

The Story of Lutheran Sects

The Story of Lutheran Sects:

“In Christ We Speak”

By

Aarne Ruben

**Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing**



The Story of Lutheran Sects: "In Christ We Speak"

By Aarne Ruben

This book first published 2020

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2020 by Aarne Ruben

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

ISBN (10): 1-5275-5208-X

ISBN (13): 978-1-5275-5208-1

Cover illustration by Lembe Ruben-Kangur

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Holy Innocents' Night	1
2. Context	7
3. Heretics: From Dignity to Scorn.....	19
4. Exegesis of Romans 1 and 3 – Revolving Elements in Revolution	27
5. Luther, Zwingli, Calvin	31
6. Hostia and its Historical Development	37
7. The Indulgences – Potent for God, Accident for Humans.....	43
8. Utopia of Marrying a Nun	49
9. A Question of Theological Competency	55
10. Reformation in Livonia and the Libraries of the Monasteries	59
11. The Vocabulary of Heretical Schools.....	71
12. 'Paper Tiger Society': Controversial Prophets Hilten and Hoffmann...	85
The Conclusion.....	91
Endnotes	95

1. HOLY INNOCENTS' NIGHT

Estonian theologian Einar Laigna, O.P. was my teacher of theology, and contributed much to this book. He has lectured on theology and expressed a Thomistic viewpoint at the Estonian Institute of Human Sciences in Tallinn, from 1990 to 1992. This experienced, strong, and lonely priest (and later a major in the Estonian army), was a blacksmith and poet, who spoke about the expansion of the borders of European civilization, and attracted many supporters. “Adam was created. Eve was built (*aedificavit, õkodomēsen*) from Adam’s rib. Was Eve an essential expansion of Adam, an addition to the first man or a more perfect extension of the male? Are women more sophisticated than men?” Laigna asked. “The world of the middle ages” he continued, “has been part of me ever since I took my first steps. Go and walk in the medieval heart of Tallinn. Whose hands made all those stained-glass windows, ladders, alleys, cornices, and drainpipes? It was not revolutions, heresy, or insurgency that made them.” Laigna was even removed from the university scholarship by the administration, due to his views. He opposed the desacralization of late medieval piety during the Reformation, considering it to be a threat to the human soul. Without Luther and Melancthon, and the greediness of Charles V, and with a diminished appreciation of Erasmus and a dimmer view of his genius, early modern technology would have been developed in the bosom of Thomistic doctrines and the inquisition.

We rushed down the steps of the History Research Institute of the Estonian SSR, located on Knight Street, near the lost armamentarium, and admired the street view. My schoolmate ate Penguin ice cream in the Town Hall Square. Sunny weather, beauty, and promising glances ruled. Here she is, I thought, the more perfect extension of the male. On another occasion, I remember, Laigna lectured again in one of the classrooms of the History Research Institute. It was the fifth week of the Gulf War. “Our [the U.S.] tanks did a great job today” he asserted. “As a former teacher of metal arts and woodwork, I would say that the best tank during WWII was the Soviet T-34. Let us compare all technical data between the T-34 and the German Panzer IV - the Soviet one was much better, if we use iron logic” (The USA is a military ally of Estonia).

Answering our question, as to where the iron logic could also be valuable, our teacher spoke:

"When calculating *qui bono*, or, who could make use of the circumstances, you must remember: everyone in Estonia wanted freedom, and to leave the USSR." Yes, we remembered the crowds gathered at Song Festival Square in Tallinn in the summer of 1988, to sing us free. Every Estonian wanted to restore the pre-war Republic of Estonia, just as the French could not live in Vichy state after 1944. Then, an orator asked them: "How can we survive when we exit from the huge Soviet market? Where shall we sell our meat, conserves, milk, cottage cheese, and jam?" The whole crowd cried: "It's not important!" and an old lady shouted: "We have all agreed to eat potato peel, if necessary, to get our freedom!"

Laigna commented on this cry, on that bright September day: "If we eat only potato peel, there should be a coterie who eat those potatoes. Only a naïve person doesn't ask where the main product has gone. Maybe some Westerners took it" (he took into account transnational corporations).

I remember Christmas 1991. It was the afternoon of the Day of Holy Innocents, the third Christmas Day, according to Estonian tradition. The day had darkened, the cold was remarkable, and old Tallinn's red roofs had changed their red to a snowy white colour. Christmastime is a landmark of the winter season, when shadows and spectres grow, of the festive and silent night, which, in medieval cities, passes over with a variety of mirth. A group of students entered the Catholic St. Peter and St. Paul Cathedral, on Russian and Müürivahe ("Between the Walls") streets. "Is our teacher Mr. Laigna also there? Let's go and look." Rein Õunapuu, Priest of the Cathedral met us, and we asked him, where Laigna could be. Õunapuu, as I remember it, said: "This holy man went home. You see, it's the Eve of Holy Innocents. The city closes the doors of its churches, and the Christmas peace is everywhere on earth, so it is in our snowy, quiet town. However, none of us is at home alone tonight."

The students hemmed and hawed in the cold cathedral choir, and Rein Õunapuu added: "The Christmas Mass is the most intense. But after it, a true servant of God goes home, and the church remains closed. The darkest hour, is just before dawn, when all stands still. The darkest hour of the church was before St. Gregory was born. There was an earthquake in Rome, a painful plague in Europe. There was a bigger order to pray for everyone's soul than church was able to fulfil." This late hour of the Holy Innocents was really lonely, but Laigna explained the Priest's speech: Gregory the Great was a remarkable representative of medieval laughter. Even so, Western civilization has been too strong to laugh at itself. One day, Gregory delivered a sermon. He spoke mildly, and then burst out

laughing. "Does he laugh? Holy Gregory himself?" the congregation asked. He explained all, and told them that he had seen the Devil on the balcony, who displayed a maroquin featuring the names of sinners. The number of sinners was too big, the Devil's maroquin broke, and he fell down. From this event, Laigna derived a difference between the Western Roman Catholic civilization and the tyranny of the East.

During the First Crusade, in April 1097, this difference became most evident. Godfrey of Bouillon, the Duke of Lower Lorraine, had to swear an oath to Alexios, the Byzantine Emperor. After the oaths were taken, a knight sat on Alexios' throne. He was told to rise by Baldwin, Godfrey's brother, to respect local custom. This perplexed this hothead, because in the Western tradition, a king who plans something with his knights, sits at almost the same level with his subordinates. The European king was *primus inter pares*, a spiritual, not a tyrannic, leader. The Eastern monarchs forced their minions to lie on the floor, and beat their heads on it, showing their servility. There is the human conception in the Western world that the knights were believed to be potentialities of the most perfect creature ever created in the world, as Thomas Aquinas pointed to man, as a being of beings. Therefore they were armed to their teeth, nobles were most protected in the battle. On the contrary, their Muslim opponents in the Crusades fought without this human conception, and their leaders could send hundreds of men into desperate sieges (although not all historical facts support this concept).

There were cases when Einar Laigna spoke in parables with his students. Once, he had just completed a high-intensity physical training session. He knew that there were several pie kiosks in Tallinn, which sold toothsome mince pies, costing only five kopeks, through thick and thin. The kiosks were managed by 'kiosk beldams' (old ladies from the kiosks), who, unfortunately, had sometimes lost interest in selling pies. They wanted power instead, to take what they could from their little and ridiculous world, which consisted only of their stall. To establish this power, the old ladies drew the curtains, and hung up a sign: "Break-down!" or simply "Break!" They did this just after their clients came and wanted to buy pies. Both these slogans had been classics of Soviet marketing practice, which quite often did not want to sell or market any goods. Laigna never got a pie from this kiosk.

Our teacher explained the case: ennoblement was widely spread across the European medieval scene. Kings, Popes, bishops, barons, merchants, and artisans were all proud of their estates. The proudest of them was the peasant, who could not be manipulated until last — it was the peasant who gave food to the upper classes. In Soviet society, however, the nobility had

been smoothed out. Therefore, the power tended to be imaginary, omitting the honour of estate. This leader is old, gray-haired, very strong, and from ancient kin. His armour is impenetrable, no dagger of the rootless nations can pass through it. Our teacher saw the President of Estonia (2001—2006) Arnold Rüütel (whose surname means *knight* in English) in this role.

Who were those rootless nations in Laigna's concept? They were the tribes which Muhammad had united. Islam is the religion against which European knights fought; all the Muslim tribes, who wandered through the history of the Middle Ages, are rootless in Laigna's vision. It takes at least the might of US tanks to stop them. Despite this, Islam is like the Catholic faith, with its dignity, relics, and saints. Most dangerous for Christianity is heresy, the inner enemy (see Chapter Two).

The topic of Einar Laigna's lecture on 9 December 1990 was the painting entitled *Death Dance*, in St. Nicholas Church, Tallinn, which was painted in oil on canvas, more than 490 years before the lecture. This artwork was an exact copy of Lübeck's *Death Dance*, which had been lost during a bombing raid by the British Royal Air Forces on Palm Sunday, 1942. In Lübeck's version forty-six figures were depicted, compared to the thirteen in the Tallinn painting. More than half of the figures in Tallinn's version have been lost without traces. This fact led to legends about death walking the streets of Tallinn; the old folk spoke of the person of Death, with his scythe, who could appear at any time, as the mortality rate in this ancient town exceeds the number of births. According to numerous fairytales, a visit by this dangerous ghost began with the Devil's marriage.

Everything was arranged for this gloomy ceremony, from serving a black drink, to a tallyho coach in the narrow streets. The legend-loving people usually marked such wedding-places with painted, 'false' windows on the walls of their houses: Vana-Viru Street 11, Ghost Street 13, Wheel-Well Street 17. All those walled-up hideaways were clearly visible at the end of Soviet rule in 1990, however, they were lost later, when money made for new trends in Tallinn's city-planning, and the apartments of the Old Town district started to cost more than a usual worker could earn in twenty years.

Laigna clarified that the men of the middle ages lived on the edge of the world, where Death or the Devil could be a companion of one's last sighs. "For example," Laigna continued, "a campanologist from the Cathedral of Cologne missed one of the feasts dedicated to Christ. The Crucified revealed himself in the hunchback's dream and hammered him with a clapper. The line between the sacred and holy laughter was flimsy." Christ, Mary, and the saints behaved against the rules according to the

profane, but normally according to the sacred. We, the students, asked Laigna: "Mr. Laigna, there is a missing room in an old house at Vana-Viru Street 11. The chamber is walled up, only a black window is painted on the wall."

"Never ask about it," our professor answered. "This is a medieval enigma. We have looked at the *Death Dance* painting. To watch it *in extenso* means to disintegrate within. There are thirteen figures between the deaths: a preacher, pope, emperor, empress, cardinal and king. But where are the rest: a bishop, duke, abbot, knight, nun, mayor, domicellarius, noble, doctor, exciseman, coatman and others? Those who asked about it, went the way of all flesh."

Laigna portrayed President Arnold Rüütel as a white knight, rescuer of the Estonians during the difficult transition times, especially during the period of constitutionalizing the Sovereignty Declaration in 1988, and through legendary opposition to the Soviet *coup d'état* on 19-20 August 1991. In 2007, he insisted that Rüütel's rival, Toomas Hendrik Ilves was a servant of Satan. "In a certain photograph, taken during Ilves' presidential campaign, the candidate makes a weird sign: the thumb, pinky, and middle finger have been raised. This finger position is not at all natural, it's controlled and carefully fixed. To whom is the candidate signalling? Who are his sympathizers in America? It is evident that the two endmost fingers are horns, and the movement of the middle finger is similar to a monster, showing its tongue." Here Laigna rendered the sign 'cornu', widely known from rock music, of which Ilves is a great fan. He kept an ulterior motive in mind, which became apparent in the presidential election. Ilves was a foreign, American candidate, whose credibility in Estonian society was equal to the Devil's.

Laigna's intellectual masculinity, his everlasting speeches about the wandering knights, magnanimous court ladies, and pious artisans, passing on traditions from generation to generation, remain vivid to this day. Such great days, such childhood! "Little kids begin to draw a house from the roof and chimney," wrote Oskar Luts, a great Estonian writer, "only adults move logically from the basement." It was my turn to begin a drawing from its roof and chimney.

2. CONTEXT

Circulating free and uncontrolled knowledge causes revolution, as was the case during the Reformation. If informal groups take over the leadership of discourse, authoritative and executive channels will change, and be diminished. There are good examples of this: evangelical preachers, dissolution of order, pendulating dogmas, illegal activities, have all collapsed empires. The initial principles become uncontrolled and intolerable. The most crucial problem of the 15th century was the question “Does God see me when I sin?” Prior to this, there was no doubt. But the world became more and more secularized, and when Johann Lohmüller, a writer from Riga, who opened the holy relic of St. Peter’s church, which was in the form of a little jewel case, on 6 May 1524, said he knew that there was holy blood within it - *Das buxbluth magstu woll nehmen** - the holy relic became ludicrous.¹

The quarrels amongst the Reformers are not an overlooked topic. For example, a good overview for the *Bildersturm* is Ulrich Bubenheimer’s article *Scandalum et ius divinum* (1981), in which he called the iconoclasm a collective downfall. Other useful texts are mentioned throughout this book.

This book is not structured on historical periods, but rather concentrates on different aspects of Christian life: heresy, creation, the Lord’s Supper, exegesis, indulgences, and chastity. Medieval heresy is a phenomenon, about which much has been written in English.² For many years, researchers have been focusing more on theological treatises concerning cultural peripheries, such as Old Livonia. In 2015, Christine Caldwell Ames wrote *Medieval Heresies*, a monograph useful for the study of heresy, in which she shows, comparatively, how heresies of the masses and theological controversies originate from different sources. Heresies of the masses sprang up from the quest for equality, while the dissents raised during theological disputation by learned men were fruits of a different understanding of the Scripture.

This text contains new archival research, and underscores more boldly the relationship between the lent feasts and the beginning of iconoclastic activity. The era was the period of the germination of rationalism. The

* ‘You may take the box blood’ (in Middle Low German).

world in which John Bull reads the Bible has, paradoxically, less room for God and its miracles.

This book grew out of the abyss called *Theologia Lutheranae trimembris epitome* (Representative Example of Lutheran Theology (1562)), by Friedrich Staphylus. *Theologia*, like tens of others, consisted of endless lists of lost children from the parishes, debunked by the so-called compendiums of heresies. All those ‘doctrines’ created a certain connection with the Reformation. For the Roman Catholic authors, the heretics always came in groups, and they were catalogued, summarized, and described, regardless of their manner and mode. The method is *compositus, sunthesis*. Lists of heretics were edited by scribes and librarians, who were guided by the Church Fathers, who also found and refuted their ideological enemies on the lists. There was an Aristotelian passion to create order, and lists. This should have been a warning of the fate wicked men could meet on the purgatorial road, since Catholic *libri memoriales* also contained thousands – now positive – of names. ‘Do not pray for them and offer them defense’, spoke the doctrine. Moreover, as Christine C. Ames shows in her book, the early synods and Church Fathers collected the names of heresies (Council of Constantinople 381, Augustine).³

The viewpoint of this book is not Thomistic in the interest of maintaining professionalism. It reflects neither Catholic, Lutheran, nor atheistic attitudes. Heretics were the first of all innocent martyrs, not *exemplae* for certain doctrines, and the proverb *ex iniura ius non oritur* could be applied.

The period we examine falls between an earlier, warmer time, and a later, colder time. Migration to the east ended in the first half of the 13th century. The hunger crisis of 1315–1318 claimed many victims in North Europe. But European cities began to grow immediately after the Black Death, in 1347. The beginning of the 15th century was the growth peak, and beef cattle gained popularity. Feliz Fabri, prior of the Ulm Dominicans wrote, in 1488: “The people rush into towns, they consider it as an action to end poverty. Artisan life in our cities makes them seek *solatium societatis* (the comfort of society) and gives new possibilities.”⁴

Opposite this, European peasant society, artisans’ guilds in medieval towns were arranged hierarchically: initially, there were apprentice years, then a sudden spark of enlightenment led to the making of a masterpiece,

after which came mastership. The works of art were unique, and the master might invite a whole 'family' of saints to assist in his creation. The names of patron saints appeared next to the name of the master himself, and his favorite apprentice, underlining a collective acceptance and belonging. This knowledge helps us to observe the period, starting in 1524, when the Reformation caused great change. The goldsmiths of Riga preserved their patronage over the St. Eligius' altar, which their guild had served since 1399. The maintenance of the altar continued, for a more modest payment. The artisans never forgot the antiphon *Alma redemptoris*, dedicated to the Virgin Mary.⁵ St. Eligius had been a part of their craft to whom they always referred when speaking about their art. This trend was common during the centuries of the devotional era, which coincided with the Golden Age of monastic life.

Similarly to the *Bildersturm*, Byzantine iconoclasm was one of the first examples of the division of Christianity into Western and Eastern, and of the resulting struggles. There were the Byzantine iconoclastic mobs who lost *acheiropoieta*, and saw in linen surfaces the eyes and tears of the dying Christ. They left only legends, and claims that one or another of those pictures had once hung on the gates of the city of Odessa, and there were also combative slogans, addressed to their enemies. Although the pictures were only invitations to the masses to pray, repent, and fear God, the Byzantine rulers still risked suppressing the legends. In Byzantium, the emperors defined theological matters, while in Europe the Byzantines stood on purely theological ground.

The icons had undeclared authorship for centuries (see the Chapter *Reformation in Livonia and Libraries of the Monasteries*, a story of the iconoclastic routine). By depicting Jesus as human, all holy images which were destroyed during the Byzantine iconoclasm, would have been saved (thanks to Gerald Bray for this insight).⁶ Between Cassiodorus' time, in the early 6th century, and Alcuin's at the end of the 8th century, the greater monasteries were islands of wisdom, literacy, and education in the surrounding barbaric countryside. But in the mid-11th century, during the era of cathedral building, the monastic society crisis grew. The status of monk became sought after in old religious centres. It was then no longer a harsh way of life, especially for the abbots who lived apart from the monks and from the monastery's daily routine. Their duties were primarily administrative.⁷ Cantor saw here the seedbed of Christian mysticism, which finally achieved its full roots in the thirteenth century.⁸

Two giants of the era were Peter the Lombard, and Thomas Aquinas. Peter the Lombard was involved with the building of the Cathedral of Notre Dame in Paris, and Thomas Aquinas prayed in that church in his

youth. They collected and analyzed scriptural data, and the monasteries should have thrived. Why, instead, did the careful systematization of Western thought bring about the powerful, combative church of Martin Luther? In answering this question, we turn to Russian scholar Nikolai Konrad. Thomas Aquinas represented the contemporary philosophy of Western European nations. He systematized the available knowledge of his time, gradually becoming a scholar of the first magnitude. Rules were formed gradually, and breaking them became a root of later reformation movements.⁹

The difference between ranks and insignias was evident in the clergy. White and black robed monks often appeared to be in competition. Benedictines (*Ordo sancti Bernardi*, (OSB)), the black monks, had the catchphrase *ora et labora*, and they avoided empty speech whenever possible, keeping silence and solemnity. They are well known for their perfect knowledge of the herbal world. Augustinian friars (*Ordo eremitarum sancti Augustini*, (OEr.SA)) were mystical, and Cistercians (O.Cist) with their white woollen robes, symbolized purity. The Order of Dominicans (*Ordo praedicatorum*, (OP)), founded in the 13th century, shared the black colour of the *Ordo sancti Bernardi*. Those monks had strict rules of observance, and they implied that they were the real holders of the rules of St. Benedict. We see below where Silvester Prierias, OP, an experienced commentator on the penitential canons, used the best possible arguments against Luther's critics. Franciscans (*Ordo minoritarum*), the gray or brown monks, spent their days full of joy and gratitude to God for the Creation. The Franciscan *tunica et cucullus* (hood and cowl) was made of hopsack, and was unbleached, with a rough texture. Sins in the cloisters differed from those in the outside world:

The same way tolling bells call a friar to mass, demons send him dreams. The monks could not resist, because the demons disturbed their sleep at night. Consequently, here is one result: a friar snores during mass (see p32–36). In another case, an abbot in his cold cell was reading a didactic book, and while considering Satan's tricks, he did not warm his hands in his robes, but allowed them to be cold so that he would not sleep. But Satan bit his hand like a flea, and when the abbot withdrew it he fell asleep, and failed to wake up in time for Mass.¹⁰

For the Livonian prelates, life at the end of the 15th century seemed desperate and ungodly. The Brotherhood of Blackheads of Riga, who would be instrumental in sparking the Reformation, paid great sums to the Beguine nuns for the last time, a year before iconoclasm (lay families wanted payment for giving their son or daughter to the monastic life of chastity *ad succurendum*). The Beguines (not a very chaste order, but one

which prohibited marriage) had two female convents in Riga: the first near St. Peter's church, and the second, founded in 1425, on Russian Street. The abbesses of the cloisters recruited girls as young as ten years of age for the novitiate. The girls found their *tunica cinera furra**, rougher and thicker than any dress in their secular life. New, young, and devoted believers came to the church, and confession was rejuvenated. The novices, while starting life as nuns, were still little girls. "Monks are cast into the cloister by their parents and relatives as if they were kittens or piglets that their mother could not nourish", wrote William of Auvergne, Bishop of Paris from 1228 to 1249, about young male converts.¹¹ "The novices are taught that the monastery is a city of God, and they have the chance to live a pious life within its walls" (A quote from the Responsory: "God's city is around you, and the angels defend its walls").* On 26 March 1524, Silvester Tegetmeyer reported that Anna, a thirteen-year-old novice from St. Maria Magdalena monastery in Riga, called the Anabaptist-style 'second baptism', a heresy.¹² The stories about Anna Nötken, or Netken (born in 1510), who preserved the Eucharist and holy water during the attacks of the blasphemers became very popular in orthodox circles at the time. Adam Naramowski, the Polish Catholic, described the events of a difficult winter day in 1524, when Anna was still too young to understand much of what was happening around her.

The wicked heretics attacked the cloister church, removed the holy Eucharist and demolished the altar of the Holy Cross. Anna was frightened, but she hid the Eucharist with the warming flame inside, just behind the altar cloth. The abbess, probably already under the influence of the heretics, rose to search for the Eucharist. Because the altar was demolished, a vulgar demon appeared, and the infernal fire blazed. The voice said: "My Anna! Light the altar candles again and defend the venerable sacrament." Once she did this with trembling hands, the darkness was gone and glory was restored. Afterwards, she took a bottle full of lustral water, and preserved it for forty years. It is said that the miraculous bottle and its contents helped the Lutheran pastors against the horrors of the Livonian War.¹³

Why did Anna feel such hostility and fear toward the new evangelical teachings? Her feelings were based on the reformers denying church rituals and ignoring certain prayers, and confession, and the differences in the altar service. The conflict was highly principled. The sermons of Huldreich Zwingli and other reformers had already reached Riga. On 17

* Tunica with the ash garment.

* *Civitatem istam tu circumda, Domine, et angeli tui custodiant muros eius...*

September 1522, Zwingli preached in Zurich, reading his *Eine Predigt von der ewig reinen Magd Maria*, which contained offensive language about the Virgin in its hamartia: *ein toerecht wyb* (stupid woman), *andre trüll* (another strolling woman, meretrix, prostitute). The text was presented as litotes: “someone I have said, but actually, I haven’t.”¹⁴ In any case, the damage was done. It is highly improbable that Zwingli’s ideas even reached little Anna from the other side of Europe. The issue was about the sacral space and reformational impurity (apropos, in his speech, Zwingli tried to demonstrate that the Holy Family was didactic: The Virgin Mary escaping from Herod’s violence, Joseph as a bachelor husband and protector of his family, and God the Father, who impregnated Mary).¹⁵ Sister Anna saw Virgin Mary as a model of womanhood, a model of herself. For her, Mary was one of the creators of *sponsa ecclesia* (“Blessed are you among women.” Luke 1:42). Anna continued to revise and develop her ego, and she rebuilt it during the most hideous moments of the Livonian War, when she was in her forties and fifties. The Virgin was the first to whom the nuns prayed to help against looters, but Zwingli stated: “Mary and the saints alone are not enough for intercession (*fürbitter*).”¹⁶ There is some inquisitional evidence that demons are afraid of Theotokos, the holiest. For instance, in Languedoc, in 1318, a woman, under influence of the Cathars, denied the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist. The demons were considered to be heretical. The woman accepted her lot when St. Mary ‘intervened’.¹⁷ This was a principal conflict between young Anna and the reformers; she would have hated the protestants, considering them to be demons, or people possessed by demons.

The church could not control the movements of vagabonds, who traveled alone, or in small groups on the roads. Such men most often met outside city walls, because of set limits to the territory in which they could gather alms. They were called Terminiers. The donations for their movable altars were made as a great honor. The former reverence of the prophets had partly returned. New intellectual freedom had already given several forms of the ‘wandering theological teacher’ a visible part in society’s mind. The contemplative wanderers were xenophobic itinerant monks, without guidance, having their own law unto themselves. The period when theologically educated journeymen walked their paths with only a donkey and a crooked stick, rose and fell, over a thousand years earlier. In the late 4th century, the itinerant monks distinguished the wandering wise men from the ordinary ‘country cousins’. The learned masters of the canons, orations, sermons, lections, vigils, abstinents, and labors of good acts, wandered with holy books and little food, but never alone. Johannes Oecolampadius (1482–1531) was a German Protestant reformer, who

spoke to his parish about Paulus's wanderings, imagining it as a walk on a contemporary roundabout. There was a talk about cheating with passage money (which St. Paul never did).¹⁸

Theodor Sprengher's painting *Tallinn's Magistrate Meets the First Preacher, sent by Luther in 1525* (1869), which hung above the entrance of Tallinn Historical Museum, gives colour to the popular view of the evangelical preachers. It expresses a romantic view of the powerful city's lords encountering a preacher and his assistant, the latter holding Luther's letter in his hands. Secular power clearly dominated over canonical wisdom; the churchmen, not the burghermasters, were forced to make the first step. The city was willing to vouchsafe a new start for clerics who had been longtime residents. The main aim of these men was a theological dispute, in which both parties declared themselves to be the winners. Johann Lange, one of the first evangelical preachers in Tallinn was a *verlaufene Mönch* (a fugitive monk), and this troubled the magister of the Livonian Order Wolter von Plettenberg, the highest authority in the country.¹⁹

This book tells the story of the German Protestant reformers. It will also examine the loss of strict order and discursive tension that European societies suffered at the end of the 14th, and the beginning of the 15th century. Among the many causes were plague, wars, cold weather, uprisings, disputes between popes and antipopes, the Hussite wars in 1421–1424 and 1430–1431, the Lollards, the Council of Constance, the witch trials which began in Switzerland and Valais in 1427–28, and a musician and preacher Hans Böhm, who burned his drum in Tauberthal and became an apocalyptic visionary in 1476 – all these are different texts of the pre-Reformation era.

Several terms were used to describe the 'black sheep' of Western society: *mali* (bad ones), *maledicti* (damned ones), *periculosi*, *expulsi* (eliminated or expelled), *perfidi* (traitorous; in Greek form, *epikataratoi*).²⁰ Aron Gurevich stated that Medieval man (which is an abstraction, since the middle ages lasted more than a thousand years) believed that the expulsion of a person had simultaneously sacred and sociopolitical grounds. You were a vain man without your own territory.²¹ It was quite easy to step from the bliss of the clerical life, *memoria rerum*, to maliciousness. This compressed the whole story of the medieval heresies into a single page document. Gurevich noted several key themes. First, is Marsilius of Padua, who said in 1117 that the Pope is not the Vicar of Christ, and that the Vicar's chair is vacant. Then he quoted the proposed *Tractat des Bogomiles* (1118), and found several errors: Jesus was a human being, the Father was human-shaped and not the central figure of

the Trinity, there must be faith even for demons, the saints are only images, and there is no other resurrection than penitence through the faith.

Gaultier asserted that the heretics believed that every church in the cities which were besieged by the Catholic armed forces was under the power of demons, e.g., the Temple of Solomon in Jerusalem, and the Great Church in Constantinople. To Tanchelin (an itinerant preacher from Flanders who preached chastity and opposed tithes, who died in 1115), he attributed the errors of the Muslim Magi: the body and blood of Christ do not belong in the Eucharist, holy matrimony is nothing more than spiritual connection. Then he spoke against Peter Abelard and his disciple Arnold of Brescia, who philosophically believed God to be only a pure action in the natural light and mind. According to Gaultier, this teaching could confuse people about the Godhead. The Holy Ghost is recognizable only for being neither Father nor Son, all Trinitarian persons embraced the Creation, Jesus is only a human prince, and the Father only tested his only-begotten son in the passions. The Father created the spirit, which is called love in the world. Faith is a necessity, and man is an arbiter over it. Abelard and Arnold ascribed to God the ability to do more than he already did, which was a blasphemous view, in Gaultier's opinion.

Gilbert of Poitiers, the chancellor of the theological school of Chartres, spoke in front of the Synod of Paris, in 1147, where the holy synod and Jacques Gaultier found several errors in his teaching: God cannot be divided and is the triune, he is all his of components con-crescent to each other, the divinity does not attribute all components of the Trinity, and, God has never incarnated, only the Word has. Christ is the only eminence. The articles caused contentious theological dispute between Gilbert and Bernard of Clairvaux, the most important theological authority at the time. Bernard was unable to refute Gilbert's positions. It was the only moment in the history of heresy when the heretic overcame his persecutor.²²

Nevertheless, Gaultier wrote that Gilbert thought that Pierre de Bruys and his followers believed that Christ's body was not in Heaven in glory, but a decomposed carcass on the Eucharist dish. Gaultier stated that the Waldensians and Cathars live without saints, do not recognize the angelical salutation, refuse to give indulgences to the Pope, and have less than ten commandments. They perceive Jesus through the perspective of St. Paul.²³ Pierre de Bruys ('The Burner') came to his end while burning crosses in St. Gilles near Nîmes, circa 1126, claiming, "the form on which Christ was cruelly slain is not worth adoration". The local people threw him into the same fire in which he burned the crosses. Gaultier was an active, but not well-informed, author, confusing top theology with Pierre the Burner's theatrics. The only coincidence between the two was the

accusation of heresy, a common insinuation during the course of the history of theology.

Martin Luther's followers believed that, when the set time had come, as it was told in the gospels, the historical situation caused their 'son', born under the law as brother Martinus Luther, to be sent into this world to reconcile the deep discord between the curia and the simple members of the countless parishes throughout Germany. Luther's competency in the old theology is disputed by Heinrich Suso Denifle, in two volumes of his comprehensive work *Luther und Luthertum* (1904). This was written while Denifle worked for twenty years in the Vatican archives, and ended when the author died. He predicated most of his criticism of Luther on the premise that Luther followed to the invitation of the flesh, and broke his oath of chastity. Despite his criticism of Luther, Denifle never cited 1. Corinthians 9, the sequence of scripture which explains the priest's free will toward matrimony.²⁴ Luther had a great many critics, but his views were accessible to, and adoptable by, the layman. He wrote that Jesus ministers to all the sins made by secure and quiet people, and to depressed, desperate, trembling, pale, and fugitive men, claiming, 'Jesus is the judge'.²⁵ He believed that faith without law could not be justified, and that a person who firmly believes could not manage his faith without law; "Where grace reigns, law cannot reign."²⁶ The Lutherans never spoke against the common law.

Luther's main philosophical view stemmed from nominalism. The British monk Pelagius (circa 360–418) is attributed with teaching the pioneering idea of the meaninglessness of original sin. The Pelagianistic viewpoint offers the argument that Adam's and Eve's journey into the real world was a necessity, and part of God's plan to make mankind happy, step-by-step, through its passions. We never carry the burden of original sin because it is not corrupt. The Council of Orange, 529, refuted this view: expulsion from Eden was a result of *radix mali* ('root of the badness'), which has been instilled into man, and if man prays, he gains his first Christian alimentation. Prayers are elementary signs for God, indicating that a subject is worthy of grace, and grace is our dearest gift from God.²⁷ The bishops in the Council stood with Augustine. They were in agreement that human nature is poisoned to the core. Thus, when Luther declared that *Facienti quod est in se, Deus non denegat gratiam*, he would emphasize that if the mind deals with finding truth, it cannot rise beyond reason, and the situation lacks faith.²⁸ If this new evangelical truth is true, then the naive child, about to step on to the path of faith, is wiser than the philosopher. But the whole argument fell apart: Luther was equally Augustinian and non-Augustinian, changes were made only after the

doctrines of one of his mentors, Robert Holcott OP (1349).

It was easy to misunderstand Luther's declaration: "Think about the men who have been recognized for their good acts, and who have pushed away God's grace and do not accept Christ."²⁹ The faithful are subject to every one of God's laws and they attain worthiness, but there is another option: Christ died and was resurrected to save human beings. However, the opponents of Luther asked: if grace is everywhere then does it lose all meaning? The Council of Trent (1551), in its fourteenth session, cited in Chapter Six — "The minister of this sacrament and absolution", answered that faith without penance effects no remission of sins. A believer, who is a heavy sinner, is not a believer at all. The Lutheran dogma allows for the possibility of being a sinner and a still a believer.

*Christus factus est pro nobis obediens usque ad mortem autem crucis**, is a hymn in praise of Jesus Christ, taken from Philippians 2:8. Luther's position toward the concept was that the Son did not live his short earthly life and then die for all men, for the Christians and pagans, for friends and enemies. Christ came because of man's original sin, and the will of Satan. Christ knew about human sin. His disciples were all sinners before His resurrection. They all slept during Jesus' prayer at Gethsemane, and left their teacher when he was caught (Mark 14:50). He knew sinful humanity, *Christus maximus peccator est*. Luther stressed this passage: "Go then and learn what this meaneth, I will have mercy and not sacrifice. For I am not come to call the just, but sinners." (Matthew 9: 9–13, Mark 2: 17). Commenting on these words, St. Augustine pointed out that men cannot reveal what they mean, and the righteous souls cannot vaunt their understanding (*Expositio in psalmum* 70, 1). St. Ambrose said that redemption will be a final mercy for sinners, but there would be others (*De poenitentia* Liber I 12, 54).³⁰ The question then becomes, where does that leave Luther?

Luther drank beer just like peasants, and fought with the Devil the same as they did. "He railleth and curseth like a deuill," wrote Friedrich Staphylus in his *Apologia*, 1560.³¹ But his time happened to be one of the most significant in the history of the Western world. It was really a turn from faith to faith, "faith first and last" (Romans 1: 17), from the fear of the Devil to faith in technology, republics, and progress. Luther's position showed the secular rulers in an ambivalent light – there was the freedom offered by him, which caused violence, which, in turn caused his intervention. The belief in progress and technology was either a phenomena of humanistic origin, or explicable by authorities distancing

* Christ was actually so obedient to die for us on the cross.

themselves less from their subordinates. The whole parish sings and preaches together, everyone knows and renders the Scriptures, everyone is familiar with both the cup and the bread. Thus, everyone knows who is a good worker or an 'evil' witch in the village. The motto is, work harder and you will gain salvation.

Luther is quoted saying "Here I stand and I cannot be otherwise", which is inspired by Galatians 1:8, "Even if an angel descend from Heaven and preach a gospel contrary to that you have received, let him be accursed." Heiko Obermann has shown how Luther realized that God had a special gift of grace for him.³² God wants humans to trust *sola fide*. Thus it is when man has no capability for sin and has only original sin.

The reformers had a common enemy, in Dr. Johann Tetzel, preacher and apostolic commissary who sold indulgences for freedom from temporal punishment for sins and guilt. He was a strong and decisive man; when reaching a town, he had to be received with bell ringing, a procession of the city councillors, scholars, disciples, monks, and others. A huge purple cross with the Pope's coat of arms, to indicate the Pope's will and a duty to build the holiest cathedral of Rome, was carried ahead of him. He held a book, bound in red velvet, with the Pope's bull, which announced freedom from temporal punishment for those who had sinned and bought the indulgence.³³

Nikolaus Paulus's research appears to support the conclusion that Tetzel had already become a Catholic martyr in this battle of ideas. He and his side feared the Devil as much as Luther did. Two of the church's main pillars — Baptism and the Eucharist — were not only proofs of faith for Luther, but also the service of Christ. It was an apostolic vow. Victory over the dark forces meant more than the number of true Christians, it was a matter of purity of faith.

Baptism is death for a corrupt person, and rebirth for new one, as Luther stated in his Small Catechism.³⁴ This statement became a turning point for thousands of young Livonian peasants, both boys and girls, who were confirmed and then married. They thought of themselves as heirs of God himself, the children of light (Luke 16:8), who would step together over the border into the second life. They believed that without this they could not reach enlightenment, and all of this has been brought forth from generation to generation.

3. HERETICS: FROM DIGNITY TO SCORN

Whether heresy (In Greek, *airesi* = ‘choice’, without any negative context) has accompanied the whole history of the Church is an ongoing debate. For Jesus, there were no heretics, because he foresaw everything. Adolf Harnack considered Simon Magus and Cerinthus to be the heretics of the Apostolic age. Both were Gnostics, and all that is known about them comes from the writings of their theological opponents.¹ The topic of this book is the doctrines of German reformers, who rarely leaned into the Trinitarian discussion, therefore, there will be no discussion of Trinitarian heresies.²

Servetus, similarly to Marcion (a second-century gnostic and heresiarch), mystified Christ. He believed that the Saviour is the original existing light in space, always clearly visible and never dispersed. To Servetus, the Saviour is the essence of everything, and is Jehovah (power of the powers with a minuscule).³ This was passionately believed by Jean Calvin, who said, “I hope that the sentence of death will at the very least be passed on him [Servetus]”. When Marcion rejected the Old Testament, Servetus rejected the idea of unified hypostases of the Trinity, which was confirmed in Nicaea and by every ecumenical council after it.

Heresy is contextualized as a choosing of something, although in 1. Corinthians 10:25–26 it is written: “When things are sold in the open market, then you may eat them, without making any enquiries to satisfy your consciences; this world, as we know, and all that is in it belongs to the Lord.” Since the Lutheran era began, and protestants encountered serious opposition, heretics were depicted as the buyers in the markets of Jerusalem or Athens, where olives could be taken with one’s own hands, but the freshness of prepared meals depended on how far away springs of flowing water were. In the history of heresy there is a visible tendency: Marcion and his companions chose the Bible quotes ‘with their own hands’. Clement of Alexandria in his *Miscellaneous Studies* emphasized: the heretics pick scriptural passages and do not read them thoroughly, “they select only what contributes to their pleasures.”⁴

Their political opponents depicted heretics as a group who met periodically, without being aware of their mistakes. In certain heretical

contexts, Arianism was interchangeable with the Nicene creed. The Emperor noticed no difference in the winter of AD 327 (immediately after the council of Nicaea), when he heard Arius speak: ‘The Father loved the Son before the creation of the World, and the Father gave Jesus authority over his parish’ (John 17: 24).⁵ The Scripture was unclear on that point, and there are conflicting and contradictory passages. Proverbs 8:22 recognizes the Arian view: “Jehovah created me at the beginning of his works, I was first in his works at the beginning!” The ‘semi-gnostic’ Gospels of John 1 and 3 mention that the Son is the only-begotten (*monogenēs*) three times. In John 8: 57, Jesus confirms that he himself existed long before Abraham, finding only few followers. However, John 1:18 explains: “The Son abides in the bosom of the Father”, thus, the two are principally different. John 6:62 insists that the Son was in Heaven before he came to the Earth, and that He would return to heaven. There is no sufficient proof that the Gospel of John is entirely gnostic, or that Jesus was depicted as an unapproachable phenomenon. St. Paul’s letters (Romans 8:29; Colossians 1:15, 18) contain passages similar to John 1:18, calling the Son *prētotokos* (first-born).⁶ In Paul’s letters, Christ is called *morphē* (Philippians 2:6) and *eikon* (Colossians 1:15). In the enthusiastic days of early Christianity, the devoted listeners of the preachers did not see the contradictions. The misunderstandings began with the study of theology, more than a century later.

Each apostle spoke in his own way, and the translations and renderings varied widely. The main theological disputes did not occur in the period of martyrdoms. The bishops came together to anathematize only after the last holy men had fallen on the lances of the Roman soldiers. In 313, Christianity was legalized in the Roman empire, but the first Ecumenical council with strong anathemas took place in 325. This was not an accidental occurrence; an outer enemy was simply replaced with one on the inside. Luther wrote in his *De Captivitate Babylonica Ecclesiae* that “the church was apostolic in the days of martyrs.”⁷ Churches of the late Roman empire were open to sinners, and the burdened churches stressed ‘the power of the key’ and stood with half-closed doors fearing the danger of heresy.

Many ecclesiastical events of the 4th century pointed to the Arian ‘untruth’. Arius’s influence continued even later, with the Council of Ephesus, in 431, introducing an anathema against Nestorius, stating that St. Mary was not *Theotokos* (she who bore God), but only *Christotokos* (she who bore Christ). There was a hypostatic union: Christ was incarnated of the Virgin Mary, who was *Theotokos*. This was high-level theology, not easily accessible to laymen. The commonalities emphasized

that no one can be 'one with his father' and that no one can be 'unbegotten' but still born to a woman. Some courier paradigm had to be involved: although the angels carried the Father's will to the Earth, and human prayers to the Lord, the Son was still born into the temporal world. First there was The Word, the Son was unbegotten because he is consubstantial with his Father (John 14: 20 supports this statement). The Eternal Son had no need for a courier, no one carried his soul anywhere. There could not be any profane view about this issue. The views of the commonalities were dismissed, and encountered Tertullian's ultimate agnosticism: we cannot know it, but we can believe it.

Arianism was very popular, in part because of Eusebios of Nicomedia, a good friend of Arius, who baptized Constantine the Great. The teaching focused on St. Mary as *Christotokos*, outlining the personality of the most beloved saint for whole of the rest of the Middle Ages. "I begot you from the womb before the morning star" (Psalms 109:3). The Arian view was closer to the ordinary man's life cycle: from woman's womb the perfect image and radiant glory of the Father is brought into being (or created). The Arian liturgies competed for popularity with orthodox worship.⁸

According to Arius, the sole glory is the Soul, everything primeval / not created is the simplest, monads are everything, and dyads are created. On this premise, the Word (Christ) cannot know the combinations which led to his creation, since no one can know his / her complexity from the beginning. Even the words in Proverbs 8:22 seem to be Arian: "The Lord made me his when first he went about his work, at the birth of time, before creation began." Friedrich Staphylus made a special statement on the topic, *An filius Dei fuerit incarnandus* (1551), soon after the quarrels about the Augsburgian Interim, which he wanted to oppose, in order to show his real competency. Staphylus sought *Hebraica veritas* behind his statement, correcting it: the Hebraic text was mistranslated through Greek into Latin; if the correct vocals are added to the signs, the Jews cannot offer them about the real words given to Jesus. Erasmus, a scholar with a supranormal understanding of the ancient root texts, was more limited when handling the problem of the alleged counterfeit of God's words. He stated that the Apostles, simple and honest men, spoke in their own language and could not transmit the divine message through foreign idiom. Their Hebrew prevailed in their messages, which seemed like hyperbole to future generations.⁹ The scholars of the Reformation realized that the sayings of Jesus' disciples could be too distant in terms of context, which was not the case in the first early Christians schools. Foreigners could only spoil the divine Word.

Heresy and heresiology require separating out the discourse. A flock of sheep has hundreds of male one-year-old lambs, but only one of them will finally be the Passover sacrifice. How to find this lamb? The peasant divides his flock: ones that are possible to the right, the others to the left. The ‘scapegoats’ are not ours, they are ‘strange’, insisted every Christian school.

The first Church Fathers had many lines of reasoning, which were later considered to be heretical. Origen (d. 253/254) argued that since God created all beings in the temporal world, God the Father created God the Son. The theory of subordination did not exist at that time, and Origen took Matthew 3:17, Mark 1:11, Luke 3:21, and many other quotations literally, for example: The Father begot the only-begotten Son. Later, such interpretation was considered heretical, since the Father and the Son are one (John 10:30). However, Tertullian (d. circa 240) went further than Origen, insisting that not only did the Father suffer on the Cross, the Son did not suffer, because he only occupied the human form that suffered (Docetism). The Word (*sermo*) was ‘native’ (*nativitas*). It was initially established (*conditus*) by the Father as ‘wisdom’ (*sophia*), then begotten for activity (*generatus ad effectum*), after which it was proceeded by the Father (or at his hand).¹⁰ This progression of the Son was a single begetting (not creation), and the substance of the Son was a special act (not gift) of the atonement. It seems that for these contemporaries, the Son came from eternity, it was he who tore the veil in the midst of the temple, his divine power acted even at the moment when his flesh experienced unimaginable passions.¹¹ Tertullian’s Docetic interpretation reminds the Anabaptist theologian Caspar Schwenckfeld of the 16th century, when it was believed that Jesus went to Heaven with all his earthly attributes: once the Lord left the tomb, he was soon at his Father’s table (see the vocabulary of different schools in the penultimate part of this book).

The Synod of Chalcedon, 451, solemnly decided: Christ is *asygshytōs*, *atreptōs*, *adiaretōs*, *achōristōs* (unconfused, immutable, undivided, inseparable). He suffered and won against death, but he could not be without passions.¹² Now it finally became clear that the Son was consubstantial with the Father, *hoc est eiusdem cum Patre substantiae* (in Gr. *homousios*). The Father is eternal, almighty and omnipotent. The Son is of the Father, of the essence of the Father. They both have a joint effect in the Trinity, and proceed with the Holy Ghost.¹³

Old Chalcedonian formulas about God’s impassibility ignited scholastic debates on the topic “Could God’s foreseeing err?” God enforced the laws, and only he could remove them. Could he harm himself? Abelard answers Abelard answers ‘No, but God’s will may move

on a different path'.¹⁴ Johann von Hilten, a rebellious Livonian Franciscan of Dorpat, and an intimidating prophet, foresaw the end of the world in MDCLI. This Roman numeral supposedly stands for *Messis Domini Christi Liberatori*.^{*} We cannot know for sure, but, pseudo-prophets have speculated about it, and Abelard questioned the logic of predestination. There are thousands of actions, which can change every situation, forcing things to go *aliter* ('otherwise' is always an illusion). Luther and Calvin asked: why God should err?^{**} If the Last Judgement is not in 1651, it would come eventually for the medieval world. Man wills, and God draws his will, predestination is inscribed into man's will, and vice versa.

Docetic views were taken more seriously than the Marcian took them. If the Son's substance was bigger than Jesus' carnal substance, as "the sea is bigger than one drop", then it was considered real if the tomb was opened not from the inside but the outside (the idea of the ubiquity: "He who lay in the manger and was held to the maiden's breast, but was at the same time seated on the right hand of God" Luther wrote to his wife, eleven days before his death.¹⁵) Pantheistic spiritualism has carried Christianity through all the millennia of its existence. A dove that brought the Father's recognition for the Son departed, and arrived. It is significant that the era of scholastics offered opportunities for mockery, and then to question various dogmas. Eustachius Atrebatensis (OFM, the bishop of Coutances who died in 1291), considered the notion that the Holy Ghost not only generated the Son, but that the Holy Ghost also produced the Son through Mary, although the Word is eternal, as St. Augustine wrote in *De Trinitate* 15.27. This concept contains a psychological model of reifying Trinitarian relations. But the logicians wanted proof. Strict logical disciplines in the medieval universities were urged to prove, or question, the holiest: the Holy Spirit is born from Mary, God is / is not a stone, a jackass, a foot of Christ. Those propositions became the future foundations of heresies.¹⁶

* Harvesting of Savior Jesus Christ the Liberator. Compare to John 4: 37–38. According to Hilten, Rome would be destroyed sometime between 1514 and 1518, and at the last date, the Antichrist will appear. Hilten died in the hospital of Eisenach monastery at the end of 1500, in the same town in which Luther, then a trivial schoolboy, studied. See Paul Johansen 1939. Johann von Hilten in Livland. *Ein Franziskanischer Schwarmgeist am Vorabend der Reformation*. In *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte*, Vol. 36, S. 24–50.

* Abelard, continuing his thought: *Logica ingredientibus*, *ibid*. Luther's opinion was that God preserves human ability to make choices, and Calvin's that God has some special enterprises with his will and predestination (Calvin's answer to Augsburg's seventh article of faith).

God exists in improper things as well. He is the essence, and his shadows are everywhere, even in filth and poison (Friar Salimbene da Parma's famous acknowledgment of an abdomen being purified and praising God). God's voice "I am who I am" speaks to "he who is hath sent me to you" (Exodus 3:14). On the basis of this passage, Peter of Lombard concluded that God is not a being, but an essence (Lib. I; dist VIII.1). But medieval readers of the Bible were not sceptical: while pasturing Jethro's sheep in the Horeb desert, Moses cried "Here I am!" (Exodus 3:4), and received God's answer "I am who I am." No one questioned whether this might have been an echo.

The contradictions between Christ's human will and divine will seems to have retained sophism in medieval theology, and, consequently, brought death to Jan Hus, a victim of the early incriminations, who had been assigned a confusion of divine, incorruptible, and worldly natures - no person with mortal sin, or who is unwilling to imitate the life of Christ and his apostles can be Pope, prelate or master; only Christ can be the head of the church. Moreover, if a man living the pure Christian life, debunks the errors of dignitaries, he fulfils Christ's will; so said St. Paul.¹⁷ Hus expressed the ordinary medieval thought: every pious and honest man is Christ in a lesser form. The doctors of the Church wrote about this many times: no one can follow Christ in will (Augustine, *De Fide et Symbolo*, c. 4; John of Damascus *Orthodoxae Fidei* III. c. 1; Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae* III, 11.5). Amalarius of Metz, the Bishop of Trier and Lyon of the Carolingian era, insisted that no human can endure such passions as Christ did.¹⁸ Even the reformist fathers agreed: the final justice of Christ will be done through his divine nature (Calvin's *Institutio Christianae Religionis*, 2.13). The view, finally and officially recognized as a dogma, was: Christ, in his second, human nature, shared the sin of Adam, but should have been distinguished from sinners due to the nature of sin, which he came to defeat (*Summa Theologiae* III.6; answer 1); he allowed himself to be tempted to strengthen us against temptation.

Wyclif-Hus-Luther's party never argued with the aforementioned conclusions and accepted them completely. In fact, Hus, criticizing the avarice of the Roman curia, concubine-rich prelates and abbots, emphasized Romans 8:29: "All those who from the first were known to him, he has destined from the first to be molded into the image of his Son, who is thus to become the eldest-born among many brethren." Luther, in his famous disputation with Johann Eck in 1519, never gave a deeper analysis of the ever-spoiled human nature, or of the fitting of Christ's real duties as a head of the embattled church. He credited the Greek dissidents, insisting that the Scripture is the only canon of the church in which Wyclif