may suffice for the greatness of the task...The Lord is expressly said to anoint His servants, as the true and effective preaching of the Gospel lies not in windy eloquence, but in the heaven sent power of the Spirit. 86

A further characteristic of preaching is that it is essentially "oral" proclamation as opposed to written forms of biblical interpretation and exposition. That is to say, preaching is normally "by word of mouth" rather than by the pen.⁸⁷ The preached Word is a word that is "heard" and given by a "living voice":

Though the law was written, yet God would have the living voice (vivam vocem) always to resound in his church, just as today the Scripture is conjoined with preaching, as by an invisible bond. 88

Again,

The Scripture has not been committed to us to silence the voice of pastors, and...we ought not be fastidious when the same exhortations often sound in our ears; for the Holy Spirit has so regulated the writings which he has dictated to the prophets and apostles that he detracts nothing from the order instituted by himself; and the order is, that constant exhortation should be heard (audiantur) in the church from the mouth of pastors (ex ore pastorum). 89

It is precisely because of the oral nature of preaching that Calvin makes the first "mark" of the Church, not simply preaching but "preaching and hearing".⁹⁰ This is because preaching

is the cause of faith,⁹¹ so that, with Paul, the Reformer maintains that "faith comes from hearing" (fides est ex auditu).⁹²

II. REVELATION AND KNOWLEDGE

Thus far, everything we have said about the nature of preaching could apply to the lectio of the doctor. What makes preaching unique among all other teaching methods in the Church is that the preached Word becomes revelation in its purest sense, that is, preaching is regarded by Calvin as an apocalyptic event where God himself speaks:

Christ has testified that in the preaching of the Gospel...it was he himself who would speak and promise all things through their [i.e. apostles] lips as his instruments...This testimony, moreover, was given to all ages, and remains firm, to make all men certain and sure that the word of the Gospel, whatever man may preach it, is the very sentence of God. 93

Again,

When a man enters the pulpit is it that he may be seen from afar, that he may be prominent? Not at all! He preaches so that God may speak to us by the mouth of a man. 94

For this reason, "ecclesiastical pastors are to be heard just like Christ himself". But they must be pastors who execute faithfully the office entrusted to them, which is to deliver the oracles they have received at the mouth of the Lord.⁹⁵ So it is not the case that preaching is an apocalyptic event in the sense that pastors deliver "new revelations".⁹⁶ God speaks through the preacher, but he speaks the same Word he spoke through the apostles so that there is always a complete continuity between the former and the latter. Therefore Calvin would certainly share the belief

expressed in the Confessio Helvetica Posterior (drawn up by Bullinger in 1562) that praedicatio verbi Dei est verbum Dei.

But would he say the same about the lectio of the theology professor? Here is a man, called to be a doctor in the Church, expounding Scripture in an academic setting to a group of students. Was he too, at that point, functioning as a "mouthpiece of God" in the same way as the preacher? Was his teaching "revelation" in the same sense as the preached sermo? We have seen that D'Ailly and Luther answered in the affirmative.⁹⁷ But the Genevan differs from these theologians on this point by drawing a clearer distinction between preaching and teaching.

Calvin recognizes and upholds the teaching of the apostle Paul whereby he singles out four basic categories pertaining to "edification" within the Christian Church: revelation (revelatio); knowledge (scientia); prophesying (prophetia); and teaching (doctrina).⁹⁸ Regarding the meaning and relationship between these terms the Reformer writes the following:

I bracket revelation and prophesying together, and I think that prophesying is the servant of revelation. I take the same view about knowledge and teaching. Therefore whatever anyone has obtained by revelation he gives out in prophesying. Teaching is the way to pass on knowledge. So a prophet will be the interpreter and minister of revelation. 99

Now Calvin does not specifically mention preaching here, but it is clear that he understands prophesying to mean just that, for he goes on to say:

This supports, rather than conflicts with, the definition of prophesy which I gave earlier. For I said that prophesying does not consist

in the simple or bare interpretation of Scripture (simplici aut nuda interpretatione scripturae), but also includes the knowledge of making it apply to the needs of the hour (sed continere simul eius in praesentem usam accommodandae) and that can only be obtained by revelation and the special influence of God. 100

Here we have an important passage dealing with the distinction, as Calvin sees it, between preaching and teaching. First we must show that the Reformer did in fact equate prophesying with preaching in this context.

He refers to his earlier definition of prophecy in this passage. This is found in two places. First, in 1 Corinthians 12:10- "I take the term prophecy to mean that unique and outstanding gift of revealing the secret will of God, so that the prophet is, so to speak, God's messenger to men".¹⁰¹ This definition is expanded in 1 Corinthians 12:28-

I am certain, in my own mind, that he means by prophets, not those endowed with the gift of foretelling, but those who were blessed with the unique gift of dealing with Scripture, not only by interpreting it (non modo interpretandae) but also by the wisdom they showed in making it meet the needs of the hour (accommodandae). Again, when he [Paul] defines the work of the prophet, or at least deals with the main things he ought to be doing, he says that he devotes himself to consolation, encouragement, and teaching...From this verse let us therefore learn that prophets are (1) outstanding interpreters of Scripture; and (2) men endowed with extraordinary wisdom and aptitude for grasping what the immediate need of the church is, and speaking the right word to meet it. That is why they are, so to speak, messengers who bring news of what God wants. 102

Calvin is of the opinion that the term prophecy can be understood in different ways, and one of these ways is to equate it with preaching:

To prophesy in Christ's name is to undertake the office of teacher on his authority and, as it were, with him as leader. For prophecy is here taken in the broad sense, as in

I Corinthians 1:14. He might simply have used the word "preach" (praedicandi), but chose to use the more distinguished term, to express better how the external profession counted for nothing, no matter what its appeal might be to the eyes of men. 103

In fact, he will often use the terms prophesying and preaching interchangeably, as in his commentary on 1 Thessalonians 5:21-

Since misguided individuals and imposters frequently pass off their nonsense under the name of prophesying, prophecy in this way might be rendered suspect or even repulsive. So at the present day there are many who are well-nigh sickened by the very name of preaching, (praedicationis) because there are so many stupid, ignorant men who blurt out their worthless brainwaves from the pulpit. 104

Again,

Despise not prophesyings...In this present passage, therefore, let us understand prophesying to mean the interpretation of Scripture applied to present need. Paul forbids us to despise it, unless we would freely choose to wander in darkness. The statement is remarkable for its commendation or outward preaching (externae praedicationis). 105

So then, we should say that when the Reformer speaks of "prophecy" in his definition of edification in the commentary on I Corinthians 14:6, he is using this term in "the broad sense" to mean preaching. Thus, we find in this passage that he makes the following distinction between preaching and teaching: Preaching is the means of conveying "revelation" and teaching is the way to pass on "knowledge". More precisely, teaching refers to the "simple" or "bare" interpretation of Scripture, and preaching, while it includes this, goes beyond it:

Prophesying [i.e. preaching] does not consist in the simple or bare interpretation of Scripture, but also includes the knowledge for

making it apply to the needs of the hour,
and that can only be obtained by revelation
and the special influence of God. 106

Therefore, Calvin distinguishes between preaching and teaching the Word of God in two ways. First, teaching refers simply to interpreting Scripture and passing on this knowledge. Now at the very heart of the Church's ministry of the Word lies the concept of interpretation (interpretatio). For the Reformer, interpretatio is not limited to "patching" the words of the Bible together, but rather consists of "explaining in clear words those matters in Scripture which perplex and hinder our understanding".¹⁰⁷ Preaching, of course, also includes interpretatio, but again it goes beyond simply explaining biblical texts and passing on this knowledge to produce understanding. At the very heart of preaching is what Calvin calls "application" or "accommodation":

The duty of ministers is to apply (applicare) to us the fruit of Christ's death...The application consists entirely of the preaching of the Gospel. 108

A good and faithful pastor ought to consider wisely what the present state of the church requires, so as to accommodate his doctrine (accommodet suam doctrinam) to its wants. 109

Secondly, this distinguishing characteristic of preaching (application) is something that depends, Calvin says, upon "the special influence of God",¹¹⁰ which is nothing less than the power of the Holy Spirit turning the feeble words of man into the very Word of God. This is why Calvin can, on the one hand, say that "preaching is the formal cause of our salvation",¹¹¹ yet at the same time maintain that "preaching on its own is nothing else but a dead letter".¹¹² The necessary ingredient, so to speak, is the Holy Spirit,

without which even the best researched and most eloquently delivered sermon will be severely ineffective.¹¹³ "So God has two ways of teaching", Calvin says. "He sounds in our ears by the mouth of men, and He addresses us inwardly by His Spirit. This He does simultaneously or at different times, as He thinks fit".¹¹⁴ He explains this at greater length elsewhere:

By the letter he means an external preaching (externam praedicationem) which does not reach the heart, and by the Spirit he means life-giving teaching which is, through the grace of the Spirit, given effective operation in men's souls. Thus the term "letter" means literal preaching (literalis praedicatio) which is dead and ineffective and perceived only by the ear: but the Spirit is spiritual teaching that is not uttered only with the mouth but effectively makes its way with living meaning into men's minds. 115

We see, then, that true preaching occurs only when God's Spirit is "added" to the words of the preacher. Calvin regards it as normal for this to occur when a properly called and duly ordained pastor preaches from Scripture, yet this can never be taken for granted.¹¹⁶ There is, therefore, a double error into which the hearer may fall. One might be tempted "to reject every doctrine without distinction", or one may display "absurd credulity" and "embrace everything that is presented...without distinction".¹¹⁷ Thus, it is necessary for the listener "to form a judgement" each time the preached Word is heard, in order to discover "whether it is His Word that is set before them, or...human inventions".¹¹⁸ It is important, Calvin says, that "believers should not receive any doctrine thoughtlessly or uncritically".¹¹⁹

This distinction between preaching as God's own Word of

revelation and teaching as bare or general biblical interpretation whereby one passes on knowledge is found, says Calvin, in Jesus and the apostles themselves:

Now when Jesus heard: John's narrative does not appear to agree with these, for he records that John and Jesus began their teaching mission (docendi munus) together at the same time. But we must note that our three Evangelists pass over that short period in silence, for the reason that John's career was not yet complete, that is, the preparation (praeparatio) for the receiving of the gospel of Christ. In fact, although Christ did act as Teacher (doctoris officio) during that time, He had not really started upon the preaching of the Gospel (evangelii praedictionem) until he succeeded John. 120

Again,

But it is surprising that Christ did not want the Apostles to bear witness (esse testes) to Him [i.e. to preach], when he had already laid this office upon them. For why had they been sent, save as the heralds (praecones) of the redemption which depended on Christ's coming? The solution is not difficult if we keep in mind what I then explained, that they were appointed not as doctores [i.e. those who preach or proclaim] who should bear a sure and full testimony to Christ (qui certum et plenum Christo testimonium redderent), but only to prepare (paro) disciples for the Master, that is, make those teachable and attentive who were very slothful. 121

And again,

He speaks of "labourers", not implying that they [i.e. Apostles] are like the ordinary ministers, who husband the vineyard of the Lord...but only as being fore-runners of that richer and complete message. For at that time there was laid on them no other teaching task than to make the Jews ready for the preaching of the Gospel. 122

We see, then, that Christ was acting as Teacher, according to Calvin, when He gave a certain kind of instruction which could not accurately be described as preaching. Rather, it was a type of instruction that served as a preparation for preaching. This was also what the Apostles were

engaged in during the time prior to Christ's death and resurrection, when they had not yet received the fullness of the Spirit. We might say that the bare or general teaching which Calvin links with knowledge had to do simply with handing on certain facts that enlighten the mind (intellect) so as to prepare one for receiving the preached Word. Preaching, on the other hand, is a highly personal form of teaching that goes beyond the mind to penetrate the heart and conscience as well:

Therefore he [Paul] tells them [the Galatians] that his teaching was so clear that it was not so much bare teaching (nuda doctrina) as the living and express image of Christ. They had a knowledge that could almost have given them a sight of Him...To show how forceful his preaching had been, Paul first compares it with a picture which showed them a portrait of Christ to the life. Then, not satisfied with his comparison, he adds, Christ has been crucified among you. By this he suggests that the actual sight of Christ's death could not have affected them more than his preaching...

Therefore we will keep to this meaning, that Paul's doctrine had taught them about Christ in such a manner that it was as if He had been shown to them in a picture, even crucified among them. Such a representation could not have been effected by any eloquence or tricks of oratory, had not the power of the Spirit been present...

Let those who want to discharge the ministry of the Gospel aright learn not only to speak and declaim but also to penetrate into consciences, so that men may see Christ crucified and that His blood may flow. 123

a. Preaching as Exhortation

We can now see more clearly what Calvin had in mind when he referred to preaching as the "living" Word. "The preaching of the Gospel has life", he says, "when men are not merely told what is right, but are pricked by exhortation and summoned to the judgement seat of God so that they may

not sleep in their errors".¹²⁴ So we should say that, according to Calvin, preaching is a type of teaching insofar as it communicates "what is right", but goes beyond this in that preaching does not only aim at the mind but at the heart and will as well:

Nous ne venons point qu sermon seulement pour ouir ce qui nous seroit incognu: mais pour estre incitez a faire nostre devoir, et pour resveillez quand nous serons lasches et paresseux, par bonnes et saintes admonitions, et pour estre regardez quand il y a aura quand rebellion et malice en nous. Et c'est ce qui nous est ici remonstre par St. Paul que chacun doit avoir engrave en son coeur. 125

Thus, the aim of preaching is not simply to pass on knowledge, but to change the will of the listener, and it does this by penetrating to the conscience of man so as to illicit a response or a decision. In a word, preaching aims at conversion:

The chief thing in preaching is that those who hear us should somehow or other come to Christ. 126

All this means that there is a radical personal element in preaching (not found in teaching per se) which touches a person's whole being (i.e. mind, soul and spirit).¹²⁷

"We have said elsewhere that testifying (testificari) is more than teaching (quam docere), for it is as if a solemn contestation were taking place between God and man, to establish the majesty of the Gospel."¹²⁸ What Calvin said "elsewhere" (i.e. Acts 20:21) is this:

By the word testifying he expresses himself with greater emphasis, as if he had said that he commended by bearing witness (attestando) so that no room might be left for excuse or ignorance. For he is alluding to the practice of the law courts, where testifying is introduced to remove all doubt. Similarly men must not only be taught (non tantum docendi) but also urged (urgendi) to embrace salvation in Christ, and yield themselves to God for newness of life. 129

So while the goal of teaching is "to pass on knowledge", "the chief end in preaching the Gospel is that man may be reconciled to God."¹³⁰ And Calvin sees a clear distinction between these two: "The gift of regeneration is one thing, the gift of mere factual knowledge (intelligentia) is another."¹³¹ The result of good teaching is intelligentia; the result of good preaching is regeneratio. That is to say, one is not only informed when one hears the Word preached, one is changed. This is why the preacher's ministry is more accurately described, according to Calvin, as one of power (virtue) than of word (sermone):

Because the Lord governs His Church with His Word, as with a sceptre, the administration by the Gospel (evangelii administratio) is often called the Kingdom of God. Here we must understand by the Kingdom of God whatever aims at this, and is appointed for this purpose: that God may reign in our midst. Paul says that this Kingdom does not consist in word (sermone); for there is nothing wonderful about anyone being adept at speaking fluently when he is pronouncing nothing but an empty jingle! Let us therefore learn that a merely superficial attractiveness and skill in teaching is like a body which is well formed and healthy in colour, while the power (virtuem), of which Paul speaks here, is like the soul. We have already seen that the nature of evangelical preaching is such that it is full of a genuine majesty. This majesty shows itself when a minister goes into action more with power (virtue) than with words (sermone). In other words, he devotes himself actively to the Lord's work, not relying confidently on his own ability or eloquence, but equipped with spiritual weapons, which are zeal in protecting the glory of the Lord, desire for setting up the Kingdom of Christ, eagerness for up-building, fear of the Lord, undefeatable steadfastness, and other gifts needed. Without them preaching is dead, and has no force at all, no matter how brilliant and colourful it may be to the last. For that reason he says in II Corinthians 5:17 that nothing less than a new creation will suffice in Christ. And that thought has the

same object in view. For he does not want us to remain content with any outward shams (externis larvis), but to persevere in the inward power (internae virtuti) of the Holy Spirit. 132

The words of the preacher come with "power" insofar as they illicit a change in one's life and this can be achieved, not simply by understanding or comprehension, but only by "renewing our souls".¹³³ Ultimately, the renewal of the soul can be achieved only by God Himself, yet he uses his ministers or "ambassadors" as a means of accomplishing this goal through the preaching of the Word. This is why the distinctive characteristic of preaching that sets it apart from teaching is "exhortation",¹³⁴ which involves, according to Calvin, admonishing, consoling and encouraging.¹³⁵

b. Preaching and pietas

Put in another way, we should say that preaching aims at nurturing and sustaining pietas. For the Reformer, pietas was an all embracing term that had reference to every aspect of the Christian faith and life. He defined it in his Institutio as "that reverence joined with love of God which the knowledge of his benefits induces".¹³⁶ Knowledge, therefore, played a prominent role in true pietas. In his commentary on Jeremiah, Calvin referred to the knowledge of God (cognito Dei) as the "beginning" of pietas.¹³⁷ And when commenting upon the meaning of the term disciples in Acts 18:22, he writes: "There is no piety without proper instruction".¹³⁸ Yet knowledge is but one of several elements which make up pietas. As one reads through the Reformer's writings, one finds a number of these other elements: "reverence",¹³⁹ "love",¹⁴⁰ "faith",¹⁴¹ "fear",¹⁴² "worship",¹⁴³ and "obedience".¹⁴⁴ Knowledge, then, is described by Calvin as only

the "first step" in a life of piety.¹⁴⁵

As we have previously noted, the Reformer defined teaching as the way to pass on knowledge. Preaching, on the other hand, goes beyond this to include exhortation (i.e. urging, admonishing, consoling etc.). That is to say, preaching is not just concerned with giving the hearer knowledge and information; it is also concerned with challenging him or her to act on that knowledge. By appealing to the will and the heart (i.e. emotions) in addition to the mind, the preached Word aims at creating true pietas within the individual. The same cannot be said of teaching which, strictly speaking, is concerned only with the impartation of knowledge (i.e. the first step in a life of piety). This is why the Reformer so often maintains that preaching is the "cause of faith" in men and women.¹⁴⁶ Teaching, on the other hand, should be regarded, according to what the Reformer has said above, as a "preparation" for receiving faith. Just as knowledge is the "first step" toward pietas, so teaching is the first step in the ministry of the Word which aims at nurturing and sustaining faith.

In the Institutio, Calvin talks about "implicit faith", which he says is "strictly nothing but the preparation of faith".¹⁴⁷ Implicit faith arises from just a limited knowledge of Christ, as in the case of those people who witnessed his miracles and were drawn to believe in him as the Messiah "although they had not been imbued with even a trace of the gospel teaching".¹⁴⁸ Though their understanding was very minimal insofar as they had simply seen Jesus perform miracles, they still willingly submitted themselves to Christ, thus prompting the Evangelists, says Calvin, to refer to this

response as "faith"; "yet", he continues, "it was only the beginning of faith".¹⁴⁹ The same was true of Cornelius, and the Eunuch to whom Philip spoke. Their faith was implicit, the Reformer says, in that they had only been "instructed in principles such as might give them some taste of Christ".¹⁵⁰

This limited (i.e. preparatory) knowledge which they received is also referred to by Calvin as "bare and external proof".¹⁵¹ Elsewhere he talks of "general instruction" and "bare", "mere" and "general" teaching.¹⁵² We should say that implicit faith, for the Reformer, was founded on a knowledge that was purely intellectual, that is, which involved only the mind. This helps us to understand how Calvin can sometimes speak of knowledge as producing faith,¹⁵³ and at other times speak of faith producing knowledge.¹⁵⁴ Just as there is implicit faith and faith per se, so too the Reformer uses knowledge in two senses. There is a certain type of knowledge that constitutes a preparation for faith, and another type of knowledge that is a result of faith. This relationship is expressed in his commentary on John 10:38:

Although he places faith after knowledge (scientia), as if it were inferior, he does so because it has to do with unbelieving and obstinate men...And yet our gracious God indulges us so far, that He prepares us for faith by a knowledge (notitia) of His works. But the knowledge of God (cognito Dei) and His secret wisdom comes after faith, because the obedience of faith opens to us the door of the Kingdom of heaven. 155

That knowledge which is a preparation for faith (written above as notitia)¹⁵⁶ would appear to be the knowledge of implicit faith. This knowledge, as we have seen, consists of only a basic understanding of Christ's authority, as in the case of Nicodemus, who witnessed some of the miracles of Jesus:

Miracles have the twofold result of preparing us for faith and then of further strengthening what has been conceived by the Word; and so Nicodemus profited aright in the former part since from the miracles he recognizes Christ as a true prophet of God. 157

We can say that, in one sense, the knowledge of God's work in creation is part of this preparation for faith:

As much in the fashioning of the universe as in the general teaching of Scripture the Lord shows Himself to be simply the Creator. 158

Yet this knowledge is preparatory to faith only in a negative way insofar as the revelation in the opera Dei serves simply to make men "inexcusable".¹⁵⁹ The more positive content of implicit faith has to do specifically with knowing Christ (i.e. as in the case of those who perceived his miracles), though, as we said above, the extent of this understanding is limited in that it is "not accompanied by a full and distinct knowledge of sound doctrine".¹⁶⁰

We have seen that the part of the ministry of the Word in the Church which Calvin calls teaching (the proper office of the doctor ecclesiae) involves the passing on of knowledge - a knowledge which aims strictly at informing the intellect (intelligentia). The substance of teaching is the "simple" interpretation of the Bible, that is, "the explaining in clear words those matters in Scripture which perplex and hinder our understanding". This corresponds with Budé's comment (cf. supra, 249) that the style of Calvin's academic lectures is well suited to the main purpose of these lectures, namely, bringing out the "true and plain meaning" of the passage under discussion. The result of the knowledge obtained from such teaching is "implicit faith" (i.e. the preparation for true faith).

Preaching includes within it this process of teaching, but it goes beyond this to include also exhortation (application). It is therefore not just directed at the mind, but at the heart (will) and soul as well. Its aim is not simply "to explain", but to "change" (conversio, regeneratio) by "training the life in pietas". And so, while teaching leads the hearer to understanding, preaching leads him to Christ (i.e. true faith). This is why preaching (but not teaching, cf. supra, 256) is regarded by the Reformer as revelation. In the preached Word, God Himself speaks. Calvin distinguishes two parts of "sound doctrine" :

The first is that by which God's grace in Christ is commended to us, so that we know where to look for salvation; the second, that by which our life is trained to the fear of God and innocence. 161

We should say, then, that teaching is concerned with only the first part of this process of edification. Thus, teaching lays the foundation, so to speak, on which the preacher builds.¹⁶²

CONCLUSION

We believe that our study has both significantly altered and, at certain fundamental points, completely redefined what appears to be the prevailing interpretation among Calvin scholars regarding the question of the nature and function of the doctoral office in the Reformer's thought and practice.

First, we have maintained that Calvin, in line with his Patristic and Medieval predecessors, did not envisage a separate and distinct "order" of doctors in the spiritual government of the Church.

Even during the early centuries when Christian "lay" doctors like Justin, Clement and Tertullian performed teaching functions "in" the Church that were quite separate from the instruction given by the local priest or bishop, they did not appear to hold any officially recognized ecclesiastical status. When the concept of office became more formalized in the third century, we still do not find a separate order of doctors. Rather, the Fathers are unanimous in their understanding of the term doctor ecclesiae as being synonymous with the episcopal office (i.e. pastorate).

With the creation of the Medieval university came a new kind of doctor ecclesiae - the doctor theologiae, whose teaching duties were entirely different from those of the episcopate. No longer was the church's doctoral function confined to a pastoral kind of edification aimed strictly at producing pietas. In the wake of scholasticism, part of this doctoral function now included a scientific - academic

approach to doctrine which employed new pedagogical tools in the scholastic quest for rationes. The doctor theologiae also possessed (according to Aquinas and D'Ailly - and they appear to be representative of the orthodox tradition here) an auctoritas by virtue of their doctoral status in the university (magisterium cathedrae magistralis) which was distinct from the authority of the bishop (magisterium cathedrae pastoralis).

Yet while the doctor theologiae clearly participated in the Church's teaching mission, he was not regarded as constituting a separate ordo in the ecclesiastical hierarchy. The threefold division of bishop, priest, deacon was maintained in the Medieval Church. We do not even find doctors listed among the "lower" or "minor" orders. The authority of the doctor theologiae to teach Christian doctrine in the Medieval university appeared to be of a derivative nature and not based on any independent jurisdictional power he possessed in his own right. He simply shared in the teaching authority that belonged properly to the episcopal order. Hence, the doctor theologiae was not himself part of the Church's official magisterium. We therefore concluded that the doctor theologiae in the Middle Ages, who was responsible for scriptural interpretation in an academic as opposed to a pastoral setting, was properly entitled doctor ecclesiae along with the bishop/priest. But he did not constitute a separate ordo of ecclesiastical government. Rather, he was understood to hold a specialized function of biblical instruction within the wider clerical order.

John Calvin followed the Patristic and Medieval tradition in not regarding the doctor as a distinct ordo of ministry. The fourfold division in Les Ordonnances Ecclésiastiques, which made the docteur an independent ordre, should not be regarded as the Reformer's definitive position on this matter. We have established that throughout his exegetical, dogmatic and other writings, Calvin consistently speaks of only three orders of ecclesiastical ministry (pastor, elder, deacon). Nowhere in these writings do we find him making the doctoral function a separate ordo alongside the pastoral order.

We have suggested that some of the confusion surrounding this area of Calvin's ecclesiology may stem from terminological ambiguity with respect to the Reformer's use of the words officium and munus. It seems that a failure to realize that Calvin uses the term "office" in two senses, namely, i) a publicly assigned office of Church government (i.e. ordo) and ii) any particular task, function or service, has led some writers to misinterpret the Reformer's doctrine of orders.

Secondly, we believe that our study has established that, while Calvin did not make the doctor ecclesiae a separate ordo of Church government, he did envisage a distinct doctoral function within the pastoral order. The reason why the Reformer did not regard doctors as an independent ordo has to do fundamentally with his understanding of the nature and scope of this doctoral function, that is, the Church's essential teaching mission. We have maintained that, for Calvin, the doctoral function of the Church had to do strictly with scriptural interpretation and did not include

instruction in other academic disciplines. Here again we saw that Calvin stood, at this point, within the Patristic and Medieval tradition.

It was noted that the term "doctor" had a multiple usage in the Middle Ages and that the Reformer also used this term in several ways. He was aware of the university doctorate awarded in various faculties which authorized its holders to teach in an academic arena. He spoke often of the "Roman doctors". In addition, he could refer to all pastors as doctors, using this term in a "general sense". But he also maintained that there were doctors in the Church's ministerial order who were not necessarily pastors. These doctors performed a distinct teaching function that Calvin insisted was quite different from the pastoral function of preaching.

Most scholars would agree that the Reformer envisaged a distinct doctoral function in the Church, but the crucial question is: what exactly, in Calvin's mind, did this doctoral function entail? As we have already mentioned, our study has concluded (in opposition to the predominant opinion among Calvin scholars) that the Reformer followed his Patristic and Medieval predecessors in identifying the doctor ecclesiae with the doctor theologiae and not the university doctorate in general. That is to say, he understood the scope of the Church's teaching ministry to be strictly confined to the interpretation of Scripture. General education, whether on the elementary level or the more advanced level of language study, arts and philosophy, was not considered by the Reformer to be part of the essential teaching mission of the Church. We found that never in his writings did he make the teachers of these secular disciplines

ecclesiastical officeholders; nor do they ever receive the title doctor ecclesiae.

In this respect, Calvin was again emulating the thinking of both the Church Fathers, who universally regarded the "doctor" as being synonymous with the episcopal magisterium, and the Medieval Church, which took care to draw a clear line of distinction between the doctor theologiae and the doctors in other faculties when it came to the question of ecclesiastical status. We saw the peculiar position in which the Medieval university stood (as in the case of the University of Paris) with respect to its relationship to the Church and State. Though originally the child of the ecclesiastical authorities, it quickly severed these ties so that by the 14th century Jean Gerson could refer to this Parisian institution as filia regis. Yet this could not be accurately applied to the Faculty of Theology which always stood in a position apart from the other faculties in its relationship to the Church.

The situation at Paris was, generally speaking, typical of what was occurring in other European universities. As the Middle Ages progressed, we find the State taking on an ever increasing role in the development and control of educational matters. We saw that this was the case in Geneva. As we traced the history of the educational institutions in this city - from the founding of the College of Versonnex in 1428, to the establishment of the Genevan Academy in 1559 - we found that the civil authorities never curtailed their dominating control in this area. On the basis of this history, we concluded that, despite the involvement of Churchmen like Calvin, the College (and later the Academy)

during this period is more accurately described as a State institution than an ecclesiastical one. This, as we saw, was certainly the view expressed by Theodore Beza in his inaugural address as Rector of the new Academy given at the official opening of this building in 1559. And there is no reason to doubt that he was not only expressing his personal opinion, but also that of his colleagues, including Calvin.

We found absolutely no evidence in Calvin's own writings to support the common contention that the Reformer conceived of the Church's doctoral function as extending to "all branches of knowledge", nor even to "the most important positions in the educative system".¹ Our study has shown that Calvin consistently and unequivocally defines the doctor ecclesiae as the one whose function it is to interpret Scripture. Nowhere does he link this office with the teaching of "secular" subjects. In fact, he explicitly regards instruction in the "liberal arts" to be the concern of the "temporal kingdom" (i.e. the State). One need not even be a Christian to teach these subjects, he says, for this is a "natural gift" given to believers and non-believers alike.

It is precisely because the Reformer strictly tied the doctoral office of the Church to scriptural interpretation that he refrains from making it a separate order in the ecclesiastical government, choosing instead to regard it as a special function of biblical instruction within the pastoral order (i.e. the ministry of the Word). It is,

1. Among such personage Dr. Henderson includes the professors of Hebrew, Greek, and philosophy (op.cit., 345). One wonders if he included among "the most important" the professor of law (cf. op.cit., 66-7).

therefore, hardly surprising to find that, although Calvin regards it as possible for one to be a doctor ecclesiae without being a pastor, all those holding the doctoral office in the Genevan Church during Calvin's day, who were not at first pastors (Calvin himself, de Geneston and Beza), eventually became so.¹

The two major conclusions of this study which we have thus far delineated regarding Calvin's understanding of the nature and scope of the Church's doctoral office and its relation to the pastorate, not only indicates that the Reformer's position on these matters closely follows the Patristic and Medieval traditions, but also demonstrates that later Reformed ecclesiologies were much more faithful to his teaching in this regard than a certain major work would have us believe.²

-
1. Farel was from the start both pastor and doctor.
 2. Henderson, op.cit. After examining the debates at the Westminster Assembly and the conclusions it reached regarding the doctoral office, Henderson comments: "There is grave doubt whether the majority of them really understood what Calvin meant by the doctorate in the Church..." (p.213) "...The doctoral office emerging from the Westminster Assembly was not the office Calvin had envisaged for the Church in Geneva..." (p.214). It was not only the Puritans who got it wrong, according to Henderson, but also "the continental Reformed Churches and those groups which trace their heritage from continental sources". He claims, "among these communions, the doctoral office in its Genevan form is no longer clearly evident. Rather, it has been restricted to the 'professor of Theology'..." (original thesis, p.341). As we have noted, a major component of Henderson's thesis is based on his assumption that Calvin regarded the doctoral office as a separate "order" (p.240), entirely distinct from the pastorate, and that the Reformer included within this "order" the professors of Greek, Hebrew and Arts (Law?), thereby making them ecclesiastical officeholders and an integral part of the spiritual government. We believe the evidence we have put forth in this study requires one to reject Dr. Henderson's conclusions.

For instance, a report drawn up by a sub-committee at the Westminster Assembly,¹ which attempted to summarize the thoughts of the Assembly concerning the nature of the doctoral office, expresses a view with which Calvin, according to our study, would completely concur:

1. The Scripture holds forth the name of doctor and teacher, as well as pastor.
2. A Teacher may be in a particular church where there is a pastor, though not always necessarily in every particular congregation.
3. A doctor is of excellent use in schools and universities, they being churches or part of the church.
4. But where one minister is, he is to do the office both of pastor and teacher.
5. The nature of the doctor's office is to expound Scripture, to hold forth sound doctrine, and to convince gainsayers. 2

In 1644, the Westminster Assembly formally adopted the following statement defining the doctoral office, which we can again say, on the basis of our study, is, for the most part,³ entirely in keeping with the views of the Reformer:

TEACHER or DOCTOR

The Scripture doth hold out the name and title of a teacher, as well as of the pastor. Who is also a minister of the Word as well as the pastor, and hath power of administration of the Sacraments. The Lord having given different gifts and divers exercises according to these gifts may meet in, and accordingly be exercised by one and the same minister. Yet where there be several ministers in the same congregation, they may be designed to several employments according to the different gifts, in which each of them do most excel. And

1. This committee consisted of Thomas Goodwin, Philip Nye, Charles Herle, Cornelius Burgess, Richard Vines and Thomas Hill, cf. Henderson, op.cit., 299, ft.N.2.
2. Henderson, op.cit., 206-207, quoting from John Lightfoot's Journal of the Assembly.
3. Calvin does not give the power of administering the sacraments to the doctor if he was not also a pastor.

he that doth most excel in exposition of Scripture, in teaching sound doctrine, and in convincing gainsayers, than he doth in application, and is accordingly employed there, may be called a teacher or doctor, (the places alleged by the notation of the Word doth prove the proposition;) nevertheless, where is but one minister in a particular congregation, he is to perform so far as he is able the whole work of the ministry. A teacher or doctor is of most excellent use in the schools and universities; as of old in the schools of the prophets, and at Jerusalem, where Gamaliel and others taught as doctors. 1

Moreover, during the course of the discussion at the Assembly concerning the doctoral office (which lasted for about five days), it is evident that, contrary to Dr. Henderson's claim, a good deal of the thinking was directly in line with the views of Calvin. Several members, for example, voiced the opinion that the distinction between pastors and doctors was "not one of order", but rather of "office and the gifts given by God necessary for the exercise of the office".² It appears that these men were aware of the important distinction Calvin made between the terms ordo, functio (i.e. officio) and donum. As well, the whole Assembly was in agreement (as the official statement indicates) that the doctoral office of the Church had to do strictly with scriptural interpretation and did not extend to other academic disciplines. While Dr. Henderson regards this as a departure from Calvin's position, our study indicates that in fact these views are entirely in harmony with the Reformer's

1. Henderson, op.cit., 212.

2. Henderson, op.cit., 198 (cf. also 201).

definition of the doctor ecclesiae.¹

Finally, we believe that we have established that, even though Calvin understood the scope of both the pastor's and doctor's teaching ministry to be exactly the same (i.e. scriptural interpretation), he made a fundamental distinction between their respective instruction in terms of aim, method and authority. That is to say, there was a crucial difference in his mind between "preaching" the Word and "teaching" the Word. This was one of the major reasons why (in opposition to Augustine and Chrysostom) he insisted on distinguishing between the pastoral and doctoral "offices" even though, like them, he understood these offices to constitute only one ordo in the ecclesiastical government.

We concluded that teaching is regarded by Calvin as the foundation or preparation for preaching. The aim of the former is simply "to explain" by informing the intellect. Preaching, on the other hand, although it always includes teaching, goes beyond it insofar as its aim is not only to explain, but also to "change" the hearer by "training the life in piety" and "leading him to Christ" (i.e. regeneratio, conversio). Hence, "exhortation" (i.e. application, accommodation) is an essential feature of preaching which distinguishes it from teaching. Moreover, it is apparent that the Reformer sees a difference in authority between these

1. It is our opinion that, even on the basis of the evidence Dr. Henderson himself sets forth, it seems evident that, from the beginning, the French, Dutch and German Reformed Churches, as well as the Church of Scotland and early Puritan Churches, were for the most part united in strictly identifying the doctoral office of the Church with scriptural interpretation (i.e. the doctor ecclesiae = the doctor theologiae).

two modes of edification. This is suggested by the fact that he brackets teaching with "knowledge", indicating that it is based on a personal academic competence, while he brackets preaching with "revelation" - God himself speaks through the pastor in the preached Word.

We once again find strong parallels between Calvin and the Medieval tradition with respect to this particular area of his ecclesiology. This is more true of that part of the Medieval tradition which follows Aquinas in this regard, than those who are in line with D'Ailly. For we saw that Thomas (unlike D'Ailly) made a clear distinction between preaching and teaching in terms of authority and function. We especially note the Reformer's close affinity to Aquinas when the latter describes the teaching given by the doctor theologiae as a scientific competence obtained per modum cognitionis. But whereas Thomas bases the authority of the bishop's praelatio on a jurisdictional power (i.e. sacerdotal), Calvin, as we have seen, defines the authority of preaching in sacramental terms. The functional relationship between teaching (legere) and preaching described by Peter the Chanter and maintained by Aquinas, whereby the former serves as a preparation for the latter, is also reminiscent of what we saw to be the Reformer's position in this matter.

The influence of Patristic and Medieval writers on Calvin's understanding of the relationship between the Church's pastoral and doctoral offices is clearly evident. And while it is equally evident that he is no mere imitator, one still needs to place the Reformer in the context of these traditions if his true position is to be correctly interpreted.

NOTES

FREQUENTLY USED ABBREVIATIONS

<u>Annales</u>	Annales Calviniani (relevant extracts from Register du Conseil de Genève, in CO)
Bétant	Notice sur le Collège de Rive
CO	Ioannis Calvinii Opera Quae Supersunt Omnia (Corpus Reformatorum)
H.E.	Historia Ecclesiasticus (Eusebius)
<u>Inst</u>	Institutio Christianae Religionis (Calvin)
LW	Luther's Works
<u>L'Ordre</u>	L'Ordre et Maniere d'Enseigner (Ordo et Ratio Docendi)
OS	Johannis Calvinii Opera Selecta (Barth and Niesel)
P.L.	Patrologiae Cursus, series Latina
QQ	Quaestiones Quodlibetales (Aquinas)
<u>Radix</u>	Radix Omnium Malorum est Cupiditas (D'Ailly)
<u>Register</u>	The Register of the Company of Pastors in Geneva in the Time of Calvin (Hughes)
<u>Summa</u>	Summa Theologiae (Aquinas)
<u>Super</u>	Super Omnia Vincit Veritas (D'Ailly)
T & T	Calvin's Tracts and Treatises

PART ONE

CHAPTER ONE

1. cf. I Corinthians 12:28, Ephesians 4:11, Acts 13:1, Barnabas 2:6, II Clement 3:1, The Didache. The term διδασκαλος occurs 58 times in the NT, cf. Kittel, Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, V.II,148ff.

The verb διδασκων occurs 95 times in the NT, ibid,135ff.

When referring to this ecclesiastical "office" in this study, we shall use the terms "doctor" and "teacher" synonymously.

2. Among the modern scholars who have written extensively on this question are:

H. von Campenhausen, Ecclesiastical Authority and Spiritual Power in the Church of the First Three Centuries (London, 1975).

J.D.G. Dunn, Jesus and the Spirit (London, 1975).

A. Lemaire, Les ministères aux origines de l'église naissance de la triple hiérarchie : évêques, presbyters, diacres (Paris, 1971)

B. Holmberg, Paul and Power : The Structure of Authority in the Primitive Church as Reflected in the Pauline Epistles (Sweden, 1978)

T.M. Lindsay, The Church and Ministry in the Early Centuries (London, 1902)

C.H. Dodd, The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments, (London, 1936)

R.H. Mounce, The Essential Nature of New Testament Preaching (Grand Rapids, 1960)

J.D. Smart, The Teaching Ministry of the Church, (Philadelphia, 1954)

3. cf. especially, Dunn, ibid; Holmberg, ibid.
4. As early as Hippolytus the term is restricted entirely to the canonical prophets, cf. Campenhausen, op.cit., 192 N.91.
5. Lindsay, op.cit., 182.
6. Campenhausen, op.cit., 192.
7. ibid, 194-195

8. The Didache purported to set out the teaching of the Apostles. There has been much debate over its dating; some arguing for a date as early as A.D. 60, others attributing it to the 4th century.
9. D. Van den Eynde, Les Normes de l'Enseignement Chrétien dans la littérature patristique des trois premiers siècles (Paris, 1933), 58.

cf. also, H. Bettenson, The Early Christian Fathers (London, 1969), 5ff.
10. Eynde, ibid, 61.
11. Campenhausen, op.cit., 194 ff.
12. Eusebius, Historia Ecclesiasticus, IV.II; hereafter cited as H.E.
13. H. Bettenson, op.cit., 10.
14. Justin Martyr, Dialogue with Trypho, I.2; cf. also Campenhausen, op.cit., 193.
15. L.W. Barnard, Justin Martyr (Cambridge, 1967), 53.
16. Barnard, ibid, 13.
17. E. De Faye, Clement d'Alexandrie (Paris, 1906), 31; R. Cadiou, La Jeunesse d'Origene (Paris, 1935), 7ff.; H. Bettenson, op.cit., 16.
18. The evidence which Bardy brings forth and the arguments he employs to support this position cannot be dealt with here; cf. his article, "Aux Origines de l'Ecole d'Alexandrie", Recherches et Science Religieuse (1937), 65-95. The views expressed here are shared by several scholars in the field; cf. for instance, Campenhausen, op.cit., 197ff.
19. Bardy, op.cit., 78.
20. ibid, 79ff.
21. ibid, 83.
22. Those who make this claim refer to an allusion found in Clement's Paedagogus I.6.37, and Alexander of Jerusalem's reference to his priesthood, cf. H.E.VI.II.6.
23. Bardy, op.cit., 82; Campenhausen, op.cit., 197.
24. Clement of Alexandria, Stromata, Anti Nicene Library v.4, 372.
25. ibid.
26. Clement of Alexandria, Stromata, Anti Nicene Library, Vol.4. 418; 420.

27. Campenhausen, op.cit., 201.
28. Bardy, op.cit., 5.
29. Clement, op.cit., 418.
30. Bardy, op.cit., 5.
31. Clement, op.cit., 398.
32. Campenhausen, op.cit., 210.
33. Clement, Stromata, VI, 105.1.
34. Campenhausen, op.cit., 209.
35. H.E.VI.II.6; cf. Campenhausen, op.cit., 211, n.270.
36. Campenhausen, op.cit., 236.
37. ibid, 230.
38. ibid, 174-175.
39. This view, however, is first recorded in his Montanist period.
40. Campenhausen, op.cit., 228.
41. ibid.
42. Justin, Apology (Anti Nicene Library).
43. Tertullian, De Praescriptione Haereticorum, VII.9, in Migne, Patrologiae Cursus, series Latina, hereafter cited P.L.
44. H. Chadwick, Early Christian Thought and the Classical Tradition (1966), 1ff.
45. Tertullian, op.cit., VII.9.
46. Tertullian, De Corona, VII, P.L.II, II.84:
"Vides igitur et curiosius et planius agendum ab originibus usque ad profectus et excessus rei. Litterae ad hoc saeculares necessariae: de suis enim instrumentis saeculares necessariae: de suis enim instrumentis saecularia probari necesse est."
47. ibid, VIII, P.L.II, 87.
48. Tertullian, De Idololatria, X, P.L. I.673, also found in Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum, XX, 30-58.
49. Tertullian, De Pallio, VI.1-4; cf. Barnes, op.cit., 231.
50. Tertullian, De Idololatria, X, P.L.I.673.

51. ibid.
52. It is possible that Tertullian may have been involved with catechesis, although such a view would be purely hypothetical, for no mention is made of a catechetical school at Carthage at this time. Moreover, the extant works of Tertullian are definitely not geared to the instruction of young children. There appears to be little basis for endowing Tertullian with the title of "catechist".
53. Tertullian, Apologeticum, 39.18: "...post aquam manuum et lumina, ut quisque de scripturis divinis vel de proprio ingenio potest, provocatur in medium deo canere"; cf. Barnes, op.cit., 117.
54. J.A. Knaake, "Die Predigten des Tertullian und Cyprian", Theologische Studien und Kritiken, LXXVI (1903), 608ff.
55. Barnes, op.cit., 117ff.
56. From about the last quarter of the 2nd century, the term "school" was often used in a pejorative way, in order to describe a separate community, often unorthodox in their teaching and at odds with the "official" teaching of the Church. cf. G.Bardy, "Les Ecoles Romaines au second siècle", Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique, Vol.28 (1932), 530, n.2.
57. H.E., VI.3.1-8.
58. J. Danielou, Origen, trans. W. Mitchell, (London, 1955), 11.
59. Bardy, "Aux Origines de l'Ecole d'Alexandrie", op.cit., 87, n.72.
60. R. Cadiou, La Jeunesse d'Origène (Paris, 1935), 31-32: "Origène ne reçut aucune ordination. Le catéchiste n'avait pas de place dans la hiérarchie. L'évêque se contentait dans la plupart des Eglises de lui remettre le livre de la catéchèse, sans lui imposer les mains. Il restait un laïque, et il enseignait sous la surveillance du clergé".
61. H.E.VI.15.
62. ibid, VI.19.12-13.
63. Bardy, "Aux Origines...", op.cit., 88-89.
64. Cadiou, op.cit., 379.
65. Origen, Comm.Matthew, 14:22; Hom.Numbers, 2:1ff. Origen himself was eventually ordained priest and therefore carried out his teaching function as a member of the external ecclesiastical hierarchy.
66. Eynde, op.cit., 233.
67. A. D'Alès, La Theologie de St. Cyprian (Paris, 1922), 309-319.

68. Campenhausen, op.cit., 270.
69. The reader or "lector" was usually a youth who intended to pass on to the priesthood. His function was simply to read the Bible in the worship service (cf. D'Ales, op.cit., 318). For the reader's place in the career of ecclesiastics, see L. Duchesne, Origines du culte chrétien, 366-367: "Most of the ecclesiastics' careers that are known in any detail began with being 'lectors'."
70. Y. Congar, "Bref Historique des formes du 'magistère' et de ses relations avec les docteurs", Revue des sciences philosophiques et theologiques, 60, (1976) 100: "Ce qui caractérise l'évêque est la cathedra, la chaire, c'est la fonction épiscopale, c'est sa continuité, c'est la succession, c'est la doctrine (cf. Augustin, Sermo Guelferib, 32.10, ed. Morin, p. 572: "Cathedram pro doctrina posuit".) ...Cathedra est le terme qui répondrait à ce que nous appelons 'magistère'."
71. Basil employs the terms προεστώς (leader) and bishop interchangeably. cf. P.J. Fedwick, The Church and the Charisma of Leadership in Basil of Caesarea (Toronto, 1979) 48ff; 79ff.
72. Basil, In.Ps.28:2; cf. Fedwick, ibid, 48. On the distinction between "kerygma" and "dogma" in Basil, see E.A. Mendieta, "The Pair: Kerygma and Dogma in the Theological Thought of St. Basil of Caesarea", Journal of Theological Studies, (1965), 129-142.
73. Fedwick, op.cit., 83, n.1.
74. A. Paulin, Saint Cyrille de Jérusalem Catéchète (Paris, 1959), 25.
75. Jerome, Comm.Eph., in P.L., 26, 510.
76. Augustine, Epist.149,2,11, in Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum, 44:358: "Sed ideo cum praedixisset pastores subiunxisse doctores ut intelligerent pastores ad officium suum pertinere doctrinam...sed hos tamquam unum aliquid duobus nominibus amplexus est: quosdam autem pastores et doctores".
77. Jerome, P.L., 23, 258C: "Oportet ergo episcopum...esse ...doctorem: nihi enim prodest conscientia virtutum frui, nisi et creditum sibi populum possit instruere". cf. P.L., 26, 500B: "...ut unus atque idem praeses Ecclesiae sit pastor et doctor".
78. Gregory the Great, In Ezech., XL, 42, in P.L., 76, 1046.
79. Gregory, Comm. Job, XXXVIII, 6, in P.L. 76, 457-458. cf. also P.L., 79, 145A; P.L., 79, 45; P.L., 79, 40B.
80. cf. P.L., 79, 308-309; P.L., 79, 104C.

81. H.I. Marrou, S. Augustine et la fin de la culture antique (Paris, 1938), 383ff.
82. P. Brown, Augustine of Hippo (London, 1967) 132-136. H.I. Marrou, in History of Education in Antiquity, trans. G. Lamb, (New York, Sheed and Ward, 1964) 443, claims that in A.D. 388 (3 years before his ordination) Augustine "formed a community round him in Thagaste while he was still a layman, and its general tone was academic". But Brown demonstrates the unlikelihood of this having occurred.
83. There are, of course, always exceptions to the rule. We have already mentioned Origen's school. There is also another exception. In A.D. 372, Emperor Valens exiled two orthodox priests to a frontier village as punishment for resisting his Arianizing policy. One of them, Protogenes, started an elementary school - there being nothing else in existence - where he gave grammar and writing lessons which were based on biblical passages in addition to his religious instruction. H.I. Marrou, (History of Education in Antiquity, op.cit., 434), writes that Protogenes would have to be regarded as the founder of religious education in the modern sense of the word- i.e. education and instruction in religious matters being combined with purely academic work. Marrou notes that these are the only cases he knows of where a "proper" Christian Church school was founded during the Patristic Age.
84. The religious instruction of the child, which they considered the most important part of their education, was entirely in the hands of the family and the Church.
85. We should be aware, however, that Christianity's acceptance of the classical system of education did not mean that it was prepared to adopt the classical culture. This is an extremely important point, but one we are not able to discuss here. The Fathers never tired of warning against the evils and dangers of pagan culture, and stressing the need to discriminate between the good and bad aspects of the knowledge which it had to offer. For Augustine's opposition to classical culture, cf. H.I. Marrou, S. Augustine...op.cit., 339-356. cf. also, C.L. Ellspermann, The Attitude of the Early Fathers Towards Pagan Literature and Learning, (The Catholic University of America, Patristic Studies, Vol. 82, Washington, 1949).
86. Bardy, "L'Eglise et l'Enseignement...", op.cit., 526-538.
87. Marrou, History of Education...op.cit., 430-432. Julian's ban was lifted less than two years later, on January 11th, 364.
88. infra, Part I, chap. two, sec. IV.
89. Rufin, Apol. adv. Hieron., II, 8 (P.L., XXI, 592), quoted in Marrou, History of Education...op.cit., 442.
90. Jerome, Correspondence, Ep., 107, 4.1; Ep., 107, 4.3; Ep., 107, 12; Ep., 128, 4.2.

91. Augustine, De Doctrina Christiana, BK.IV,33: IV,37.
92. Marrou, S. Augustine...op.cit.,380-381. cf. Augustine's Preface to De Doctrina Christiana.
93. Augustine, op.cit.,BK.II,28-61.
94. ibid, IV,35.
95. ibid, IV,4.
96. Augustine, Confessions, IX:2; IX:4-5.
97. Marrou, S. Augustine...op.cit.,399.
98. Augustine, De Doctrina Christiana, IV,1.

CHAPTER TWO

99. H.I. Marrou, op.cit.,451.
100. W. Boyd, The History of Western Education, 7th ed., (London,1964),103.
101. ibid,105-106.
102. Gregory, Epistles, XI,54.
103. Marrou, op.cit.,442.
104. ibid.,444: "It is not always easy to separate the episcopal from the monastic school, at least in the early stages, for we know that many of the great Western bishops, who had been educated as monks and inherited the monastic ideals, were keen to have monastic communities near them."
105. It would appear that this became a firmly established practice first in England and then later on the continent. cf. Boyd, op.cit.,112-113.
106. Monumenta Germaniae Historica (Hanover,1826-), Leges, sectio 111,ii,2,581, cap.XXXIII.
107. Mansi, Sacrorum Conciliorum nova et amplissima Collectio, ed. P. Labbe and G. Cossart (1759-1798), XIV,1014.
108. Boyd, op.cit.,115.
109. Concilia Merovingici Aevi, (ed. Maassen) in Marrou, op.cit.,447.
110. ibid.
111. P. Mandonnet, Saint Dominique: : 'Idée, L'Homme et L'Oeuvre, (Paris, 1937), 64. Some writers who use the terms ordo praedicatorum and ordo doctorum interchangeably are:

111. (cont...) Innocent III, universis Christi fidelibus tam in urbe metensi quam eius dioecesi constitutis (1189), P.L.214,696-6; Anastase IV, episopis Sueciae (1154), P.L. 188,1085; Peter Lombard, Collect. in epist. ad Philipp. I, P.L.192,227B; Alain de Lille, P.L.210,379; S. Bernard, P.L.183,506A; Joachim de Flore, Expositio magni prophete Abbatis Joachim in Apocalipsini, Venetiis, 1527, fol.106A; Richard of St. Victor, In Apocalypsim, P.L.196,775-797. cf. also Guelly, R., "La place des théologiens dans l'église et la société médiévales", in Miscellanea Historica, V.I, ed. by A.de Meyer, (Louvain), 1946.
112. cf. Rengstorf's article in Kittel, Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, v.2, 148 and 148 n.3.
113. The Catholic Encyclopedia (1909 edition), 72.
114. The arts teacher could not receive the title "doctor" at Paris, cf. Dictionnaire de Theologie Catholique (Paris, 1924), see "Doctor".
115. G. le Bras, "Velut splendor firmament: le Docteur dans le droit de l'Eglise médiévale", in Melanges offerts a Etienne Gilson de L'Académie Francaise (Toronto-Paris, 1959), 374.
116. ibid, 377.
117. ibid, 377-8.
118. ibid, 379.
119. ibid, 380.
120. For the "Doctors of the Church", see New Catholic Encyclopedia, 938-939.
121. The Council of Trent decreed that all bishops had to have the academic doctorate in theology or canon law, cf. The Catholic Encyclopedia, 73.
122. cf. supra, n.16. Although the doctorate was not given to "artists" in Paris, it was a common practice in the universities of Southern Europe.
123. H. Rashdall, The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages, Vol.1 (Oxford, 1936) 225.
124. The one exception was the doctor decretorum who, especially from the 14th century, held a similar status to that of the doctor theologiae, cf. Oberman, The Harvest of Medieval Theology, (Grand Rapids, 1967), 369, 370-371.
125. The ecclesiastical status of the doctor theologiae will be discussed in the following section.
126. R. Guelluy, op.cit., 588. We focus on the university of Paris for two reasons. First, this institution served as a kind of prototype for other universities in northern

126. (cont...) Europe (i.e. Toulouse, Vienne, Heidelberg, Cologne). Secondly, it was here that Calvin studied and taught in his youth.
127. L.B. Pascoe, Jean Gerson: Principles of Church Reform, (Leiden, 1973), 81 ff.
128. Dictionnaire de Theologie Catholique (Paris, 1924), v.4, 1506.
129. The situation at the University of Bologna was typical. Here the archdeacon of the cathedral Church was required to give his assent to the licensing of the doctors in the various faculties, but this function was merely a formality, cf. Rashdall, op.cit., 222-4.
130. New Catholic Encyclopedia, 73 ff.
131. Rashdall, op.cit., 252-253.
132. ibid, 325.
133. ibid.
134. C. Thurot, De L'Organisation de L'Enseignement dans L'Université de Paris au Moyen-Age, (Paris, 1850), 106.
135. This soon became little more than a formality.
136. Rashdall, op.cit., 333-334.
137. On the medieval understanding of the term "status", cf. G. de Lagarde, La naissance de l'esprit laïque au déclin du moyen age, v.1: Bilan de XIIIe siècle; ch.VIII: Le régime des estats, 3rd ed., (Paris-Louvain, 1956), 99-125.
138. B. Smalley, The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages, (Oxford, 1952), 35.
139. Y. Congar, "Bref Historique des formes du Magistère et des ses relations avec les Docteurs", Revue des sciences philosophiques et theologiques, 60, (1976), 99-112.
140. "Haec ergo tibi scholastico more respondemus. Sed si oportet nos more apostolico respondere, simplicius quidem sed cautius respondemus". (P.L.216, 1178).
141. J. de Ghellinck, "Pagina et Sacra Pagina. Histoire d'un mot et transformation de l'object primitivement désigné", in Mélanges August Pelzer (Louvain, 1947), 23-59.
142. H. Denifle, "Quel livre servait de base à l'enseignement des maitres en théologie", Revue thomiste, 2(1894), 154.
143. Roger Bacon, Compendium studii theologiae: "The main business of the study of the theologians should be concerned with the sacred text". Hugh of St. Victor, Miscellanea, P.L.177, 510C: "Cathedra doctoris sacra

- Scriptura est", in M.-D. Chenu, Toward Understanding St. Thomas, tr. A.M. Landry and D. Hughes (Chicago, 1963), 259. T. Aquinas, Quaestiones Quodlibetales, quodlibet III, q.IV, a.9: "Doctores sacrae Scripturae adhibentur ministerio verbi Dei, sicut et praelati". J. Gerson, Diligite justitiam: "La police espirituelle, que nous nommons ecclesiastique ou evangelique, se gouverne principalement par l'evangile et par ceulx qui le scevent, que nous appellons theologiens". Gerson defines the task of theology as "an affective reflection upon the Scriptures in the spirit of faith, hope and charity", in De consolatione theologiae, from Pascoe, op.cit., 34. P. D'Ailly, Tractus Universitatis: It pertains to the theological doctors to teach Holy Scripture...that it pertains to theological doctors to teach Holy Scripture is plain from the very name, since theology is nothing but the teaching of Holy Scripture", from Denifle, op.cit., 152. H. Oberman, op.cit., notes (p.201) that Gregory of Rimini, Occam, and Biel all hold "that it is the task of the doctor of theology to interpret and develop biblical and not other truths".
144. P. Mandonnet, "Chronologie des écrits scripturaires de saint Thomas d'Aquin", Revue thomiste, 33(1928), 35.
145. Hence, the bachalarri biblici was often referred to as cursor biblicus.
146. In his commentary on Isaiah, Aquinas defines the role of the bachalarrius biblici when he writes: "To run through [the text] is to come to the end of it by running the course of it rapidly...without dubitation coming to impede", quoted in Chenu, op.cit., 243. Pope John XXII (1317) describes the lectures given by the bachelors with the phrase; "textualiter legere", quoted in Denifle, op.cit., 159.
147. Roger Bacon (Opus minus) reflects the animosity among theologians toward this inflated regard for the bachalarri sententarii and the direction theological study appeared to him to be taking: "The fourth sin [of the study of theology] is the preferring of a certain magistral summa, namely the Book of Sentences, to the text of the faculty of theology...And the bachelor who 'reads' the text [of Scripture] makes way, at Paris and everywhere else, for the 'reader' of the sentences who is honored and preferred in everything...", quoted in Chenu, op.cit., 266.
148. For a detailed account of the requirements for doctoral status in the Faculty of Theology at Paris, cf. Rashdall, op.cit., 473 ff.
149. CUP, III, 427, quoted in Denifle, op.cit., 151. Jean Gerson, Contra curiositatem studentium, criticizes theologians of his day for their excessive concern with logic, mathematics, physics and other sciences.

150. The lectio cursorie would appear to be more akin to the old monastic lectio.
151. Hugh of St. Victor, Didascalicon. De studio legendi, lib.III, c.8 in P.L.176,771D: "The exposition contains three things: the littera, the sensus and the sententia. The littera is the congruent ordering of the words, which is also called construction. The sensus is a certain easily-recognized and apparent meaning which the littera offers at first sight. The sententia is a deeper understanding which is not arrived at except by means of exposition or interpretation...When this has been done, the exposition has reached the stage of completion", quoted in Chenu, op.cit., 85, n.11.
152. G. Bardy, "La litterature patristique des quaestiones et responsiones sur l'Ecriture sainte", Revue biblique, XLI (1932), has traced the quaestio as far back as the 9th century.
153. B. Smalley, op.cit., 66 ff.
154. Chenu, op.cit., 253.
155. Hence, the continuous use of the word utrum in this pedagogical method.
156. There was one other major pedagogical technique employed by the doctor theologiae at the university. This was called the disputatio which referred to the practice of disputing a particularly difficult quaestio. The disputations were held irregularly, unlike the lectiones which were given each day. The disputations took place in a great hall in the presence of the entire student body (in theology) and all the doctors. One of the doctors would submit a quaestio of current interest and this was discussed at length with his colleagues in the form of a debate. For a detailed description of this procedure, cf. P. Mandonnet, "Chronologie des questions disputees de saint Thomas d'Aquin", Revue thomiste, XXIII (1928), 267 ff. One should be aware that in addition to the lectio and quaestio (disputatio), the sermo was also a part of the doctor's responsibilities (cf. infra, Part I, N.180). The bachelors as well were obliged by statutes to engage in preaching: "Pour le maître, le sermon est un des devoirs résultant de sa charge; pour le bachelier, bibliste, sententiaire ou formé, il est un exercice préparant à cette charge. La difference n'est pas dans la nature de l'exercice ou sa présentation, mais dans la maîtrise que'on y peut apporter". (P. Glorieux, "L'enseignement au moyen âge: techniques et méthodes en usage à la faculté de théologie de Paris, au XIIIe siècle". Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen âge, V.35 (1968), p.153). Whereas the bachelors confined their preaching activities to the university ("university sermons"), the doctors, although they too preached mainly in this milieu, were

also active in regular Church services. But this aspect of the doctor's office was occasional. Moreover, in actual practice, it is difficult to distinguish between the doctor's lectio and his sermo; cf. M.-D. Chenu, op. cit., 61, who writes: "Even their [university doctors] sermons, witness those of St. Thomas, were scholastic".

157. "...ut fortissimis sanctorum cuneis, etiam doctorum hujus temporis levior armatura praeludatur" in P.L. 199,1053.
158. De Malo, q.3,a.14: "Secundum expositionem antiquorum, et etiam secundum expositionem magistralem..."
159. Chenu, op. cit., 136.
160. "Haec glossa magistralis est et parum valet".
161. "Quam dicta Hugonis a S. Victore magistralia sint, et robur auctoritatis NON habeant, tamen..."; quoted in Chenu, op. cit., 136-137.
162. cf. the eight examples listed by Bonaventure, in Doctoris Sersphici s. Bonaventure, Opera Omnia, ed. P. Collegii a S. Bonaventura, v.II, (1885), 1016.
163. Obviously we have had to be selective in our choice of writers. We have chosen Aquinas, D'Ailly and Wyclif because each deals fairly extensively with the questions we are interested in, and because each is representative of a certain "tradition" with regard to the attitudes toward the authority of the doctor in the Middle Ages. Other factors in this decision were the relative prominence of these individuals, and their possible influence on Calvin.
164. cf. supra, N.143.
165. Aquinas, Summa Theologiae, ed. T. Gilby (McGraw-Hill, London-New York, 1964), 2a2ae, 171, 5 (hereafter cited, Summa).
166. "In Thomas doctrina does not have the more precise meaning which it has for us of a fixed and formal system of teaching, or "doctrine". As used by Thomas it has an active meaning which corresponds most closely to what we mean by teaching; hence it denotes at the same time both the act of teaching and the knowledge communicated in teaching", from P.E. Persson, Sacra Doctrina: Reason and Revelation in Aquinas, (Oxford, 1970), 43-44.
167. Summa, 3a, 7, 7.
168. Persson, op. cit., 43.
169. Summa, 2a2ae, 3, 1.
170. Aquinas, In 1 ad Cor., 12:3, cf. infra, Part I, N.76.

171. Aquinas, Quaestiones disputatae, v.1: De Veritate, ed. R. Spiazzi, 8th ed., (Turin-Rome, 1949), 12, 14 ad 5.
172. Summa, 3a, 42, 4.
173. Summa, 3a, 67, 1; cf. also, In ad Eph. 4:4.
174. Aquinas, in I ad Cor. 12:3 : "Et quamvis ad apostolos praecipue pertineat doctrinae officium, quibus dictum est Mtth: 'Euntes docete omnes gentes', tamen alii in communionem huius officii assumuntur, quorum quidam per seipsos revelationes a Deo accipiunt, qui dicuntur prophetae, quidam vero de his, quae sunt aliis revelata, populum instruunt, qui dicuntur doctores".
175. Aquinas, Quaestiones Quodlibetales, ed. R. Spiazzi, 8th edition, (Rome, 1949), quod. III, q. 4, a. 9. Hereafter cited as QQ.
176. Summa, 1a2ae, 106, 4; 2a2ae, 187, 1; 2a2ae, 188, 6; and especially 3a, 42, 1-4, where the "preaching" of Christ is discussed under the heading De Doctrina Christi.
177. Chenu, op.cit., 61, notes that even the sermons of Thomas were "scholastic" and in this he was typical of most medieval doctors.
178. QQ., quod. III, q. 4, a. 9; cf. also Aquinas, Scriptum Super Sententius, ed. M.F. Moos, (Paris, 1947), v. 4, distinctio XIX, q. 2, a. 2 (P. 994-95).
179. Peter the Chanter, Verbum Abbreviatum, P.L. 205, 25. P. Glorieux, "L'enseignement au Moyen Age: Techniques et méthodes en usage à la Faculté de Théologie de Paris, au XIIIe siècle", Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Age, v. 35 (1968) 107, confirms that Thomas followed the Chanter in making this threefold distinction: "... Et saint Thomas en soulignera heureusement l'exacte portée: de his tribus officiis, scilicet praedicandi, legendi et disputandi, dicitur Tit. 1, 9 "ut sit potens exhortari" quantum ad praedicationem, "in doctrina sana" quantum ad lectionem, "et contradicentes revincere" quantum ad disputationem".
180. His preaching was mainly before students, but also at regular Church services. For the preaching duties of the doctor theologiae cf. C. Spicq, Eskuisse d'une histoire de l'exégèse latine au moyen âge, (Bibliothèque thomiste, 26), Paris, 1944.
181. Mandonnet, "Chronologie des questions..." op.cit.
182. cf. infra, 185, where "certainty" rather than "probability" marks the teaching given by the magisterium cathedrae pastoralis.
183. QQ., quod. IV, q. 9, a. 9.

184. Summa, 1a,1,6 ad 3.
185. Summa, 1a,1,8, ad 2: "Auctoritatibus autem canonicae Scripturae utitur proprie, ex necessitate argumentanda. Auctoritatibus autem aliorum doctorum ecclesiae, quasi arguendo ex propriis, sed probabiliter".
186. ibid.
187. QQ., quod. III, q. 4, a. 9.
188. QQ., quod. XII, q. 17, a. 26.
189. QQ., quod. III, q. 4, a. 9.
190. Aquinas, Scriptum Super Sententius, op. cit., dist. XIX, q. 2, a. 2, 2qa.
191. ibid., cf. also, QQ., quod. III, q. 4, a. 9.
192. Summa, 2a2ae, 1, 10.
193. QQ., quod. IX, q. 8, a. 16.
194. Radix Omnium Malorum est Cupiditas and Super Omnia Vincit Veritas. The original texts (edited) of both these quaestiones are reprinted in A.E. Bernstein, Pierre D'Ailly and the Blanchard Affair, (Leiden, 1978), 197-298.
195. For what follows we are particularly indebted to A.E. Bernstein, ibid. For a detailed history of this affair see Bernstein's book.
196. The following quotations from the two quaestiones (n.194) will be cited as Radix and Super followed by the pagination from Bernstein's book and the marginal number indicating the line which the author has provided.
197. Super, 241, 19-27.
198. Super, 240, 1-8. Bernstein, op. cit., 157: "D'Ailly's treatment of his first major proposition, that theology is spiritual, has important consequences for his idea of the university. His approach suggests that he conceived of the university as being in an intermediary position between God and man. In the Faculty of Theology, at least, the university dispenses the divine gift of theological knowledge, which is received efficaciously by those who have received the grace and are so disposed. His analogy between the sacraments and theological teaching is eloquent testimony to his implied belief that, like the priest, the doctor of theology bestows a good which perfects those who have been properly prepared by God. Such a theory views the university as a church in microcosm. Accordingly, the two institutions are seen as sharing the same function, that of developing for those in attendance a divine disposition already granted, which in the case of the university is

the construction of theological science on the foundation of faith. In the same way, Church and university, both unique institutions, share a similar ecumenical character and authority."

199. Bernstein, op.cit., 155-156; Super, 240, 13-19.
200. Radix, 208, 3-4.
201. Bernstein, op.cit., 157.
202. ibid., 158: "To a very large extent, of course, preaching is teaching, especially in the context of the apostolic or primitive Church, where both functions could be personally exercised or directly supervised by the priest or bishop. In the Latin Church of the 12th century, however, the introduction of the scholasticus, schoolmaster, or Chancellor into the cathedral clergy effected a clear division of labor, and further developments such as the emancipation of university teachers from the bishop and his Chancellor...carried this specialization even further".
203. Bernstein, op.cit., 158.
204. ibid., 157, n.4: "This assimilation [between preaching and teaching] is not original with d'Ailly, yet his development of it seems unusually systematic. For example, in the phrase 'ut mittat operarios in messem suam' (Mtth. 9:37 - But few are the laborers for the harvest), the Glossa Interlinearia explains 'operarios' as 'praedicatores', whereas Nicholas of Lyra glosses 'operarii' from the preceding verse as 'doctores et praedicatores verbi', and 'operarios' as 'praedicatores ad erudiendum populum', Biblia Sacra cum Glossis V, 185-186. The use of the word 'erudire', however, also serves to compare preachers to teachers because this function was traditionally attributed to the masters of Paris...On the other hand, when Distinctio 21 cap.2 of Gratian's Decretum quotes the corresponding passage in Luke (10: 24), Johannes Theutonicus interprets 'operarios' as 'doctores'."
205. Super, 242, 22-27.
206. ibid., 244, 17ff: "Quarto dico quod, quia papa est summus episcoporum, et ordinarius singulorum, excertis causis, secundum quod iudicaverit expedire, potest mittere aliquas personas ad predicandum vel aliud regimen animarum, ut Extra., De Hereticis, Cum ex Iniuncto, et hoc modo ab eo mittuntur illi qui auctoritate apostolica in theologica licentiantur". For the full quotation cf., Super, 243, 5-244, 26.
207. Bernstein, op.cit., 160.
208. ibid.
209. ibid., 160-161.

210. Radix, 208,3-9: "...doctrinam seu predicationem theologice sapientie...".
211. Radix, 208,22-25; Bernstein, op.cit., 161: "William's inclusion of people who may be ordained for preaching but are not simply priests is ambiguous. Written in the early 13th century, his vague formulation may reflect an awareness of the unresolved debates concerning the preaching activities of the newly organized mendicant orders or even the still-evolving teaching activities in the universities".
212. Radix, 208,25-29: "...quod intelligo non solum de ordinatis in Ordine Sacro, sed etiam in ordine hierarchico, id est missorum et approbatorum ad predicandum auctoritate apostolica, pro universali Ecclesia, iuxta illud Apostoli: 'Quomodo predicabunt hisi mittantur'".
213. Radix, 208,29-31: "Et ideo patet quod huiusmodi missio ad predicandum, que nihil aliud est quam licentia ad docendum, est potestas spiritualis".
214. "Definitio circa ea quae sunt fidei...potest esse dupliciter. Uno modo authoritative et judicialiter", from D'Ailly, Apologia, in Gerson, Opera Omnia, v.5, 710A, ed. L.E. du Pin (Antwerpen, 1706), quoted in Oberman, op.cit., 386, n.62.
215. P. de Vooght, Les sources de la doctrine chrétienne d'après les théologiens du XIVe siècle et du début du XVe... (Paris, 1954), 237, where the author quotes from C. Duplessis d'Argentre, Collectio Judiciorum, v.1, (Paris, 1728), 77.
216. Oberman, op.cit., chap.11, esp.382-385.
217. ibid., 371-372: "In the 14th century, at the time of the Western schism and the final phase of the struggle between Pope and Emperor, the canon lawyer was in high demand. To judge from the many bitter comments by doctors of theology, he not only equalled but surpassed the theologian in status, both at the papal curia and at the royal courts".
218. D'Ailly, Utrum Petri ecclesia lege reguletur, quoted in Oberman, op.cit., 385, n.70: "Hoc enim modo ecclesia est majoris auctoritatis quam evangelium sit: quia huius ecclesiae evangelisto, seu scriptor evangelii pars existit". Others who stand in this same tradition are Gerson, Occam, and Biel. While all of these figures would, to varying degrees, attribute high importance to the doctors, they would nevertheless subordinate their authority to that of the bishops in the same manner as d'Ailly. In all these writers, apostolic succession is elevated over the successio doctorum.
219. One of the earliest exponents of this view was Thomas Bradwardine (cf. H. Oberman, Archbishop Thomas Bradwardine: A Fourteenth-Century Augustinian: A Study of his Theology in its Historical Context, (Utrecht, 1958).

Bradwardine had a considerable influence on Wyclif who also stands in this tradition along with others such as John Hus and Wessel Gansfort (cf. Oberman, Harvest...op.cit., 408).

220. Oberman, Harvest...op.cit., 377.
221. "Sacra Scriptura which is the law of Christ contains in itself all truth; since all law is truth, it therefore contains in itself all law". Wyclif, Tractatus de Blasphemia (hereafter cited, TB), ed. M.H. Dziewicki (London, 1893), 227. "All law useful to the Holy Mother Church is taught explicitly or implicitly in Scripture", Wyclif, Tractatus de Ecclesia, (henceforth cited TE) ed. J. Loserth, (London, The Wyclif Society, 1896), 173. cf. also, Tractatus de Civili Dominio (hereafter cited, TCD), v.1, ed. R.L. Poole (London, The Wyclif Society, 1885), 296. Also, De Veritate Sacrae Scripturae (hereafter cited, VSS), ed. R. Buddensieg (London, The Wyclif Society, 1905-1907) which H.B. Workman, John Wyclif: A Study of the English Medieval Church, v.2, (Oxford, 1926), 5, calls "a rambling but uncompromising defense of the absolute inspiration and authority of the Bible".
222. "On the sufficiency of the Bible as a guide for living, there is a clear cleavage between Wyclif and his contemporaries in both theory and practice. There was at the time probably no settled dogma concerning the infallibility of the Scriptures, and certainly nothing to indicate their exclusive authority", P.A. Knapp, The Style of John Wyclif's English Sermons (Paris, 1977), 29.
223. H. Kaminsky, "Wyclifism as Ideology of Revolution", Church History XXXII (1963).
224. ibid, 60.
225. Wyclif, Tractatus de Potestate Pape, (henceforth cited, TPP), ed. J. Loserth (London, The Wyclif Society, 1907), 74ff, 165, 201, quoted in Workman, op.cit., 13; 75-76.
226. ibid.
227. ibid, 77, where the author quotes from TPP, 118. cf. also TE, 507.
228. TB, 297, quoted in W. Farr, John Wyclif as Legal Reformer (Leiden, 1974), 35. Commenting on Wyclif's concept of hierarchy, Workman, op.cit., 93, writes: "Distinctions of a sort there must be, but such distinctions should not be of spiritual status; they are, as we should now express it, distinctions of convenience or function".
229. TB, 10; 140. cf. also, TPP, 272, where Wyclif suggests a layman could be a pope.
230. "Sed ista exigunt continuacionem theologice facultatis, cum sine ipsa, ut dictum est, non est possibile regnum stare", in Wyclif, Tractatus de Officio Regis (henceforth

- cited, TOR) ed. A.W. Pollard (London, The Wyclif Society, 1897), 177.
231. ibid, 177, 179, 189-190, 193-194, 250.
232. "Quomodo ergo sine theologis staret regnum? Quod si legista decretista vel eciam quicumque laicus habet habitum sic docendi, ipse est vere theologus". TOR, 72.
233. ibid, 77; cf. also, VSS, 378.
234. Farr, op.cit., 69, who quotes from TOR, 72-73.
235. "The temporal lords have power given to them by God, so that where the spiritual arm of the Church does not suffice to convert the antichrists by evangelical preaching, ecclesiastical admonition, or the example of virtues, the secular arm may help its mother by severe coercion", TOR, 186, quoted in Kaminsky, op.cit., 72, n.45.
236. "Debet enim rex omnis, quantum sufficit, semovere a regno suo hereticos, quod non faceret prudenter nisi secundum doctrinam et iudicium theologorum qui sciunt quod solum illi sunt heretici qui sunt scripture sacre, que est les dei, contrarii", TOR, 177. See also, TOR, 51, where it is noted that theologians are to "instruant eum (the King) secundum legem dei quid est catholicum et quid hereticum in hiis que concernunt regimen regni sui".
237. TOR, 78.
238. ibid, 125.
239. TCD, 437: "Et patet quam necessarius est theologus ad rempublicam gubernadadam".
240. TE, 330-331.
241. "Minus malum esset quod expropriata forent omnia temporalia quibus ecclesia Anglicana dotatur, ut pro eorum proventibus darentur stipendia servitoribus regis nostri quam quod episcopi et alii curati forent adeo secularibus regni negotiis implicata", Wyclif, Opera Minora, 51, quoted in Farr, op.cit., 94. For the reference to the "laymen": "Ideo alias dixi, quod minus malum foret, ut expropriata forent omnia temporalia, quibus ecclesia Anglie est dotata, ut ex eis darentur stipendia laicis literatis, necessariis ad officium regis et secularium dominorum...", VSS, III, 85, quoted in Farr, ibid.
242. This comes out most clearly in Jean Gerson who stands broadly in the same tradition as d'Ailly on this whole question. At times he says that both bishops and doctors possess the authority to scholastice determinare (only bishops can judicialiter determinare), but since the former are busy with other pastoral activities, then this task belongs chiefly to the doctors. On other

- occasions, however, he formally excludes the power to scholastice determinare from the episcopal office. And yet, even then he realizes that bishops must possess this authority in some degree in order to fulfill their pastoral duties. (cf. Gerson, Tractatus pro unione Ecclesiae in Oeuvres complètes, ed. P. Glorieux (Paris, 1960-1968), v.6,15; quoted in L.B. Pascoe, op. cit., 97). Everything taken into consideration, he concludes that the work of the theologians and bishops can be more readily distinguished in theory than practice (ibid.).
243. We shall deal only with Luther. For Melancthon's views on the doctoral office, cf. P. Fraenkel, Testimonia Patrum (Geneva, 1961), esp. pp.110-159. For Bucer, cf. infra, Part II, chap. one.
244. J. Pelikan, Luther the Expositor (St. Louis, 1959), 46 and 49. cf. also, P. Steinlein, "Luther Doktorat", Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift, 23 (1912).
245. Luther often maintained that he had acquired his doctorate, not through any personal desire, but out of obedience to his superiors; cf. Comm. Psalms 8:4, in Luther's Works, 55 vols. (Concordia Publishing House and Fortress Press, St. Louis) vol. 33:66; hereafter cited LW with volume number and pagination; cf. also LW 48:6, N.5
246. Luther received his B.A. in 1502; his M.A. in 1505; by 1509 he was a baccalaureus biblicus (Wittenberg), and the following year a baccalaureus sententiaris (Erfurt). The licensing process and ceremonial procedure for the theological doctorate at Wittenberg was basically the same as the University of Paris during the Middle Ages, that is, the distinction between the licentia docendi (pope) and the magisterium (faculty) was still in force; cf. Steinlein, op.cit., 759-768; cf. also, H. Boehmer, Martin Luther: Road to Reformation (London, 1957), 86: "However, as a doctor [i.e. having been granted the license to teach by the bishop] he was still not a member of the theological faculty. It was not until three days later, on October 22, that he became a member by formal reception into the "senate", that is, the professorial staff of the faculty, which at the time consisted of only five persons."
247. D. Martin Luther Werke. Briefwechsel (Weimar, 1930-), V.I, 112, quoted in Congar, op.cit., 511.
248. Steinlein, op.cit., 793-802, where he cites several letters and theological works written between 1517-1520 in which Luther refers to his doctorate as a source of authority to teach.
249. LW, 44 (To the Christian Nobility of the German Nation: 1520), 204-205.

250. H. Preuss, M. Luther. Der Prophet (Gütersloh, 1933), 100-101.
251. Steinlein, op.cit., 791ff. where he indicates the sharp rise in Luther's usage of his doctoral title after this date.
252. LW, 46 (A Sermon on Keeping Children in School, 1530); cf. also, LW, 2 (Lectures on Genesis), 220 and 220 N.11, where Luther rejects Carlstadt's view that it is a sin to create doctors of theology by academic degrees.
253. LW, 13 (Commentary on Psalms, 82:4), 65-66: "If one wants to preach or teach, let him give proof of the call and command which drives and compels him to do it, or else let him be silent". The context of the passage makes it clear that by "teaching", Luther specifically had in mind the work of the theologian.
254. LW, 44 (To the Christian Nobility...), 205; cf. also LW 44 (ibid), 202: "I leave the medical men to reform their own faculties; I take the jurists [whom he wants to get rid of] and theologians as my own responsibility".
255. LW, 46 (A Sermon on Keeping...) 22.
256. ibid, 239-240.
257. ibid, 242.
258. LW, 21 (Commentary on Sermon on the Mount, 5:9), 44.
259. As was noted above (N. 251), Luther's references to his doctoral status sharply increase post 1524. In 1529 he refers to himself as "doctor" in 1/20 of his letters; in 1530, 1/10; 1531, 1/2; 1532-1533, 2/3; cf. Steinlein, op.cit., 791ff. cf. also, Y.M.-J. Congar, "Role de Docteurs dans l'Eglise", in Vraie et Fausse Réforme dans l'Eglise (Paris, 1950), 503-536. Congar believes that Luther attached great significance to his claim to be a "doctor" and sets forth the hypothesis that having rejected the "magisterium of bishops", the Reformer replaced it with a "magisterium of doctors".
260. H. Strohl, "La Théorie et la pratique des quatre ministères à Strasbourg avant l'arrivée de Calvin", Société de l'histoire de Protestantisme française, (1935) 142.
261. E.H. Harbison, The Christian Scholar in the Age of the Reformation, (New York, 1956), 125.
262. This concept of "office" as an indelible mark was given authoritative formulation in bull Exultate Deo (1439). Eugenius IV, summing up the decrees of the Council of Florence wrote: "Among these sacraments there are three- baptism, confirmation and orders- which indelibly impress upon the soul a character, i.e. a certain spiritual mark which distinguishes them from the rest"., quoted in LW, 44:129 N.22.

263. LW, 44 (To the Christian Nobility...) 129: "It follows from this argument that there is no true, basic difference between laymen and priests, princes and bishops, between religious and secular, except for the sake of office and work, but not for the sake of status. They are all of the spiritual estate, all are truly priests, bishops, and popes".
264. On the one hand, Luther wrote in reaction to the doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church; on other occasions his writings were directed against "spiritualists" in Saxony.
265. LW, 40 (On the Sneaks and Furtive Preachers:1532), cf. also, LW, 13 (Comm. on Psalms, 82:1;1530), 49; and, LW, 41 (On the Councils and the Church, 1539) 154, where the special "ministry" is said to be the fifth mark of the Church.
266. LW, 41 (On the Councils...), 154.
267. LW, 46 (A Sermon on Keeping...), 237.
268. LW, 13 (Comm. on Psalms, 110:3), 291.
269. Pelikan, op.cit., Chapter III: "The Bible and the Word of God", 48-70; also H. Bornkamm, Luther's World of Thought (St. Louis, 1958).
270. Quoted in B. Gerrish, "Priesthood and Ministry in the Theology of Luther", Church History, 34 (1965), 410;413.
271. LW 46 (A Sermon on Keeping...), 220: "He [Christ] paid dearly that men might everywhere have this office of preaching, baptizing, loosing, binding, giving the sacrament, comforting, warning and exhorting with God's Word, and whatever else belongs to the pastoral office". All these tasks were understood by Luther to be a form or extension of the preached Word: "The first and foremost of all, on which everything else depends, is the preaching of the Word of God. For we teach with the Word, we baptize with the Word, we consecrate with the Word, we bind and loose with the Word, we sacrifice with the Word, we judge all things by the Word...The 'foundation for all the other functions', is the function of preaching the Gospel". (LW, 40, On Appointing Ministers of the Church).
272. LW, 13 (Comm. Psalms, 82:4), 65-66.
273. LW, 30 (Sermons on the Second Epistle of St. Peter), 169: I believe that God's arrangement to have our teachers called doctores was based on a special decision...In this way he [Peter] hits the schools of higher learning".
274. cf. Eck's complaint (Excusatio, 1519), that Melancthon is merely a layman, in Philippi Melancthonis Opera quae Supersunt Omnia (Corpus Reformatorum, V.I, 103).

Melanchthon joined the theology faculty at Wittenberg in 1519 at which time he began lecturing on various books of the Old and New Testament. At the same time he lectured on languages and philosophy. Despite his strong desire to give up his theological post so he could devote his energies to the classics, Luther managed to persuade him to continue his theology lectures. From 1526 on, he lectured (as a layman) at least once a week on the Bible; cf. J.W. Richard, Philip Melanchthon: The Protestant Praeceptor of Germany (New York, 1974), 58; 107-111.

275. The highest theological degree that the Praeceptor accepted was that of "Bachelor".
276. LW, 13 (Comm. Psalms, 68:33), 35.
277. LW, 18 (Lectures on Malachi, 2:7), 401.
278. Luther's Church Postil (1522) quoted in Pelikan, op.cit., 63.
279. ibid.
280. LW, 13 (Comm. Psalms) quoted in Pelikan, op.cit., 64 N.65.
281. cf. LW, 25 (Lectures on Romans), xiff.
282. LW, 28 (Lectures on I Timothy, 4:13), 329-330; cf. also LW, 2 (Lectures on Genesis, 12:10), 288, where theologians are referred to as "readers".
283. LW, 28 (Lectures on I Timothy, 4:13), 330.
284. Harbison, op.cit., 125.
285. LW, 28 (ibid.), 329.
286. H. Oberman, Christianity Divided (London, 1962), chapter 10: "Reformation, Preaching, and Ex Opere Operato", 233.
287. Pelikan, op.cit., 220.
288. R. Prenter, Spiritus Creator (tr. J.M. Jensen, Philadelphia, 1953), 142-143.
289. Luther, Tischreden, Weimar Ausgabe, III, 672-674, quoted in T.H.L. Parker, The Oracles of God, 47., (italics mine).
290. Oberman, op.cit., 232: "In the last chapter we should like to show that the Reformation had its own ex opere operato doctrine, in connection not with the sacraments, the visible Word, but with the audible Word, the sermon".
291. cf. LW, 4 (Lectures on Genesis, 24: 1-4), 220.
292. cf. Melanchthon's preface to the Wittenberg edition of Luther's works, Corpus Reformatorum, V.I, 159, where he says that Luther knew "Cameracensis" - i.e. the Cardinal of Cambrai (D'Ailly), as well as Gabriel Biel, "almost by heart".

293. Jean Gerson, for instance. cf. supra, N. 242.
294. Luther's Table Talk (1540), quoted in H. Grisar, op.cit., v. 5, 170.
295. Congar, "Role de Docteurs..." op.cit., 510.
296. According to Professor Oberman, Luther was at one with other Reformers like Calvin in making the "sermon" alone "the living magisterium and bridge between Church and Scripture", op.cit., 234.

PART TWO

INTRODUCTION

1. W.F. Dankbarr, "L'office des docteurs chez Calvin", Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses, 44(1964), 364.
2. R.W. Henderson, The Teaching Office in the Reformed Tradition, (Philadelphia, 1962). Henderson begins his study with the situation in Calvin's Geneva, but devotes the bulk of his work to later Reformed ecclesiologies.
3. Henderson, ibid.
4. These writers appear to be unaware that Calvin most often spoke of only three orders. In addition to Henderson, cf. W. Pauck, The Heritage of the Reformation (London, 1968), 123; J. Cadier, "Calvin Educateur", Foi-Education, 25 (1965), 14. cf. also, G.A. Taylor, John Calvin, The Teacher: The Correlation Between Instruction and Nurture within Calvin's Concept of Communion (unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Duke Univ., 1953). Taylor covers our area of concern in a very sketchy manner and also makes several mistakes (cf. especially chapter IV). E. Doumergue, Jean Calvin. Les hommes et les choses de son temps (Lausanne, 1917), cf. v.5, chapitre troisième (p.96-112): "Pasteurs et docteurs". Doumergue devotes only two pages to the doctor, and he does not consider at all the relationship between these two offices. H. Bavinck, Het doctorenambt (Kampen, 1899). Bavinck is one of the few authors who considers the Medieval background in his study of the doctor, however, he has very little to say about Calvin's position. (cf. Gereformeerde Dogmatiek, ed. J.H. Kok, Kampen, 1918) 4:423.
5. Institutio Christianae Religionis (hereafter cited : Inst.) IV.6.9., in Johannis Calvini Opera Selecta, vol. V:97, (ed. P. Barth and W. Niesel, Munchen, 1926-1936) hereafter cited: OS followed by volume number and page.
6. Comm. Numbers 17:14, in Ioannis Calvini Opera Quae Supersunt Omnia (Brunsvigae, 1863-1900), Corpus Reformatorum (vols. 29-87), XXV:230, hereafter cited: CO, followed by volume number from Corpus Reformatorum and page number.
7. Comm. Hebrews 5:3, CO LV: 59; cf. also Comm. Eph. 4:11, CO LI: 196-197; and Inst. IV.4.10, OS V:82 - "Consequently they [the various Roman orders] ought to have no place in the description of spiritual government which, when it was consecrated by the Lord's own words, the Church received".
8. Inst. IV. 6.9, OS V:98.
9. Comm. I Corinthians 11:2, CO XLIX: 473.

10. Calvin's Tracts and Treatises (tr. H. Beveridge, 3 vols., Grand Rapids, 1958), II:15 (CO IX: 762), hereafter cited: T+T, followed by volume number and page.
11. Comm. I Corinthians 12:28, CO XL: 506.
12. A Paternal Admonition by the Roman Pontiff Paul III to the Most Invincible Emperor Charles V: with Remarks, T+T, I: 265-266 (CO VII: 266).
13. Inst. IV.10.30, OS V :192.
14. Inst. IV.10.30, OS V: 192, "But because he did not will in outward discipline and ceremonies to prescribe in detail what we ought to do (because he foresaw that this depended upon the state of the times, and he did not deem one form suitable for all ages), here we must take refuge in these general rules which he has given, that whatever the necessity of the Church will require for order and decorum should be tested against these". This speaks directly against R.E. Davies' contention that "Calvin ordered his Church exactly according to the word of God, and in fact tried to reconstruct the Apostolic Church". (The Problem of Authority in the Continental Reformation, London, 1946, p.128).
15. A Paternal Admonition...op.cit., T+T:266 (CO VII:266).
16. Inst. IV. 10.27, OS, V:189-190.
17. ~~cf.~~ Part Two and Three.

CHAPTER ONE

18. CO Xa:15 N.1.
19. CO Xa:15-16.
20. For the circumstances surrounding Calvin's exile, cf. infra, Part III, chap. 2.
21. Bucer spoke here of "doctors", "pastors", "governers", and "deacons"; cf. J. Courvoisier, La notion de l'Eglise chez Bucer dans son développement historique (Paris, 1938), 88; cf. also H. Strohl, "La théorie et la pratique des quatre ministères à Strasbourg avant l'arrivée de Calvin", Société de l'histoire de Protestantisme française (1935), 123-144.
22. In the former work, "pastores ac doctores" are combined to form one office (Tomus Anglicanus:275); in the latter work, the division is made thus: "Ministerium muneris pastoralis, Procuratio pauperum; et Scholae ad instituendam adolescentiam ecclesiae". (Tomus Anglicanus:232).

23. Quoted in W.P. Stephens, The Holy Spirit in the Theology of Martin Bucer (Cambridge, 1970), 183 N.3.
24. Inst. IV.4.1, OS V :58 (cf. infra, chap.III).
25. CO Xa: 15 N.1.
26. ibid.
27. ibid. For instance, in the original draft, the "imposition of hands" was recommended for the rite of ordination, but this was subsequently struck out during the editorial process. H.Y. Reyburn, John Calvin, His Life, Letter and Work (London, 1914), 112, comments: "The Ordonnances may therefore be considered Calvin's work, but they do not represent Calvin's ideal." We believe this is particularly true with respect to his division of ecclesiastical orders.
28. CO Xa:17.
29. CO Xa:17.
30. CO Xa:18.
31. For a fuller account of the "congrégation", cf. infra, Part III, chap. three).
32. CO Xa:21.
33. ibid.
34. ibid. It should be noted that the inclusion of "civil government" makes it clear that the College is not to be regarded simply as a theological seminary. For the history of this College, cf. infra, Part III, chapter two: "Education in Geneva".
35. CO Xa:22.
36. ibid.
37. cf. infra., Part III, chapter one, 150-151.
38. CO Xa:21, "Ainsi pour user d'un mot plus intelligible nous appellerons l'ordre des escolles".
39. cf. infra., Part II, chapter three.
40. cf. infra., Part III, chapter one.
41. Henderson, op.cit., 48.
42. Henderson, op.cit., 34-35.
43. CO Xa:22.
44. CO Xa:16 N.1, cf. the preamble to the Ordonnances.

45. The exact wording of the Ordonnances reads thus: "nous compregnons en ce tiltre les aydes et instructions pour conserver la doctrine de Dieu....". (CO Xa:21).
46. CO Xa:21.

CHAPTER TWO

47. To a lesser extent he uses the term pars.
48. Comm. I Corinthians 1:13, CO XLIX:331. In the same connection Calvin refers to Christ's "office (munus) of washing" in his Commentary on John 13:8, CO XLVII:307.
49. Comm. II Corinthians 2:15, CO L:34.
50. Inst. IV.4.1, OS V:58.
51. Inst. IV.5.13, OS V:84.
52. Inst. IV.5.15, OS V:85-86.
53. Comm. I Timothy 2:12, CO L 11:276.
54. Inst. IV.3.5, OS V:43.
55. Comm. II Corinthians 9:11, CO L:111.
56. ibid.
57. Inst. IV.4.9, OS V:66.
58. Inst. IV.4.9, OS V:66.
59. Comm. Ephesians 4:13, CO LI:202.
60. Inst. IV.4.1, OS V:58.
61. Inst. IV.4.1, OS V:58; cf. also Inst. IV.19.22, OS V:456-457.
62. Inst. IV.4.1, OS V:57, "Up to this point we have discussed the order (ordo) of Church government as it has been handed down from God's pure Word".
63. Inst. IV.1.1, OS V:1, "Accordingly, our plan of instruction now requires us to discuss the Church, its government, orders (ordinibus) and powers".
64. Inst. (1536 ed.), OS I:212, "Ordo est ipsa vocatio".
65. Comm. Ephesians 4:11, CO LI:198. cf. also, Comm. Acts 19:13, CO XLVII:446 and Inst. IV.4.1, OS V:57-8.

66. Inst. IV.5.10, OS v:83.
67. Inst. IV.5.10, OS V:83.
68. Inst. IV.3.1, OS V:43. For Calvin's teaching on the priesthood of all believers, cf. J.R. Crawford, "Calvin and the Priesthood of all Believers", Scottish Journal of Theology, 21 (1968), 145-146; and A.L. Farris, "Calvin and the Laity", Canadian Journal of Theology, 11(1965), 54-67.
69. Inst. IV.3.3, OS V:45, "...illa gubernandae ac retinendae per ministros Ecclesiae ratio, quam Dominus in perpetuum sancivit."
70. Inst. IV.3.8, OS V:50; cf. also Inst. IV.4.1, OS V:58. We shall deal more fully with this question in Part III.
71. Inst. IV.5.10, OS V:82-83.
72. ibid.
73. Inst. IV.3.8, OS V:50 - "But in indiscriminately calling those who rule the Church 'bishops', 'presbyters', 'pastors', and 'ministers', I did so according to Scriptural usage which interchanges these terms." On numerous occasions the Reformer also equates doctores with these terms; cf. for instance, Comm.Titus 1:5, CO LII:409 - "Although we may infer from I Timothy that there were two kinds of 'presbyteros', here the context makes it quite clear that doctores are to be understood, that is, those ordained to teach, for almost immediately he will refer to the same people as bishops (episcopos)".
74. Comm. II Corinthians 10:18, CO L:117-118.
75. Comm. Titus 1:5, CO LII:409.
76. Comm. Numbers 3:5, CO XXIV:445, "Political distinction is not to be repudiated, for nature itself dictates this [ranking among ministers] in order to take away confusion.
77. ibid.
78. Inst. IV.4.4, OS V:61.
79. Comm. Titus 1:7, CO LII:411.
80. Inst. IV.20.6, OS V:476-477.
81. Comm. Acts 6:3, CO XLVIII:121.
82. Comm. I Thessalonians 5:12, CO LII:172.
83. Comm. Matthew 22:21, CO XLV:601, "Nam hic inter spirituale et politicum regimen clara distinctio ponitur...".
84. Comm. II Thessalonians 3:10, CO LII:213.

85. cf. infra., Part III, chapter one. Calvin does not regard the teaching of "liberal arts" to be part of the spiritual government's domain.
86. Inst. IV.3.10, OS V:52.
87. ibid.
88. ibid.
89. Comm. Acts 13:3, CO XLVIII:283, "For the call (vocatio) properly belonged to God, but on the other hand the external ordination belonged to the Church, and that according to the heavenly oracle (ex coelesti oraculo)". cf. also, Lectures on Jeremiah 23:21, CO XXXVIII:432, "There is a twofold call; one is internal and the other belongs to order, and may therefore be called external or political."
90. Lectures on Jeremiah 23:21, CO XXXVIII:433, "The internal call of God cannot be surely discerned by us". cf. also, Inst. IV.3.11, OS V:52, "I pass over that secret call, of which each minister is conscious before God, and which does not have the Church as witness".
91. Comm. Isaiah 61:1, COXXXVII:372, cf. also, Inst. IV.3.22.
92. Lectures on Jeremiah 23:21, CO XXXVIII:432, "The external call is never legitimate unless it is preceded by the internal call".
93. Inst. IV.3.12, OS V:53, "Only those are to be chosen who are of sound doctrine and of holy life"; cf. also, Comm. Exodus 28:4, CO XXIV:430.
94. Inst. IV.19.29, OS V:464.
95. Inst. IV.14.20, OS V:278; cf. also, The Adultero-German Interim : to which is added the true Christian method of giving Peace and Reforming the Church, CO VII:632. Here also Calvin refers to ordination as a "sacrament".
96. Comm. I Timothy 4:14, CO LII:303; cf. also Inst. IV.3.16, OS V:57.
97. Comm. II Timothy 1:6, CO LII:349-350.
98. Lectures on Jeremiah 18:18, CO XXXVIII:310, "Even if we allow them to be legitimate ministers, and their calling to be approved according to God's Word, it does not follow that they are true ministers of God (veros Dei ministros) simply because they hold an ordinary station and jurisdiction in the Church".
99. Inst. IV.19.29, OS V: 463-464.
100. Comm. I Timothy 5:22, CO LII:319 - "First the laying on of hands means ordination; that is, the sign is put for the thing signified".

101. Comm. Acts 6:6, CO XLVIII:122 - "The laying on of hands is a rite agreeable to decorum and order, and yet it has of itself no power or efficacy, but its strength and effect depend upon the Holy Spirit alone".
102. Inst. IV.19.28. OS V:463 - "...fidele spiritualis gratiae symbolum". cf. also Comm. Luke 24:49, CO XLV:819, "Those whom God calls as ministers of the Gospel are imbued with the heavenly Spirit, and therefore it is promised always to all teachers of the Church (doctores ecclesiae) without exception".
103. Inst. IV.19.28, OS V:463.
104. Inst. IV.5.4, OS V:77.
105. Inst. IV.8.2, OS V:134.
106. Comm. Mark 16:20, CO XLV:829.
107. Comm. II Timothy 1:6, CO LII:350.
108. Comm. II Corinthians 5:18, CO L:70-71; cf. also, Comm. I Corinthians 3:5, CO XLIX:349. With regard to deacons, cf. Comm. II Timothy 3:8, CO LII:378.
109. Comm. II Corinthians 4:5, CO L:52. Comm. Psalms 45:16, CO XXXI:459. Comm. Isaiah 42:1, CO XXXVII:58.
110. Comm. I Peter 5:5, CO LV,287 - "Pastors cannot perform their duty unless this feeling of reverence is strong and is cultivated, so that the younger allow themselves to be ruled. If there is no subjection, government is overturned. When those who ought by right or order of nature to rule have no authority, everyone will immediately become insolent and wanton". cf. also, Comm. John 7:47, CO XLVII:185 - "...If the rulers and governors of the Church do not retain their authority, nothing can possibly ever be well-ordered, nor can the Church long continue in a well-ordered condition".
111. Inst. IV.12.1, OS V:212 - "To understand it better, let us divide the Church into two chief orders: clergy and laity. I call by the name 'clergy' those who perform public ministry in the Church". cf. also Inst. IV.4.9, OS V:65-66, where Calvin says that he would have preferred to use "a more proper" word than "clergy", for this term in its strict sense refers to all Christians. However, the distinction between officeholders and laypersons remains.
112. Comm. Luke 5:10, CO XLV:150 - "Some God is content to have in his flock and Church, and others He assigns to a particular station (statio), but those who are appointed to a public office (publica persona) must realize that more is required of them than of the ordinary individual. Thus Christ makes no change in the everyday life of the others, but takes these four disciples away

from the craft they had lived on to this time, in order to use their effort for a higher calling (ad praestantiorum functionem)".

CHAPTER THREE

113. Inst. (1536 ed.), OS I:205 ff.
114. ibid., 215, "...oportere episcopum esse irreprehensibilem, doctorem, non pugnacem, non avarum etc."
115. Responsio ad Sadoleti epistolam, OS I:458.
116. F. Wendel, L'Eglise de Strasbourg: sa constitution et son organization, 1532-1535 (Paris, 1942), 117, where the author notes that Bucer regarded "lecturers", "masters", and "regents" of the schools as true "doctors" of the Church; cf. also H. Strohl, op.cit., 124.
117. J.I. McCord, "Foreward" of Supplementa Calviniana. Sermons inédits. Neukirchen (1536) 1961ff: "Calvin's work in Geneva began with a sermon preached in St. Pierre on 1 September, 1536"; cf. also, R.Y. Reyburn, op.cit., 60: "Calvin began his work in Geneva by delivering a sermon in St. Peter's cathedral on 1 September, 1536".
118. J.C. Coetzee, "Calvin and the School", in J.T. Hoogstra (ed.), John Calvin, Contemporary Prophet (Grand Rapids, 1959): "During the first 12 months of his stay in Geneva, Calvin held no regular post as preacher, or pastor, or tutor".
119. CO XXI, 58. This biography was written in 1565.
120. CO XXI, 126. Beza's biography was written in 1575.
121. Dating according to T.H.L. Parker's revisions, cf. his book John Calvin (London, 1975), appendix I, 156 ff.
122. Parker, ibid., 21-22, who garners this evidence from L. Raymal, Histoire du Berry depuis le temps les plus anciens jusqu'en 1789, t.3 (Bourges, 1844), III:308-309. cf. also Beza's Life of Calvin, (Co, XXI, 121): "...Calvin though not in priests orders, preached (conciones) several sermons in this place [Pont l'Evêque] before he left France".
123. Annales Calviniani (relevant extracts from Registre du Conseil de Genève) in CO XXI, 204 ; hereafter cited Annales.
124. Annales, 208.

125. The titles "lecteur", "doctor" and "professor" were all attributed to Calvin during his early years in Geneva: Capiton to Calvin, December, 1536, CO Xb:75, "Viro doctissimo maximeque pio D. Calvino sacras literas et Christum docenti Gebennis"; Oporinus to Calvin, March, 1537, CO Xb:80, "Insigni theologo D. Ioanni Calvini sacram literarum professori Gebennis"; Counsel of Bern to Farel and Calvin, August, 1537, CO Xb:118, "A maistre Guillaume Pharel prescheur de leglise et Iehan Caulvin lecteur en la sainte escripture".
126. Comm. Psalms (To the Reader), CO XXXI:25.
127. Calvin's Commentary on Romans was brewing in his mind in 1535-1536 during which time he was discussing the matter of biblical interpretation with Simon Grynée while living in Basel. It is highly probable that his first lectures in Geneva were on this book (cf. infra, Part IV, chap. one), and it is not unlikely that he used these lectures when writing up the first version of his commentary which appears to have been completed by October, 1539, the date of the dedication.
128. Comm. Romans 12:6-8, CO XLIX:239.
129. ibid, CO XLIX:240.
130. cf. infra, Part IV, chapter two.
131. In the following line he uses the term officii instead of functiones, CO XLIX:240. These two terms are often used by Calvin interchangeably; at other times they are distinguished.
132. ibid ; cf. also Inst. IV.3.9, OS V:50-51.
133. Jean Calvin, Institution de la Religion Chrestienne, texte établi et présenté par Jacque Pannier, 4 tomes, (Paris, 1936-1939), cf. t. quatrième, chapitre XV: De la puissance ecclésiastique; henceforth cited: Inst. (1541).
134. Calvin uses these terms in accordance with Paul's terminology in Ephesians 4:11. Referring to this passage, the Reformer writes: "Car il a donné Apostres, Prophètes, Docteurs, Pasteurs, lesquels tous, par divers offices, mais d'un mesne courage, s'employassent à l'edification de l'Eglise...".
135. Inst. (1541), IV: 120-122.
136. ibid, IV:94;108;179.
137. ibid, IV:167.
138. ibid.
139. ibid. IV:173-174.
140. ibid, IV:173.

141. References to the 1543 edition of the Institutio are taken from OS and for convenience will be correlated to the corresponding reference in the 1559 edition, (Inst.).
142. In the 1559 edition, Calvin has inserted this title to the section: "De Ecclesiae doctoribus et ministris, eorum electione et officio", OS V:42 (Inst. IV.3.4).
143. OS V:45 (Inst. IV.3.4).
144. OS V:50-51 (Inst. IV.3.8-9).
145. OS V:50 (Inst. IV.3.8), "Hic iam observandum est, nos hactenus nonnisi, ea officia recensuisse, quae in verbi ministerio consistunt; nec de aliis Paulus meminit illo quarto ad Ephesios capite quod citavimus".
146. OS V:45 (Inst. IV.3-3), "...nothing is more notable or glorious in the Church than the ministry of the gospel, since it is the administration of the Spirit and of righteousness and of eternal life."
147. OS V:46 (Inst. IV.34).
148. ibid.: "Munus tamen ipsum nihil minus extraordinarium appello, quia in Ecclesiis rite constitutis locum non habet".
149. OS V:46 (Inst. IV.3.4).
150. OS V:47 (Inst. IV.3.5).
151. OS V:46 (Inst. IV.3.4).
152. OS V:48 (Inst. IV.3.6).
153. ibid.
154. OS V:58 (Inst. IV.4.1).
155. Comm. I Corinthians 12:28, CO XLIX:505.
156. Comm. I Corinthians 12:6, CO XLIX:498.
157. ibid., 12:6, CO XLIX:497-498; cf. also ibid 12:28, CO XLIX:505-506, "For the Lord only appointed ministers after first providing them with the requisite gifts (necessariis donis), and making them fit for the office (munus) they had to carry out...The natural order is that the gifts (dona) come before the ministry (ministerium)". cf. also, Comm. Ephesians 4:11, CO LI:196, "Whenever men are called by God, gifts (dona) are necessarily connected with offices (officiis)".
158. We should also note that, according to Calvin, "one person may be endowed with many gifts, and hold two of the functions (functiones) to which Paul has referred; and there is nothing really out of place about that". (Comm. I Corinthians, 12:29, CO XLIX:507).

159. ibid., 12:28, CO XLIX:507.
160. ibid.
161. ibid., It is interesting to note that Beza, in his Confession de la Foi (1559), interprets this term to justify the magistracy as an integral "office" in the Church's government. (cf. T. Maruyama, The Ecclesiology of Theodore Beza, Geneva, 1978, 12 N.47).
162. Comm. I Corinthians 12:28, CO XLIX:506.
163. ibid.: "The office of doctor (officium doctoris) belongs to the first class, that of Apostle to the second. For the Lord appointed the apostles, so that they might spread the Gospel throughout the whole world...In that respect they differ from the pastors (pastores), who are bound, so to speak, to their own churches, that has been committed to his charge".
164. ibid.
165. ibid.
166. ibid.
167. ibid., CO XLIX:507.
168. ibid., CO XLIX:506.
169. We should note that this description of the prophetic office is very similar to that of the pastoral office.
170. Comm. Acts 13:1, CO XLVIII:278, "I have explained in Ephesians 4:11 and I Corinthians 12:28 how, at least in my opinion, 'doctors' differ from 'prophets'. In this verse, these two words can be synonomous".
171. Comm. Titus 1:5, CO LII:409, "Although we may infer from I Timothy that there were two kinds of presbyters, here the context makes it quite clear that doctores are to be understood, that is, those ordained to teach, for almost immediately he will refer to the same people as episcopos (i.e. pastors)". cf. also, Inst. IV.1.5, OS V:8, "We see the way for it" the preaching of the heavenly doctrine has been enjoined upon the pastors. We see that all are brought under the same regulation, that with a gentle and teachable spirit, they may allow themselves to be governed by doctors appointed to this function". It is significant that in the 1560 edition of the Institutio, the term "doctor" was translated as "Pasteur", cf. OS V:8, N. a). cf. also Comm. Acts, 21:7-8, CO XLVII:477.
172. Comm. Ephesians 4:11, CO LI:196.
173. ibid., CO LI:197.
174. ibid., CO LI:198.

175. ibid.
176. ibid, CO LI:197: "Et illis quidem ex parte subscribo, Paulum de pastoribus et doctoribus promiscue loqui, ac si unus idemque esset ordo".
177. ibid., CO LI:198, "Et doctor aliquis esse poterit, qui tamen concionando non erit appositus". All "preaching", on the other hand, involves teaching: "teaching is the duty of all pastors" (ibid.).
178. Calvin believes that both these functions are absolutely essential for the government of the Church: "sine pastoribus autem et doctoribus nullam potest esse ecclesiae regimen". (ibid, CO LI:198).
179. Calvinus Regi Poloniae (December, 1554), CO XV:329-335.
180. ibid, 335.
181. ibid.
182. ibid : "God himself brings the remedy in raising up fitting and upright doctors".
183. ibid.
184. ibid, CO XV:334.
185. ibid.
186. ibid, CO XV:335.
187. ibid.
188. ibid, (italics mine).
189. cf. infra, Part III, chapter three (cf. esp. N.328).
190. This Confession may be found in OS II:297-324. cf. also J. Pannier, Les origines de la Confession de Foi et la Discipline des Eglises réformées de France (Paris, 1936). Pannier notes that Calvin was opposed to having one man draw up a Confession. He therefore suggests that Calvin, Viret and Beza were all involved in its production.
191. OS II:321 (article 27).
192. CO Xa: 91-124. The revision of the Ordonnances was apparently undertaken by Calvin himself: "Pource que dernièrement avoit este parle de reveoir les editz ecclésiastiques le Sr. Roset a rapporte en avoir communique avec M. Calvin qui les a reveuz comme ilz sont reduiz par escript". (Annales, 765).

PART THREE

CHAPTER ONE

1. In addition to Reyburn, Henderson and Taylor, cf. Introduction, p. 5 N.1 .
2. Reyburn, op.cit., 114. (italics mine).
3. Taylor, op.cit., 171.
4. Henderson, op.cit., 35-36.
5. ibid, 48 N.51.
6. ibid, 70-71.
7. ibid, 66.
8. ibid, 67.
9. cf. infra, 52.
10. Henderson, op.cit., 48.
11. ibid., 65-71.
12. ibid, 241.
13. ibid, 240.
14. Inst. III.19.15, OS IV:294.
15. ibid.
16. ibid, "...varii reges et variae leges".
17. ibid.
18. Inst. IV.11.3, OS V:199.
19. Inst. IV.20.1, OS V:472.
20. Inst. III.19.15, OS IV:294.
21. Inst. IV.20.1, OS V:472, "...spirituale Christi regnum et civilem ordinationem res esse plurimum sepositas".
22. Inst. IV.11.5, OS V:200.
23. Inst. IV.11.5, OS V:201, "... praedicatione doctrinae Christi".
24. Inst. IV.1.5, OS V:8.
25. Inst. I.15.4, OS I:179, "Now we are to see what Paul chiefly comprehends under this renewal. In the first place he posits knowledge (agnitionem), then pure righteousness and holiness".

26. Comm. I Peter 5:2, CO LV,285.
27. Inst. IV.2.1, OS V:31; Comm. Acts, Dedicatory Epistle, CO XLVIII: vii-viii.
28. Comm. Ephesians 4:12, CO LI:199, "Our true completeness and perfection consists in our being united into the Body of Christ. He could not have commended the ministry of the Word more highly than by ascribing this effect to it".
29. Comm. I Timothy 3:15, CO LII:289, "If there be no public teaching of the Gospel, and no godly ministers who by their preaching rescue the truth from darkness and oblivion, falsehoods, errors, impostures, superstitions and corruption of every kind will immediately seize control".
30. Inst. IV3.3, OS V:45; Comm. I Timothy 5:17, CO LII:315, "But he [Paul] gives priority to those who labour in the Word and in teaching. For these two expressions mean the same thing, the preaching of the Word".
31. Inst. IV.8.1, OS V:133, "...authoritatem dogmatum tradendorum, et eorum explicationem".
32. Inst. IV.8.1, OS V:133.
33. Comm. I Timothy 2:2, CO LII:266.
34. Inst. IV.20.6, OS V:476-478.
35. Inst. IV.20.2, OS V:473.
36. Inst. IV.20.3, OS V:473-474. This surely militates against W. Niesel's assertion that Calvin "is not concerned about the State as such, not even about the Christian State". (in The Theology of Calvin, tr. H.Knight, London, 1956, p. 230).
37. Inst. IV.20.10, OS V:481-482.
38. Inst. IV.20.14, OS V:486.
39. Inst. IV.10.1, OS V:164. Ordo politicus, politia and societas are used interchangeably by Calvin.
40. Inst. IV.10.1, OS V:164.
41. Inst. IV.10.5, OS V:167-168.
42. Inst. IV.20.25-26, OS V:495-498.
43. Comm. Daniel 4:10-16, CO XL:647.
44. Comm. Genesis 16:8, CO XXIII:227, "Lawful authorities are to be obeyed for conscience' sake".
45. Inst. III.19.16, OS IV:296. We must bear in mind that, for Calvin, conscientia "solum Deum respicit"; Inst. III.19.16, "Therefore, as works have regard to men, so conscience refers to God. A good conscience, then, is nothing but inward integrity of heart". cf. also, Inst.

- IV.10.4, OS V:166-167, "Speaking properly, it [conscience] refers to God alone."
46. Inst. IV.10.5, OS V:167-168; cf. also Inst. III.19.15, OS IV:294-299, where Calvin, commenting on the same verse in Romans, says that if one interprets this passage to mean that consciences are bound by civil laws, then "all that we said a little while ago and are now going to say about spiritual government would fall".
47. Lectures on Daniel, XXX; CO XLI:25; cf. also Inst. IV.20.31-32, OS V:501-502. H. Naef, La Conjuration d'Amboise et Genève (Genève, 1922), 46ff, believes that Calvin would have sanctioned a revolt led by Condé, brother of the King of Navarre.
48. Inst. III.19.15, OS IV:294.
49. Inst. II.2.13, OS III:256.
50. Inst. II.2.12, OS III:254.
51. Comm. Colossians 1:9, CO LII:80-81.
52. Inst. II.2.12, OS III:254.
53. Inst. II.2.13, OS III:256.
54. Inst. II.2.12, OS III:254.
55. Inst. II.2.13, OS III:256
56. ibid, "In priore genere sunt politia, oeconomia, artes omnes mechanicae, disciplinae que liberales".
57. Inst. II.2.14, OS III:258.
58. Inst. II.2.15, OS III:258.
59. Inst. II.2.16, OS III:259; cf. also ibid, 258: "If we regard the Spirit of God as the sole fountain of truth, we shall neither reject the truth itself, nor despise it wherever it shall appear, unless we wish to dishonour the Spirit of God."
60. Inst. II.2.16, OS III:259.
61. Inst. IV.8.8, OS V:139.
62. Inst. III.2.34, OS IV:35.
63. Comm. John 17:8, CO XLVII:380.
64. T.H.L. Parker, Calvin's Doctrine of the Knowledge of God, (Grand Rapids, first published 1952), 106.
65. Inst. II.2.14, OS III:258.
66. Inst. II.2.18, OS III:260.

67. Annales, 206. The text of these articles may be found in OS I:367-377.
68. ibid.
69. Annales, 225.
70. A.L. Herminjard (ed.), Correspondance des reformateurs dans les pays de langue francaise, 9 tomes, (Paris, 1878-1897), t. IV:416; cf. also, Annales, 224.
71. Annales, 227.
72. ibid, 209-210.
73. ibid, 210.
74. Calvin uses various terms to describe this office: in Latin, "presbyteri", "seniores", "gubernationes"; in French: "prestres", "anciens", "gouvernements", "commis de la Seigneurie".
75. Inst. IV.11.1, OS V:195.
76. Comm. James 5:14, CO LV, 431.
77. Inst. IV3.8, OS V:50; Comm. I Timothy 5:7, CO LII:308, "The people elected earnest and well-tried men, who, along with the pastors in a common council and with the authority of the Church, would administer discipline and act as censors for the correction of morals".
78. CO Xa:22.
79. Reyburn, op.cit.
80. R. M. Kingdon, "Social Welfare in Calvin's Geneva", American Historical Review, 76 (1971), 50-51.
81. ibid, 54.
82. CO Xa:24.
83. The extensive duties of the deacons carried out in connection with the Hospital have been well detailed by Kingdon, op.cit., 57ff.
84. Inst. IV.4.5, OS V:62.
85. ibid.
86. Inst. IV.3.16, OS V:57.
87. Anthoine Chicand, 1540-1541; Pierre Jean Jesse, 1550-1553; Pernet des Fosses, 1560-1561; taken from Kingdon, op.cit., 56 N.15.
88. ibid, 56.

89. ibid, 62-63. Kingdon notes that it is not until 1562 that one finds any evidence of the pastors intervening openly in the election of deacons (ibid, 63).
90. Sermon I Timothy XXIV, CO LII:291.
91. cf. for instance, Inst. IV.3.9, OS V:50-51; IV.4.5, OS V:61-62; IV.5.15, OS V:85-86; Comm. Philippians 1:1, CO LII:7-8; Sermon I Timothy XXIV, CO LIII:289-294; Comm. Acts 6:5, CO XLVIII:122.
92. Kingdon, op.cit., 59 : "There is practically no evidence in any of the voluminous manuscript records of the Hospital that the pastors were involved in its operation in any significant way".
93. Ordonnances, CO Xa:21.
94. ibid, 22.
95. H. Heyer, L'Eglise de Genève: 1535-1909. Equisse Historique de son Organisation (Genève, 1909), 10.
96. J. Vuy, "Notes Historiques sur le Collège de Versonnex", Mémoires de l'Institut National Genevois, v.12 (Genève, 1867-1868), 4, where Vuy claims that only those who could afford to pay the fees received instruction. J.P. Gabarel, Histoire de l'Eglise de Genève, v.I, (Genève, 1858), p.324, maintains that this education was gratuitous.
97. C. Borgeaud, Histoire de la Université de Genève: L'Academie de Calvin (Genève, 1900), 2ff.
98. A.B. Cobban, The Medieval Universities: Their Development and Organization (London, 1975), 118; cf. also, M. Deanesly, A History of the Medieval Church, (London, 1925), 206.
99. Borgeaud, op.cit., 13.
100. Vuy, op.cit., 8.
101. It was not an uncommon practice for wealthy citizens to take an active role in financing public institutions; cf. Deanesly, op. cit., 206.
102. Vuy, op.cit., 12; Borgeaud, op.cit., 13.
103. Vuy, op.cit., 13.
104. ibid, 9.
105. Borgeaud, op.cit., 14-15.
106. H. Naef, Les Origines de la Reforme à Genève, I (Genève, 1968), 282ff. The full text of these statutes is reproduced in Vuy, op.cit., 39-40.

107. W.S. Reid, "Calvin and the Founding of the Academy of Geneva", Westminster Theological Journal, 18 (1955), 6-7.
108. A. Roget, "Annales scolaires genevoises", L'Educateur revue pédagogique, 19 (1883), 75.
109. Vuy, op.cit., 13ff.
110. For a history of this struggle, cf. E. Monter, Calvin's Geneva (New York, 1967) 29-59.
111. Annales, 201.
112. Vuy, op.cit., 21.
113. H. Fazy, L'Instruction primaire à Genève, (Genève, 1896), 8ff.
114. Vuy, op.cit., 21. There were several small private schools in Geneva at this time, as there had been in previous years, but their fate during this critical period is not known.
115. Doumergue, op.cit., 375.
116. For Saunier's personal background, cf. J. Le Coultre, Maturin Cordier (Neuchatel, 1926) 121-124.
117. Saunier continued at his post until he was exiled in 1538.
118. Herminjard, op.cit., IV:456 N.4, where he gives the date as 1537. Le Coultre, op.cit., 124, makes it 1536.
119. Le Coultre, op.cit., 5.
120. Woodward, Education During the Renaissance (Cambridge, 1906), 140ff.
121. Comm. I Thessalonians, Dedicatory Epistle, : To Maturinus Cordier: A Man of Outstanding Godliness and Learning, Principal of the College of Lausanne.
122. Le Coultre, op.cit., 5.
123. ibid, 11.
124. Taken from Woodward, op.cit., 155.
125. cf. infra, Part IV.
126. The original document was in Latin and entitled: Ordo et Ratio Docendi. This original draft was probably drawn up at the end of 1537: cf. Herminjard, op.cit., IV:455. The text of the French translation printed by Gerard is reproduced in full in E-A Bétant, Notice sur le Collège de Rive (Genève, 1866). Hereafter references to this 20 page document will be cited as: L'Ordre... (There is no pagination). References to the "Notice..." itself will be cited as: Bétant.

127. Borgeaud, op.cit., 16.
128. Doumergue, op.cit., VII:150 N.2.
129. Herminjard, op.cit., IV:455.
130. Le Coultre, op.cit., 125.
131. J. Cadier, "Calvin Educateur", op.cit., 117.
132. L'Ordre...op.cit.
133. L'Ordre...; cf. also Annales, 204.
134. ibid.
135. Woodward, op.cit., 157.
136. L'Ordre...
137. ibid.
138. Henderson, op.cit., 36.
139. CO Xa:72;74.
140. CO Xa:71-73.
141. CO Xa:20-21.
142. Henderson, op.cit., 36 N.12: "The device of a catechism for religious instruction was contemplated [i.e. in the Articles...CO Xa: 12ff.] but no supervision for its use was projected, which leaves us to assume that the institutions involved would be those which had functioned heretofore in this matter - the family and the school".
143. L'Ordre...
144. Comm. I Thessalonians: Dedicatory Epistle.
145. Borgeaud, op.cit., 79.
146. R. Peter, "L'abécédaire genevois ou catéchisme élémentaire de Calvin", Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses, 17; Borgeaud, op.cit., 27ff. gives the age as "6 or 7"
147. Le Coultre, op.cit., 54.
148. J.T. McNeill, The History and Character of Calvinism, (New York, 1954), 192: "The College de la Rive, which was begun under Antoine Saunier in 1536, had ceased activity during Calvin's Strasbourg period".
149. Le Coultre, op.cit., 130-131; cf. also Bétant, op.cit., 9.
150. Bétant, op.cit., 11.

151. Herminjard, op.cit., v:285.
152. ibid.
153. Herminjard, op.cit., VI:153 N.3. Christin was described by the Bernese as a stranger "qui est alterius religionis (cf. Herminjard, op.cit., V:285 N.2.)
154. ibid., VI:152 N.2; ibid VI:153 N.4; cf. also Bétant, op.cit., 11.
155. Le Coultre, op.cit., 132.
156. Herminjard, op.cit., VII:91 N.4;N.5.
157. ibid, V:204-207; ibid, V:333-335; ibid., IV:107 N.5;N.6, cf. also, R.D. Linder, "Pierre Viret's Ideas and Attitudes Concerning Humanism and Education", Church History, 35, (1965).
158. Herminjard, op.cit., VII:135 N.1.
159. ibid, IV:222; cf. also, ibid, V:206 N.16; ibid, VIII:91, N.4;N.5.
160. It appears that the second unnamed under-master also either left or was dismissed around this same time.
161. This new under-master was probably Pierre Mussard who remained at this post for several years. He later became Castellio's brother-in-law (cf. Herminjard, op.cit., VIII:104.).
162. Herminjard, op.cit., VII:159 N.4.
163. ibid., VII:359. It seems that after Castellio was hired, Bussier was finally allowed to retire.
164. Annales, 294; cf. also ibid., VIII:105, N.6. Castellio was given 450 florins by the Council for his services as rector, but out of this he had to pay his two under-masters.
165. CO XIV:40 (January, 1551).
166. Claude Baduel to Calvin, CO XII:587-590.
167. Registre du Conseil, 9 March, 1542: "Maystre Estienne Rolph et Pierre Musard, bachelliers des escholes", taken from Herminjard, op.cit. VIII:104.
168. Herminjard, op.cit., VII:373.
169. ibid, VIII:104, "On comprend que ces querelles entre Chateillon principal du College, et son subordonne P. Mussard devaient nuire à la discipline et à la renommee de cet etablissement".

170. These opinions had to do with his doubts on the doctrine of election, the descent of Christ into hell, and the authenticity of the Song of Solomon; cf. Annales, 328-329.
171. It seems that the main motivation behind this request was to supplement his salary.
172. Annales, 328. (cf. infra, Part III, chapter three).
173. Castellio did not leave Geneva for several months. During this time, when he held no public office, he attended the Friday "congrégations" and challenged the doctrinal positions of those whom he felt had unjustly driven him out of Geneva. In 1553 he was made professor of Greek in Basle.
174. Bétant, op.cit., 17.
175. Cornier had formerly been "regent" at Monteliard.
176. Sometime prior to Cornier's tenure, Etienne Rolph was replaced by Jean Colinet as under-master.
177. Bétant, op.cit., 17.
178. ibid, 18. Since the time of Saunier, it was the established procedure to have the "regent", in consultation with the Council, appoint his under-masters and pay them out of the budget allotted to him by the State.
179. Annales, 573, There appears to have been quite a turnover among the teaching staff, making it difficult to know exactly how many under-masters there were during this period; cf. Calvin's letter to Farel (June 15, 1551), CO XIV:134, "Nostri quoque tibe plurimam salutem dicunt, collegae mei, Normandius, Budaeus, Triecius, Sanlaurentius, Colladonii ambo...".
180. Bétant, op.cit., 19.
181. Annales, 721.
182. Bétant, op.cit., 20-21.
183. The Register of the Company of Pastors in Geneva in the Time of Calvin (edited and translated by P.E. Hughes, Grand Rapids, 1966), 316; hereafter cited: Register.
184. Annales, 673.
185. Diverses pieces concernant l'histoire de Genève (17th century), taken from Borgeaud, op.cit., 34 N.3.
186. Annales, 687.
187. A. Roget, Histoire du Peuple de Genève depuis la Réforme jusqu'a l'Escalade (Genève, 1870-1881), V:244 N.1.

188. Registre du Conseil, 15 June, 1562: "...n'est pas queres propre, les leçons publique, et qu'il vaudroit mieux les faire à Nostre-Dame-la-Neuve, ...qu'il sait ainsi fait", (from Doumergue, op.cit., III:344 N.2).
189. CO XVII:94. Mercier had succeeded Vatable as professor of Hebrew in the Collège de France in Paris.
190. CO XVII:310. Tremellius had taught Hebrew at Cambridge before becoming professor at Hornbach.
191. Annales, 707.
192. ibid., 708.
193. Register, 343. As we shall see, Beza was also appointed rector of the Academy when it was officially opened a few months later, on 5 June, 1559. He also taught theology in this institution (cf. infra, 203).
194. It appears that Bérauld had never been ordained pastor.
195. Before coming to Lausanne, Chevalier taught Hebrew at Cambridge and Strasbourg (cf. Register...343 N.5). He was a pastor at Montreux and Lausanne, but left the latter city to go to Geneva before actually beginning his duties (cf. Borgeaud, op.cit., 64).
196. Tagaut was ordained before coming to Geneva (cf. Borgeaud, op.cit., 66).
197. Randon held a similar post at Lausanne (cf. Register...op.cit., 343, N.8).
198. Annales, 722.
199. ibid., 774.
200. Registre du Conseil, 5 juin, 1559: "...Davantage ilz [the ministers] ont esleu Recteur du Collège spectable Theodore de Bèze, lequel ilz ont présenté avec une forme de serment de laquelle a icy este faite lecture et a este trouvée bonne..." (taken from CO Xa:65 N.1).
201. Registre du Conseil, 22 mai, 1559: "Status du Collège. Ledit S. Calvin a aussi presentes de la part des Ministres les status du Collège sil plait Messrs. ils le translateront en françois. Arreste quil soit fait quon puisse veoir et entendre". (taken from CO Xa:65 N.1).
202. CO Xa:68, "Antea vero designarant iiden Antonium Cevallerium hebraeae linguae, Franciscum Beraldum graecae, Iohannem Tagautium philosophiae, professores.
203. CO Xa:68.
204. CO Xa:65ff.
205. CO Xa:65 N.1.

206. CO Xa:67; 67 N.3.
207. CO Xa:67 N.3.
208. CO Xa:67; 67 N.5. In the Latin edition the terms praeceptores and hypodidascali were used for the teachers in the schola privata, and the term publici professores for those in the schola publica (cf. CO Xa:68).
209. CO Xa:68.
210. CO Xa:72.
211. The following material concerning the schola privata was gathered from CO Xa:71-79.
212. A. Dufour, "La Foundation du Collège de Genève et l'histoire de l'éducation", Le Collège de Genève, 1559: 1959 (University of Geneva publication, Genève, 1959), 48; where Dufour notes that the students in the schola privata usually remained more than one year in each class, especially in the lower grades.
213. In H. Delarue's article, "Les Premiers Manuels en usage au Collège de Genève", ibid, 69-70, he draws up a list of books for each class in the schola privata which he thinks were probably used during the early years of the schools existence.
214. Before the lessons were started, each morning a specially prepared prayer was said in each classroom of the schola privata; cf. CO Xa:73. The text of this prayer is found in CO VI:137ff.
215. CO Xa:73, "Qu'il y ait aussi en chasque temple quelque Regent et qu'il y soit d'heure, à fin qu'il prenne garde sur la troupe. Le sermon fini, si besoing est, qu'il face lire le rolle, et qu'il note les absens et ceulx qui auront este nonchalans a escouter la parolle de Dieu".
216. CO Xa:75, "Le Samedi qu'ils repetent leur septmaine le matin".
217. CO Xa:79, "Le Samedi depuis trois iusqu' à quatre, qu'on leur lise l'Evangile S. Luc en Grec". (2nd class).
"Le Samedi depuis trois heures iusques à quatre, qu'on leur lise quelque Epistle des Apostres". (1st class).
218. CO Xa:75, "Ou 'ils recitent ce qui debvra estre le lendemain traicte au Catechisme, et que les sens en soit familierement expose selon leur capacite".
219. CO Xa:75, "Que le iour du Dimanche soit employe a ouir et a mediter et recorder les sermons".
220. Since the students in the 1st and 2nd classes did not attend the preparatory classes for catechism on Saturday afternoons, we may assume that their catechetical

- classes were over and that they were taking communion by this age (11-12).
221. CO Xa:87-88.
222. CO Xa:85-87.
223. A. Bouvier, La compagnie des Pasteurs de Genève (Genève, 1878), 23: "Les professeurs ou lecteurs de l'Académie, qui devaient être en minimum au nombre de trois, et dont l'un enseignait l'Ancien Testament, le second le Nouveau Testament, le troisième les arts font-ils partie de la Compagnie". H. Heyer, Catalogue des Thèses de Théologie Soutenues à l'Académie de Genève (Genève, 1898), IX-X, : "A l'ouverture de l'Académie en 1559, l'enseignement théologique fut confié à trois professeurs: Antoine Chevalier interprétait les livres de l'Ancien Testament et enseignait l'hébreu, tandis que Theodore de Bèza et Calvin expliquaient à tour de rôle les livres du Nouveau Testament et exposaient les loci communes, c'est ainsi qu'on désignait la théologie systématique". J.E. Cellerier, "L'Académie de Genève", Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire du Protestantisme Français, (Paris, 1856), : "Le professeur d'hébreu devait aussi, outre l'enseignement des éléments de la langue consacrer six heures par semaine à l'exégèse de l'Ancien Testament". cf. also, P.F. Geisendorf, L'Université de Genève, 1559-1959 (Genève, 1959), 28; and W.S. Reid, op.cit., 15.
224. CO Xa:87.
225. CO Xa:86.
226. Borgeaud, op.cit., 65.
227. T.H.L. Parker agrees (personal conversations) that interpretari could mean "translate". He notes, for instance, that Vetus interpres was a common expression for the Vulgate, and Nova Interpretatio for Erasmus' translation. However, the same cannot be said with regard to exposer.
228. W.S. Reid, op.cit., 15-16: "The professor of Hebrew was to devote his morning lecture to an exposition of some Old Testament book with the aid of the Jewish commentaries...Strange as it may seem, the professor of Greek was not to deal with the New Testament."
229. CO Xa:87. These three hours of theological lectures raises the total number of lectures, as we have noted, to 27 hours of lectures each week.
230. H.M. Baird, Theodore Beza: The Counsellor of the French Reformation (London, 1899), 107.
231. Annales, 733.
232. ibid, 757.

233. ibid., 789.
234. Calvin's letter to Nicholas Colladon, 3 October, 1560, CO XLVI:213-214.
235. Calvin's letter to the Queen of Navarre, 24 December, 1561, CO XLVII:197.
236. CO Xa:85.
237. Annales, 712.
238. Annales, 778. The professors did not receive anymore increases in salary until 1570 when it was raised to 500 florins.
239. Annales, 709. Presumably Beza's salary was raised to 400 florins in 1562 like the other pastors in the city.
240. Calvin's salary was increased to 600 florins on 21 May, 1562 (Annales, 780).
241. cf. infra, Part III, chapter three.
242. CO Xa:87.
243. ibid.
244. Registre du Conseil, 26 September, 1559, in Doumergue, op.cit., VII:149.
245. Registre du Conseil, 28 September, 1559, in Borgeaud, op.cit., 95.
246. Borgeaud, op.cit., 95.
247. ibid, 94 and 96.
248. Borgeaud, op.cit., 96-97:" In the Middle Ages the study of Medicine was closely tied to physiology, consequently, to the whole of Aristotelian philosophy...It is possible that Simoni, instead of using the Commentaries of Hippocrates or Galien, took his text for his lectures from Aristotle".
249. Registre du Conseil, 15 April, 1566, in Borgeaud, op.cit., 91.
250. For a complete list of the students attending the Academy during these years, cf. Le Livre du Recteur, Catalogue des Etudiants de L'Academie de Genève, de 1559-1859, (J.-G. Fick, ed., Genève).
251. Reyburn, op.cit., 114.
252. Henderson, op.cit., 66-67; 70-71.
253. cf. supra, 161.
254. Comm. Romans 12:6, CO XLIX:239.
255. Comm. I Peter 1:25 CO LV:230.

256. OS V:46 (Inst. IV.3.4).
257. OS V:47 (Inst. IV.3.5).
258. Comm. Romans 12:6, CO XLIX:239; cf. also Comm. I Corinthians 12:28, CO XLIX:506, "I am certain, in my own mind, that he means by prophets, not those endowed with the gift of foretelling, but those who were blessed with the unique gift of dealing with Scripture, not only by interpreting it, but also by the wisdom they showed in making it meet the needs of the hour."; and Comm. I Thessalonians 5:20, CO LII:176, "By the term prophesying, however, I do not mean the gift of foretelling the future, but as in I Cor. 14:3, the science of the interpretation of Scripture, so that a prophet is the interpreter of the divine will."
259. Comm. I Corinthians 12:28, CO XLIX:506.
260. Comm. I Timothy 1:19, CO LII:263.
261. Comm. I Peter 4:11, CO LV,355.
262. Comm. Acts 13:15, CO XLVII:288.
263. Comm. Harmony of the Gospels, Matthew 13:51, CO XLV:376.
264. ibid., Mt. 22:16, CO XLV:600-601.
265. cf. for instance, Inst. I.14.3, OS III:156; Inst. I.14.16, OS III:166; Inst. III.20.47, OS IV:364; Comm. I Timothy 1:4, CO LII:252; Comm. I Cor. 14:6, CO XLIX:518.
266. Sermon I Timothy 1:4, CO LIII,15ff.
267. Comm. I Corinthians 14:3, CO XLIX:517.
268. Inst. IV.8.4, OS V:136.
269. Inst. V.8.8, OS V:139-140.
270. OS II:380;384.
271. OS II:382-383.
272. OS II:379-380.
273. Annales, 201; cf. also supra, N.164.
274. cf. supra, Part III, chapter two.
275. OS II:338.
276. Annales, 299.
277. ibid, 300.
278. ibid, 308.
279. ibid, 331.

280. supra, 189ff.
281. Annales, 313.
282. ibid, 314.
283. supra, 178ff.
284. cf. infra, Part IV, chapter one (ii).
285. Annales, 301. We need to remember that Calvin, following Scripture, regarded the office of deacon as an "ordained" ministry, cf. Inst. IV.3.16.
286. supra, 178 .
287. Annales, 326.
288. ibid, 336.
289. supra, Part II, chapter three, p. 142
290. supra, Part III, chapter two.
291. Annales, 294; cf. also F. Buisson, Sébastien Castellion: sa vie et son oeuvre (1515-1563), 2 vols. (Paris, 1892), 142.
292. Herminjard, op.cit., IX:185.
293. ibid.
294. Annales, 328.
295. Castellio expressed doubts about the doctrine of election, the descent of Christ into Hell, and the authenticity of the Song of Solomon; cf. Annales, 328-329.
296. Annales, 359.
297. ibid, 311.
298. cf. for instance, Annales (Reg. du Conseil), 418, (22 Dec., 1547); 431 (9 Aug. 1548); 460 (20 Jan. 1550); 462 (3 April, 1550); 485 (7 Aug, 1551); Register...op.cit., 68 (20 Oct., 1547); 83 (11 Jan., 1548); 111 (April, 1549); 150 (21 Oct., 1551); 190 (3 June, 1552).
299. R. Peter, "Calvin and Louis Budé's Translation of the Psalms", in G.E. Duffield (ed.), John Calvin: A Collection of Distinguished Essays (Grand Rapids, 1966), 192.
300. cf. infra, Part IV, chapter one (ii).
301. Annales, 630.
302. Annales, 600; cf. also Register...op.cit., 305-307.
303. Register, 209.

304. Annales, 636.
305. Bétant, op.cit., 19.
306. Annales, 636.
307. ibid, 706.
308. ibid, 707.
309. ibid, 708.
310. Register, 341, (italics mine).
311. ibid, 343.
312. supra, N.289.
313. Annales, 717.
314. Taylor, op.cit., 173.
315. We should note that in the prolegomena to the Leges Academiae Genevensis (L'Ordre du Collège de Genève), penned by the secretary, Michel Roset, he makes reference to the "publicae et privatae scholae doctores" (scavans docteurs); cf. CO Xa:67,68. But the term doctores is obviously used here in a general sense, and not to describe any individual's public office or a personal title. Moreover, this term, as we have already pointed out, is not used in the actual text of the documents:
316. supra, Part III, chapter one, P. 151-153.
317. Farel, writing on behalf of the pastors of Geneva to the ministers at Lausanne (21 Nov., 1536) mentions the creation of colloquia: "Colloquia ereximus per Christum"; cf. CO Xb:73.
318. Herminjard, op.cit., IX:264-265; cf. also the entry in the Reg. du Conseil printed in Herminjard, op.cit., IX:263 N.1.
319. Register, 137ff.
320. Herminjard, op.cit. IX:264, "Aderant heri circiter sexaginta, cum in coetu Scriptura tractaretur".
321. Herminjard, op.cit., IX:262.
322. CO Xa:85. No mention is made in L'Ordre du Collège de Genève of the bacheliers being required to attend. In fact, they had classes scheduled for this time (7 a.m.).
323. This document, probably drawn up by William Whittingham at the beginning of 1556, is found in, Phoenix Reprints: Scarce and Curious Tracts (London, 1708) under "Calvin's Common-Prayer Book: or, The Service, Discipline and Form of the Sacraments used in the English Church of Geneva".

324. ibid, 213.
325. Register, 93, Friday 15 February, 1549: "It was decided by the brethren that henceforth any of the ministers who should speak after the expounder should also be severely censured if he should be in error; and this applied to the expounder also".
326. Henderson, op.cit., 67.
327. CO Xa:86.
328. Inst. IV.3.16, OS V:57.
329. CO Xa:69;70.
330. ibid, 81-82.
331. ibid, 81.
332. cf. supra, Part III, chapter three (II).
333. L'Ordre et maniere d'enseigner...op.cit. (no pagination).

PART FOUR

CHAPTER ONE

1. G.A. Taylor, John Calvin, The Teacher: The Correlation Between Instruction and Nurture within Calvin's Concept of Communion, (unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Duke University, 1953) p.125.
2. A good deal of work has already been done on Calvin's sermons, so we shall touch upon them only briefly here. Less work has been done on the lectures.
3. CO XXI, 58-59.
4. Register, 40.
5. Herminjard, op.cit., VIII, 79.
6. CO XXI, 302.
7. CO XXI, 457.
8. CO XXI, 66.
9. cf. G. Gagnein, "L'Histoire des Manuscrits des sermons de Calvin", in Supplementa Calviniana, V.II, XIV-XXVII.
10. CO XXVI, 473ff.
11. T.H.L. Parker, John Calvin: A Biography, 92-93.
12. cf. supra, Part II, chapter three, p.125-127.
13. cf. supra, Part III, chapter two (II).
14. Calvin's N.T. Commentaries; ed. D.W. Torrance and T.F. Torrance (Eerdmann's, Grand Rapids), for Romans, v.8, "John Calvin to Simon Grynaeus" (Dedicatory Epistle), 1.
15. CO Xa:91.
16. We know for certain that Calvin did not lecture on Romans after 1549 (cf. CO XXXI, 51-118). Assuming that he would have lectured on this book at some point in his career, then he must have done so between 1536-1549. It is possible that these lectures could have been given between 1541-1549, but our reasoning suggests that it is more probable that they were delivered between 1536-1539, that is, before the writing of the commentary.
17. Calvin's NT Commentaries, op.cit., Romans, V.8, p.2.
18. Rodolphe Peter [his address to the International Congress on Calvin Research, September, 1978, Amsterdam] believes

- that Calvin did lecture on Romans while, in Strasbourg. R. Mehl ("Calvin Professeur a la Haute-Ecole", Foi et Vie, V.39, 1938) is of the same opinion: It is "probable qu'il commenta les Romains" while teaching at Strasbourg. Herminjard shares this view (V.230, N.19): "Il est naturel de supposer qu'il les avait inaugurees [his lectures in Strasbourg] par l'interpretation de l'Épître aux Romains". None of these authors give any evidence for this supposition.
19. During the month of October, 1536, Calvin was absent from Geneva attending conferences at Lausanne and Bern (cf. Herminjard, op.cit., IV, 86-90). Not long after arriving in Geneva, Calvin was incapacitated for about ten days with catarrh (ibid, IV, 86).
 20. The earliest extant lectures by Calvin, recorded by his secretaries, are the ones on Hosea (1557). These, as well as all the others, show that this was indeed the method employed by the Reformer (cf. CO XXI, 51-118). There is no reason to doubt that he employed this same method from the start.
 21. The French refugee church was later transferred to the "chapelle de Penitentes" (now called Sainte-Madeleine). Near the end of Calvin's stay, the cite was moved again, this time to "le choeur des Dominicains"; cf. J. Pannier, Calvin à Strasbourg (Strasbourg, 1925).
 22. Herminjard, op.cit., 227.
 23. J.V. Pollet, "Bucer et l'École", in Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance, v.26 (1964), 560. Pollet notes that Bucer held only minor academic status ("bachelier biblique") in the "Haute-Ecole".
 24. By this time Hedion had joined the theology faculty, cf. Doumergue, op.cit., II, 429.
 25. At this time in its history, the educational programme at Strasbourg was in a totally different class from that in Geneva; the latter was by comparison strictly second rate. While the "Collège de Rive" was struggling to keep its doors open, Strasbourg had the reputation of being "la plus importante pépinière de prédicateurs pour toute l'Allemagne du Sud". (cf. Pannier, op.cit., 57). For a history of the early educational system in Strasbourg see, F. Wendel, L'Eglise de Strasbourg: Sa constitution et son organization, 1532-1535 (Paris, 1942).
 26. This number is deduced from two letters. In one, written by Calvin to Farel in January, 1539 (Herminjard, V, 230), the author remarks that he either lectures or preaches daily: "Nuper ad publicam professionem invitatus a Capitione protractus sum. Ita quotidie aut lego aut concionor." In another letter, written by Jean Zwick to Bullinger, on 9 November, 1538 (Herminjard, V, 145), the former notes that Calvin preaches four times a week: "Gallis Argentorati

- ecclesia data est, in qua a Calvino quater in septimana conciones audiunt, sed et coenam agunt et psalmos sua lingua canunt". It therefore follows that he must have lectured three times a week.
27. The "scholarques" were members of a supreme council (comprised of three men), elected from the three ruling councils in Strasbourg, who were responsible for the oversight of public instruction in the city. This council was first instituted by the magistrate on 9 February, 1526. It was established in order to fill the vacuum created by the exile of the bishop and his staff, who hitherto had supervised all education in Strasbourg. The first "scholarques" were Jacques Sturm, Nicolas Kniebis, and Jacques Meyer. In 1531-32, two "inspecteurs scolaires", called "visitatores", were added to this council - Gaspard Hédion, "docteur en theologie", and Jacques Bédrot, "maitre es arts". cf. Charles Engel, L'École Latine et l'Ancienne Académie de Strasbourg, 1538-1621, (Strasbourg, 1900).
 28. Herminjard, op.cit., V.231,n.19; also, Borgeaud, op.cit., 28,n.2. The text of the decision by the "scholarques" to hire Calvin as a lecturer is published in M.C. Schmidt, Vie de Jean Sturm, p.48, translated from the German; reprinted in Herminjard, op.cit., V,231.
 29. Jean Sturm, in his Quarti antipappi, p.20, says: "The first author that Calvin expounded was the gospel of John"; quoted in Doumergue, op.cit., II,434.
 30. Bédrot's letter to Myconius, 12 May, 1539 (Herminjard, op.cit., V,230,n.19): "Scholarchae nostri Calvinum stipendis conduxerunt, ut in theologia legat. Hodie itaque exordietur Epistolas ad Corinthios, quod felix et faustum sit!".
 31. Herminjard, op.cit., V,247ff.
 32. The document in question is reprinted in M. Fournier, Les Statuts et Privilèges des Universités Françaises, (Paris, 1894), t.IV: L'Université de Strasbourg et les Académies Protestantes Françaises, fascicule I: Gymnase, Académie, Université de Strasbourg, p.31, "Plan d'études du Gymnase"...1538-1539: "Joannes Calvinus ter in septimana legit in theologia, die Martis a secunda ad primam [sic]. Die Jovis 9-10 et die Sabati 2-3 et legit epistolam Pauli ad Philippenses".
 33. After October, 1540, Calvin's time at the lectern was severely curtailed by other responsibilities.
 34. Having lectured on Romans, then Corinthians, followed by Philippians, one might suppose that Calvin would have continued with the Pauline epistles. That he lectured on the gospel of John and not a Pauline epistle prior to his lectures on Corinthians was due, possibly, to the fact that he had not as yet been officially installed

- in his professorial post, and therefore decided to deal with a random NT book before beginning his official lecture course in the "Haute-Ecole".
35. Herminjard, op.cit.,VI,312 (Calvin à Farel, about the end of September,1540).
 36. Herminjard, op.cit.,VII,176 (Jean Calvin à Farel,July1541).
 37. Herminjard, op.cit.,VII,412.
 38. CO XXI,51-118. On at least two occasions, Calvin lectured on the NT (post 1559) while taking over for Beza (appointed lecturer in NT in 1559) who had to leave Geneva on church business. Calvin, of course, did not cease lecturing on the OT. cf. CO XLVI,213ff. (Calvin's letter to Colladon, 3 Oct.,1560); CO XLVII,197(Calvin's letter to the Queen of Navarre, 24 Dec.,1561).
 39. Since Calvin did not write commentaries on II and III John and Revelation, it is conceivable that he also omitted these books in his lectures.
 40. CO XXI,66: "Il preschoit d'ordinaire de deux sepmaines l'une tous les jours: il lisoit chacune sepmaine trois fois en Theologie...".
 41. Colladon consistently uses the term "leçon" to describe the ex tempore theology lectures which Calvin gave in the "auditoire" of Saint Pierre. He distinguishes these "leçons" from the Reformer's written "commentaires", worked out in his study, and his "sermons", delivered from the cathedral pulpit. The editors of the Calvin Translation Society confuse the issue when they refer to their translations of Calvin's "leçons" as "commentaries" (i.e. "Commentaries on the Twelve Minor Prophets"), even though the individual lectures are marked in the text. Jean Budé, in his Preface to the 1557 edition of Calvin's lectures on Hosea (Co XLII, Ioannes Budaeus Christianis Lectoribus S.), refers, at one point, to these lectures as "commentariorum genus" - it is significant that the editors of C.T.S. translate this simply as "commentaries". Budé more commonly employs the term "lectiones" or "praelectiones" as the Latin equivalent for the "leçons", as does Crispin (CO XLII, Ioannes Crispinus Christianis Lectoribus S.).
 42. CO XXI,70. Nicolas des Gallars, François Bourgoing, and Jean Cousin were the first to attempt this, but with little success. The main stenographers were Jean Budé and Charles de Jonviller. From the start, the audience at Calvin's lectures was comprised of "escoliers, Ministres et autres auditeurs" (ibid,71).
 43. Calvin's Dedicatory Epistle to King Gustavus (January, 1559), prefixed to the Calvin Translation Society (hereafter cited as CTS), Commentaries on the Twelve Minor Prophets, v.I, Hosea, (Edinburgh,1846).

44. CO XLII, Ioannes Budaeus Christianis Lectoribus S. (hereafter cited as Budaeus...).
45. CO XLII, Ioannes Crispinus Christianis Lectoribus S. (hereafter cited Crispinus...).
46. CO XLII, Ioannes Calvinus Christiano Lectori S.
47. ibid.
48. CO XXI,71. The reference to the "leçons" on Isaiah was the first entry in Colladon's biography regarding Calvin's lectures. The Reformer's biographer, a French refugee, first arrived in Geneva in 1550 which perhaps explains why he began his account at this date.
49. One would be hard pressed to suggest another book which the Reformer might have preferred to begin his OT lectures with, remembering that the lectures on Genesis came after those on Isaiah.
50. CO XXI,70.
51. CO XXI,72. Although Calvin himself confirms that des Gallars was indeed responsible for actually writing up the first edition of this commentary, the Reformer was, in fact, much more involved in its production than Colladon's words suggest. On 7 March, 1550, Calvin wrote to Francis Drylander: "You say that you are waiting for my meditations on Isaiah. They will come out soon. But they were written by des Gallars; for I do not have much time for writing. He takes down what I dictate to him, and after arranges it at home. Then I read it over again, and if anywhere he does not follow my meaning, I restore the sense". (CO XIII,536). The commentary on Isaiah was published in 1551.
52. CO XXI,75. Calvin also started to write his commentary on Genesis in 1550. It was not published until 1554.
53. CO XLII, Budaeus...
54. It was published in 1557.
55. CO XLII, Budaeus...
56. CO XXI,661.
57. CO XLII, Ioannes Calvinus Christiano Lectori S.
58. Of course, in addition to the lectures, Calvin continued to write (or dictate) commentaries on the OT (i.e. Genesis (1554), Psalms (1557), a second edition of Isaiah - Calvin's own, (1559), Harmony of the Pentateuch (1561), and Joshua, published posthumously in 1564).
59. The "leçons" on Hosea were published as a separate volume in 1557 (CO XXI,82). They were published again in the collected edition of the Minor Prophets (1559).

60. CO XXI, 87-88. Several people were present at the time and "icelles leçons recueillies de sa bouche ainsi que les autres".
61. In the same month (5 June, 1559), the Leges Academiae Genevensis were promulgated in a ceremony at Saint Pierre, thereby officially opening the new institution of higher learning in Geneva.
62. CO XXI, 89-90. These lectures were published in 1561, (ibid,91).
63. CO XXI, 90, 93, 96. Jeremiah and Lamentations were published in 1563, (ibid,95). In June, 1562, the location of Calvin's "auditoire" was moved from Saint Pierre to one of the older churches in Geneva at this time - Notre-Dame-la-Neuve, located directly across from the cathedral, (cf. Doumergue, op.cit., III, 344, n.2, who quotes the entry from the Registre).
64. CO XXI, 96.
65. ibid.
66. CO XLIII, Budaeus...Budé also describes Calvin's manner of lecturing as being "more in the scholastic than in the oratorical style".
67. CTS, op.cit., found on the page preceding the "Argument".
68. These prayers were not included in CO because the editors found them to be too repetitious! (cf. CO XXXVII, 580, n.1: "Precationes istas, utpote ubique sibi simillimas deinceps omittemus").

CHAPTER TWO

69. cf. supra, 233.
70. Comm. Acts 4:20; Comm. I Cor. 1:17; Comm. I Cor. 9:16; Comm. I Cor. 3:16.
71. Comm. Romans 12:6-7, CO XLIX, 239.
72. Comm. Acts 13:15, CO XLVIII, 288. cf. N.80.
73. Comm. I Thess. 2:12, CO LII, 150.
74. Inst. IV.3.4.
75. Comm. I Thess. 2:12, CO LII, 150.
76. Comm. Ephesians 4:11, CO LI, 198: "Teaching is the duty of all pastors; but there is a particular gift of interpreting Scripture, so that sound doctrine may be kept and a man may be a doctor who is not fitted to preach".
77. ibid., 197.

78. Comm. Matthew 28:19, CO XLV,821: "In Matthew the Apostles are told at first simply to teach (docere) but in Mark the type of teaching is specified, namely the preaching of the gospel (evangelium praedicit)".
79. Sermons de Deuteronomie, CO XXV,646.
80. Sermons sur la Seconde Épître à Timothée, CO LIV.
81. Inst., IV.7.8.
82. Comm. II Cor. 5:19, CO L,72.
83. Comm. Romans 10:15, CO XLIX,205.
84. ibid.,204.
85. Comm. II Cor. 5:18, CO L,70-71.
86. Comm. Luke 4:18, CO XLV,141. cf also Comm. Acts 13:2, CO, 279.
87. Comm. Romans 1:16, CO XLIX,19.
88. Comm. Leviticus 10:9, CO XXIV,453.
89. Comm. Hebrews 13:22, CO LV,198.
90. Inst., IV.1.9.
91. cf. Comm. Romans 1:4, CO XLIX,10; Comm. II Cor. 13:5, CO L,151; Comm. I Tim. 3:15, CO LII,288; Comm. John 17:20, CO XLVII,386; Inst. IV.1.5.
92. Comm. I Timothy 3:15, CO LII,288.
93. Inst. IV.11.1.
94. Sermon sur la Premier Épître à Timothée, CO LII,266. cf. also Comm. John 4:43, CO XLVII,98; Comm. Galatians 4:14, CO L,233: "Pastors...are the messengers of God by whose mouth God speaks to us"; Inst. IV.4.5; and Homilies on I Samuel, XLii, CO XXXIX, where Calvin says that prophets and pastors are "the very mouth of God".
95. Responsio ad Sadoleti Epistolam, OS I,477.
96. Comm. John 16:12, CO XLVII, 361.
97. cf. supra, Part I, chapter three (d.ii), and chapter four.
98. Comm. I Cor. 14:6, CO XLIX, 518-519.
99. ibid.
100. ibid.

101. Comm. I Cor. 12:10, CO XLIX, 500.
102. Comm. I Cor. 12:28, CO XLIX, 506.
103. Comm. Matthew 7:22, CO XLV, 228.
104. Comm. I Thess. 5:21, CO LII, 176.
105. ibid.
106. Comm. I Cor. 14:6, CO XLIX, 519.
107. Inst. I.13.3.
108. Comm. II Cor. 5:19, CO L, 72.
109. Comm. Jude 1:4, CO LV, 490.
110. Comm. I Cor. 14:16, CO XLIX, 523.
111. Comm. Eph. 1:8, CO LI, 150.
112. Comm. Acts 16:4, CO XLVIII, 372.
113. Comm. John 14:25, CO XLVII, 334: "Outward preaching will be useless and vain unless the teaching of the Spirit is added to it"., also: Comm. I John 4:1, CO LV, 346: "Unless the Spirit of Wisdom is present, there is little or no profit in having God's Word in our hands."
114. Comm. John 14:25, CO XLVII, 334.
115. Comm. II Cor. 3:6, CO L, 39.
116. Comm. II Cor. 3:6, CO L, 40: "When Paul calls himself a minister of the Spirit, he does not mean that the grace and power of the Holy Spirit are so bound to his preaching that he could, whenever he wished, breathe out the Spirit along with the words that he spoke."
117. Comm. I Thess. 5:21, CO LII, 177.
118. Comm. I Cor. 14:29, CO XLIX, 529.
119. Comm. I John 4:1, CO LV, 346.
120. Comm. Matthew 4:12, CO XLV, 138.
121. Comm. Matthew 16:20, CO XLV, 479.
122. Comm. Matthew 10:10, CO XLV, 277.
123. Comm. Galatians 3:1, CO L, 202.
124. Comm. I Thess. 2:12, CO LII; 150. cf. also Sermons sur L'Épître aux Corinthiens, CO XLIX, 614: "Si un homme, quand il monte en chaire, expose seulement l'écriture sainte, et qu'il n'ait point esgard à ce qui sera pour le profit commun de ceux auquel il parle, et ne scache

comment il les doit edifier: c'est une chose morte, il n'y a pas grande utilité. Que fait-il donc? Que ceux qui ont la charge d'enseigner a visent bien quand le peuple sera entanché de quelque mal et corruption, d'y parvenir et s'adresser là."

125. Sermons sur L'Epitre aux Ephesians, CO LI,783.
126. Comm. John 1:45, CO XLVII,33.
127. Comm. Hebrews 4:12, CO LV, 51-52: "The noun soul often means the same as spirit, but when they are both joined together the former includes all the affections, while the latter indicates the faculty which they call the intellect...
Now let us come to the passage we are considering. God's Word pierces to the dividing of soul and spirit.. That means that it tests the whole soul of man. It inquires into his thoughts and it searches his will and all his desires...This is what Paul says in I Cor. 14:24, that prophecy [i.e. preaching] has the power of convicting and judging men so that the secrets of the heart are made manifest."
128. Comm. Acts 26:22, CO XLVIII,545.
129. Comm. Acts 20:21, CO XLVIII,462.
130. Comm. John 20:23, CO XLVII,440.
131. Comm. I Cor. 12:3, CO XLIX,497.
132. Comm. I Cor. 4:20, CO XLIX,375.
133. Inst. II.4.5.
134. Inst. IV.4., "Teachers are not put in charge of...warnings and exhortations."
135. Exhortation, according to Calvin, includes within it "encouraging", "consoling" and "admonishing", cf. Comm. I Thess. 2:12, CO LII,150.
136. Inst. I.2.1.
137. Comm. Jeremiah 10:25, CO XXXVIII,94.
138. Comm. Acts 18:22, CO XLVIII,435.
139. Inst. I.2.1.
140. ibid.
141. Inst. III.2.28.
142. Comm. Psalms 119:78, CO XXXII,249.
143. Inst., I.2.2.
144. Comm. Psalms 119:73ff., CO XXXII,249.

145. Inst. II.6.4.: "Let the first step toward piety be to know (agnoscere) that God is our father..."
146. cf. Comm. Romans 10:14, CO XLIX,204; Comm. II Cor. 13:5, CO L,151; Comm. I Tim. 3:15, CO LII,287; Comm. John 17:20, CO XLVII,386; Inst.,IV.1.5.
147. Inst. III.2.5.: "We may call that faith implicit which is still strictly nothing but the preparation of faith."
148. ibid.
149. ibid.
150. Inst., II.2.32.
151. Inst., III.2.33.
152. cf. Comm. Genesis 15:1, CO XXIII,206; Comm. Jeremiah 1:3, CO XXXVII,485; Comm. Galatians 3:1, CO L,201; Comm. I Cor. 3:12, CO XLIX,355: "We must pay attention to the order of doing things, so that a start may be made with general doctrine (generalis doctrina) and the more essential of the chief points as the foundation. After that there follows reproof, exhortations and whatever is necessary for perseverance, strengthening and progress." cf. also, Comm. II Corinthians 6:1, CO L, 75: "Ministers of the Gospel...It is not enough to teach (docere) if you do not also urge (urgeas). For the teaching of the gospel is assisted by exhortations that it may not lack effect...Here ministers are taught that it is not enough merely to propound doctrine (non sufficere si doctrina simpliciter proponant).
153. Comm. Ephesians 1:13, CO LI,146: "The beginning of faith is knowledge."
154. Comm. John 6:69, CO XLVII,163: "Faith is the beginning of true understanding."
155. Comm. John 10:38, CO XLVII,254.
156. cf. Inst. III.2.3. The word notitia is not consistently used by the Reformer to describe the preparatory knowledge.
157. Comm. John 3:2, CO XLVII,53.
158. Inst. I.2.1.
159. Comm. Romans 1:20, CO XLIX,24. cf. also T.H.L. Parker, Calvin's Doctrine of the Knowledge of God (Grand Rapids), appendix, p.121.
160. Comm. Matthew 15:22, CO XLV, 456-457.
161. Comm. Titus 2:1, CO LII,418.
162. Comm. Ephesians 4:5, CO LI,191: "I have been content to point out the apostle's meaning briefly and leave the fuller treatment to my sermons", (plenam tractationem concionibus relinquo).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources and Reference Works

- Annales Calviniani (Relevant extracts from the Registre du Conseil de Genève), in Ioannis Calvinii Opera quae supersunt omnia, v.XXI, pp., 189-818.
- Aquinas, T., Divi Thomae Aquinatis doctoris angelici ordinis praedicatorum opera editio altera veneta, tome 19, for "Contra impugnantes dei cultum et religionem", (1787).
- _____, Quaestiones Disputatae, v. I, : De Veritate, ed. by R. Spiazzi, 8th ed., Turin-Rome, 1949.
- _____, Quaestiones Quodlibetales, ed. by R. Spiazzi, 8th ed., Rome, 1949.
- _____, Sancti Thomae Aquinatis doctoris angelici opera omnia iussu impensaue Leonis XIII, 15 v., Romae, 1882-1930.
- _____, Scriptum Super Sententius, ed. by M.F. Moos, Paris, 1947.
- _____, Summa Theologiae, ed. by T. Gilby, 60 vols., London-New York, 1964.
- Augustine, A., Confessions and Enchiridion, tr. and ed. by A.C. Outler, Philadelphia, 1955 (The Library of Christian Classics, v.7).
- _____, De doctrina christiana libri quattuor, Recensuit et praefatus est G.M. Green, Vindobonae, 1963 (Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum Latinorum, v. 80).
- _____, On Christian Doctrine, tr. by D.W. Robertson, New York, 1958.
- _____, The Works of Aurelius Augustine, 15v., ed. and tr. by M. Dods, Edinburgh, 1872-1897.
- Baker, D., and Cuming, G.J. (eds.), Studies in Church History: Councils and Assemblies, Cambridge, 1971.

- Bettenson, H. (ed.), The Early Christian Fathers, London, 1969.
- _____, (ed.), The Later Christian Fathers, London, 1970.
- Béza, T., Du droit des magistrats, Genève, 1970.
- Béza, T., Histoire ecclésiastique des églises réformées : au royaume de France, 3 tomes, Paris, 1833-1889.
- Béza, T., Ioannis Calvinii Vita in Calvinii Epistolae et Responsa, Geneva, 1575 (COXXI, 119-72).
- Bonaventure, Doctoris sersphici S. Bonaventure, opera omnia, v. II, ed. by P.P. Collegii A S. Bonaventure, (1885).
- Calvin, J. Calvin's Commentaries, ed. by D.W. Torrance and T.F. Torrance (various translators), 3rd ed., Edinburgh, 1972 (New Testament Commentaries).
- _____, Calvin : Theological Treatises, tr. and ed. by J.K.S. Reid, Philadelphia, 1954 (Library of Christian Classics).
- _____, Institution de la religion chrestienne (1541), 4 tome, edit. J. Pannier, Paris, 1936.
- _____, Institution of the Christian Religion, translation of Christianae religionis institutio... published in 1536, tr. by F.L. Battles, Atlanta, 1975.
- _____, Institutes of the Christian Religion 2 vols., ed. J.T. McNeill; tr. by F.L. Battles, 7th ed., Philadelphia, 1975.
- _____, Instruction in the Faith (1537), tr. by P.T. Fuhrman, Philadelphia, 1949.
- _____, Ioannis Calvinii Opera quae supersunt omnia, vols., 1-59, edit. G. Baum, E. Cunitz, E. Reuss. Corpus Reformatorum, vols. 29-87, Brunsvigae, 1863-1900.
- _____, Joannis Calvinii, Opera Selecta, edit. P. Barth, München, 1926.
- _____, John Calvin's Sermons on the Ten Commandments, ed. and tr. by B.W. Farley, GrandRapids, 1980.
- _____, The Letters of John Calvin, vols. 1-2; tr. by Constable. vols 3-4; tr. by M.R. Gilchrist; ed. by J. Bonnet, Philadelphia, 1855-1858.
- _____, Sermons on Isaiah's Prophecy of the Death and Passion of Christ, tr. and ed. by T.H.L. Parker, London, 1956.

- Calvin, J., Supplementa Calviniana. Sermons inédits, 7 v., Neukirchen, 1936.
- _____, Tracts Relating to the Reformation, 3 vols., tr. by H. Beveridge, Edinburgh, 1844-1851.
- _____, The Works of John Calvin, tr. by The Calvin Translation Society, Edinburgh, 1843-1855.
- The Catholic Encyclopedia, 15 vols., New York, 1909.
- Chatelain, E., and Denifle, H., (eds.), Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis, 4 vols., Paris, 1889-1897.
- Clemens, Titus Flavius, Alexandrinus, Clementis Alexandrini opera, 4 v., Ex recensione G. Dindorfii, Oxonii, 1869.
- Clement of Alexandria, The Writings of Clement of Alexandria, tr. by W. Wilson, Ante-Nicene Christian Library v. 4, Edinburgh, 1867.
- Colladon, N., Commentaires de M. Jean Calvin sur le livre de Iosué. Avec une Preface de Theodore Besze, contenant en brief l'histoire de la vie et mort d'iceluy. Genève, 1565 (CO, XXI, 51-118).
- Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum, Editum consilio et impensis Academiae litterarum caesareae vindobonensis..., Vindobona, (1866-).
- Dictionnaire de Theologie Catholique, vol. IV, Paris, 1924.
- Dufour, C., and Meylan, H. (eds.) Correspondance de Théodore de Bèze, 8 v., Genève, 1976.
- Eusebius, The Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius Pamphilus, tr. by C.F. Crusé, 12 ed., Philadelphia, 1860.
- _____, Historia Ecclesiastica, Graece et Latine, in tres tomos...Cambridge, 1720.

- Fatio, O., and Labarthe, O., (eds.), Registres de la compagnie des pasteurs de Genève, tome III, 1565-1574, Genève, 1969.
- Fournier, M., and Engel C., (eds.) Gymnase, Académie et Université de Strasbourg, 1525-1621, fasc. I, "Les statuts", Paris et Strasbourg, 1894.
- Haag, E. and Haag, E., (eds.), La France protestante ou vies des Protestants Français, 10 tomes, Paris, 1846-1858.
- Herminjard, A.L. (ed.), Correspondance des reformateurs dans les pays de langue française, 9 tomes, Paris, 1878-1897.
- Heyer, H., Catalogue des thèses de théologie soutenues à l'Académie de Genève pendant les XVI, XVII, et XVIII siècles, Genève, 1898.
- Huguet, E.E.A., Dictionnaire de la langue française du seizième siècle, 7 vols., Paris, 1925-67.
- Justin Martyr, The Writings of Justin Martyr, tr. by M. Dods, G. Reith, and B.P. Pratten, Ante-Nicene Christian Library, v. II, Edinburgh, 1867.
- Kidd, B.J., Documents Illustrative of the Continental Reformation, Oxford, 1911.
- Kittel, G., and Friedrich, G. (eds.) Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, 10 v., Grand Rapids, 1964-1976.
- Laing, D., The Works of John Knox, vol.4, Edinburgh, 1855.
- Le Livre du Recteur : Catalogue des étudiants de l'Académie de Genève, 1559 - 1859, Genève, 1860.

Luther, M. Luther's Works, 55 vols., ed. by J. Pelikan and H.T. Lehmann, 2nd printing, Philadelphia, 1973.

Mansi, G.D., Sacrorum Conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio, ed. by P. Labbé and G. Cossart.

Melancthon, P., Philippi Melanthonis Opera quae Supersunt Omnia (Corpus Reformatorum) 28v., edidit C.G. Bretschneider, Halis Saxonum, 1834-60.

de Meyer, A. (ed.), Miscellanea Historica, vol.I, Louvain, 1946.

Monumenta Germaniae historica...t.1-32, Hannoverae, 1826-1934.

The New Catholic Encyclopedia, New York, 1967.

Olin, J.C. (ed.), A Reformation Debate : Sadoleto's Letter to the Genevans and Calvin's Reply, 2nd ed., Grand Rapids, 1976.

L'Ordre du College et leges Academiae Genevensis, ed. by C. Lefast, Genève, 1859.

Origen, Commentaire sur l'évangile selon Matthieu, tr. by R. Girod, Paris, 1970.

_____, Homélie sur les nombres, tr. by A. Méhat, Paris, 1951.

_____, Opera omnia, 7 v. edidit A.B. Caillau et M.N.S. Guillon, Parisiis, 1829.

Patrologiae cursus completus...Series latina... Accurante J.P.Migne, 222v., Parisiis, 1844-1890.

Peter, R., Jean Calvin : Deux Congrégations et Exposition du Catéchisme. Première réimpression de l'édition de 1563 avec une introduction et des notes, presses Universitaires de France, 1964.

Phoenix Reprints (Scarce and Curious Tracts) Calvin's Common-Prayer Book, or, the Service, Discipline and Form of the Common-Prayers, and Administration of the Sacraments used in the English Church of Geneva, London, 1708.

Quasten, J., Patrology, vol.II, Westminster, Md., 1953.

Ramée, Pierre de la, Advertissement sur la réformation de l'Université de Paris au Roy (1562) tome.5, dans le series, Archives curieuses de l'histoire de France, Paris, 1835.

Registre du Conseil de Genève, see Annales Calviniani.

Registres de la compagnie des pasteurs de Genève au temps de Calvin, 3 vols., ed. R.M. Kingdon and J.-F. Bergier, Genève, 1962, 1964, 1969.

The Register of the Company of Pastors of Geneva in the Time of Calvin, ed. and tr. by P.E. Hughes, Grand Rapids, 1966.

Roset, M., Les chroniques de Genève, ed. by H. Fazy, Genève, 1894.

Schaff, P., The Creeds of Christendom, 3 vols., 4th edition, New York, 1919.

Schroeder, H.J., Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent, St. Louis-London, 1941.

Vorgrimler, H. (ed.), Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II, vol.IV, New York, 1969.

Walter Steuart of Pardovan (ed.), Collection and Observation... Concerning the Worship, Discipline and Government of the Church of Scotland, 4 bks., Aberdeen, 1802.

Wyclif, J. Latin Works, 22v., London, The Wyclif Society, 1883-1922.

Secondary Sources : Books

Ainslie, J.L., The Doctrine of Ministerial Order in the Reformed Churches of the 16th and 17th Centuries, Edinburgh, 1940.

Ainsworth, A.D., The Relation Between Church and State in the City of Geneva, Atlanta, 1965.

d'Alès, A., La Théologie de Saint Cyprien, Paris, 1922.

Bainton, R.H., The Reformation of the Sixteenth Century, Boston, 1952.

_____, Studies on the Reformation, Boston, 1963.

Baird, H.M., Theodore Beza: The Counsellor of the French Reformation, London, 1899.

Barnard, H.C., The French Tradition in Education, Cambridge, 1922.

Barnard, L.W., Justin Martyr; His Life and Thought, London-Cambridge, 1967.

Barnes, T.D., Tertullian: A Historical and Literary Study, Oxford, 1971.

Battles, F.L., The Piety of John Calvin: An Anthology Illustrative of the Spirituality of the Reformer, Grand Rapids, 1978.

Bavinck, H., Gereformeerde Dogmatiek, 4 dln., 3 ed., ed. by J.H. Kok, Kampen, 1918.

_____, Het Doctorenambt Kampen, 1899.

- Benoit, J.D., Calvin: Directeur d'Ames, Strasbourg-Oberlin, 1944.
- _____, Direction spirituelle et Protestantism. Etude sur la légitimité d'une direction protestante, Paris, 1940.
- Bernstein, A.E., Pierre d'Ailly and The Blanchard Affair, Leiden, 1978 (Studies in Medieval and Reformation Thought, v.24).
- Bétant, E.-A., Notice sur le Collège de Rive, Genève, 1866.
- Biéler, A., The Social Humanism of John Calvin, tr. by P.T. Fuhrmann, Richmond, 1964.
- Binns, L.E., The Reformers and the Bible, Cambridge, 1923.
- Black, A., Monarchy and Community: Political Ideas in the Later Conciliar Controversy 1430-1450, Cambridge, 1970.
- Bodin, Y., Saint Jérôme et l'Eglise, Paris, 1966.
- Boehmer, H., Luther and the Reformation in the Light of Modern Research, London, 1930.
- _____, Martin Luther: Road to Reformation, tr. by J.W. Doberstein and G. Tappert, London, 1957.
- Borgeaud, C., Histoire de la Université de Genève, tome I: l'Académie de Calvin, 1559-1798, Genève, 1900.
- Bornkamm, H., Luther's World of Thought, tr. by M.H. Bertram, St. Louis, 1958.
- Bourchemin, D.-P., Etude sur les Académies protestantes en France au XVI et Au XVII siècle, Paris, 1882.

- Bouvier, A., La Compagnie des Pasteurs de Genève (Esquisse de son histoire depuis l'origine jusqu'à à maintenant), Genève, 1878.
- Boyd, W., The History of Western Education, 7th ed., London, 1964.
- Bratt, J.H. (ed.), The Heritage of John Calvin, Grand Rapids, 1973.
- Breen, Q., John Calvin: A Study in French Humanism, Grand Rapids, 1932.
- Brockhaus, U., Charisma und Amt, 2nd ed., Wuppertal, 1975.
- Brown, P., Augustine of Hippo London, 1967.
- Buisson, F., Sebastien Castellion: sa vie et son oeuvre (1515-1563), 2 vols., Paris, 1892.
- Cadiou, R., La jeunesse d'Origène, Paris, 1935.
- von Campenhausen, H., Ecclesiastical Authority and Spiritual Power in the Church of the First Three Centuries, London, 1969.
- Chenevière, M.-E., La pensée politique de Calvin, Genève, 1970.
- Chenu, M.-D., Toward Understanding Saint Thomas, tr. by A.-M. Landry and D. Hughes, Chicago, 1964.
- Choisy, E., La théocratie à Genève au temps de Calvin, Genève, 1897.
- Clarke, M.L., Higher Education in the Ancient World, London, 1971.
- Clebsch, W.A., Pastoral Care in Historical Perspective, London, 1964.

- Cobban, A.B., The Medieval Universities: Their Development and Organization, London, 1975.
- Congar, Y.M.-J., Lay People in the Church, tr. by D. Attwater, London, 1965.
- _____, L'ecclesiologie du Haut Moyen Age, Paris, 1968.
- _____, Vraie et fausse réforme dans l'église, Paris, 1950.
- Copleston, F.C., A History of Medieval Philosophy, London, 1972.
- Le Coultre, J., Maturin Cordier et les origines de la pédagogie protestante dans les pays de langue française (1530-1564), Neuchâtel, 1926.
- Courvoisier, J., La notion de l'église chez Bucer dans son développement historique, Paris, 1938.
- Dakin, A., Calvinism, London, 1941.
- Daniélou, J., Origène, Paris, 1948.
- Dargan, E.C., A History of Preaching, New York, 1905.
- Davies, R.E., The Problem of Authority in the Continental Reformers, London, 1946.
- Dawson, C.H., The Dividing of Christendom, New York, 1965.
- Deanesley, M., A History of the Medieval Church, London, 1925.
- Dickens, A.G., The English Reformation, New York, 1974.
- Dodd, C.H., The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments, London, 1936.

- Douglass, E.J.D., Justification in Late Medieval Preaching, Leiden, 1966.
- Doumergue, E., Jean Calvin, les hommes et les choses de son temps, 7 vols., Lausanne, 1899-1927.
- Dowey, E.A., The Knowledge of God in Calvin's Theology, New York, 1952.
- Duchesne, L., Origines du culte chrétien, étude sur la liturgie Latine avant Charlemagne, 5e éd., Paris, 1925.
- Duffield, G.E., (ed.), John Calvin : A Collection of Distinguished Essays, Grand Rapids, 1966.
- Dufour, A., La foundation du Collège de Genève et l'histoire de l'education : Le Collège de Genève, 1559-1959, Genève, 1959.
- Dunn, J.D.G., Jesus and the Spirit, London, 1975.
- Eastwood, C., The Priesthood of all Believers (An Examination of the Doctrine from the Reformation to the Present Day, London, 1960.
- Ellspermann, C.L., The Attitude of the Early Fathers Towards Pagan Literature and Learning, Washington, 1949.
- Empie, P.C., and Murphy, T.A., (eds.), Teaching Authority and Infallibility in the Church, Minneapolis, 1978.
- Engel, C., L'école latine et l'ancienne Académie de Strasbourg (1538 - 1621), Strasbourg, 1900.
- Van Den Eynde, D., Les normes de l'enseignement chrétien dans la littérature patristique des trois premiers siècles, Paris, 1933.

- Farr, W., John Wyclif as Legal Reformer, Leiden, 1974.
- De Faye, E., Clément d'Alexandrie, Paris, 1906.
- Fazy, H., L'instruction primaire à Genève, Genève, 1896.
- Fedwick, P.J., The Church and the Charisma of Leadership in Basil of Caesarea, Toronto, 1979.
- Forstman, H.J., Word and Spirit : Calvin's Doctrine of Biblical Authority, Stanford, 1962.
- Forsyth, P.T., Positive Preaching and the Modern Mind, London, 1953.
- Fraenkel, P., Testimonia Patrum, Geneva, 1961.
- Gabarel, J.P., Histoire de l'église de Genève : depuis le commencement de la réformation jusqu'à nos jours, 3 tomes, Genève, 1858.
- Ganoczy, A., Calvin : Théologien de l'église et du ministère, Paris, 1964.
- Geisendorf, P.-F., Théodore de Bèze, Genève, 1967.
- _____, L'université de Genève : 1559-1959, Genève, 1959.
- Gilbert, N.W., Renaissance Concepts of Method, New York, 1960.
- Gilson, E., History of Chirstian Philosophy in the Middle Ages, New York, 1955.
- _____, Les ideés et les lettres, Paris, 1955.

- Graham, F.W., The Constructive Revolutionary, Richmond, 1971.
- Graves, F.P., Peter Ramus and the Educational Reformation of the Sixteenth Century, New York, 1912.
- Greenslade, S.L., Early Latin Theology, Philadelphia, 1956.
(The Library of Christian Classics, v.5).
- Greeves, F., Theology and the Cure of Souls, London, 1960.
- Harbison, E.H., The Christian Scholar in the Age of the Reformation, New York, 1956.
- Harkness, G., John Calvin : The Man and his Ethics, Nashville, 1931.
- Harnack, A., Sources of the Apostolic Canons, London, 1895.
- Haskins, C.H., The Rise of the Universities, New York, 1923.
- Heer, F., The Medieval World, tr. by J. Sondheimer, New York, 1961.
- Henderson, R.W., The Teaching Office in the Reformed Tradition, Philadelphia, 1962.
- Heppe, H.L.J., Reformed Dogmatics tr. by G.T. Thomson, London, 1950.
- Heyer, H., L'église de Genève 1535-1909. Esquisse historique de son organisation, Genève, 1909.

- Holmberg, B., Paul and Power : The Structure of Authority in the Primitive Church as Reflected in the Pauline Epistles, Coniectanea Biblica, Sweden, 1978.
- Hoogstra, J., John Calvin, Contemporary Prophet, Grand Rapids, 1959.
- Howie, G., Educational Theory and Practice in St. Augustin, London, 1969.
- Hunt, C.R.N., John Calvin, London, 1933.
- Hunter, A.M., The Teaching of Calvin, Glascow, 1950.
- Jansen, J.F., Calvin's Doctrine of the Work of Christ, London, 1956.
- Jeffreys, M.V.C., Education : Christian or Pagan, London, 1946.
- Jenkins, D., The Gift of Ministry, London, 1947.
- Kampschulte, F.W., Johann Calvin seine kirche und sein staat in Genf, v.1, Leipzig, 1869.
- Kingdon, R.M., Geneva and the Coming of the Wars of Religion: 1555 - 1563, Geneve, 1956.
- Knapp, P.A., The Style of John Wyclif's English Sermons, The Hague-Paris, 1977.
- Knappen, M.M., Tudor Puritanism, Chicago, 1939.
- Knowles, D., The Evolution of Medieval Thought, London, 1962.

- Kristeller, P.O., Medieval Aspects of Renaissance Learning, Durham, N.C., 1974.
- Kuiper, H., Calvin on Common Grace, Grand Rapids, 1930.
- De Lagarde, G., La naissance de l'esprit laïque au déclin du moyen âge, v.1: bilan du XIIIe siècle, 3rd ed., Paris - Louvain, 1956.
- Lamirande, E., Etudes sur l'ecclésiologie de Saint Augustin, Ottawa, 1966.
- Leff, G., Paris and Oxford Universities in the 13th and 14th Centuries, New York, 1968.
- Lemaire, A., Les ministères aux origines de l'église. Naissance de la triple hiérarchie : Evêques, Presbyters, Diacres, Paris, 1971.
- Lindsay, T.M., The Church and the Ministry in the Early Centuries, London, 1902.
- MacGregor, G., Corpus Christi : The Nature of the Church According to the Reformed Tradition, Philadelphia, 1958.
- Mandonnet, P., Saint Dominique : l'idée, l'homme et l'oeuvre, Paris, 1937.
- Marrou, H.I., S. Augustine et la fin de la culture antique, Paris, 1938.
- _____, A History of Education in Antiquity, tr. by G. Lamb, New York, 1964.
- Martin, C., Les protestants anglais réfugiés à Genève au temps de Calvin (1555-1560), Genève, 1915.

- Maruyama, T., The Reform of the True Church : The Ecclesiology of Theodore Beza, Genève, 1978.
- McDonnell, K., John Calvin, the Church and the Eucharist, Princeton, 1967.
- McNeill, J.T., (ed.), The History and Character of Calvinism, New York, 1954.
- _____, A History of the Cure of Souls, London, 1954.
- _____, John Calvin on the Christian Faith, New York, 1957.
- De Mendieta, E.A., The "Unwritten" and "Secret" Apostolic Traditions in the Theological Thought of St. Basil of Caesarea, Edinburgh, 1965.
- Milner, B.C., Calvin's Doctrine of the Church, Leiden, 1970.
- Monter, E., Calvin's Geneva, New York, 1967.
- Mounce, R.H., The Essential Nature of New Testament Preaching, Grand Rapids, 1960.
- Naef, H., La Conjuration d'Amboise et Genève, Genève, 1922.
- _____, Les origines de la réforme à Genève, vol.1, Genève, 1968.
- Neill, S. and Weber, H.R., (eds.), The Layman in Christian History, London, 1963.
- Niebuhr, H.R., The Ministry in Historical Perspective, New York, 1956.
- Niesel, W., The Theology of Calvin, tr. by H. Knight, London, 1956.

- Nixon, L., John Calvin : Expository Preacher, Grand Rapids, 1950.
- Oberman H.A., Archbishop Thomas Bradwardine : A Fourteenth Century Augustinian, Utrecht, 1957.
- _____, Christianity Divided, London, 1962.
- _____, The Harvest of Medieval Theology, Grand Rapids, 1967.
- Owst, G.R., Preaching in Medieval England, Cambridge, 1924.
- Pannier, J., Calvin et l'episcopat, Strasbourg, 1927.
- _____, Calvin à Strasbourg, Strasbourg-Paris, 1925.
- Paquet, J., (ed.), Les universités à la fin du mōyen âge, Louvain, 1978.
- Parker, T.H.L., Calvin's Doctrine of the Knowledge of God, Edinburgh, 1953.
- _____, John Calvin : A Biography, London, 1975.
- _____, The Oracles of God : An Introduction to the Preaching of John Calvin, London, 1947.
- _____, Portrait of Calvin, London, 1954.
- Partee, C., Calvin and Classical Philosophy, Leiden, 1977.
- Pascoe, L.B., Jean Gerson : Principles of Church Reform, Leiden, 1973.
- Pauck, W., The Heritage of the Reformation, London, 1968.
- Paulin, A., Saint Cyrille de Jérusalem catéchète, Paris, 1959.

- Pearcy, H.R., The Meaning of the Church in the Thought of Calvin, Chicago, 1941.
- Pelikan, J., Luther the Expositor, St. Louis, 1959.
- Persson, P.E., Sacra Doctrina : Reason and Revelation in Aquinas, tr. by R. MacKenzie, Oxford, 1957.
- Petry, R.C., Preaching in the Great Tradition : Neglected Chapters in the History of Preaching, Philadelphia, 1949.
- Plagnieux, J., Saint Grégoire de Nazianze théologien, Paris, 1951.
- Polman, A.D.R., The Word of God According to St. Augustine, London, 1961.
- Prenter, R., Spiritus Creator, tr. by J.M. Jensen, Philadelphia, 1953.
- Preuss, H., M. Luther. Der Prophet, Gütersloh, 1933.
- Quistorp, H., Calvin's Doctrine of the Last Things, London, 1955.
- Rahner, K., Theological Investigations, v.14, "The Dispute Concerning the Church's Teaching Office", London, 1976.
- Rashdall, H., The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages, 3 vols., a new edition, F.M. Powicke and A.B. Emden (eds.), London, 1936.
- Reid, J.K.S., The Authority of Scripture, London, 1957.
- Reyburn, H.Y., John Calvin : His Life, Letters and Work, London, 1914.

- Richard, J.W., Philip Melanchthon : The Protestant Preceptor of Germany, New York, 1974.
- Richard, L., The Spirituality of John Calvin, Atlanta, 1974.
- Roget, A., Histoire du peuple de Genève depuis la réforme jusqu'à l'escalade, 7 vols., Genève, 1870-1883.
- _____, L'église et l'état à Genève du vivant de Calvin, Genève, 1867.
- Rolston, H., John Calvin Versus the Westminster Confession, Richmond, 1972.
- Schwartz, W., Principles and Problems of Biblical Translation. Some Reformation Controversies and Their Background, Cambridge, 1970.
- Schweizer, E., Church Order in the New Testament, London, 1959.
- Smalley, B., The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages, 2nd edition, Oxford, 1952.
- Smart, J.D., The Teaching Ministry of the Church, Philadelphia, 1954.
- Smith, P., The Life and Letters of Martin Luther, Boston, 1914.
- Stephens, W.P., The Holy Spirit in the Theology of Martin Bucer, Cambridge, 1970.
- Stuermann, W., A Critical Study of Calvin's Concept of Faith, Tulsa, 1952.
- Taylor, G.A., John Calvin, the Teacher : The Correlation Between Instruction and Nurture within Calvin's Concept of Communion, Duke University Ph.D. Thesis (unpublished) 1953.

- Thurot, C., De l'organisation de l'enseignement dans l'université de Paris au moyen-âge, Paris, 1850.
- Tilley, A., The Literature of the French Renaissance, vol.I, New York, 1959.
- Torrance, T.F., Calvin's Doctrine of Man, London, 1949.
- _____, Kingdom and Church, Edinburgh, 1956.
- _____, The School of Faith, London, 1959.
- De Vooght, P., Les sources de la doctrine chrétienne d'après les théologiens du XIVE siècle et du début du XVe, Paris, 1954.
- Vuilleumier, H., Histoire de l'église réformée du pays de Vaud sous le régime Bernois, vol.IV, Lausanne, 1933.
- Walker, W., John Calvin : The Organizer of Reformed Protestantism, 1509 - 1564, New York, 1906.
- Wallace, R.S., Calvin's Doctrine of the Christian Life, London, 1959.
- _____, Calvin's Doctrine of the Word and Sacrament, Edinburgh, 1953.
- Walwood, J.F. (ed.), Inspiration and Interpretation, Grand Rapids, 1957.
- Warfield, B.B., Calvin and Augustine, Philadelphia, 1956.
- _____, Calvin and Calvinism, New York, 1931.
- Wendel, F., Calvin : The Origins and Development of his Religious Thought, 6th edition, tr. by P. Mairet, London, 1974.

Wendel, F., L'église de Strasbourg : sa constitution et son organization, 1532 -1535, Paris, 1942.

Willis, E.D., Calvin's Catholic Christology, Leiden, 1966.

Woodward, Education During the Renaissance, Cambridge, 1906.

Workman, H.B., John Wyclif : A Study of the English Medieval Church, vol.II, Oxford, 1926.

Zweig, S., The Right to Heresy : Castellio Against Calvin, tr. by E. and C. Paul, New York, 1936.

Secondary Sources : Articles

Aubert, H.-V., "Nicholas Colladon et les registres de la compagnie des pasteurs et professors", Bulletin : Société d'histoire et d'archéologie de Genève, II (1898).

Bardy, G. "Aux origines de l'école d'Alexandrie", Recherches et science religieuse, (1937), 65-95.

_____, "Les écoles romaines au second siècle", Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique, 28 (1932).

_____, "L'église et l'enseignement au IVe siècle", Revue des sciences religieuses de Strasbourg, 14(1934), 539-541.

_____, "L'église et l'enseignement pendant les trois premiers siècles", Revue des sciences religieuses de Strasbourg, 13(1932), 1-28.

_____, "La littérature patristique des questions et responsiones sur l'écriture sainte", Revue biblique, 41 (1932).

Bouttier, M., "Les diverses formes du ministère de docteur", Foi et vie, (April, 1957), 419-429.

- Le Bras, G., "Paris, seconde capitale de la chretienté", Revue histoire église de France, 37 (1951), 5-17.
- _____, "Velut splendor firmamenti: Le docteur dans le droit de l'église médiéval", in Melanges offerts à Etienne Gilson de l'académie française, (Toronto-Paris, 1959), 373-387.
- Breen, Q., "John Calvin and the Rhetorical Tradition", Church History, 26 (March, 1957), 3-21.
- Bulman, J.M., "The Place of Knowledge in Calvin's View of Faith", Review and Expositor, 50 (1953), 323-329.
- Cadier, J., "Calvin Educateur", Foi-education, 25 (1965).
- Cellerier, J.E., "L'académie de Genève : esquisse d'une histoire abrégée de cette académie, pendant les trois premières époques de son existence: 1559-1798", Bulletin de la societe de l'histoire du protestantisme française, (1856).
- Ciappi, L., "Crisis of the Magisterium, Crisis of Faith", The Thomist, 32 (1968), 147-170.
- Congar, Y., "Bref historique des formes du magistère et de ses relations avec les docteurs", Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques, 60 (1976), 99-112.
- Courvoisier, J., "La Dialectique dans l'ecclesiologie de Calvin", Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses, 44 (1964), 267-422.
- Crawford, J.R., "Calvin and the Priesthood of All Believers", Scottish Journal of Theology, 21 (January, 1968), 145-156.
- Daly, C.B., "Theologians and the Magisterium", Irish Theological Quarterly, 43 (1976), 225-246.

- Dankbaar, W.F., "L'office des docteurs chez Calvin", Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses, 44 (1964), 364-388.
- Dean, E.T., "Relation Between Scripture and Tradition in Calvin and Barth", Encounter, 23, (1962), 277-291.
- De Jong, P., "Calvin's Contributions to Christian Education", Calvin Theological Journal, 2 (1966-1967), 162-201.
- Delarue, H., "Les premiers manuels en usage au collège de Genève", in Le Collège de Genève, 1559-1959, Genève, (1959) 57-75.
- Denifle, H., "Quel livre servait de base à l'enseignement des maîtres en théologie dans l'université de Paris", Revue thomiste, 2(1894), 149-161.
- Duffield, G.E., "Calvin's Institutes of the Christian Religion", The Churchman, 73(1959), 136-146.
- Eels, H., "Martin Bucer and the Conversion of John Calvin", Princeton Theological Review, (1924), 402-419.
- Farris, A.L., "Calvin and the Laity", Canadian Journal of Theology, 11, (Jan.1965), 54-67.
- _____, "Calvin's Letter to Luther", Canadian Journal of Theology, 10 (1964), 124-131.
- Fuhrmann, P.T., "Calvin the Expositor of Scripture", Interpretation, 6 (1952), 188-209.
- Gerrish, B.A., "Biblical Authority and the Continental Reformation", Scottish Journal of Theology, 10 (Dec. 1957), 337-360.
- _____, "Priesthood and Ministry in the Theology of Luther", Scottish Journal of Theology, 7(1954), 404-420.

- De Ghellinck, J., "Pagina et sacra pagina ; Histoire d'un mot et transformation de l'object primitivement désigné", Mélanges August Pelzer, (Louvain, 1947).
- Glorieux, P., "L'enseignement au moyen âge: techniques et méthodes en usage à la faculté de theologie de Paris au XIIIe siècle", Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire au moyen âge, 35 (1968).
- Green, T.A., "Ecclesiastical Organization of Geneva in the Time of Calvin", Journal of the Presbyterian Historical Society, 8 (Oct.1923), 305-367.
- Guelly, R., "La place des théologiens dans l'église et la société médiévales", Miscellanea Historica, v.1, ed. by A. de Meyer (Louvain, 1946).
- Henderson, R.W., "Problem of the Reformed Eldership in its Early History", Journal of Presbyterian History, 45, (Dec.1967), 227-242.
- _____, "Sixteenth Century Community Benevolence : an Attempt to Resacralize the Secular", Church History, 38 (Dec.1969), 421-428.
- Hesselink, I.J., "Development and Purpose of Calvin's Institutes", Reformed Review, 28 (1970), 136-142.
- Hok, G., "Luther's Doctrine of the Ministry", Scottish Journal of Theology, 7 (1954), 16-35.
- Huizinga, A.V.C.P., "Calvinistic View of Church and State", Bibliotheca Sacra, 83 (April, 1926), 174-184.
- Hunt, R.N.C., "Calvin's Theory of Church and State", Church Quarterly Review, 108 (April), 56-71.
- Kaminsky, H., "Wyclifism as Ideology of Revolution", Church History, 32 (1963), 57-74.

- Kingdon, R.M., "Social Welfare in Calvin's Geneva", American Historical Review, 76 (Feb.1977).
- Klerk, P., "Calvin Bibliography", Calvin Theological Journal, 10 (Nov. 1975), 175-207.
- Knaake, J.A., "Die Predigten des Tertullian und Cyprian", Theologische Studien und Kritiken, 76 (1903), 608ff.
- Lewis, E.R., "Calvin and Tradition", Theology, 23(1942), 220-222.
- Linder, R.D., "Pierre Viret's Ideas and Attitudes Concerning Humanism and Education", Church History, 35, (1965), 25-35.
- Little, L.K., "Calvin's Appreciation of Gregory the Great", Harvard Theological Review, 56(April, 1963), 145-157.
- Mandonnet, P., "Chronologie des questions disputees de saint Thomas d'Aquin", Revue thomiste, 23(1928), 267ff.
- Matheson, J.G., "Calvin's Doctrine of the Christian Life", Scottish Journal of Theology 2 (1949), 48-56.
- McDonnell, K., "Ecclesiology of John Calvin and Vatican II", Religion in Life, 36(Winter, 1957), 542-556.
- McKeon, P.R., "Concilium Generale and Studium Generale : The Transformation of Doctrinal Regulation in the Middle Ages", Church History, 35 (1966), 24-34.
- McNeill, J.T., "Calvin as an Ecumenical Churchman", Church History, 32 (Dec. 1963), 379-391.

- McNeill, J.T., "Calvin's Efforts Toward the Consolidation of Protestantism", Journal of Religion, 8 (July, 1928), 411-433.
- _____, "The Church in 16th Century Reformed Theology", Journal of Religion, 22(1942), 252-269.
- _____, "The Doctrine of the Ministry in Reformed Theology", Church History, 12(1943), 77-97.
- _____, "John Calvin on Civil Government", Journal of Presbyterian History, 42(Jan.1964), 71-91.
- _____, "Significance of the Word for Calvin", Church History, 28 (June, 1959), 131-146.
- _____, "Thirty Years of Calvin Study", Church History, 17 (Sept., 1948), 207-240.
- Mendieta, E.A., "The Pair : Kerygma and Dogma in the Theological Thought of St. Basil of Caesarea", Journal of Theological Studies, 16 (1965), 129-142.
- De Moreau, E., "Luther et l'université de Louvain", Nouvelle revue theologique, 54 (1927), 401-435.
- Oberman, H.A., "Extra Dimension in the Theology of Calvin", Journal of Ecclesiastical History, 21(Jan.1970), 43-64.
- Pannier, J., "Calvin et l'episcopat", Revue de l'histoire des religions, v.6, 305-335.
- Parker, T.H.L., "The Approach to Calvin", Evangelical Quarterly, 16 (1944), 165-172.
- _____, "A Bibliography and Survey of the British Study of Calvin, 1900-1940", Evangelical Quarterly, 18 (1946), 123-131.
- _____, "Calvin's Concept of Revelation", Scottish Journal of Theology, 2 (1949), 29-47.
- _____, "Calvin the Biblical Expositor", The Churchman, 78 (1964).
- _____, "Great Preachers : Calvin", Theology, 54 (1951), 93-97.

- Partee, C., "Calvin and Experience", Scottish Journal of Theology, 26 (May 1973), 169-181.
- Pauck, W., "Calvin and Butzer", Journal of Religion, 9 (April, 29), 237-256.
- _____, "Calvin's Institutes of the Christian Religion", Church History, 15 (Mar., 1946), 17-37.
- Pelkonen, J.P., "The Teaching of Calvin on the Nature and Function of the Conscience", Lutheran Quarterly, 21 (Feb., 1969), 24-88.
- Peter, J.F., "Ministry in the Early Church as seen by John Calvin", Evangelical Quarterly, 35 (1963) 68-78.
- _____, "The Place of Tradition in Reformed Theology", Scottish Journal of Theology, 18(1965), 294-307.
- Peter, R., "L'abécédaire genevois ou catéchisme élémentaire de Calvin", Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses, 45 (1965), 11-45.
- _____, "Jean Calvin Prédicateur : Notice bibliographique à propos d'un ouvrage récent", Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses, (1972), 111-117.
- Petry, R.C., "Calvin's Conception of the *communio sanctorum*", Church History, 5 (1936), 227-238.
- Pollet, J.V., "Bucer et l'école", Bibliothèque d'humanisme renaissance, 26(1964), 559-572.
- Raum, J.J., "Church Discipline : A Comparative Study of Luther and Calvin", Lutheran Church Quarterly, 6 (Jan. 1933), 61-83.
- Ray, R., "Witness and the Word", Canadian Journal of Theology, 15 (Jan. 1969), 14-23.
- Reid, W.S., "Calvin and the Founding of the Academy of Geneva", Westminster Theological Journal, 18 (1955), 1-33.

- Richard, L., "John Calvin and the Role of the Church in the Spiritual Life", Journal of Ecumenical Studies, 111, (1974), 477-500.
- Roget, A., "Annales scolaires genevoises", L'educateur revue pédagogique, 19 (1883).
- Rott, J., "Documents strasbourgeois concernant Calvin", Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses, 44 (1964), 267-422.
- Schwiebert, E.G., "New Groups and Ideas at the University of Wittenberg", Archiv Fur Reformationsgeschichte, 49, (1958), 60-79.
- Spicq, C., "Esquisse d'une histoire de l'exégèse latine au moyen âge", Bibliothèque thomiste, 26 (1944).
- Stauffer, R., "Les discours à la première personne dans les sermons de Calvin", Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses (1965), 46-78.
- Steinlein, P., "Luther doktorat", Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift, 23 (1912).
- Strohl, H., "La théorie et la pratique des quatre ministères à Strasbourg avant l'arrivée de Calvin", Société de l'histoire de protestantisme française, (1935), 123-144.
- Torrance, J.B., "The Vicarious Humanity and Priesthood of Christ in the Theology of John Calvin", (unpublished paper delivered at the International Calvin Conference, Amsterdam, 1978).
- Torrance, T.F., "Knowledge of God and Speech About Him", Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses, 44 (1964), 267-422.
- Vischer, W., "Calvin, exégète de l'ancien Testament", Etudes théologiques et religieuses (1965), 213-31

Vuy, J., "Notes historiques sur le collège de Versonnex", Mémoires de l'institut national Genevois, 12, (1867-1868), 5-28.

Walker, C.S.M., "Calvin and the Church", Scottish Journal of Theology, 16 (1963), 371-389.

Weber, O., "Compétence de l'état d'après les ordonnances ecclésiastiques de 1561", Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses, 44 (1964), 267-422.

White, R., "The School in Calvin's Thought and Practice", Journal of Christian Education, 12(1969), 5-26.

Willis, E.D., "Reformed Piety and Consumer Pietism", The Reformed World, 33 (1974), 116-123.