

CALVIN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

ANTOINE DE CHANDIEU (1534-1591): ONE OF THE FATHERS OF
REFORMED SCHOLASTICISM?

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO
THE FACULTY OF CALVIN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BY
THEODORE GERARD VAN RAALTE

GRAND RAPIDS, MICHIGAN

MAY 2013



CALVIN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

3233 Burton SE • Grand Rapids, Michigan • 49546-4301

800 388-6034 fax: 616 957-8621 info@calvinseminary.edu

www.calvinseminary.edu

This dissertation entitled

**ANTOINE DE CHANDIEU (1534-1591): L'UN DES PÈRES DE LA
SCHOLASTIQUE RÉFORMÉE?**

written by

THEODORE GERARD VAN RAALTE

and submitted in partial fulfillment of

the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

has been accepted by the faculty of Calvin Theological Seminary

upon the recommendation of the undersigned readers:

Richard A. Muller, Ph.D.

Lyle D. Bierma, Ph.D.

Laura Smit, Ph.D.

Irena D. Backus, Ph.D.

Ronald J. Feenstra, Ph.D.
Dean of Academic Programs

Date May 18, 2013

Copyright © 2013 by Theodore G. (Ted) Van Raalte

All rights reserved

For Christine

CONTENTS

Preface	viii
Abstract	xii

Chapter 1

Introduction: Historiography and Scholastic Method

Introduction.....	1
State of Research on Chandieu	6
Published Research on Chandieu's Contemporary Theologians	8
Argument of the Present Work	11
Historiography and Methodology in Intellectual History	14
' <i>Seeing things their way</i> '	14
<i>Objectivity but not neutrality</i>	16
<i>Need for study of religious texts and ideas</i>	18
Scholastic Method and Renaissance Humanism	21
<i>Introduction</i>	21
<i>Scholastic method defined and described</i>	22
<i>Renaissance humanism</i>	27
<i>Free-flowing rhetoric versus tight scholastic reasoning</i>	30
<i>The Renaissance humanists' Aristotle</i>	31
<i>Aristotle as artifex methodi in the early modern period</i>	34
<i>The teaching of Aristotelian logic in Reformed Basel, Strasbourg, Lausanne, and Geneva</i>	38
<i>The role of disputations in sixteenth century Reformed pedagogy</i>	42
<i>Two kinds of disputations: question and argument formats</i>	46
The Periodization of Intellectual History: Continuities and Discontinuities	47
<i>Broad continuity in intellectual history c. 1250 to c. 1750</i>	47
<i>Specific developments in rhetoric and logic in the sixteenth century</i>	51
Plan of the Present Work	55
Outline of the Present Work	56

Chapter 2

A Chronology of the Life and Writings of Antoine de Chandieu

Introduction.....	59
Chandieu's Family, Titles, and <i>nommes de plume</i>	61
Chandieu's Education	64
Chandieu's Service and Travels	70
Chandieu's Writings	76
The Structure of the <i>Opera Theologica</i>	95
Conclusion	97

Chapter 3

The 1560s: Scholastic Method in Two Early Disputations

Introduction.....	99
Fallacy of Origins and Genetic Fallacy	99

Possible Influences on Chandieu's Method.....	102
<i>La confirmation de la discipline ecclesiastique</i> (1566).....	104
<i>The Discipline ecclesiastique of 1559</i>	105
<i>Context: Morély threatens the stability of the</i>	
<i>French Reformed Churches</i>	106
<i>Evidences of scholastic sophistication</i>	110
<i>Structure of enumerated arguments, objections, and errors</i>	111
<i>A rather keen sensitivity for disputational and hermeneutical principles</i> ...	113
<i>Contextual, philological, and grammatical arguments</i>	118
<i>Conclusion</i>	123
<i>Refutatio libelli quem Claudius de Sainctes</i> (1567)	125
<i>Historical circumstances of the Refutatio</i>	125
<i>Style and structure of the Refutatio</i>	127
<i>The arguments of the Refutatio – I. Defence of Calvin</i>	129
<i>The arguments of the Refutatio – II. Ridiculing the Schoolmen</i>	130
<i>The arguments of the Refutatio – III. Religious orders are divisive</i>	132
<i>Medieval sources in the Refutatio</i>	133
<i>Conclusion on the Refutatio</i>	134
Conclusion re. the 1560s.....	136

Chapter 4

The 1570s: Chandieu's Scholastic Refutations Regarding Lawful Calling

Introduction	137
<i>De Legitima vocatione pastorum Ecclesiae Reformatae</i> (1577)	138
<i>Scholastic terms to guide the reader</i>	139
<i>"Common sense" enlisted in his support</i>	142
<i>The lengthy summarizing argument, expressed hypothetically</i>	144
<i>Sophismata F. Turriani . . . rectè & Theologicè disputandi</i> (1577)	146
<i>Leading the way scholastically and analytically</i>	147
<i>Structure of the disputation</i>	149
<i>Pursuit of academic precision</i>	152
<i>Patristic and Medieval sources, especially Gratian</i>	154
<i>Conclusion</i>	154
The State of Chandieu's Scholastic Method c. 1577	155
Claude Auberi and the Development of Chandieu's Scholastic Method	157
<i>Chandieu "revived" the precepts of the Aristotelian method</i>	157
<i>Claude Auberi and the "highly erudite Frenchmen" of Lausanne</i>	159
<i>Auberi's textbooks on early parts of the Organon</i>	161
<i>Conclusion re. Auberi's influence up to 1577</i>	165
Some Conclusions re. Chandieu's Sources of and Occasions for	
Scholastic Method	166

Chapter 5

Prolegomenal Matters in 1580: "Theological and Scholastic"

Introduction.....	170
Choosing a Scholastic Style, not Rhetorical	171

The Titles of the “Theological and Scholastic” Treatises	173
The Programmatic Introduction to the “Theological and Scholastic” Treatises	176
<i>Editions of the preface: 1580, 1584, and the 1592 Opera Theologica</i>	176
<i>The opening letter of 1580</i>	180
<i>The Preface: I. Theology as a Science with Principles/Axioms (1592)</i>	182
<i>The Preface: II. Disputing “scholastically”</i>	188
<i>The Preface: III. “Disputing theologically and at the same time scholastically”</i>	193
The Hermeneutical Rules from 1581	194
Conclusion re. Chandieu’s preface and the “newness” of his method	197

Chapter 6

Proving the 1580 Thesis: All Necessary Dogmas Are in Scripture

Introduction	203
The Contents of <i>De verbo Dei scripto</i>	203
<i>Chapter 1. Staging the argument: thesis and antithesis</i>	203
<i>Chapter 2. The positive argument: Scripture loci as grounds</i>	204
<i>Chapter 3. The negative argument: Refuting the opposing thesis</i>	214
<i>Chapter 4. Refuting the Papists’ arguments</i>	220
<i>Chapter 5. How (not) to use the Church Fathers</i>	230
<i>Chapter 6. Church fathers in support of Reformed teaching</i>	232
Chandieu’s Doctrine of Scripture Drives His Method	235
<i>An area of agreement: All of Scripture is inspired by God</i>	235
<i>The locus method and deductive reasoning</i>	236
<i>True faith must be firm and certain</i>	238

Chapter 7

Reflection on Chandieu’s Scholastic Method 1580-1589

The Disputational Structure	241
<i>Medieval sources: two kinds of disputation</i>	243
<i>Written “for the better practice of disputations”</i>	249
<i>Back to Geneva, Lausanne, Basel, Berne, and Nîmes</i>	251
<i>Chandieu’s and Thomas’s disputational structures</i>	255
<i>A parallel to Chandieu’s overall structure</i>	258
<i>Chandieu employs the genre of the medieval quaestio disputata</i>	259
<i>Sources of Chandieu’s unique disputational elements</i>	262
<i>Chandieu’s sense of “newness” of method</i>	264
<i>Looking back: 1566 to 1580</i>	266
<i>Looking forward: 1580 to 1589</i>	269
Chandieu and the Hypothetical Syllogistic.....	273
<i>Aristotle’s “syllogism from a hypothesis” and the Stoics</i>	274
<i>The medieval scholastics and the hypothetical syllogistic</i>	276
<i>A fortiori: the hypothetical syllogistic useful in comparisons</i>	279
<i>Chandieu’s terminology for the parts of the syllogism</i>	281
<i>Renaissance manuals of dialectic and the hypothetical syllogism</i>	283
<i>Pierre de la Ramée and the hypothetical syllogism</i>	285

<i>Claude Auberi and hypothetical syllogisms</i>	289
<i>Jacob Schegk and hypothetetical syllogisms</i>	293
Conclusion	296
 Chapter 8	
Conclusion: <i>One of the Fathers of Reformed Scholastic Theology</i>	303
Paeans and Poems Contemporary to Chandieu	303
Conclusions: The Contributions of This Study	308
Appendix 1: Publications of Antoine de Chandieu.....	317
Appendix 2: Organization and Structure of the <i>Opera Theologica</i>	318
Appendix 3: Schematic of the structure of <i>Confirmation</i> <i>de la discipline ecclesiastique</i> (1566)	319
Appendix 4: Theses for Disputation	325
Bibliography	327

PREFACE

In a work such as this, the apogee of joy normally coincides with the completion of writing. I must say, however, that I have had a multitude of joys along the way also, and count it a privilege to be allowed to do this work. My first thanks are to my Father in heaven for granting me not only the desire, but also the health, time, and understanding necessary to research, analyse, and write. That I have completed this work is also a testimony to the love and dedication to my dear wife Christine who never (!) ceased to encourage me in this process. When I thought I couldn't do it, she was there to encourage. I thank God for granting me her as gift with whom to spend my life. To her I dedicate this dissertation.

For help along the way, I would like to single out the mentorship of Richard Muller, especially for teaching so brilliantly, writing so copiously, and conversing so cordially. Our day trip up to Sion and Evolène in the Alps will always be a great memory. Irena Backus is hereby thanked for taking me under her wing during a summer intensive in Geneva, suggesting I study Antoine de Chandieu, and providing immediate feedback on chapters of this dissertation. I could not have had a better outside reader. Lyle Bierma also deserves thanks not only for reading this dissertation but also for guiding me as his tutorial assistant. Thanks also to Laura Smit, the sympathetic fourth reader.

My good friends, Albert Gootjes and Jason Zuidema, have always been a great encouragement – the former while traipsing the halls of the Hekman Library and the streets of Geneva, and for helping with Latin and French; the latter for inviting me to co-author a work on Guillaume Farel, talking long hours by phone, and traipsing the streets of Geneva and Montreal. John Cooper once answered some of my early questions about

categorical and hypothetical syllogisms. He is but one of the many fine professors at Calvin Theological Seminary who taught some fabulous courses and grilled us in our year of written and oral comprehensives.

Scholars always depend on those who preceded them, and Donald Sinnema paved the way for further study of Chandieu with a fine analysis of Chandieu's theological method, published in 1994. Although I offer nuance to his findings, I benefited from his research. Nicolas Fornerod kindly gave me a copy of this essay to stimulate my interest.

I would especially like to thank my dear wife and children for cheerfully moving to Grand Rapids for three years to fulfill the residency portion of the Ph.D. program. Those were wonderful years, living on Hiawatha Drive! Thank-you, Alex, Elianna, Carissa, Matthew, Abigail, Sophia, and (since then) Elicia! I recall the excitement we all shared when I found the château de Chandieu on Google Earth. Another memorable event was Abigail learning how to pronounce Chandieu (Shon-djee-uh) correctly at age five by spontaneously repeating it over and over to herself at the supper table.

The consistory of the Redeemer Canadian Reformed Church of Winnipeg, MB, was particularly kind to their pastor by granting him a study leave of three years without knowing whether or not the Lord would provide them with another pastor in that time. Thankfully he did, letting me breathe easier while studying. The consistory of the church I now serve, the Maranatha Canadian Reformed Church of Surrey, BC, has been very encouraging to me in all my academic pursuits, including the completion of this dissertation. They granted leave from meetings and one less sermon per week for the summer of 2012. This turned out to be a big help. Thank-you! Many people along the way have encouraged me in this journey, and I thank them all.

I would be remiss if I did not mention Nicolaas Gootjes, my professor in dogmatics at the Canadian Reformed Theological Seminary. Back in 2001, when I had been in ministry for two years, he encouraged me to continue my academic studies. He also gave me good advice about what degrees to take as I continued. Jelle Faber, the first dogmatics professor at our seminary, now deceased, was also very encouraging in some public correspondence back in 2003. Besides these men, David Widdicombe, Egil Grislis, and Terrance Tiessen, all of Manitoba, stand out as great teachers who urged me onward. Although I have had several memorable occasions in my life when I plainly said that I was done with formal education, God has directed my life differently. His plan was far more interesting and challenging than anything I could have dreamed of. Sometimes I think he smiles at the things we say about our future because he knows what he really has in store for us. Back of all the teachers who formed me were my very first teachers, my parents Clarence and Ryma Van Raalte. They have always supported whatever career and calling their children pursued, as long as it was godly. They were also more than ready to help financially. Thank-you!

Finally, a number of librarians have been eminently helpful. Absolutely outstanding among them is Paul Fields at Calvin's Hekman Library who, for academic reasons, first connected me with my good friend Jason Zuidema, and who thereafter has by diverse means managed to supply me with at least a dozen hard-to-get articles and essays (my thanks to Drew McGinnis also!) and even had the library purchase works that I needed to use. The libraries of the University of Geneva, the University of British Columbia, and the Canadian Reformed Theological Seminary also supplied various works. With the sea-change that digitization has brought about, I extend my warmest

thanks to David Sytsma, the moderator of the Post-Reformation Digital Library. I well remember the day when Richard Muller first sent around a list of findings from Google books and some of us starting downloading. Last but not least, I mention Junho Hwang, a Ph.D. candidate in math who also happens to love Reformed theology and is a member of the congregation I pastor. He has helped me secure some resources and even an inter-library loan. Thank-you to all! Though none of you are responsible for my mistakes and shortcomings, all of you may take some credit for whatever good it pleases God to work through this study.

ABSTRACT

The present work is the first dissertation to study any of Antoine de Chandieu's prodigious output of scholastic theological works. Chandieu was a French Reformed pastor and theologian who lived from 1534 to 1591. He had a fascinating life as a French nobleman with extensive land holdings in France who was Protestant in the time of the Wars of Religion. His role in the church polity of the French Reformed Churches was crucial in the period 1559-1572. After this he resided in Lausanne and Geneva and in time taught theology at their academies, with a break from 1585-1588 while he served the future Henry IV of France as chaplain and fundraiser. Chandieu was a master of genres who published famous poetry that was set to music in his own lifetime. He also wrote a martyrology, a stage play, and of course, a lot of emails. Poets in the generation that followed him considered him one member of an illustrious threesome – after 1605 they looked back to the golden years of “Calvin, Chandieu, and Beza.” In the widest sense, then, this dissertation aims to rescue Chandieu from obscurity by understanding him through the eyes of his contemporaries and thus to produce a history that is more accurate to the era because it reaches for the requisite level of detail.

More concretely, I argue that polemical and educative reasons primarily lie behind Chandieu's extended recourse to scholastic method for theological argument. While his works of 1566, 1567, and 1577 certainly prepared the way, six works from the 1580s – all entitled “theological and scholastic” – especially rely on a very intricate scholastic method to make their arguments. This dissertation shows that these model treatises of Chandieu and his appeal to his fellow theologians to reason in accordance with Aristotle's *Analytics* fit well into the precise era of 1575-1585 in the Swiss cantons.

At the same time, I show that Chandieu was not merely an “Old Aristotelian” (Risse’s category), for he resurrected the medieval genre of the written *quaestio disputata* and made his arguments predominantly by way of hypothetical syllogisms. Both of these developments go beyond Aristotle and the latter is even to some extent against Aristotle’s *Organon*. I also prove, based on a statement of Simon Goulart, that Chandieu’s written *quaestiones disputatae* (he does not call them this, but I have thus identified them) were produced in conjunction with his classroom disputations. By means of these he desired to teach theology and philosophy together.

Perhaps most fascinating to some readers will be the argument that Chandieu’s utilization of scholastic method was precisely to present theological conclusions worthy of faith. His recourse to the hypothetical syllogistic appears to be somewhat novel, but his reasons for it extend back to the desire to let Scripture speak and forward to the desire that believers would rely on true and valid theological conclusions with a firm faith.

The conclusions of this study confirm the model of continuity from the medieval to reformation eras, while adding detail and nuance to the question of the “rise” of scholastic method and the nature of one of the many Aristotelianisms of the era. As an exercise in intellectual history, and not just Reformation history, this dissertation surveys scholarship on Aristotle and the medieval to early modern university to underline the continuity in intellectual history that existed broadly speaking from 1250 to 1750. At the same time it reveals the particular developments in the mid to late sixteenth century and demonstrates the extent to which Chandieu fits these developments and the extent to which he offers elements of discontinuity.

Chapter 1

Introduction: Historiography and Scholastic Method

Introduction

In early June 1558, two young men, one eighteen and the other twenty-four, sat together in a Paris prison cell. One had been caught with a copy of Calvin's *Institutes*; the other was guilty as accomplice; a third had slipped some silver into the hands of the arresting sergeant and had gotten away. The two prisoners softly spoke various Scriptures from memory to cope with their capture. They shouted and sang Psalms through the walls of the prison to communicate comfort to others imprisoned for similar offenses. But the next day the older of the two prisoners was removed and the two cellmates never saw each other again. The one that remained, Jean Morel, was interrogated by the judges of the Châtelet on June 09, 1558.

A week later two doctors of theology from the Sorbonne carried out a much longer interrogation. When asked what books he read, the young man replied that he read the Bible and Calvin's *Institution*. His interrogator declared that Calvin had written heresies, to which the young man conceded that if Calvin's writings could be proved to conflict with Scripture, he would not believe them. His interrogator responded that he had never read said *Institution*, but for the love of the young man's soul he would read it to show him its errors. The King's prosecutor then gave the Sorbonne doctor the *Institution* which had been taken when the young man was captured. The doctor of theology promised to return right after lunch. A full eight hours later he came back with said book and several other large tomes. Still finding no success with the young man, he turned to flattery, then to manipulation, as he reminded the young man of all the good he could do

if he would just concede. Then he would not have to be burned but could anticipate going to Geneva to study more, to live, and not to waste his life. This rattled the young man's brain, and he was left in his cell to ponder.

Several days later the lords of the Châtelet brought the young man before them. This made little difference. On Tuesday, July 12, a bishop tried. The next day a party of six, including three previous interrogators, came to intimidate and persuade the young man. Cracks began to appear; he said with his mouth what they wanted to hear but secretly in his heart meant it another way. Soon he conceded everything with his mouth, thinking that in his heart he was still holding fast.¹ But when he had signed a recantation, his signature came to be like the crowing of the rooster after Peter had denied Christ the third time. The young man's conscience would not let him alone in his hypocrisy and the judgment of God troubled him deeply. Multiple Scriptures came into his heart as warnings for his sin. He began to realize how he had denied his Lord and began to ask his Father in heaven to forgive him. Soon Scriptures of forgiveness and comfort filled his heart. He regained stability and comfort in his soul. He thought of his prison as a place without the temptations of the streets, without the multiple idols – really, it was a place to pray and sing freely, nay, it was almost a church! With these thoughts and more, he sustained multiple interrogations and various unsavoury prison cells over the next several months. Finally, on February 16 he was officially judged to be a heretic. His body had wasted away in sickness due to his treatment, but his soul remained strong. On the 17th he wrote his final letter to his fellow believers and had it too smuggled out of the prison. It

¹ The brothers Haag report that Morel's brother was the well-known printer Guillaume Morel, a sympathizer of Reform ideas who remained Roman Catholic, i.e., a Nicodemite. He apparently entreated his imprisoned brother Jean to follow the same course in order to save his life, and this also influenced Jean. Eugène and Émile Haag, *La France Protestante* (Paris: J. Cherbuliez, 1856), vol. 6, p. 500.

detailed one last interrogation on all the same topics. Three or four days later the young man Jean Morel expired, possibly due to poison, but most likely due to the harsh conditions. The prison officials quickly buried the body but the next day the authorities had it disinterred because he was a heretic.² On February 27 the body was burnt to ashes.

The report of this martyrdom covers some eighty-one pages in Antoine de Chandieu's *Histoire des persecutions*, and for good reason.³ The original cellmate of Jean Morel was none other than Antoine de Chandieu. By publishing Morel's account in *Histoire des persecutions* Chandieu honoured the memory of his friend, thanked God for his own freedom, and encouraged Protestants to stand firm against Nicodemite dissimulation.⁴ The events tell us something about Chandieu, for he was rescued from the cell by none other than Antoine de Bourbon, the King of Navarre and father of the future King Henry IV. Bourbon arrived at the prison the day after their capture, claimed that Chandieu was his chamberlain, and spirited him away before the authorities realized that Chandieu was actually one of the pastors of the Protestant church of Paris. A big catch had slipped through their fingers.

Not only was Chandieu well connected as a member of the nobility, but he also carried a deep pastoral concern for his Paris congregation to whom he dedicated *Histoire des persecutions*. Obviously he had followed the trial of Jean Morel as closely as possible, using various connections to obtain Morel's letters and quite possibly whatever official transcripts of the trials existed. *Histoire des persecutions* came out at the same

² On the ancient canon law for this, see Nicholaus Eymeric, *Directorium Inquisitorum* (Venice: Simeon Vasalin, 1595), p. 104. For an English Translation, see *Illustrations of Popery*, n. trans. (New York: J. P. Callender, 1838), p. 378.

³ Antoine de Chandieu [pseudo. Zamariel], *Histoire des Persecutions* (Lyon: s. n., 1563), pp. 210-91.

⁴ Chandieu probably would approve of Morel's story heading up the present work.

time as the first full English edition of John Foxe's *Actes and Monuments* (1563), commonly called *Foxe's Book of Martyrs*.⁵ Foxe, however, had earlier published for scholars in Latin, Chandieu straightaway in the vernacular French for Protestants in the French kingdom.⁶

In his trial Morel was accused of being a preacher.⁷ He was not, but he had been working very closely with Chandieu, was captured together with two ministers who were at his home, and his trial records show an astonishing knowledge of the Bible and the Church Fathers, especially for an eighteen year old.⁸ His interrogator once suggested that if he would recant he would be able to go to Geneva and study, and this seems to have rattled the young man. It's my guess that Jean Morel aspired to the ministry, and this gave Chandieu all the more reason to supply the church with the details of his trials.

Chandieu was already strongly committed to the Reformed cause, but his time in prison in 1558 only served to increase his resolve. For the next thirty years he would utilize his noble status, substantial wealth, academic learning, and his pastor's heart to help – even to lead – the French Reformed Churches. His presence at their Synods, travels to their churches, connections to French royalty, trips to foreign governments and churches, and great variety of publications all vouch for his important place in the history of Reformed theology and of the Reformed Churches in France and Switzerland. His life

⁵ John Foxe, *The Actes and Monuments of these Latter and Perillous Days, Touching Matters of the Church* (London: John Day, 1563). The earliest edition (much shorter) appeared as *Commentarii rerum in ecclesia gestarum, maximarumque, per totam Europam, persecutionum* (Strasbourg: Rihelius, 1554). Later Latin editions appeared in Basel in 1559 and 1563.

⁶ Earlier the following 700 page work had appeared in French: Jean Crespin, ed., *Le livre des martyrs* ([Geneva]: Jean Crespin, 1554).

⁷ Chandieu, *Histoire des Persecutions*, p. 277.

⁸ Haag writes that when Morel came to Paris “il entra au service d’*Antoine de Chandieu* . . .” He also writes about him “embarrasser ses juges par ses réponses toutes empreintes d’une profonde connaissance de la Bible et des Pères.” Haag, *La France Protestante*, vol. 6, pp. 500-501.

was also fascinating: He lived through the tumultuous French Wars of Religion, often a refugee, always with a big question as to the status of his substantial land holdings in France, and yet close enough to Henry of Navarre (the future King Henry IV) that he served as one of Henry's personal chaplains in the Wars from 1585-1588 and had the official task then and afterward of raising funds from Switzerland and Germany for Henry's military campaigns in France. At one point, Chandieu himself personally financed Henry's efforts, but was not repaid. In the midst of such an intriguing life Chandieu produced some rather erudite pieces of theology. From the programmatic church order for the French Reformed Churches – the *Discipline ecclesiastique* of 1559 – to the series of six “theological and scholastic” treatises of the 1580s, Chandieu produced some very highly valued works for the church.

Yet study of Chandieu has lagged far behind study of many other Reformers. Even many students of the Reformation do not know him. Suffice to say that – in spite of the fact that he is named “one of the fathers of Reformed scholasticism” by the present-day Reformation historian Olivier Fatio – after 400 years no dedicated study of either his theological method or content exists in any language.⁹ Ignorance of Chandieu's theological contributions is disproportionate to his importance in his own era: his polemics were closely followed, especially by Beza; he was the go-to theologian for Reformed refutations of the Jesuits; an early version of his *Opera* was published in Cambridge already seven years before his death; and, his more complete posthumous *Opera Theologica* then went through multiple editions and printings from 1592 to 1620.

At the same time Chandieu's (very non-scholastic) poetry inspired more than one

⁹ “Figure importante du protestantisme francophone, il est l'un des pères de la scolastique réformée,” *Dictionnaire Historique Suisse*, sub “Chandieu, Antoine de,” accessed July 04, 2012, <http://www.hls-dhs-dss.ch/textes/f/F11077.php>.

musician in his day to compose moving accompaniments. These are, by the way, still recorded by early music ensembles. All in all, Chandieu is a fascinating figure whose contributions to the history of Reformed theology should no longer be overlooked. In particular, the present study analyzes his important contributions to scholastic method among the Reformed theologians in the third quarter of the sixteenth century.

State of Research on Chandieu

Several scholars have studied Chandieu but his unique contributions to the shape and argument of Reformed theology have still not received much attention. In 1994 Donald Sinnema published an essay in which he analysed a key introduction to Reformed scholastic method in one of Chandieu's works.¹⁰ Richard Muller has incorporated into his *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics* some of Chandieu contributions.¹¹ These are helpful beginnings that open the way for sustained study of Chandieu as such. Besides the brief encyclopaedia entry of Fatio from which the present work takes its title, one can also refer to the remarks of Wilhelm Neuser who called Chandieu's application of Aristotelian analytics to theological construction "new," and to Dolf te Velde's brief remarks on the same preface that Sinnema analyzed.¹² Other authors have examined Chandieu in other contexts; for instance, Glenn Sunshine noticed Chandieu's key role in the early French Reformed Synods, and Robert Kingdon, Willem van't Spijker, Philippe

¹⁰ Donald Sinnema, "Antoine de Chandieu's Call for a Scholastic Reformed Theology (1580)," in *Later Calvinism: International Perspectives*, ed. W. Fred Graham (Kirkville, MO: Sixteenth Century, 1994), pp. 159-90.

¹¹ Richard A. Muller, *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics*, 4 vols. (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2003).

¹² Wilhelm Neuser, "Dogma und Bekenntnis in der Reformation: Von Zwingli und Calvin bis zur Synode von Westminster," in *Handbuch der Dogmen- und Theologiegeschichte*, ed. Carl Andresen, vol. 2 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980), p. 311; Dolf te Velde, *Paths Beyond Tracing Out* (Delft: Eburon, 2010), pp. 79-80.

Denis, and Jean Rott studied Chandieu's debate on church polity with Jean Morély.¹³ Finally, Sara Barker's recently published doctoral dissertation on Chandieu – the first dedicated to any of Chandieu's works – still leaves wide open the gap that will be addressed by the present work. In her dissertation Barker made an overview of the entire corpus of Chandieu's *vernacular* prose and poetry to explore how he helped shape French Reformed identity.¹⁴ She correctly noted Chandieu's "mastery of genres" but concentrated on his poetry rather than his scholastic method.¹⁵ She takes a somewhat sociological approach to her historical study, leaving examination of the content and method of Chandieu's influential Latin treatises on theology for other scholars.¹⁶

Peter Mack closes his 2011 study of renaissance rhetoric with a list of twenty recommended projects – studies he would have liked to use but couldn't find. The last of these is, "Studies of the revival of scholastic logic in the late sixteenth century . . ."¹⁷ Some of the published research we are about to review would have assisted Mack; perhaps the present work will form a suitable addition.

¹³ Glenn S. Sunshine, *Reforming French Protestantism: The Development of Huguenot Ecclesiastical Institutions, 1557-1572* (Kirkville, MO: Truman State, 2003), pp. 25-40; Robert M. Kingdon, *Geneva and the Consolidation of the French Protestant Movement 1564–1572* (Geneva: Droz, 1967); Willem van't Spijker, *Democratisering van de kerk anno 1562* (Kampen: Kok, [1974]); Philippe Denis and Jean Rott, *Jean Morély et l'utopie d'une démocratie dans l'Eglise* (Geneva: Droz, 1993).

¹⁴ Sara K. Barker, *Protestantism, Poetry and Protest: The Vernacular Writings of Antoine de Chandieu (c. 1534-1591)* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009). Her doctoral dissertation: Sara K. Barker, "Developing French Protestant Identity: the political and religious writings of Antoine de Chandieu (1534-1591)," (Ph. D. dissertation, University of St. Andrews, 2006). For reviews of the published work see: Scott Manetsch, *Renaissance Quarterly* 63:1 (2010): pp. 212-13; Theodore Van Raalte, *Calvin Theological Journal* 46:1 (2011): pp. 182-4.

¹⁵ Barker, *Protestantism, Poetry and Protest*, p. 11. For other references to Chandieu's literary versatility, compare pp. 109, 111, 123, 175, 247, 283.

¹⁶ Barker writes, "There remains a need for a systematic survey of his Latin works and their impact on the intellectual circles of late sixteenth-century Europe." Barker, *Protestantism, Poetry and Protest*, p. 4, n. 5.

¹⁷ Peter Mack, *A History of Renaissance Rhetoric 1380-1620* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), p. 318.

Published Research on Chandieu's Contemporary Theologians

As a case study of prolegomena, and the interaction of method and content, the present work joins a limited number of other similar monograph length studies. Olivier Fatio very ably examined Lambert Daneau (c. 1535-c. 1590), a contemporary of Chandieu. Daneau, however, had a more ambivalent relationship to scholastic method than Chandieu. Interestingly, in this work on Daneau, Fatio identifies Chandieu as a figure needing further study for the very reason that we cannot properly characterize each theologian's contribution apart from ongoing detailed study of their contemporaries.¹⁸

Richard Muller has masterfully probed the method of John Calvin (1509-1564), who was less inclined to rely upon overt scholastic method but who nevertheless exhibits certain scholastic motifs, as might be expected of a theologian in the period.¹⁹ John Patrick Donnelly explored Peter Martyr Vermigli's (1499-1562) Thomistic roots, finding that he did not jettison his scholastic training when he adopted Reformed teachings. Rather, he pressed his training into the service of the Reformed faith.²⁰ Sebastian Rehnman made a fine study of John Owen's (1616-1683) methodology in theology.²¹ Owen, however, worked in a later period than Chandieu, when the contours of Reformed theology and theological method were more well-established, and thus Owen's project is

¹⁸ "Certes son [Daneau's] oeuvre est particulièrement spectaculaire par l'étendue de ses intérêts, mais elle n'est pas seule à mériter une étude. Certains parmi ses maîtres ou ses amis, Hyperius, Zanchi, Chandieu, J.-J. Grynaeus ou Boquin attendent que l'on s'intéresse à leur théologie. Seule la multiplication de telles études pourra rendre sa place à la scolastique réformée dans l'histoire de la théologie et montrer la nouveauté qu'elle représente." Olivier Fatio, *Méthode et Théologie: Lambert Daneau et les débuts de la scolastique réformée* (Droz: Geneva, 1976), p. XII.

¹⁹ Richard Muller, *The Unaccommodated Calvin: Studies in the Foundation of a Theological Tradition* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000).

²⁰ John Patrick Donnelly, *Calvinism and Scholasticism in Vermigli's Doctrine of Man and Grace* (Leiden: Brill, 1976).

²¹ Sebastian Rehnman, *Divine Discourse: The Theological Methodology of John Owen* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2002).

much more comprehensive. The same may be said of a great number of useful studies on the seventeenth century Reformed scholastic theologians.²² The present thesis will elucidate a figure who stands after the first generation Reformers, and somewhere among the second and third generation. Rehnman rightly observes that these second generation Reformers did not write any “formal dogmatics.”²³ Chandieu’s “theological and scholastic” works are highly formalized and detailed but do not yet form a dogmatics text, say, in the sense of Turretin’s *Institutes of Elenctic Theology*, because Chandieu deals only with a limited number of disputed doctrines.

Besides these monograph length case studies, one can also turn to various scholarly articles and essays on the method of sixteenth century Reformed theologians. For instance, Olivier Fatio, Willem van’t Spijker, Donald Sinnema, and Dolf te Velde have each probed the methodology of Andreas Hyperius (1511-1564).²⁴ Fritz Broeyer analyzed William Whitaker’s (1548-1595) views on revelation and reason, showing his strong ties to Thomas Aquinas.²⁵ John Patrick Donnelly examined the Augustinian Peter Martyr Vermigli and his pupil Jerome Zanchi (1516-1590) on the same points, as did

²² See, for example the collections of essays in the following works: Maarten Wisse, Marcel Sarot, and Willemien Otten, eds., *Scholasticism Reformed: Essays in Honour of Willem J. van Asselt* (Leiden: Brill, 2010); Richard A. Muller, *After Calvin: Studies in the Development of a Theological Tradition* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003); Carl R. Trueman and R. Scott Clark, eds., *Protestant Scholasticism: Essays in Reassessment* (Carlisle, Cumbria: Paternoster Press, 1999); Willem J. van Asselt and Eef Dekker, eds., *Reformation and Scholasticism: An Ecumenical Enterprise* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2001).

²³ Rehnman, *Divine Discourse*, p. 52, cf. p. 48.

²⁴ Olivier Fatio, “Hyperius Plagié par Flacius: La Destinée d’une Méthode Exégétique,” *Histoire de l’exégèse au XVI^e siècle* (Geneva: Droz, 1978), pp. 362-81; Willem van’t Spijker, *Principe, methode en functie van de theologie bij Andreas Hyperius* (Kampen: Kok, 1990); Donald Sinnema, “The Distinction Between Scholastic and Popular: Andreas Hyperius and Reformed Scholasticism,” in *Protestant Scholasticism*, eds., Trueman and Clark (Carlisle, Cumbria: Paternoster, 1999), pp. 127-43; te Velde, *Paths Beyond Tracing Out*, pp. 79, 96-7, etc.

²⁵ Fritz G. M. Broeyer, “Traces of the Rise of Reformed Scholasticism in the Polemical Theologian William Whitaker (1548-1595),” in *Reformation and Scholasticism*, ed. Willem J. van Asselt and Eef Dekker (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2001), pp. 155-80.

Lambert Leijssen in regard to the Dominican trained Martin Bucer (1491-1551).²⁶ Frank James III makes the valid point that Vermigli's scholasticism was in no way mutually exclusive of his employment of Renaissance humanism.²⁷ R. Scott Clark points out the same for Caspar Olevian (1536-1587), as does Harm Goris for Jerome Zanchi in his study of Zanchi's scholastic method in his doctrine of God.²⁸ He also argues that Caspar Olevian and Antoine de la Faye (1540-1615) self-consciously employed scholastic method in order to transmit the gains of the earlier reformers to the needs of the schools.²⁹ The points made by James, Clark, and Goris hold true for Chandieu also, who worked a bit later than Vermigli but at the same time as Zanchi, Olevian, and de la Faye.

Joseph Freedman, Richard Muller, Howard Hotson, and Peter Mack have studied Bartholomäus Keckermann's (1572-1609) contributions to the study of logic – from a time shortly after Chandieu. Hotson explains Keckermann's conversion from Ramism to Aristotelianism.³⁰ Muller highlights Keckermann's thesis that true philosophy is not out to do battle with theology; more than that, true philosophy is necessary to theology.³¹

²⁶ John Patrick Donnelly, "Calvinistic Thomism," *Viator* 7 (1976): pp. 441-55; Lambert Leijssen, "Martin Bucer und Thomas von Aquin," *Ephemerides theologiae Lovanienses* 555:4 (1979): pp. 266-96.

²⁷ Frank A. James III, "Peter Martyr Vermigli: At the Crossroads of Late Medieval Scholasticism, Christian Humanism and Resurgent Augustinianism," in *Protestant Scholasticism: Essays in Reassessment*, ed. Carl R. Trueman and R. S. Clark (Carlisle, Cumbria: Paternoster, 1999), pp. 62-78; cf. Donnelly, *Calvinism and Scholasticism in Vermigli*, p. 29.

²⁸ R. Scott Clark, *Caspar Olevian and the Substance of the Covenant: The Double Benefit of Christ* (Grand Rapids, MI: Reformation Heritage Books, 2008), pp. 39-73; Harm Goris, "Thomism in Zanchi's Doctrine of God," *Reformation and Scholasticism: An Ecumenical Enterprise*, ed. Willem J. van Asselt and Eef Dekker (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2001), pp. 121-39, esp. pp. 125-6.

²⁹ Clark, "The Authority of Reason in the Later Reformation," pp. 111-26.

³⁰ Howard Hotson, *Commonplace Learning: Ramism and its German Ramifications 1543-1630* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), pp. 126-65.

³¹ Richard A. Muller, "Vera philosophia cum sacra theologia nusquam pugnat: Keckermann on philosophy, theology, and the problem of double truth," *Sixteenth Century Journal* 15:3 (1984): pp. 341-65. Compare Joseph S. Freedman, "The Career and Writings of Bartholomew Keckermann," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 141 (1997): pp. 505-64; reprinted in: Joseph S. Freedman, *Philosophy*

Mack presents Keckermann as part of the “new synthesis” together with Vossius and Caussin.³² In addition to the sources on Aristotle noted earlier in this chapter, several scholars have examined the important place of Aristotle particularly amongst various Reformers of Chandieu’s time.³³

Argument of the Present Work

The central thesis of the present work is that polemical, educative, and to some extent apologetic reasons prompted the French Reformed theologian Antoine de Chandieu in the 1580s to adopt the tightly argued method of the schools for the transmission of Reformed theology. His aims were at least threefold: to defeat the arguments of the Jesuits for the sake of the Reformed churches (polemical); to instruct the Reformed candidates in theology (educative); and, to defend the Reformed faith before the French Crown (apologetic). His overtly logical formulations consolidated the more prosaic arguments with which Reformed theologians had vigorously disputed

and the Arts in Central Europe, 1500-1700: Teaching and Texts at Schools and Universities (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1999), pp. 305-64.

³² Mack, *History of Renaissance Rhetoric*, p. 192. For Keckerman, see pp. 186-92.

³³ Irena Backus, “‘Aristotelianism’ in some of Calvin’s and Beza’s expository and exegetical writings on the doctrine of the Trinity, with particular reference to the terms οὐσία and ὑποστάσις,” in *Histoire de l’exégèse au XVIe siècle* (Geneva: Droz, 1978), pp. 351-60; Richard A. Muller, “Scholasticism, Reformation, Orthodoxy, and the Persistence of Christian Aristotelianism,” *Trinity Journal* 19:1 (Spring 1998): pp. 81-96; Richard A. Muller, “Reformation, Orthodoxy, ‘Christian Aristotelianism,’ and the Eclecticism of Early Modern Philosophy,” *Nederlands Archief voor Kerkgeschiedenis*, 81:3 (2001): pp. 306-25; T. Theo J. Pleizier and Maarten Wisse, “‘As the Philosopher Says’: Aristotle,” *Introduction to Reformed Scholasticism* ed. Willem J. van Asselt, trans. Albert Gootjes (Grand Rapids, MI: Reformation Heritage Books, 2010), pp. 26-43; Joseph S. Freedman, “Aristotle and the Content of Philosophy Instruction at Central European Schools and Universities during the Reformation Era (1500-1650),” *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 137:2 (1993): pp. 213-53; reprinted in: Joseph S. Freedman, *Philosophy and the Arts in Central Europe, 1500-1700: Teaching and Texts at Schools and Universities* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1999), pp. 213-53; Charles B. Schmidt, “Towards a Reassessment of Renaissance Aristotelianism,” *History of Science* 2 (1973): pp. 159-93. For an essay that approaches these historical questions with certain Neo-Calvinist impulses, see Donald Sinnema, “Aristotle and Early Reformed Orthodoxy,” in *Christianity and the Classics: The Acceptance of a Heritage*, ed. Wendy Helleman (New York: University Press of America, 1990), pp. 119-48.

against their opponents in the previous half-century. Since Chandieu had already used simpler variations of scholastic method in earlier works and since he lived and worked within an academic milieu, I argue that his appropriation of this method was not unexpected. In particular, the intricate disputational structure of Chandieu's 1580 *De verbo Dei scripto* will be probed in chapter 7 to demonstrate the continuity of his method with medieval disputations. Indeed, I will argue that he was rejuvenating a neglected written genre for use in Protestant theology.

The several arguments and contributions of the present work may be described utilizing concentric circles: At the widest compass I review key secondary literature to argue for continuity in intellectual history from c. A.D. 1250 to 1750 – specifically in terms of the universities, the role of Aristotle, and a fairly stable scholastic method. Even the introduction of Renaissance humanism did not replace scholastic method but instead became another tool that was brought into the academy and absorbed into the scholastic setting. Moreover, many figures – Chandieu being prominent among them – could as easily pen a poem as a scholastic disputation. The relationship of scholasticism and humanism is thus better understood as complementary and not pugnacious. Here we agree with the scholarly trajectory which correctly understands scholasticism not as a doctrine but an analytical method tied to the academies and schools.

Tightening the circle to the relationship of the medieval to the early modern era also brings out continuity in terms of philosophy, logic, and theological methodology, and Chandieu's theological work serves as a fitting exhibit of this. Besides the obvious overall continuity evidenced by the locution “theological and scholastic” in six of his book titles in the 1580s, precise examples of continuity will be argued at a more restricted

level.

At the penultimate level of Chandieu's precise era, I demonstrate that his increasing recourse to scholastic method and his adherence to a more "pure" Aristotle – especially in terms rejecting Ramism and utilizing the distinction between probable arguments that follow Aristotle's *Topics* and certain arguments that follow his *Analytics* – matches similar movements in the Reformed academies and perhaps even in Europe and England generally in the period 1575 to 1585. However, Chandieu provides more logical detail and precision than his Reformed contemporaries while also having recourse to elements of logic that are not Aristotelian – in other words, he, like many other Reformed theologians, was partly eclectic in his use of philosophy.³⁴ Previous scholars have been correct to characterize Chandieu as an "Old Aristotelian" (following Risse's categories) but no one explored Chandieu's work deep enough to nuance this characterization with the fact that he also depended heavily on medieval developments, including extensive use of the hypothetical syllogism – a syllogistic with Stoic and not Aristotelian roots.

At the core of the argument, I prove several points about *why* Chandieu turned increasingly to scholastic method: As noted above, first, he utilized scholastic method for theological disputations with his learned Roman Catholic, specifically Jesuit, opponents (the polemical motive); second, he taught theology and logic together for the Reformed candidates of theology by showing them how to argue "theologically and at the same time scholastically," that is, with Scripture as *principium* and logic as *instrumentum*, thus carefully distinguishing the truth and validity of the arguments (the educative motive); third, he sought to defend the legitimacy of the Reformed churches before the

³⁴ Muller, *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics*, vol. 1, p. 67.

French crown (the apologetic motive). One might add that he did all of this irenically, at least inasmuch as he avoided slurs and insults when making his arguments.

Finally, following careful analysis, I will make a number of specific and detailed characterizations about *what* Chandieu was doing. These will be summarized in chapters 7 and 8 below.

After all of these points have been argued, we will be in a position to test the question – with all the historiographical pitfalls that such a phrase places before us – whether it is appropriate to call Chandieu “one of the *fathers of* Reformed scholasticism.”

Historiography and Methodology in Intellectual History

‘Seeing things their way’

To understand an intellectual figure such as Chandieu requires close study of his published treatises guided by a critical and self-aware historical methodology.³⁵ In what follows I justify the approach of this study, based on recent discussions in historiography. The present work is an effort in intellectual history, specifically the history of theology – not to be understood in the older sense of the history of ideas.³⁶ Rather, as Skinner has persuasively argued, close study of primary sources can only be done when as much detail as possible is considered about the time and circumstances of their composition.³⁷ It is no longer possible to paint unified pictures of broad intellectual traditions; good

³⁵ “The subjects of intellectual historians are texts.” Donald R. Kelley, “What is Happening to the History of Ideas?” *Journal of the History of Ideas* 51:1 (Jan. – Mar. 1990): p. 19.

³⁶ Whereas some studies in historical theology of the last century treated historical figures through modern lenses and highlighted only that which contributed to some modern program’s questions, others treated their writings as instances of contact with the transcendent realm of “ideas.”

³⁷ Quentin Skinner, “Meaning and Understanding in the History of Ideas,” *History and Theory* 8:1 (1969): pp. 3-53. Compare Anthony Grafton and Suzanne Marchand, “Proof and Persuasion in History: A Preface,” *History and Theory* 33:4 (Dec 1994): pp. 3-4.

history requires the requisite level of detail.³⁸ Such detail should help us approach the history with as much objectivity as we can, which requires that we enter into the world of the figures we study, in order to “see things their way.”³⁹ In other words, we cannot abstract their writings from their own personal religious commitments. A number of prominent historians have lately been pleading for an understanding of religious history which does not overlook either the historical context or the actual doctrines in debate. A round table discussion of “Post-Confessional Reformation History” at the 2004 Sixteenth Century Society and Conference discussed the last half decade of study wherein the shift from church history to religious history and from key thinkers and theological ideas to “anthropological approaches to religion” had occurred.⁴⁰ Awareness had grown that confessional agendas had distorted the complicated historical reality of the past. However, the panel sensed that the pendulum had swung too far in overlooking religious factors and sought to increase space for specifically theological history. Philip Benedict stated, “For Reformation scholarship in North America, the most serious threats to the long-term health of the field come less from the remaining pockets of confessional historiography than from the current culture wars that now make so many liberal intellectuals tone deaf or hostile to most varieties of Christian religious tradition.”⁴¹ He warned historians to avoid two dangers: historians of theology should not overlook the many extra-theological influences; social and cultural historians of religion should not

³⁸ Anthony Grafton, *Worlds Made by Words: Scholarship and Community in the Modern West* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2009), p. 190.

³⁹ Alister Chapman, John Coffey, and Brad S. Gregory, eds., *Seeing Things Their Way: Intellectual History and the Return of Religion* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2009).

⁴⁰ Philip Benedict, “What is Post-Confessional History?” *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 97 (2006): p. 277.

⁴¹ Benedict, “What is Post-Confessional History?” p. 282.

distort the history by exploring it only for its implications of, for instance, gender dynamics or social and political transformation. In some areas these warnings have already been bearing fruit for several decades – for instance, in studies of the French Wars of Religion.⁴²

Objectivity but not neutrality

Researchers who pursue objectivity by framing history in terms of its own time and by pursuing the requisite level of detail still have to grapple with their own personal commitments. “Objectivity is not neutrality,” argues Carl Trueman.⁴³ He explains, “It is now generally accepted that no history is ‘neutral,’ in the sense that it just gives you the facts. Said facts are selected and then fitted together into a narrative by historians who have their own particular viewpoints and their own particular ways of doing things.”⁴⁴ Scott Hendrix acknowledged that a historian’s personal views affect his or her analysis whether such views are firmly held or not. “Post-confessional research” does not guarantee objectivity nor does strong confessional commitment “necessarily impinge on good scholarship.”⁴⁵ Similarly, Ethan Shagan cautioned historians not to turn from confessional, self-supporting historical study only to end up with an “ecumenical Reformation history . . . that is suspiciously close to modern, liberal ecumenism.”⁴⁶ The

⁴² Mack Holt, “Historical Writing in English on the French Reformation: The Last Thirty Years,” *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 100 (2009): p. 270.

⁴³ Carl R. Trueman, *Histories and Fallacies: Problems Faced in the Writing of History* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2010), p. 27, and pp. 25-68 generally.

⁴⁴ Trueman, *History and Fallacies*, p. 25.

⁴⁵ Scott Hendrix, “Post-Confessional Research and Confessional Commitment,” *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 97 (2006): pp. 284-6.

⁴⁶ Ethan H. Shagan, “Can Historians End the Reformation?” *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 97 (2006): p. 299.

key, then, is to “recognize . . . that secular ideas and ideologies are just as capable of distorting the study of religion as are particular religious commitments,” and therefore to be up front with oneself and others about one’s own commitments, and to distinguish these from the commitments of those under study.⁴⁷

When one’s own commitments find parallels in certain figures under study, as in the case of the present project, the researcher may have the benefit of an ‘insider’s’ understanding, but must also guard carefully against false assumptions and playing favourites. The more an era or a figure looks like one’s own, the more likely it is that aspects of context are being ignored. Nevertheless, even confessional motives can have their benefits: Benedict stated that it would be unfortunate if historians were to “stigmatize confessional motives for studying the religious history of this period so completely that those inspired by such motives found that they could not get jobs or were directed away from topics of special interest to them. Personal commitments to a given cause can distort historical investigation, but they also often inspire.”⁴⁸ Lyndal Roper even suggested that the personal commitments of certain scholars have allowed them to detect things that others did not, thus cautioning us against immediately labeling such influences negatively.

In my view, all historians bring to the table their own outlook, as shaped by past experience and learning.⁴⁹ The historian’s presuppositions and past experiences colour

⁴⁷ Brad S. Gregory, “Can We ‘See Things Their Way’? Should We Try?” *Seeing Things Their Way: Intellectual History and the Return of Religion*, ed. Chapman, Coffey, and Gregory (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2009), pp. 42-3.

⁴⁸ Benedict, “What Is Post-Confessional Reformation History?” p. 281.

⁴⁹ Lyndal Roper, “Allegiance and Reformation History,” *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 97 (2006): p. 296; see also pp. 293-5. Roper’s analysis would benefit from Trueman’s distinction between objectivity and neutrality.

his or her work all the time; although on the one hand we aim for objectivity and can, within certain limits, reasonably attain to it, on the other we also realize that subjectively speaking, neutrality is virtually impossible.⁵⁰ Historians present their evidence based on the hard work of historical analysis, yet they themselves always work within their own specific life context.⁵¹

Need for study of religious texts and ideas

Other impulses in historiography justify the present study by pointing to the need for further analysis of specifically religious texts and ideas. Recent developments in the study of late medieval and early modern history include massive research on the book as such as well as an enormous volume of newly digitized works.⁵² Both of these developments put the focus on bibliographical work – the number of works and even pages printed, the number of editions, the output of various presses, etc. In connection with this Grafton notes the profound effect which the so-called “material turn” has had on

⁵⁰ See the fine discussion in Gregory, “Can We ‘See Things Their Way’?” pp. 24-45.

⁵¹ Grafton and Marchand, “Proof and Persuasion in History,” p. 4. This historiographical discussion encourages me as an historian who is also a Reformed pastor that I have a place at the table, provided I aim for objectivity. Thus even if my motivation is partly confessional – and it is – nevertheless only accurate historical work will actually come close to what really happened, possibly see things the way that Chandieu did, and actually be of help to anyone who wants to compare these findings to the present.

⁵² For example: Andrew Pettegree, Malcolm Walsby, and Alexander Wilkinson, eds., *French Vernacular Books: Books Published in The French Language Before 1601* (Leiden: Brill, 2007); See also Andrew Pettegree, *The French Book and the European Book World* (Leiden: Brill, 2007); Jean-François Gilmont, *John Calvin and The Printed Book*, trans. Karin Maag (Kirkville, MO: Truman State University Press, 2005); Gilmont, *Le livre réformé au XVIe siècle* ([Paris]: Bibliothèque nationale de France, 2005); Gilmont, *The Reformation and The Book*, trans. Karin Maag (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1998); Jean-François Gilmont and William Kemp, eds., *Le livre évangélique en français avant Calvin* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2004); Francis M. Higman, *Piety and The People: Religious Printing in French, 1511–1551* (Aldershot: Scholar Press, 1996). For the explosion of digital resources, one need only consult the Post-Reformation Digital Library, which now brings together links to about 50,000 digitized titles – and these are only in regards to philosophy and theology. See <http://www.prld.org/>, accessed July 04, 2012.

the study of history in the last two decades.⁵³ All of this is extremely valuable, but doesn't answer the question why so many works on religion as such were published or why people were persuaded by Reformation teachings. The religious question, in fact, has often been overlooked.⁵⁴ Lyndal Roper mused, "One might occasionally wonder, though, whether [post-confessional history] has now left us without an understanding of why early Reformation theology gained an audience, or what it was that made Luther's message – and not just its packaging – electrifying."⁵⁵ Again, Philip Benedict, in a review essay of several fine works on the book in the 16th century, argues that, "more work needs to be done on the contents of songs and sermons to get away from the excessive focus on printed books as vectors of the French Reformation."⁵⁶ As an exercise in intellectual history, this investigation couples close study of religious texts and ideas with philosophical considerations of the period, the history of these religious ideas, and observations from social history.⁵⁷ The relationship of the contents and packaging of the Reformation message is scrutinized.

⁵³ Grafton, "The History of Ideas: Precept and Practice," pp. 210-11.

⁵⁴ The present work adopts a Skinnerian approach to historiography, yet also recognizes that Skinner's influential methodology minimized the importance of religious ideas. See John Coffey and Alister Chapman, "Introduction: Intellectual History and the Return of Religion," *Seeing Things Their Way: Intellectual History and the Return of Religion*, ed. Chapman, Coffey, and Gregory (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2009), pp. 3-5.

⁵⁵ Roper, "Allegiance and Reformation History," pp. 293-4.

⁵⁶ Philip Benedict, "Propaganda, Print, and Persuasion in the French Reformation: A Review Article," *Bibliothèque d'humanisme et renaissance* 69, no. 2 (2007): p. 471. See also pp. 462-5.

⁵⁷ Compare Willem J. van Asselt, *Introduction to Reformed Scholasticism*, trans. Albert Gootjes (Grand Rapids, MI: Reformation Heritage Books, 2011), pp. 203-204. Anthony Grafton now defines the history of ideas "in a general sense" as, "a study of texts, images, and theories that seeks to balance responsibility and precision in the formal treatment and analysis of its objects with an equally measured effort to connect them to a particular historical world." Further, "It will welcome investigations of texts and ideas – especially when these are located in time and space and explicated, in part, in terms of a wider historical context. But it will also be open to the investigation of books and other material objects, so long as these have a direct relation to larger questions in intellectual history and to the practices of intellectual life in all periods. It will not include positions . . . on questions of Theory per se . . . But it will certainly see providing historically informed studies of the development of hermeneutics, the work of influential

When one examines the last thirty years of English-speaking scholarship on the French Reformation, it becomes glaringly obvious that far more could be done in terms of careful historical theological study.⁵⁸ The field is wide open for deeper historical study of the theology of the French Reformation, provided that essential cross-disciplinary study in social history and the history of philosophy accompanies such work. In the case of early modern figures, this is all the more important since they did not observe our modern divisions of the disciplines. For instance, theology teachers often taught philosophy, rhetoric, and biblical languages.⁵⁹ Not a few cut their teeth teaching the basics of logic in the trivium before moving on to more specialized teaching.

Historians of theology can continue to make a valuable contribution today, especially to the study of an era where religious and theological factors had such a wide influence. In her recent study of the education of four generations of Basel pastors, Amy Nelson Burnett argued that the parish clergy had been rather neglected in the many recent sociological studies of the Reformation, which have focused on ritual and popular religious practice. She called the parish pastors, “the crucial link in teaching the Reformation.”⁶⁰ Although Chandieu travelled around a lot, he was one of those parish

theorists, and any and all other topics in the capricious realms of Theory’s empire as part of its task.” Grafton, “The History of Ideas: Precept and Practice,” pp. 213-14.

⁵⁸ Holt, “Historical Writing in English on the French Reformation,” pp. 256-70.

⁵⁹ To take just a few examples from figures treated in the present work: Pedro Nuñez Vela was a Greek professor at Lausanne who wrote a Dialectics textbook; Jacob Schegk was a Lutheran doctor of medicine who taught law and philosophy; Theodor Zwinger was a student of Ramus who became a doctor of medicine yet was the mentor of Claude Aubert, an Aristotelian philosopher. See also Richard A. Muller, “Reflections on Persistent Whiggism and Its Antidotes to the Study of Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century Intellectual History,” *Seeing Things Their Way: Intellectual History and the Return of Religion*, ed. Chapman, Coffey, and Gregory (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2009), p. 148; John C. Scott, “The Mission of the University: Medieval to Postmodern Transformations,” *The Journal of Higher Education* 77:1 (Jan-Feb 2006): p. 9.

⁶⁰ Amy Nelson Burnett, *Teaching the Reformation: Ministers and Their Message in Basel, 1529–1629* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), p. 5.

pastors who played a vital role in developing the theology and spirituality of the French Reformed Churches. He was also one of those figures who was considered significant in his own era but has been largely forgotten in subsequent eras.⁶¹

Scholastic Method and Renaissance Humanism

Introduction

Crucial to “seeing things their way” is an examination of the place of scholasticism and humanism in the early modern period, one not accommodated to later ages. Since we are undertaking study of several scholastic works of Chandieu, such questions rate careful examination, especially because much of the history of theology in the first three quarters of the twentieth century treated scholasticism negatively as dry, speculative, rigid, ossified theology.⁶² Scholasticism was frequently treated as a doctrine rather than a method. Scholars have often also regarded Renaissance humanism to be directly opposed to medieval scholasticism, as if the two were incompatible and the former demoted and replaced the latter. As a result of further scholarly study in the last few decades, these positions are no longer tenable.

In what follows, we will first establish what we mean by scholasticism and humanism in the early modern period. Then we will review briefly what scholars have concluded regarding the skirmishes between humanists and scholastics. Following this we will proceed to a more detailed level to inquire about Aristotelianism in the period,

⁶¹ Muller, “Reflections on Persistent Whiggism,” p. 136. Muller also rightly cautions against an older “great thinkers” historiography. Avoiding this problem requires that Chandieu’s writings not form the only context for their interpretation.” *Ibid.*, pp. 139-40.

⁶² See the introductory remarks of Luca Bianchi, “Continuity and change in the Aristotelian tradition,” in *The Cambridge Companion to Renaissance Philosophy*, ed. James Hankins (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2007), p. 49.

given that at least one author believes that Chandieu was “an old Aristotelian.”⁶³ Within this circle, we will review what recent scholars are saying about the teaching of logic in the sixteenth century in the Reformed universities, part of which involved the key instructional method of disputations. This section will close with a summary of the continuities and discontinuities from late medieval to early modern scholastic method as well as a more pointed construal of the period in which Chandieu’s scholastic work appeared – the 1570s and 1580s.

Scholastic method defined and described

The commonly accepted – and absolutely correct – definitions of recent scholars highlight at least two things about scholastic method: first, as named, it was the style of teaching and writing employed by the schools – thus it would be most appropriate to call it “academic”; second, this academic or scholastic element was a method, not a certain kind of theology.⁶⁴ In fact, scholasticism was not at all restricted to theology: “Scholastic method (or methods) was not actually developed in theology but was also used in law, philosophy, and medicine . . . it was a matter of scientific method, by which theology was also guided.”⁶⁵ Both the trivium (grammar, logic, rhetoric) and the quadrivium (arithmetic, geometry, music, astronomy) utilized scholastic method, of which the quantity and detail increased as one progressed, with the greatest measure reserved for

⁶³ Sinnema, “Chandieu’s Call for a Scholastic Reformed Theology, p. 189. Compare Donald Sinnema, “The Distinction Between Scholastic and Popular: Andreas Hyperius and Reformed Scholasticism,” *Protestant Scholasticism: Essays in Reassessment*, ed. Carl Trueman and R. Scott Clark (Carlisle, UK: Paternoster, 1999), p. 142, where he says that for Chandieu “the scholastic method meant an analytical treatment of theology using Aristotelian logic.”

⁶⁴ See below, p. 33, n. 99.

⁶⁵ Ulrich G. Leinsle, *Introduction to Scholastic Theology*, trans. Michael J. Miller (Washington, DC: Catholic University Press, 2010), p. 8. Compare also pp. 5, 11.

one's subsequent specialization in law, medicine, or theology. In other words, scholastic method was a method or process which could be applied to any given body of knowledge to elucidate and structure what was known and to lead the way to further knowledge. Aristotle himself understood his logical works this way: the title *Organon* highlighted the instrumental role of reason in attaining, probing, and explaining all knowledge.⁶⁶ Within the theological and philosophical realm, one could be a Thomist scholastic or an Ockhamist (nominalist) scholastic, or for that matter an Aristotelian, Ramist, or Cartesian scholastic. In addition one could be a Roman Catholic, Lutheran, Reformed, or even Arminian scholastic, that is, no particular doctrine such as predestination is called up because one is scholastic. As shown below, the things that make a method academic have to do with the tightness of its reasoning, the clarity of its arguments, and the utilization of recurring concepts and distinctions.

L. M. de Rijk, writing on medieval scholasticism, insisted that it is a method only, and no more: an “approach, which is characterized by the use, in both study and teaching, of a constantly recurring system of concepts, distinctions, proposition analyses, argumentative techniques and disputational methods.”⁶⁷ Richard Muller has observed the same thing and extended it to the period of Reformed Orthodoxy in which Chandieu lived and worked. Muller offers this definition:

[A] discourse is “scholastic” only when it follows scholastic method – specifically, only when it concentrates on 1) identifying the order and pattern of argument suitable to technical academic discourse, 2) presenting an issue in the

⁶⁶ Note the title of Claude Auberi's commentary on Aristotle's logical works: Claude Auberi, *Organon: id est instrumentum doctrinarum omnium* (Lausanne: Jean le Preux, 1584). The title translates as: *Organon: that is, the instrument for learning everything*.

⁶⁷ Willem J. van Asselt, “Scholasticism Revisited: Methodological Reflections on the Study of Seventeenth-century Reformed Thought, in *Seeing Things Their Way: Intellectual History and the Return of Religion*, ed. Alister Chapman, John Coffey, and Brad S. Gregory (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2009), p. 157; van Asselt, *Introduction to Reformed Scholasticism*, p. 7.

form of a thesis or question, 3) ordering the thesis or question suitably for discussion or debate, often identifying the “state of the question,” 4) noting a series of objections to the assumed correct answer, and then 5) offering a formulation of an answer or an elaboration of a thesis with due respect to all known sources of information and to the rules of rational discourse, followed by a full response to all objections.⁶⁸

This clear definition helps avoid the mistake of characterizing all the writing of a scholastic theologian as “scholastic” – a rather puzzling element in Ulrich Leinsle’s otherwise fine *Introduction to Scholastic Theology*.⁶⁹

More helpfully, Leinsle correctly points out something Chandieu and most theologians of his era would maintain – the role of Scripture and other normative writings as *sources* of knowledge whereas logic serves as *instrument*:

As to its method, however, this theology is ‘reflection on the text’ . . . Because of the form of instruction in the schools, theology, like philosophy, is mainly interpretation, commentary on normative texts . . . the text sparks questions (*quaestiones*) which are then discussed further in separate treatises, or, at the universities from the thirteenth century on, in a *disputatio* . . . A fundamental clarification of the truth is expected, especially where the authorities seem to contradict one another. Initially, therefore, the most important instrument is logic.⁷⁰

⁶⁸ Richard A. Muller, *Scholasticism and Orthodoxy in the Reformed Tradition: An Attempt at Definition* (Grand Rapids, MI: Calvin Theological Seminary, 1995), p. 4, compare pp. 26-7. Compare van Asselt, “Scholasticism Revisited,” p. 157.

⁶⁹ Leinsle develops a “description,” not a “definition” of scholasticism (he may be distinguishing scholasticism from scholastic theology but the discussion is not transparent). Leinsle, *Introduction to Scholastic Theology*, pp. 10-11, 16. He later speaks of sermons and letters – even those with little evidence of academic activity, as he says – as “scholastic.” *Ibid.*, pp. 65-73. Rather, we should maintain that letters and sermons are nearly always not scholastic, given their genre. Only in the rare case might one of these media intimately discuss some locus of theology with pros and cons, scientific terminology, and disputational techniques and thus be called scholastic. The mere fact that a theologian who constructs his theology academically/scholastically preaches a sermon does not make the sermon scholastic.

⁷⁰ Leinsle, *Introduction to Scholastic Theology*, p. 12. Muller notes this also: “When, however, scholasticism is rightly defined as a dialectical method of the schools, historically rooted in the late patristic period, particularly in the thought of Augustine, and developed throughout the Middle Ages in the light of classical logic and rhetoric, constructed with a view to the authority of text and tradition, and devoted primarily to the exposition of Scripture and the theological topics that derive from it using the best available tools of exegesis, logic, and philosophy, a rather different picture [of Calvin’s thought and method] emerges.” Richard A. Muller, “Scholasticism in Calvin: A Question of Relation and Disjunction,” in *The Unaccommodated Calvin: Studies in the Foundation of a Theological Tradition* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), p. 42.

Scholars also do well to distinguish scholastic motifs – such as Muller correctly finds even in John Calvin – from actual scholastic works.⁷¹ The former consist in the utilization of various scholastic distinctions and categories in an otherwise non-scholastic treatise (e.g., four-fold causality, absolute and ordained power, archetypal and ectypal theology). The latter usually arise from written disputations, polemics, or school textbooks. It is important to recognize these genres in order to understand the author's scope and appreciate why he or she has left out certain matters or has not aimed for rhetorical polish. Thus, once more, Leinsle: "The characteristics that distinguish [scholastic theology] from contemporary forms of theology (epistolary literature, monastic treatises, spirituality, mysticism) are the methods accepted in these schools for use in theology: commentary on an authoritative text, *lectio*, *disputatio* and *praedicatio*, taking into account the changing standards of rationality and concept of science in the individual eras . . . its history can only be reconstructed genetically."⁷²

The continuum from scholastic motifs (e.g., in Calvin) at one end to sophisticated medieval scholastic treatises at the other suggests that a good many school textbooks would fall in between these two extremes and may be classified as scholastic. Thus, although Ramus sought to simplify Aristotle, and although he promoted the humanistic pedagogy of Agricola, yet many of the textbooks he wrote may be considered scholastic, for they deal with each item briefly, constantly labour to identify the order and pattern of argument, argue based on theses, and make a multitude of distinctions. Ramus, thus, was not anti-scholastic so much as anti-Aristotelian, and even then he was not outrightly

⁷¹ Muller, *The Unaccommodated Calvin*, pp. 43-52.

⁷² Leinsle, *Introduction to Scholastic Theology*, p. 15.

rejecting all of Aristotle, but seeking to simplify the presentation and speed up the learning process.⁷³ At the heart of the scholastic method is the drive towards systematic exposition, and this was also at the heart of Ramus's efforts. This is also why textbooks such as those produced by the very much humanist-influenced paedagogues Sturm and Melancthon are, by virtue of being textbooks that systematically expound categories, definitions, and distinctions, scholastic.⁷⁴

A word about terms would be fitting before continuing. "Logic" and "dialectic" were often used synonymously in the early modern period, as in much present-day literature. However, there are occasions when a distinction must be made. In these cases, "logic" is usually the overarching term whereas "dialectic" refers to those arguments which bring reasonable but not necessarily indubitable conclusions. This distinction stems from Aristotle who had asserted a difference between "dialectic" (in his *Topics*) and "demonstration" (in his *Analytics*). Both required the use of syllogisms but because of the differing quality of their premises, their conclusions differed in their level of certainty.⁷⁵ Chandieu was aware of this difference, as we will see. The humanist-type textbooks on logic in this period generally styled themselves as works on dialectic in order to make the link with rhetoric stronger.⁷⁶

⁷³ Hotson, *Commonplace Learning*, pp. 17, 36, 41-4. Hotson points out that in time Ramus grew to appreciate Aristotle (43). Hotson's otherwise very fine account suffers somewhat from a lack of recognition that Ramus's "drive toward systematic exposition" (51) was in fact a central scholastic trait. Thus his "anti-scholastic spirit" (53) in fact had at the same time imbibed scholastic method. One could argue that he was not trying to jettison scholastic method so much as to improve it, at least at the lower level academies.

⁷⁴ See also below, pp. 32-3, 123.

⁷⁵ Robin Smith, "Aristotle's Logic," *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Spring 2012 Edition), ed. Edward N. Zalta, <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/aristotle-logic/#DiaArgArtDia>, accessed July 04, 2012. For a helpful overview of Aristotle's corpus on logic, see van Asselt, *Introduction to Reformed Scholasticism*, pp. 27-36.

⁷⁶ Mack, *History of Renaissance Rhetoric*, pp. 5-6, 25. Aristotle himself had closely related his *Analytics* and *Rhetoric* to each other in the introductory paragraphs of both works.

We turn now from scholasticism to examine humanism.

Renaissance humanism

By humanism we are referring to Renaissance humanism in particular.⁷⁷ This movement was not exactly an alternative to scholasticism though it did seek to amend certain scholastic motifs, and certainly to shift focus. The strong rhetoric of some of the late 15th c. humanists and the early 16th c. reformers against scholasticism was generally against the excesses of scholastic style which they regarded as vulgar and against particular doctrines and/or the particular scholastic theologians who defended them.⁷⁸ The humanists also polemicized against each other as often as they did against scholastics. In a good many cases they lacked intimate first-hand knowledge of scholastic works.⁷⁹ Finally, humanist rhetorical flourish was quite willing to overstate the case.⁸⁰ As will be argued below, the clash between humanists and scholastics was not inevitable and

⁷⁷ For a helpful disambiguation of the term “humanism,” see James Hankins, “Humanism, Scholasticism, and Renaissance Philosophy, in *The Cambridge Companion to Renaissance Philosophy*, ed. James Hankins (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2007), pp. 30-31.

⁷⁸ Charles E. Trinkaus, *In Our Image and Likeness: Humanity and Divinity in Italian Humanist Thought* (University of Chicago Press, 1970, vol. 1, pp. 23-4. Muller, *The Unaccommodated Calvin*, pp. 50-52.

⁷⁹ “After all the admirable and necessary work of classification that has come from Kristeller and other scholars the one thing that we can be sure about is that most of the humanists were likely to know the works of the thirteenth- and fourteenth-century scholastics *by reputation only* though there is ground for doubting even this in the case of certain humanists.” Trinkaus, *In Our Image and Likeness*, vol. 1, p. 23, emphasis added. See also Alan Perreiah, “Humanist Critiques of Scholastic Dialectic,” *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 13:3 (1982): pp. 3-22.

⁸⁰ van Asselt, *Introduction to Reformed Scholasticism*, pp.77-9; Ann Blair and Anthony Grafton, “Reassessing Humanism and Science,” *Journal of the History of Ideas* 53:4 (Oct.-Dec. 1992): pp. 536, 539-40; Charles B. Schmitt, “Aristotle as a Cuttlefish: the Origin and Development of a Renaissance Image,” in *The Aristotelian Tradition and Renaissance Universities* (London: Variorum, 1984), pp. 60-72; James H. Overfield, *Humanism and Scholasticism in Late Medieval Germany* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985); James H. Overfield, “Scholastic Opposition to Humanism in Pre-Reformation Germany,” in *Viator* 7 (1976): pp. 391-420; David V. N. Bagchi, “Sic et Non: Luther and Scholasticism,” in *Protestant Scholasticism*, ed. Carl R. Trueman and R. Scott Clark (Carlisle, Cumbria: Paternoster, 1999), pp. 3-15.

by no means did teachers and authors fit into only one camp or the other.⁸¹ Willem van Asselt writes, “We could thus, without undue exaggeration, speak of a relatively peaceful coexistence of humanism and scholasticism.”⁸²

Renaissance humanists were mainly concerned with the recovery of knowledge, artifacts, and behaviours from classical Greek and Roman culture. Scholars such as Jacques Lefèvre produced influential new paraphrases of Aristotle.⁸³ Humanists emphasized the improvement of written Latin and the inculcation of Greek, including the pursuit of beauty in poetry; explored questions of text and authorship of ancient works and produced critical texts; integrated new material discoveries into the knowledge of history; developed the art of rhetoric and persuasion; and moved away from speculative knowledge to practical.⁸⁴ Hankins writes, “The center of the humanist’s interests, both as professionals and amateurs, was traditional language arts such as grammar and rhetoric as well as the literary genres of history and biography, lyric and epic poetry, comedy and tragedy, letters, orations, novels, moral treatises and dialogues, and antiquarian studies of all kinds.”⁸⁵ Trinkaus’s massive work on the Italian humanists argues that the philosophical motivation for their emphases lay in the central place they gave to man as

⁸¹ Somewhat contra Charles G. Nauert, “Humanism as Method: Roots of Conflict with the Scholastics,” *Sixteenth Century Journal* 29:2 (1998): pp. 427-38; Erika Rummel, “*Et cum theologo bella poeta gerit*: The Conflict between Humanists and Scholastics Revisited,” *Sixteenth Century Journal* 23:4 (1992): pp. 713–26; Charles G. Nauert, “The Clash of Humanists and Scholastics: An Approach to Pre-Reformation Controversies,” *Sixteenth Century Journal* 4:1 (1973): pp. 1-18.

⁸² van Asselt, *Introduction to Reformed Scholasticism*, p. 79.

⁸³ Brian Lawn, *The Rise & Decline of the Scholastic ‘Quaestio Disputata’ with Special Emphasis on its Use in the Teaching of Medicine and Science* (Leiden: Brill, 1993), p. 113.

⁸⁴ Hankins, “Humanism, Scholasticism, and Renaissance Philosophy,” pp. 31-2; Paul Oskar Kristeller, “Humanism,” in *The Cambridge History of Renaissance Philosophy* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1988), pp. 113-14, and generally pp. 113-37; van Asselt, *Introduction to Reformed Scholasticism*, pp. 73-4. See also Grafton’s fine discussion about the Republic of Letters – a circle of highly trained professional polymath humanists. Grafton, *Worlds Made by Words*, pp. 9-34.

⁸⁵ Hankins, “Humanism, Scholasticism, and Renaissance Philosophy,” p. 32.

highest being in the world, made in the image of God, and given freedom of choice. Their strong insistence on human autonomy led to the careful study of language and rhetoric as the mode of persuasion for the will.⁸⁶ Many Reformers hotly opposed the humanists on the will's freedom of choice.⁸⁷

One of the results of humanistic influence – when combined with the existing academic or scholastic curricula – was the intermingling of ideas and methods. Anthony Grafton explains that the educational system supplied a common set of skills and backgrounds to scholars in most every discipline:

The whole system of formal education was geared to produce generalists. Every learned person became a classicist at school. Specialists in the ancient higher faculties – medicine, law, and theology – imported their humanistic training into these fields and changed the humanities by bringing medical, legal, and theological perspectives to bear on them. Specialists in a more modern sense often did the same. Even the most gifted mathematicians studied Greek, Latin, and history in school, and logic and philosophy in college, before they turned to numbers.⁸⁸

This mix of subjects and the thoroughness of training in each one ensured that a good many scholars could equally utilize scholastic method and the study of letters (or: humanities), and combine the tools of each stream.⁸⁹

⁸⁶ Trinkaus, *In Our Image and Likeness*, vol. 1, xiii-xiv, xx; pp. 41-50, 76-102.

⁸⁷ For example, Martin Luther, *De servo arbitrio* (Wittenberg: Lufft, 1525); François Lambert, *In primum duodecim prophetarum, nempe Oseam . . . commentarii. Eiusdem libellus de Arbitrio hominis vere captivo* (Strasbourg: Jo. Hervagen, 1525). Both works were against Erasmus and are available in English translation.

⁸⁸ Grafton, *Worlds Made by Words*, p. 11.

⁸⁹ Or, sometimes humanists could resort to intricate scholastic distinctions when it served their case, as when Erasmus employed the distinction between *necessitas consequentiae* and *necessitas consequentis* against Luther in their debate on freedom of choice. See Martin Luther, *The Bondage of the Will*, trans. J. I. Packer and O. R. Johnston (Old Tappan, NJ: Revell, 1957), pp. 212-13, 220-23.

Free-flowing rhetoric versus tight scholastic reasoning

The same authors in this period could produce both highly technical scholastic tracts, careful studies of etymology, and popular rhetorically persuasive speeches. The same hand could pen a poem and a textbook, a letter and a set of theses. Antoine de Chandieu was one such figure, as the next chapter will show – indeed, one of many such figures.

The distinction between the more humanist genres and the more scholastic genres had, since the time of Zeno, been illustrated with the difference between an open hand and a closed fist. Like many other writers of his day, Chandieu referred to these symbols in the introduction to his “theological and scholastic” works.⁹⁰ The open hand represented the more expansive and rhetorically pleasing kind of writing whereas the closed fist represented the tight and concise argumentation of a scholastic treatise.⁹¹ Each had their place and purpose. This well-known distinction guides us in deciding what we should call “scholastic” and what we should call “rhetorical,” that is, if we wish to describe much of the work of the early modern period in the way early modern figures themselves did. It also points us away from making “humanist” the polar opposite of “scholastic.” Although it is true that humanistic motifs had far more influence on rhetorical than scholastic styles, yet either style could utilize the results of humanistic study.

⁹⁰ Antoine de Chandieu, *Locus de verbo Dei scripto* (Morges: Jean le Preux, 1580), a4r-v.

⁹¹ van Asselt, *Introduction to Reformed Scholasticism*, pp. 73-85; Sinnema, “The Distinction Between Scholastic and Popular,” pp. 127-43; Walter J. Ong, *Ramus, Method, and the Decay of Dialogue* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, repr. 2004), p. 16, n. 24; Edward P. J. Corbett, “The Rhetoric of the Open Hand and the Rhetoric of the Closed Fist,” *College Composition and Communication* 20:5 (1969): pp. 288-96. See also Hobbins’s remarks on Jean Gerson, who wrote *On the Two Kinds of Logic*. Daniel Hobbins, “The Schoolman as Public Intellectual: Jean Gerson and the Late Medieval Tract,” *The American Historical Review* 108:5 (Dec 2003): p. 1328. Melancthon made the same distinction by appealing to a ship with its sails reefed (dialectic/logic, suited to teaching) or fully spread (rhetoric, suited to persuasion). Mack, *History of Renaissance Rhetoric*, pp. 108, 112.

The Renaissance humanists' Aristotle

Although many historians over the past centuries have correctly pointed to humanism as one of most important stimulants for the Reformation – a historiography with roots in none other than Heinrich Bullinger (1504-1575) – this is not to say that the earlier scholastic style died out.⁹² For several reasons humanism never became an entire replacement for scholasticism, such as: the humanist project did not aim to replace the entire scholastic program since humanists generally avoided the deeper philosophical and theological questions that were the bread and butter of the medieval scholastics, regarding their style to be barbarous and archaic and their theology impractical and impious; no schools or religious orders arose that were dedicated to humanist pursuits alone; humanists and scholastics alike worked from the same texts of Aristotle but emphasized different parts; and “in the course of the sixteenth century, the humanist approach to Aristotle gradually merged with traditional scholastic methods, though fusion never removed all stresses between the two.”⁹³ In fact, the two streams of study were not incompatible, for the scholastics could take up into their system of questions and arguments the improved texts supplied by the humanists and the results of additional language study undertaken by the humanists. This indeed happened.⁹⁴

⁹² Irena D. Backus, “Bullinger and Humanism,” in *Heinrich Bullinger – Life, Thought, Influence*, ed. Emidio Campi and Peter Opitz (Zurich: TVZ, 2007), vol. 2, pp. 639-60.

⁹³ Brian P. Copenhaver and Charles B. Schmitt, *Renaissance Philosophy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992), p. 65; compare Hankins, “Humanism, Scholasticism, and Renaissance Philosophy,” pp. 45-6. See also Grafton, *Worlds Made by Words*, p. 11, quoted previously.

⁹⁴ Luca Bianchi, “Continuity and change in the Aristotelian tradition,” in *The Cambridge Companion to Renaissance Philosophy*, ed. James Hankins (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2007), pp. 61, 63, 66-7.

The only branch of philosophy acknowledged really to be the domain of the humanists was moral philosophy, in keeping with their high view of humanity's will and their desire for theology to promote a simple and practical piety.⁹⁵ According to Kristeller moral theology was the only area where humanists found themselves in direct conflict with their scholastic colleagues.⁹⁶ What neither humanists nor scholastics did was replace technical school textbooks with poems, novels, letters, or comedies. This is not to say that humanists produced no textbooks – to the contrary – but to say that the context of teaching was a hard datum requiring certain kinds of written texts and pedagogical tools such as disputations.

Thus, whereas the great *praeceptor Germaniae*, the humanist Philip Melanchthon, produced textbooks in all kinds of subjects, and especially in dialectics, his textbook in dialectics was of necessity a scholastic treatise of sorts – the discussion of each term and item is short; the topics, divisions, definitions, and many of the examples are derived from the medieval scholastic commentaries; the third edition in particular is structured by questions and answers throughout; the questions asked of each topic are pretty well the typical scholastic fare; and the whole work basically builds upon Aristotle's *Topicae*, as was common in the period.⁹⁷ Mack describes Melanchthon's immensely popular *De*

⁹⁵ Trinkaus, *In Our Image and Likeness*, vol. 1, p. 24. Backus shows that Bullinger regarded the study of the profane classics to be the proper preparation for the gospel by making good persons of those who followed the morals found in these *bonae litterae*. Note that Backus specifies in what senses Bullinger may be regarded as a humanist. Backus, "Bullinger and Humanism," pp. 649-50, *passim*. In another article, she specifies in what senses the humanist Lefèvre may be appealed to as an initiator of reform – not in terms of his theological positions regarding sin and justification, but in terms of his philology and his Bible translation. Irena D. Backus, "Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples: a Humanist or a Reformist View of Paul and His Theology?" in *Companion to Paul in the Reformation*, ed. R. Ward Holder (Leiden: Brill, 2009), pp. 61-90.

⁹⁶ Kristeller, "Humanism," p. 134.

⁹⁷ Melanchthon's dialectical manual *De Dialectica libri quatuor* (later *Erotemata Dialectices*) went through a staggering 99 editions between 1520 and 1600. Lisa Jardine, "Humanism and the Teaching of Logic," in *The Cambridge History of Later Medieval Philosophy: From the Rediscovery of Aristotle to the Disintegration of Scholasticism 1100-1600*, ed. Norman Kretzmann, Anthony Kenny, and Jan Pinborg

dialectica libri quator as follows, “Melanchthon covers the whole Aristotelian logic syllabus, devoting most attention to categories, syllogisms, topics, and fallacies.”⁹⁸ The work was, of course, not a commentary on Aristotle’s *Organon* as such, for it was not for the highest level of education, and therefore we also do not encounter the intricate medieval discussions of syncategorematic terms, obligations, consequences, insolubles, etc. As was acknowledged in the period, if a scholar wanted to delve into these matters, he had no choice but to leave the humanists behind, for this was exclusive scholastic territory.

In areas of philosophy, logic, and theology – and certainly also in various matters of law and medicine – the scholastic contributions remained the most precise and deepest analytical treatments available.⁹⁹ Scholastics had developed a sort of meta-language by which they sought to analyze the logic of discourse. Penetrating it was not easy, and this difficulty is part of the explanation for the humanist critiques.¹⁰⁰

(Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), p. 801. Günter Frank observes, “[S]cholars have repeatedly presented Melanchthon the Aristotelian.” He sees no reason to change this evaluation. Günter Frank, “Philipp Melanchthon (1497-1560): Reformer and Philosopher,” *Philosophies of the Renaissance*, ed. Paul Richard Blum, trans. Brian McNeil (Washington, DC: Catholic University Press of America, 2010), p. 149. See also Sachiko Kusukawa, “Vinculum Concordiae: Lutheran Method by Philip Melanchthon,” in *Method and Order in Renaissance Philosophy of Nature*, ed. Daniel A. Di Liscia, Eckhard Kessler, and Charlotte Methuen (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1997), pp. 339-41, 344, 347.

⁹⁸ Mack, *History of Renaissance Rhetoric*, p. 110.

⁹⁹ Bianchi, “Continuity and change in the Aristotelian tradition,” pp. 50, 64-6. This is not to conclude that scholasticism was a doctrine as such, but that scholastics pursued various questions farther than anyone else and sought clarity at points where others were satisfied with ambiguity. This fact makes it understandable that their method of inquiry and presentation in some people’s minds stand in for the actual doctrines. See also p. 23 above.

¹⁰⁰ Perreiah, “Humanist Critiques of Scholastic Dialectic,” pp. 20-22.

Aristotle as artifex methodi in the early modern period

No one should be surprised when Chandieu or any other university trained 16th c. theologian refers to Aristotle favourably. From the thirteenth century onward new translations spurred study in the newly forming universities: “Euclid in geometry, Ptolemy in astronomy, Hippocrates and Galen in medicine, and above all, Aristotle for method and system.”¹⁰¹ Precisely because Aristotle dealt with questions of pedagogy by addressing logic, categories, and other aspects of method, the Aristotelian system became “decisive for the formation of the medieval university.”¹⁰² In the sixteenth century Melanchthon too “came to regard Aristotle as the one and only *artifex methodi* [artisan of method].”¹⁰³ As the study of Aristotle developed, various trajectories and emphases emerged, including Ramism.¹⁰⁴ Early modern historians thus now doubt the value using the broad label “Aristotelian,” for their period. Which Aristotelianism does one mean? Bianchi states the problem well, “Charles Schmitt has convincingly argued that in the Renaissance there was a multiplicity of ‘Aristotelianisms’ in competition with one another.”¹⁰⁵

The thirteenth century distinction between the *logica vetus* and the newly-recovered works of Aristotle constituting the *logica nova* still existed, but added to it

¹⁰¹ Charles H. Lohr, “The Medieval Interpretation of Aristotle,” in *The Cambridge History of Later Medieval Philosophy: From the Rediscovery of Aristotle to the Disintegration of Scholasticism 1100-1600*, ed. Norman Kretzmann, Anthony Kenny, and Jan Pinborg (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982, p. 84.

¹⁰² Lohr, “The Medieval Interpretation of Aristotle,” p. 87.

¹⁰³ Kusakawa, “Lutheran Method by Philip Melanchthon,” p. 347.

¹⁰⁴ Hotson writes about Ramus’s project to replace Aristotle: “His basic source of such principles and techniques – ironically, perhaps, but also inevitably – was Aristotle’s corpus of logical writings, the *Organon*.” Hotson, *Commonplace Learning*, p. 44.

¹⁰⁵ Bianchi, “Continuity and change in the Aristotelian tradition,” p. 65; compare Burnett, *Teaching the Reformation*, p. 116.

were a couple of centuries of disputations on both, new translations and commentaries, and a variety of ways in which practical humanist concerns shifted attention to different parts of Aristotle's corpus.¹⁰⁶ Thus, "the Aristotelian tradition in the Renaissance, far from being the monolithic body of dogma it was once thought to be, comprised a rich plurality of orientations, and that these, both because of strictly intellectual conflicts and because of geographic, institutional, religious, linguistic, and sociological factors, ensured its vitality and differentiated development."¹⁰⁷

Yet, even though historians should avoid the sweeping term "Aristotelianism" without further clarification, it is a fact that of all the philosophical traditions at the time – and note well that Stoic, Epicurean, Skeptical, and Platonic traditions were reviving as well – "Aristotelianism nevertheless remained the predominant one through the end of the sixteenth and into the seventeenth century."¹⁰⁸ His texts and commentaries on his texts enjoyed a "near monopoly . . . in university curricula until the middle of the seventeenth century."¹⁰⁹

The sheer number of editions, translations, and commentaries on Aristotle in the sixteenth century alone was over 3000, thanks to both humanist- and scholastic-type

¹⁰⁶ E. J. Ashworth, "Traditional Logic," in *The Cambridge History of Renaissance Philosophy*, ed. Schmitt, Skinner, Kessler, and Kraye (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1988), pp. 143-5.

¹⁰⁷ Bianchi, "Continuity and change in the Aristotelian tradition," p. 65.

¹⁰⁸ Bianchi, "Continuity and change in the Aristotelian tradition," p. 49. The definitive work of Wilhelm Risse distinguishes the "Old Aristotelian" trajectory, which returned to Aristotle's distinction between probable and certain reasoning from the Melanchthonian humanist trajectory as well as trajectories that mixed Ramist and Aristotelian motifs. Wilhelm Risse, *Die Logik der Neuzeit* (Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Frommann, 1964), vol. 1.

¹⁰⁹ Bianchi, "Continuity and change in the Aristotelian tradition," p. 50. Study of Aristotle was at the time going through its third stage. The first stage was in the 6th c. when Boethius translated Aristotle's logic treatises (and many other works) into Latin; the second began in the 12th c. with the gradual translation of all of Aristotle's works – at this time began the concerted use of Aristotle's science to elucidate Christian theology; the third began in the fifteenth century with more focus on the original text of Aristotle and on dealing with difficult aspects of the use of Aristotle. See Lohr, "The Medieval Interpretation of Aristotle," pp. 80-81.

scholars. Commentaries on Aristotle outnumber those on Plato twenty to one.¹¹⁰

Copenhaver gives us one example: “Publishers in the scholastic citadel of Paris printed many Greek editions of Aristotle at low cost for use by students.”¹¹¹ Bianchi argues that this was not merely because of conservative adherence to an old curriculum on the part of the universities, rather, “Rightly or wrongly, the works of the Stagirite seemed to most professional teachers of philosophy the most suitable for learning logic, philosophy, and science.”¹¹² The newly discovered texts and improved editions of the humanists definitely pushed forward the prominence of Aristotle. Thus, their diligent work should not be interpreted as the dismissal of the medieval tradition. Bianchi, again, says, “It led, rather, to an enrichment of the exegetical environment.”¹¹³ To take the example of Jacopo Zabarella, whose education was thoroughly humanistic, he put it to use explicating Aristotle.¹¹⁴ Teachers now had better texts of Aristotle, but with some different emphases.¹¹⁵

Let it be noted that we are primarily focused on university curricula when speaking of Aristotle’s corpus. At the same time, one cannot overlook the flood of Ramist texts, especially in northwest Germany which sought to simplify Aristotle and teach by

¹¹⁰ Bianchi, “Continuity and change in the Aristotelian tradition,” p. 50; Compare the staggering list of Renaissance commentaries on Aristotle assembled by Charles Lohr. Charles H. Lohr, “Renaissance Latin Aristotle Commentaries,” in *Studies in the Renaissance*, 21 (1974): pp. 228-89; in *Renaissance Quarterly*, 28:4 (Winter 1975): pp. 689-741; 29:4 (Winter 1976): pp. 714-45; 30:4 (Winter 1977): pp. 681-741; 31:4 (Winter 1978): pp. 532-603; 32:4 (Winter 1979): pp. 529-80; 33:4 (Winter 1980): pp. 623-734; 35:2 (Summer 1982): pp. 164-256; Charles H. Lohr, “Latin Aristotle Commentaries: Supplementary Renaissance Authors,” in *Freiburger Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Theologie*, 40:1-2 (1993): pp. 161-8.

¹¹¹ Copenhaver and Schmitt, *Renaissance Philosophy*, p. 65.

¹¹² Bianchi, “Continuity and change in the Aristotelian tradition,” p. 50.

¹¹³ Bianchi, “Continuity and change in the Aristotelian tradition,” p. 61.

¹¹⁴ Copenhaver & Schmitt, *Renaissance Philosophy*, p. 118

¹¹⁵ Bianchi notes that humanists sought to bring literary elegance to translations of Aristotle. Bianchi, “Continuity and change in the Aristotelian tradition,” p. 51.

way of compendia rather than with the authentic, even Greek text of Aristotle. But the Ramist effort took root almost entirely in the lower level gymnasias.¹¹⁶

On the whole, then, it would be better to note the complementary nature of humanist and scholastic contributions to the Aristotelian tradition.¹¹⁷ Whereas humanist scholars put more emphasis on Aristotle's Topics than his Analytics, their efforts to recover the genuine Greek text of Aristotle and their improved Latin translations were utilized by scholastic teachers to advance the teaching of logic, physics, ethics, arithmetic, and astronomy. If, however, we restrict study to the tradition of medieval logic in the sense of their extremely refined and complex study of syncategorematic terms, consequences, modes of prediction, et cetera, then we could say that this mostly died out during the sixteenth century.¹¹⁸ Historians of logic state that one of the last to indulge in it was John Mair (up to about 1515) and one the first to return to it was Francisco Suarez (starting in the 1590s).¹¹⁹ We shall offer some nuance to this statement in both the present chapter and in chapter 7. In general we should appreciate the symbiotic relationship of humanists and scholastics, noting that a good many teachers, including Chandieu, embodied both trajectories. Indeed, the resurgence of this sort of

¹¹⁶ Hotson, *Commonplace Learning*, pp. 41-4, 79-82.

¹¹⁷ Conflicts certainly occurred, but the remarks of the great Erasmus scholar Hilmar Pabel in a recent review are quite apropos. "After reading this and other essays in the volume, readers might wonder whether humanists among themselves as much as scholastics arrayed against humanists marked the dawn of modern biblical scholarship with lively and acrimonious controversy." Hilmar M. Pabel, review of *Biblical Humanism and Scholasticism in The Age of Erasmus*, ed. Erika Rummel, *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 61 (2010): p. 185.

¹¹⁸ For example, see Peter Mack's description of George Trapezuntius's *Isagoge dialectica*, widely used in the early sixteenth century: "It is a cleaned-up version of Peter of Spain's *Tractatus* or Paul of Venice's *Logica parva*, which conveys the essence of logical teaching without the metaphysical implications, the semantic explorations, or the doctrine of consequences." Mack, *A History of Renaissance Rhetoric*, p. 46.

¹¹⁹ Copenhaver & Schmitt, *Renaissance Philosophy*, p. 96.

intricate scholastic study in the late sixteenth century suggests that it may have successfully assimilated the findings of the humanists.

The teaching of Aristotelian logic in Reformed Basel, Strasbourg, Lausanne, and Geneva

We must now consider more specifically the kind of logic promoted in the Reformed academies where Chandieu taught in the 1570s and 1580s, namely Geneva and Lausanne. The role of Aristotle in Basel's schools is also pertinent, since Chandieu sent his own sons there in the 1580s and had a strong collegial relationship with Grynaeus – a theologian with methods similar to his own.

To begin with the latter, Amy Nelson Burnett states that the 1551 statutes gave special importance to Aristotle, particularly in the master's course. She notes that whereas other universities had one or two chairs for dialectic, there were actually three positions in Basel – “one at the Pedagogium, one at the bachelor's level, and a third, specifically on Aristotle's *Organon*, at the master's level.”¹²⁰ An important figure in the University of Basel who represents well the developments in Aristotelian philosophy in the period 1550 to 1575 is Johannes Hospinian. Chandieu could have used his Greek text of Aristotle.¹²¹

As for Geneva, Pierre Fraenkel and Irena Backus state that the curriculum of Geneva's Academy was based on that of Lausanne and Strasbourg.¹²² This makes sense since Beza came from teaching in Lausanne to teach in Geneva and Calvin had learned

¹²⁰ Burnett, *Teaching the Reformation*, p. 120. Note that study of the authentic text of Aristotle was reserved for the master's level.

¹²¹ See p. 198 below.

¹²² Pierre Fraenkel, *De L'écriture à la dispute: le cas de l'Académie de Genève sous Théodore de Bèze* (Lausanne: Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie, 1977), p. 7; Irena Backus, “L'enseignement à Genève au temps de l'Escalade,” in *Recueil de l'Escalade 1602-2012* (Genève: Compagnie de 1602, 2012), p. 34.

much under Bucer in Strasbourg, including the aim of having an institution of higher learning.¹²³ No one doubts that Beza approved the Aristotelian system, though in the 1580s he self-consciously turned more to biblical studies as such.¹²⁴ Calvin's regulations for Geneva's preparatory school, the *schola publica*, begun in 1559, stipulated that the rudimentary elements of Dialectics be taught in the sixth year, followed by the knowledge of predicaments, categories, topics, and arguments in the seventh (and final) year.¹²⁵ These are obviously the terms arising from Aristotle's works on logic and were needed to ready the students for more advanced work in the Academy.

Irena Backus compares the logic texts of Melanchthon, Sturm, and Néobar to determine whether any one of the three can be said for certain to be the one used in Geneva in the first six years of the Geneva Academy (1559-1565). She concludes that it is more likely that Sturm or Néobar was used, although they were inferior in teaching dialectics.¹²⁶ Elsewhere she opens her study on Pacius and Havenreuter by writing, "There is no need to remind the reader that, by the end of the 16th century, Aristotelian Logic was considered as an indispensable tool for formulating theological arguments and

¹²³ Doumergue reasonably suggests that when Calvin visited Strasbourg in 1556 and was entertained at the high school (*gymnasium*) where he had taught from 1539 to 1541, his resolve to begin Geneva's *College* and *Académie* took more definite shape. Emile Doumergue, *Jean Calvin: Les hommes et les choses de son temps*, vol. 7 (Lausanne: G. Bridel, 1927), p. 126.

¹²⁴ Scott M. Manetsch, *Theodore Beza and the Quest for Peace in France, 1572-1598* (Leiden: Brill, 2000), p. 137, n. 75. Numerous references could be made to Beza's correspondence, where he also expresses his fatigue with polemics and his desire to hand this work over to others, particularly to Chandieu.

¹²⁵ Jean Calvin, *L'ordre du College de Geneve* (Geneva: Estienne, 1559), b2r-v, c2r. The *Academie de Genève* was also known as the *College de Genève*. It comprised the *schola privata*, which was more geared towards private tutoring and apprenticeship and the *schola publica*, which had the primary purpose of training men for ministry in the church. Backus, "L'enseignement à Genève au temps de l'Escalade," pp. 34-5.

¹²⁶ Irena Backus, "L'enseignement de la logique à l'Académie de Genève entre 1559 et 1565," in *Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie* 3 (1979): p. 163. Compare Burnett, *Teaching the Reformation*, p. 119, who concludes that Basel's schools used Caesarius, Melanchthon, Sturm, and Willichius. For all but the last of these authors, see Mack, *History of Renaissance Rhetoric*, pp. 104-22, 132-4.

was thus taught in all ‘Protestant’ Academies, Reformed and Lutheran alike.”¹²⁷ Backus finds both of these logicians – Julius Pacius who taught logic in Geneva from 1582-1583 and from 1596-1597 and Johann Havenreuter who taught logic in Strasbourg from 1573-1597 – reluctant to follow Zabarella’s innovations to Aristotle’s doctrine of demonstration. They adhered to a more or less pure Aristotle.¹²⁸ Pacius wrote a very influential commentary on Aristotle’s *Organon*. If we are considering these men as influences on Chandieu, Havenreuter would be the more likely candidate than Pacius given their dates, since Chandieu’s method was quite definitively established in 1580 and certainly shows its outlines already by 1566, as we shall see in chapters 3 and 4 below. In fact, though both of these philosophers help us appreciate the Aristotelian milieu around Chandieu, their fuller Aristotle commentaries appeared too late to be influences on Chandieu prior to 1580.

In another article where Backus examines Bucer’s views on logic, particularly on the conditions for truth and on predication, Backus finds Bucer – who was Dominican before becoming Protestant – to be a realist in logic, consonant with the views found in the works of the Dominicans Pierre Crockaert (1465-1514) and Georges de Trébizonde (1396-1472), whose texts belonged to his personal library.¹²⁹ In 1571 Johann Sturm published his letters to Johann Havenreuter describing the curriculum which he had established in 1538 and maintained for some 33 years (at that time) in Strasbourg’s *Gymnasium* (high school). Sturm, a humanist, stipulated the use of Aristotle for

¹²⁷ Irena Backus, “The Teaching of Logic in two Protestant Academies at the End of the 16th Century: The Reception of Zabarella in Strasbourg and Geneva,” in *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 80 (1989): p. 240.

¹²⁸ Backus, “The Teaching of Logic in two Protestant Academies,” pp. 241, 247, 251.

¹²⁹ Irena Backus, “La Théorie logique de Martin Bucer,” in *Logique et théologie au XVI^e siècle: aux sources de l’argumentation de Martin Bucer* (Geneva: Cahiers de la Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie, 1980), pp. 27-39.

dialectics, rhetoric, physics, and ethics. His students would be learning Aristotle's logic by the age of twelve.¹³⁰ Sturm's school became a pattern for many others throughout Europe.¹³¹

In Lausanne the teaching of philosophy also made use of Aristotle's *Organon*, as the school regulations of 1547 demonstrate.¹³² Pedro Nuñez Vela (c. 1502-1580), a Spaniard who taught Greek from 1567 to 1580 at Lausanne, published a *Dialectics* in three books in 1570, with a second edition in 1578.¹³³ The possibility that Chandieu was familiar with Nuñez's work is strong and will be investigated in chapter 7 below.¹³⁴ In 1576 the chair in philosophy went from Blasius Marquard to Claude Auberi.¹³⁵ Though we know of no publications from Marquard, we certainly have Auberi's textbooks, and he and Chandieu became good friends.¹³⁶ The printer François le Preux issued several of Auberi's textbooks in philosophy for the Academy of Lausanne in 1577, all of which were summaries of Aristotle, on the categories, modes of predicating, and on interpretation.¹³⁷ In 1584 Auberi produced his 712 page octavo commentary on

¹³⁰ Johann Sturm, *Schola Argentinensis* (Strasbourg: Iosias Rihelius, 1571), b4v, c2v. Compare Barbara Sher Tinsley, "Johann Sturm's Method for Humanistic Pedagogy," *Sixteenth Century Journal* 20:1 (1989): p. 27; Mack, *History of Renaissance Rhetoric*, pp. 132-4; Hotson, *Commonplace Learning*, pp. 51-2, 70-73.

¹³¹ Tinsley, "Johann Sturm's Method," p. 31.

¹³² Henri Meylan, *La Haute école de Lausanne 1537-1937* (Lausanne: University of Lausanne, 1986), p. 19 and plate III.

¹³³ Edward Boehmer, *Spanish Reformers of Two Centuries from 1520*, (London: Trübner, 1883), vol. 2, pp. 145-58. Nuñez Vela should not be mixed up with Juan Luis Vives (1493-1540), a rabid anti-scholastic.

¹³⁴ See below, p. 282.

¹³⁵ Marc Kiener, *Dictionnaire des professeurs de l'Académie de Lausanne (1537-1890)* (Lausanne: University of Lausanne, 2005), pp. 405, 620. Boehmer in 1883 was unsure whether the date was 1572 or 1576. We will rely on the more recent research of Kiener. Boehmer, *Spanish Reformers of Two Centuries from 1520*, vol. 2, p. 153, n. 45.

¹³⁶ There is a poem of Marquard (Marcuard). See the collection of letters and poems by multiple authors, *Litterae illustriss. principis* ([Geneva: Henri Estienne, 1569]), pp. 25-6 [103-104].

¹³⁷ Claude Auberi, *Posteriorum notionum quas secundas intentiones & Praedicabilia vocant, Brevis & luculenta explicatio* (Berne: François le Preux, 1576). The subtitle of this 12 page work adds, *In usum*

Aristotle's *Organon*.¹³⁸ Possible influences of Auberi on Chandieu will be investigated in chapters 3, 4, and 7 below. This cursory review shows that when Chandieu came to Lausanne and Geneva (1572-1591) he encountered an attitude favourable to – if not awash in – Aristotle's logic.¹³⁹

The role of disputations in sixteenth century Reformed pedagogy

One of the key pedagogical tools of the medieval scholastics was the disputation. This too had its place in sixteenth century Reformed pedagogy. For instance, the Academy of Geneva held regular disputations in its *congrégations* – weekly Friday morning meetings of the ministers of Geneva and of the surrounding villages under Geneva's authority. This scholastic tool, far from being abandoned by the humanists, underwent small changes and continued in both verbal and written forms. If we consider the turbulent period of the early reformers, we notice that public disputations were a key component for persuading the public and other theologians to embrace reform. Guillaume Farel used this very effectively in the Pays de Vaud in the period 1524 to 1536, from Basel to Geneva, and many small villages in between.¹⁴⁰ The public Disputations of Heidelberg (1518), Leipzig (1519), Zurich (1523), Basel (1524), Baden (1526), Bern

schola Lausannensis. The copy I consulted had Auberi's two other introductory texts on Aristotle for use in the Lausanne Academy bound with it, namely *Categoriae quae vulgo praedicamenta*, also from 1576 (60 pages) and *περί ἐρμηνείας seu de enuntiationibus*, from 1577 (79 pages).

¹³⁸ Claude Auberi, *Organon, id est: Instrumentum doctrinarum omnium* (Morges: J. Le Preux, 1584).

¹³⁹ One could make many similar observations about the schools in Basel at this time. See Burnett, *Teaching the Reformation*, pp. 119-21, 153. Later, however, Ramism took root for a time in the Academies of Basel and elsewhere. In Geneva and Lausanne, Ramus was decisively turned away for not accurately following Aristotle. See Hotson, *Commonplace Learning*, pp. 19-20; Irena Backus, "Loci communes, and the Role of Ramism in the European Diffusion of Calvin's Reformation," in *Giovanni Calvino e il calvinismo*, ed. Laura Ronchi De Michelis and Lothar Vogel (Rome: Carocci, 2010), p. 235.

¹⁴⁰ Jason Zuidema and Theodore Van Raalte, *Early French Reform: The Theology and Spirituality of Guillaume Farel* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2011), pp. 10-14.

(1528), Marburg (1529), Rive (1534), Geneva (1535), Lausanne (1536), Worms (1540), Regensburg (1541), Worms (1557) as well as meetings such as the Colloquy of Poissy (1561) all exhibit a practice from the medieval schools exported into the public square – though even public disputations also had their place in the medieval period.¹⁴¹

As for disputations in the school curriculum, Fraenkel remarks, “The Reform had hardly changed these practices of the academic life. The students in theology – and those of the other faculties – continued to dispute not only to obtain their degrees, but also as a regular practice in their course of studies.”¹⁴² We can observe, for instance, how Antoine Saulnier described Geneva’s educational system in 1538 to answer its detractors. He included the following, “Oftentimes there are also public disputations held in the cathedral concerning the Christian faith and religion.” He specifies that they are not full of sophistry, but conducted with moderation and peace. He adds, “But in these assemblies it is permitted to dispute as much for the one position as for the other upon whatever someone has proposed.” The others can then raise objections but the confirmation or refutation must ultimately be based only on Scripture. This is done, he says, to find out who is ready to teach others.¹⁴³ Sturm’s educational system, as begun in Strasbourg and

¹⁴¹ The disputations of the early Reformation were serious business, and yet were surely also a form of public entertainment. See Grendler, “Renaissance and Reformation Universities,” pp. 14-15 for the connection between Luther’s 95 theses for disputation and the medieval university curricula. One should maintain a distinction between university disputations, official ecclesiastical disputations, and those held before town councils. Leinsle, *Introduction to Scholastic Theology*, pp. 251-4.

¹⁴² “La Réforme n’avait guère change ces pratiques de la vie académique. Les étudiants en théologie – et ceux des autres faculties – continuaient à disputer non seulement pour obtenir leur degrés, mais aussi de manière régulière en cours d’études.” Fraenkel, *De l’écriture à la dispute*, p. 5.

¹⁴³ “Il ya souuantesfoyes aussi au temple dessusdict disputations publiques touchant la Foy et religion Chrestienne, non pas de cés disputations qui se font à crier en sophisterie & en debat, mais avec toute moderation de paroles, & tranquillité d’esprit. Or en icelles assemblées il est permis de disputer tant pour l’une partie que pour l’autre sur cela que quelcun a propose & mis en termes: & ce pendant qu’il soustient la matiere proposée, les autres luy font des obiections chacun selon son iugement: mais toutesfois de tell sorte que pour confermer ou reprouuer on n’allegue rien qui ne soit fondé en auctorité de la sainte scripture. Et quant à ceste maniere de disputer & conferer ensemble, on la traicte principalement à celle fin

exported elsewhere, also included public disputations.¹⁴⁴ In 1551 the statutes for the schools at Basel, for instance – which did use Sturm’s texts, though not necessarily all of his curricula – specified disputations for the bachelors on Thursdays and for the masters students on Saturdays.¹⁴⁵ Similarly, the 1547 regulations for the school of Lausanne stipulated that a public disputation in the arts be held every Saturday while a theological disputation be held once every fifteen days. Meylan correctly identifies the continuity of this method with the medieval universities and with other Protestant universities such as Wittenberg.¹⁴⁶

The Genevan *congrégations* represent an under-explored area where groundbreaking study has just been made, based on the discovery of hitherto mis-catalogued and thus unnoticed manuscripts.¹⁴⁷ We know that these discussion groups, probably based on Zwingli’s *prophezei* in Zurich, were likely in place already in 1536 and were certainly codified in the 1541 *Ordonnances ecclésiastiques*.¹⁴⁸ Erik de Boer has shown that two *congrégations* occurred each Friday – in the morning session the

qu’on esprouue si quelcun est suffisant pour luy bailler la charge d’enseigner le peuple, après toutesfoys auoir diligemment congneu & esprouué ses meurs, & sa maniere de uiure.” Antoine Saulnier, *L’ordre et manière d’enseigner en la ville de Genève au college* (Geneva: Iehan Gera[r]d, 1538), a6r-a6v.

¹⁴⁴ Sturm, *Schola Argentinensis*, c3r-v.

¹⁴⁵ Burnett, *Teaching the Reformation*, p. 120, compare pp. 84, 282.

¹⁴⁶ Meylan, *La Haute école de Lausanne*, p. 20. For a more complete copy of all the school’s regulations of 1547, see Karine Crousaz, *L’Académie de Lausanne entre Humanisme et Réforme (ca. 1537-1560)* (Leiden: Brill, 2012), pp. 481-501.

¹⁴⁷ See Erik A. de Boer, *The Genevan School of the Prophets. The Congrégations of the Company of Pastors and their influence in the 16th century* (Geneva: Droz, 2012); Erik A. de Boer, *Congrégations et disputations*, appearing in the series *Ioannis Calvini opera omnia* (Geneva: Droz, forthcoming, 2013). My thanks to the author for sharing this information with me.

¹⁴⁸ Erik A. de Boer, “Calvin and Colleagues. Propositions and Disputations in the Context of the Congrégations in Geneva,” in *Calvinus Praeceptor Ecclesiae* (Geneva: Droz, 2004), pp. 332; Bernard Cottret, *Calvin: A Biography*, trans. M. Wallace McDonald (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2000), pp. 296-7. Burnett also points to Zurich’s *prophezei* as source for the model followed by Oecolampadius and Phrygio in Basel around 1530, when their own University was temporarily nonoperational. Burnett, *Teaching the Reformation*, pp. 78-80.

ministers admitted the learned public but after dinner the ministers alone met, for a more formal disputation.¹⁴⁹ They discussed propositions put forward by members of the group. In 1548 they decided that these propositions should be recorded in writing.¹⁵⁰ The stipulation was also made that these disputations should be carried out “in a moderate tone and without strife. And that they should avoid the outward show and loud verbal contest of the sophists, so that it can be called a quiet exchange of disputable topics, rather than a disputation.”¹⁵¹ This regulation makes it sound like the Reformed ministers of Geneva were taking a strong stand against medieval sophistic disputations. In fact, they were endorsing a statement which was a common place in regulations of these kinds: after all, the regulations at Paris at the beginning of the sixteenth century stipulated “no deceptive arguments” and Fraenkel, when writing about the restoration of disputations at Wittenberg in 1523 and their ongoing use at Basel, adds, “As in the Middle Ages, the regulation forbade the participants formally from making statements meant to sow impious doubt, to use sophisms, subtleties, or wrangling, or to take the opponent for an adversary.”¹⁵² Indeed, Vincent of Beauvais (c. 1200-1277) “had set up rules to keep the disputations within the bounds of scholastic discipline. One must have, he said, the proper intention of discovering the truth so that faith may be confirmed and morals edified. One must shun disputation simply for the sake of argument or for fault-finding in

¹⁴⁹ Erik A. de Boer, “The Presence and Participation of Laypeople in the Congrégations of the Company of Pastors in Geneva,” in *Sixteenth Century Journal* 35:3 (Fall 2004): pp. 651-70.

¹⁵⁰ de Boer, “Calvin and Colleagues. Propositions and Disputations,” p. 333.

¹⁵¹ de Boer, “Propositions and Disputations in Geneva,” p. 333.

¹⁵² “Comme au Moyen Age, le règlement interdisait formellement aux participants de faire état de doutes impies, d’employer des sophisms, arguties ou chicanes, ou de s’en prendre à la personne de l’adversaire.” Fraenkel, *De l’écriture à la dispute*, p. 5.

debate.”¹⁵³ The medieval universities probably often struggled with this problem, especially with young men who relished “frivolous” and “lascivious” questions.¹⁵⁴ And if anyone thinks that Geneva’s disputations were always, “quiet exchanges” they need only listen in to the *congrégation* of Friday, October 16, 1551 when Calvin slipped in unnoticed by Jerome Bolsec who was speaking repugantly about the doctrine of election.¹⁵⁵ Later, in 1586, Antoine de la Faye defended the systematic use of disputations in the Academy of Geneva as a means of teaching and maintaining the truth of Scripture.¹⁵⁶

Two kinds of disputations: the question and argument formats

As will be seen below, Chandieu’s polemics as well as his “theological and scholastic” treatises are written disputations. His “theological and scholastic” treatises in particular follow a carefully crafted disputational format. Disputations as such go back to classical Greek culture, though no doubt disputes and possibly even formal rules for them are a universal phenomenon.¹⁵⁷ In the medieval era precise structures were stipulated, in line with the ancient Greek practice of having the *opponens* posit a thesis and the

¹⁵³ Astrik L. Gabriel, “The Ideal Master of the Mediaeval University,” in *The Catholic Historical Review* 60:1 (1974): pp. 24-5. Gabriel adds remarks of Humbertus Romanus (c. 1200-1277) to the same effect.

¹⁵⁴ Gabriel, “The Ideal Master,” p. 25; Brian Lawn, *The Rise & Decline of the Scholastic ‘Quaestio Disputata’*, p. 127.

¹⁵⁵ Cottret, *Calvin: A Biography*, pp. 208-13; see also pp. 296-7 on the *congrégations*. Erik A. de Boer, “The ‘Consensus Genevensis’ Revisited: The Genesis of the Genevan Consensus on Divine Election in 1551,” in *Acta Theologica Supplementum* 5 (2004): pp. 57-9.

¹⁵⁶ R. Scott Clark, “The Authority of Reason in the Later Reformation: Scholasticism in Caspar Olevian and Antoine de la Faye,” in *Protestant Scholasticism: Essays in Reassessment*, ed. Carl R. Trueman and R. S. Clark (Carlisle, Cumbria: Paternoster, 1999), pp. 123-5.

¹⁵⁷ “Debate and argumentation are as ancient as civilization itself and perhaps innate to the human mind.” Alex J. Novikoff, “Toward a Cultural History of Scholastic Disputation,” in *The American Historical Review* 117:2 (2012): p. 335.

respondens ask questions to try and lead his opponent into a contradiction. At the same time – though we are not clear on the exact time of origin – a different practice developed where the *opponens* put forward a thesis to prove and defend while the *respondens* posited an opposing thesis that he had to prove and defend. They could then mutually attack each other's thesis, as noted above in Saulnier's report of Geneva's educational model in 1538.¹⁵⁸ This development nuances our characterization of early modern disputations as "Aristotelian," "Old Aristotelian," or otherwise. We must carefully account for the discontinuities through time.

The Periodization of Intellectual History: Continuities and Discontinuities

Broad continuity in intellectual history c. 1250 to c. 1750

Given our descriptions above, we cannot rely on a simplistic periodization of ecclesiastical history with the "Middle Ages" ending in 1517, even if the following decades do represent a "turning point" ecclesiastically and spiritually.¹⁵⁹ For, if we survey the era from the standpoint of intellectual history or the history of the university, of logic, or of formalized disputations, a different broad picture emerges.¹⁶⁰ Muller stated this as follows: "It is also an error to discuss Protestant orthodoxy without being continually aware of the broad movement of ideas from the late Middle Ages, through the Reformation, into post-Reformation Protestantism. Whereas the Reformation is surely the

¹⁵⁸ Ignacio Angelelli, "The Techniques of Disputation in the History of Logic," in *The Journal of Philosophy* 67:20 (Oct. 1970): pp. 800-815. Angelelli misleadingly calls the two models, "old" and "modern."

¹⁵⁹ On the developments in spirituality see the discussion in Zuidema and Van Raalte, *Early French Reform*, pp. 36-41, 45-6, 50-53, 56-9, 68-9, 96-100.

¹⁶⁰ See, for example, Paul F. Grendler, "The Universities of the Renaissance and Reformation," in *Renaissance Quarterly* 57 (2004): pp. 1-42.

formative event for Protestantism, it is also true that the Reformation, which took place during the first half of the sixteenth century, is the briefer phenomenon, enclosed, as it were, by the five-hundred year history of scholasticism and Christian Aristotelianism.”¹⁶¹

Without being excessively strict about the periodization, an argument could be made for substantial continuity in intellectual history in terms of method and logic from the period c. 1250 to c. 1750.¹⁶² At the beginning of this period the medieval university had arisen. Throughout the period its basic structure and purpose remained more or less constant, although its role with respect to the state developed.¹⁶³ During all of this period Aristotle’s logic was head and shoulders above others.¹⁶⁴ Other treatises of Aristotle, such as on the heavenly bodies, on animals, and on geography were refuted, corrected, and updated, but Aristotle as such was not let go.¹⁶⁵

¹⁶¹ Richard A. Muller, *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics: The Rise and Development of Reformed Orthodoxy, ca. 1520 to ca. 1725*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2003), vol. 1, p. 73.

¹⁶² Muller rightly warns against excessively strict periodization. Muller, “Reflections on Persistent Whiggism,” p. 141. Note that the *Cambridge History of Later Medieval Philosophy* from 1982 covers the period 1100-1600.

¹⁶³ Scott, “The Mission of the University,” pp. 4, 6-13. See also Antonie Vos, “Scholasticism and Reformation,” in *Reformation and Scholasticism: An Academic Enterprise*, ed. Willem J. van Asselt and Eef Dekker (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2001), pp. 109-110. Vos writes, “the traditional view sees a deep gulf between medieval theology before 1500 and reformational theology after 1517. However, this scheme overlooks the degree of continuity in the history of the European university during the three centuries before 1500 and the three centuries after 1500. The medieval university and the ‘confessional’ university of the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries are two types of the same Christian university. Only the nineteenth century saw a new kind of university. The period between about 1775 and about 1825 created a deep gulf. The theoretical continuity of university and learning is broken. The Latin and scholastic university is replaced by the national type of university.”

¹⁶⁴ Other classical philosophies revived in the early modern period as well, such as Stoicism, Epicureanism, Platonism, and Skepticism. But Aristotle’s works were in use well before and long after the revival of other Classical philosophies. Aristotle also was far more comprehensive, covering poetry, physics, ethics, metaphysics, logic, anatomy, astrology, politics, and rhetoric. Trueman has stated, “It was not until the Gottlob Frege in the nineteenth century that [Aristotle’s] logic was finally dethroned.” He thus points out that when a Post-Reformation author such as Turretin repeatedly references Aristotle, this is not surprising at all in his own era. Trueman, *Histories and Fallacies*, p. 125; compare p. 144.

¹⁶⁵ Bianchi, “Continuity and Change in the Aristotelian Tradition,” p. 67.

Students who wished to study for the higher degrees could only succeed if the basic principles of logic and rules of disputation – more or less Aristotelian, varying by era and locale – were studied by them in the preceding years; thus, an education in these aspects of philosophy was a near ubiquitous part of early education in a way unknown in our era. In all this time the role of the disputation remained firmly ensconced as a key pedagogical tool, as shown above. Latin remained the *lingua franca* of scholars, especially in theology.¹⁶⁶

These points hold for law, medicine, and theology. They also apply to Reformed, Lutheran, and Roman Catholic theologians alike.¹⁶⁷ Basically, a remarkably constant – and elastic – academic or scholastic method remained in place.¹⁶⁸

It is beyond the scope of the present work to examine the *terminus ad quem* of this suggested period of intellectual history, but suffice to say that with the Enlightenment *ratio* becomes the *principium* of knowledge rather than its *instrumentum*. This writer agrees with Charles Schmitt that “[t]he force of the Aristotelian tradition did not end with the thirteenth or fourteenth century but persisted as a backdrop against which intellectual achievement had to be evaluated for several more centuries.” Schmitt, however, points to Bacon (1561-1626), Descartes (1596-1650), and Galileo (1564-1642) as the end of Aristotelianism, whereas philosophers such as Leibniz (1646-1716) still depended

¹⁶⁶ “Latin remained the language of all scholars from 1500 to about 1650 and still played a prominent role thereafter.” Grafton, *Worlds Made by Words*, p. 9.

¹⁶⁷ Looking at European history on the widest scale, Dietrich Gerhard argued that the period 1100-1800 “should be regarded as one unit, as the period of the ‘Old Europe.’” Dietrich Gerhard, “Periodization in European History,” in *The American Historical Review* 61:4 (July 1956): p. 903.

¹⁶⁸ Liensle, *Introduction to Scholastic Theology*, p. 15.

heavily on Aristotle for a viable general philosophy.¹⁶⁹ Brian Lawn expresses surprise not at the longevity of the Aristotelian *quaestio disputata* method, but that it did not last longer.¹⁷⁰ George Makdisi, who argues for legal origins of the scholastic method, writes, “But not only is law to be found at the birth of the scholastic method, it has also become its sole heir. One has only to sit in a court of law and watch trial lawyers put on their cases.”¹⁷¹ Novikoff correctly considers our era’s dissertation defense as another successor.¹⁷²

Certainly the broad continuity just described does not preclude widespread and long lasting change in many other areas and also within scholasticism.¹⁷³ Many have already been noted above, such as the humanists’ recovery of better texts of Aristotle, their preference for his dialectics over his analytics, their omission of the more intricate scholastic discussions, and their pressure upon the syllogism for practical rhetorical benefit.¹⁷⁴ Some philosophers, such as Ramus, sought to simplify and modify Aristotle’s

¹⁶⁹ Schmitt is not quite correct when he writes, “Only with Bacon, Descartes, and Galileo – feeding on the critical tradition of Copernicus, Ramus, Telesio, Patrizi, and Bruno, among others – do we see that Aristotelianism failed to revive itself as a viable general philosophy, though even then several branches of the *Peripatetic* system displayed continuing stamina.” Charles B. Schmitt, *John Case and Aristotelianism in Renaissance England* (Montreal: McGill-Queens University Press, 1983), p. 8. For evidence of Leibniz’s Aristotelianism, see Kelly L. Ross, “Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz (1646-1716),” <http://www.friesian.com/leibniz.htm>, accessed July 04, 2012; Christia Mercer, “Leibniz, Aristotle, and Ethical Knowledge,” in *The Impact of Aristotelianism on Modern Philosophy*, ed. Ricardo Pozzo (Washington DC: Catholic University Press of America, 2004), pp. 113-47. I thank Irena Backus for assistance on this point.

¹⁷⁰ Lawn, *The Rise & Decline of the Scholastic ‘Quaestio Disputata’*, p. 148.

¹⁷¹ George Makdisi, “The Scholastic Method in Medieval Education: An Inquiry into Its Origins in Law and Theology,” in *Speculum* 49:4 (1974): p.660.

¹⁷² Novikoff, “Toward a Cultural History of Scholastic Disputation,” p. 351.

¹⁷³ In its second issue, Francis Higman defended the choice of 1350-1750 as a suitable window for the *Journal of Early Modern History*. He argued that these four centuries represent a time of change, at the end of which we find all the factors that define our modern intellectual era. Francis Higman, “1350-1750? The Perspective of Intellectual History,” in *Journal of Early Modern History* 1:2 (1997): pp. 95-106.

¹⁷⁴ Certainly it was not the case that humanists used enthymemes while scholastics used syllogisms. Logic texts written by humanists routinely treated the syllogism, with the enthymeme typically serving as a subtopic to, or immediately following the syllogism, since an enthymeme is simply an incomplete

presentation, not abandon it, in order to educate youths more quickly and seemingly more practically.¹⁷⁵ But throughout these developments the Stagirite's hegemony remained.¹⁷⁶

Specific developments in rhetoric and logic in the sixteenth century

To situate Chandieu's increased scholastic output more specifically within the broad continuity just noted, we turn to four recent works, with confirmation from a medieval specialist as well. Peter Mack's *A History of Renaissance Rhetoric* (2011), Howard Hotson's *Commonplace Learning* (2007), Amy Nelson Burnett's *Teaching the Reformation* (2006), and Brian Lawn's *Rise & Decline of the Scholastic 'Quaestio Disputata'* all argue for a specific development in the pedagogy of dialectic during the sixteenth century.

Mack introduces his work as, "the first comprehensive history of renaissance rhetoric."¹⁷⁷ He overviews a multitude of renaissance textbooks on rhetoric – sufficient in number to draw broader conclusions. One of the most important conclusions he draws pertinent to this study of Chandieu is his view that scholastic logic took a backseat to humanist-driven dialectic and rhetoric during the period 1530-1580 approximately. If this is correct, we would have a fairly well defined framework within which to fit the scholastic writing of Chandieu. We would also, of course, have to ask ourselves whether

sylogism. "Enthymema est imperfectus syllogismus." Philip Melanchthon, *Erroremata dialecticae et rhetoricae* in *Philippi Melanthonis opera quae supersunt omnia*, vol. 13 (Halle an der Salle: C. A. Schwetschke et filium, 1846), col. 617.

¹⁷⁵ Hotson, *Commonplace Learning*, pp. 39-40, 44.

¹⁷⁶ According to Copenhagen and Schmitt, Ramus's purported thesis against Aristotle for his MA tells us little about what he himself positively believed, and when considered in context, his claim was no more weird or mind-bending than many others in the quodlibetal and sophistical literature of the centuries before him. See Copenhagen & Schmitt, *Renaissance Philosophy*, p. 232. Note that on the next page Copenhagen mistakes the timing of Ramus's conversion.

¹⁷⁷ Mack, *A History of Renaissance Rhetoric*, p. 1.

his scholastic writing would properly fall under one category – “humanist dialectic” – or the other – “scholastic logic” – or whether perhaps this dilemma has a third horn. For, if by scholastic logic one is referring to the likes of John Mair or Francisco Suarez, Chandieu only partly fits the category. Nevertheless, the specificity of the dates Mack suggests and the breadth of his survey lead us to take his suggestions seriously.

Mack specifies this period more than once. For instance, by studying the publication figures of Cicero’s very widely used *Rhetorica ad Herennium/De inventione* he could suggest, “It may well be that across Europe as a whole rhetoric became a more important part of the syllabus from the 1530s onwards with the fashion for humanist logic and that after 1580 scholastic logic reasserted its former predominance.”¹⁷⁸ He specifically identifies 1529/30 as the “moment” when “humanist dialectic” superseded “scholastic logic.”¹⁷⁹ Elsewhere his comments on Melanchthon’s *Erotemata dialectices* (1547) demonstrate what he means by the contrast of humanist and scholastic logic: “Some of the medieval additions to logic (such as consequences and the theory of supposition), which had been dropped from other humanist dialectics, reappeared in this book, which may reflect the beginning of a gradual revival of scholastic logic.”¹⁸⁰ This observation is in line with his identification of Pedro da Fonseca’s 1564 *Institutionum dialecticarum libri octo* as part of the “swing away from humanist dialectic and back towards scholasticism, which we find in some university syllabuses of the time,

¹⁷⁸ Mack, *History of Renaissance Rhetoric*, p. 21. See also the tables of publications records for manuals of rhetoric in the years 1490-1620 on p. 31. These tables show the smashing success of both classical and renaissance manuals of rhetoric in the years 1520-1590.

¹⁷⁹ Mack, *History of Renaissance Rhetoric*, p. 123. Mack’s observations match those of Jenny Ashworth, “Changes in logic textbooks from 1500 to 1650: the new Aristotelianism,” in *Aristotelismus und Renaissance: In memoriam Charles B. Schmitt*, ed. E. Kessler, C. Lohr, and W. Sparr (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1988), pp. 75-6.

¹⁸⁰ Mack, *History of Renaissance Rhetoric*, p. 108.

especially in Catholic countries.”¹⁸¹ One could certainly wonder whether dropping the “medieval additions to logic” and reviving them form sufficient grounds to categorize one style “humanist dialectic” and the other “scholastic logic,” for, as I will show, Chandieu’s “theological and scholastic” treatises are not of the “humanist dialectic” style, nor do they cover the medieval additions to logic, yet they are definitely scholastic. Suffice to say that Mack’s observations – though not his precise terminology – match those made above in the sections on humanism and scholasticism.

One of the great historians of medieval philosophy, Jenny Ashworth, confirms what we find in Mack. She has written, “[A]fter about 1530 not only did new writing on the specifically medieval contributions to logic cease, but the publication of medieval logicians virtually ceased.” With respect to publication, she cites re-publications of Scotus and Aquinas as exceptions. Key to the rejuvenation of medieval logic were Toledo and Fonseca, two Jesuit philosophers who published texts in 1561 and 1564, but with less of the highly technical language which the humanists had called barbaric.¹⁸² One author who has generally gone unnoticed in these discussions is Augustin Huens (1521-1578), who in 1551 produced at least one work dependent upon the medieval discussions – simple, but still transmitting the intricate medieval meta-linguistic discussions.¹⁸³

¹⁸¹ Mack, *History of Renaissance Rhetoric*, p. 183. He also cites the Protestant John Case’s *Summa veterum interpretum in universam dialecticam Aristotelis* (1584) as an example of the revival of “scholastic logic.” *Ibid.*, p. 184.

¹⁸² E. J. Ashworth, “Editor’s Introduction,” in *Logicae Artis Compendium* [by Robert Sanderson, 1618], (Bologna: Clueb, 1985), XVII, XXII; compare E. J. Ashworth, “Changes in logic textbooks from 1500 to 1650: the new Aristotelianism,” in *Aristotelismus und Renaissance: In memoriam Charles B. Schmidt*, ed. E. Kessler, C. Lohr, and W. Spurn (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1988), pp. 75-6. One of the reasons for the “barbaric” epithet was that humanists did not understand that the logicians were really working on a meta-language in the pursuit of deep study of logic. Perreiah, “Humanist Critiques of Scholastic Dialectic,” pp. 20-22.

¹⁸³ Augustin Huens, *De Disputatione inter disceptantes, Dialectice instituenda, libellus* (Louvain: Verhasselt, 1551); compare Augustin Huens, *Logices fundamentum. Seu prodidagmata de dialecticis vocum affectionibus & proprietatibus* (Antwerp: Silvius, 1563).

Burnett describes a similar shift in quite strong terms when she writes about the training of pastors in Basel. “The pastors who began their study of theology after Grynaeus came to Basel in 1575 were trained in a fundamentally different way from their predecessors, with dialectic, rather than philology, serving as the most important component of theological method.”¹⁸⁴ Her focus is on Reformed pastors, with the contrast being that from 1529 to about 1575 the training in Basel was more philological than dialectical. She also notes that from the 1520s to about 1600 the study of metaphysics was neglected, stating that in this period, “Protestant theology made use of Aristotelian dialectic but not Aristotelian metaphysics.”¹⁸⁵ After careful examination of the teaching of men for the pastorate in Basel between 1529 and 1629, she emphasizes that “pedagogical necessity drove the evolution of dialectic over the course of the sixteenth century.”¹⁸⁶ I will argue the importance of pedagogical necessity in the case of Chandieu’s scholastic output also.

Hotson describes how the University of Leiden began in 1575 with a Ramist curriculum only to repudiate this already in 1582 because they wished to explain the full text of Aristotle rather than waste the time of their students with Ramist compendiums. Interestingly, Hotson sees this repudiation as driven by the humanists in their desire for a highly elite approach to education.¹⁸⁷

Finally, Lawn notes the turn to a “more orthodox Aristotelianism” at the

¹⁸⁴ Burnett, *Teaching the Reformation*, p. 153. Compare pp. 291-3 where she presents the commentaries of Oecolompadius (1530), Grynaeus (1587), and Polanus (1599) to illustrate the development in their theological method.

¹⁸⁵ Burnett, *Teaching the Reformation*, pp. 116, 120-21.

¹⁸⁶ Burnett, *Teaching the Reformation*, p. 117, compare p. 85.

¹⁸⁷ Hotson, *Commonplace Learning*, pp. 54, 57-60.

University of Oxford precisely in 1585/6 with the adoption of new statutes.¹⁸⁸ This regulatory change suggests a negative reaction to Ramism and follows – perhaps a bit later – the same pattern as the institutions just noted.

Thus we find five recent authors suggesting that the time of 1575-1585 was important for the recovery of a more genuine Aristotle, which led to a rejuvenation of the medieval scholastic logic and dialectic. Their arguments conform to those of Copenhaver and Schmidt, noted above, who saw a certain stoppage of highly sophisticated scholastic theology with John Mair (up to about 1515) and a kind of rejuvenation of the same with Francisco Suarez (starting in the 1590s).¹⁸⁹ Chandieu was not writing scholastic theology in the order of Mair or Suarez, but it does appear that Chandieu advances scholastic theology for the Reformed in a time when change is occurring in the wider Protestant field of theology. Our study must therefore determine how Chandieu does or does not match this particular description of the development of dialectic and logic in the last quarter of the sixteenth century.

Plan of the Present Work

To determine how Chandieu fits into the developments just outlined and to ascertain his contributions to the development of the scholastic presentation of Reformed theology, we will especially analyse Chandieu's first "theological and scholastic" treatise, namely his 1580 *Locus de verbo Dei scripto, adversus humanas traditiones, theologice et scholastice tractatus*, and draw comparisons of its method with those of the five similar

¹⁸⁸ Brian Lawn, *The Rise and Decline of the Scholastic 'Quaestio Disputata' with Special Emphasis on its Use in the Teaching of Medicine and Science* (Leiden: Brill, 1993), pp. 124-5.

¹⁸⁹ Copenhaver and Schmidt, *Renaissance Philosophy*, p. 96.

“theological and scholastic” treatises which followed from 1581 to 1590. Given the claim of Neuser that Chandieu’s method was “new,” and the suggestions of Sinnema that Claude Auberi was a significant source of Chandieu’s method, we will precede our study of *De verbo Dei scripto* with four earlier scholastic works of Chandieu. Two of these – from 1566 and 1567 – precede his contact with Auberi by a decade. The other two came at the very beginning of Chandieu’s interaction with Aubery (1577). These will also be scrutinized so that we can establish what precisely was “new” for Chandieu in the method of his six “theological and scholastic” works in the 1580s.

Each of his “theological and scholastic” works presents its arguments by means of dozens of overt syllogisms. They also follow an identical disputational structure of six chapters of positive and negative arguments. In all of them the number of hypothetical syllogisms far exceeds the number of categorical. This disputational structure, generally speaking, has deep medieval roots which will need to be explored. Similarly, Chandieu himself claims that the medieval scholastics made frequent use of hypothetical syllogisms. This claim requires investigation.

Outline of the Present Work

The following chapter will introduce Antoine de Chandieu as a student, pastor, ambassador, chaplain, poet, author, and theologian. All of his known writings will be overviewed in chronological order, with some sense of the context of each one. We will obtain a reasonable amount of detail about his education and gain a sense of his place among his contemporaries. Chandieu’s mastery of genres will be highlighted.

Chapter 3 studies the 1560s: Chandieu’s *Confirmation de la discipline*

ecclesiastique (1566) and his *Refutatio libelli quem Claudius de Sainctes* (1567). The first engaged Jean Morély's arguments for congregationalism, finely crafting its arguments in the form of a scholastic disputation. The second defends Calvin and Beza's views on the Lord's Supper. This treatise stands out for its abundant use of patristic and medieval sources and its familiarity with medieval scholastic questions.

Chapter 4 looks at the 1570s, examining the more general work of 1577, *De legitima vocatione pastorum*, as well as *Sophismata F. Turriani*, a scholastic disputation of the same year that includes full syllogisms. Careful study of the possible influence of Claude Auberi will lead us to revise the suggestions of Sinnema.

Chapter 5 examines the preface to Chandieu's 1580 *De verbo Dei scripto*, wherein Chandieu defends his choice of the scholastic genre and explains what he means by "theological" and "scholastic." Briefly, "theological" indicates that scripture is his source and content for the arguments whereas "scholastic" indicates his method, a method he considered apropos to the classroom and to careful theological formulation.

Chapter 6 surveys *De verbo Dei scripto* in sufficient detail to become closely acquainted with the practice of his method. His acceptance of the axiom that all Scripture is inspired by God was foundational for his view of the authority of Scripture, of theology as a science, and of faith as a certainty.

Chapter 7 takes the setting described in chapter 1, returns to it, and deepens it with respect to these two major points: disputational structures and hypothetical syllogisms. Included are medieval antecedents to Chandieu's artfully arranged disputational structure as well as minor updates he offered in the following five "theological and scholastic" treatises from 1580-1589. The interesting – and not exactly

Aristotelian – history of the hypothetical syllogistic also receives fairly detailed attention, with some interesting observations about Pierre de la Ramée.

The work will close with conclusions in chapter 8 regarding Chandieu's role in the rise of Reformed Orthodoxy. In what sense might we call Chandieu "one of the fathers" of Reformed scholasticism?

Chapter 2

A Chronology of the Life and Writings of Antoine de Chandieu

Introduction

The year of Antoine de Chandieu's birth was the same as Ignatius de Loyola's initial formation of what would become the *Societas Iesu* and the date some have assigned to John Calvin's conversion to Protestantism – A. D. 1534.¹ Calvin in turn would influence Chandieu's conversion while Loyola's followers would find a formidable foe in Chandieu. The concurrence goes further, however, for when Chandieu utilized scholastic form, he did so both to pass on succinctly for ministerial candidates the same teachings Calvin had transmitted more prosaically and to dispute methodically the sophisticated arguments of various rising Jesuits. In these respects, Chandieu played the role of consolidator and defender – a second/third generation Reformer. However, with respect to the federating of the French Reformed Churches, Chandieu charted the course – a first generation effort. Whatever the circumstances, his academic precision gave practical guidance to the Reformed churches.

In order to familiarize the reader with Chandieu and to justify the choice of treatises that this dissertation probes, this chapter reviews all of his writings, both scholastic and prosaic. It arranges them all in order, characterizes them briefly, and notes many of the written responses of his opponents.

Chandieu wrote out of his own life context. Thus, factors such as his upbringing, education, friendships, occupations, social status, conflicts, and geographical movements will also be explored in this chapter in order to shed some light on the contexts, sources,

¹ I realize the date and meaning of Calvin's *subito conversio* are disputed points in the scholarship.

and reasons for his use of the scholastic method. Given the present project, most of the focus in this chapter will fall on Chandieu's education and his known writings. Readers seeking more detail regarding his movements, aristocratic connections, and non-scholastic writings should consult the biographies and studies noted below.

Existing biographies include that found at the head of Chandieu's *Opera theologica*, written by Jacques Lect (1556-1611) the year after Chandieu's death. Lect was a very prominent figure in both state and church in Geneva for several decades, sometimes considered in that era to be Beza's successor (though earlier Beza may have thought of Chandieu as such).² Melchior Adam's biography is taken from Lect.³ Another account is based on the unpublished personal journal of Chandieu, brought to light by a nineteenth century scholar and pastor in Basel, August Bernus. His biography exceeds Lect's significantly in length and detail, bringing to bear some contemporary literature as well as the bits of epistolary literature connected to Chandieu (very little remains).⁴ Unfortunately Bernus never published the actual journal and its whereabouts is now

² "Jacobi Lectii IC de vita Anton Sadeelis et scriptis, epistola ad archiepiscopum Cantuariensum," in *Opera Theologica* (Geneva: Jean le Preux, 1593), c1r-c5v. Note that the first edition of the *Opera Theologica* did not contain Lect's biography. It first appeared in the second edition, in 1593, and was dated IIII Cal. Mart. 1593. On Lect, see Matteo Campagnolo, "Jacques Lect, juriste et magistrat, 'théologien et évêque'," in *Jacques Godefroy (1587-1652) et l'humanisme juridique à Genève*, ed. B. Schmidlin and A. Dufour (Helbing & Lichtenhahn: Basel, 1991), pp. 149-73. Scott Manetsch speculates that Beza may have hoped Chandieu would one day succeed him at the Geneva Academy. I would agree. Scott Manetsch, *Theodore Beza and the Quest for Peace in France, 1572-1598* (Leiden: Brill, 2000), pp. 215-16.

³ Melchior Adam, *Vitae germanorum theologorum, qui superiori seculo ecclesiam Christi voce scriptisque propagarunt et propugnarunt congestae et ad annum usque 1618 deductae* (Frankfurt: Jonae Rosae, 1653), Volume II, pp. 153-63.

⁴ August Bernus, "Le ministre Antoine de Chandieu d'après son journal autographe inédit (1534-1591), cinq parties," in *BSHPF* 37 (1888): pp. 2-13, 57-69, 124-36, 169-91, 393-415, 449-62, 561-77, 617-35. Published the following year as a monograph: August Bernus, *Le ministre Antoine de Chandieu d'après son journal autographe inédit, 1534-1591* (Paris: Imprimeries réunies, 1889). References which follow will cite the BSHPF article first, since it is more accessible. References to the monograph will follow in square brackets.

unknown.⁵ Various bits of evidence can also be gleaned from the published correspondence of Beza and the acts of some early French Reformed Synods. The entry on Chandieu in the biographical dictionary of the brothers Haag appears to rely on Lect and Synod acts.⁶ Sara Barker's recent work does assemble some new information on Chandieu's ancestors but mostly helps by setting Chandieu within his socio-political context.⁷ Barker, however, neither reviews all of Chandieu's works nor probes his scholastic training.

Chandieu's Family, Titles, and *nommes de plume*

Chandieu was born as the second son into a family of nobility with substantial assets and centuries of political connections in the province of Dauphiné. His father, Guy de Chandieu, was from an ancient line of barons and either he or his brother served in the entourage of King Francis I (ruled 1515-1547). Starting with Guy, one of the family's estates was in the eastern part of France about 150 kilometres due west of Geneva (at Chabot/Chabottes in the Macconais). Antoine's mother, Claudine du Molard, had inherited the estate with its château when her first husband, Antoine Gobert, passed

⁵ Bernus intended to publish the journal together with about 20 letters of Chandieu. He states that the journal contained brief daily entries, in Latin, touching the principle events of Chandieu's life and sometimes the lesser details. The affections of Chandieu are also expressed in a number of heartfelt prayers, some of which Bernus has transmitted. In the 1880s the journal belonged to the family of M. L. de Tschanner of Berne. Bernus, *Le ministre Antoine de Chandieu* (1888), pp. 3-4 [1889, pp. 2-3].

⁶ Eugène Haag and Émile Haag, *La France Protestante*, 2nd ed. (Paris: Fischbacher, 1883), vol. 3, pp. 1049-58. A brief biography of Chandieu in English appears to rely on Lect. Thomas Fuller, *Abel Redivivus* (London: William Tegg, 1867), vol. 2, pp. 105-109.

⁷ Sara K. Barker, *Protestantism, Poetry and Protest: The Vernacular Writings of Antoine de Chandieu* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009). This monograph is largely based on her dissertation: Sara K. Barker, "Developing French Protestant Identity: the political and religious writings of Antoine de Chandieu (1534-1591)" (Ph. D. dissertation, University of St. Andrews, 2006).

away.⁸ Guy de Chandieu was her second.⁹ Antoine was born at the Chabot castle.¹⁰ About four years later Guy passed away and Claudine then remained a widow.¹¹ Antoine's older brother Bertrand inherited the title "de Chandieu" at this time (1538). When he died in December 1562 at the battle of Dreux, the title went to Antoine.¹² At the time of Chandieu's marriage to Françoise de Félin in 1563 he also held the title "seigneur de Poule(s)."¹³ His signature to a last will and testament in 1567 named him lord of several estates: de Chandieu, de Pole, and de Prepiers (in Beaujolais). Bernus states that he might have added de Chabottes, de Viellecourt (in Maconnais), de Grevilly (in Bourgogen), de la Roche (in Dauphiné), and de Folleville (in Beauce).¹⁴ The family's estates seem to have supported Chandieu all his life – ensuring that he could pursue a good education from a young age and later providing enough that he apparently never

⁸ Barker, *Protestantism, Poetry and Protest*, p. 16, n. 12.

⁹ Barker discusses two interpretations on the question whether Antoine's father was named Guy (Guido) or Guillaume and whether the Guillaume Chandieu in the entourage of Francis I was Antoine's father or uncle. Barker, *Protestantism, Poetry and Protest*, p. 15.

¹⁰ The Chabot château may no longer exist, but the Chandieu château does, close to Lyon. See Raoul de Cazenove, "Chandieu et ses seigneurs – Antoine de la Roche-Chandieu," in *BSHPF* 39 (1890): pp. 271-6; A. de Puyroche, "Le Chateau de Chandieu et les Protestants de Lyon a la fin du XVI^e siècle," in *BSHPF* 39 (1890): pp. 276-83. See also Jimre & co. "Chandieu," *Rhone-Medieval.fr*, accessed July 04, 2012, <http://rhonemedieval.free.fr/index.php?page=accueil&dept=69&chateau=22>.

¹¹ Bernus, *Le ministre Antoine de Chandieu*, p. 4 [1889, p. 3].

¹² Thus, in 1562 Chandieu's name went from Antoine de la Roche to Antoine de Chandieu or Antoine de la Roche Chandieu. Bernus, *Le ministre Antoine de Chandieu*, p. 4 [1889, p. 3]; Haag & Haag, *La France Protestante*, 2nd ed., vol. 3, p. 1053; Barker, *Protestantism, Poetry and Protest*, p. 15, n. 10. On April 25, 1562, 8 months before Bertrand's death, Antoine signed the Acts of the Synod of Orleans, "Chandieu Seigneur de la Roche." The order of titles and the placement of the nobiliary particle indicate that he was not yet "de Chandieu." Jean Aymon, *Tous les synodes nationaux des églises réformées de France* (Den Haag: Charles Deloo, 1710), vol. 1, p. 31.

¹³ See the discussion in Bernus, *Le ministre Antoine de Chandieu*, pp. 170-72 [1889, pp. 38-40]; Barker, *Protestantism, Poetry and Protest*, p. 15.

¹⁴ Bernus, *Le ministre Antoine de Chandieu*, p. 170, n. 1 [1889, p. 38].

requested a stipend from the churches he served.¹⁵ Those of Antoine and Françoise's thirteen children who did not die young were likewise ensured a good education, married in their social class, and came to hold prominent political positions.¹⁶

Chandieu's family name may be derived from the French Chant-de-Dieu (song of God) or Champ-de-Dieu (field of God). This led him to several pen names derived from other languages. Some early works lack any author's name, for instance in 1561 and 1566.¹⁷ Also anonymous is Chandieu's 1585 response to the monks of Bordeaux.¹⁸ The first pseudonym we encounter is A. de la Croix (of the cross), used in 1561 for a play Chandieu authored and for a letter to Calvin.¹⁹ In 1563 Chandieu used A. Zamariel, Hebrew for "song of God."²⁰ Soon after, in 1567, we encounter A. Theopsaltes, Greek for "song of God."²¹ Chandieu's dedication of a work to John Bos in 1573 employs, "A. Sadeel Theopsal[tes]."²² His most common pen name, from 1577 onward, was Sadeel,

¹⁵ For example, when serving the church of Geneva in the last years of his life, Chandieu's belongings in France had been sequestered but he still did not receive a stipend. From time to time the Council of Geneva voted him a cask of wine. Bernus, pp. 125, 631-2 [1889, pp. 25, 123-4].

¹⁶ See the list of their children in Haag & Haag, *La France Protestante*, vol. 3, pp. 1058-1060.

¹⁷ [Antoine de Chandieu], *Advertissement aux fideles* (s.l.: s.n., 1561); [Antoine de Chandieu], *La confirmation de la discipline ecclesiastique observée es églises reformées du royaume de France, avec la response aux obiections proposées alencontre* (s.l.: s.n., 1566). The anonymity of the author in the 1566 publication may be tied to the fact that the work was authorized by Synod to be an official defence of the French Reformed church polity, not just one man's opinion.

¹⁸ [Antoine de Chandieu], *La response a la profession de foy publiée contre ceux de l'Eglise Reformée: Avec la refutation tant des calomnies qui y sont contenues, que generalmente des erreurs de l'Eglise Romaine pretendue Catholique* ([La Rochelle: Pierre Haultin], 1585).

¹⁹ Damon di Mauro, "Antoine de Chandieu, auteur d'un drame biblique?" in *BSHPF* 151 (2005): pp. 219-29; Barker, *Protestantism, Poetry and Protest*, pp. 111-13.

²⁰ A. Zamariel [Antoine de Chandieu], *Histoire des persecutions et martyrs de l'Eglise de Paris depuis l'An 1557 iusques au temps du Roy Charles neufviesme* (Lyon: s.n., 1563). See p. 70 of this edition for the pseudonym.

²¹ A. Theopsaltes [Antoine de Chandieu], *Refutatio libelli quem Claudius de Sainctes Monachus nuper edidit cum hac inscriptione: Examen doctrinae Calvinianae et Bezanae de Coena Domini, ex scriptis authorum eiusdem collectum* (Geneva: [Jean Crespin], 1567). See p. 3 for the pseudonym.

²² A. Sadeele Theopsaltes [Antoine de Chandieu], *Meditationes in psalmum XXXII* (Lausanne: François Le Preux, 1578). Included in the *Opera Theologica*, pp. 888-926.

Hebrew for “field of God.” Although Lect suggests that “Sadeel” was already the family name of Chandieu’s father Guy, it seems more likely that “Sadeel” began with Antoine, since records show that Guy’s family name was Chandieu.²³ One of Chandieu’s contemporaries uses “Champdieu” in a letter to Beza in 1590.²⁴ Whether Antoine’s various pen names succeeded very long in concealing his identity is debatable, but concealment was one of their initial designs – certainly this was the case with “de la Croix” and possibly also with Theopsaltes.²⁵ Pseudonyms were also an exercise in humanist flair.

Chandieu’s Education

Chandieu’s early education was in Paris. Around 1540 his mother sent him there, to the tutor Matthias Granjean.²⁶ Bernus states that Granjean was already in contact with Calvin, though he provides no sources for the claim.²⁷ We know that later Granjean was definitively Reformed and of good scholarly calibre, when the Genevan authorities asked

²³ Chandieu’s marriage contract stated, “Contrat de mariage d’Antoine de Chandieu, seigneur de Poules, fils de Guillaume de Chandieu et dame Claudine du Molard.” Alice Chevalier, “La Famille Chandieu et la Réforme,” in *Divers Aspects de la Réforme aux XVI^e et XVII^e siècles* (Paris: Société de l’histoire de la protestantisme français, 1975), pp. 635-45. Cited in Barker, *Poetry, Protestantism and Protest*, p. 15, n. 7.

²⁴ The letter is from Jean Castol of London. *Correspondance de Théodore de Bèze*, vol 31 (1590), ed. Alain Dufour, Béatrice Nicollier, and Hervé Genton (Geneva: Droz, 2009), p. 173.

²⁵ It seems that Claude de Saintes, against whom Chandieu was writing, could not figure out who Theopsaltes was, so he simply poked fun at the pseudonym. He writes in his response to Beza in 1567, “Examen compositi à Theodoro Beza, & altero ministro, cuius nomen gallicum latine reddi debuit Canideus, sed se graece per Theopsaltem cum idem significet, maluit exprimere . . . ardentius Besopsaltem se quam Theopsaltem ostendit.” Claude de Saintes, *Responsio F. Claudii de Saintes Parisien. Theologi ad Apologiam Theodori Bezae* (Paris: Claude Fremy, 1567), a2v-a3r.

²⁶ Barker helpfully points out the immense influence of French noblewomen over their households. Her suggestion that Chandieu’s mother was already amenable to the Reform is defensible, given the life course of both of her sons. Lect, however ascribes “the first seeds of religion” in Chandieu to his tutor Grandjean. Barker, *Protestantism, Poetry and Protest*, pp. 17-18; Antoine de Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, 3rd ed. (Geneva: Jean le Preux, 1599), c1v.

²⁷ Bernus, *Le ministre Antoine de Chandieu*, p. 5 [1889, p. 4]. The claim seems unlikely given that in 1540 Calvin was just returning to Geneva from Strasbourg and was only beginning to form a reputation.

him in 1557 to head up their school for orphans and the poor (*l'éschole à l'hôpital*).²⁸

Soon afterward Granjean was ordained as a pastor for one of the villages around Geneva.²⁹ Chandieu's later success in various written genres, his wide use of sources, and his solid grasp of languages suggest that Granjean provided a very solid academic foundation for Chandieu.³⁰

In his teens Chandieu went to the illustrious University of Toulouse to study law. Not much is known about this time in Chandieu's life. His journal states that he kept company with the more serious students.³¹ Bernus pointed readers to a description of the course of study from one of Chandieu's illustrious contemporaries (Henri de Mesmes [1531-1596], magistrate and diplomat), who wrote,

At [the University of] Toulouse we were auditors for three years in a more rigorous life and more painful labours than those of the present would be willing to bear. We arose at four o'clock and, having prayed to God, we went at five o'clock to our studies [that is to say, the lectures] with our big books under our arms and our writing tablets and candlesticks in our hands. We listened to all the lectures until ten o'clock, without interruption. Then we went to dinner, after having had a quick half-hour discussion about what we wrote from the lectures. After dinner we read, as a kind of recreation, Sophocles, Aristophanes, or Euripedes, and sometimes Demosthenes, Cicero, Virgil, or Horace. At one o'clock we returned to our studies [lectures]; at five we went to our lodgings to look up the passages alleged by the professors in class and rehearse them. After supper, we followed readings in Greek or Latin.³²

²⁸ On the Genevan "hospital" and its oversight, see Jeannine Olson, *Calvin and Social Welfare: deacons and the Bourse française* (Cranberry, NJ: Associated University Presses, 1989), pp. 19-21, 30-33; François Bonivard, *Police de Geneve* (Geneva: Fick, 1865), pp. 156-8.

²⁹ Bernus, *Le ministre Antoine de Chandieu*, p. 5, n. 1 [1889, p. 4, n. 1]; Robert M. Kingdon, *Geneva and the Coming of the Wars of Religion 1555-1563*, 2nd ed., (Geneva: Droz, 2007), pp. 26-7. Most of our information about Granjean derives from the Registers of the Company of Pastors of Geneva.

³⁰ Colladon also later employed Granjean as a teacher for his children. Bernus, *Le ministre Antoine de Chandieu*, p. 5, n. 1 [1889, p. 4, n. 1].

³¹ Bernus, *Le ministre Antoine de Chandieu*, p. 5 [1889, p. 4].

³² Nous susmes trois ans Auditeurs en plus estroite vie & penibles estudes que ceux de maintenant ne voudroient supporter. Nous estions debout à quatre heures, & ayant prié Dieu, allions à cinq heures aux estudes, nos gros Livres sous le bras, nos escrivoires & nos chandeliers à la main. Nous oyons toutes les lectures jusques à dix heures sonnées sans intermission; puis venions disner, après avoir en haste conféré demie heure ce qu'avions escrit des lectures. Après-disner, nous lisions par forme de jeu Sophocles ou

This memoir includes further valuable information not culled by Bernus.

Considering that Henri de Mesmes was in the faculty of law just like Chandieu was about five years later, we note that de Mesmes' father prepared him for his studies in law by first providing him with a private tutor and then sending him at the age of 11 (1542) to the College of Bourgogne (in Paris) for 18 months. He chose this institution with two concerns, "the one for the association with happy and innocent youths, the other for its scholastic discipline (*Discipline Scholastique*)."³³ De Mesmes adds that he learned "to answer and dispute and argue in public," and at the end of the 18 months, "I recited in public some Latin and Greek prayers of my own composition, presented several Latin verses and two thousand Greek verses made according to my years, and recited Homer by heart from one end to the other."³⁴ Although de Mesmes represents an exceptionally gifted student (and may have exaggerated?), Chandieu was also outstanding and would have learned similar things in preparation for his studies at the University of Toulouse. Interestingly, de Mesmes' memoir makes no rigid distinction between humanist and scholastic studies: the use of classical languages and literature grew up in the midst of the

Aristophanes ou Euripides, & quelquefois Demosthenes, Cicero, Virgilius, Horatius. A une heure aux Estudes, à cinq au logis, à repeater & voir dans nos Livres les lieux alleguez, jusques après six. Puis nous soupions & lisions en Grec ou en Latin. J. Le Laboureur, *Additions aux memoires de Messire Michel de Castelnau* (Brussels: Jean Leonard, 1731), vol. 2, p. 773.

³³ "l'un à la conversation de la jeunesse gaye & innocente, l'autre à la Discipline Scholastique." The initial upper case letters are original, suggesting that de Mesmes is thinking of scholasticism as a science, art, or discipline, with the connotation of academic rigour. Le Laboureur, *Additions aux Memoires*, vol. 2, p. 772.

³⁴ "j'appris à repeter & disputer & haranguer en Public . . . je recitay en Public quelques Oraisons Latines & Grecques de ma composition; presentay plusieurs Vers Latins, & deux mille vers Grecs faits selon l'âge, recitay Homere par coeur d'un bout à l'autre." Le Laboureur, *Additions aux Memoires*, vol. 2, p. 772. De Mesmes' prayers "of his own composition" suggests possible Protestant influence. See Jason Zuidema and Theodore Van Raalte, *Early French Reform: The Theology and Spirituality of Guillaume Farel* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2011), pp. 67-8. The heavier emphasis on Greek than on Latin occurred both at the *Collège Royal* in Paris and at the University of Toulouse, as part of recovering the Classics.

rigorous scholastic life wherein one learned to “answer, dispute, and argue” as part of the *Discipline Scholastique*.

The four volume history of the institutions of Toulouse by du Mège recounts the fame of the faculty of law at the University of Toulouse in the sixteenth century. Bernus speaks of its illustrious professors and its solid classical learning.³⁵ Beza singles out its faculty of law for praise.³⁶ Students from every country of Europe sought out Toulouse’s fine professors, and professors who taught there for twenty years were honoured with knighthood by Francis I as part of his support of the new Renaissance learning.³⁷ Many of the elite received their education there.

Noteworthy was the particular humanist-influenced approach to law at Toulouse, named the *mos gallicus*. Initiated by Guillaume Budé (1468-1540), Andrea Alciato (1492-1550), and Ulrich Zasius (1461-1536), this method found a broad reception in France (hence its name).³⁸ Difficulties that arose from trying to reconcile centuries of canon and civic law were resolved first of all by way of taking into account historical differences of language, time, and circumstances, as opposed the more systematic way of the older *mos italicus*. The most prominent lawyers who could have served as Chandieu’s teachers at the University of Toulouse were humanist-trained and under the influence of Alciati and Budé. These include Jacques Cujas (1522-1590), Guy du Faur de Pibrac

³⁵ Bernus, *Le ministre Antoine de Chandieu*, pp. 5-6 [1889, pp. 4-5].

³⁶ Theodore Beza, *Histoire ecclesiastique des eglises reformees au royaume de France* (Anvers: Iean Remy, 1580), vol. 1, pp. 10-11.

³⁷ Alexander Louis Charles André du Mège, *Histoire des institutions religieuses, politiques, judiciaires et littéraires de la ville de Toulouse* (Laurent Chapellet: Toulouse, 1846), vol. 4, p. 625.

³⁸ See, for instance, under “Guillaume Budé,” in Patrick Arabeyre, Jean-Louis Halpérin, and Jacques Krynen, eds., *Dictionnaire historique des juristes français XII^e—XX^e siècle* (Paris: Quadrige/Puf, 2007), pp. 142-3. My thanks to Irena Backus for pointing me to this source.

(1529-1584), and Arnaud du Ferrier (1506-1585).³⁹ The latter was later ambassador to Venice and president of the Paris *parlement*. Pibrac is a good example of a lawyer who not only by profession would have crafted meticulous analytical (read: scholastic) arguments, but who also was well-known for his poetry. The same can be said for Etienne Forcadel (1519-1568), another student-then-professor at Toulouse.⁴⁰ Other prominent humanist scholars who labored in the region of Toulouse include Jean de Pins (1470-1537) and Etienne Dolet (1509-1546).⁴¹

The strong presence of humanist studies at Toulouse does not mean that scholastic method was neglected or that Aristotle was not used to teach advanced logic. Rather, we encounter the incorporation of historical studies into the scholastic curriculum. The main texts in the faculty of law were the Bible, Aristotle, and the bodies of canon and civil law. These three latter texts were definitely scholastic, but study of them at Toulouse was deeply influenced by humanism. Of course this included numerous commentaries on these base documents.⁴² For the present purposes, we must note that Chandieu studied the *droit canonique* at a university filled with humanist influence, yet because it was a

³⁹ See their entries in *Dictionnaire historique des jurists français XII^e—XX^e siècle*, pp. 220-22, 268-70.

⁴⁰ Nathalie Dauvois, “‘Jura sanctissima fabulis et carminibus miscere.’ La concorde de la poésie et du droit dans quelques traités d’Etienne Forcadel,” in *L’Humanisme à Toulouse (1480-1596)* ed. Nathalie Dauvois (Paris: Honoré Champion, 2006), pp. 91-106. See also *Dictionnaire historique des jurists français XII^e—XX^e siècle*, pp. 337-8.

⁴¹ Petris writes, “Véritable plaque tournante vers l’Espagne et l’Italie, Toulouse est un centre humaniste majeur, malgré l’intransigence de son Parlement que dénonce déjà Dolet. Nombreux sont les humanistes qui y étudient, comme Bodin, Lambin, Muret, Dolet, Pibrac, Du Bartas, ou qui y enseignent comme Budé, Caturce, Bunel, Coras, Boyssoné, Du Ferrier, Forcadel et Turnèbe, protégés par des prélats aussi influents qu’Odet de Coligny, Jean d’Orléans, Pierre Buxie et Jan de Pins.” Cette “*studiosa Tholosa*” que loue Du Bellay devient le creuset d’une fusion entre les juristes et les lettrés, entre science juridique et humanisme philologique.” Loris Petris, “*Foi, éthique et politique dans Les Quatrains de Pibrac*,” *L’Humanisme à Toulouse (1480-1596)* ed. Nathalie Dauvois (Paris: Honoré Champion, 2006), p. 509. See from the same volume, Jan Pendergrass, “Jean de Pins et l’humanisme en région toulousaine,” pp. 187-201.

⁴² Patrick Arabeyre, “Un enseignement de science politique dans les facultés de droit canonique françaises de la fin du XV^e siècle et du début du XVI^e siècle (Paris, Cahors, Toulouse),” in *Science politique et droit public dans les facultés de droit européenne (XIII^e-XVIII^e s.)*, ed. J. Krynen and M. Stolleis (Frankfurt am Main: V. Klostermann, 2008), p. 299.

university, this influence was fitted into a scholastic framework. We do not know exactly how Aristotle's texts were interpreted there.

During Chandieu's student years, Protestant ideas circulated among the students. For example, Du Ferrier was crypto-Reformed until late in his life when he openly declared himself in favour of Reformed views.⁴³ Another advocate of religious freedom in France was Paul de Foix (1528-1584). He too had Toulouse connections, having studied law there around the same time as Chandieu, and having met du Ferrier there.⁴⁴ Even more eminent was Michel de l'Hôpital, who also likely studied at Toulouse and certainly was a close associate of Pibrac, a very eminent teacher at the University.⁴⁵ (Some of Chandieu's poetry can be found bound with Pibrac's quatrains.)⁴⁶ Finally, mention should be made of Antoine de Lautrec, a judge of the *Parlement* of Toulouse. In 1553 he left his post and fled to Geneva with his family, causing a major scandal in Toulouse. Among these eminent men were varying degrees of toleration of or even acceptance of Protestant ideas. In response to these impulses, the *Parlement* of Toulouse suppressed the Protestant "heresy" vigorously from 1550-1554.⁴⁷ Beza records two martyrs' names from 1552.⁴⁸

⁴³ Malcolm Smith, "Early French Advocates of Religious Freedom," *Sixteenth Century Journal* 25 (1994): pp. 40-43.

⁴⁴ Smith, "Early French Advocates of Religious Freedom," pp. 43-6.

⁴⁵ Smith, "Early French Advocates of Religious Freedom," pp. 35-8; Robert Alan Schneider, *Public Life in Toulouse, 1463-1789: From Municipal Republic to Cosmopolitan City* (New York: Cornell University Press, 1989), pp. 54-5. Michel de Montaigne may also have taken a law degree at Toulouse.

⁴⁶ Theodore Beza, A. Zamariel [Antoine de Chandieu], and Guy de Pibrac, *Poemes Chrestiens & Moraux* (s. l.: s. n., c. 1600).

⁴⁷ E. William Monter, *Judging the French Reformation: Heresy Trials by Sixteenth-Century Parlements* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999), pp. 135-7.

⁴⁸ Beza, *Histoire ecclesiastique*, vol. 1, p. 86.

Bernus relates the satirical account of Florimond de Raymond who spoke of the spirit of Calvin and Geneva settling upon the schools of Toulouse and drawing students away.⁴⁹ This may indeed have been the case for Chandieu: after Toulouse, he made the journey to Geneva where, according to Lect and Bernus, he was definitively won for the Reformation.⁵⁰ This must have occurred sometime during 1552-1555. Sometime later, in Paris, Chandieu abandoned a career in law to study theology and enter the ministry. Lect ascribes the impetus for this to François de Morel, pastor of the young Protestant congregation in Paris, who called together a number of the bright young men in his congregation and admonished them to study for the ministry.⁵¹ Soon Chandieu would press his high quality education, his considerable wealth, his rather eminent social status, and his tremendous personal talents into the service of these Reformed churches.

Chandieu's Service and Travels

Many details of Chandieu's life are unknown to us, but we know that in 1556, at the age of 22, he was chosen by the church of Paris to become second pastor. This was after he had already proven his worth as a catechist there.⁵² Unfortunately we have no record of where and how he studied theology.

⁴⁹ See Florimond de Raemon, *Histoire de la naissance de l'hérésie* (Rouen: Estienne Verevl, 1622), pp. 936-7. The claim of Mario Richter that while Chandieu studied at the University of Toulouse he read Calvin's Institutes alongside his Bible is not unlikely, but also cannot be verified. He cites no sources for the claim. Mario Richter, *La poesia lirica in Francia nel secolo XVI* (Milan: Instituto Editoriale Cisalpino, 1983), p. 275.

⁵⁰ Bernus, *Le ministre Antoine de Chandieu*, p. 8 [1889, p. 7]; Antoine de Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, 3rd ed. (Geneva: Jean le Preux, 1599), c1r.

⁵¹ Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, c1v. Morel's Latin name was Collongius. Compare Haag & Haag, *La France Protestante*, 2nd ed., vol. 3, p. 1049; Bernus, *Le ministre Antoine de Chandieu*, p. 8 [1889, p. 7].

⁵² Bernus, *Le ministre Antoine de Chandieu*, pp. 8-9 [1889, pp. 7-8].

In 1557 we find Chandieu in Poitiers, where he at least discussed with local church leaders their *Articles polytiques*, the first known church order of (some of) the French Churches.⁵³ Soon back in Paris, Chandieu was jailed in 1558 but rescued by Antoine de Bourbon, one of the royal princes. As one of the Parisian pastors, he helped convene the first national Synod in 1559 where the *Confession de foi* and *Discipline ecclesiastique* were adopted. Given Chandieu's noble status, he was selected by the church of Paris to meet with royal officials of the Bourbon family in 1559 to seek their public alignment with the Protestant cause, which might help end persecution.⁵⁴ Throughout his life Chandieu would maintain close ties to the royal family Bourbon, though the vicissitudes of France's Protestants entailed his fleeing France from time to time. In 1559-1560 Chandieu became mixed up with the Conspiracy of Amboise, at least inasmuch as he had gone to Geneva to seek advice from Calvin and Beza and subsequently was interrogated by the Geneva Council when they investigated the accusations of Morély against Calvin and Beza.⁵⁵ In 1562 Chandieu was chosen as president of the Synod of Orleans, and seems to have worked there for about a year.⁵⁶ After the Edict of Amboise ended the First War of Religion in 1563, Chandieu married, re-secured his castle and estate at Poule, and successfully rejuvenated the Church of

⁵³ Sunshine, *Reforming French Protestantism*, p. 25. See now the critical edition of the *Articles polytiques*: Philip Benedict and Nicolas Fornerod, eds., *L'organisation et l'action des églises réformées de France (1557-1563): Synodes provinciaux et autre documents* (Geneva: Droz, 2012), pp. 1-7.

⁵⁴ Bernus, *Le ministre Antoine de Chandieu*, p. 62 [1889, p. 17].

⁵⁵ Ably discussed by Barker, *Protestantism, Poetry and Protest*, pp. 87-104.

⁵⁶ Quick, *Synodicon in Gallia Reformata*, vol. 1, p. 22. Barker mentions the year-long work in Orleans. See her appendix A, a chronology of events involving Chandieu. Barker, *Protestantism, Poetry, and Protest*, pp. 287-98.

Paris, which had for a time ceased to meet.⁵⁷ The Provincial Synod of La Ferté-sous-Jouarre 1564 tasked him with preparing a memoir for the Queen Mother (Catherine de Medici; Charles I was 14 years old) to defend the Reformed cause and disprove certain rumours.⁵⁸ In 1565 Chandieu was loaned to the church of Lyons. The National Synod of Paris 1565 commissioned him to rebut the church political views of Morély.⁵⁹

The Wars of Religion make it hard to trace the movements of Chandieu definitively, but in September 1568 he fled to Lausanne and shortly after moved to Geneva.⁶⁰ Sometime in 1569 his properties in France were sequestered but in October 1570 he returned in peace, when the Third War of Religion came to a close.⁶¹ His properties were sequestered also in 1572 and again in 1586, as the status of the Protestants in France altered. At the First Synod of La Rochelle in 1571 Chandieu was mandated to examine the writings of Cozain, which he must have done while Synod met, for the Acts record that Cozain's views were condemned, rejected, and detested.⁶² With the St. Bartholomew's Massacre in August 1572 Chandieu managed to flee to Geneva. Bernus describes Chandieu's role as one of the four lead pastors who represented the French refugees in Geneva and wrote letters to the other Swiss cantons to seek assistance.⁶³ On May 23, 1573 Chandieu settled his family in Lausanne. Due in part to letters of support from the Swiss cantons to the French monarch, Chandieu learned on

⁵⁷ Bernus, *Le ministre Antoine de Chandieu*, pp. 132-3, 170 [1889, p. 32-3, 38]. Bernus comments that this may be why Beza gave Chandieu the title of "Founder of the Paris Church." *Ibid.*, p. 136 [1889, p. 36].

⁵⁸ Robert M. Kingdon, *Geneva and the Consolidation of the French Protestant Movement 1564-1572* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1967), pp. 157-60.

⁵⁹ Sunshine, *Reforming French Protestantism*, p. 88.

⁶⁰ Barker, *Protestantism, Poetry and Protest*, p. 291.

⁶¹ Bernus, *Le ministre Antoine de Chandieu*, pp. 184-8 [1889, pp. 50-54].

⁶² Quick, *Synodicon in Gallia Reformata*, vol. 1, p. 91.

⁶³ Bernus, *Le ministre Antoine de Chandieu*, pp. 395-403 [1889, pp. 60-68].

October 11 that his belongings were no longer sequestered.⁶⁴ The dedication of his *Meditationes* on Psalm 32 in 1573 to Jean Boeuf, principal of the Academy of Lausanne, ties Chandieu to Lausanne at this time. His 12 page poem personifying Lac Lemman, published in 1571, showed his affection for this area and its people (see further in this chapter). Chandieu seems to have enjoyed some years of relative tranquility in Lausanne.

In 1577 Chandieu was invited to become a professor of theology in Lausanne. The timing of this invitation has been disputed, but Bernus cites Chandieu's journal for a start on the 27th of June 1577.⁶⁵ From here Chandieu put out many of his key writings, though we do have evidence that at least one time he retired to his French château to write a major work.⁶⁶ He also became friends with the philosopher Claude Auberi and the historian Jean de Serres, among others.⁶⁷ Henri Meylan speaks of Chandieu lecturing on the Psalms in 1577.⁶⁸ In June of 1579 Beza tells one of his correspondents that Chandieu was teaching theology and giving lectures on the Letter to the Hebrews.⁶⁹ A month later a plague outbreak meant yet another move; from then till 1583 the Chandieu family lived

⁶⁴ Bernus, *Le ministre Antoine de Chandieu*, pp. 403-404 [1889, p. 68]. See also Henri Meylan, *La Haute École de Lausanne, 1537-1937* (Lausanne: University of Lausanne, 1986), p. 29.

⁶⁵ Bernus, *Le ministre Antoine de Chandieu*, p. 414 [1889, p. 79]; In the 19th c. Boehmer complained that "whatever has been written on the history of the evangelical academy at Lausanne in the 16th century, is insufficient and full of errors." Edward Boehmer, *Spanish Reformers of Two Centuries from 1520* (Strasbourg: Trübner, 1883), vol. 2, pp. 151-2, n. 44 and pp. 152-3, n. 45. A few decades later biographies of several of the early professors appeared. See William Heubli, *L'Académie de Lausanne à la fin du XVI^{me} siècle* (Lausanne: Rouge, 1916). Recently another splendid resource filled the gaps: Marc Kiener, *Dictionnaire des professeurs de l'Académie de Lausanne (1537-1890)* (Lausanne: University of Lausanne, 2005). Unfortunately Kiener did not find further information on Chandieu's tenure, except to note that around 1572 he was a minister connected to the Academy and around 1583 he was teaching some theology. Kiener, *Dictionnaire des professeurs*, p. 620. The early history of the Academy is now covered in Karine Crousaz, *L'Académie de Lausanne entre Humanisme et Réforme (ca. 1537-1560)* (Leiden: Brill, 2012).

⁶⁶ *Correspondance de Théodore de Bèze*, vol. 24 (1584), pp. 281-2; Compare vol. 25 (1585), p. 108, n. 3.

⁶⁷ Bernus, *Le ministre Antoine de Chandieu*, pp. 410ff. [1889, pp. 75ff.].

⁶⁸ Meylan, *La Haute École de Lausanne*, p. 29.

⁶⁹ *Correspondance de Théodore de Bèze*, vol. 20 (1579), p. 123. Beza is writing to Andreas Dudith (1533-1589), the Hungarian Protestant humanist. Dudith had read one of Chandieu's works and was delighted. Beza was explaining who Chandieu was.

in Aubonne, just outside Lausanne.⁷⁰ In 1583 the French Reformed Synod of Vitré advised that Chandieu undertake a visit to Germany to effect a union between the Reformed Churches in France and Germany.⁷¹ These years also witnessed Chandieu's efforts to secure a good education for his children, for instance, sending his sons Jean, Jacques, and Daniel to Basel and later to Zurich with their tutor, Gaspar Laurent.⁷² Probably in 1583 the Chandieu family moved to Geneva.

In 1585 Beza reported to Jacques Pardaillan, superintendent of Henry of Navarre's finances, that Chandieu had returned to secure his estates in the wake of the Treaty of Nemours.⁷³ When this treaty led to open hostilities within France, this year also saw Chandieu return to one of the duties of nobility – service to the king, that is, to Henry, King of Navarre. Henry was the heir apparent to the French throne, a distant cousin of King Henry III, and son of Antoine de Bourbon, the man who had rescued Chandieu in 1558. Chandieu was to serve as one of four chaplains, who apparently attended in rotation to Henry of Navarre and the Huguenot troupes.⁷⁴ Chandieu was present with Henry during the War of the Three Henrys at battles in Nérac and Montauban in 1587-8.⁷⁵ When Chandieu had recovered from a severe illness he returned to Geneva in March of 1588.⁷⁶ Henry then dispatched him to Germany and the Swiss

⁷⁰ Bernus, *Le ministre Antoine de Chandieu*, p. 415 [1889, p. 80].

⁷¹ Quick, *Synodicon in Gallia Reformata*, vol. 1, p. 153. This suggests that the French churches still considered Chandieu one of their ministers.

⁷² Bernus, *Le ministre Antoine de Chandieu*, pp. 454-6 [1889, pp. 85-7]; *Correspondance de Théodore de Bèze*, vol. 23 (1582), pp. 51-3; vol. 24 (1583), pp. 39-41.

⁷³ *Correspondance de Théodore de Bèze*, vol. 26 (1585), pp. 156-60. The treaty of Nemours outlawed Protestantism afresh, but not all parts of France came under the same control.

⁷⁴ *Correspondance de Théodore de Bèze*, vol. 28 (1587), p. 13, n. 2.

⁷⁵ Bernus, *Le ministre Antoine de Chandieu*, p. 569, 577 [1889, pp. 101, 109].

⁷⁶ Bernus, *Le ministre Antoine de Chandieu*, p. 577 [1889, pp. 109].

cities to raise funds and troops but Chandieu did not return to chaplaincy on the battlefield.⁷⁷ Henry became King Henry IV of France in 1589, to the great joy of Chandieu, who received his first letter signed by “Henry, king of France” in January 1590.⁷⁸ However, as is well-known, Henry abjured his Protestantism in 1593, two years after Chandieu’s death, in order to gain the throne more completely and have peace in his kingdom.

The last years of Chandieu’s life find him in Geneva, preaching, teaching, and writing theological works as well as political letters.⁷⁹ He and Beza worked closely together, for instance, receiving letters addressed to them jointly and co-authoring letters to the French Churches, Henry IV, Queen Elizabeth, and others.⁸⁰ Some of this work involved raising funds and troops for Henri de Navarre. Chandieu’s 1590 *Index errorum Gregorij de Valentia* stated in the subtitle that it was written for the candidates in philosophy and theology at the University of Geneva, indicating that he had some role in their learning. Chandieu became deathly ill at the beginning of 1591, made his last journal entry on January 14 and passed away on February 23. His son Jean gathered his theological works and published them as a collection in 1592. This collection represented Chandieu’s mature theological thought, and by no means included the whole of his writings. In what follows we have described, largely in chronological order, every one of Chandieu’s writing of which we are aware.

⁷⁷ *Correspondance de Théodore de Bèze*, vol. 29 (1588), pp. 46, n. 3; 55, n. 5; 58, n. 10; 60-61; esp. pp. 229-31. See also vol. 30 (1589), pp. 12-14; Manetsch, *Beza and the Quest for Peace in France*, pp. 177-84.

⁷⁸ Bernus, *Le ministre Antoine de Chandieu*, p. 624 [1889, p. 116].

⁷⁹ Barker, *Protestantism, Poetry and Protest*, p. 46.

⁸⁰ *Correspondance de Théodore de Bèze*, vol. 30 (1589), pp. 12-18, 259-66; vol. 31 (1590), pp. 32-5, 104-07, 125-7, 168-9, 211-16, 223-5, 238-9.

Chandieu's Writings

Chandieu may have written his first two published works in 1557 – an *Apologie ou defense des bons Chrestiens contre les enemis de l'Église chrestienne* and a *Remonstrance au roi*, both written as an apologetic for the Parisian Protestants with the aim of securing freedom from persecution.⁸¹ His authorship of these tracts is disputed, but the majority position favours him as author.⁸² A number of similarly-themed tracts appeared in 1561.⁸³ Chandieu found out how real this persecution was, not only by having to move from place to place within and outside Paris to escape detection, but also by being jailed in June 1558. His prior contact with the most-highly placed French Protestants allowed his escape when a royal prince, Antoine de Bourbon, came to the jail with the claim that Chandieu was his chamberlain.⁸⁴ Chandieu's cellmate, however, lost his life.⁸⁵ This loss was mourned by Chandieu in his 1563 *Histoire des persecutions*, a 450 page martyrology which covers 33 martyrs, often giving context and passing on

⁸¹ The 40 page *Apologie* is most commonly known from its inclusion in Chandieu's *Histoire des persecutions* (1563), pp. 87-108 [note pagination errors in original]. Barker states that only two known exemplars exist outside of this. Barker, *Protestantism, Poetry and Protest*, p. 21, n. 30; 173-4. Compare Bernus, *Le ministre Antoine de Chandieu*, p. 58, n. 1 [1889, p. 12, n. 2]. The *Remonstrance* is described by Chandieu in his *Histoire des persecutions* (1563), pp. 85-6, but we do not possess its actual text, nor is it clear that he alone was the author, though Bernus attributes it to him. Beza reproduced Chandieu's description. See Beza, *Histoire ecclesiastique*, vol. 1, pp. 123-4. According to Barker the 1557 *Expositio fidei* usually attributed to Calvin has been attributed to Chandieu, however, she provides no references. See Barker, *Protestantism, Poetry and Protest*, p. 67, n. 54. See also *Selected Works of John Calvin: Tracts and Letters*, trans. M. R. Gilchrist, ed. Jules Bonnet (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1983), vol. 6, pp. 372-7.

⁸² In 1559 a *Seconde apologie* was authored by Nicolas des Gallars. However, the first apology has traditionally been assigned to Chandieu (e.g., Haag, Bernus). See Jean-François Gilmont, *Bibliographie des éditions de Jean Crespin, 1550-1571* (Geneva: Droz, 1981), vol. 1, p. 115. Luc Racaut attributes the first *Apologie* to des Gallars also, but offers no reasons. See Luc Racaut, "Religious Polemic and Huguenot self-perception and Identity, 1554-1619," in *Society and Culture in the Huguenot World, 1559-1685*, ed. Raymond A. Mentzer and Andrew Spicer (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), p. 31.

⁸³ See Benedict and Fornerod, *L'organisation et l'action des églises réformées*, pp. 21-4, 80-93, 102-105.

⁸⁴ Barker, *Protestantism, Poetry and Protest*, 22-3.

⁸⁵ See ch. 1, pp. 1-3 above.

supporting documents.⁸⁶ None of the afore-mentioned works are scholastic in style, but they do exhibit the author's methodological self-awareness and his legal training as he makes his case before the king and as he follows a similar pattern with each report of martyrdom, to build an argument that will encourage his Protestant readers and challenge their opponents.⁸⁷

Two very different works – succinct, set out article by article – were the *Confession de foi* and *Discipline ecclesiastique* of the French Reformed Churches, both adopted by the Synod of Paris in 1559. Although both documents were the property of the churches and no single delegate to the Synod is known to have authored them, tradition is universal that Chandieu had the major hand in the *Discipline* and an editorial hand in the *Confession*.⁸⁸ In the case of the *Confession*, Calvin had provided a draft but the French Synod adopted a version with added material on revelation – both general and special revelation, with a clear delineation of the canonical and apocryphal books of the Bible, and other additions. Chandieu's later emphasis on the value of the “express words

⁸⁶ Barker, *Protestantism, Poetry and Protest*, pp. 175-85.

⁸⁷ Barker, *Protestantism, Poetry and Protest*, pp. 161-85. In the two cases of which he wrote the most (Jean Morel and Anne du Bourg), Chandieu transmitted verbatim accounts of the interrogations and trials. *Ibid.*, p. 167.

⁸⁸ There is no doubt that Chandieu was key to the convoking of the Synod of Paris. See Beza, *Histoire ecclésiastique*, vol. 1, pp. 172-3. His authorship of the *Discipline* is further addressed and fully supported in Glenn S. Sunshine, *Reforming French Protestantism: The Development of Huguenot Ecclesiastical Institutions, 1557-1572* (Kirksville, MO: Truman State, 2003), pp. 39-40; Jacques Pannier, *Les origines de la Confession de Foi et la Discipline des Églises Réformées de France* (Paris: Alcan, 1936), p. 103; Bernus, *Le ministre Antoine de Chandieu*, pp. 125-6 [1889, pp. 25-6]; Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1993), vol. 3, p. 493, n. 2. At least two biographical dictionaries state that Chandieu drew up the Gallican Confession (identical entries), but this is not correct. See Alexander Chalmers, *A New General Biographical Dictionary* (London: J. Nichols, 1816), vol. 27, p. 23; Hugh James Rose, *A New General Biographical Dictionary* (London: B. Fellowes, 1850), vol. 11, p. 424. The authorship of the *Confession de Foi* is addressed by Pannier, *Les origines de la Confession de Foi et la Discipline*, pp. 119ff. The editorial hand in the confession could as likely be that of François Morel, first pastor of the church of Paris, as Chandieu. Gaspar Laurent, tutor to Chandieu's sons, mentions Chandieu as staunch and clear defender of the Confession, but does not name him as author. See [Gaspar Laurent, ed.], *Catholicus et orthodoxus ecclesiae consensus, ex verbo Dei, patrum scriptis, Ecclesiae reformatae Confessionum harmonia* ([Geneva]: Eustache Vignon, 1595), b2v.

of Scripture” would benefit from a clear delineation of canonical and apocryphal books.⁸⁹ In any case, Chandieu is the author of the letter to King, the *Epître au roi* which prefaces the Confession of Faith and was written for Francis II in 1560.⁹⁰ This document, coupled with his place in the second estate (the nobility), hints at the apologetic purpose that indirectly affects much of his theological work. In the case of the *Discipline*, several indications point to Chandieu as the primary author, such as: his election as president at the Synod of Orleans in 1562, where extensive additions were made to the *Discipline*, as well his key role in some further synods which continued adding to the basic structure of 1559; the request of the churches in 1565 that he be the one to pen a refutation of Jean Morély’s views on church government; the clear statement in the Synod Acts that he composed a Form for Ordination in 1571; and, his repeated efforts to address the delicate question of the lawful calling of ministers in the Reformed Churches – something he addressed outside of the *Discipline* in publications from 1557, 1561, 1566, 1567, and 1577 to 1583.⁹¹ Good order mattered deeply to him, and he addressed this in the context of promoting the unity of the French Reformed Churches.

In 1561 Chandieu produced a biblical drama on Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego in the furnace (Daniel 3).⁹² At one time Beza had written in the same genre on

⁸⁹ See chapter 4 below. Compare Wes Bredenhof, “Guy de Brès and The Apocrypha,” *Westminster Theological Journal* 74:2 (2012): pp. 305-21, esp. p. 318.

⁹⁰ For the text of this letter, see Jacques-Auguste de Thou, *Memoires de Condé, servant d’éclaircissement*, (London [Paris]: Rollin, 1743), vol. 1, pp. 419-22. Cited in Bernus, *Le ministre Antoine de Chandieu*, p. 127 [1889, p. 27].

⁹¹ See Jacques-August de Thou, *Histoire universelle*, trans. from the Latin (London [Paris]: Rollin 1734), vol 4, p. 206; Bernus, *Le ministre Antoine de Chandieu*, p. 127 [1889, p. 27]; Sunshine, *Reforming French Protestantism*, pp. 25-26, 30; Quick, *Synodicon in Gallia reformata*, vol. 1, pp. 22-8, 93.

⁹² Antoine de la Croix [Antoine de Chandieu], *Tragi-comédie. L’argument pris due troisiemes chapitre de Daniel: avec le Cantique des trois enfans, chanté en la fornaiſe* (s.l.: s.n, 1561).

Abraham's sacrifice of his son Isaac (Genesis 22).⁹³ The genre does not seem to have enthused Calvin very much, but there is evidence that not a few schoolboys in France and Switzerland received the rudiments of biblical knowledge through Protestant biblical theatre productions.⁹⁴ This year also saw the first of Chandieu's pastoral concerns being expressed in print. His *Advertissement aux fideles* warned the Reformed believers not to receive the gospel from men who presumed to preach without having been lawfully called and ordained by the Reformed churches, lest the purity of God's Word and the unity of the churches be compromised. The treatise opens with a careful narrowing of the topic to be addressed and sticks to this for its 30 pages, referencing many Scripture passages.⁹⁵

The year 1563 witnessed various efforts at poetry. The *Histoire des persecutions*, already mentioned above, included a sonnet.⁹⁶ In two separate works of polemical poetry Chandieu also took on the famous French poet, Pierre de Ronsard. For the first, Chandieu took Ronsard's text, retained two-thirds of it, named Ronsard as author, but changed the rest to turn Ronsard's poetry in favour of the Reformed Churches, as if Ronsard had

⁹³ Théodore de Bèze, *Abraham sacrificiant* ([Geneva: Jean Crespin and] Conrad Badius, 1550). Compare the 1566 work of Andre de Rivaudeau, *Aman: tragedie sainte tiree du VII. Chapitre d'Esther*, ed. C. Mourain de Sourdeval (Paris: Auguste Aubry, 1859).

⁹⁴ Barker, *Protestantism, Poetry and Protest*, pp. 111-23. See the wider discussion in Andrew Pettegree, *Reformation and the Culture of Persuasion* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), pp. 77-100. Pettegree also mentions Bullinger's "youthful work of drama," his *Lucretia and Brutus*, *ibid.*, p. 88. See also Margaret Soulié, "Le théâtre et la Bible au XVI^e siècle," *Le temps des Réformes et la Bible*, ed. Guy Bedouelle and Bernard Roussel (Paris: Beauchesne, 1989), pp. 635-58; Glenn Ehrstine, *Theater, Culture, and Community in Reformation Berne, 1523-1555* (Leiden: Brill, 2002).

⁹⁵ Likely there was a work of Chandieu written in 1562 against Villegagnon, leader of the French expedition to Brazil in 1555. However, at least two works against Villegagnon in 1562 were anonymous and scholars are not sure which one might belong to Chandieu. See Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, c3r; Bernus, *Le ministre Antoine de Chandieu*, p. 178, n. 1 [1889, p. 45, n.2]. Perhaps further investigation will solve this.

⁹⁶ Chandieu, *Histoire des persecutions*, p. 70.

converted.⁹⁷ He followed this by publishing a collection of poetry together with Bernard de Montmeja, challenging Ronsard on questions of tradition, Scripture, and the self-authenticating nature of Scripture.⁹⁸ Ronsard's response zeroed in on Chandieu as the worthiest of his opponents but Chandieu did not re-enter the debate.⁹⁹ Around 1564/5 Chandieu wrote three tombeaus commemorating the death of Calvin. These, and others like them, would be the only "tombstone" Calvin would receive for several centuries.¹⁰⁰

Chandieu's defense of the French church polity, *La confirmation de la discipline ecclesiastique*, written in French and published in 1566, is the first piece of his writing that openly exhibits a number of important scholastic features such as a clear gradation of relied upon authorities, numbered arguments, lots of marginal quotations, and exposure of the absurdities of his opponents' arguments.¹⁰¹ These features will be explored in chapter 3, below. Suffice to say for now that Chandieu was writing polemically against Jean Morély and those with him who envisioned a more congregational church polity for the French Reformed Churches.

In 1567 Chandieu again entered the polemical arena, this time with a refutation of Claude de Saintes, an Augustinian theologian of Paris, who had examined the teachings

⁹⁷ [Antoine de Chandieu], *Palinodies de Pierre de Ronsard, sur les discours des misères de ce temps* ([Lyon: Jean Saugrain], 1563). See Barker, *Protestantism, Poetry and Protest*, pp. 140-43.

⁹⁸ A. Zamariel and B. Mont-Dieu [Antoine de Chandieu and Bernard de Montmeja], *Response aux Calomnies continues au Discours & Suyte du Discours sur les Misères de ce Temps* (Orleans, s.n., 1563). See Barker, *Protestantism, Poetry and Protest*, pp. 143-6.

⁹⁹ Barker, *Protestantism, Poetry and Protest*, p. 147. Other Protestants contributed and Ronsard answered them also. In September of 1563 Charles IX forbade any further exchanges. *Ibid.*, p. 152.

¹⁰⁰ A. Zamariel [Antoine de Chandieu], "Tumbeau a Iean Calvin," *Recueil des opusculs* (Geneva: Jacob Stoer, 1611), a6r-a6v. See Barker, *Protestantism, Poetry and Protest*, pp. 218-19. In the seventeenth century tombeaus would become musical compositions but in the sixteenth these were just poems. The present marker on Calvin's supposed grave is from the 19th century.

¹⁰¹ [Antoine de Chandieu], *La confirmation de la discipline ecclesiastique observée es églises reformées du royaume de France, avec la response aux obiections proposées alencontre* (s.l.: s.n., 1566).

of Calvin and Beza on the Lord's Supper and found them heretical.¹⁰² Here we find Chandieu working within a scholastic context, though not exhibiting the same kind of scholastic features as his *Confirmation* of 1566. Writing under the name Theopsaltes, he devotes most of his fifty-six page work to the middle of his three questions, where he examines the medieval scholastics on the nature of Christ's body in the sacrament. Scores of quotations from Augustine, Lombard, Gratian, Durandus, Scotus, Bonaventure, Thomas, Berengarius, and Cajetan fill the pages, with Chandieu's comments interspersed. In some cases Chandieu uses "your teachers" to support the Reformed view; in other cases he uses them to expose the absurdity of their scholastic intricacies and undermine his opponents. Chandieu calls his booklet a *disputatio*.¹⁰³ He openly objects to the ambiguity of bad scholasticism, whether from Thomas or the Sorbonne. Further examination of this document's style will occur in chapter 3 below, but a complete study of its ideas would require comparing it together with Beza's response to de Sainctes, de Sainctes' rebuttal, and other treatises of Chandieu on the same topic, noted below.¹⁰⁴

Noteworthy is the inclusion of the previous work of 1567 in the *Opera Theologica*. It is the earliest publication included in the *Opera* by Chandieu's son Jean. The other works in the *Opera* are all from a decade later, at least.

For 1568 we have no publication from Chandieu, but in 1569 another set of poems appears as a separate publication in honour of Prince Wolfgang of the Palatinate

¹⁰² A. Theopsaltes [Antoine de Chandieu], *Refutatio libelli quem Claudius de Sainctes . . . examen doctrinae calvinianae et bezanae de Coena Domini* (Geneva: [Jean Crespin], 1567). Included in Antoine de Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, 3rd ed. (Geneva: Jean le Preux, 1599), pp. 331-43.

¹⁰³ Chandieu, *Refutatio libelli de Sainctes*, p. 23.

¹⁰⁴ Theodore Beza, *Apologia Th. Bezae Vezellii, ad libellum Sorbonici Theologastri Claudii Xaintes* (Geneva: Jean Crespin, 1567); Claude de Sainctes, *Responsio F. Claudii de Sainctes Parisien, theologi ad apologiam Theodori Bezae* (Paris: Claude Fremy, 1567); Claude de Sainctes, *Declaration d'aucuns atheisms de la doctrine de Calvin et Beze contre les premiers fondemens de la Chrestientés* (Paris: Claude Fremy, 1568).

who had helped the French Reformed Churches in the Third War of Religion in France. This work includes an ode set to music, mourning the sad state of the French churches under persecution.¹⁰⁵ Two years later Chandieu wrote a poignant canticle upon the death of his seven year old daughter, the eldest child.¹⁰⁶ In 1571 he also published an interesting and lengthy poem – twelve pages long, enveloped between two sonnets – wherein he personifies Lake Geneva (Lake Lemman) and has it present an “examination and notable [court] brief” to all the towns surrounding it.¹⁰⁷ The lake points out all their blessings, contrasts the troubles in France, and urges the Swiss towns to obey God faithfully. Since all the readers know that the author is using the lake for his own voice, the message is reminiscent of Deuteronomy 32, where Moses calls heaven and earth as witnesses to his admonition of the people of Israel. The year after, 1572, Chandieu wrote verses on the death of the Admiral Gaspard de Coligny who was killed in the St. Bartholomew’s Day Massacre.¹⁰⁸ Barker explores how Chandieu’s poetry expresses his emotion and aims to help the French churches come to grips with their pain after St. Bartholomew’s Day.¹⁰⁹

Before we turn to the mature Chandieu’s increase in scholastic writing, two more popular works will be surveyed. First, with the year 1576 we come to Chandieu’s finest

¹⁰⁵ A. Zamariel [Antoine de Chandieu], *Epithaphe de la Mort de Tresillustre Prince Wolfgang and Un Ode sur les misères des Eglises Françaises* ([Geneva]: Iean Durant, 1569). See Barker, *Protestantism, Poetry, and Protest*, pp. 209-18.

¹⁰⁶ Antoine de Chandieu, “Cantique à la Memoire de sa fille,” *Poemes Chrestiens & Moraux* (s. l.: s. n., c. 1600). See Barker, *Protestantism, Poetry and Protest*, pp. 221-4. My copy of *Poemes Chrestiens & Moraux* lacks this poem, but Barker had a copy that included it.

¹⁰⁷ A. Z. [Antoine de Chandieu], *Discours et advertissemens notables fais par le Lac Lemman aux villes et lieux circonvoisins* (s.l.: s.n., 1571). Barker does not seem to have been aware of this work of Chandieu, for though it is one of his vernacular poems she does not mention or treat it.

¹⁰⁸ Antoine de Chandieu, “Vers sur la mort de Coligny,” *BSHPF* 24 (1875): pp. 83-6.

¹⁰⁹ Barker, *Protestantism, Poetry and Protest*, pp. 219-21.

poetry, a work called the *Octonnaires sur la Vanité et Inconstance du Monde*.¹¹⁰ In 1576 it consisted of 19 eight-line poems. In 1583 the first full edition of 50 *Octonnaires* appeared.¹¹¹ These octaves on human futility, worldliness, and the need to find rest in God were incorporated into many other collections, translated from French into Latin, and even put to music. Early music ensembles have made recent recordings which are available presently.¹¹² Finally, in 1587 Chandieu wrote a brief canticle to celebrate the victory of Henry of Navarre, for whom Chandieu was serving as chaplain.¹¹³

Working in yet another genre – in fact, quite likely pioneering this genre for the Protestants – Chandieu wrote a lengthy meditation on Psalm 32.¹¹⁴ Discussion of this work forms a suitable bridge to the discussion of his more scholastic works. The *Meditationes* were written in Latin and dedicated to his friend John Bos (Jean Boeuf) in 1573.¹¹⁵ Bos, a teacher at the Academy of Lausanne, received the unpublished manuscript as a testimony of Chandieu's appreciation. Bos in turn shared it with his

¹¹⁰ Antoine de Chandieu, *Octonnaires sur la Vanité et Inconstance du Monde*, ed. Françoise Bonali-Fiquet (Geneva: Droz, 1979). See Barker, *Protestantism, Poetry and Protest*, pp. 225-38. These were translated into Latin by Jean Jaquemot. See *Selectorum carminum ex doctiss. poetis collectorum* ([Geneva]: Israellem Taurinum [Jacob Stoer], 1590), pp. 141-149; Malcom Smith, "Looking for Rome in Rome: Janus Vitalis and his Disciples," *Revue de Littérature Comparée* 51 (1977): pp. 519-21.

¹¹¹ Barker, *Protestantism, Poetry and Protest*, p. 231.

¹¹² These were written by Paschal de l'Estocart and Claude Le Jeune, respectively. Recent recordings of both are available on compact disc from Ensemble *Jacques Feuillie* (1999), Anne Quentin (2000), and Ensemble *Clément Janequin* (2006).

¹¹³ Antoine de Chandieu, "Cantique pour le Roy, sur la victoire par luy obtenue a Coutras," *Cantique sur la victoire d'Yvry*, ed. G. de Saluste (Lyon: Jean Tholoson, 1594). See Barker, *Protestantism, Poetry and Protest*, pp. 239-40. See also Bernus, *Le ministre Antoine de Chandieu* (1888), pp. 575-6. Around 1558 Chandieu was in close association with Antoine de Bourbon, who rescued him from prison. In the late 1580s Chandieu served as chaplain to Antoine de Bourbon's son, Henry of Navarre, who would become one of France's most loved kings (Henry IV, 1589-1610), but would abjure his Protestantism in 1593 to gain the acceptance of all of France.

¹¹⁴ Barker notes that previously Beza was thought to pioneer this genre in the year 1581. She correctly notes that Chandieu's meditations were published three years before Beza's, but she fails to point out that Chandieu's work was actually composed in 1573, judging by the date of its dedication. Barker, *Protestantism, Poetry and Protest*, pp. 247-51.

¹¹⁵ Bos is identified by Boehmer as Jean Boeuf. Boehmer, *Spanish Reformers*, vol. 2, p. 149, n. 31. See also Bernus, *Le ministre Antoine de Chandieu*, p. 408, n. 5 [1889, p. 73, n. 5].

students who sensed that others would also benefit from it and therefore saw the work to press in 1578.¹¹⁶ This brought it to an international audience and thus the next year it was translated into English; several years later into French.¹¹⁷ Chandieu's son included it as the closing piece in the *Opera Theologica*, evidently considering its tenor not to be out of sync with the much more scholastic works that make up the rest of the *Opera Theologica*.

Given some of Chandieu's remarks in this work and its place in the *Opera Theologica*, a few comments are in order: At the beginning of the meditation, Chandieu takes issue with pagan philosophers whose webs of subtle questions and disputations are unable to ascertain the true condition of humanity in sin and the true way of salvation. He points to the message of Christ crucified as a knowledge which should be preferred above all others and concludes that faith should be considered the reason of reason itself.¹¹⁸ Near the close he applies this especially to those scholastics who teach that forgiveness must be merited.¹¹⁹ Thus his anti-scholastic polemic is very specific. Noteworthy are several scholastic-like features, such as the frequency of Chandieu's careful distinctions to solve problems,¹²⁰ his distinguishing different audiences as he applies the Psalm,¹²¹ his

¹¹⁶ A. Sadeele Theopsaltes [Antoine de Chandieu], *Meditationes in psalmum xxxii* (Lausanne: François Le Preux, 1578). Included in the *Opera Theologica*, pp. 888-926, including the 1573 dedication, which appears on the reverse of the title page in 1578.

¹¹⁷ Antonie Sadel [Antoine de Chandieu], *Moste excellent Meditations vppon the xxxii. Psalme*, trans. William Watkinson (London: Cooke and Man, 1579); A. Zamariel [Antoine de Chandieu], *Méditations sur le psalme XXXII*, trans. from Latin, ([Geneva]: J. Laimarie, 1583). See Barker, *Protestantism, Poetry and Protest*, pp. 247-56.

¹¹⁸ Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, pp. 888-9, 922; Compare Chandieu, *Moste excellent Meditations*, fols 3r-4v, 120v.

¹¹⁹ Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, p. 918. Compare Chandieu, *Moste Excellent Meditations*, fols 106v-107v.

¹²⁰ Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, pp. 892, 905. Compare Chandieu, *Moste Excellent Meditations*, fols 11r, 59r, 60r.

¹²¹ Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, pp. 892, 895-6. Compare Chandieu, *Moste Excellent Meditations*, fols 8r-8v, 21v-23v.

explanation of different degrees of repentance,¹²² his frequent set up of overt objections and responses as well as questions and answers,¹²³ and, finally, his relating of cause and effect.¹²⁴ None of these items make the meditations scholastic – they are not scholastic precisely because they are meditations – yet the precision of Chandieu’s mind shows itself. His negative comments against certain scholastics are aimed at those whose doctrine was wrong in his view.

The year 1577 marks the beginning of an increase in Chandieu’s use of the scholastic style and the 1580s follow with numerous scholastic treatises. In 1577 both a more general anti-Nicodemite treatise and the first of a very specific series of polemic treatises against Francisco Torres appeared, both on the same topic. The anti-Nicodemite treatise appeared early in 1577 and was entitled *Concerning the lawful calling of the pastors of the Reformed churches*, with a subtitle that specified its address to be those who generally agreed with Reformed teaching, but disagreed on the one point of the lawful calling and ordination of Reformed ministers.¹²⁵ This addresses the second category of opponents in Chandieu’s *Confirmation de la discipline ecclesiastique*, from

¹²² Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, p. 901. Compare Chandieu, *Moste Excellent Meditations*, fol. 45r.

¹²³ Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, pp. 897-900, 905, 909, 912, 915, 924. Compare Chandieu, *Moste Excellent Meditations*, fols 30r, 34v, 37r, 43r, 47v, 60v, 62r, 74v, 85r, 95r, 130r.

¹²⁴ Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, p. 892. Compare Chandieu, *Moste Excellent Meditations*, fol. 11r.

¹²⁵ A. Sadeele [Antoine de Chandieu], *De legitima vocatione pastorum ecclesiae Reformatae. Aduersus eos qui in hoc tantum capite se ab Ecclesia Reformata dissentire profitentur. Ex libro de Disciplina Ecclesiastica* ([Geneva]: s.n., 1577). Pages 3-4 speak further about the addressees. See also Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, pp. 541-60. Since no libraries list the 1577 edition in their catalogues, note the request for publication in Paul Chaix, Alain Dufour, and Gustave Moeckli, *Les livres imprimés à Genève de 1550 à 1600* (Geneva: Droz, 1966), p. 88; also Haag, *La France Protestante* 2nd ed., vol. 3, p. 1056. The preface to *Sophismata F. Turriani* (see note 117 below) was signed on March 6, 1577 and appears to mention *De legitima vocatione pastorum* as a work that Chandieu had already published. Puzzlingly, Chandieu states that he had treated this topic “some years before.” “Praeterea quum ante aliquot annos hoc ipsum argumentum de legitima Pastorum nostrorum vocatione tractauerim.” Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, p. 562. He could be referring to his 1566 *Confirmation*, however, its treatment of this topic was quite brief and had been published eleven years prior.

1566. The opponents in view favoured the ongoing apostolic succession claimed by the Roman Catholic Church. Chandieu may also have had in mind the jurist Charles du Moulin (1500-1566), whose views on the calling of ministers were censured by the Second Synod of Paris 1565. He, however, disagreed with a good many other teachings of the Reformed Churches.¹²⁶

The more specific polemical work engaged Francisco Torres, a Spanish Jesuit, with the title, *The Sophistries of F. Torres, a monk of the brotherhood which abuses the inviolable name of Jesus by the title of their sect, collected from his book Concerning the Church and Ordination of the Ministers of the Church, against the points of disputation at Leipzig, each of which is subjected to a clear and true solution as required by the rules of sound and theological disputation.*¹²⁷ It formed the beginning of seven years of polemics with Torres on this topic. This work, as well as *De legitima vocatione pastorum* of the same year, will be studied in chapter 4 below.

¹²⁶ The National Synod of Paris (1565) singled out du Moulin's *Unio quatuor Evangelistarum* for erroneous views on free will, purgatory, the sin against the Holy Spirit, and the Lord's Supper. The churches agreed not to hear or assist with his preaching. Quick, *Synodicon in Gallia Reformata*, vol. 1, p. 67.

¹²⁷ Antonio Sadeele [Antoine de Chandieu], *Sophismata F. Turriani Monachi ex eorum sodalitate qui sacrosanct Iesu nomine ad suae sectae inscriptionem abutuntur: Collecta ex eius libro De Ecclesia, & Ordinationibus Ministrorum Ecclesiae, adversus capita disputationis Lipsica. Quibus singulis subiecta est perspicua & vera Solutio ex praeceptis rectè & Theologicè disputandi petita* ([Geneva]: Pierre de St. André, 1577). See also Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, pp. 561-602. The reader should be aware that a work by this title, held by the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek and available digitally, actually has combined elements from three different works of Chandieu and in fact does not contain the text of *Sophismata F. Turriani*. The title page is for the 1577 *Sophismata*, as is the preface (signed March 6, 1577) and a one-page index of 12 Scripture passages following the preface. However, the work that follows is Chandieu's *De legitima vocatione*. Bound with it and bearing its own title page is the 1580 *Ad repetita F. Turriani* (see note 130 below). The contents of the *Sophismata F. Turriani* are, of course, available in the *Opera Theologica* as well as in the 1584 Cambridge edition, to be described below (see note 138).

After Torres responded,¹²⁸ Beza urged Chandieu to counter.¹²⁹ Chandieu rebutted Torres' counter arguments point by point in a much lengthier two part publication from 1580 and 1581, entitled *A Response to the repeated sophistries of F. Torres*.¹³⁰ To give the reader the proper context, Chandieu followed the same duodecimal structure as 1577, incorporated all of the 1577 publication, but added at the appropriate places: (1) a discussion of Torres' misuse of philosophy and theological principles; (2) a set of 3 syllogisms to summarize Torres' argument, with a lengthy discussion of each one; and, (3) summaries of Torres's objections, about 10 or more for each of the 12 loci (with marginal references to the pages of Torres' latest work). Chandieu, of course, countered these responses and objections one by one. All told, this took more than a thousand pages. The 1580 publication covered the first three locuses while the 1581 publication covered the other nine.

Another product of this written disputation was a collection of errors snipped from Torres' works to expose him to ridicule. Chandieu entitled this, *One hundred little flowers from the disputation of Torres plucked from both sides of his book and collected*

¹²⁸ Francisco Torres, *Defensio locorum S. Scripturae de ecclesia catholica et eius pastore episcopo romano B. Petri principis Apostolorum successore libri duo: aduersus nugatorias cauillationes Antonij Sadeelis lutherani*. Books 1 and 2 (Arnold Birckmann, 1580).

¹²⁹ *Correspondance de Théodore de Bèze*, vol. 21 (1580), pp. XIVff.; compare vol. 24 (1583), p. 281, 282-3, n. 10; Bernus, *Le ministre Antoine de Chandieu*, p. 596 [1889, p. 98]. Earlier Beza had indicated to Andreas Dudith that he was giving over to others the task of polemicizing. *Correspondance de Théodore de Bèze*, vol. 20 (1579), p. 123. Concerned for his own ailing health, he rejoiced to witness young theologians like Chandieu taking over from the older ones like himself. *Correspondance de Théodore de Bèze*, vol. 21 (1580), pp. 235. Ironically, Beza would outlive Chandieu by 14 years. Small wonder his sorrow at Chandieu's death, expressed in the poem in Chandieu's *Opera Theologica*, a4r.

¹³⁰ A. Sadee [Antoine de Chandieu], *Ad repetita F. Turriani Monachi Iesuitae sophismata de Ecclesia et ordinationibus Ministrorum ecclesiae, Responsio. In qua refelluntur omnes tum responsionis, tum objectiones à Turriane propositae in libro Defensionis Sophismatum, quem ille perperam, Defensionem locorum Scripturae, inscripsit* (Morges: Jean le Preux, 1580). The second part had the same title with a small variation, *Responsionis ad repetita F. Turriani . . . pars altera* (Morges: Jean le Preux, 1581). A new preface for 1581 included five rules for the right interpretation of Scripture. In the *Opera Theologica* the two treatises are combined under the title *Ad omnia repetita . . .*, pp. 602-793. The preface for part II appears between locus 3 and 4 (pp. 703-05).

for the pleasure of the Jesuits.¹³¹ The title cavorts with an existing scholastic genre – the anthology or *florilegium*.¹³² His last contribution to this dispute came in 1583 with his response to Torres’ work of 1581.¹³³ Torres countered again but it appears that Chandieu did not respond.¹³⁴

Two other works are grouped in the *Opera Theologica* with Chandieu’s responses to Torres. These are his polemics with Laurent Arthur Faunt, a Polish Jesuit.¹³⁵ Here Chandieu argues that the Reformed churches are true churches. The first work, from 1583, is divided into 12 chapters and 87 theses;¹³⁶ the second is also divided into 12 chapters, since, like the disputations noted above, it is the follow-up to the earlier work. The second work, however, was assembled by Chandieu’s son Jean for the *Opera*

¹³¹ A. Sadeele [Antoine de Chandieu], *Centum flosculi Turrianicae disputationis ex utroque eius libro decerpti, & in Iesuitarum gratiam collecti* (Morges: Jean le Preux, 1581). The work was first published as an addendum to the *Responsionis* of 1581. See also Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, pp. 793-802.

¹³² Ulrich G. Leinsle, *Introduction to Scholastic Theology*, trans. Michael J. Miller (Washington, DC: Catholic University Press, 2010), p. 32.

¹³³ Antoine de Chandieu, *Index ἐλεγκτικὸς repetitionum & ταπτολογίων Turriani ex Tertio eius libro quem διβιβλον inscripsit, collectus* (Morges: Jean le Preux, 1583). It first appears bound with the second edition of Chandieu’s *Ad repetita F. Turriani*, pp. 63-132. See also Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, pp. 803-31. Torres work was: Francisco Torres, *Liber III. Bipartitus, contra epistolam Antonii Sadeelis ad eundem illustrissimum principem, et contra eiusdem Sadeelis repetitas cavillationes de Ecclesia Catholica visibili, & de primatu episcopi romani* (Ingolstad: Sartorius, 1581).

¹³⁴ Francisco Torres, *Posterioris Defensionis Locorum Scripturae De Una Ecclesia Catholica in terris visibili & de Episcopo eius Pontifice Romano: Contra secundas cauillationes Antonii Sadeelis Lutherani, Liber Primus Et Secundus* (Ederus, 1583); Francisco Torres, *Aduersus tertias in librum bipartitum cauillationes Antonii Sadeelis Lutherani Ἐλέγκος Δυσωπητικὸς, sive idonea ad erubescendum deprehensio confessionum & mendaciorum eiusdem* (Ingolstad: Sartorius, 1584).

¹³⁵ Faunt (Faunteus) was born in England c. 1554 but is identified as Polish because he was professor at Poznan for many years, and died there in 1591. Between 1583 and 1591 he published about 10 polemical works against Protestants. One of his works against Chandieu was: Laurentius Faunteus Arturus. *De Christi in terris ecclesia quanam et penes quos existat Libri tres, in quibus Calvinianos, Lutheranos et ceteros, quise Evangelicos nominant, alienos a Christi ecclesia esse, argumentis, signisque, clarissimis demonstratur, et simul Apologia Assertionum quosdam inscriptionis contra falsas Antonii Sadeelis criminationes continetur* (Poznan: Ivan Wolrab, 1584).

¹³⁶ A. Sadeele [Antoine de Chandieu], *Posnaniensium assertionum de Christi in terris Ecclesia, quanam & penes quos existat: propositarum in Collegio Posnaniensi, à Monachis nouae Societatis, Quam illi Societatem Iesu, non sine blasphemia nominant, nisi forte unius Iudae Iscariotae posteris, ac haeredes haberi velint, Analysis et Refutatio* (Geneva: Jacob Chouet, 1583).

Theologica based on his father's marginal notations in his own copy of Arturus's response to the earlier work. Thus its publication date would be 1592.¹³⁷

Mention should be made of a collection of Chandieu's Latin theological works up to 1584, published that year in Cambridge. Nine of Chandieu's treatises were included, and the collection was entitled, "*Meticulous Disputations of the Most Excellent Man and Truly a Theologian, Antonio Sadeele, Concerning the Most Weighty Controversies, Theologically and Scholastically Treated*."¹³⁸ Noteworthy is the publication of such a collection – an *Opera Theologica* such as it was up to that date – in the author's own lifetime, and that outside the country of his birth and residence.

Another series of works from the 1580s still require mention. These include Chandieu's polemics regarding the human nature of Christ, eating and drinking at the Lord's Supper, and the formal and instrumental causes of the believer's union with Christ in the Lord's Supper. The latter topics involved polemics circa 1590 with the Jesuit Gregory of Valentia over the matter of transubstantiation.¹³⁹ This matter had already been treated by Chandieu in 1567 when he opposed Claude de Sainctes, but now he gave it much more detailed attention. In the treatise of 1590, called *Index errorum Gregorij de*

¹³⁷ Antoine de Chandieu, *Ad tres Libros Laurentii Arturi quos inscripsit de Ecclesia Christi in terries: seu Apologia Assertionum Posnaniensium de Ecclesia* ([Geneva]: Jean le Preux, 1592). See Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, pp. 868-87.

¹³⁸ Antonio Sadeele [Antoine de Chandieu], *Antonii Sadeelis viri clarissimi vereque theologi de rebus gravissimis controversis disputationes accuratæ theologice et scholastice tractatæ* (Cambridge: Thomas Thomson, 1584).

¹³⁹ Gregorius de Valentia, *De Reali Christi Praesentia In Eucharistia, Et De Transubstantiatione Panis Et Vini In Corpus Et Sanguinem Christi: Libri tres: In quorum postremo nominatim respondetur Fortunato cuidam, Calvini discipulo* (Ingolstadt: Sartorius, 1587); _____, *Examen Et Refutatio Praecipui Mysteriorum Doctrinae Calvinistarum, De Re Eucharistica: cum Responsione ad Obiectiones Antonii Sadeelis & Fortunati Crellii* (Ingolstadt: Sartorius, 1589); _____, *Redargutio Inscitiarum Et Fraudum, Quibus Nonnulli Theologi Et Philosophi Genevenses, Subsidiarii Antonii Sadeelis, itemque Fortunatus Crellius Haidelbergensis, eum librum cavillati sunt: quo praecipuum mysterium doctrinae Calvinistarum superiore anno examinatum & convictum est* (Ingolstadt: Sartorius, 1590).

Valentia, we encounter the same evaluation of arguments and careful syllogistic reasoning as in the treatises regarding the lawful calling of ministers, etc.¹⁴⁰ Some sixty errors are identified by Chandieu. However, Chandieu's references are almost exclusively to Scripture. Remarkable is the subtitle of the *Index*: "Completed for some of the candidates in philosophy and theology in the Academy of Geneva." These men were to be convinced of the correct form of the arguments of Reformed theology, learn how to form their own positive arguments, and learn how to refute the Jesuits. It seems to be an exercise in reasoning. Thus the needs of the day in terms of polemics and teaching ministerial candidates came together. The second *Index*, a rebuttal to Valentia's responses, received a new title in the third edition of the *Opera Theologica*. Chandieu never saw the work to publication himself; the preface was written by Gaspar Laurent and signed March 1591 (Chandieu died Feb. 23, 1591). Laurent updated this preface in February 1598.¹⁴¹

Besides these rather narrowly focused polemics, Chandieu's writings also include a response to the profession of faith of the monks of Bordeaux.¹⁴² This was published anonymously in French in 1585 and translated into Latin by Thierry Gautier in 1590.¹⁴³

¹⁴⁰ [Antoine de Chandieu], *Index errorum Gregorij de Valentia monachi blasphemiae Societatis. Ex eo libro quem inscripsit, Examen praecipui mysterij doctrinae Calvinistarum, etc. Confectus à nonnullis Theologiae & Philosophiae Candidatis in Schola Genevensi.* (Geneva: Jean le Preux, 1590). See Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, pp. 343-61; _____, *Index secundus ἐλεγκτικὸς errorum Gregorij de Valentia, blasphemiae societatis monachi. In quo agitur de Causa Formali unionis nostrae cum Christo.* See Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, pp. 362-95.

¹⁴¹ Although the title in the table of contents of the *Opera Theologica* stays the same, the work itself changes from *Index secundus ἐλεγκτικὸς errorum Gregorij de Valentia . . .* (1592) to *Tractatus de nostra in sacramentis cum Domino Iesu Christo coniunctione. In quo agitur de Causa Formali & Instrumentali unionis cum Iesu Christo* (1599). Note that Gaspar Laurent had served as tutor for some of Chandieu's sons.

¹⁴² According to Barker, no copies remain of the work to which Chandieu responded. Barker, *Protestantism, Poetry and Protest*, p. 256, n. 31.

¹⁴³ [Antoine de Chandieu], *La response a la profession de foy publiée contre ceux de l'Eglise Reformée: Avec la refutation tant des calomnies qui y sont contenues, que generally des erreurs de*

Chandieu follows the 63 articles of the monks' confession, attempting to expose the errors in each article. Arguments from the church fathers figure largely. Jean de Serres (c. 1540-1598), professor of theology at the Reformed Academy of Nîmes, stated that because the monks of Bordeaux meddled so greatly in the matter of persuading Protestants to abjure, Chandieu, "a gentleman of singular piety and a very learned theologian, refuted their errors so completely and solidly that afterwards neither they nor their companions in all of France either dared or knew how to answer him."¹⁴⁴ Numerous reprintings occurred in the following years, with the edition of 1590 bearing an additional twenty page refutation of Gilbert de Coeffier's 1586 *Defence de la verité de la foy catholique contre les erreurs de Calvin*.¹⁴⁵ This augmentation of Chandieu's work is important, for the preface to his *De Verbo Dei scripto* was also augmented in his posthumously published *Opera Theologica*, though we have no record of the extra material ever being published in the editions of *De Verbo Dei* published during his lifetime.

Another confessional work, this one a positive expression, was undertaken by Chandieu together with Theodore Beza, Jean-François Salvard, Simon Goulart, and Lambert Daneau. Named the *Harmony of the Confessions of Faith*, it was commissioned

l'Eglise Romaine pretendue Catholique ([La Rochelle: Pierre Haultin], 1585); Chandieu, *Responsio Ad Fidei (quam vocant), professionem à monachis Burdegalensibus editam in Aquitania, anno 1585, ut esset verae religionis abjurandae formula. Quae antea non semel excusa Gallicè, & ab autore locupletata: nunc primum Theodori Gauteri Aureliensis studio & fideli opera, Latinè prodit*, trans. Thierry Gautier (Geneva: Jean le Preux, 1591). Because the original was in French, Barker treats it. Barker, *Protestantism, Poetry and Protest*, pp. 256-78.

¹⁴⁴ "Pource que les moines de Bourdeaux s'en meslerent fort avant, Antoine de Chandieu, gentilhomme de singuliere pieté, & tresdocte Theologien refuta amplement & si solidement leurs erreurs que depuis ni eux ni leurs compagnons en toute la France n'eut osé ni sceu lui respondre." Jean de Serres, *Recueil des choses memorables . . . depuis l'an M.D.XLVII iusques au commencement du mois d'Aoust M.D.LXXXIX* ([Geneva: Jean le Preux], 1595), p. 285.

¹⁴⁵ Gilbert de Coeffier, *Defence de la verité de la foy catholique contre les erreurs de Calvin* (Paris: Guillaume Chaudière, 1586).

by the French Reformed Synod of Figeac (1579), and approved by the Synod of Vitré (1583). The theologians brought together some 11 Reformed Confessions (including the Augsburg Confession of 1530) and set out parts of their articles by topic to demonstrate their unity in doctrine.¹⁴⁶

Finally, we turn to the writings with which the *Opera Theologica* opens. These are Chandieu's six treatises, each of which is subtitled, "A scholastic and theological treatment of . . ." Presumably Chandieu could have continued producing such treatises for other doctrinal loci had he lived longer. The first of these treatises forms the central study of this dissertation, with comparisons to the method of the following five. Though these works are still polemical, they do not engage particular theologians by name. Rather, Chandieu attempts to cover a wide range of positive and negative arguments pertinent to the topic so as to make the works suitable for academic instruction. Further evidence of this will follow in chapters 5 through 7 below.

The first treatise was entitled, *Concerning the written Word of God, over against the traditions of men, treated theologically and scholastically*.¹⁴⁷ This appeared in 1580 as a programmatic study with a careful structure suitable for further treatises on other doctrinal topics. Clearly Chandieu was opposing the Roman Catholic reliance on an unwritten tradition. A response to his work was late in coming but did appear after his

¹⁴⁶ Antoine de Chandieu, Theodore Beza, Jean-François Salvard, Simon Goulart, and Lambert Daneau. *Harmonia confessionum fidei* (Geneva: Pierre de St. André, 1581). See also John Quick, *Synodicon in Gallia reformata* (London: Parkhurst and Robinson, 1692), vol. 1, pp. 133, 151, 153; Francis Higman, "L'Harmonia confessionum fidei de 1581," in *Actes du VIII^e Colloque Jean Boisset: Catéchismes et Confessions de foi*, ed. Marie-Madeleine Fragonard and Michel Peronnet (Montpellier: Université Paul Valéry, 1995), pp. 243-62; Robert D. Linder, "The French Calvinist Response to the Formula of Concord," in *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 19:1 (Winter 1992): pp. 29-30.

¹⁴⁷ Antonio Sadeele [Antoine de Chandieu], *Locus de Verbo Dei scripto, adversus humanas traditiones, theologicæ et scholasticæ tractatus* (Morges: J. Le Preux, 1580).

death, followed by Protestant rebuttals.¹⁴⁸ Further discussion of this work follows in chapters 5 and 6 below.

In 1581 Chandieu published the second such work, *A theological and scholastic treatise concerning the one sacrifice and priesthood of Christ over against the invented sacrifice of the Mass*.¹⁴⁹ In 1582 Chandieu published his third “theological and scholastic” work, entitled *A theological and scholastic disputation concerning the true forgiveness of sins, over against the human works of satisfaction and the invented purgatory of the Roman church*.¹⁵⁰ Both the 1581 and 1582 works followed the programmatic structure set forth in 1580, as did the three further treatises of that decade. The six treatises typically reference each other, that is to say, the later treatises refer back to the former with Chandieu indicating that he has laid the foundation for the present treatise in the former one. Thus, we will compare their method in chapter 7 of the present work.

¹⁴⁸ Jean de Lens, *De verbo Dei non scripto, seu traditionibus ecclesiasticis, contra scholasticam Antonii Sadeelis de verbo Dei Scripto disputationem libri III* (Antwerp: Plantin, 1591); Daniel Tossanus, *Theses theol. de scrutandis scripturis sacris, et earum sufficientia ad veram Dei et vitae aeternae cognitionem in quibus examinantur aliquot instantiae et exceptiones Joh. Lensei pro traditionibus, et verbo non scripto, contra D. Ant. Sadeelem P. M.* (Heidelberg: Smesmannus, 1591); Enoch Himmel, *De verbo Dei scripto, libri quatuor. Qui legitimam vendicationem praecipue continent disputationis theologica et scholastica, D. Antonii Sadeelis, De verbo Dei scripto adversus humanas traditiones: Oppositam instantiis et accusationibus Joannis Lensei, regii professoris in Academia lovaniensi, quibus labefactare conatus fuit illam D. Sadeelis disputationem* (Geneva: Héritiers d’Eustache Vignon, 1594).

¹⁴⁹ Antonio Sadeele [Antoine de Chandieu], *De unico Christi sacerdotio et sacrificio, adversus commentitium missae sacrificium, theologica et scholastica tractatio* (Geneva: J. Le Preux, 1581). Opposed by Willem van der Lindt, *Christomachia Calvinistica, et sacramentariorum omnium vere sathanica: qua invidus diabolus nunc Antichristo suo indies aduenturienti certum praeparat iter: hic est insertus Anti-Sadelius, sive. Viginti sophismatum Anton. Sadelij contra propitiatorium Christi Dom. sua in Ecclesia Catholica sacrificium, refutatio Christiana* (Coloniae: Cholinum, 1584).

¹⁵⁰ Antonio Sadeele [Antoine de Chandieu], *De vera peccatorum remissione, adversus humanas satisfactiones et commentitium Ecclesiae Romanae purgatorium, theologica et scholastica disputation* (Morges: J. Le Preux, 1582). In the *Opera Theologica* the title of this work is changed from a *disputatio* to a *tractatio*, likely to bring all six titles into conformity.

The “theological and scholastic” treatise of 1585 and the two of 1589, unlike their earlier counterparts, dealt with topics about which Chandieu had been engaged in extended polemics. Disputing about the true human nature of Christ (1585), and treating both the spiritual eating and drinking in the Lord’s Supper (1589), and the sacramental eating and drinking in the Lord’s Supper (1589), respectively, these works treated the same topics as Chandieu had disputed with Claude de Saintes and Gregory of Valentia.¹⁵¹ However, each treatise restricts itself to unique opponents – that of 1585 engaging the Gnesio-Lutherans on ubiquity and consubstantiation; the first of 1589 engaging the Anabaptist (and to some extent Zwinglian) view of the Lord’s Supper as a mere memorial; and the second of 1589 engaging the Roman Catholics on transubstantiation. Multiple Lutheran rebuttals followed.¹⁵² The correspondence of Beza demonstrates the eagerness with which he received and dispersed these writings of Chandieu on the Lord’s Supper.¹⁵³ These three treatises should be studied in light of the just mentioned polemics.¹⁵⁴ The very structure of the *Opera Theologica*, in fact, suggests this.

¹⁵¹ Antonio Sadeele [Antoine de Chandieu], *De veritate humanae naturae Jesu Christi: theologica et scholastica disputatio* (Geneva and Morges: Jean le Preux, 1585) [note that a second edition of 1590 changed *disputatio* to *tractatio*]; idem, *De spirituali manducatione corporis Christi et spirituali potu sanguinis ipsius in Sacra Coena Domini: theologica et scholastica tractatio* (Jean le Preux: Geneva, 1589); idem, *De Sacramentali manducatione corporis Christi et sacramentali potu sanguinis ipsius in Sacra Coena Domini: theologica et scholastica tractatio* (Geneva: Jean le Preux, 1589). The gap between 1585 and 1589 is explained by the fact that Chandieu was serving Henri de Navarre as chaplain and thus was not teaching in either Lausanne or Geneva.

¹⁵² Chandieu was opposed by Balthasar Mentzer in a two part work of 1594, by Philipp Nicolai in 1595, by Leonhard Hutter in three disputations in 1600-1602, and by Johannes Winckelman in two works of 1606. Mattheaus Martinus came to Chandieu’s defense posthumously in 1597. See the bibliography of the present work for these authors’ publications.

¹⁵³ For instances, see *Correspondance de Théodore de Bèze*, vol. 30 (1589), pp. 29-30, 61-2.

¹⁵⁴ For a summary of all of Chandieu’s publications and their dates, see Appendix 1 below, p. 314.

The Structure of the *Opera Theologica*

It appears that Chandieu's son Jean, who assembled the *Opera Theologica* after his father's death, followed a principle of organization. After a dedicatory preface, various eulogies, and – starting in 1593 – a biography of his father, he opens the *Opera* with the six treatises styled, “theological and scholastic,” thus observing a division based on genre or method. Beginning with these surely is as Chandieu intended, given the more general approach of these treatises. Grouping them based on their similar titles and structures is likewise an obvious choice. Given that Chandieu at some time recently before his death augmented the preface of *De Verbo Dei scripto*, it seems likely that he intended it to head up a possible publication of his series of theological and scholastic works.¹⁵⁵ The first three of these treatises treat topics Chandieu did not address elsewhere. The second set of three treatises, however, dovetails with Chandieu's polemics regarding the human nature of Christ and our participation in Christ at the Lord's Supper.

As one scans the list of works in the *Opera*, one can see that as Jean moved from the sixth to the seventh work he switched from a principle of organization based on genre and style to a principle based on subject matter, and overlapped it with the principle based on genre and style. That is, since the “theological and scholastic” treatises 4 through 6 deal with Christ's human nature and our participation in him via the Lord's Supper, Jean grouped three more treatises of the same topic with them, namely Chandieu's refutation of Claude de Saintes from 1567 and his refutations of Gregory of

¹⁵⁵ In chapter 5 below we will study the timing and purpose of the augmentation of the preface.

Valentia from 1590. As a result, the treatises 4 through 9 of the *Opera* all deal with the same topic, basically the Reformed doctrine of the Lord's Supper.

Next Jean has inserted his father's most comprehensive doctrinal work, the refutation of the profession of faith of the monks of Bordeaux. This allows for the transition to the second major topic of Chandieu's polemics: the lawful calling and ordination of ministers in the Reformed churches. Treatises 11 through 15 all deal with this topic, following a chronological order. Thus, the 1577 polemic against the Nicodemites comes first, followed by the first response to Torres of the same year, followed by the lengthy second refutation which had been originally published in two parts in 1580 and 1581. Treatises 14 and 15 also stem from the polemics with Torres.

The sixteenth and seventeenth entries in the *Opera* derive from Chandieu's polemics with Arturus and tie closely to entries 11 through 15 inasmuch as they also deal with ecclesiology, arguing that the Reformed Churches are true churches.

Finally, the *Opera* closes with Chandieu's meditations on Psalm 32, perhaps suggesting to the reader that all theology must have a practical spiritual benefit. The structure of Chandieu's *Opera* is schematized for the reader in Appendix 2 of the present work.¹⁵⁶ Further study of Chandieu's theological treatises would do well to probe sections of the *Opera* with a keen sense of their place in the whole.

Noteworthy is the exclusive use of Latin for the *Opera*, to the point that entry 10 is actually Thierry Gautier's translation of what Chandieu had composed in French. Latin remained the language of precise theological definition and made the work accessible to theologians from different countries.

¹⁵⁶ See p. 315 below.

Conclusion

This chapter has surveyed Chandieu's entire corpus. Although Chandieu's scholastic abilities appear to have developed and sharpened over time, his poetic abilities did also. He did not begin with one genre and end with the other, but employed both throughout his career. We do notice a development with respect to audience. At first Chandieu wrote for French Protestants generally. Later he focused more on the leaders of the church, writing academic works with students of theology in mind. Chandieu tried to help make and keep the Reformed faith academically respectable, strongly opposing the rising Jesuit order. We may observe that whether Chandieu was writing for the church members generally or for the leaders, the act of engaging the church's opponents stayed with Chandieu from the *Epistre au roi* all the way to his posthumously published works.

This brief survey demonstrates that Chandieu was a master of genres, as much at home in poetry as in academic disputation. This observation supports the survey of literature relayed in chapter 1, where it was observed that humanist and scholastic strains were not necessarily opposites. It also helps us determine what part of Chandieu's corpus should be studied to advance the state of the question historically and methodologically. While most of Chandieu's poetry and some of his other French language prose works have undergone examination by Sara Barker in the last decade, his tightly argued Latin language theological works still await analysis. This dissertation makes a start by analyzing the first and most important scholastic works. It focuses on method rather than content, except insofar as Chandieu's 1580 treatise argues from the very content of Scripture to the legitimacy of his method. The two main areas of Chandieu's extended

polemics – the Lord’s Supper and associated doctrines, and the lawful calling of ministers and associated doctrines – receive only incidental attention herein. Instead, detailed analysis occurs of such matters as the Aristotelian roots of his “analytical” approach, much of his technical philosophical vocabulary, the medieval origins of his disputational structure, and the long and checkered history of the hypothetical syllogistic.

Armed with the mere knowledge of what Chandieu authored, we cannot yet answer the question whether he ought to be named “one of the fathers of Reformed Scholasticism.” More data and detail are needed. As a study of method, the present chapter at least shows that Chandieu’s scholastic method did not arise suddenly or in a vacuum. Earlier works of his manifest a certain penchant for the precision of the scholastic method. The next two chapters explore four of these works, to prepare the way for our study of the landmark treatise from 1580, which will follow in the chapters 5 through 7.

Chapter 3

The 1560s: Scholastic Method in Two Early Disputations

Introduction

This chapter examines two publications of Chandieu from the 1560s. Each work exhibits different scholastic motifs. One is clearly scholastic in its method whereas the other, though it deals with medieval scholastic discussions and follows the form of a scholastic disputation, is somewhat more expansive and rhetorical in its prose. The dates of the works in question are 1566 and 1567 and both were written as polemical responses to opponents. As we study these earlier works in relation to the more well-known “theological and scholastic” treatises of the 1580s, we must avoid two related pitfalls: the fallacy of origins and the genetic fallacy.

Fallacy of Origins and Genetic Fallacy

The fallacy of origins is committed when one argues or assumes that the earlier or earliest rubrics of a later idea or method are deemed the sufficient explanation of its origin. Perhaps the Darwinian era coupled with German organic philosophy and an exclusively efficient causality (no formal, material, and final causality) have together contributed to the modern search for origins, where one searches history for “earlier” traces of later events and ideas.¹ This process runs the risk of viewing earlier history in the wrong context, ignoring its detail in order to (over-) emphasize its relation to later ideas or events. Instead, historians recognize that a multiplicity of causes and influences

¹ Robin W. Winks and Lee Palmer Wandel, *Europe in a Wider World 1250-1550* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), p. 2. On exclusively efficient causality, see Louis Dupré, *The Enlightenment and the Intellectual Foundations of Modern Culture* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2004), pp. 20-21, 243, 257-9.

lie behind a single event. Even a lengthy sequence of events is not a sufficient explanation as such. Correlation does not imply causation – the error is *post hoc, propter hoc*.²

Somewhat akin to the fallacy of origins is the genetic fallacy, wherein one imagines that the earliest form of a thing is best simply because it is earliest, or that the origin of a thing ought to determine its ongoing nature and meaning.³ One sometimes encounters an attitude of repristination or *ressourcement* affecting an historian's interpretation. This fallacy has led some scholars to dismiss scholastic theology simply because they do not find Luther and Calvin practicing it. Besides raising the question of just what constitutes the beginning of something (e.g., Calvin was a second generation reformer), this fallacy also relies upon certain assumptions regarding the preeminence of one figure or school over contemporary figures or schools and from there also assumes that subsequent trajectories of influence emanate largely from the figure or school which they have identified. In the case of Chandieu's scholastic theology as such, this fallacy is committed when a historian dismisses either Chandieu's method or content (or both of them) as "unreformed" on the grounds that one or the other (or both) is rooted in late medieval scholasticism and thus represents a turning away from the early, apparently humanist, reformers.⁴

² Carl Trueman, *Histories and Fallacies: Problems Faced in the Writing of History* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2010), pp. 152-6.

³ Robert Malcolm Murray and Nebojsa Kujundzic, *Critical Reflection: A Textbook for Critical Thinking* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's Press, 2004), pp. 435-6; Trueman, *Histories and Fallacies*, pp. 158-9.

⁴ Such a dismissal would be particularly odd given the fact that Chandieu was a very prominent leader of the *Reformed* churches in France and Switzerland, commissioned to correspond with and visit foreign rulers and churches on their behalf. Nevertheless, such a dismissal still finds support in the following revisionist works, in spite of massive scholarly rebuttal. Alan C. Clifford, *Atonement and Justification: English Evangelical Theology, 1640-1790: An Evaluation* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000). He follows the views of R. T. Kendall, *Calvin and English Calvinism to 1649* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980) as

Thus in this chapter we are not searching for the elusive first evidence of scholastic method among the Reformed or the first instance of it in Chandieu's writings. Chapter 1 of the present work points out the substantial continuity in academic methods from the late medieval to early modern period. It suggests that most early modern intellectual figures had received an academic training in logic, had utilized school textbooks which may be called scholastic, and had surely received training at some level in Aristotelian logic. Many of the early reformers – particularly those trained prior to their conversion in the theological disciplines at the existing schools – took with them their scholastic method, more or less. Besides Chandieu, one can think of Martin Bucer (Dominican),⁵ Alexander Alesius (a canon of St. Andrews),⁶ François Lambert (Franciscan),⁷ Wolfgang Capito (Benedictine), Konrad Pelikan (Franciscan), Peter Martyr Vermigli (Augustinian),⁸ Jerome Zanchi (Augustinian), Andreas Hyperius,⁹ and

well as such authors as Brian Armstrong and Perry Miller. To a lesser extent we find the same problem in publications of Willem van't Spijker and Cornelis Graafland. See Willem van't Spijker, "Reformation and Scholasticism," in *Reformation and Scholasticism*, ed. Willem J. van Asselt and Eef Dekker (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2001), pp. 79-98. See in the same volume Antonie Vos's critique of Berkhouwer, Polman, van der Linde, and Graafland on this point. Vos attributes to them the view of scholasticism as "decay theology" after the "golden time of Calvin." Antonie Vos, "Scholasticism and Reformation," pp. 114-15. The bibliography of recent research that critiques this historiographical trajectory and the works that now supply far more detail within an overall framework of continuity have been introduced in chapter 1 above. Here we add only, Richard A. Muller, "Calvin and the 'Calvinists': Assessing Continuities and Discontinuities between the Reformation and Orthodoxy," in *Calvin Theological Journal* 30 (1995): pp. 345-75, and 31 (1996): pp. 125-60.

⁵ On Bucer's Thomism, see Lambert Leijssen, "Martin Bucer und Thomas von Aquin," in *Ephemerides theologicae Lovanienses* 55:4 (1979): pp. 266-96.

⁶ See, for example, the four disputations presided over by Alesius and written against Servetus. Alexander Alesius, *Contra Horrendas Serveti blasphemias . . . disputatio* (Leipzig: Hantzsch, 1554).

⁷ As far as we know, Lambert was the first French *monk* to join Luther's cause, in 1522. Many of his works contain pithy theses, either throughout or as summaries at the end. These often grew out of public disputations. See, e.g., François Lambert, *Farrago omnium fere rerum theologicarum* ([Strasbourg: Jo. Hervagen, 1525]).

⁸ For instance, Vermigli introduces his disputation with William Tresham on the Eucharist by speaking about how it is his duty to preside over scholastic disputations, especially in theology. "Doctissimi viri, quamquam ego ex officio meo disputationibus scholasticis, praecipue autem Theologicis prae esse debeo." Peter Vermigli, *Disputatio de Eucharistia Sacra Sacramento* (Zurich: Gesner, 1552), p. 1.

Caspar Olevian. Thus the existence of scholastic motifs in Chandieu's works prior to 1580 is really not that remarkable.¹⁰ Nevertheless study of the same is valuable to probe the question whether about mid-career Chandieu may have been heavily influenced by certain philosophers such that he began to utilize scholastic method more frequently or in a particularly new way.

Possible Influences on Chandieu's Method

One of the key persons who has been said to have influenced Chandieu is Claude Auberi.¹¹ Donald Sinnema concluded, "Claude Aubery ought to be recognized as one significant source of Chandieu's Aristotelian logic," adding, "This suggests that in his stance on logic Chandieu shared Auberi's Old Aristotelian perspective, as distinct from that of Melanchthonian dialectic."¹² In this chapter and the next we will probe these statements as we add detail to the question of the possible "rise" of Chandieu's scholastic method.

One way that Sinnema's argument can be tested is by establishing the earliest possible dates for Auberi's influence – based on the publication dates of Auberi's

⁹ Hyperius's work on the method of theological studies, from 1556, recommends scholastic theology in the appropriate setting. "Ecclesiasticum munus subeundum decerni prae caeteris idoneos, qui in studio et pulvere scholastico Theologicarum rerum peritia reliquos anteverterint." Andreas Hyperius, *De theologo, seu de ratione studii Theologici* (Basel: Oporinum, [1556]), p. 14, compare pp. 400-422.

¹⁰ "What is unusual – the dog that did not bark, if you like – is so much of the rhetoric of the early Reformers (including Luther and Calvin) against Aristotle's writings and thought." Trueman, *Histories and Fallacies*, p. 125.

¹¹ Henri Meylan, "Claude Aubery: L'affaire des 'Orationes,'" in *Recueil de travaux publiés à l'occasion du quatrième centenaire de la fondation de l'université* (Lausanne: F. Rouge, 1937), pp. 15-16; Henri Meylan, *La Haute École de Lausanne 1537-1937* (Lausanne: Rouge, 1986), pp. 29-30.

¹² Donald Sinnema, "Antoine de Chandieu's Call for a Scholastic Reformed Theology (1580)," in *Later Calvinism: International Perspectives*, ed. W. Fred Graham (Kirkville, MO: Sixteenth Century, 1994), p. 189. Compare this statement: "Yet these later developments [disagreement with Auberi c. 1587] should not detract us from recognizing the important influence of Aubery upon Chandieu in the years just prior to, and perhaps during, his writing of *De Verbo Dei Scripto* [1580]." *Ibid.*, p. 164.

textbooks and the time of his earliest association with Chandieu – and comparing these with the scholastic motifs in Chandieu’s works before and after these dates. This will occur in the present chapter.

Probing deeper, one ought also to examine the nature of Chandieu’s logic in relation to the *logica vetus et logica nova* (both of Aristotle), and in relation to Auberi. How Aristotelian was Chandieu’s method? What part of Aristotle’s oeuvre did Chandieu utilize? How distinct was this from “Melanchthonian dialectic”? And, in what ways did Auberi manifest an “Old Aristotelian perspective”? This second series of questions will be addressed in both the present and next chapter.

Examination of these questions requires familiarization with the category “Old Aristotelian,” thus adding detail to the discussion in chapter 1 above. Sinnema describes Auberi as an “Old Aristotelian” based on the standard work of Wilhelm Risse on the history of logic.¹³ Risse’s category of “Old Aristotelian” describes those logicians who adhered to Aristotle’s entire *Organon*, particularly its structure which emphasizes the distinction between the use of analytical reasoning in the academy and the more topical and dialectical style for occasions which required persuasion and probable arguments.¹⁴ Renaissance humanists tended to blur this distinction. For example, Melanchthon, though a convinced Aristotelian in most respects, incorporated Valla and Agricola’s insights into his textbooks and put the material of Aristotle’s *Analytics* under an organization arranged more or less by the *Topicae*.¹⁵ It should be noted that “Old Aristotelian” is not the same

¹³ Sinnema, “Chandieu’s Call for a Scholastic Reformed Theology,” p. 162, n. 10.

¹⁴ Wilhelm Risse, *Die Logik der Neuzeit* (Stuttgart-Bad Cannstadt: F. Frommann, 1964), vol. 1, pp. 15, 201-307. Compare. p. 296 where Risse describes Auberi as an “Old Aristotelian” (Altaristoteliker).

¹⁵ E. J. Ashworth, “Editor’s Introduction,” in Robert Sanderson, *Logicae Artis Compendium [1618]* (Bologna: Clueb, 1985), XIX-XXI. Excerpts available at <http://www.ontology.co/logic-modern.htm>, accessed Sept. 21, 2012.

category as *logica vetus*. The latter refers to that section of Aristotle's *oeuvre* which had been widely available throughout the medieval period, encompassing Aristotle's *De Categoriae* and *De Interpretatione*, in contrast to the *logica nova* which described later sections of Aristotle's *Organon* which had only become widely available in the 12th century, namely his Prior and Posterior Analytics.¹⁶

We now proceed to an examination of Chandieu's 1566 publication *La confirmation de la discipline ecclesiastique* and his 1567 refutation of Claude de Saintes regarding Calvin and Beza's views on the Lord's Supper, entitled, *Refutatio libelli quem Claudius de Saintes . . . examen doctrinae calvinianae et bezanae de Coena Domini*. We must situate these works within the general academic and scholastic milieu of Chandieu's time as well as the more specific milieu of the Reformed churches.

La confirmation de la discipline ecclesiastique (1566)

In chapter 2 we noted that Chandieu's *La confirmation de la discipline ecclesiastique* from 1566 exhibits a number of important scholastic features.¹⁷ The work grew out of some 4-5 years of contention against the established church polity of the young federation of French Reformed Churches. Chandieu was just over thirty years old when he wrote *La confirmation* at the request of the French Reformed synods. This work was never included in the *Opera Theologica*, likely because it did not concern an

¹⁶ Ashworth, "Editor's Introduction," XVI-XVII.

¹⁷ The copy of *La Confirmation* that I am using is: [Antoine de Chandieu], *La confirmation de la discipline ecclesiastique, observee es eglises reformees du royaume de France. Avec la response aux obiectiones proposees alencontre* ([Geneva: Henri II Estienne], 1566). Eugénie Droz has discussed the anonymity of the treatise. E. Droz, "Autor de l'affaire Morély: La Roche Chandieu et Barth. Berton," *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance* 22:3 (1960), pp. 570-77.

international audience so much as a French audience and also because it had thus never been translated into Latin.

The Discipline ecclesiastique of 1559

The *Discipline ecclesiastique*, which Chandieu defends, was adopted in 1559 and is generally agreed to be his work.¹⁸ With respect to its emphasis on rule of the church by a body of elders, it reflects the practice of other Reformed churches such as in Geneva. But there were also several key differences in the French kingdom: first, the French Reformed churches did not enjoy the favour of the civil authorities and thus it was impossible to integrate members of the government into the consistories, as was done in Geneva; secondly, the French Reformed *Discipline* began with an explicit article that no church could dominate or rule over another, whereas the churches in Geneva, Zurich, and Berne clearly did have significant jurisdiction over the churches in the smaller villages around them; thirdly, the power of appointment enjoyed in Geneva by the *Company of Pastors* was invested by the French in each consistory, which included elders; and finally, the Reformed Church in Geneva did not belong to a federation which necessitated regular meetings of churches in synods.¹⁹ These differences had profound effects on the

¹⁸ For Chandieu's role, see August Bernus, "Le ministre Antoine de Chandieu d'après son journal autographe inédit (1534-1591), cinq parties," in *BSHPPF* 37 (1888): pp. 125-6 [Monograph (Paris: Imprimeries réunies, 1889), p. 27]. Compare Sunshine, *Reforming French Protestantism*, pp. 25-26, 30; Jacques Pannier, *Les origines de la Confession de Foi et la Discipline des Églises Réformées de France* (Paris: Alcan, 1936), p. 103.

¹⁹ Philip Benedict and Nicolas Fornerod, eds., *L'organisation et l'action des églises réformées de France (1557-1563): Synodes provinciaux et autres documents* (Geneva: Droz, 2012), lviii; Thomas A. Lambert, Isabella M. Watt, eds., *Registres du consistoire de Genève au temps de Calvin*, Tome I (1542-1544) (Geneva: Droz, 1996), XXII; Philip Benedict, *Christ's Churches Purely Reformed: A Social History of Calvinism* (New York: Yale University Press, 2002), pp. 135-6; Robert Kingdon, *Geneva and the Consolidation of the French Protestant Movement 1564-1572* (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1967), p. 80.

development of Reformed synodical and federational church polity in the Dutch and Scottish contexts, where the model followed was not that of Geneva, but that of France.²⁰

The French church order began as a set of 40 succinct articles, but over the years the various national synods augmented the *Discipline* so that by the mid-seventeenth century it had become a formidable document about ten times as large as in 1559.²¹ Throughout this period, the basic principles of the document remained intact.

Context: Morély threatens the stability of the French Reformed Churches

Chandieu wrote the *Confirmation* primarily in response to Jean Morély's *Traicté de la discipline & police Chrestienne*, published in 1562 in Lyon.²² Morély argued that the church polity established in 1559 was of a temporary nature. The authority of the consistories was really an interim step until governing authority could be put in the hands of all the people, including determination of doctrine, censure of scandals, excommunication, and the election and deposition of office bearers. Aiming at a mix of aristocracy and democracy, Morély considered Aristotle's *politeia* to be ideal for the church. The consistories could remain, but purely in an administrative sense, without

²⁰ "As a whole, the confession and discipline were a model for the Church of Holland and of Scotland, and an improvement on the church polity of Geneva." William Henry Foote, *The Huguenots* (Richmond: Presbyterian Committee of Education, 1870), p. 79. Foote's statement re. origins is correct, in contrast to that of Abraham Kuyper, as related by S. Greijdanus. J. DeJong, ed., *Bound Yet Free: Readings in Church Polity* (Winnipeg: Premier, 1995), p. 32.

²¹ The precise text of the original *Discipline ecclesiastique* is difficult to determine. For versions of it, see Beza, *Histoire ecclesiastique*, pp. 215-20 and Jean Aymon, *Tous les synodes nationaux des églises réformées de France* (Den Haag: Charles Deloo, 1710), vol. 1, pp. 1-7. A critical edition has been proposed by Bernard Roussel, "La 'Discipline' des Eglises réformées de France en 1559," in *De l'Humanisme aux Lumières, Bayle et le protestantisme: Mélanges en l'honneur d'Elisabeth Labrousse*, ed. M. Magdelaine, M-C. Pitassi, R. Whelan, and A. McKenna (Paris: Universitas, 1996), pp. 186-91. The lengthier version of the mid-seventeenth century is found – together with relevant synodical decisions grouped with the *Discipline* articles – in Isaac d'Huisseau, *La Discipline des eglises pretendues reformees* (Paris: Vendosme, 1663). The same version was translated into English in John Quick, *Synodicon in Gallia Reformata* (London: Parkhurst and Robinson, 1692). vol. 1, pp. xvi-lviii.

²² Jean Morély, *Traicte de la discipline et police Chrestienne* (Lyon: Ian de Tournes, 1562).

authority.²³ This amounted to a kind of congregationalism – though not without classes and synods – possibly alongside an increased role for the state in the governing of the church.²⁴ Morély intended to publish a follow-up volume on state government but this never appeared.²⁵

In their 1993 work on Morély Philippe Denis and Jean Rott called his views a utopian dream, unattainable in this world.²⁶ The churches of the time regarded Morély's dream to be much worse. Appearing as it did at the start of Wars of Religion, both Beza and Chandieu considered Morély's work a danger to the already fragile existence of the Reformed Churches in the French kingdom, as well as a danger to the unity they were enjoying with their common confession of faith and commonly adopted church polity.²⁷ The federation of churches was already quite large and thus Morély's plan would have had far-reaching consequences. Beza estimated that there were 2150 Reformed churches in France in 1562. Since this number included assemblies that were not fully *dressée* (instituted with consistories), scholars have since put the number at 816, still a very high

²³ Philippe Denis and Jean Rott, *Jean Morély et l'utopie d'une démocratie dans l'Eglise* (Geneva: Droz, 1993), pp. 205-06.

²⁴ The French pastors and elders were horrified in 1565 when Morély resorted to charging their Synod with illegitimacy for meeting apart from a decree of the king. See Kingdon, *Consolidation of the French Protestant Movement*, pp. 49, 70. Chandieu indicts Morély at one point for adulterating ecclesiastical discipline and civil authority. Chandieu, *Confirmation*, p. 237.

²⁵ Kingdon, *Consolidation of the French Protestant Movement*, p. 49.

²⁶ Denis and Rott, *Jean Morély*, p. 208. Willem van't Spijker makes the same judgment. Willem van't Spijker, *Democratisering van de kerk anno 1562: Het Conflict-Morély in de begintijd van de Gereformeerde Kerk in Frankrijk* (Kampen: Kok, [1974]), p. 37.

²⁷ Beza reflected on these events in a long letter to Bullinger in 1571, emphasizing the connections between Morély and Peter Ramus (at the time Ramus was taking up the views of Morély and trying to enlist Zurich's support). Bullinger replied that this dispute would bring greater harm to the churches than the religious war in France already had. See van't Spijker, *Democratisering van de kerk*, pp. 9-10; Kingdon, *Consolidation of the French Protestant Movement*, pp. 38-40, 74-5, 209-15. The next year the National Synod of Nîmes soundly condemned the views of Ramus, Morély, and others. See J. Aymon, *Tous les synods nationaux des églises réformées de France* (Den Haag: Charles Deloo, 1710), vol. 1, pp. 122-4.

number for such a short time.²⁸ The key role of the consistories was at stake and Morély's views would be understood to subvert societal order rather than buttress it – something that could only make the Reformed more unfavoured. In Geneva, where he lived, Morély was excommunicated and his book publicly burned in 1563. He fled to France, where he was required by a Provincial Synod of 1564 to subscribe to the established *Discipline ecclésiastique* and send letters of recantation to Geneva if he was to be admitted to the Lord's Supper in the French churches.²⁹ These letters did not meet Geneva's expectations.³⁰ Another Provincial Synod of 1565 (Paris) then mandated Chandieu to refute Morély's work.³¹ That year's National Synod in Paris also condemned his book. Chandieu penned his refutation in this context, not so much to fight for personal victory – he could have done that earlier – as to give clear expression to the official decisions and sentiments of the French Synods.³²

Barker comments that Morély was “distinctly unlucky” to have Chandieu rebut his work.³³ Indeed, Chandieu is succinct but thorough. He took the opportunity not only to dismantle Morély's arguments, but also to set forth the French churches' objections to other views on church government. Thus he divides his response into four distinct parts,

²⁸ Whereas six churches were *dressées* in 1555, there were 816 by 1562. Philip Benedict and Nicolas Fornerod, “Les 2150 églises' réformées de France de 1561-1562,” *Revue Historique* 651 (July 2009): pp. 551-6; Benedict and Fornerod, *L'organisation et l'action des églises réformées*, ix.

²⁹ Denis and Rott, *Jean Morély*, pp. 61-3; Kingdon, *Consolidation of the French Protestant Movement*, pp. 62-5.

³⁰ Denis and Rott, *Jean Morély*, p. 62.

³¹ Denis and Rott, *Jean Morély*, p. 61-2.

³² The discussion of Kevin C. Robbins on Morély and Chandieu cannot be recommended, being fraught with error. He states that the Genevan consistory commissioned Chandieu to refute Morély and that Chandieu's manuscript was “personally corrected by John Calvin himself.” One hardly needs mention that Calvin had already died in 1564. Kevin C. Robbins, *City on the Ocean Sea: La Rochelle, 1530-1650* (Leiden: Brill, 1997), p. 175.

³³ Sara K. Barker, *Protestantism, Poetry and Protest: The Vernacular Writings of Antoine de Chandieu (c. 1534-1591)* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009), p. 200.

the first against those who want to abolish order and discipline entirely. Chandieu answers that discipline is part of the gospel. This was, of course, important to say in his political context. Second, he addresses Nicodemites of a sort – those who agreed with Reformed doctrine but remained Roman Catholic because they considered only their clergy lawfully called due to their share in the continual succession since the time of the apostles. This was no doubt a difficult point since some of the early Reformers had never undergone formal ordination.³⁴ Chandieu points out that the Reformed churches have the marks of the true church and thus legitimately call and ordain men to the ministry.³⁵ Third, Chandieu addresses those who intrude into the ministry of the Word without being lawfully called. Such men ought to guide their enthusiasm into a zeal for good order and be “sent” by the churches.³⁶ Fourth and most extensively, Chandieu engages Morély’s treatise by name, though he never names Morély, presumably because Morély had officially (at least) recanted his views.³⁷ (It turned out that Morély’s recantations had been deceptive.³⁸) Chandieu also avoids discussion of the broader assemblies (classes and synods), likely because these meetings were illegal in the French kingdom at this time.³⁹

³⁴ Chandieu acknowledges this problem by speaking of the “miracle” of the Reformation and the “extraordinary times” in which God himself had “stirred up” men and given them the duty to restore the church. Chandieu, *Confirmation*, pp. 31-2, 47. This is why Luther, Farel, and Calvin were sometimes called apostles. See, for example, Doumergue’s comments that Farel objected to being addressed as *L’Apôtre des Allobroges* and told his friends to address their letters very simply, to *G. Farel, Genève*. Émile Doumergue, *Jean Calvin: Les hommes et les choses de son temps* (Lausanne: Georges Bridel, 1902), vol. 2, p. 168, n.3.

³⁵ Chandieu, *Confirmation*, p. 17.

³⁶ Chandieu, *Confirmation*, pp. 42, 50-1.

³⁷ Barker suggests that Morély and his treatise’s title are not named in Chandieu’s title to deny Morély further publicity. Barker, *Protestantism, Poetry, and Protest*, p. 201. This is no doubt correct, although it is also true that styling his *Confirmation* as a rebuttal of Morély would also not have been true to its contents, since the first 68 pages deal with other opponents. Chandieu makes one mention of Morély’s title, on page 69 and refers to his book (without mentioning its title) on pp. 163, 176, 194, 238.

³⁸ In June 1566 evidence was found in Morély’s correspondence with a Reformed minister, Hughes Sureau du Rosier, that Morély’s retractions were all feigned. Chandieu did not know this at the time of writing, nor did the Church of Paris. Beza thought Paris was being far too conciliatory. Not until Morély’s fifth letter did Geneva become more friendly. However, the subsequent discovery of Morély’s correspondence with du

By engaging more opponents than the synod required, Chandieu marginalizes Morély somewhat as just one of several. He gives the appearance of rhetorical and intellectual superiority by taking on all sides in turn, something that also allows him to lay out more fully the scriptural principles upon which he considers the *discipline ecclésiastique* to be built. Third, he associates Morély with certain detractors whose views are clearly distasteful to the Reformed, such as Roman Catholics and Anabaptists.⁴⁰ Finally, he elucidates areas of agreement to delimit the state of the question – a very necessary part of disputation.

Evidences of scholastic sophistication

Robert Kingdon describes Chandieu's treatise as follows, "The *Confirmation* is organized in a much more tight and formal fashion than Morély's book. In fact its organization is really scholastic: it states a number of general propositions, and lines up several categories of evidence for each; it states a number of objections to each of these propositions; then it methodically presents one or several refutations for each of these objections."⁴¹ Kingdon's evaluation is correct, and can be supplemented with more detail. The sophistication of Chandieu's treatise consists in (1) its structure of enumerated arguments, objections, responses, and identification of errors, as well as (2) a rather keen

Rosier confirmed Geneva's early reticence about the wording of Morély's letters to them. Denis and Rott, *Jean Morély*, pp. 63, 65. Nearly all of the correspondence relating to the *affaire Morély* can be found in *Correspondance de Bèze*, vol. 7 (1566) (Geneva: Droz, 1973), pp. 296-318.

³⁹ According to Sunshine, Morély exploited this restriction for his own benefit. Glenn S. Sunshine, *Reforming French Protestantism: The Development of Huguenot Ecclesiastical Institutions, 1557-1572* (Kirkville, MO: Truman State, 2003), pp. 88, 148.

⁴⁰ Morély's congregationalism moved him in an Anabaptist and 'enthusiastic' direction. See Chandieu, *Confirmation*, pp. 107, 116 for direct mention of the Anabaptists.

⁴¹ Kingdon, *Consolidation of the French Protestant Movement*, p. 78.

sensitivity for disputational and hermeneutical principles, and (3) contextual, philological, and grammatical exegesis of Scripture.

Structure of enumerated arguments, objections, responses, and errors

We examine first of all the structure, described below, and visualized in a schematic in Appendix 3 below.⁴² Besides the division into four major “parts” plus a conclusion, the treatise guides the reader with other rubrics throughout, invaluable duplicated in the seventeen-page table of contents (*Sommaire des principales matieres continues en ce liure*) with which the treatise closes. Here, as within the treatise, the titles of the five “parts” of the book catch the reader’s eye with the largest font, while second and third order headings sport successively smaller fonts. The words *response*, *chap.*, *obiectio*, and *argument* are indented and sport all upper case letters when introducing new sections. Close inspection of this structure reveals strategic planning and arguing. Many present-day readers would be challenged to follow the argument but the French Reformed pastors and elders who found themselves dealing with these discussions in their classes and synods would have followed it well, and could have turned to the table of contents at any time to locate Chandieu’s arguments and responses on particular Scripture passages and particular doctrines.

“Part 1” has two “chapters:” the first introduces the four sorts of adversaries; the second relates two arguments made by those who would abolish all order in the church – Chandieu calls them “objections” – followed by five numbered “responses” of Chandieu (pp. 3-15).

⁴² See pp. 316-21 below.

Part 2 does not continue the “chapter” designations. Instead it offers four “responses” to the Roman Catholic position on apostolic succession (pp. 15-40).

Part 3 addresses those who consider the teachings of the Reformed churches to be good but think they can hold office without being called through the church. Chandieu first advances three positive “arguments” from Scripture for lawful calling through the church, then follows these with 3 “objections” raised by these adversaries. He embeds his responses without specifically naming them as such, and finishes with a hortatory section, to warn the churches not to receive such men (pp. 40-68).

Part 4 – the lengthiest and most involved by far – addresses the views of Morély (pp. 68-233). It divides into two main “articles” of which article 1 has five short “chapters” while article 2 is divided into three lengthy “points,” each of which subdivide into two or three “chapters.” The first chapter in each section – i.e., in article 1 and in each of the 3 points of article 2 – provides positive arguments while the second chapter in each section replies one by one to numerous objections that are put in the mouths of opponents of the *Discipline*.

The conclusion – Part 5 – identifies 3 principle errors of Morély’s treatise, provides an overall conclusion and finishes with exhortations for the adversaries of the *Discipline* to stop troubling the churches and to the faithful to remain united not only in doctrine but also in ecclesiastical polity (pp. 233-47).

Chandieu’s divisions and enumerations suggest to the reader that the author has applied much forethought to the task at hand. His treatise promoting good order in the church fittingly presents itself orderly. Yet the prose flows well, the sections connect

quite well, and introductions and perorations remind the reader of the function of each argument, suggesting that Chandieu is rhetorically and methodologically self-aware.⁴³

A rather keen sensitivity for disputational and hermeneutical principles

A good disputant was expected either to affirm, deny, or distinguish.⁴⁴ Chandieu affirms exactly where the debaters find agreement – that is, in the bulk of their Reformed doctrine – so as to establish the starting point of their disputation.⁴⁵ In fact, the entire treatise’s structure proceeds logically, from those opponents with whom Chandieu finds the least agreement – those who would abolish all discipline – to those with whom he finds the strongest agreement, namely, Morély’s followers.⁴⁶ Chandieu writes, “They praise the discipline of the church,” but they will only accept it as they want it.⁴⁷ He suggests that Tertullian’s words apply, “That the devil often fights the truth under the

⁴³ Barker speaks of Chandieu’s “mastery of genres.” Barker, *Protestantism, Poetry, and Protest*, p. 11.

⁴⁴ This is true of what Angelelli calls the “modern” or “argument” method, linked more with Aristotle’s *Analytics*. Alternatively, in the medieval *quaestio* method of disputation belonging to the *ars obligatoria* and linked more with Aristotle’s *Topica*, one was expected to affirm, deny, or express doubt. Ignacio Angelelli, “The Techniques of Disputation in The History of Logic,” *The Journal of Philosophy* 67:20 (1970): pp. 800-809.

⁴⁵ Chandieu, *Confirmation*, pp. 69, 87, 181-2.

⁴⁶ In between these two were the Roman Catholics (part 2) and those who would intrude into office (part 3). The opponents in part 2 obviously didn’t agree with Reformed soteriology and ecclesiology. Chandieu specifies that his opponents in part 3 do hold to Reformed doctrine but think that they can teach without having been lawfully called. Morély’s views are in fact closer to Chandieu’s than those of part 3 since Morély does maintain that those who teach be lawfully called. Only, Morély sets up a novel system of calling as part of a wide-sweeping democratization of the process.

⁴⁷ Chandieu, *Confirmation*, p. 69.

appearance of defending it.”⁴⁸ Thus, Morély’s views get the most attention because they had the most in common with Chandieu’s and this made them all the more dangerous.⁴⁹

Worthy of attention is the structure of the positive and negative arguments. This is a common enough disputational necessity, and Chandieu would also divide his treatises in the 1580s in this way. The *Confirmation* is interesting for presenting only the negative arguments – responses to objections – for the first two groups of opponents whereas his disagreement with the third and especially the fourth group warranted a number of positive arguments before he replied to their objections. The theoretical idea behind this has to do with the degree of agreement mentioned above. Those with whom greater agreement exists can be addressed on the basis of a common authority and thus can be opposed with positive arguments based on this authority, while those with whom only a little agreement exists are best opposed by exposing the inadequacies and contrarities of their argument.⁵⁰ Readers can appreciate this structure by consulting the indented schematic in Appendix 3.⁵¹

⁴⁸ Chandieu, *Confirmation*, p. 69; cf. pp. 87, 181-2. Chandieu writes on p. 70 that Morély’s verbosity forces him to write much more than he did against the other objecting parties, but the better explanation is probably encapsulated in his appeal to Tertullian. There is a Dutch expression of similar import, about the difference between the devil coming in wooden shoes or quietly in slippers.

⁴⁹ In fact, on the question of discipline, both men agreed that true doctrine could not flourish without proper discipline. Morély, *Traicte de la Discipline*, p. 11; Chandieu, *Confirmation*, pp. 4, 248.

⁵⁰ See, for example, Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Sacrae Theologiae in tres partes divisa* (s.l.: Comini Venturæ, 1590), 1,1,8 (pp. 19-20) where he states that in the case of an opponent who will not concede any views of the theologian, the theologian can only answer objections. Though the application in Thomas’s case is much broader, the principle of disputation is similar. See also Thomas Aquinas, *Summa contra Gentiles. Commentariis Francisci de Sylvestra* (Paris: Foucherium, 1552), ch. 2 (a2r, col. 2). Thomas states that when disputing with others Christians can use the New Testament against heretics, the Old Testament against Jews, but against Muslims and pagans only natural reason can be used because they do not accept the authority of the Christian Scriptures. He adds, however, that such reason is deficient with respect to divine things.

⁵¹ See pp. 316-21 below.

Chandieu's keen sensitivity for hermeneutical principles characterizes most of the treatise, but especially appears in the "arguments," which he ranks by authority. This is clear in all three "points" of article 2 of the fourth part. To prove the first point – that the general government of the church belongs to the consistory, composed of pastors, elders, and deacons, and not to all the people – Chandieu begins with four arguments: Argument 1 is based on "the express passages of Scripture." Argument 2 is "founded upon what the apostles practiced in the early church." Argument 3 is "founded upon the authority of the ancient doctors." Argument 4 contends that popular government never existed in the church and would only bring horrible confusion.⁵² These four arguments follow a ranking from greatest authority to least, presumably most persuasive to least. His last argument is hypothetical, to imagine what troubles would follow from practicing Morély's system. This of course has strong rhetorical power and Chandieu loves to draw out the implications of his opponents' positions with statements like these, but – to ratchet our way back up through the arguments – in principle the preceding arguments based on early church practice are weightier.⁵³ Yet the church in history has often gone astray in practice, so the practices of the earliest churches in the very time of the apostles carry more weight. Yet even the biblical examples can be ambiguous in terms of obedience to the commands of God, so the highest authority goes to the actual commands and teachings of Scripture. To these all churches must undoubtedly conform.

The same kind of ranking occurs in three arguments to prove the point that "the censure of scandals belongs to the governors of the church and not to all of its multitude" as well as in six arguments to show that "the same charge of excommunication is given to

⁵² Chandieu, *Confirmation*, pp. 75-82.

⁵³ For example, see Chandieu, *Confirmation*, pp. 177-8, 185-6, 190-1, 199.

the pastors assisted by the elders and not to all the multitude.”⁵⁴ In the latter example, the first four arguments all grow out of “express passages of Scripture” whereas the fifth proceeds from the examples of the early church and the last speaks of necessity itself requiring the practice of the French churches. This movement from express passages to examples to necessity itself also occurs to point out that electing and deposing office bearers belongs to “well regulated consistories and not to all the body of the church.”⁵⁵

An added point of precision occurs to prove that all the parts of the discipline are expressly attributed to the consistory, for the first argument is based on the express *commands* of the Lord and not just the express *passages*.⁵⁶ The distinct naming of the “commands” of the Lord includes the call to office of the elders and pastors: they are commissioned as ambassadors of Christ and thus charged to speak in the name of God. This also makes them responsible for the spiritual welfare of God’s people.⁵⁷ By distinguishing the commands and commissions in Scripture from its doctrinal teachings, Chandieu indicates an added sense of responsibility for following Scripture first and foremost.

In each case the hierarchy of authorities represents an important aspect of Chandieu’s hermeneutic in terms of how Scripture has authority over the church and regulates it. We shouldn’t regard Chandieu’s hermeneutical rules to be unusual for the

⁵⁴ Chandieu, *Confirmation*, pp. 150, 155.

⁵⁵ Chandieu, *Confirmation*, p. 205. Even in the earlier third part of the treatise where Chandieu addresses those who intrude into office without being lawfully called through the church, while the titles of his three “arguments” as such manifest no such ranking, yet within each one he follows a careful pattern of first laying out express passages that he considers to teach his position and then confirming these with biblical example. *Ibid.*, pp. 42-52. He also supplies negative examples – those in Scripture whom God said were not “sent” by him. *Ibid.*, pp. 50-1.

⁵⁶ Chandieu, *Confirmation*, pp. 88-96. The second argument draws on the examples of the Old and New Testaments, the third on the examples of the old bishops, and the fourth on the chaos that would follow from a popular church government. *Ibid.*, pp. 96-108.

⁵⁷ Chandieu, *Confirmation*, pp. 89-902

Reformed; only, he makes them more apparent than other authors might. Although he does not use the language of *principia* or *principium*, clearly he regards Scripture generally to be the foundation (*principium*) of all theological truth and its particular texts as the *principia* of particular doctrines and theological arguments. In fact, Chandieu is more specific than that: he distinguishes, as we have shown, between the express commands and the more ambiguous biblical examples.⁵⁸

He also clearly uses what he considers to be the clearer passages to interpret the less clear passages.⁵⁹ All or nearly all of his arguments appear in enthymematic form, and a good number are hypothetical.⁶⁰ Chandieu often uses hypothetical statements to expose what he regards to be the inconsistencies and failures of his opponents' arguments. The entire treatise purports to be filled with what may be called "good and necessary consequences," that is sound conclusions, validly reached. He employs his syncategorematic terms quite strictly, in my judgment.⁶¹

⁵⁸ For a late medieval comparison, see the remarks of Hobbins regarding Jean Gerson, who outlined six levels of truth in his *Declaratio veritum quae credendae sunt de necessitate salutis* (c. 1416). Daniel B. Hobbins, "Gerson on Lay Devotion," in *A Companion to Jean Gerson*, ed. B. P. McGuire (Leiden: Brill, 2006), pp. 47-8.

⁵⁹ For example, Chandieu, *Confirmation*, p. 84.

⁶⁰ For example, Chandieu writes, "What then do the Bishops of the Roman Church have to make us conclude that the true succession is on their side rather than with the ministers of the Reformed Church? Those have succeeded to the title, but these to the office; those have succeeded to the name, but these to the power and the truth. If then the true successors are those who hold the office, the power, and the truth (as we have proved above), it follows that our Ministers must rather be counted the successors of the true Bishops, and not the Bishops of the Roman Church." Syllogistically this would be: If the true successors are those who have the office, etc., then our ministers are the true successors. But the true successors are those who have the office, etc., as we have proved above. But our ministers have the office, etc. Therefore, our ministers are the true successors. This affirms the antecedent, which in this case is found in the words, "as we have proved above." Chandieu, *Confirmation*, p. 37.

⁶¹ For example, the terms *si, si donc, car, il s'ensuit que, combien que, puis que, il faut conclurre* [152], *par consequent* [159], *veu que* [159]. He also recognizes the nature of deductive reasoning. We know this not only from his repeated *il s'ensuit que* but also from his remark that he will make the French *Discipline* more easily understood by spreading it over two principle points, "the one deduced from the other." Chandieu, *Confirmation*, p. 74; cf. p. 234. Note well that this remark is really not that remarkable since such terms and their use in arguments were, of course, common fare.

Contextual, philological, and grammatical arguments

Turning back to Morély, one can notice that whereas he uses Scripture to build his case, he also leans upon a certain principle of immutability: “[God’s polity] is so perfect that the Lord God, having once ordained it in his Ancient Church of Israel . . . does not want to change this same external form of its first government.”⁶² “Moses ordained this Republic forever, having instituted a council of elders for its government. . . but there is no doubt that the people choosing the elders had the sovereignty.”⁶³ He later explains that the Jewish Scribes and Pharisees perverted God’s perfect order, but Christ and his apostles restored it.⁶⁴ He continues by noting that the French Churches presently do not attain to this; they are as a child still under tutelage and governorship, but once they follow Morély’s program, their tutor will have no more power over them. Here he references Galatians 4 in the margin.⁶⁵ Paul, he argues, was pushing the Corinthian church to maturity when he commanded them to excommunicate an immoral man in First Corinthians 5. They were to take charge of their own affairs. Just so, the churches of the present should reject the elementary principles, that is, the current *Discipline*.⁶⁶ To most of the French Reformed pastors, this was a rather shocking idea.

Morély further maintains that “Tell it to the church” in Matthew 18 supports his view, as does First Corinthians 14 where we read that all can prophesy in turn.⁶⁷ Thus all

⁶² Morély, *Traicte de la discipline*, a2r-v.

⁶³ Morély, *Traicte de la discipline*, p. 129.

⁶⁴ Morély, *Traicte de la Discipline*, a2v.

⁶⁵ Morély, *Traicte de la discipline*, p. 35.

⁶⁶ Morély, *Traicte de la discipline*, p. 36. Morély’s rhetoric about elementary principles alludes again to Galatians 4 where the apostle Paul speaks of being enslaved to the basic principles of this world and probably also to Hebrews 6:1 where we read about moving on from basic principles to maturity.

⁶⁷ Morély, *Traicte de la discipline*, pp. 77-8.

the church must be mature. Indeed, if the ministers are drawn from among the church in general, surely it cannot be they alone who are given the Spirit of prophecy.⁶⁸ God shows no favourites: “All, whether Jews or Greeks, Barbarians, Scythians, slaves, free, are redeemed by one blood, called with one calling, received by the one Spirit,” etc.⁶⁹

Nevertheless, a qualifier follows: Children under 15 are excluded, as are the women.⁷⁰ Interestingly, Morély here has followed a universal statement with a qualifying distinction, yet was unable to do so with other texts that the French churches read as indicating the separate power of the office bearers and consistories over against the general membership of the church.

How does Chandieu respond to arguments such as these? He of course leaps at what he considers to be inconsistencies, such as the exclusion of the women and children from the church, for if Morély wants to argue on the basis of the word “church” for popular sovereignty yet exclude women and children from this sovereignty, then he must be excluding them from the church as such.⁷¹ Chandieu points out that the word “church” is even used for several households in the New Testament. He follows this with a hypothetical and *a fortiori* argument: “If then this term can be given to a family which is in a church, *how much more* to those who are assembled in the name of said church, approved by it, and established by our Lord Jesus Christ?”⁷² That is, the consistory.

Chandieu also probes Morély’s appeals to Scripture. Kingdon writes, “Time and again he picks out particular Biblical verses cited rather casually by Morély, and

⁶⁸ Morély, *Traicte de la discipline*, pp. 78-9.

⁶⁹ Morély, *Traicte de la discipline*, p. 119.

⁷⁰ Morély, *Traicte de la Discipline*, p. 120.

⁷¹ Chandieu, *Confirmation*, p. 179.

⁷² Chandieu, *Confirmation*, p. 179. See page 25 for another argument roughly in this form.

examines them at length in order to demonstrate that Morély misinterpreted them. These rebuttals are cast in the scholastic form to which I have already alluded.”⁷³ For example, when Chandieu deals with Christ’s command to tell it to the Church, he observes that Christ is brief about this because he is depending upon his Jewish audience’s knowledge of the details. Jesus, he says, names the whole for the part. He actually means, “Tell it to the consistory.” According to Chandieu, we know this from Christ’s tacit approval of the Jewish Sanhedrin Council when he said in Matthew 5 that if one calls his brother a fool [Raca] he will be accountable to the Sanhedrin. In fact, Sanhedrin and consistory are interchangeable terms, and the structure of the New Testament church thus carries through from the Old Testament. He adds a distinction: Of course we realize that this Sanhedrin consistory condemned Jesus, but one must not mix up the structure of the thing with its abuse.⁷⁴ Here Chandieu is following Calvin’s exegesis of Matthew 18.⁷⁵

On the question of whether all can prophesy, Chandieu is careful. First he states that Paul spoke these words in First Corinthians 14 only about the company of prophets, that is to say, those who explain God’s word. Further, Paul is writing about a particular spiritual gift, as we learn from chapter 12 and Romans 12. Then Chandieu explains that one must distinguish the times, that the time of founding the New Testament church was a time of extra gifts like tongues, miracles, and prophecy. Chandieu does not clearly commit himself on the question of whether the Reformed churches have been granted

⁷³ Kingdon, *Consolidation of the French Protestant Movement*, p. 79.

⁷⁴ Chandieu, *Confirmation*, pp. 181, 183-5.

⁷⁵ John Calvin, *Commentary on a Harmony of the Evangelists, Matthew, Mark, and Luke*, vol. 2, pp. 355-7 (*Calvini Opera*, vol. 45, col. 514-15). See also Theodore Beza, *Confessio Christianae Fidei in Volumen tractationum theologicarum* (Geneva: Jean Crespin, 1570), p. 52 (I owe this reference to van’t Spijker, *Democratisering van de kerk*, p. 25, n. 101). Note that in Matthew 5:22 Lefevre had translated the Vulgate’s *concilio* with *concile* and Olivétan translated the Greek *synedrion* with the same word.

prophets in his own time, but he does suggest that the church's current ingratitude has curtailed the number of prophets. He does point out, however, that if all are prophets, the church will have to submit itself to Anabaptists, Servetists, and numerous other *esprits transportez*.⁷⁶ Showing himself adept at turning an argument against his opponent, Chandieu then goes on to point out that the passage states that the spirits of the prophets are subject to prophets, which must mean that those who explain the doctrine in the church must be examined by the other prophets. And if they must be examined, then the same must approve or disapprove of them. Ergo, they, and not all the church have jurisdiction over the doctrine and office of ministers.⁷⁷

Both men appeal at times to Hebrew and Greek terms or expressions.⁷⁸ Both cite multiple church fathers. Chandieu uses at least 10 of 240 pages to cite the fathers and early church councils.⁷⁹ The most-quoted is Eusebius (9x), followed by Cyprian (8x), Ephiphanius (7x), Jerome (6x), and Augustine (4x). Another twelve church fathers are quoted less frequently. The only reference to the medieval scholastics occurs when Gratian's *Decretals* are sourced positively regarding the choosing of men for church office.⁸⁰ These references are worth noting, especially because the *Confirmation* is not included in the *Opera Theologica* and thus not included in the index.⁸¹

⁷⁶ Chandieu, *Confirmation*, pp. 111-16.

⁷⁷ Chandieu, *Confirmation*, pp. 116-117. See pp. 96-7, 178-9, 190-1 for other examples.

⁷⁸ For example, Chandieu, *Confirmation*, pp. 75, 165, 180, where he deals with the Hebrew *qahal* and the Greek *ekklesia*. Morély once speaks about not sitting at table with someone or not having conversation as a Hebraic expression for fellowship.

⁷⁹ Chandieu, *Confirmation*, pp. 79, 98-102, 167-70, 211-14.

⁸⁰ Chandieu, *Confirmation*, p. 213.

⁸¹ As it is, the index of older theologians and scholastics in the *Opera Theologica* is incomplete. It appears to rely on the marginal references of the works *intra*, yet there are significant references within the text of the works not indicated in the margins. An example will be given below in the discussion of the 1567 work against Claude de Saintes.

Chandieu identifies the principle error of Morély's treatise to be its failure to distinguish the unchanging substance of church order with its necessary accommodation to circumstances.⁸² We must add the rule this represents to our account of Chandieu's hermeneutics: not only does he distinguish the express commands from the more ambiguous biblical examples; he also distinguishes the substance or principle behind specific biblical commands from the particular biblical circumstances, arguing that application in his own day could be different than in biblical times, so long as the substance or principle of the matter was maintained. Other distinctions solve other difficulties, such as that between magisterial and ecclesiastical discipline,⁸³ between the practices to be followed when the visible church is stable and pure versus those to be followed when it has become corrupted and perverted,⁸⁴ between the rule or ordinary form and the particular examples of deeds which should conform to it,⁸⁵ and between finer matters such as judgment and sentence.⁸⁶

⁸² Morély, *Traicte de la Discipline*, a2r-a2v; Chandieu, *Confirmation*, pp. 113-15 (re. NT prophets), 223, 234-6. "External form can and must be changed according to the times, places, and other circumstances." Chandieu, *Confirmation*, p. 223. Morély's view was not purely democratic, for he retains a consistory which serves a purely administrative function: to put into effect the will of the people. He also envisions an increased responsibility for the civil authorities in terms of maintaining the church. At the same time Chandieu chides Morély for taking authority from the magistrates by giving the church the power to command shop owners to open their granaries at certain times and places. Morély's proposal lacks clarity at these points. Chandieu, *Confirmation*, pp. 237-8.

⁸³ Chandieu, *Confirmation*, pp. 10ff, 195.

⁸⁴ Chandieu, *Confirmation*, pp. 20-1.

⁸⁵ Chandieu, *Confirmation*, pp. 200, 202-3, 227ff. This appears to parallel the distinction between substance and form, or accommodation of a rule to changing circumstances. This distinction also supports Chandieu's ranking of authorities in his own positive argument, since it recognizes that the practice of a thing may be adapted to particular circumstances and if so, will not necessarily apply in the same way in other circumstances. One needs to regard the deeper principle or substance of the matter and then apply it with wisdom to one's current situation.

⁸⁶ Chandieu, *Confirmation*, p. 198. General commands in Scripture such as the command to administer justice never bypass the offices God has already put in place to oversee justice. *Ibid*, p. 203.

Conclusion

Patient attention to detail is, of course, a scholastic virtue and was something the French churches needed not only for their *Discipline ecclesiastique* in the first place, but especially for the defence of it.⁸⁷ Morély had employed Scripture – especially the Old Testament – in his favour and this required a careful response. Chandieu stepped up, as requested.

The most important element that reappears in Chandieu's theological treatises in the 1580s is his use of Scripture generally as the *principium* of his position, and its texts as the *principia* of particular arguments.⁸⁸ This will be explored further in the next chapter. Next in importance is the careful structure of positive and negative arguments. Inasmuch as this would be a normal part of any polemic it is not remarkable, but the careful division Chandieu makes and the rigour with which he follows it demonstrate that he is knowingly following scholastic disputational techniques. Without doubt, he had already practiced these in law school at the University of Toulouse, since disputation was pretty well a universal teaching technique in the various faculties of the European universities at that time, as we have shown in the first chapter of the present work. At the same time we must observe that Chandieu took a historical approach in dealing with the exegesis of Scripture texts, thus reflecting better the humanist-influenced *mos gallicus* of the University of Toulouse.

⁸⁷ Humanists, of course, also paid close attention to details too – especially historical, philological, and literary details. This leads to a question: Should one apply the label “scholastic” to such motifs as Erasmus's delineation and even creation of hundreds of categories for kinds of letters, literary devices, ways to address a letter, etc.?

⁸⁸ Chandieu, *Confirmation*, pp. 30-1.

Since the 1566 *Confirmation* does not carry its message by way of overt syllogisms, but mostly by enthymemes, it does not have the logical tightness of his later treatises. At the same time one cannot overlook the overall appearance of the work with its numbered arguments and responses, as well as its identification of the opponents' errors. As we will see, in the 1580s Chandieu proceeded to identify the errors in his opponents' arguments by naming the fallacy in each case. He also named the parts of the arguments carefully, such as the *major*, *minor*, *antecedent*, *consequent*, *middle*, *assumption*, *hypothetical mode*, etc. None of these occur in 1566. No doubt Chandieu's learning continued after 1566, but the difference between 1566 and the 1580s derives in large part from the differing audiences and purposes. The 1580s treatises were written in Latin for instructing advanced students – candidates for the Reformed ministry. They aimed high. The *Discipline ecclésiastique* and its *Confirmation* were written for the churches generally, and in French; thus more popular. Moreover, Morély's treatise did not warrant the same scholastic response as did the detailed arguments of Francisco Torres and other Jesuits because Morély's arguments did not operate at that level.

In conclusion, Chandieu's *La Confirmation de la discipline ecclésiastique* has many signs of an author trained in scholastic disputation. These include his careful definition and narrowing of the questions at hand; elucidation of points of agreement; adherence to the arguments, point for point; structure of distinct positive arguments and negative responses; gradation of authorities; and overt attention to hermeneutical and disputational rules. Chandieu was quite adept at analyzing an opponent's argument to break it down into its constituent parts, rebut it thoroughly, and, also as a good humanist, poke some fun at it (e.g., whether women were members of the church in Morély's view).

He does not use overt syllogisms and analyze these, but he does argue succinctly and in scholastic style.

Refutatio libelli quem Claudius de Sainctes (1567)

Another work of the younger Chandieu also found birth in the arena of disputation and exhibits a number of scholastic motifs. His refutation of the views of Claude de Sainctes (1525-1591) was a short work of 56 pages, but chock full of quotations from Gratian and the medieval scholastic theologians.⁸⁹ The scholastic characteristics of this work differ from the previous year's treatise but are equally important because they argue for a familiarity on Chandieu's part with the methods and teachings of the medieval schoolmen. This work is the earliest of the publications included in Chandieu's *Opera Theologica*.

Historical circumstances of the Refutatio

Claude de Sainctes (1525-1591) was a Roman Catholic doctor of the Augustinian order who first opposed the French Reformed theologians in the presence of the young King Charles IX and the Queen Mother Catherine de' Medici at the Colloquy of Poissy in 1561.⁹⁰ Later that year he published a Roman Catholic Confession of Faith, offering his "corrections" to what the "Calvinist" theologians had presented at the Colloquy. This appears to follow the order of articles in the Gallican Confession.⁹¹ In March of 1566 de

⁸⁹ A. Theopsaltes [Antoine de Chandieu], *Refutatio libelli quem Claudius de Sainctes . . . examen doctrinae calvinianae et bezanae de Coena Domini* (Geneva: Jean Crespin, 1567). Included in Antoine de Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, 3rd ed. (Geneva: Jean le Preux, 1599), pp. 331-43.

⁹⁰ Chandieu considered de Sainctes to belong to the Benedictine order. Chandieu, *Refutatio libelli*, p. 4.

⁹¹ Claude de Sainctes, *Confession de la foy catholique, contenant en brief la reformation de celle que les ministres de Calvin presentèrent au roy, en l'assemblée de Poissy* (Paris: Claude Fremy, 1561).

Sainctes signed the preface to his *Examen doctrinae Calvinianae et Bezanae de Coena Domini*. In this work he subjected to detailed criticism the teachings of Calvin and Beza on the Lord's Supper.⁹² A few months later, in July and August, he joined in public disputation in Paris alongside Simon Vigor (1515-1575) against Hughes Sureau du Rosier (d. c. 1578) and Jean de l'Espine (1505-1597) for the Protestant side.⁹³ The record of this disputation quickly appeared.⁹⁴ Clearly de Sainctes had become a formidable foe of the Reformed churches and needed to be rebutted. Thus Beza took up the pen in defense of himself in a work that appeared in 1567.⁹⁵ The dispute was really Beza's, but Chandieu also entered it because, as he said, he felt the need to speak up on behalf of the French Reformed Churches whom De Sainctes had charged with division and conflict on the question of the Lord's Supper. He also felt moved to defend Calvin, who had died in 1564.⁹⁶ That same year De Sainctes responded to both defenses in one work, though he

⁹² Claude de Sainctes, *Examen doctrinae Calvinianae et Bezanae de Coena Domini, ex scriptis auctorum eiusdem collectum* (Paris: Claude Fremy, 1566). See also Donald Nugent, *Ecumenism in the age of the Reformation: the Colloquy of Poissy* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1974), pp. 137-8.

⁹³ In an effort to induce his married daughter Françoise to follow him in abandoning the Reformed teachings, Louis de Bourbon, Duke of Montpensier, sponsored the disputation. As it turned out, one of the Reformed disputants himself was probably already rather doubtful in his allegiance to the Reformed faith and afterward turned from it for a time – Hughes du Rosier was the same man noted earlier in this chapter, who favoured the church political views of Morély. See Jason Zuidema, "Piety in Print: Mapping the Contours of the Spirituality of Jean de l'Espine," *Calvin Theological Journal* 47:1 (April 2012): pp. 138-9; Pierre Bayle, *Dictionnaire historique et critique*, 2nd ed. (Rotterdam: Reinier Leers, 1702), vol. 3, pp. 2613-16.

⁹⁴ Claude de Sainctes et al., *Actes de la dispute & conference tenue à Paris, és mois de Iuillet, & Aoust, 1566, etre deux doctevrs de Sorbonne, & deux Ministres de l'Eglise reformee. Distinguez selon les journees* (Strasbourg: Pierre Estiard, 1566). See also Claude de Sainctes et. al., *Actes of conference in religion, holden at Paris, betweene two papist doctors of the Sorbonne, and two godlie ministers of the Church*, trans. Geffraie Fenton (London: H. Bynneman, 1571). Another English translation by John Golburne appeared in 1602.

⁹⁵ Theodore Beza, *Apologia Th. Bezae Vezelii, ad libellum sorbonici theologastri F. Claudii de Xaintes, cui titulum fecit, Examen Calvinianae et Bezanae doctrinae de coena Domini ex scriptis authorum ejusdem collectum* (Geneva: Jean Crespin, 1567).

⁹⁶ Chandieu, *Refutatio libelli*, pp. 4-5, 9-23.

focused more on Beza than Chandieu, whose identity was unclear to him due to the use of Theopsaltes as *nomme de plume*.⁹⁷

Style and structure of the Refutatio

Chandieu calls his work both a *refutatio* and a *disputatio*.⁹⁸ Given that de Saintes was a Sorbonne theologian, Chandieu writes against “the troops of the whole school of the Sorbonne.”⁹⁹ Like Calvin, Chandieu polemicized with these contemporary theologians of Paris.¹⁰⁰ However, in the present work Chandieu reserves the term “scholastics” for the medieval schoolmen whereas his contemporary opponents are simply “theologians” and “doctors.” Yet they are clearly linked; given the reliance of the Sorbonne theologians on various medieval scholastics, Chandieu will especially turn to the latter in part 2. His main objection to all of these teachers appears to be their frequent formulation of theology in terms of their various opinions rather than out of the certainty of God’s Word. He writes, “But we have learned that the task of the theologian is to treat the divine matters in a holy and Christian manner out of the sources of the sacred Writings and the greater devout [writers], to guide all interpretations by the Word of God,

⁹⁷ Claude de Saintes, *Responsio F. Claudii de Saintes Parisien. Theologi ad Apologiam Theodori Bezae* (Paris: Claude Fremy, 1567). In the preface he speaks against Theopsaltes as well (Chandieu), though the bulk of his refutation deals with Beza. At a4v he writes, “Nam antevertit me, ac levavit hoc onere ex Sorbonicis quidam à quo safisfit, & Examini doctrinae Sorbonicae, & Theopsalti, quoniam eiusdem ferè sunt argumenti, & breui apparebit opusculum longe doctius & elegantius nostro.” As noted above in ch. 2, n. 25

, de Saintes does not seem to have figured out the identity of this “Theopsaltes.” Chandieu does, however, clearly identify himself as one of the French Reformed believers. Chandieu, *Refutatio libelli*, p. 9. The next year de Saintes wrote another attack: Claude de Saintes, *Declaration d’aucuns atheisms de la doctrine de Calvin et Beze contre les premiers fondemens de la Chrestientés* (Paris: Claude Fremy, 1568).

⁹⁸ “Iam ergo accedo ad secundum caput nostrae disputationis.” Chandieu, *Refutatio libelli*, p. 23.

⁹⁹ “totius scholae Sorbonicae.” Chandieu, *Refutatio libelli*, p. 6.

¹⁰⁰ On Calvin and the Sorbonne, see Richard A. Muller, *The Unaccommodated Calvin: Studies in the Foundation of a Theological Tradition* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), pp. 50-52.

and to form faith in our souls from the only truth of God; but to observe, refute, and overcome *opinions* which are foreign to the Word of God, by means of the very same Word.”¹⁰¹ Similarly, Chandieu objects to de Sainctes that he has made unsubstantiated arguments, unworthy of a theologian.¹⁰² Thus, if Chandieu has a concern with de Sainctes’ method, it lies in whatever brings about the promulgation of various human opinions instead of firm and certain conclusions rooted in Scripture.¹⁰³ However, Chandieu does not debate or chastise this method in any detail; his stated concerns are with the conclusions reached and even with some of the questions that were entertained by the medieval scholastics.

Chandieu divides his disputation into three parts: after an introduction (pp. 3-9) he argues in part one against de Sainctes’ accusation that the French Reformed Churches are divided in their understanding of the Lord’s Supper (pp. 10-23); second, he turns the tables to argue that it is really the Roman Catholics who are divided specifically in their doctrine of the Eucharist and thus de Sainctes’ arguments stick more to his own party than his opponents (pp. 23-50); finally, he opens a broader attack on de Sainctes and the Roman Catholics by pointing to their wider internal disagreements as evidenced in their various monastic orders (pp. 50-56).¹⁰⁴

¹⁰¹ Nos vero hoc esse Theologi munus & ex sacris Literis & ex piis maioribus didicimus, res sanctas & divinas sanctè & Christianè tractare: interpretationes omnes ex Dei verbo dirigere: fidem que in animis nostris ex sola Dei veritate formare: opiniones autem à verbo Dei alienas ex eodem verbo notare, refutare, convincere.” Chandieu, *Refutatio libelli*, p. 6, emphasis mine. Protestant theologians had been making this criticism ever since Melanchthon in 1521. See Ulrich Leinsle, *Introduction to Scholastic Theology*, trans. Michael J. Miller (Washington: Catholic University Press, 2010), p. 260.

¹⁰² “Quid autem magis indignum Theologo quam calumniando non disserendo, conuitiis non ratione disputare?” Chandieu, *Refutatio libelli*, p. 6, compare p. 13.

¹⁰³ Compare the same concerns, expressed by Calvin. Muller, *The Unaccommodated Calvin*, pp. 48-9.

¹⁰⁴ “Tria autem mihi in hoc scripto praestanda suscipio. Primùm confirmabo falsum id esse quod asseruisti, nostras Ecclesias Coenae Domini quaestione inter se dissidere: nulliùsque momenti esse quod adscripsisti ad istius mendacii confirmationem. Deinde ea omnia quae nobis obiicis docebo in tuis doctoribus tuàque

Noteworthy is Chandieu's approach: while he might have used de Sainctes' specific arguments and simply answered them point for point, he has left this for Beza and instead has taken a more global approach by mounting a retort (*refellere* or *retorquere*). For the second part – which forms the bulk of the treatise – relies upon Chandieu's own wider reading in the medieval schoolmen, suggesting that de Sainctes' would-be supporters undermine his own arguments. Although Chandieu is no doubt reliant upon the arguments already made by earlier Reformers and could have located many of these medieval opinions in florilegia or glossa, the diversity and precision of the quotations suggest first-hand familiarity. We will now proceed to examine this work in more detail.

The arguments of the Refutatio – I. Defence of Calvin

On the first point, de Sainctes thought he had detected a shortcoming in Calvin's doctrine because it is impossible for believers to participate really and substantially in the physical body of Christ if the mode of receiving his body is spiritual. But, counters Chandieu, Christ needs to enter the soul, and how will his physical body get into our soul? Isn't Christ apprehended by faith, per canon law?¹⁰⁵ Chandieu posits that the French Reformed Churches hold in common the view that Christ and his benefits are received really and truly, in a spiritual mode. They agree with Calvin, he says, whose writings contain nothing contradictory.

doctrina ita haerere, vt t etuis conciliandis vel emendandis operam dare praestiterit, quàm nostris perperam examinandis. Postremò refellam paucis & modestè ea conuitia que tu in nos non satis modestè coniecisti.” Chandieu, *Refutatio libelli*, pp. 9-10.

¹⁰⁵ Chandieu, *Refutatio libelli*, pp. 18-21. The reference to Gratian's Canon is on p. 21.

The arguments of the Refutatio – II. Ridiculing the Schoolmen

On the second and lengthiest point, Chandieu highlights the great variety of views debated among the scholastic doctors. He charges them with having reduced theology to empty and vain philosophy, fulfilling the adage of Tertullian, “Philosophy is the mother of all heresies.”¹⁰⁶ He then presents some thirteen different *quaestiones* which the scholastics debated, laying out their differing opinions. He presents them in logical order: The first *quaestio* was whether (*utrum*) the true body of Christ, which was crucified for us, is eaten in the Eucharist.¹⁰⁷ If it is eaten in the Eucharist, then follows the second question: whether Christ’s body is held by the mouth and destroyed in the belly or grasped by faith alone and by the soul.¹⁰⁸ The third *quaestio* stems from answering the second physically. It asks whether the body of Christ is chewed by the wicked. Some say yes; others no. Chandieu proceeds to point out what he considers excessive discussion and strong dissension among the scholastics on the body of Christ in the sacrament. For instance, he states that after Thomas and others say (correctly, in Chandieu’s view) that Christ’s true body is in heaven and is visible there, they have the problem that its presence on earth ought to be visible also, in the sacrament. To solve this they say that it is invisible in the Eucharist; it is in that location, but not local; it is a size but not by way of quantity. A few lines later Chandieu asks a typical Protestant question, “How can Christ’s body be present in the Eucharist without its accidental properties?”¹⁰⁹ Chandieu then employs one of Calvin’s favourite metaphors – this leads to an “inextricable

¹⁰⁶ Chandieu, *Refutatio libelli*, pp. 23-4.

¹⁰⁷ Chandieu, *Refutatio libelli*, pp. 24-8.

¹⁰⁸ Chandieu, *Refutatio libelli*, pp. 28-34.

¹⁰⁹ “Aiunt enim idem corpus esse in caelo visibile, & in Eucharistia inuisibile: esse in loco sed non localiter: esse quantum sed non per modum quantitates . . . An corpus Christi possit esse in Eucharistia sine propriis accidentibus?” Chandieu, *Refutatio libelli*, p. 37.

Labyrinth” of questions.¹¹⁰ He criticizes his opponents for resorting to the explanation that the Eucharist is a miracle.¹¹¹ Chandieu appears to be familiar with the scholastic discussion about what really happens in transubstantiation: does the substance remain bread, as Scotus says? Or is the substance annihilated and brought back to (Aristotelian) prime matter? Or does it actually become Christ’s body? These were the varied opinions offered, says Chandieu.¹¹² In order to highlight the dissension that he senses among his opponents, he not infrequently quotes from the same scholastic for both sides of a question. This happens, for instance, with Cajetan, Thomas, Lombard, Astesanus, and Durandus.

The fourth question is whether the water of baptism is also transubstantiated, while the fifth through eighth debated questions are presented almost humorously to those who don’t believe in transubstantiation. These include, for instance, whether mice are healed by eating the Eucharist, whether the bodily fluids are included in it, and thus the blood itself, whether – on the view that where a part of Christ is, there is the whole of him – in the sacrament Christ’s foot is mixed up with his mouth, and, whether the whole body of Christ moves up and down whenever the sacrifice of the mass does so.¹¹³ Some of these things Chandieu regards to be blasphemous. His stance against the schoolmen is therefore quite intense.

In the ninth question he notes their discussion on whether the words of consecration spoken by Christ himself in the gospels actually transubstantiated the bread

¹¹⁰ For a recent, short but balanced discussion of the labyrinth concept in Calvin, see Herman J. Selderhuis, *John Calvin: A Pilgrim’s Life*, trans. Albert Gootjes (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2009), p. 35.

¹¹¹ Chandieu, *Refutatio libelli*, pp. 37-8.

¹¹² Chandieu, *Refutatio libelli*, pp. 38-9.

¹¹³ Chandieu, *Refutatio libelli*, pp. 41-5.

he held in his hand.¹¹⁴ The following debated questions need only be noted: how many words precisely are needed for consecration of the host; whether the bread and wine are consecrated simultaneously or not; how to understand the pronouns and the copulative in “This is my body”; and, whether an impious priest can successfully consecrate the elements.¹¹⁵ He notes on the latter point that the common view is that consecration depends on the right intention of the priest. But then it may happen often that consecration actually doesn’t occur!¹¹⁶

Altogether this second part of the treatise is a retort. Chandieu takes the argument of de Saintes against the Reformed Churches and turns it back against him in regard to the Roman Catholic Church.

The arguments of the Refutatio – III. Religious orders are divisive

The disputation closes with part three, a further refutation of de Saintes’ “insults.” Here Chandieu points to the various religious orders in the Roman Catholic Church. He argues that the differences between Benedictines and Franciscans are much greater than those between Geneva and Zurich. The Reformed don’t call themselves Zwinglians or Calvinists, but Christians. They are not divided.¹¹⁷ Before calling on God

¹¹⁴ Chandieu, *Refutatio libelli*, p. 46.

¹¹⁵ Chandieu, *Refutatio libelli*, pp. 47-8.

¹¹⁶ Chandieu, *Refutatio libelli*, p. 49.

¹¹⁷ Chandieu, *Refutatio libelli*, pp. 50-53. Compare the earlier arguments regarding the variety of religious orders made by François Lambert d’Avignon in his *In regulum Minoritarum, et contra universas perditionis sectas, Fransisci Lamberti Avenioneni. Commentarii vere Evangelici, denuo per ipsum recogniti & locupletati. Sectarum Regni filii catalogum in prologo habes* ([Strassburg]: s.n., 1523). In folios a8v to b3r Lambert lists some 94 sects within the Roman Catholic Church.

as his witness, he also reminds de Sainctes that the Reformed Churches obey the king of France.¹¹⁸

Medieval Sources in the Refutatio

A word must be added about Chandieu's sources. All told, Chandieu quotes and references the medieval scholastics, including Gratian, about 150 times. His quotations from Gratian's *Decretals* are particularly noteworthy: Gratian is quoted some forty-five times in part 2 (not including *Glossa* references which may also derive from Gratian). All of the quotations are drawn from Part III of the *Decretals* (*De consecratione*), distinction 2, regarding the bread of the sacrament. Chandieu uses Gratian overwhelmingly to support the Reformed position and challenge de Sainctes that the medieval scholastics who followed Gratian did not agree with the very *Decretals* to which they were bound.¹¹⁹ Chandieu makes this point often by beginning his discussion of a *quaestio* with statements from the *Decretals* and then following these with debate from the later scholastics which contradicts the same. When one turns to the index of Chandieu's *Opera Theologica*, it becomes obvious that he knew his way around Gratian's *Decretals*, for the only other non-biblical author with more references is Augustine. The short *Refutatio libelli* of 1567 from early in Chandieu's career accounts for about one quarter of those.

¹¹⁸ Interestingly, de Sainctes would expire in prison in 1591 because he had advocated regicide in one of his late pieces of writing.

¹¹⁹ For example, Chandieu introduces a series of five quotations from the *Decretals* by writing, "Obstant tamen transsubstantiationi haec quae sequuntur." The quotes then support the Reformed understanding that the bread and wine are signs and do not change in substance. He then concludes, "Hic vide, Monache, in quot angustias te haec verba tui canonis adigant. Nam Christi similitudo adducta fateri cogit superesse substantiam panis. Deinde si haec propositio vera est, quemadmodum tui doctores affirmant, de pane fieri corpus Christi, evincetur hoc canone naturam & veritatem panis in Eucharistia remanere." Chandieu, *Refutatio libelli*, pp. 39-40.

Chandieu may not be saying *Gratianus totus est noster* but at least he is claiming strong continuity for the Reformed position.¹²⁰

The scholastics whom Chandieu quotes are Thomas (1225-1274), Astesanus (d. 1330), Bonaventure (1221-1274), Lombard (c. 1096-1164), Caetani (c. 1235-1303), Durandus (c. 1275-1332), Richard of St. Victor (d. 1173), Lanfrancus (c. 1005-1089), Scotus (c. 1250-1308), and Vincentius (c. 1190-1264?). Most of them are quoted multiple times. Select references to Augustine, Cyprian, and Chrysostom do occur, but the preponderance of quotations are from Gratian and the medieval scholastics. Interestingly, Chandieu does appear to follow his training in the *mos gallicus* inasmuch as he notes the historical development from Gratian to the later scholastics, yet he does not try to reconcile these authors with Gratian, given his own Protestant commitments.

Conclusion on the Refutatio

Keeping to the topic on which de Sainctes had attacked Calvin and Beza, Chandieu endeavours to refute him by castigating many of the medieval doctors for their seemingly useless debates about abstruse questions on the Eucharist. He used this discussion to prove that the Roman Catholic church was divided, presumably because their theologians could not agree. His disputation focuses on the medieval doctrinal discussions and actually has very little to say about the method of the Scholastics as such. In spite of his negative comment drawn from Tertullian about philosophy being the mother of all heresies (at the opening of section 2), his stated charge against the Scholastics was that they dabbled in opinions rather than maintaining the certainty of

¹²⁰ On Calvin's statement, "Augustinus totus noster est," see Anthony N. S. Lane, *John Calvin, Student of the Church Fathers* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1999), pp. 38-9.

God's Word. Chandieu quotes some ten medieval scholastic authors multiple times. Whether he possessed full copies of all the works he cited or also made use of other collections does not need to be determined for the present study, but we must at least appreciate his familiarity with Gratian and with the medieval scholastic methods and discussions.

Whether to designate Chandieu's 56 pages as scholastic in their method is debatable. On the one hand he does not appear to adhere to the style of the previous year's *Confirmation de la discipline ecclesiastique*, for the numbered arguments, gradation of authorities, and combination of positive and negative arguments seem not to be found. On the other hand, he himself calls the work a *disputatio*, and all the topics and quotations deal with scholastic theological writings. Furthermore, the overall division does follow that of a *disputatio* – first is the negative *responsio* to de Sainctes' main accusation (the action is to refute, *refellere*), then follows the positive response of Chandieu with its thirteen *quaestiones* (the action is to retort, *retorquere*), followed by the a wider retort (again, the action is *retorquere*). In fact, then, the type of structure of the previous year is adhered to roughly, with the difference being that there is only one opponent and one main argument in view. Thus – and in spite of the prose of the disputation falling *a bit more* on the side of rhetorical expansiveness and Chandieu's analysis not employing overt syllogisms or naming the logical errors of his opponents – the disputation is scholastic at the structural level. As we seek to label the work, we should remind ourselves that there was a continuum between the scholastic and humanist extremes with lots of healthy middle ground. Finally, to maintain the requisite level of

detail, our conclusion must transcend the mere designation of “scholastic,” and describe the particular scholastic features, as we have done.

Conclusion re. the 1560s

Without repeating all that has been concluded regarding the works of 1566 and 1567, it is clear that Chandieu was adept as a disputant. He brought to bear some sophisticated strategies and showed himself to be methodologically self-aware. He chose whatever method he considered most suited to the occasion. In 1566 he adhered to a fairly strict scholastic method, but at a popular level. In 1567 he wrote in Latin at a more academic level as he showed his familiarity with the discussions of the medieval schoolmen. Given his familiarity with their discussions, it seems reasonable also to conclude that he was familiar with their scholastic method. Further evidence of this will arise in the coming chapters.

Chapter 4

The 1570s: Chandieu's Scholastic Refutations Regarding Lawful Calling

Introduction

Ten years after the refutation of Claude de Saintes, in 1577, Chandieu produced two further scholastic works. Both dealt with a topic that had been in dispute since early Reformation times: the office and calling of Protestant, and specifically Reformed, pastors. Their post-1572 composition – after St. Bartholomew's massacre – meant that some readers had increased sympathy for the Protestants of France while at the same time potential converts were more fearful about leaving the Roman Catholic Church. Judging by Chandieu's writing, the issue of the lawful ordination of Reformed pastors must have been a burning question for certain "Nicodemites."

In the one work Chandieu expanded part of his 1566 *Confirmation* by composing a Latin treatise defending in general the lawful calling of Reformed pastors over against an insistence on a "visible" succession. In substance he argues that true vocation is only present where the ordination and the task are understood and carried out according to Scripture.¹ This work is rather prosaic, but its marginal notations and arguments speak for its scholastic character.

In the other work he entered the arena of higher-level written scholastic disputation in earnest when he defended Andreas Freyhub against Francisco Torres in *The Sophistries of F. Torres, a monk of the brotherhood which abuses the inviolable name of Jesus by the title of their sect, collected from his book Concerning the Church*

¹ A. Sadeele [Antoine de Chandieu], *De legitima vocatione pastorum ecclesiae Reformatae. Adversus eos qui in hoc tantum capite se ab Ecclesia Reformata dissentire profitentur. Ex libro de Disciplina Ecclesiastica* ([Geneva]: s.n., 1577). See chapter 2, p. 78, n. 115 for a bibliographic note on this work. See also Antonio Sadeele [Antoine de Chandieu], *Opera Theologica* (Geneva: Jean le Preux, 1593), pp. 541-60.

and Ordination of the Ministers of the Church, against the points of disputation at Leipzig, *each of which is subjected to a clear and true solution as required by the rules of sound and theological disputation*.² Like his *Confirmation de la discipline ecclesiastique*, this work may be termed scholastic as such. In it we encounter the first instances of fully developed and analyzed syllogisms in Chandieu's *oeuvre*.

We will satisfy ourselves here with a brief examination of the method of both works and leave for another occasion deeper discussion of the context and substance of his arguments, since both treatises' topics lie outside the scope of the present work and received much more attention by Chandieu in the following years.³

De legitima vocatione pastorum Ecclesiae Reformatae (1577)

In his more global defense of 1577 Chandieu does not identify a particular person as his opponent. Note well, however, that he is not disputing with those Roman Catholics who stand by all of the Roman teachings, but with those who agree with Reformed teaching in soteriology. They differ only in ecclesiology because they cannot overcome their sense that the Reformed pastors lack lawful ordination. Chandieu takes this question

² Antonio Sadeele [Antoine de Chandieu], *Sophismata F. Turriani Monachi ex eorum sodalitate qui sacrosanct Iesu nomine ad suae sectae inscriptionem abutuntur: Collecta ex eius libro De Ecclesia, & Ordinationibus Ministrorum Ecclesiae, adversus capita disputationis Lipsica. Quibus singulis subiecta est perspicua & vera Solutio ex praeceptis rectè & Theologicè disputandi petita* ([Geneva]: Pierre de St. André, 1577). In the *Opera Theologica* see pp. 561-602.

³ Chandieu states in the preface of his *Sophismata F. Turriani* that he considered apropos to his own calling the task of answering Torres because he had already addressed this some years before. What work he is referring to is unclear but given his audience here one would expect him to be referring to a scholarly Latin work. His 1566 *Confirmation* never appeared in Latin and his *De legitima vocatione* did not appear before 1577, as far as we know. "Praeterea quum ante aliquot annos hoc ipsum argumentum de legitima Pastorum nostrorum vocatione tractauerim, existimaui me nihil alienum ab officio facturum, si nouum hunc hostem idem certamen instaurantem exciperem, ne fortè meo silentio quibusdam videar scutum ad tergum reiecisse." Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, p. 562.

seriously, stating that he must dispute⁴ with those adversaries who attempt to overturn the principle part of Reformed ecclesiastical polity by their assertion, for if the Reformed pastors are not legitimate, the churches cannot have true preaching, lawful administration of the sacraments, or church discipline – the marks of the true church. To the contrary, he asserts that all the marks of the true church are found among the Reformed and reasons from this conclusion to the legitimacy of Reformed ordinations. His introduction closes with three rhetorical questions, stated hypothetically, “If however those who have chosen them and acknowledged them to be true pastors are churches of God; if they were chosen according to the regulations of the gospel, and if they were faithfully engaged in their own office,” then (he says in sum) they cannot be rejected.⁵

Scholastic terms to guide the reader

After the introduction, the reader notices rubrics in the margins – scholastic terms which identify the steps of the argument. For instance, early on Chandieu advances and refutes three *rationes* given by his opponents. First, that the earliest teachers (*doctores*) of the “Reformed churches” were not called by the Roman church but actually rejected by them; second, that the church should be bound to certain times, places, or persons; and third, that visible succession is a mark (*nota*) of the church.⁶ His response includes the concern that huge sections of the church would thereby be excluded, such as all the

⁴ “adversus eos nunc nobis disputandum est.” Chandieu, *De legitima vocatione pastorum*, p. 1 (*Opera Theologica*, p. 541).

⁵ “Si enim Ecclesiae Dei sunt, quae illos elegerunt, & pro veris Pastoribus agnouerunt: Si ipsi ex praescriptis Evangelicis sunt electi, si fideliter officio suo funguntur . . .” Chandieu, *De legitima vocatione pastorum*, p. 3 (*Opera Theologica*, p. 542).

⁶ Chandieu, *De legitima vocatione*, pp. 3-10 (*Opera Theologica*, pp. 542-3). I am, of course, not limiting the description of his arguments merely to what we find in the marginal notations.

Eastern church. Next he offers his *responsiones* to five *objectiones*. Here he refers to Scripture frequently.⁷ In the last of these responses, he homes in on what “succession” means, citing multiple passages from the church fathers to argue that real succession is the “succession of faith,” a “succession to the apostolic faith,” and “a succession of piety.”⁸ Thus, with Tertullian, one must argue from faith to persons, not from persons to faith.⁹ According to Augustine, succession is only present where the doctrines of the apostles are maintained, for the church is built upon the Word of God, not upon certain men.¹⁰ In summary, this section of the disputation is negative, arguing against the thesis of his opponents.

The treatise becomes quite rhetorical in the mid section, asking multiple questions regarding the legitimacy of the Papists’ ordinations and orders, and claiming that the pope is not the rightful heir of Peter. Chandieu uses a more humanist term for this section, calling it an *oratio*.¹¹ After this he begins to argue more positively for his own position on extraordinary calling, for he asserts that the external form of the church has often precluded the Roman Catholic idea of an outward succession, for the church has often suffered disruption due to apostasy. The reader is guided through the discussion by marginal notations of three *loci* while the text of the treatise carries on prosaically. The first locus appeals to Second Chronicles 15 where the prophet Azariah came to King Asa

⁷ Chandieu, *De legitima vocatione*, pp. 10-15 (*Opera Theologica*, pp. 543-4).

⁸ Chandieu, *De legitima vocatione*, pp. 18-27 (*Opera Theologica*, p. 545-7). “fidei Successio” (p. 19). “[P]rimū doceant apud se esse verae & Apostolicae fidei successionem” (p. 20). “Concludemus hac elegantissima Nazianzeni sententia: pietatis, inquit, successio, propriè successio existimanda est” (pp. 27-8).

⁹ “[N]on fidem ex personis, sed ex fide personas probari debet.” Chandieu, *De legitima vocatione*, p. 21 (*Opera Theologica*, p. 546).

¹⁰ Chandieu, *De legitima vocatione*, pp. 22-3 (*Opera Theologica*, p. 546).

¹¹ Chandieu, *De legitima vocatione*, p. 33 (*Opera Theologica*, p. 549).

and reminded him that Israel had been without God, sacrifices, teachers, and God's law for a long time. The second appeals to various biblical images of the church that suggested fluctuation in the church's faithfulness, such as the church as a vine or tree which sometimes grows wild. Ambrose even once said the church is like the moon, waxing and waning. The third recounts the history of disruption and apostasy in the Old Testament church. A marginal note labels this *locus* an *inductio*, indicating that the many Old Testament references are to be understood as so many particulars which together support a universal.¹²

After this, Chandieu summarizes in hypothetical form his own thesis by stating that ordinary calling should be followed and accepted when the church exhibits all the marks of a true church. When, however, the church is corrupted, extraordinary calling is necessary, as it was in the early period of the Reformation.¹³ The latter point is then explained with five *argumenta*, followed by a conclusion.¹⁴ Next our author reviews two *obiectiones* to his own thesis, each of which receive a *responsio*. This leads to what constitutes an extraordinary calling. His opponents argue that such must be accompanied by the performing of miracles. Chandieu offers five *rationes* why this is not always the

¹² Chandieu, *De legitima vocatione*, pp. 38-9 (*Opera Theologica*, p. 550). The notation "locus II" is missing in the margin of the original work but not in the *Opera Theologica*.

¹³ Chandieu, *De legitima vocatione*, pp. 42-3 (*Opera Theologica*, p. 551). He explains on p. 59 that God uses extraordinary calling to re-establish the church in times of apostasy. Elsewhere he singles out Wyclif, Hus, Luther, Zwingli, Oecolampadius, Calvin, and Bucer as most learned pastors and doctors from whom much of the Reformed churches flowed (p. 62). The extraordinary calling was a confessional point for the French Reformed Churches, already established in 1559 in article 31 of the Gallican Confession. See Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1983), vol. 3, p. 377.

¹⁴ Chandieu, *De legitima vocatione*, pp. 44-8 (*Opera Theologica*, pp. 551-2).

case.¹⁵ All of these disputational terms appear in the margins rather than in the text. The marginal notations also include summaries of the arguments' substance.¹⁶

Interestingly, he admits that the early Reformers such as Luther, Zwingli, Oecolampadius, and Calvin did not perform miracles, but then he suggests that the Reformation itself – coming out of all the darkness of the Roman Catholic church – is the miracle.¹⁷

“Common sense” enlisted in his support

Although *De legitima vocatione pastorum* is less scholastic than the *Confirmation de la discipline ecclesiastique* of 1566, it does maintain a similar hierarchy of authorities. For example, Chandieu states in objection five that when his adversaries cannot find any support in the testimony of Scripture [1] or in its examples [2], they flee to the authority

¹⁵ Chandieu, *De legitima vocatione*, pp. 52-5 (*Opera Theologica*, pp. 553-4).

¹⁶ Muller notes the presence of marginal notations indicating disputational structures, among other things, in the sixteenth and seventeenth century editions of Calvin's *Institutio* as examples of a scholastic framework. Richard A. Muller, *The Unaccommodated Calvin* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp. 45-6, 62-78. Irena Backus has “qualified” Muller's descriptions. Irena Backus, “*Loci communes*, and the Role of Ramism in the European Diffusion of Calvin's Reformation,” in *Giovanni Calvino e il calvinismo*, ed. Laura Ronchi De Michelis and Lothar Vogel (Rome: Carocci, 2010), pp. 233-47. Backus argues that some of the marginalia and summaries of Calvin's *Institutes* made the book “adaptable to a variety of doctrinal positions” (p. 234), particularly to Ramism (p. 244). Several points are worth noting: First, Muller focused on the earlier work of Nicolas Colladon (1530-1586), Augustin Marlorat (1506-1560), and Caspar Olevian (1536-1587), whereas Backus mostly focused on Johannes Piscator (1546-1625), who was actually a Ramist. Given the dates of their contributions, the indices, etc., by Marlorat and Colladon could hardly be characterized as Ramist. Second, Muller did note that Edmund Bunnie's (1540-1618), William DeLaune's (16th c.), and Olevian's summaries of the arguments in chart form were “of an Agricolan or Ramist character” (p. 65; see also pp. 66, 73). Third, Backus follows Perry Miller and Howard Hotson in contrasting Ramist “logic” with Aristotelian by stating that “Ramus and his disciples replaced syllogistic reasoning by a series of definitions and dichotomies” (p. 235). In fact, Ramus actually treats the syllogism *in extenso* in his *Dialectica* (*Dialectica libri duo* [Paris: Wechel, 1560], pp. 147-208). Many examples of Ramists utilizing enthymemes and syllogisms could be advanced, including the example of Piscator. In my view, Ramus's method was well suited to the scholastic approaches of the era, and the apparatuses analyzed by Backus, while Ramist in inclination, are at the same time scholastic in method. I prefer to avoid a false dilemma here. Finally, I question Backus's characterization of Ramus's pedagogical *method* as a *doctrinal position* – an unusual tact she appears to take when one compares the thesis of her article with its conclusion.

¹⁷ Chandieu, *De legitima vocatione*, pp. 57-9 (*Opera Theologica*, p. 554-5).

of the church fathers [3].¹⁸ This is where he explores what the fathers meant by “succession.” The treatise quotes Augustine and Tertullian about a dozen times each, plus many other fathers. Recourse to the medieval doctors is limited to a couple of references to Gratian in the final summarizing argument, which is reproduced below.

With his scriptural and early church arguments in place, Chandieu can then add that “common sense” itself supports his position. Rhetorically, he asks what choice the Reformed churches have with respect to lawful ordination when every day they see men from among the papist doctors convert to the Reformed churches only to be rejected and condemned by the papists.¹⁹ Their only recourse is to root the early Reformed ordinations in an extraordinary calling, and thereafter develop their own practice of ordinary calling.

Finally, Chandieu moves beyond the scope of his disputation somewhat, to engage the doctors of the Sorbonne in particular, with respect to four objections they had expressed in a written disputation with Bucer.²⁰ Here he defends, for instance, the view that the New Testament words for “bishop” and “elder” refer to the same office. While identifying two *errores* of his opponents’ argument, one of which is a *non sequitur*, he also defends the practice of a plurality of elders participating in the ordination of a pastor by laying on hands.²¹

¹⁸ Chandieu, *De legitima vocatione*, p. 16 (*Opera Theologica*, p. 544). Compare his statements about the “express testimonies of Scripture” on p. 48. The language he typically uses regarding the church fathers or the examples of the early church in relation to the teachings of Scripture is that they “confirm” or “strengthen” the doctrine. They may not found doctrine, in his view.

¹⁹ Chandieu, *De legitima vocatione*, pp. 60-61 (*Opera Theologica*, p. 555).

²⁰ Chandieu, *De legitima vocatione*, pp. 62-74 (*Opera Theologica*, pp. 556-8). Chandieu does not specify any particular titles or the name of the Sorbonne teacher(s) in view, but mostly likely he is thinking of Barthélemy Latomus who taught at the Collège Royal. See Willem van’t Spijker, *The Ecclesiastical Offices in the Thought of Martin Bucer*, trans. John Vriend and Lyle D. Bierma (Leiden: Brill, 1996), pp. 286-306. Bucer also debated with Eck and Pighuis on ecclesiology, *ibid.*, pp. 282-6.

²¹ Chandieu, *De legitima vocatione*, pp. 64, 69-70 (*Opera Theologica*, p. 556, 558). The French Reformed Churches considered the practice of laying on hands to be beneficial but not of the essence of ordination.

The lengthy summarizing argument, expressed hypothetically

A motif found elsewhere in his works brings his arguments to a conclusion – a lengthy conditional or hypothetical argument which summarizes and recaps many of his earlier points. (We might note that Scripture uses such arguments also, for instance in First Corinthians 15:12-19 and especially in Second Peter 2:4-9.)²²

Now therefore we have come to the conclusion of this treatise, which I will soon bring to an end completely. I will bring together at this place divine and human laws so that they join in battle and with their forces united make an attack on papistic succession, and overthrow it entirely for our benefit. For if he who enters into the sheepfold from another place instead of through the door, that is, through Christ, is not a pastor, as Christ himself teaches; if in order that one might be a bishop, he must be lawfully examined, chosen, and admitted by the church, as the word of God prescribes; if a bishopric is a task, as Paul defined it; if those who are pastors ought to feed the flock, not shamefully pursuing wealth, but with a ready heart, not as domineering clerics, but as examples to the flock, as Peter warns; if he who speaks in the church ought to bring forth the very utterance of God, as the same apostle taught; if Paul and Barnabas taught by their own example that elders should be ordained by the laying on of hands and by lawful election; behold, will any place at all remain for the calling and succession of the papist bishops?

Again, if anyone who is defiled by venerating foreign [gods] cannot be a bishop, as Cyprian piously related; if one who longs to be in charge [but] not to be useful is not a bishop, as Augustine argued; if a bishop from whom no sound leaves his mouth is dead, that is, who does not preach the word of God, as Gregory said at length (indeed, I gladly pass over the papist priests who recite not so much to others as to themselves); if those who by means of wealth or the partiality of leaders come into the episcopacy are not bishops and do not have the power to ordain other bishops, as the old canons determined; if, in the end the matter comes back to this, that the episcopate and priesthood are not a function of the church, that is, an office, but are the office of the Head, that is, a sacrifice; if the bishop cannot be elected apart from a synod and whenever he was made in another way, an arrangement of such a kind had no validity; if those who buy and sell the sacred offices (as they call them) are not priests, as it was confirmed by the ancient canons; if, as the same Canons determine, schismatics have no authority at

The Synod of Gap in 1603 decided that any churches that were laying on hands for the ordination of elders ought to cease the practice, restricting it to the ordination of pastors. John Quick, *Synodicon in Gallia Reformata* (London: T. Parkhurst and J. Robinson, 1692), vol. 1, p. 22.

²² The first regards the relationship of Christ's resurrection to the resurrection of believers; the second regards God's power to keep prepared and to carry out a judgment against the ungodly.

all in the church; if Pope Eugene, having damned schisms, nevertheless persisted in the papacy,²³ and the other popes, bishops, and priests proceeded from him afterward; if, I say, they acknowledge, transmit, approve all these things, or rather, certainly these defenders of the Roman churches do not dare to condemn them; is there anyone anywhere who would take up the cause of papal succession, which is condemned by the very laws and decrees of the papists?²⁴

On the whole this summarizing argument is “destructive,” opposing his opponents’ thesis. Although some of the arguments support Chandieu’s thesis regarding the legitimacy of Reformed ordinations, he does not include his arguments about the Reformed churches being true churches and thus having lawful ordination and calling. This latter point comes back, however, as he brings the treatise to a close. He returns to those who consider the Reformed churches to be right in doctrine but lacking the proper succession of office. He simply states that true succession is not in name but must be according to the God’s Word. Indeed, since the Roman Catholic orders do not abide by

²³ Chandieu is referring to Pope Eugene IV who ruled from A.D. 1431-1477. During his reign the struggle between conciliarists and papists came to a head. In 1439 the conciliarists excommunicated Eugene and set up Felix V as an antipope. However, Eugene fought back and regained Rome in 1443.

²⁴ “Iam ergo pervenimus ad huius Tractatus conclusionem, quam ego priusquam penitus absoluam, huc & Divinas & humanas leges convocabo, ut concurrant, & coniunctis viribus in Pontificiam Successionem impetum facientes, eam nobis funditus evertant. Nam si ille Pastor non est qui aliunde quam per ostium, id est, per Christum ingreditur in caulam ovium, ut ipse Christus docuit: si ut quis sit Episcopus, eum necesse est legitime probari, eligi & ab Ecclesia recipi, ut verbo Dei Praescriptum est: si Episcopatus est opus, quemadmodum Paulus definivit: si qui pastores sunt, debent pascere gregem, non turpiter assectantes lucrum, sed prompto animo, nec ut dominantes cleris, sed ut exemplaria gregis, ut Petrus admonuit: si qui in Ecclesia loquuntur, debet ipsa Dei eloquia proferre, ut idem Apostolus praecepit: si Presbyteros τῇ χειροτονίᾳ & legitima Ecclesiae electione instituendos esse Paulus & Barnabas exemplo suo docuerunt: ecquid, cedo, loci supererit Episcoporum Pontificiorum vocationi & Successioni? Rursus, si, qui alienis cultibus polluuntur, non possunt esse Episcopi, ut sanctè tradidit Cyprianus: si Episcopus non est, qui prae esse cupit non prodesse, ut censuit Augustinus: si Episcopus mortuus est, è cuius ore nullus sonus exit, id est, qui non praedicat verbum Dei, ut aliquando dixit Gregorius (libenter enim praetereo Sacerdotes Pontificios qui non tam aliis quam sibi canunt:) si, qui pecunia aut favore Principum ad Episcopatum perveniunt, Episcopi non sunt, nec habent ius instituendi alios Episcopos, ut veteres Canones statuerunt: si tandem huc res rediit, ut Episcopatus & sacerdotia iam non sint Ecclesiae munera, id est, officia: sed Principum munera, id est, dona: si Episcopus eligi non potest absque Synodo, & ubi secus factum fuerit, talis institutio nullius sit momenti: si qui sacros (ut vocant) ordines vel vendunt, vel emunt, Sacerdotes non sunt, ut veteribus Canonibus sancitum est: si, ut iidem Canones definiunt, schismatici nihil prorsus habent iuris in Ecclesia: si Papa Eugenius schismatis damnatus, nihilominus permansit in Papatu, & ab eo caeteri postea Pontifices, Episcopi & Sacerdotes profluxerunt: si, inquam, haec omnia agnoscunt, tradunt, probant, vel certè improbare non audent ipsi Romanae Ecclesiae propugnatores, ecquis unquam suscipiat causam Pontificiae successionis, quae ipsis Pontificiorum legibus ac decretis damnata est?” Chandieu, *De legitima vocatione*, pp. 80-82 (*Opera Theologica*, p. 560).

the Word, they are not legitimate. However, here Chandieu had to tread a fine line since the ordinations of many of the early Reformers were never repeated in the Reformed churches, but simply carried on from their earlier Roman Catholic ordination. The French Reformed Synod of Gap in 1603 would specify that when their theologians discussed the call of the first Reformers, they ought to ground this in their extraordinary calling rather than their earlier ordination in the church of Rome.²⁵

Sophismata F. Turriani . . . rectè & Theologicè disputandi (1577)

Francisco Torres was born in 1509 (same year as Calvin) and thus senior to Chandieu, but he did not become a Jesuit till 1567. From about 1570 until his death in 1584 he wrote many polemical works against Reformed authors such as Pierre Bouquin, Andrzej Wolan, and Antoine de Chandieu. His polemics with Chandieu extended from 1577 to 1584, with Chandieu's last response occurring in 1583. As noted above, Chandieu first engaged Torres by defending Freyhub against him.

Andreas Freyhub (1526-1585) was a Philippist Lutheran who held a professorship in Leipzig and had written in 1571 on the lawful calling and ordination of ministers of the Word.²⁶ Since said work already engaged an earlier publication of Torres, he responded to it in 1574.²⁷ Around 1575 the Lutherans deposed Freyhub for his Reformed views and

²⁵ Quick, *Synodicon in Gallia Reformata*, vol. 1, p. 227.

²⁶ Andreas Freyhub, *Capita Disputationis in qua asseritur Ius Vocandi & Ordinandi ministros verbi Dei . . . Et simul breviter respondetur ad praecipua Argumenta, quae contra hanc recens à quidam Francisco Turriano sunt emissa* (Leipzig: Rambau, 1571).

²⁷ Francisco Torres, *Adversus capita disputationis Lipsicae Andreae Freyhub, De ecclesia, et de ordinationibus ministrorum ecclesiae* (Cologne: Calenius and Quentil, 1574). Torres earlier work on the subject was probably from 1569.

he seems to have been expelled the next year.²⁸ Soon after Freyhub's deposition Chandieu decided to publish a response to Torres; his dedicatory letter is dated March 1577 (in June 1577 Chandieu took up his position as teacher of theology in Lausanne). Chandieu proceeds by dividing his response into 12 loci, based on the 12 Scripture passages which were key to Torres' arguments. At the head of the discussion Chandieu summarizes, in syllogistic form, the entire argument of Torres and then offers his own syllogistic solution to make clear from the outset what his position will be in this disputation.

Leading the way scholastically and analytically

The scholastic style of the treatise appears immediately, for the subtitle speaks of subjecting Torres' arguments "to a clear and true solution as required by the rules of sound and theological disputation."²⁹ This suggests that Chandieu has certain rules at hand and will apply them. In his introduction, Chandieu addresses the occasion for his scholastic method further by noting that he is leading the way "scholastically" with Torres due to the disputation held in Leipzig "against which that inferior sycophant Jesuit published his book."³⁰ Presumably this means that Torres had produced a sophisticated enough treatise that a scholastically-styled refutation was necessary. Chandieu adds his

²⁸ John C. L. Gieseler, *A Text-book of Church History*, trans. Henry B. Smith (New York: Harper, 1862), vol. 4, p. 469, n. 42.

²⁹ "Quibus singulis subiecta est perspicua & vera Solutio ex praeceptis rectè & Theologicè disputandi petita."

³⁰ "Quod autem hic agam scholasticè cum Turriano, in causa est disputatio Lipsiae habita, aduersus quam ille sycophanta Iesuitaster suum librum edidit." Chandieu, *Sophismata F. Turriani in Opera Theologica*, p. 562. Chandieu appears to have invented the term "Iesuitaster." See J. Ramminger, "Iesuitaster," in *Neulateinische Wortliste. Ein Wörterbuch des Lateinischen von Petrarca bis 1700*, accessed August 09, 2012, www.neulatein.de/words/0/007536.htm. In 1586 Christiann Amport used the term *Iesuastri* (poor disciple of Jesus) in a book title: *Ad Sebastiani Verronis Friburgensium apud Helvetios Parochi Sacerdotis Iesuastri, quaestiones de Verbo Dei* (Geneva: Vignon, 1586).

disapproval of “those foolish men who scorn the rules for disputing rightly, bequeathed by the Philosophers, and arrogantly and stupidly (ἄπαιδευτῶς) disdain the analytical method (τροπος παιδεία).”³¹ This technical Greek term is for Aristotle’s method in his *Analytics*, and not just for “analytic” generally, as opposed to “synthetic.”³² Chandieu’s use of it is highly significant. In Claude Auberi’s textbook published 7 years later, it is defined it as the “analyticus eruditionis modus” of Aristotle in contrast to Aristotle’s “dialectica methodus.” The former, writes Auberi, was the way of explaining matters completely (perfectè), especially helpful for teaching and learning.³³ We have defined the term “Old Aristotelian” in the previous chapter, to describe this contrast. The fact that Chandieu refers explicitly to this contrast and appeals positively to the analytical method already in his preface to the 1577 work suggests that his appreciation of it may precede his contact with Auberi. It also means that he regards his entire refutation of Torres to make liberal use Aristotle’s methods in the *Prior* and *Posterior Analytics*. In this matter Chandieu almost certainly benefitted from the works of the Lutheran Jacob Schegk (1511-1587) who already in 1564 promoted at length reasoning based on Aristotle’s *Posterior Analytics*. Schegk’s concern was certainty in argumentation, though he did not

³¹ “Ita igitur visum est eo disserere, ut si praesens in Lipsensi Academia sisteretur: Neque moror ineptos quosdam homines, qui praecepta recte disputandi à Philosophis tradita, & ipsum τροπον παιδείας superbè & ἀπαιδευτῶς reiiciunt.” Chandieu, *Sophismata F. Turriani in Opera Theologica*, p. 562.

³² In the midst of an extended argument for establishing schools, Zanchi uses the terms “analytic” and “synthetic” in a similar but more general sense as follows: “Duplex ea cùm sit, συνθετικὴ καὶ ἀναλυτικὴ: mihi quoque sacras literas interpretaturo, Theologiamque professuro, utraque utendum est, sed suo quaque loco. In explicandis scripturis ἀναλύσει opus est: qua demonstrato inprimis auctoris scopo atque proposito, ad quod omnia, quae scribit, referuntur, totum corpus libri seu Epistolae in suas partes, totaque doctrinae summa in certas propositiones, & propositionum confirmationes tanquam in sua membra resolatur: In colligendis verò locis Theologicis è sacris literis iam explicatis, συνθεσις necessarii est . . .” Jerome Zanchi, *De Aperiendis in ecclesia scholis, deque opera sacrarum literarum studiis cumprimis danda* (Neustadt: Meyer, 1579), p. 18.

³³ Claude Auberi, *Organon: id est instrumentum omnium* (Morges: Jean le Preux, 1584), p. 1. English translators in the sixteenth century sometimes rendered τροπος παιδεία more simply as “logic.” This occurs, for instance, in the 1583 translation of Chandieu’s *De verbo Dei scripto*.

argue for as high a degree of certainty as did Chandieu.³⁴ In due course we shall further investigate Schegk's influence on Chandieu.

Chandieu did not want his readers to think, however, that his appreciation of Aristotle meant that philosophy could be a source for his arguments. In fact, when debating with Torres the definition of the church and the relation of particular visible churches to the catholic church, he challenges Torres not to derive his doctrines from philosophy or dialectics.³⁵ At the same time the relationship of the instrument of logic to the content of theology appears to be too intricate to allow this distinction to become a disjunction: After stating that the Word of God precedes the church, he tells Torres, "For if you had shown respect for the rules for rightly disputing, you would have seen that the church is redirected to the Word of God: as it were, the measured one stands before the measure."³⁶ In Chandieu's view, then, the rules for right method themselves direct the theologian to the Word of God as source.

Structure of the disputation

Our author opens the treatise by first presenting a summary of Torres' entire disputation in one thesis: "The ordination of Protestants is invalid, null, and merely of the laity." He states that Torres' assumption is that the Pope is the visible head of the visible

³⁴ Sachiko Kusakawa, "Lutheran uses of Aristotle: A comparison between Jacob Schegk and Philip Melanchthon," in *Philosophy in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries*, ed. Constance Blackwell and Sachiko Kusakawa (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1999), pp. 169-88, esp. pp. 174, 179-80.

³⁵ "Ego verò libenter hoc à te percontari velim, ex qua tandem vel Philosophiae vel Dialectices penu deprompseris, τὰ κατ' ὅλου aliis quàm mentis oculis videri posse?" Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, p. 566.

³⁶ "consequitur verbum Dei esse priùs Ecclesia. Quòd si ad leges rectè disputandi respexisses, vidisses Ecclesiam referri ad verbum Dei, tanquam τὸ μετρητὸν πρὸς τὸν μέτρον." Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, p. 565. Compare "rectè disputandi scientia" on p. 567.

church and under him as head there ought to be a continual succession of bishops. In syllogistic form, Torres' argument would then be:

All lawful ordinations depend upon the ordinary succession of bishops under the only head of the visible church, the Roman Pontiff.
But no Protestant ordinations are of such a kind.
Therefore no Protestant ordinations are lawful, but, by reason of the consequence are invalid, null, and merely of the laity.³⁷

Chandieu calls this a "sophism" – a deceitful or specious argument.³⁸ His own *solutio* to this sophism is then adumbrated. He singles out Torres' assumption regarding the pope being the head of the visible church, stating that it is "utterly defeated by the express passages of Scripture."³⁹ After laying out a series of argumentative steps, he adds that the arguments of Torres are not only false because they depend on false principles, but also inept, inasmuch as they can easily be refuted.⁴⁰ Finally, he states that having overturned Torres' arguments, he can now put forward the truth, which he does in the form of a counter syllogism.

All the ordinations which depend upon the laws and precepts of the Apostles and upon the express Word of God are lawful.
But the ordinations which occur in the Reformed Churches are of such a kind.
Therefore the ordinations of the Reformed Churches are lawful, and by reason of the consequence are authoritative, true, and purely ecclesiastical.⁴¹

³⁷ "Omnes legitimatae ordinationes nituntur ordinaria Episcoporum successione, sub visibili totius Ecclesiae capite Pontifice Romano. Nullae autem Protestantium ordinationes tales sunt: Quare nulla Protestantium ordinationes sunt legitima, sed, ex ratione consequentis irrita, nulla, & merè Laica." Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, p. 563.

³⁸ This is a somewhat Protestantized definition of sophism. For the more common understanding of what a sophism was, see below, ch. 7, p. 295.

³⁹ "Expressis Scripturae locis euincendum est." Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, p. 563. More expansive arguments occur on pp. 590-93.

⁴⁰ At this point Chandieu is of course not suggesting that his syllogism representing Torres' views is illogical or fallacious, but within the treatise he regularly names fallacies, as we will see.

⁴¹ "Omnes ordinationes quae legibus & praescriptis Apostolicis atque expresso Dei verbo nituntur sunt legitime. At ordinationes quae sunt in Ecclesiae reformatae sunt eiusmodi: Quare Ecclesiae reformatae ordinationes sunt legitime: &, ex ratione consequentis, ratae, verae, & merè Ecclesiasticae." Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, p. 564.

Such syllogisms do not characterize the whole of the treatise, but their presence at its commencement signals a higher-level academic modern-era disputation where the *respondens* advances a counter thesis against the *opponens*.⁴² Further syllogisms occur, but have not been typeset in any distinctive way by the printer (in the treatises of 1580-1589 font changes and indentation would lead the reader's eyes to the syllogisms).

Chandieu structures the rest of the treatise based on twelve key passages of Scripture he considers misused by Torres and at the same time all supportive of the Reformed position.⁴³ He calls each text and the treatment of it a *locus*, resulting in twelve *loci*. His use of the word *locus* accords well with Melanchthon's definition (drawn from Cicero and Agricola; not Aristotle), where "crucial biblical texts are (or provide) *loci* as 'seats' or 'grounds of arguments' (*sedes argumentorum*)."⁴⁴ Each one thus forms a "locus" for argument.⁴⁵ Evidently Chandieu did regard these twelve to be foundational, for he chose them based on his own analysis of Torres' work. Torres, after all, had treated in varying degrees quite a few more texts – he lists forty-six of them in his own *Index locorum sacrae scripturae hoc volumine explicatorum*.⁴⁶ Chandieu structures each locus identically: A few verses of the Scripture in question are quoted in larger font, then follows the particular *Sophisma Turriani* in italicized text (usually ten-twenty lines), and

⁴² See above, chapter 1, pp. 35-6.

⁴³ He introduces these as follows, "Loca ex quibus Turrianus argumentatur adversus ordinationes quae fiunt in Ecclesiis Protestantium." Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, p. 563. The loci are from Matthew 18:20, 16:18, John 21:15-17, Acts 10 and 11, First Peter 3:20-21, Ezekiel 34:20, First Corinthians 12:14ff., Hebrews 10:1ff., Isaiah 59:21, Matthew 28:19, Isaiah 1:26, and First Timothy 4:14 along with Acts 13:3, First Timothy 5:22, and Titus 1:5.

⁴⁴ Muller, *The Unaccommodated Calvin*, pp. 110-11. See also Quirinius Breen, *Christianity and Humanism* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1968), pp. 101-102. Ramus, of course, made abundant use of the locus method also, but this motif was much wider and earlier than Ramus. Thus its presence in Chandieu's works should not be called Ramist but Agricolan or Melanchthonian.

⁴⁵ "... huius loci Matthaei, de quo disputamus." Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, p. 567.

⁴⁶ Torres, *Adversus Freyhub*, c3r-c4r.

then in third position and in regular font Chandieu offers his own much lengthier *Solutio superioris Sophismatis*. All twelve *sophismata* are based on Chandieu's analysis of the logic of Torres' arguments and are thus stated more or less syllogistically. His "solutions" engage both the method and content of Torres' arguments, typically ending with a *conclusio*, followed by an ἀντίφασις [contradiction], that is, a statement of Chandieu's position which grows out of the exegesis and analysis within the given locus and is set up as a thesis against Torres' position on the particular Scripture of that locus. Syllogistic theses thus fulfill an important function in the disputation, though it should be noted that some are enthymemes. Once all twelve *loci* are complete, Chandieu also offers an ἀνακεφαλalaίωσις, that is, a summing up of the entire argument, with his last words being that Protestant ordinations are not humanly devised but "dependent upon the firmest foundation and most reliable truth of the Word of God."⁴⁷ This careful adherence to structure also characterized his 1566 *Confirmation* where he would introduce each argument, execute it, and then state briefly what he considered himself to have accomplished. These rubrics guide the reader through the arguments. Marginal notations frequently cite page numbers of Torres' disputation against Freyhub.

Pursuit of academic precision

In the longer analytical sections Chandieu makes other moves similar to 1566. For instance, the marginal notations sometimes note that Chandieu is rebutting (*refello*) an argument of Torres, sometimes offering a response to an objection of Torres (*responsio*),

⁴⁷ "Atque ita dicendum potius eas esse veras, legitimas, & verè ecclesiasticas, ut quae non humanis iustitutis, sed firmissimo verbi Dei fundamento, & certissima veritate nitantur." Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, p. 602.

while at other times he turns Torres' own arguments back against him (*retorquor*). Since the present treatise with its Latin language caters to a more educated audience than the 1566 French treatise, we find much more overt use of Hebrew (transliterated) and especially Greek (in Greek). This occurs for his biblical exegesis, but even more for Aristotelian philosophical terms which identify elements of arguments as well as errors in argument. For instance, he uses the Greek technical term for arguments that are not to the point, παρὰ τὸ μὴ αἴτιον (in Latin *ignorantia elenchii*), and another for conclusions that do not follow, παρὰ τὸ ἐπόμενον (in Latin *non sequitur*).⁴⁸ Demonstrative arguments – those that belong to the τρόπος παιδείας and bear the highest degree of certainty – are important to him as a theologian; he refers to these with cognates of ἀποδείκνυμι.⁴⁹ He shows his awareness of the distinction between positive, constructive arguments and negative, destructive ones when he uses the term ἀνασκευαστικῶς (a distinction structural to his 1580's "theological and scholastic" treatises).⁵⁰ Greek phrases can also indicate the importance and history of certain characterizations, such as the church being measured by Scripture and not the other way around – he writes τὸ μετρητὸν πρὸς τὸν μέτρον.⁵¹ Chandieu also proffers a number of advanced academic moves such as disputing elements of definition; offering theological distinctions; exegeting the given Scriptures philologically, grammatically, and contextually; and discussing instances of allegory, analogy, and equivocation (ὁμωνυμία), among others.

⁴⁸ Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, pp. 566, 587, 595.

⁴⁹ Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, pp. 556, 578, 583.

⁵⁰ Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, p. 574.

⁵¹ "The measured one [standing] before the measure." Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, p. 565.

Patristic and Medieval sources, especially Gratian

Although we do not find nearly the references to the church fathers and medieval schoolmen in *Sophismata F. Turriani* (1577) as we did in *Refutatio libelli Claudii de Sainctes* (1567) and *De legitima vocatione pastorum* (1577), a rough count unearths (not all are duly noted in the margins) seven citations for Augustine, three each for Chrysostom and Cyprian, one each for Justin Martyr, Basil, Nazianzus, Ambrose, Lombard, and Thomas. In nearly every case, Chandieu cites them favourably.

Similar to the 1567 refutation of Claude de Sainctes, once again we find the *Decretals* of Gratian being used in support of Chandieu's arguments. In fact, there are more than twenty references to Gratian. At least ten of these references are not noted in the margins and therefore also do not find mention in the Index of the *Opera Theologica*. This added decade of references to Gratian underlines what we noted earlier about Chandieu claiming Gratian for Protestants. Further, such references make a lot of sense in polemics with Roman Catholic theologians, since the *Decretals* had acquired such an authoritative status in the Roman Catholic Church. Finally, Chandieu's training at the University of Toulouse included abundant study of the *Decretals* as part of *le droit canonique*.

Conclusion

Sophismata F. Turriani focuses on biblical exegesis much more than the *Refutatio Claude de Sainctes* from a decade earlier, for obvious reasons: Chandieu had to stake the very legitimacy of the Reformed churches and their ordained pastors on the teachings of Scripture. This did not in any way preclude careful attention to the right rules for

disputing theologically. With the Word of God as the “firmest foundation,” Chandieu seeks to draw true conclusions which are valid according to the rules of analytical logic. In his preface, he characterizes the entire disputation as an exercise in the style of the *τροπος παιδεία* – at least, he castigates those who disparage it and states that the rules for disputing rightly are found there. At the same time he appears also to share in the Renaissance humanist enthusiasm for *ad fontes* inasmuch as he utilizes the Greek terms of Aristotle for various principles and errors of logic. The early medieval Gratian serves for corroboration. These various elements reflect his training at Toulouse.

Altogether, the structure, the syllogisms, and the analytical philosophical elements of method present a formidable and relatively sophisticated scholastic treatise. These elements – and the truth being defended by use of them – led Beza to recommend Chandieu’s work highly, and send many copies of the same to his correspondents.⁵²

Whereas his other work from 1577, *De legitima vocatione*, is significantly less scholastic, its marginal notations help guide the reader through the elements of the arguments and suggest that the author was paying careful attention to his method even while he composed a more prosaic argument. The closing argument is particularly noteworthy for its conditional or hypothetical structure and its summary of the whole treatise.

The state of Chandieu’s scholastic method c. 1577

Having overviewed two scholastic works from 1560 in chapter 3 and two more from 1570 in this chapter, we should draw some comparisons and conclusions.

⁵² Noted by the editors of Beza’s correspondence in volumes 18, 19, and 20. See, for example, *Correspondance de Bèze* (Geneva: Droz, 1998) vol. 20 (1579), letter 1334 (p. 23, n. 14).

Confirmation, from 1566, gives evidence of careful methodological considerations which result in a scholastic work of succinct and pointed arguments. The topic was a contemporary intra-Reformed argument about the structure of Reformed church polity in France. Since this situation in 1566 gave no occasion or reason to use the kind of terms and syllogisms we encounter in 1577, we cannot say whether Chandieu was or was not learned in the latter. But when the works of 1566 and 1567 are put side by side, we suspect that Chandieu was learned in scholastic disputation and even in medieval scholastic argument, for whereas his earliest scholastic treatise (1566) is a highly structured disputation with arguments and responses, weighted authorities, etc., that of the following year (1567) exhibits familiarity with the actual discussions of the medieval scholastic theologians and their method of *quaestiones*. Chandieu seems particularly acquainted with Gratian's *Decretum*, which he surely had studied at the University of Toulouse as a law student.

What the broader work of 1577 adds is the indication that even in a more prosaic argument, Chandieu is crafting his discussion scholastically, as a kind of first step that would precede rhetorical polish in the mind of its craftsman. The more specific polemical work of 1577 brings out special emphasis on the *τροπος παιδεία* and thus the use of overt syllogisms with analyses of them and the more learned Greek terms of Aristotle for the parts of disputation (for example, ἀντίφασις), types of arguments (for example, ἀνασκευαστικῶς), and types of logical errors (for example, παρὰ τὸ ἐπόμενον).⁵³ It sets these elements within a *loci* framework generally associated with the humanists and

⁵³ The term ἀντίφασις, for example, is found in Aristotle's *Prior Analytics*, Book1, Chapter 1 (24a23-25). The revised Oxford edition translates it as "a contradictory." The fact alone that Chandieu employs Greek for these terms highlights Aristotle as source.

in this case understood in the Melancthonian sense rather than the Aristotelian sense, showing that one need not drive the wedge between Melancthonian dialectic and Aristotelian analytical logic too deeply, and perhaps also suggesting that Chandieu, like many of his Reformed contemporaries, was somewhat eclectic in his choice of logical and dialectical systems and structures. All in all, he resorted to some fairly sophisticated scholastic formulations as the need arose.

Claude Aubert and the development of Chandieu's scholastic method

Chandieu "revived" the precepts of the Aristotelian method

The foregoing puts us in a good position to discuss the possible influence of Claude Aubert on Chandieu up to 1577. Aubert was identified especially by Donald Sinnema as the major influence on Chandieu's mature scholastic method. Sinnema wrote, "Yet these later developments [doctrinal opposition of Chandieu and the Swiss churches against Aubert c. 1587] should not detract us from recognizing the important influence of Aubert upon Chandieu in the years just prior to, and perhaps during, his writing of *De Verbo Dei Scripto* [1580]." ⁵⁴ He later concluded, "Claude Aubert ought to be recognized as one significant source of Chandieu's Aristotelian logic." ⁵⁵ Sinnema also pointed to Henri Meylan's (less definitive) remarks. Meylan wrote about Chandieu, "The method

⁵⁴ Donald Sinnema, "Antoine de Chandieu's Call for a Scholastic Reformed Theology (1580)," in *Later Calvinism: International Perspectives*, ed. W. Fred Graham (Kirkville, MO: Sixteenth Century, 1994), pp. 163-4.

⁵⁵ Sinnema, "Chandieu's Call for a Scholastic Reformed Theology," p. 189.

that he used in opposition to the arguments of the Jesuits is not without analogy to that which Auberi had recommended in his *Organon* (1584).”⁵⁶

Jacob Lect, Chandieu’s younger contemporary and his first biographer, described matters this way:

When he saw the new and deadly tricks of that new and proud sect which they call the Jesuits, he avidly learned [*avidé arripuit*] the precepts of the Aristotelian method and penetrated that distinguished art to such a degree and revived it out of the shadows and schools to practical use, that he might keenly and accurately investigate and destroy all the traps of those men. Therefore, insofar as Sadeel so vigorously and so effectively explained the particular and more obscure points of religion, insofar as he disseminated so much skill, insofar as he vindicated the shining brightness of heavenly doctrine from the pursuit of worldly darkness, posterity truly acknowledges it as owing to the effrontery and shamelessness of such sophists.⁵⁷

The overall emphasis of Lect is that the occasion of Jesuit polemics was instrumental to Chandieu’s utilization of Aristotle’s system, and that Chandieu used it effectively. He did not compose a commentary on logic, but put it “to practical use” in his disputations. One phrase of Lect is worth probing: *avidé arripuit* could mean “eagerly seized” (if we take the words separately) or “eagerly learned” (if we take them as a unit). The latter translation suggests Chandieu learned the *disciplina Aristotelica* for the occasion of disputing with Jesuits. This occasion did coincide with his contact with Auberi since Chandieu’s opposition to the Jesuits began in earnest in 1577 (though Lect makes no

⁵⁶ “La méthode qu’il emploie, à l’encontre des arguments des Jésuites, n’est pas sans analogie avec celle qu’Aubery allait préconiser dans son *Organon* (1584).” Henri Meylan, *La Haute École de Lausanne 1537-1937* (Lausanne: University of Lausanne, 1986), pp. 29-30.

⁵⁷ “Nouae & arrogantis sectae quam Iesuitarum appellant, nouas & exitiabiles tricas cum videret, Aristotelicae disciplinae praecepta avidé arripuit: sicque artem egregiam penetrauit, atque ex umbra & scholis in usum praximque reuocauit, ut eorum hominum laqueos omnes acutè & subtiliter excusserit, dissolveritque. Quare quòd praecipua & obscuriora Religionis capita, tam industriè, tam utiliter Sadeel enucleauit, quod tanta arte disseminauit quòd coelestis doctrinae nitidum iubar ab assectata seculi nocte vindicauit, id vero talium sophistarum procacitati & impudentiae posteritas ferat acceptum.” Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, d1r. Sinnema also translates the first of these two sentences. Sinnema, “Chandieu’s Call for a Scholastic Reformed Theology,” p. 163.

mention of Auberi). However, it is doubtful whether Lect, born in 1558, would have known the details of when Chandieu actually learned his philosophy, and so we should not make too much of “eagerly *learned*.” Lect’s biography is rhetorically expansive and rather general on these points.

Claude Auberi and the “highly erudite Frenchmen” of Lausanne

Claude Auberi was born in 1545 in France, received some of his education in Geneva, graduated as a doctor of medicine in Basel, and soon after found his way to Berne whence he was invited in 1576 to teach philosophy at the Academy of Lausanne.⁵⁸ The Academy installed him as their new professor sometime in the spring or early summer of 1576. In a letter dated July 7, 1576, Auberi informs his fellow doctor of medicine Theodor Zwinger of Basel that he is lecturing on Aristotle’s *Organon*. He also mentions Chandieu by name. “I have begun to explain the *Organon* of Aristotle before a numerous audience, for there are here some highly erudite Frenchmen – among them the Lord Chandieu, a very noble and learned man – who enjoy to the utmost the system of Aristotle.”⁵⁹ (Note that Auberi was a Frenchman himself.) A year later, on June 17, 1577, Chandieu was asked to be professor of theology at the Lausanne Academy. He began lecturing on Psalm 110 on June 27.⁶⁰ As the first year of their contact progressed, Auberi

⁵⁸ Eugène Haag and Émile Haag, *La France Protestante*, 2nd ed. (Paris: Fischbacher, 1877), vol. 1, pp. 440-41; Bernus, *Le ministre Antoine de Chandieu*, pp. 410-12 [1889: pp. 75-7]. Being from Triaucourt in Champagne he took the name Claudius Alberius Triuncurianus or Campanus. See William Heubli, *L’Académie de Lausanne à la fin du XVI^{me} siècle: Étude sur quelques professeurs* (Lausanne: Rouge, 1916), p. 12.

⁵⁹ “Organum Aristotelis explicare coepi frequenti auditorio. Sunt enim hic doctissimi quidam viri Galli (inter quos est dominus Chandaueus, vir nobilissimus et doctissimus) qui Aristotelis doctrina mirum in modum delectantur.” As found in Edward Boehmer, *Spanish Reformers of Two Centuries from 1520* (Strasbourg: Trübner, 1883), vol. 2, p. 152, n. 45.

⁶⁰ Bernus, *Le ministre Antoine de Chandieu*, p. 414 [1889: p. 79].

and Chandieu probably developed a strong friendship, for Auberi was godfather at the baptism of Chandieu's son Paul on November 13, 1577 (as was the French pastor Jean de Serres).⁶¹ A decade later, when Auberi published a work on Romans in which he made some un-Reformed statements about justification, Chandieu opposed him but acknowledged in 1590 in a letter to Grynaeus how difficult this was because he and Auberi were close friends.⁶²

Auberi's letter to Zwinger states that in Lausanne Auberi had encountered not just Chandieu, but a significant number of learned Frenchmen, all of whom appreciated to the highest degree the system of Aristotle.⁶³ This certainly does not mean that these Frenchmen were learning Aristotle for the first time from Auberi. Rather, Chandieu and his peers already had a developed appreciation for the system of Aristotle – not at all surprising for this era (see chapter 1 above), but no doubt a welcome thing for Auberi who would have known that Ramus had once lectured in Lausanne, since Zwinger, his correspondent and former teacher, had himself been taught by Ramus in Paris.⁶⁴ Whatever the case, an appreciation of Aristotle was already in place. Given Auberi's special mention of Chandieu, this must have been particularly true for him. Auberi's letter does not specify whether Chandieu and his fellow learned Frenchmen were all

⁶¹ Having a godfather was not uncommon, especially in tumultuous times. One of Lausanne's noblemen, Sebastien Loys, served in this capacity for Chandieu's son Isaiah (Sept 23, 1576). Bernus, *Le ministre Antoine de Chandieu*, pp. 407, 411 [1889, pp. 72, 76].

⁶² Bernus, *Le ministre Antoine de Chandieu*, pp. 411-12 [1889, pp. 76-7].

⁶³ Sinnema's translation (perhaps inadvertently) added an "s" to form "delights" instead of "delight." That is: "Chandieu, a well-known and very learned man, who delights . . ." Unfortunately, such a translation suggests that Chandieu was alone in delighting to the highest degree in Aristotle's system, whereas Auberi clearly used a plural verb (Bernus's French translation maintains the plural also), describing a number of learned Frenchmen. Sinnema, "Chandieu's Call for a Scholastic Reformed Theology," p. 163.

⁶⁴ James Veazie Skalnik, *Ramus and Reform: University and Church at the End of the Renaissance* (Kirksville, MO: Truman State University Press, 2002), pp. 110, 116; Howard Hotson, *Commonplace Learning: Ramism and its German Ramifications 1543-1630* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), p. 22. Note that Zwinger was of two minds about Ramus, as Hotson relates in this place.

following the lectures as such or whether their presence merely made the atmosphere conducive to lecturing on Aristotle. We should not press the letter too far.

Auberi's textbooks on early parts of the Organon

As we relate Chandieu and Auberi to each other, we note that both men were accomplished scholars, but Chandieu had more experience, more theological knowledge, and many more publications covering multiple genres. It is unlikely that Chandieu's seniority of 11 years or his noble status impeded their relationship, since Chandieu had been a vulnerable refugee and his humble character was widely attested.⁶⁵ At the same time we must realize that in 1576 Auberi was just beginning his scholarly career; he had published only one work before this – a Latin translation of a Greek work of Theodore II Ducas Lascaris (emperor of Nicaea, 1254-1258).⁶⁶

We can say without equivocation that Auberi had no influence on Chandieu's scholastic publications of 1566 and 1567; clearly Chandieu had learned, even mastered, the art of disputation long before contact with Auberi. To ascertain the possible influence of Auberi on Chandieu's 1577 publication (the preface was signed March 6, 1577), we would benefit from knowing more about Auberi's first 8 months of lectures. In fact, this

⁶⁵ For example, Abraham Musculus, Jean de L'Espine (or Jacob Stoer), and Jacques August de Thou all vouched for Chandieu's humility and modesty. See Bernus, *Le ministre Antoine de Chandieu*, pp. 121, 402 [1889, pp. 24, 67]; Jean de L'Espine, *De Tranquillitate animi, Libri VII*, trans. Thierry Gautier ([Geneva]: Stoer, 1594), b3r. The first edition of this translation by Gautier from de L'Espine's French to Latin had its preface signed March 1591. Chandieu had passed away in February. The second edition, cited here, then included an epitaph to Chandieu by Thierry (Theodore) Gautier with an introduction by the printer Jacob Stoer. The mention of Chandieu as a "modestissimus vir" occurs in said introduction.

⁶⁶ Theodore Duca Lascaris, *De Communicatione naturali libri VI*, trans. Claude Auberi (Basel: s.n., 1571). Auberi's translation of this work would have been important for his invitation to lecture on Aristotle, for it showed that he could access Aristotle in the original Greek – important in the time and a great illustration of what was said in chapter 1 above about the intersection of humanist *ad fontes* concerns with the teaching of philosophy and scholastic logic. Johannes Hospinian of Basel had published the entire Organon of Aristotle in Greek in 1564.

is not too difficult, since Auberi published three short textbooks, two in 1576 and another in 1577. Given Auberi's statement in his letter to the students in the first work of 1576, there is little doubt that Auberi simply started at the beginning of Aristotle's *Organon* and marched through it section by section.⁶⁷ After beginning with a 12 page prolegomena of his own making, he explained the earliest parts of Aristotle's *Organon*, closely following *De Categoriae* (1576) and *De Interpretatione* (1577) for 60 pages and 79 pages, respectively.⁶⁸ Given the normal pace of lecturing and the dates of publication of these small textbooks, it is highly unlikely that Auberi would have lectured on either the Prior or Posterior Analytics of Aristotle in time for Chandieu to use such learning in his disputation with Torres.⁶⁹ More likely Chandieu's syllogisms, analyses, structures, and many of his Greek terms in the 1577 disputation derived from his wider reading and his earlier education.

Auberi's early publications on Aristotle, noted above, do not make much of the distinction between Aristotle's dialectics and his analytics – not even the first work with its prolegomenal remarks, where one might expect such a discussion – whereas Chandieu appeals very strongly to Aristotle's analytics and criticizes those who neglect it. Now it is true that Auberi strongly iterates the same distinction in his 1584 *Organon*. As such, Auberi was part of a wider Reformed trajectory, for the Reformed philosopher of

⁶⁷ “Necessitas igitur ordinis διδασκαλικού, εὖ adduxit Aristotelem, ut à Categoriis inciperet.” Cl. Alberius, *Posteriorum notionum quas secundas intentiones & Praedicabilia vocant, Brevis & luculenta explicatio. In usum scholae Lausannensis* (Lausanne: François le Preux, 1576), a2r.

⁶⁸ Besides the work referenced in the previous note, see also C. Alberius, *Categoriae, quae vulgo praedicamenta dicuntur. In usum scholae Lausannensis* (Lausanne: François le Preux, 1576); Claudius Alberius Triuncurianus, *Περὶ ἐρμηνείας, seu De Enuntiationibus, quas propositiones vocant, in quibus verum & falsum primò diiudicantur. In usum scholae Lausannensis* (Lausanne: François le Preux, 1577).

⁶⁹ In July of 1579 an outbreak of the plague in Lausanne forced Chandieu to move to Aubonne (see p. 66 above). It may be that Auberi's lectures temporarily broke off at this point also and contributed to him publishing nothing more on Aristotle until the comprehensive commentary in 1584.

Heidelberg, Fortunatus Crell, published his commentary on Aristotle in 1584 also, appealing to the same distinction.⁷⁰ On this basis Risse calls both Auberi and Crell “Old Aristotelian” in contrast to “Melanchthonian Dialectic” (that is, they did not fudge the line between the Topics and Analytics, as Melanchthon did).⁷¹ What we cannot be certain about, however, is what Auberi’s stance was on this matter in 1576/77. He was happy, according to his letter of July 1576, to find in Lausanne some fellow Frenchmen who delighted “to the utmost in the system of Aristotle,” since this granted his lectures a good reception. However, for the years 1576-1583 Auberi published only on the very sections of Aristotle from which the structures of Melanchthonian dialectic presumably were derived.⁷²

A brief comment must now be made to clarify the distinction – advanced by Risse and utilized by Sinnema – between Melanchthonian Dialectic and Old Aristotelian method. Never was it Melanchthon’s purpose to exclude syllogisms and truth from dialectics or to weight all arguments as merely probable, but to ensure that logic served rhetoric. Thus, Melanchthon certainly treats many aspects of logic, including the various forms of the syllogism, in his works on dialectics. He also praises Aristotle as “the philosopher *par excellence* because of his logic,” argues for three grounds of certainty (experience, first principles, and rightly constructed syllogisms), and distinguishes merely

⁷⁰ These recommendations of Auberi from 1584 will be dealt with further in chapter 7 of the present work. See Claude Auberi, *Organon. Id est: instrumentum doctrinarum omnium: in duas partes divisum* (Lausanne: Morges, 1584), pp. 1-15, 331-66. Compare Fortunatus Crell, *Isagoge logica* (Neustadt: Matthæus Harnisch, 1584), pp. 271-90; 389-91.

⁷¹ Wilhelm Risse, *Die Logik der Neuzeit* Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Frommann, 1964), vol. 1, pp. 295-6.

⁷² Sinnema, “Chandieu’s Call for a Scholastic Reformed Theology,” p. 189. A recent essay erroneously and without foundation gives a date of 1580 for Auberi’s *Organon*. In fact, it was published in 1584. Ian Maclean, “Philippist hermeneutics after the Formula of Concord: the case of George Sohn (1551-1589),” in *Hermeneutik, Methodenlehre Exegese*, ed. Günter Frank and Stephan Meier-Oeser (Stuttgart-Bad: frommann-holzboog, 2011), p. 154, n. 26.

probable from certainly true propositions.⁷³ Thus, we should not press this distinction too far.

If one was to maintain that Auberi was a significant source for Chandieu's method in 1577, this could only be via special lectures by Auberi or by private conversation. If one was to point to Auberi as a significant source for Chandieu's theological and scholastic treatises of the 1580s, one would have to detail the developments of Chandieu's method in the 1580s treatises as compared to the 1577 work in particular, and then compare these particular developments to Auberi's precise recommendations in his 1584 *Organon*. Given the evidence here uncovered of Chandieu's appeal to the *τροπος παιδείας* with its method of demonstration (*ἀποδείξις*) early in 1577 and his intricate system of disputation in 1566, it would appear that much of his system used in the 1580s was already in place by 1577.

One searches Chandieu's works in vain for any reference to Auberi, which one might expect if Chandieu had learned his method from Auberi, particularly his method in the theological and scholastic works of the 1580s. In fact, the opposite occurs: in 1584, at the end of the preface of his *Organon*, Auberi urges his readers to follow the good example of an outstanding theologian friend of his who most accurately treats theological issues both theologically and analytically and refutes heresies.⁷⁴ Auberi recommends this theologian's work because of how well it illustrates what Auberi is arguing in his Aristotle commentary about utilizing analytical arguments as opposed to dialectical in

⁷³ Breen, *Christianity and Humanism*, pp. 102-103.

⁷⁴ "Omnibus exemplum esse potest praestantissimus Theologus amicus summus noster, qui, quo est iudicio acerrimo, *Analyticum eruditionis modum* statim vehementissimè amplexus, haereses refutare: & problemata Theologica Analyticè & Theologicè: hoc est, accurantissimè, tractare coepit." Auberi, *Organon*, p. 14. Noted by Sinnema, *Chandieu's Call for a Scholastic Reformed Theology*, p. 176, n. 76. Compare Henri Meylan, "Claude Aubery: L'Affaire des 'Orationes'," in *Recueil de Travaux publié à l'occasion du quatrième centenaire de la fondation de l'université* (Lausanne: University of Lausanne, 1937), pp. 15-16.

theological polemics. His statements do not amount to an admission of Chandieu influencing him, but they also do not claim any credit for Chandieu's method. We encounter, as Meylan observed, an "analogy."

Deeper probing of Chandieu's method in chapter 7 below will uncover key elements of method which do not derive from Auberi. We must even acknowledge the possibility that Chandieu's method came first, and Auberi's recommendations in the 1584 *Organon* actually stem in part or whole from observing Chandieu's method.⁷⁵ At any rate, Chandieu's publications were championing the analytical method well before either Auberi's or Crell's. Most likely Chandieu had been trained in or had read earlier champions of the "Old Aristotelian" perspective.

Conclusion re. Auberi's influence up to 1577

We may conclude at this point that we have no evidence that Auberi was a significant source for Chandieu's scholastic method up to 1577. It may be that some of the Greek terms used by Chandieu in 1577 were encouraged by his interaction with Auberi, but these were readily available from other sources, including, undoubtedly, Chandieu's education at Toulouse. For that matter, Chandieu could certainly have acquired Johannes Hospinian's Greek edition of Aristotle, published in 1564 (or any number of other editions of Aristotle, Greek or Latin).⁷⁶ Additionally, we have noted the

⁷⁵ I doubt this possibility could be proven, nevertheless, the evidence we have allows it to stand as possible. Perhaps an exhaustive reading of Auberi's *Organon* would unearth a number of examples which parallel earlier arguments of Chandieu; I have found one: Auberi's discussion (1584) of how to defeat the argument that the pope is the visible head of the visible church closely fits with Chandieu's (1577). Compare Auberi, *Organon*, pp. 430-32 with Chandieu, *Sophismata F. Turriani* in *Opera Theologica*, pp. 582-6. Of course, as Chandieu notes, the argument was "Protestant" and not unique to Chandieu.

⁷⁶ Aristotle, Ἀριστοτέλους Ἀσκληριαδου του σταγειριτου ὄργανον, ed. Johannes Hospinian (Basel: Ioannes Oporinus, 1564).

work of Jacob Schegk from the same year. In this 500 page work he clearly promoted the method of Aristotle's *Analytics* as a better way to truth than the dialectical way of Aristotle's *Topics*.⁷⁷ He also freely quoted Aristotle's Greek terms from the *Analytics*. Both of these books were published in Basel, putting them in Reformed quarters and making them very accessible to Chandieu. Schegk also published a seven hundred folio commentary on Aristotle's *Organon* in 1577, the same year as Chandieu's *Sophismata F. Turriani*. In it he also promoted the analytical method – likely also as a reflection on his polemical interchange with Pierre de la Ramée from 1569-1571.⁷⁸ This work, alongside Schegk's 1564 work, could much more reasonably be suggested as inspiration and source for Chandieu's promotion of the analytical method than Auberi's work of 1584.⁷⁹ In addition to these particular sources, Aristotle's system held sway, generally speaking, whether in the faculty of law, medicine, or theology (note well that Auberi had a degree in medicine and in the letter quoted above was writing to Zwinger, a fellow doctor). Thus, no one should be surprised that Chandieu had Aristotelian techniques in his quiver.

Some Conclusions re. Chandieu's Sources of and Occasions for Scholastic Method

A further remark about Chandieu's mastery of genres is apropos. The multiplicity of genres he mastered argues for methodological self-awareness. Already in 1566 the tight argumentation with the brevity of the arguments in the *Confirmation* signify Chandieu's utilization of scholastic method. This is remarkable when situated

⁷⁷ Jacob Schegk, *De Demonstratione libri XV, novum opus . . . in duos posteriorum analyticorum Aristotelis libros commentarium* (Basel: Joannes Oporinus, 1564), b3r-b5v and *passim*.

⁷⁸ Sachiko Kusakawa, "Uses of Philosophy in Reformation Thought: Melanchthon, Schegk, and Crellius," in *The Medieval Heritage in Early Modern Metaphysics and Modal Theory, 1400-1700*, ed. Russell L. Friedman and Lauge O. Nielsen (Dordrecht: Kluwer, 2003), p. 149.

⁷⁹ Jacob Schegk, *Organi Aristotelei* (Basel: Eusebius Episcopus, 1577).

within the wider context of Chandieu's other writings – we see that from the start he was as much at home in legal-type documents such as the *Discipline ecclesiastique* of 1559 as in the flowing poetry against Ronsard in 1563 and almost everything in between, such as the martyrology he published in 1563, the stage play of 1561, and the refutation of Claude de Saintes in 1567. By 1576 he already had six pieces of published poetry – the polemical poetry with Ronsard written for French elites being the best known – and in 1576 he published the initial installment of what would become his very famous *Octonnaires de la Vanité et Inconstance du Monde*. At the very same time that his output of scholastic work increased sharply – 1576 to 1583 – he would keep working on the *Octonnaires* until he had completed fifty stanzas of exquisite expression in 1583. Evidently Chandieu considered his choices of method very carefully, given the wide range of his abilities. Whatever his chosen genre, the man was a wordsmith.

One of the reasons he did not earlier pen a scholastic treatise as sophisticated as that of 1577 surely had much to do with the occasion. Specifically, the types of learned attacks of the Jesuits were just beginning, the very first in the mid to late 1560s with quite a few more between 1570 and 1577. This was when Petrus Canesius, Diego de Ledesma, Willem van der Lindt, Stanislaus Hosius, Jerome Osório, Theodoor van Pelt, Luca Pinelli, Antonio Possevino, Piotr Skarga, Jerónimo Torres, Francisco Torres, Gregory de Valentia, and Andreas Vega all began to write more or less learned disputations against the Protestants. Most of these men were Jesuits. Obviously Chandieu had learned the principles of disputation before this time, as witnessed by his *Confirmation de la discipline ecclesiastique*. But whether prior to 1577 he had all the tools for higher level purely *analytical* disputation such as we find in his *Sophismata F. Turriani* is impossible

to say, mainly because the audiences and occasions for disputation had not up to that time required it. The disputation with Torres was the first time that Chandieu engaged a Jesuit in print, but it would be far from the last.

As we search for sources of Chandieu's method, we are strongly confirmed in the view that his education at Toulouse included the study of Gratian's *Decretals*, for he was in the faculty of law. As was common in the time, he would have obtained a law degree in civil and canon law.⁸⁰ The multiple uses of Gratian in his works of 1567 (about 45x) and 1577 (about 20x) are highly significant. Even his work of 1566 – which was entirely for a French Reformed audience of ministers and elders – included a reference to Gratian. Anyone familiar with Gratian had been reading early scholastic theology and scholastic law studies.

The varying structures of the four works we studied in this and the previous chapter suggest that Chandieu was not simply copying one model learned in classroom disputations at Toulouse or elsewhere. Rather, his teachers had purposefully inculcated various models in their students, and no doubt he had also learned from reading various medieval and early modern disputations.

Clearly, when we now step back to review the list of Chandieu's publications and the place of the 1566, 1567, and 1577 disputations, we may conclude that they were his early forays into this genre and that following them his scholastic output rose significantly, for his bibliography is chock full of highly technical scholastic works throughout the 1580s. The existence and usage of his scholastic method should by now in our analysis not be remarkable. The earliest usage of this academic style of writing

⁸⁰ In his early career John Calvin, who also studied law, quoted Gratian frequently. See Jean-François Gilmont, *John Calvin and the Printed Book*, trans. Karin Maag (Kirksville, MO: Trueman State University Press, 2005), pp. 142, 160, 165-6.

appears thus far to be occasioned by the polemics at hand and no doubt due also in part to the natural bent of Chandieu's lawyer-like and methodologically self-aware mind.

As we turn to the following chapters to study the programmatic first "theological and scholastic" treatise from 1580, academic instruction will also be noted as an occasion for this kind of writing. Further details on Auberi's influence as well as interesting and rather unique aspects of Chandieu's scholastic method also await us.

Chapter 5 Prolegomenal Matters in 1580: “Theological and Scholastic”

Introduction

In both the sixteenth century and today, historians have highlighted the novelty of Chandieu’s scholastic method. Already in 1592 his biographer Jacques Lect said that he “revived” scholastic method; in 1980 Wilhelm Neuser said that his use of Aristotelian logic in Reformed theology was “new”; and in 2005 Olivier Fatio designated him one of the “fathers” of Reformed scholasticism.¹ These characterizations stem particularly from the set of six “theological and scholastic” treatises published by Chandieu in the 1580s. The treatises were all entitled similarly with the word “scholastic” appearing unabashedly and intentionally in each title.

In this chapter we will subject Chandieu’s programmatic preface to detailed analysis. This preface appears in his 1580 *De verbo Dei scripto* and presents itself as a prolegomena for all the “theological and scholastic” treatises that would follow. In it Chandieu explicitly identifies his choice of genre, situates it in reference to other choices, and defends it. For 1592 the preface received a significant update that made more explicit Chandieu’s theological foundations. He takes a firm Aristotelian – Thomistic position on theological (and other) axioms or principles. He also defends his use of the word “scholastic” in relation with the word “theological.”

¹ Lect: “atque ex umbra & scholis in usum praximque reuocauit.” Antonio Sadele [Antoine de Chandieu], *Opera Theologica* (Geneva: Jean le Preux, 1593), d1r; Neuser: “dieser Anspruch der aristotelischen Logik auf theologischem Gebiet ist neu.” Wilhelm Neuser, “Dogma und Bekenntnis in der Reformation: Von Zwingli und Calvin bis zur Synode von Westminster,” in *Handbuch der Dogmen- und Theologiegeschichte*, ed. Carl Andresen, vol. 2 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980), pp. 310-11; Fatio: “il est l’un des pères de la scolastique réformée.” *Dictionnaire Historique Suisse*, sub “Chandieu, Antoine de,” accessed July 04, 2012, <http://www.hls-dhs-dss.ch/textes/f/F11077.php>.

Choosing a Scholastic Style, not Rhetorical

In chapter 1 above we already noted the distinction between an analytical and rhetorical treatment of doctrine. Chandieu, like many authors before him, illustrates the difference with reference to a closed fist (analytical, to the point) and an open hand (rhetorical, free-flowing, persuasive).² Dolf te Velde pointed to Hyperius' *De theologo, seu de ratione studii theologici* (1556) for this distinction and noted his recommendation that the scholastic/analytical method be used in the schools.³ Te Velde does not mention that this is an ancient distinction arising from Zeno. Donald Sinnema describes this section of Chandieu's preface in a way that can hardly be improved upon.

Chandieu's usage makes it evident that he used the term [analytical] in reference to the field of "Analytics," i.e., the *Prior Analytics* and *Posterior Analytics* of Aristotelian logic, and thus in reference to reasoning by syllogism and logical demonstration. Since such reasoning was usually associated with the schools, this accords with the school-related connotation that the term "scholastic" also carried in the sixteenth century.

Such a scholastic or analytical way of arguing Chandieu clearly distinguished from fallacious reasoning and sophistry (*sophistis fallaciis*; cf. Aristotle's *De Sophisticis Elenchis*), which he regarded as the customary form of reasoning used by the Jesuits of his day. Likewise, he distinguished it from topical reasoning (*Topicis exercitationibus*; cf. Aristotle's *Topica*), which deals not with certain principles but with debatable opinions and probabilities. Finally, he distinguished it from rhetoric with its copious and ornate eloquence. Hence Chandieu's scholastic approach differed from the rhetorical style of the humanist tradition, which so influenced sixteenth-century modes of expression.⁴

Sinnema thus identifies three distinct forms of reasoning and/or writing which Chandieu forgoes in his "theological and scholastic" treatises. He continues by noting that Chandieu in no way intended to detract from a rhetorical approach if it was properly

² See above, chapter 1, p. 30, including the literature in n. 91.

³ Dolf te Velde, *Paths Beyond Tracing Out* (Delft: Eburon, 2010), p. 79.

⁴ Donald Sinnema, "Antoine de Chandieu's Call for a Scholastic Reformed Theology (1580)," in *Later Calvinism: International Perspectives*, ed. W. Fred Graham (Kirkville, MO: Sixteenth Century, 1994), p. 170.

used. Indeed, as we have seen above, Chandieu was a master at various genres, and pleaded simply for the right application of each one. Chandieu's explanation – as translated by Sinnema – follows:

I maintain that there are two ways of treating a topic theologically. The one, abundant and composed in a copious style, teaches even the ignorant and arouses the slow of comprehension to embrace the doctrine of the truth. The other, however, is exact and yet contracted, and, with those things set aside which are added to influence minds and with the cloak of eloquence removed, it simply and plainly displays to us the things themselves, and sets forth bare arguments, so that the very truth of things can almost be gazed at with our eyes and touched with our fingers.⁵

Chandieu also compares the two approaches to the difference between examining a body's anatomy and skeleton and seeing the body whole, with flesh and blood. The latter is more pleasant, but knowing the former helps us understand and treat the latter.

Theologians who analyze arguments can thus be as doctors who detect the origins of maladies. They – as true scholastics – can do this while avoiding a flood of vain words or slurs against their opponents.⁶

After reviewing Chandieu's discussion of the two approaches, Van Asselt rightly concludes, "The use of one or another of these genres depended on the situation. We are sure to encounter the rhetorical approach more in homiletical or popular theological works, and the scholastic genre in academic and polemical contexts."⁷

⁵ "Quod ad tractandi rationem attinet: duplicem esse statuo Theologicam tractationem: unam, plenam & uberiori stylo compositam, quae & rudes doceat, & tardos excitet ad veritatis doctrinam amplectendam: Alteram autem, accuratam quidem sed contractam, & quae sepositis iis quae ad commouendos animos adhibentur, detractaque orationis veste, res ipsas simpliciter & enunciatè nobis explicet, atque argumenta nuda proponat: ita ut ipsa rerum veritas oculis propemodum conspici & digitis atrectari possit." Antoine de Chandieu, *Opera Theologica* (Geneva: Jean le Preux, 1593), p. 11. See Sinnema, "Chandieu's Call for a Scholastic Reformed Theology," p. 171.

⁶ Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, p. 12; compare p. 9.

⁷ Willem J. van Asselt, *Introduction to Reformed Scholasticism*, trans. Albert Gootjes (Grand Rapids, MI: Reformation Heritage Books, 2011), p. 83.

When this distinction is recognized, the distaste with which some view scholastic treatises suggests that they may be expecting the wrong thing from them. Few students expect a prosaic science textbook; why then expect that a theology textbook should be rhetorically pleasing? By no means does Chandieu think that all theological writings should be scholastic, but just as strongly does he plead that not all theological treatises should be rhetorical, for theology deals with deep matters of truth, grounded in Scripture. The hard datum of teaching encourages a brief and succinct treatment of the categories, distinctions, and arguments. More prosaic works can follow, but a textbook is expected to be more like a manual that one first learns in the classroom setting and afterward consults from time to time on specific questions.

Chandieu was not the only Reformed theologian of this era concerned with method. Lambert Daneau also examined Hyperius's recommendations in *De theologo* closely, but did not endorse them as sufficient. Convinced by his pupil Bastingius to publish his own *De methodo Sacrae Scripturae*, Daneau added a third category, a middle ground between Hyperius's flowing rhetorical style and more compressed analytical style. Daneau appreciates Aristotle, Aquinas, and scholastic theology, but argues that some combination of Hyperius's two methods is needed for effective pulpit ministry.⁸

The Titles of the "Theological and Scholastic" Treatises

Chandieu's first of six theological and scholastic treatises begins with the word *locus* and argues the sufficiency of the written Word of God over against the Roman

⁸ Lambert Daneau, *Methodus Sacrae Scripturae in publicis tum praelectionibus tum concionibus utiliter tractandae* (Geneva: Pierre de St. André, 1579), pp. 27-37. See the discussion in Olivier Fatio, *Méthode et Théologie: Lambert Daneau et les débuts de la scolastique réformée* (Geneva: Droz, 1976), pp. 64-74. Chandieu may well have agreed with Daneau with respect to preaching, since his own use of the scholastic method was designed for polemics and for the academic setting of the classroom, not for sermons.

Catholic appeal to an unwritten tradition.⁹ In 1577 he had used the term *locus* for the treatment of and focus on particular Scripture texts as *sedes argumentorum* (foundations of argument) in his controversy with Torres. In 1580 his entire treatise is characterized as a “locus” – a place, area, or even topic of controversy – in theology. This is a small change from 1577, but not very remarkable, given the common and flexible use of the term *locus* among Reformed and Lutheran theologians in his era.¹⁰

The second theological and scholastic treatise (1581) also uses “locus” in its title, but the four that follow drop “locus” while retaining the “theological and scholastic” terminology. Typically they were called treatises or tractates (*tractationes* or *tractatus*), although Chandieu at first called the third and fourth *disputationes* (1583, 1585). He switched the fourth to *tractatio* in the second edition (1590), while the third made the same switch in the 1592 *Opera Theologica*, presumably to reconcile the titles of all six treatises (his son’s doing?).¹¹ Clearly the term *disputatio* could apply to any of the six

⁹ Antonio Sadeele [Antoine de Chandieu], *Locus de Verbo Dei scripto, adversus humanas traditiones, theologicæ et scholasticæ tractatus* (Morges: J. Le Preux, 1580). This work was translated into English in 1583 and into French in 1596. However, translations in this chapter are my own. A. Sadeele, *A Treatise Touching the Word of God Written, against the Traditions of Men, Handled both Schoolelike, and Divinelike*, trans. John Coxe (London: John Harrison, 1583); Antoine de Chandieu, *Traité theologic et scholastique, de la parole de Dieu*, trans. Simon Goulart (Geneva: Jean le Preux, 1596). I will utilize the *Opera Theologica* and draw comparisons only when changes are noted.

¹⁰ See the discussion in Richard Muller, *The Unaccommodated Calvin* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), pp. 101-117, 179-81, 186. Muller discusses Calvin’s use of *loci* within his historical context.

¹¹ Antonio Sadeele [Antoine de Chandieu], *De unico Christi sacerdotio et sacrificio, adversus commentitium missæ sacrificium, theologia et scholastica tractatio* (Geneva: J. Le Preux, 1581). [Chandieu], *De vera peccatorum remissione, adversus humanas satisfactiones et commentitium Ecclesiæ Romanæ purgatorium, theologia et scholastica disputatio* (Morges: J. Le Preux, 1582); _____, *De veritate humanæ naturæ Jesu Christi: theologia et scholastica disputatio* (Geneva and Morges: Jean le Preux, 1585); _____, *De spirituali manducatione corporis Christi et spirituali potu sanguinis ipsius in Sacra Coena Domini: theologia et scholastica tractatio* (Geneva: Jean le Preux, 1589); _____, *De sacramentali manducatione corporis Christi et sacramentali potu sanguinis ipsius in Sacra Coena Domini: theologia et scholastica tractatio* (Geneva: Jean le Preux, 1589).

volumes, for they are all structured identically as disputations.¹² But – though sections of these treatises began life in classroom disputations (as Meylan speculated and as we will prove) and though Chandieu’s structure is quite scholastic – he may have avoided the term *disputatio* in the titles for the fact that he was not engaging any particular opponent.¹³ (His own publisher noted the latter point in 1590.)¹⁴ The more general term *tractatio* (i.e., “discussion”) frequently occurs for publications by Beza and Vermigli. It also appears in the titles of works by Bucer, Ochino, Bullinger, and many other Reformed theologians.¹⁵ We should not lose sight of its late medieval meaning, which may tie such *tractatus* or *tractationes* to the classroom.¹⁶ Although the theological *tractatus* appears to have had a more popular beginning in the fourteenth century through the attempts of Jean Gerson, John Wyclif, and others to make persuasive popular-level arguments on single theological topics, in time it also had a classroom application.¹⁷ Kenney and Pinborg write, “[A] need arose [in the late medieval period] for more systematic expositions of doctrine. The standard title for such expositions is *summa*, which originally meant a

¹² Certainly within the treatises Chandieu refers to his works as *disputationes*. Within the works individual chapters can also be called *disputationes*, as in “the previous disputation,” meaning the previous chapter.

¹³ For Meylan’s suggestion, see: “On peut supposer aussi que tel de ses traités théologiques publiés par Jean le Preux à Morges, comme par exemple le *Locus de Verbo Dei scripto adversus humanas traditiones, theologice et scholastice tractatus*, sont issus des disputes régulières de l’Académie auxquelles il dut participer.” Henri Meylan, *La Haute École de Lausanne, 1537-1937* (Lausanne: University of Lausanne, 1986), p. 29.

¹⁴ The remark of the publisher occurs in a letter to the reader for Chandieu’s *Index errorum Gregorii de Valentia*. He writes, “Testatus est enim Sadeel in suis Theologicis & Scholasticis Tractationibus velle se de re ipsa agere, omissis personis.” Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, p. 343.

¹⁵ For instance, Théodore de Bèze, *Tractatio de polygamia* (Geneva: Jean Crespin, 1568); Peter Martyr Vermigli, *De sacramento eucharistiae tractatio* (Zurich: Gessner and Wyssenbach, 1552).

¹⁶ For further information, see p. 248 below.

¹⁷ Hobbins characterizes the fourteenth century appearance of such tracts, especially from Jean Gerson (1363-1429), as attempts to “apply magisterial learning to the real world,” and as “a treatment of a single moral case with some connection to the world outside the university in a form brief enough to be easily distributed.” Daniel Hobbins, “The Schoolman as Public Intellectual,” in *The American Historical Review* 108:5 (Dec 2003): pp. 1318-21.

summary, or *tractatus* (treatise). Such expositions were generally intended for the use of beginners in order to facilitate their introduction into a discipline.”¹⁸ Development continued from the late medieval era to Chandieu’s, such that the title *tractatus* conforms to Chandieu’s several references in his prefaces to the candidates of theology. His *tractatus* were treatments of a single doctrine in a fairly comprehensive way, strongly argued.

The Programmatic Introduction to the “Theological and Scholastic” Treatises

Editions of the preface in 1580, 1584, and in the 1592 Opera Theologica

The treatise of 1580 opens with an important preface on the topic of the true method of disputing theologically and at the same time scholastically. Neuser calls this “an impressive defense of the use of Aristotelian philosophy in theology.”¹⁹ Neuser would be more correct if he restricted his comment to Aristotelian logic and not Aristotelian philosophy generally speaking. Donald Sinnema’s fine essay on this preface can now be improved upon in some points, as I will show.²⁰

From the outset some brief remarks about the editions of this preface are in order. Compared to the original preface from 1580, his 1592 *Opera Theologica* contains a preface to *De verbo Dei scripto* (and to the entire *Opera*) with substantial additions on the matter of theological axioms. Sinnema suggested that the 1584 edition of *De verbo*

¹⁸ Anthony Kenny and Jan Pinborg, “Medieval philosophical literature,” in *The Cambridge History of Later Medieval Philosophy: From the Rediscovery of Aristotle to the Disintegration of Scholasticism 1100-1600*, ed. Norman Kretzmann, Anthony Kenny, and Jan Pinborg (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), p. 33.

¹⁹ “eine eindruckliche Verteidigung des Gebrauchs der aristotelischen Philosophie in der Theologie.” Neuser, *Handbuch der Dogmen- und Theologiegeschichte*, vol. 2, p. 309.

²⁰ Sinnema, “Chandieu’s Call for a Scholastic Reformed Theology,” pp. 159-90.

Dei, to which he did not have access, might contain the updated preface. His reasoning was understandable, namely that, “this is the only other edition in which Chandieu could have had a hand.”²¹ With much easier access to sources today, including the 1584 edition, we now know that its preface is identical to the 1580 preface and that the enlarged preface first appears in the posthumous 1592 *Opera Theologica*. This suggests that before his death in 1591 Chandieu either envisioned a new edition of *De verbo Dei* or perhaps a single publication of all six of his “theological and scholastic” treatises or possibly even a publication of all of his theological *opera*. For a number of reasons the most likely of these three possibilities is the latter.

First, Chandieu already had the *Opera* of all his scholastic works up to 1584 published in London, with *De verbo Dei scripto* as the first disputation (the *Meditationes* on Psalm 32 open the collection).²² Having published more scholastic works in the same style afterward, a new and improved edition of the preface was desirable.

Second, *De verbo Dei scripto* clearly forms the starting point of Chandieu’s theological work, so that an updated preface for it would pertain to all the treatises that follow and even to all of Chandieu’s biblical disputational literature. Indeed, only the preface is updated; not the actual treatise.²³ Further, the particular additions, which regard theological axioms or principles, were not needed for *De verbo Dei* alone but more as an explanation of Chandieu’s already established method in all his treatises.

²¹ Sinnema, “Chandieu’s Call for a Scholastic Reformed Theology,” p. 168, n. 39; compare p. 176, n. 76, where Sinnema speculates on the “intriguing question” of how the changed preface would relate to the lengthy “oratio apodictica” of Claude Auberi, also published in 1584 by Jean le Preux at Morges.

²² Antonio Sadeele [Antoine de Chandieu], *Antonii Sadeelis viri clarissimi vereque theologi de rebus gravissimis controversis disputationes accuratæ theologice et scholastice tractatæ* (Cambridge: Thomas Thomson, 1584).

²³ Chandieu states the priority of this treatise as follows: “Caeterùm, propono disputationem, de verbo Dei scripto, quae vt primaria est, ita debet esse Theologicarum omnium disputationum fundamentum.” Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, p. 3.

Third, Chandieu had become deathly ill while accompanying Henri de Navarre as chaplain in 1588. He recovered, but lived only 3 more years and probably had a keener sense that his time might be limited.²⁴ This could have motivated him to prepare for a new *Opera*.

Fourth, the comments of Chandieu's son Jean in the dedicatory letter to King Henry IV hint at a plan of his father ("as if bequeathed and endowed by our father's inheritance"), even if he doesn't overtly say it was his father's plan. Jean writes,

Therefore I and my four remaining brothers now reverently offer to Your Majesty, O most Christian King, this volume, a work of our father, as if bequeathed [and] endowed by testament from our father's inheritance – by him [Jean] who already then dedicated himself and all he possessed to his father, and we hope that Your Majesty will receive this monument of our service and your graciousness with kindness, just as then you deigned to patronize our father with grace and kindness.²⁵

Given Chandieu's care for Henry's spiritual well-being and his deep concern that Henry remain steadfastly Protestant in the presence of Roman Catholic courtiers, the dedication to him was apropos.²⁶

²⁴ Chandieu returned to Geneva in March of 1588 and passed away in February of 1591.

²⁵ "Ego igitur & reliqui fratres mei quatuor, Maiestati Vestrae, Christianissime Rex, nunc illud volumen Parentis nostri Operam, religiosè offerimus, quasi ex haereditate paterna legatum testamento relictum ab eo qui iam olim ei se, suos, suaque omnia vouerat & addixerat: quod quidem nostri obsequii, vestrique beneficii monumetum Maiestas vestra clementia sua Regia, ut speramus excipiet, sicut olim Parentem illum nostrum gratia & benignitate sua prosequi dignata est." Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, a3r.

²⁶ Earlier in the dedicatory letter Jean de Chandieu reminds the King that his father Antoine de Bourbon had rescued Jean's father from prison back in 1558 (see chapter 1 of the present work). The passage quoted here indicates that while Henry had become Chandieu's patron, Chandieu had also put the king in his debt. The fact is that in the years 1585-1588 Henry had put Chandieu in a difficult position by having Chandieu pursue funding from foreign governments and churches with the promise that Henry would pay them back once he became King of France. This did not happen, which may help explain why Jean does not show as much deference as one might expect. August Bernus, "Le ministre Antoine de Chandieu d'après son journal autographe inédit (1534-1591), cinq parties," in *BSHPF* 37 (1888): p. 623. Published the following year as a monograph: August Bernus, *Le ministre Antoine de Chandieu d'après son journal autographe inédit, 1534-1591* (Paris: Imprimeries réunies, 1889), p. 115. References which follow will cite the BSHPF article first, since it is more accessible. References to the monograph will follow in square brackets.

Fifth, we are also aware of other instances where Chandieu updated a work to adjust to a new situation or offer improvements. Two examples can be given: in the 1590 edition of his refutation of the monks of Bordeaux Chandieu added a 20 page refutation of Gilbert de Coyffier's 1586 *Defence de la verité de la foy catholicque contre les erreurs de Calvin*; and, also in 1590 the second edition of Chandieu's *De veritate humanae naturae Iesu Christi* had a couple of short passages added to oppose Claude Auberi (without naming him).²⁷

Sixth, Chandieu mentions some rules for the proper interpretation of Scripture which he had spelled out in his second refutation of Torres (1581). He quotes only the fifth rule in his additions to the preface, and directs the reader to the work against Torres to see the rest. This would be most fitting if the works against Torres were bound with said preface. Binding those seven years of polemics with the theological and scholastic treatises would have been fitting also because the topic of the former was included in his list of topics to be treated already in the opening letter of 1580, to be described below.²⁸

Finally, for Chandieu's sons to include the new preface in the *Opera* in spite of it never having been published before, Chandieu would have had to tell his sons where to find the addition and what to use it for. The forgoing leads me to think that sometime before his death Chandieu envisioned the publication of a new *Opera Theologica*.

²⁷ For the information on the additions to *De veritate humanae*, I am indebted to: Bernus, *Le ministre Antoine de Chandieu*, p. 411, n. 3 [1889, p. 76, n. 3].

²⁸ Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, p. 11.

The opening letter of 1580

Whatever the case regarding a plan for the publication of his *Opera*, without question Chandieu's opening letter in 1580 (distinct from and prior to the preface just discussed) envisaged a series of theological and scholastic treatments of Reformed doctrine. This letter was written to his fellow French Reformed pastors to encourage them to maintain their opposition to the "falsely named" Jesuits. Chandieu recommends the analytical method of disputation and states his intention to cover the topics of Christ's human nature, the presence of Christ in the sacrament, the lawful calling of pastors, and purgatory. He fulfilled his desire on the first two and the fourth with "theological and scholastic" treatises while the third received ongoing attention in his polemics with Francisco Torres from 1577 to 1583. Interestingly, Chandieu also stated his intention to treat a topic, which, as far as we know, he never did: freedom of choice.²⁹

Whereas Chandieu states that he will address the matter of his analytical method further in the preface, he cannot hold himself back from recommending it to his fellow pastors in this opening letter. Holding close to the "Old Aristotelian" model he mentions the distinction between the Analytics on the one hand and the Topics and Rhetoric on the other. He advocates the analytical method for theological disputation and states that he is not going to follow the "muddy rivers" of the new method of certain recent men.³⁰ This ambiguous statement could refer to many rhetoricians from Valla to Melancthon to

²⁹ Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, p. 3. He added, "and other similar [topics]."

³⁰ "Porro eam disputandi methodum, mihi sequendam proposui, quae accommodatior visa est, vt Theologica, ac propterea verè Analytica disputatio: non solum ab ἀπατητικαῖς ratiocinationibus & Sophisticis fallaciis, sed etiam à Topicis ac Rhetoricis exercitationibus distingueretur: ipsamque methodum, quoad eius fieri potuit, haurire malui expurissimus veterum fontibus, quàm turbidos eorum riuulos consectari, qui nostra memoria nouum quendam disserendi modum excogitarunt." Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, p. 2.

Ramus, though the latter seems most likely.³¹ However, the reader is not left to think that more copious treatises have no place, for Chandieu also states that these are suitable to their time and place. He urges his theological opponents to utilize plain and clear syllogisms, drawn from the “shadows of the schools” and brought out for all to see.³²

This opening letter presents the work as a polemical scholastic piece. A bit farther afield one can also discern its apologetic purpose, inasmuch as Chandieu wants the Reformed churches to appear academically respectable to the French crown. Given Chandieu’s close association with Henry IV, King of France, his son Jean would dedicate the *Opera Theologica* to this king. But Chandieu’s own works do not contain many such dedications, and those that do occur are to foreign rulers, to encourage them in their Reformed faith: of Germany, of the Spanish Netherlands, and of Poland.³³ Part of the reason may be that Chandieu was not a client or vassal indebted financially to any political ruler; at times another reason was his desire for anonymity. But from his early assignment from the French Reformed churches to speak to the king (1559) to his *Epître au roi* (1560), his (minor) role in the Conspiracy of Amboise (1560), his sparring with Ronsard (1560s), his frequent arguments for the legitimacy of the calling of Reformed pastors (1566-1583), and his direct service to the king (1585ff.), Chandieu would have

³¹ Both Sinnema and Neuser single out Ramus as the opponent Chandieu has in mind. Chandieu writes in the plural of “those who within recent memory have invented a new way of arguing,” without specifying. Sinnema, “Chandieu’s Call for a Reformed Scholastic Theology,” p. 173; Neuser, *Handbuch der Dogmen- und Theologiegeschichte*, vol. 2, p. 311.

³² “Quamobrem peto à pontificiis, praesertim ab iis qui sibi disputandi scientiam imprimis arrogant, ut eam ex scholae umbraculis in solem atque pulverem . . . & vicissim suam sententiam confirmare conentur, planis atque perspicuis syllogismis.” Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, p. 3. Note that throughout this treatise Chandieu has in mind the Roman Catholic theologians generally, and not any particular opponent. Thus I will refer to his opponents in the plural, as he does.

³³ *De veritatae humanae naturae* (1585) is to the German princes and magistrates; *De spiritali manducatione* (1589) is to Frederick of the Palatinate; *De sacramentali manudactione* (1589) appears to be for Prince Mauritz of the Netherlands; *Sophismata F. Turriani* (1577) is addressed to Wilhelm, Landgrave of Hesse; *Assertionum Posnaniensium* (1583) is dedicated to the Polish Lord Stanislaus.

always been well aware of the many Roman Catholic influences in the French court. He was not about to leave the French Reformed Churches without a theological defense at the highest academic level. Although his apologetic purpose in adopting scholastic method is not at the forefront, we do well to keep it in mind.

The Preface: I. Theology as a Science with Principles or Axioms (1592)

Chandieu subtitles his preface, “Concerning the true method of disputing theologically and at the same time scholastically.”³⁴ The meaning of each term – “theological” and “scholastic” – is important. As already noted, Chandieu augmented his remarks on axioms sometime after 1584 but before his death in 1591. These remarks pertain directly to the term “theological.” However, their addition did not in any way alter Chandieu’s views as they were already held in 1580, for the addition did not necessitate altering any of the arguments in his existing treatises or deleting any of the existing preface. He merely put to words a prolegomenal position he already held. As will become clear, his epistemological position on these points closely accords with that of Thomas Aquinas. We begin, then, with “theological.”

To dispute “theologically” means to have God’s Word as sole authority and foundation for argument. It is the material from which the science of theology draws. Chandieu’s account depends upon a certain view of the nature of the “sciences” as specified by Aristotle, explained by Thomas, and generally understood in Chandieu’s

³⁴ “*De vera methodo Theologicè simul & Scholasticè disputandi.*” Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, p. 5; compare p. 9.

time.³⁵ This must detain us for a moment, as we turn to Thomas's response to the question whether theology is a scientific discipline in the Aristotelian sense. He writes,

I answer that, sacred doctrine is a science. We must bear in mind that there are two kinds of sciences. There are some which proceed from a principle known by the natural light of intelligence, as arithmetic and geometry and the like. There are some which proceed from principles known by the light of a higher science: thus the science of perspective proceeds from principles established by geometry, and music from principles established by arithmetic. So it is that sacred doctrine is a science because it proceeds from principles established by the light of a higher science, namely, the science of God and the blessed. Hence, just as the musician accepts on authority the principles taught him by the mathematician, so sacred science is established on principles revealed by God.³⁶

The importance of "principles" in Thomas's account is obvious. As a science, theology proceeds from principles revealed by God. Chandieu explains the role of these principles or axioms similarly in the 1592 addition to his preface. He writes:

The most excellent of those who are philosophers teach this to be the nature of the sciences, namely, that they depend on fixed principles (*certis Principiis*), beyond which one may not go. For if one might, there would be an infinite regress and therefore no existing knowledge: thus the philosophers pretty well hold it to be an oracle, that there is no science concerning infinite things. If then you should require a Theologian to demonstrate his principles, how in the end could he do it, unless through another which would be higher than these principles? If then he would, there would be progress into infinity, something which the philosophers detest as a particular outrage in the sciences.³⁷

³⁵ Some translations of Aristotle use "science" and others "understanding" for ἐπιστήμη. On the "sciences" see Aristotle's *Posterior Analytics*, Book 1, Chs 1 and 10; *Topics*, Book 1, Chapter 2 (71a1-11, 76a38-77a3, 101a25-101b4). I have consulted *A New Aristotle Reader*, ed. J. L. Ackrill (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1987) and *The Complete Works of Aristotle: The Revised Oxford Translation*, ed. Jonathan Barnes, 2 vols (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984). See also Robin Smith, "Aristotle's Logic," in *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Spring 2012 Edition)*, ed. Edward N. Zalta, accessed August 31, 2012, <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2012/entries/aristotle-logic/>.

³⁶ Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, trans. Fathers of the English Dominican Province (London: Burns Oates and Washbourne, 1920), 1.1.2. Note: The correct title is *Summa Theologiae* but *Summa Theologica* has also had wide usage.

³⁷ "Tradunt praestantissimi quique Philosophi hanc esse Scientiarum singularum naturam, ut nitantur certis Principiis supra quae non liceat ascendere. Quòd si liceat, infinitam fore disquisitionem, ac propterea nullam futuram scientiam: quandoquidem hoc propemodum pro oraculo habent Philosophi: Infinitorum scientiam non esse. Si igitur Theologum iubeas sua Principia probare, qui tandem id praestare possit, nisi

He continues by defining a *principium* in theology:

Moreover, a principle of theology seems to me to be an indemonstrable and self-credible [ἀναπόδεικτον & αὐτόπιστον] axiom concerning sacred things, which, once posited, an evident and necessary conclusion follows regarding the things which pertain to religion. Of such a kind is this axiom, “*All of Holy Scripture is inspired by God*,” of which no Christians express doubt . . . that [axiom] is true because God said it and it shall please no one to go beyond this . . . Therefore theologians ought to dispute in such a way that they ought never to demonstrate their principles in these matters. For without indemonstrable principles there cannot be a science, of which matters the scientists actually profess to have no doubt. Indeed, is there any mathematician who would ever doubt that the whole is greater than its parts? Which philosopher has ever doubted the demonstrative principle, that for anything [any proposition], either its affirmation or its negation immediately opposite is true? If someone doubted these, the philosophers recommended that he ought to be tortured until he should admit that to be tortured and not to be was not the same thing. If then someone would not receive the Principles of some science, the Philosophers judge that either he ought not to be disputed with or that the error of his arguments having been reduced to an absurdity, he ought to be refuted.³⁸

Chandieu’s closing statement about how the philosophers would deal with those who do not share any presuppositions (principles) with them is also identical to what we find in

Thomas, who had written, “If our opponent believes nothing of divine revelation, there is

per aliud quod sit illis Principiis superius? quod si fieret, progressus esset in infinitum: quod Philosophi tanquam aliquod flagitium in scientiis perhorrescunt.” Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, p. 9. The problem of an infinite regress was addressed in the context of demonstration by Aristotle in his *Posterior Analytics*, Book 1, Chapter 3 (72b5-14).

³⁸ “Principium autem Theologicum mihi videtur esse Axioma de rebus sacris ἀναπόδεικτον & αὐτόπιστον, quo posito, conclusion de iis quae ad Religionem pertinent, evidens & necessaria consequatur: cuiusmodi est hoc Axioma: SCRIPTURA SACRA TOTA EST ΘΕΟΠΝΕΥΣΤΟΣ: de quo nulli Christiani dubitant . . . illud est verum, quia Deus id dixit; neque licebit vltra progredi . . . Theologi igitur ita disserere debent, vt nunquam illis sua Principia demonstranda sint. Nam sine Principiis Indemonstrabilibus nulla potest esse scientia, de quorum veritate qui scientias profitentur non dubitant. Ecquis enim Mathematicus unquam dubitavit, Totum esse maius sua parte? Quis Philosophus in dubium reuocavit hoc principium demonstratum κατὰ πάντος φάναι ἢ ἀποφάναι ἀληθές, h. e. de quocunque vera est eius vel Affirmatio vel Negatio immediatè opposita? de quo si quis dubitaret, eum Philosophi censuerunt torquendum, usque dum fateretur: Aliud esse torqueri, quàm non torqueri. Siquis igitur non admittit Principia alicuius scientiae, iubent Philosophi adversus illum vel non esse disputandum, vel errorem, argumentis ad absurdum deducentibus, conuincendum esse.” Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, pp. 9-10.

no longer any means of proving the articles of faith by reasoning, but only of answering his objections – if he has any – against faith. Since faith rests upon infallible truth, and since the contrary of a truth can never be demonstrated, it is clear that the arguments brought against faith cannot be demonstrations, but are difficulties that can be answered.”³⁹ The statements about the principle of non-contradiction as well as those regarding the principles in the natural sciences find their ultimate literary source in Aristotle, it would seem.⁴⁰

When Chandieu here makes the point about the sciences not having to demonstrate their own *principia* or *axiomata*, he has not distinguished the sciences whose principles derive from natural reason (mathematics and philosophy) from the science of sacred theology whose principles are revealed by God in sacred Scripture. However, shortly after this he argues that human reason – and this obviously includes Aristotelian logic – cannot be a principle in theology. To corroborate his own position, Chandieu finally reaches out overtly to Thomas to quote some programmatic passages from his *Summa Theologiae*, namely from 1,1,5 and 1,1,8. Chandieu writes:

But human reason cannot be the principle of Theology . . . Rightly therefore did Thomas himself acknowledge this: “Sacred doctrine does not place its principles under any other human science, but only from divine wisdom, from which (he himself says), as it were, all our knowledge ought to be set in order.” And a little after, “Whatever is found elsewhere which contradicts the truth of this science [theology], must be entirely condemned as false.” Again, “Sacred doctrine does not argue so as to prove its principles: rather, it argues from its principles to its conclusions.” These are that man’s words.⁴¹

³⁹ Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, 1.1.8.

⁴⁰ See Aristotle’s *De Interpretatione*, ch. 9; *Posterior Analytics*, Book 1, chs 6 and 9; and especially *Metaphysics* Book IV, chs 3-6 (18a28-19b4, 74b5-33, 75b38-76b23, 1005a19-1011b23). See *The Complete Works of Aristotle: The Revised Oxford Translation*, ed. Jonathan Barnes.

⁴¹ “Humana autem ratio non potest esse principium Theologiae . . . Rectè igitur ipse Thomas agnuit: *Sacram doctrinam non supponere sua principia ab aliqua scientia humana: sed tantum à sapientia diuina, à qua, inquit ipse, sicut à summa sapientia, omnis nostra cognitio ordinari debet.* Et paulò post. *Quicquid*

A number of key Augustine quotes also follow in support of the idea that human reason itself cannot serve as a Principle for faith. Scripture must rule.

Chandieu closes this discussion by saying, “Now, from the things we have said above, we gather that the theological principle is self-credible [αὐτόπιστον], not to be grasped by the bare authority of the church, nor by human reason. Therefore Athanasias said splendidly that “Scripture is for us the anchor and sustenance of faith, and these instructions which are found in Scripture suffice for faith.”⁴²

Claude Auberi’s arguments regarding principles in theology – an eighteen page digression in his commentary on Aristotle – treat them as presuppositions (*anticipatas notiones*) which he roots in the speaking acts of God in the beginning, and then in God himself. Theological principles are self-credible, he argues, because their origins are prior to all creation, making them divine. He presents this axiom, “Everything which was with God in the beginning, or before all created things, was God. Of such a kind are theological principles.”⁴³ In other words, there is nothing beyond these principles. Only if one could reach prior to God could one find these principles rooted in something higher in authority or logically prior. Taken this way, theology is the “Queen of the Sciences,” a

in aliis inuenitur veritati huius scientiae repugnans, totum condemnandum est ut falsum. Item, S. doctrina non argumentatur ad sua principia probanda: ex principiis tamen suis ad conclusiones argumentatur. Haec ille.” Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, p. 10. Note that these sections of Aquinas (1,1,5 and 1,1,8) are programmatic for his entire *summa*. At the same time one could argue that he does not always put his principles into practice. Thus, Chandieu also holds Aquinas up for criticism together with Scotus and Occam for sometimes making philosophy a principle in theology and for leaving the reader with unresolved puzzles instead of faith-worthy conclusions. Chandieu’s concern about “unresolved puzzles” was important to his choice of Aristotle’s *Analytics* rather than his *Topics*, for Chandieu wanted answers that were certain.

⁴² “Nunc autem ex iis quae diximus colligitur Principium Theologicum esse αὐτόπιστον, nec esse petendum ex nuda Ecclesiae auctoritate, neque ex humana ratione. Praeclarè igitur Athanasius dixit *Scripturam esse fidei nostra anchoram & sustentaculum: atque ad fidem sufficere illa quae in Scriptura reperiuntur documenta.*” Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, p. 11.

⁴³ “Omnino, quod erat apud Deum in principio sive ante res creates, erat Deus. Huiusmodi sunt Principia Theologica.” Claude Auberi, *Organon: id est instrumentum doctrinarum omnium* (Morges: Jean le Preux, 1584), pp. 350-51.

statement with which Auberi introduces his discussion.⁴⁴ It transcends all the other sciences.

Thomas's prolegomena to the *Summa* states that theology transcends all other sciences both because it is more certain (being based on divine truth) and because its subject matter deals mostly "with those things which by their sublimity transcend human reason; while other sciences consider only those things within reason's grasp."⁴⁵ Finally, he states that theology has as its ultimate practical aim eternal happiness and its ultimate speculative end God himself.⁴⁶ In other words, while other sciences must accept their principles from higher sciences, theology has no higher science. It is rooted in God himself.

Richard Muller has captured this view as follows, "[T]he orthodox Protestant prolegomena are dogmatic, not predogmatic declarations. Neither here, in the identification of *principia*, nor anywhere in the prolegomena have we stood outside the bounds of theology and, on the basis of nontheological grounds, identified the basis of right argumentation." Both God's existence and his revelation are "principal . . . more basic even than demonstration."⁴⁷

We may conclude that Chandieu's idea of what it means to dispute "theologically" reveals a basically Thomistic and Aristotelian epistemology. Chandieu's

⁴⁴ "si quidem Theologia est Regina doctrinarum & scientiarum omnium, non dubito quin vos . . ." Auberi, *Organon*, p. 349. It may be noted that Auberi's discussion of principles in theology is substantially more philosophical than Chandieu's. Where Chandieu roots his discussion in Scripture's own claim of divine inspiration, Auberi roots his in the ontological priority of God as such.

⁴⁵ Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, 1.1.5.

⁴⁶ Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, 1.1.6 and 1.1.7.

⁴⁷ Richard Muller, *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2003), vol. 1, p. 432.

view would be shared by many Reformed theologians, all the way forward to the Dutch theologian Herman Bavinck (1854-1921).⁴⁸

The Preface: II. Disputing “scholastically”

Whereas the previous section largely reviews Chandieu’s additions to his preface, we now turn to what belonged to the original preface in 1580. It will be clear that the ideas conveyed in the new section were not themselves new for Chandieu.

The distinction between rhetorical and expansive treatments of topics over against the tighter method of the schools already received attention in Chapter 1 above. Its roots go at least as far back as Aristotle.⁴⁹ Chandieu’s mention of this early in his preface leads the way into his defense of the scholastic method for theological arguments.⁵⁰ After quoting Second Timothy 3:16 (all Scripture is profitable for teaching, rebuking, correcting), he cites Augustine to the effect that whereas it is easy, relatively speaking, to teach what we ought to believe, hope, and love, it is more difficult to refute errors. Chandieu observes how difficult this was for the church fathers, particularly with those heretics who were practiced in “sophistic and contentious” kinds of disputation.⁵¹ To

⁴⁸ See David S. Sytsma, “Herman Bavinck’s Thomistic Epistemology: The Argument and Sources of His *Principia* of Science,” in *Five Studies in the Thought of Herman Bavinck, a Creator of Modern Dutch Theology*, ed. John Bolt (Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen, 2011), pp. 1-56. Sytsma, with Bavinck, notes either a general Thomistic epistemology or specific aspects of it in such Reformed theologians as Vermigli, Zanchi, Polanus, Voetius, Alsted, Turretin, and Witsius. Although Sytsma does not mention Chandieu, clearly Bavinck’s view of *principia* and theology as a science compares favourably with Chandieu’s (ibid., pp. 30-31).

⁴⁹ Both Aristotle’s *Prior Analytics* and his *Posterior Analytics* open with this distinction.

⁵⁰ Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, pp. 5. He deals with this in more depth at the pp. 11-12.

⁵¹ “illi praeferunt qui in Sophistica & ῥηριστικῇ palaestra erant exercitati.” Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, p. 5. Note well that ῥηριστικῇ – like the other Greek philosophical terms used by Chandieu – derives from Aristotle. The use of the Greek terms had become more common due to the discovery of Aristotle’s original Greek text and the Renaissance drive *ad fontes*. Using them also bypassed the problem of exactly how to translate each term consistently.

succeed against such men the church fathers used “analytical logic.”⁵² Chandieu cites passages from Gregory of Nazianzus, Gregory of Nyssa, and Augustine where they speak of the benefits of philosophy and of the art of logic for their polemics with heretics. Even Tertullian – of fame for his remarks about the distance between Jerusalem and Athens – spoke of being driven to dispute with heretics in matters of philosophy. Chandieu is concerned that the passage of Colossians 2:8 where the Apostle Paul warned against “vain philosophy” not be applied more widely than it ought. He argues:

The apostle [Paul] did not reject the actual science of rightly and truly disputing, which summons up the knowledge of the truth from reliable, particular, and necessary principles, but instead [he rejected] the vain art of deception and those sophistical and fraudulent snares which heretics are accustomed to knot together in order to deceive the pious and orthodox by them. This is evident not only by the sequence of the context itself, but the word ἀπάτης, seized upon by Paul, also openly declares it.⁵³ Thus if analytical logic chiefly tests the deceptions and fallacies of the Sophists, refutes errors, banishes lies, and puts forward the light of truth to be admired by the eyes of our souls, is there anyone who would rightly judge this clear discipline to have been rejected by the Apostle?⁵⁴

Chandieu argues that the art of logic compares favourably to the men of Tyre and Sidon who helped Solomon build the temple. In this connection, Nanzianzus did not say that the use of logic in the church was tantamount to bringing in the Moabites and Ammonites but that *the Sophists who misused* logic were like the Moabites and Ammonites.⁵⁵ He quotes

⁵² “utpote armis τοῦ τροποῦ παιδείας instructi” Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, p. 5.

⁵³ The word ἀπάτη in Colossians 2:8 refers to a trick, fraud, or deceit, and Chandieu understands this term to be interpretive of the kind of philosophy the Apostle Paul had in mind.

⁵⁴ “Apostolum non ipsam rectè ac verè disserendi scientiam improbare, quae à certis, propriis & necessariis principiis arcessit ipsius veritatis cognitionem: sed potius vanum fallendi artificium, & lacqueos illos sophisticos & ἀπατηλικούς, quos nectere solebant haeretici, ut ita pios atque Orthodoxos deciperent: quod ita esse, non solum ipsa contextus Apostolici series, sed etiam vocabulum ἀπάτης à Paulo usurpatum manifestè declarat. Iam cum imprimis eò spectet τρόπος παιδείας ut Sophistarum praestigias fallaciásque discutiatur, errores redarguat, mendacia expellat atque veritatis lucem animorum oculis intuendam proponat: ecquis unquam meritò existimauerit, praeclaram hanc disciplinam fuisse ab Apostolo reiectam?” Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, pp. 6.

⁵⁵ Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, p. 5.

Augustine's early work *Contra Academicos*, written to refute sceptics: "Since Dialectics is knowledge of the truth, the wise man knows it, so that he may with scorn destroy the calumnies of the Sophists."⁵⁶ Then, from Augustine's *De ordine*, he cites this: "Dialectics is the discipline of disciplines which teaches us both how to teach and how to learn, which knows how to know and how to make others know."⁵⁷ Although in these instances Augustine uses the word dialectics more generally than did Aristotle and he is not necessarily referring to Aristotle's kind of analytical demonstration, nevertheless the context particularly of the first quotation shows that Augustine is objecting to the pursuit of probable knowledge instead of certain knowledge – a distinction which does match the division between Aristotle's *Topicae* and *Analyticae*.⁵⁸

Once Chandieu has established the authority of the church fathers for the role of logic in theological discourse, he faces the question whether this means that he also condones the medieval scholastics who drew on Lombard (*Scholasticorum Doctorum . . . ex Lombardi fontibus*). Chandieu's reply is coy. Instead of directly answering he advocates that each be judged on their own merit and he lays out his concern that generally they are guilty of mixing philosophy and theology. He identifies four errors:

⁵⁶ "Si dialectica est scientia veritatis, sic illam nouit sapiens, ut Sophistarum calumnias contemnendo enecet." Note that the 1580 text had mouit where the 1592 text – correctly – has nouit. Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, p. 6. The substance of the quotation appears to be drawn from Book 3, chapter 13 of *Contra Academicos*, as Chandieu notes. However, this precise statement does not occur there. For a succinct defense of the use of logic in theology which also references Augustine's *Contra Academicos*, see the work of Benedict Aretius (1505-1574), who taught philosophy and later theology at Berne. Benedict Aretius, *Examen theologicum breui et perspicua method conscriptum* (Lausanne: François le Preux, 1574), pp. 28-31.

⁵⁷ "Dialectica est disciplina disciplinarum quae docet docere ac discere, quae scit scire, & alios scientes facere." Note that the 1580 text had scit where the 1592 text – incorrectly – has sit. The quotation is drawn from Book 2, chapter 13 (not 12, as Chandieu has in the margin) of Augustine's *De ordine*.

⁵⁸ The opening of Aristotle's *Topics* sets forth this distinction.

1. The Scholastics made logic the ground of their arguments, and thus silenced the Scriptures. They cited the philosophers and church fathers as authorities equal to Scripture.
2. The Scholastics argued for and against, being satisfied only with probable conclusions, whereas they should have arrived at most certain conclusions since Scripture is the source of theology.⁵⁹
3. The Scholastics obscured the truth by searching for difficulties where these did not exist.
4. The Scholastics wasted their time by entertaining vain and frivolous questions and thus did not make faith's foundation stronger but weaker.⁶⁰

As he lays out these concerns, Chandieu makes a clear distinction between theological principles as source of truth and logical rules as instrumental to the arguments. Noting Lombard in the margin, he writes, "But we have learned from theology itself about theology that it ought to be disputed on the basis of theological principles and ought to be engaged in thus. Actually we affirm this from analytical logic itself, which forbids us from shifting between kinds [of grounds] and roving outside the circle of that science in which one has begun disputing."⁶¹ He immediately alludes to the prevalent idea, noted

⁵⁹ Note how Chandieu had clearly documented this concern in his 1567 refutation of Claude de Saintes (see chapter 3 above).

⁶⁰ Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, pp. 7-8. Compare Sinnema, "Chandieu's Call for a Scholastic Reformed Theology," pp. 174-5.

⁶¹ "At nos de Theologia ex principiis Theologicis disputandum esse, ex ipsa Theologia didicimus, & ita faciendum esse, vel ex ipso τρόπῳ παιδείας affirmamus, qui vetat μεταβαίνειν εἰς ἄλλο γένος, & vagari extra orbem illius scientiae de qua disserendum suscepimus." Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, p. 7. Note that logic "affirms" whereas theology "instructs." The veto against shifting from one genus or science to another is found in Aristotle's *Posterior Analytics*, Book 1, Chs 87 and 89 (75a38-75b20, 75b41-76a15). Much discussion of the function of genus in arguments also occurs in the *Topics*. Chandieu references Lombard's *Sentences* Book 1, Distinction 34 and Book 2, Distinction 9. However, the purpose of these references is not clear since Lombard is not dealing with theological *principia* or logic.

above, that theology is the Queen of the Sciences when he adds that theology is far above all the other sciences and should not be made subject to the principles of philosophy. His view of demonstration – derived from Aristotle – must state that he has learned about theology and its principles *from theology* because its *principia* do not derive from another science.

Under the second error Chandieu adds to his arguments for the use of Aristotle's Analytics (though he never mentions Aristotle by name) when he writes, "But learned/scientific treatises (of which kind theological ones primarily are) require analytical disputations, which ought to be supported by true, certain, necessary and demonstrative arguments."⁶² He adds the point that theologians do not dispute about their principles because these are self-convincing (per se ἀξιόπιστα) and beyond all doubt. Faith is contrary to doubt, and theological conclusions must be worthy of faith.⁶³ These arguments, original to the 1580 preface, show that the additions of 1592 regarding theological principles did not advance anything new but merely gave more flesh to the bones of his arguments.

One point that must not be missed is that Scripture's own claims for clarity and authority drive Chandieu's theological methodology – the "true" method of disputing theologically and at the same time scholastically. Scripture's claims mean that theologians should only advance conclusions which are certain, worthy of faith. This in turn requires analytical rather than topical arguments, for only the former deal in

⁶² "Tractationes autem ἐπιστημονικαὶ (cuiusmodi sunt imprimis Theologicae) requirunt analyticas disputationes, quae veris, certis, necessariis, & ἀποδεικτικαῖς argumentis, niti debent." Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, p. 7.

⁶³ Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, p. 7. For study of the terms ἀξιόπιστος and ἀυτόπιστος in the context of sixteenth century Reformed theology see Henk van den Belt, *The Authority of Scripture in Reformed Theology: Truth and Trust* (Leiden: Brill, 2008), pp. 123-5.

complete certainties, requiring undoubted premises. We may conclude that Chandieu does not regard his method to be neutral. He chooses it precisely to let Scripture speak, to allow it to demand the submission of the believer's heart.

The Preface: III. "Disputing theologically and at the same time scholastically"

Given what has been said above, the important adverb *simul*, found in the subtitle of Chandieu's preface, now has its place: "theologically and *at the same time* scholastically." His treatise aims to be both, at once. All the scholastic method in the world without any theological grounding will have nothing substantial or true to say for theology. All the theological assertions in the world, grounded perhaps, yet unclearly argued, will only lead to confusion. One must start with indubitable theological grounds, then follow the rules of logic in valid analytical form, and finally one ought to reach theological conclusions which can end controversy because they are correct by good and necessary consequence. Thus, "scholastic" is not an end in itself, rather, it serves as a tool to connect the conclusions back to their indubitable grounds. Scholastic method is the bridge or thread that joins grounds to conclusions, and permits the theologian's conclusions to lay claim to the believer's heart as being truly "biblical." "Scholastic" and "theological" are therefore two tightly intertwined ideas for Chandieu. He accuses the Roman Catholic doctors of failing on both counts – neither maintaining truly theological grounds nor rightly utilizing the rules of logic.⁶⁴

Chandieu recognizes that the principles of logic he recommends are not found in Scripture as such, though he would argue that Scripture's propositions certainly satisfy

⁶⁴ Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, p. 9.

the rules of logic. As part of justifying the use of logic he has recourse to Augustine, who compared knowledge in the *humanarum disciplinarum* to the spoils the Israelites took from the Egyptians and used to build the tabernacle of the Lord.⁶⁵

Whether the lengthy medieval undertaking of bringing authority and reason into harmony was ever concluded by the medievals themselves may be hard to determine, but Chandieu's answer clearly puts the authority of Scripture in front with reason serving as viceroy. It seems fair to say that he also puts this principle into practice consistently, as further study will demonstrate.⁶⁶

The Hermeneutical Rules from 1581

If Scripture has one Author, is self-credible, and interprets itself, theologians need a clear hermeneutic to ensure uniformity of interpretation, both of parts with the whole and of individual exegetes with each other. Chandieu did not offer any guidelines in his 1580 preface, but when he updated it for the *Opera Theologica*, he included a reference to five rules for the right interpretation of Scripture. These had appeared in 1581 as part of the dispute with Torres. Interestingly, instead of making them prefatory to part one of rebuttal of Torres in 1580, Chandieu inserted them in the preface to part two in 1581. This suggests that he noticed a different style of interpretation between himself and Torres and thus decided that his hermeneutical rules needed to be spelled out. The rules are as follows:

⁶⁵ Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, p. 9.

⁶⁶ Makdisi identifies the *sic-et-non* method, dialectic, and the disputation as three elements that went into the make up of the medieval scholastic method. He then writes, "This is the outer form, the schema, of the scholastic method. There is also an inner spirit, the basic characteristic of which is a deep and equal concern for both authority and reason, engaging scholastics over a long period of time in an effort to effect a harmony between the two." George Makdisi, "The Scholastic Method in Medieval Education: An Inquiry into Its Origins in Law and Theology," in *Speculum* 49:4 (1974): p. 643.

Rule 1. It ought to be observed that the primary meaning of every passage should be gathered from the preceding and following context. As indeed Chrysostom says: without the foundation, edification is weak, and so unless I probe into its scope, Scripture is unprofitable.⁶⁷

Rule 2: The words ought to be investigated one at a time, so that we might distinguish figures of speech from ordinary [words] and we might know their usual and more proper meaning, which Augustine admonished us to do. For if some word means many things, it ought to be considered from the surrounding context what is the more suitable signification.⁶⁸

Rule 3: Hebrew idioms also ought to be especially given attention, which are also scattered throughout the writings of the Apostles, and the same sense ought to be drawn out as from the Hebrew sources, as Jerome, Augustine, and many other learned men agree.⁶⁹

Rule 4: One ought to distinguish between allegories carefully, and they ought to be explained not by the choice of whatever one pleases, but by the surrounding passages and from other passages of Scripture so that firm arguments might be drawn from them, which was the meaning of Jerome, Augustine, and other highly learned men. With respect to which the same ought to be observed in words that are used metaphorically.⁷⁰

Rule 5: One ought to consider the interpretation according to the first meaning of every passage, then according to other passages of Scripture in which the same things are treated, according to the very analogy of faith, so that everything will be in agreement with the truth. Rightly therefore did Chrysostom say that Scripture was similar to a chain which of course all agrees with itself and in which everything is exactly in harmony. Thus Augustine teaches not only that Scripture is to be explained according to the rule of faith, but also he forbids us to

⁶⁷ “I. Regula. Spectandam esse primarium totius loci sententiam eamque cum ex antecedentibus tum ex subsequentibus colligendam. Ut enim (inquit Chrysostomus) absque fundamento imbecilla est aedificatio: ita nisi inuento scopo [ac instituto], Scriptura est inutilis.” Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, p. 705.

⁶⁸ “II. Regula. Singula vocabula diligenter excutienda, ut figurata distinguamus a propriis, & eorum usitatiorem ac magis propriam significationem cognoscamus: quod faciendum esse Augustinus admonuit. Quòd si vocabulum aliquod multa significat, dispiciendum erit ex loci circumstantia, quaenam sit accommodatior significatio. Rectè enim idem Augustinus, Verba, inquit, Evangelica secum portant expositiones suas.” Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, p. 705.

⁶⁹ “III. Regula. Phrases etiam animadvertendas, Hebraicas praesertim, quae passim sparsae sunt in scriptis etiam Apostolicis: earumque sensum ex ipsis Hebraeorum fontibus hauriendum: ut Hieronymus Augustinus, & alii plerique doctissimi censuerunt.” Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, p. 705.

⁷⁰ “III Regula. Diligenter esse inter Allegorias distinguendum: easque non cuiusvis arbitrio, sed ex locorum circumstantiis & ex aliis Scripturae locis exponendas, ut firma inde argumenta depromantur: quae fuit Hieronymi, Augustini, & aliorum doctissimorum sententia. Quod idem in vocabulis metaphoricè usurpatis observandum erit.” Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, p. 705.

explain any place so as to make it disagree with other clearer passages of Scripture.⁷¹

Each of the rules includes marginal references to the church fathers, one for rule 1 and several for each of the other rules. This shows that Chandieu considered the humanist attention for details of language – such as Hebrew expressions underlying some things written in New Testament Greek – not to be new but rather in complete agreement with the church fathers. He also seamlessly fitted this *ad fontes* emphasis into his scholastic treatment of theology. His notable concern for the literal meaning of Scripture did not preclude attention to allegory, since the literal meaning in certain cases was allegorical. However, the interpreter is not free to allegorize where Scripture does not and he must probe the context of allegorical passages to determine their scope and meaning. If all this is done well, Chandieu is confident that one's exegesis will provide firm and certain foundations for theological conclusions, all in agreement with the *analogia fidei*.

In connection with these five rules, we should recall our observations regarding Chandieu's nuanced approach to the express commands, express passages, biblical examples, church historical examples, and "necessity itself." His hermeneutic was more detailed than these five rules suggest, but evidently these were important principles to establish for the sake of his dispute with Torres.

⁷¹ "V Regula. Exigendam esse interpretationem tum ad primariam sententiam totius loci, tum ad alios Scripturae locos, in quibus res eadem tractatur, adeoque ad ipsam fidei analogiam, ut omnia sint συναληθῆ. Rectè enim Chrysostomus Scripturam dixit esse catenae simile: quippe quae tota sibi constet, & in qua omnia secum aptissimè cohaereant. Augustinus autem non solum docet Scripturam esse secundum fidei regulam exponendam, sed etiam vetat locum ullum ita exponere ut cum aliis manifestioribus Scripturae locis repugnet." Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, p. 705.

Conclusion re. Chandieu's preface and the "newness" of his method

Readers of the important 1580 preface do receive the sense that Chandieu is charting a new course, for he felt the need to offer a defense of his method. Further, he states that until those who excel at the study of theology and logic come up with something fuller, his meagre initial efforts in the present treatise(s) will have to suffice. He particularly aims his treatise at the candidates in theology who also excel in the discipline of logic, suggesting thereby that his treatment of theology is educative and illustrative of the way that all the topics of theology should be handled.⁷²

Although he recognizes that one can write theology in a more rhetorical and expansive way, he argues that this makes it easier to cloak errors under the guise of many pious words. In such cases an analysis will be needed to make clear the arguments of the treatise (after all, every argument should be able to be expressed via syllogisms). Best would be if the authors themselves would recapitulate the precise arguments of their expansive treatises in a succinct appendix. Then readers could more readily test for error.⁷³ This interesting idea depends upon the view that logic is implicitly and unavoidably necessary for the communication of all ideas, so that even logorrheic treatises can be reduced to at least some propositions. While examples of this style pre-exist Chandieu, interestingly, a significant number of the Scripture commentaries and theological treatises that follow this pattern after him were Ramistic.⁷⁴ Indeed,

⁷² "Ac tantisper dum illi qui & Theologiae studio & τρόπου ἐπιστήμης scientia excellunt, id praestandum suscipiant, ego in eorum adolescentum gratiam, qui sunt Theologiae candidati non dubitabo aliquid ea de re leuiter adumbrare . . ." Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, p. 9.

⁷³ This section, original to 1580, follows the 1592 addition on theological principles. Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, p. 12.

⁷⁴ Among the many treatises prior to Chandieu that exhibit such a structure would be François Lambert's disputation on freedom of choice over against Erasmus, which closes with 38 summarizing theses. This occurs in his 1523 commentary on Hosea, as an excursus at 4:19. This excursion later appeared in English

Chandieu's recommendation accords well with Ramist practice, though one should note that the idea of summarizing one's arguments was certainly wider than Ramus and not that far from a detailed table of contents, such as Chandieu provided for his 1566 *Confirmation de la discipline ecclesiastique*.⁷⁵ Chandieu himself practiced this sort of analysis in his response to the arguments of Arthur Faunt and the Polish Jesuits, analyzing and summarizing their theses before refuting them.⁷⁶

All this being said, we must not lose sight of Chandieu's own view of what he was promoting – he made an appeal to Aristotle's *Analytics* and the tight reasoning of the schools, not an appeal to Ramus.

Were Chandieu's recommendations for the use of Aristotelian logic in the discipline of Reformed theology something “new,” as Neuser has argued?⁷⁷ Set within the wider context established in the chapters 1 and 3 above – the almost universal use of Aristotle in the universities, particularly in Lausanne, Geneva, and Basel; the important role of scholastic disputations for instruction in the Reformed classrooms; the significant number of Reformed theologians who were trained in and made use of scholastic method

as: François Lambert, *The minde and judgement of maister Fraunces Lambert of Auenna of the wyl of man* (London: John Day, 1548), See 70r-74r for the 38 theses. For later Ramistic examples, see the “logical” Scripture commentaries of Johannes Piscator (1546-1625), Robert Rollock (1555-1599), and Amandus Polanus (1561-1610) on various books of Scripture, or William Perkins' *Βασκανολογία, hoc est tractatio de nefaria arte venefica* (Hanover: G. Antonium, 1610). For these, the succinct logical analysis usually occurred chapter by chapter throughout the commentaries. Note also Piscator's summary of Calvin's *Institutes* in the form of aphorisms. Johannes Piscator, *Aphorismi Doctrinae Christianae, ex Institutiones Calvini excerpti* (Herborn: Corvinus, 1589).

⁷⁵ On the Ramist method, see Howard Hotson, *Commonplace Learning: Ramism and its German Ramifications 1543-1630* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), pp. 46-7. The table of contents of Chandieu's *Confirmation* are reproduced in appendix 3 below.

⁷⁶ A. Sadele [Antoine de Chandieu], *Posnaniensium assertionum de Christi in terris Ecclesia, quaenam & penes quos existat: propositarum in Collegio Posnaniensi, à Monachis novae Societatis, Quam illi Societatem Iesu, non sine blasphemia nominant, nisi forte unius Iudae Iscariotae posteris, ac haeredes haberi velint, Analysis et Refutatio* (Geneva: Jacob Chouet, 1583).

⁷⁷ “Mochte in der Reformationszeit die Dialektik gelegentlich mehr als eine formale logische Methode gewesen sein, dieser Anspruch der aristotelischen Logik auf theologischem Gebiet ist neu.” Neuser, *Handbuch der Dogmen- und Theologiegeschichte*, vol. 2, pp. 310-11.

or at least shared Chandieu's Thomistic views on revelation and reason (Hyperius, Bucer, Vermigli, Zanchi, Beza, Daneau, de la Faye, Whitaker, Olevian); and the need to meet particularly the rising Jesuit order in polemics – Chandieu's "call" for a Reformed scholastic theology is not that remarkable.⁷⁸ Rather, it is the extension of an already present phenomenon, extending it to the writing of theological texts in the Reformed universities.

For comparison let us mention Amy Nelson Burnett's study of the educational developments in nearby Basel, the place where Chandieu sent his sons with their tutor Gaspar Laurent c. 1583. She demonstrates that Johann Hospinian, professor for Aristotle's *Organon* from 1546 till his death in 1575, shifted from at first more or less teaching Caesarius's dialect text (a more humanist approach to Aristotle) to publishing in 1557 a textbook three times larger which he called "an epitome of Aristotle." Burnett writes that "Hospinian crowned his career by publishing a Greek and Latin edition of Aristotle's *Organon* in 1573."⁷⁹ Thus there was a movement towards a more "pure" Aristotle. (What may have begun as a humanist concern about sources stimulated an increase in scholastic method because of the actual contents of Aristotle's treatises.) Similarly, Johann Jacob Grynaeus, also of Basel, applied Aristotelian dialectic to his exegesis of multiple books of Scripture starting already in 1577. For instance, he gave lectures on Romans during 1577-1578 which treated the book, "as an argument that makes use of syllogisms and refutes logical errors, from which propositions can be drawn

⁷⁸ We must also be careful not to over-conclude, for Chandieu's "call" is specific to theology, particularly to theological construction, instruction, and polemics. His own wide range of genres argues for the appropriateness of other genres and methods for other circumstances.

⁷⁹ Amy Nelson Burnett, "The Educational Roots of Reformed Scholasticism: Dialectic and Scriptural Exegesis in the Sixteenth Century," *Nederlands Archief voor Kerkgeschiedenis* 84 (2004): pp. 309-10.

that are then defended using the tools of logical analysis. The lecture material itself is presented in the form of theses and axiomata and demonstrations.”⁸⁰

Once again we see that adherence to a “pure” Aristotle was already happening around Chandieu in the 1570s. Given the advances in the institutionalization of the education of Reformed pastors between 1550 and 1580, combined with advances in philology (original text of Aristotle, among other examples) as well as sophisticated attacks by the Jesuits, the ground was fertile for a scholastic treatment of theology such as Chandieu’s.⁸¹ Burnett rightly points to Lambert Daneau, doing the same thing in Geneva with his students of theology, and she then goes on to mention Chandieu. She correctly concludes, “The decade between 1575-85 thus witnessed an important step for the development of Reformed scholasticism.”⁸² We must see Auberi and Chandieu as equally part of this important step, with neither one necessarily preceding the other and neither of them being very unique in their emphasis on Aristotle. Both belonged to a trajectory of increasing adherence to a more “pure” Aristotle, yet within an overall eclectic philosophical milieu which had developed Aristotle one way and another, and within an overall Protestant religious sphere which held onto Scripture as self-authenticating and authoritative, no matter what philosophical system one espoused.

Kusukawa compared Melanchthon, Schegk (both were Lutheran), and Crell (Reformed) on their use of philosophy in theology in this period. She highlights their diversity: “The cases of Melanchthon, Shegk, and Crellius indicate just how

⁸⁰ Burnett, “Education Roots of Reformed Scholasticism,” p. 315.

⁸¹ These advances are closely traced in Amy Nelson Burnett, *Teaching the Reformation: Ministers and Their Message in Basel, 1529–1629* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006). See also the present treatise, chapter 1, pp. 28-31 in particular for the situations in Basel, Geneva, and Lausanne in the 1570s and 1580s.

⁸² Burnett, “Education Roots of Reformed Scholasticism,” p. 316.

heterogeneous the shape, form, and content of Aristotelian philosophy and logic could be in this period. They drew on heterogeneous sources: humanist scholarship, Arabic commentators, medieval distinctions, Platonic psychology, and new Paduan commentaries.⁸³ Thus – as Methuen noted particularly in the case of Tübingen – a development similar to that of the Reformed universities also occurred in the Lutheran ones, though perhaps a bit earlier under Schegk, at least.⁸⁴

Seen in this way, Chandieu’s particular way of adhering to the Aristotelian division between the Topics and the Analytics represented a return to a more “pure” Aristotle and was in its precise method – though not necessarily in its outcomes – discontinuous with the more humanist influenced dialectics such as Melanchthon’s, yet well adapted to the Reformed educational milieu in the Swiss cities as well as the Lutheran milieu. Indeed, the Jesuit *Ratio studiorum* of 1586 would also prescribe Aristotle.⁸⁵ Chandieu’s own view of the matter was that his method was continuous with that espoused by Lombard and Aquinas and other medieval scholastics (granted that they had not practiced their own principles consistently, particularly in the late medieval era). Chandieu also believed that the Cappadocian Fathers and Augustine solidly supported the right use of logic within theology. But most importantly, he was convinced that the method he was espousing would do justice to the authority and self-authenticating power of Scripture itself, would keep theological constructions as close to Scripture as possible,

⁸³ Sachiko Kusukawa, “Uses of Philosophy in Reformation Thought: Melanchthon, Schegk, and Crellius,” in *The Medieval Heritage in Early Modern Metaphysics and Modal Theory, 1400-1700*, ed. Russell L. Friedman and Lauge O. Nielsen (Dordrecht: Kluwer, 2003), p. 158.

⁸⁴ Charlotte Methuen, “The teaching of Aristotle in late sixteenth-century Tübingen,” in *Philosophy in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries*, ed. Constance Blackwell and Sachiko Kusukawa (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1999), pp. 191-3.

⁸⁵ *The Ratio Studiorum: The Official Plan for Jesuit Education*, trans. Claude Pavur (Saint Louis: Institute of Jesuit Sources, 2005).

and would expose errors more readily, all the while demanding the allegiance of the believer's heart. In the end, then, Chandieu championed his method because he believed the needs of the church called for it. He was optimistic that writers of theology would be able to present their arguments in a logical fashion and that his method would improve unity in the truth. Unfortunately, it would take considerable skill to carry out his recommendations successfully.⁸⁶

⁸⁶ In light of the above discussion it seems fair to say that there is a good deal more going on in Chandieu's discussion than Dolf te Velde allows. He states, "Next I note briefly Antoine de Chandieu, a French minister who added to his treatise *De verbo Dei scripto adversus humanas traditiones* a preface, in which he explained his method. Chandieu has attracted some attention, since Wilhelm Neuser portrayed him as the crown witness of the introduction of scholastic method into Reformed theology. But, as a matter of fact, Chandieu's preface is quite short and simple, just repeating the distinction we found in Hyperius between the popular and the scholastic way of dealing with a subject. Chandieu was well aware, as were his colleagues, that the scholastic method was abused by many in the Late Middle Ages. Therefore he adds the warning, that scholastic reasoning must proceed exclusively from the proper principles of theology (the Word of God) and must deal with necessarily true propositions only." Dolf te Velde, *Paths Beyond Tracing Out* (Delft: Eburon, 2010), pp. 79-80. Not surprisingly, te Velde fails to include Chandieu in a later list of early orthodox theologians, whereas he does include Hyperius, Zanchi, Vermigli, and Ursinus. *Ibid.*, p. 94.

Chapter 6

Proving the 1580 Thesis: All Necessary Dogmas Are in Scripture

Introduction

In this chapter we will survey all of *De verbo Dei scripto* in some detail. Doing so will highlight at least two things: Chandieu's close adherence throughout to an intriguing disputational structure and his predominant use of the hypothetical syllogism. The former is a finely-honed organization that likely grows out of classroom disputations with their long medieval history. The latter is a highly unique element in Chandieu's works that will need to be set within the history of the hypothetical syllogistic to determine how "Aristotelian" was its use, and thus nuance previous descriptions of Chandieu's method. These two motifs will be exhibited here and explored more fully in the next chapter.

With respect to the theological content of his arguments, we will see that they all depend on a point agreed with his Roman Catholic opponents: all Scripture is inspired by God. Further, this indubitable axiom is foundational for his view of the authority of Scripture, of theology as a science, and of faith as a certainty.

The Contents of *De verbo Dei scripto adversus humanas traditiones* (1580)

Chapter 1. Staging the argument

How does Chandieu execute his arguments? The entire treatise argues just one proposition, "All the dogmas necessary for the Christian faith are contained in Holy Scripture."¹ He establishes this over against the Roman Catholic proposition, "All the dogmas necessary for the Christian faith are not contained in the Holy Scripture."

¹ "Omnia dogmata fidei Christiana necessaria in Sacra Scriptura contineri." Antonio Sadeele [Antoine de Chandieu], *Opera Theologica* (Geneva: Jean le Preux, 1593), p. 13.

Chandieu has thus established an *opponens* and a *respondens*, just as he did in the 1577 *Sophismata F. Turriani*.² He asserts that by the “first light of reason” only one of these two positions can be true (the law of non-contradiction).³ He then defines the terms of his argument, such as “Word of God,” “Tradition,” and “Holy Scripture.” As part of his definition of what is “necessary for salvation” (considered equivalent to “necessary for the Christian faith”), he stipulates that this refers to those things which must be agreed to with the fullness of faith, as distinct from mere opinion and the results of merely probable disputations.⁴ This introduction shows that his entire treatise is designed to argue for Scripture as sole *principium* in the science of theology.

Chapter 2. The positive argument: Scripture loci as grounds for the thesis

In the second chapter Chandieu presents the positive scriptural arguments which he believes sustain his position. These are divided into 9 *loci*, much like his *Sophismata F. Turriani* of 1577. Each locus begins with a Scripture text and proceeds to reason with that text as *principium*. Ancillary texts regularly appear in each argument, but the text that heads the locus forms the primary ground for the syllogism. The function of Scripture texts in Chandieu’s arguments is highlighted by Muller, who writes:

The development from a language of multiple dogmatic *principia*, all found in the text of Scripture, to the concept of Scripture as *principium unicum theologiae*, moreover, can be identified as having taken place in the work of the Reformed theologians of the last three decades of the sixteenth century. It was typical of thinkers like Chandieu, Junius, and Lubbertus to maintain the medieval language

² See above, chapter 4, p. 150.

³ “Ita ut alteram tantum sententiam esse veram oporteat, ex prima illa luce ratiocinationis, de re quaque veram esse affirmationem aut negationem.” Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, p. 14.

⁴ “Caeterum per *Verbum Dei nobis ad salutem necessarium*, intelligemus ea omnia quibus Deus nos iubet certa fidei πληροφορίᾳ assentiri, vt ita fidem ab opinione, & Christianae religionis dogmata à probabilibus hominum disputationibus ac placitis distinguamus.” Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, p. 14.

of many biblical *principia* or *axiomata* as a foundation element in their discussions of the use of scholastic logic in Protestant theological argument . . . In the language of scholastic argumentation, Scripture is the ultimate *principium* or foundation of theology, from which the individual *principia*, more clearly identified as *axiomata*, of any given theological argument are to be drawn.⁵

Concretely, this means – correctly – that whereas Chandieu’s entire treatise argues for Scripture as sole *principium*, each of his positive *loci* in chapter two show that the individual texts of Scripture serve as so many *principia* for the individual arguments which contribute to the whole argument of the treatise. Chandieu’s nine *loci* in *De verbo Dei scripto* are based on Hebrews 1:1-2; Luke 1:3-4; Deuteronomy 4:2 and Proverbs 30:6; Isaiah 8:20; Second Timothy 3:14-16; John 5:39; First Corinthians 4:6; John 20:31; and Psalm 19:7-11. Each text emphasises in some way the sufficiency of the written Word of God in the life of the church. We will review all of these nine arguments to get the feel for his style.

The text of the first locus, which in this case matches Beza’s Latin translation, reads as follows, “God, in many successions and in many ways having spoken in the past to the fathers through the prophets, in these last days has spoken to us through the Son” (Heb 1:1-2).⁶ He then presents a complete syllogism, argued hypothetically:

⁵ Richard A. Muller, *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2003), vol. 2, p. 160; compare vol. 1, p. 434. Note that the first edition (1992) has the same paragraph. Thus the criticism of Sinnema, published in 1994 and resting on observations in volume 1, is unfounded. See Donald Sinnema, “Antoine de Chandieu’s Call for a Scholastic Reformed Theology (1580),” in *Later Calvinism: International Perspectives*, ed. W. Fred Graham (Kirkville, MO: Sixteenth Century, 1994), p. 190, n. 128.

⁶ “Deus multis vicibus multisque modis olim loquutus Patribus per Prophetas, ultimis diebus hisce nobis loquutus est per Filium.” Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, p. 14. For the New Testament Chandieu appears to use Beza’s text primarily, though many quotations are abbreviated. See *Novum Jesu Chriſti Domini noſtri Testamentum latine* (Basel [Geneva]: Barbir and Courteau, 1559). For the Old Testament his quotations appear to adhere somewhat to the translation of Sanctes Pagninus. See *Biblia Veteris ac Novi Testamenti* (Basel: Thomas Guarinus, 1564). Since few of his quotations match any existing translation exactly, Chandieu may at times be quoting from memory or correcting existing Latin texts based on his own analysis of the original Greek and Hebrew.

If the Word of God, necessary for the salvation of the church, was delivered to us first by the prophets, then by Christ and the apostles, and the Word of God delivered by the prophets is today to be sought only in the writings of the prophets, then truly the Word of God delivered to us by Christ and the apostles is today to be sought only in the writings of the apostles, unless a sure reason for dissimilarity [between Old and New Testaments] can be given.

But the Word of God, necessary for the salvation of the church, was delivered to us first by the prophets, then by Christ and the apostles, and the Word of God delivered by the prophets is today to be sought only in the writings of the prophets, and no sure reason for dissimilarity can be given why the same will not be established regarding the Word of God delivered through Christ and the apostles.

Therefore the Word of God delivered to us by Christ and the apostles is to be sought today only in the writings of the apostles. And accordingly the whole Word of God, necessary for the salvation of the church, is today to be sought only in the writings of the prophets and apostles.⁷

After presenting this syllogism, Chandieu analyzes the parts of its argument. He states what kind of a syllogism it is (hypothetical), what is its ground, and how such arguments are useful in this context (more about this momentarily). His analysis notes three parts to the *assumptum* of his argument, that is, the middle term or minor. First, that the Word of God was given via prophets, Christ, and the apostles; second, that the Old Testament prophets wrote down the Old Testament Word of God and now their writings are the only place one is to look for said Word; third, that no reason can be given why the same does not hold true when we carry through to the New Testament words of Christ and the

⁷ “Si verbum Dei ad salutem Ecclesiae necessarium nobis primum per Prophetas, deinde per Christum & Apostolos traditum est, & verbum Dei per Prophetas traditum hodie quaerendum est tantum in scriptis Prophetis. Certè verbum Dei nobis per Christum & Apostolos traditum, hodie quaerendum est tantum in scriptis Apostolicis, nisi certa ratio dissimilitudinis reddi possit. At verbum Dei ad salutem Ecclesiae necessarium nobis primum per Prophetas, deinde per Christum & Apostolos traditum est: & verbum Dei per Prophetas traditum hodie quaerendum est tantum in scriptis Prophetis, nec ulla certa ratio dissimilitudinis reddi potest quominus idem de verbo Dei per Christum & Apostolos tradito statuendum sit. Quare verbum Dei, nobis per Christum & Apostolos traditum hodie quaerendum est tantum in Scriptis Apostolicis. Ac proinde totum Verbum Dei ad salutem Ecclesiae necessariam hodie quaerendum est tantum in scriptis Prophetis & Apostolicis.” Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, pp. 14-15.

apostles. Making use of about eight more Scripture texts in the process, he thus uses the middle term to affirm the antecedent, following the rule of *modus ponens*.

The second syllogism is rooted in Luke 1:3-4, which Chandieu states as follows, “It seemed best to me to write everything in order that you might know the truth of those things which you accepted by hearing.”⁸ Chandieu first presents five further New Testament passages wherein various authors recommend the benefits of their written records for the clear memory and firm faith of the recipients. These are followed by the second syllogism:

If the apostles and evangelists committed the teaching of the gospel to writing to this end, namely that the truth of those things which they had transmitted by their living voice might be more and more known and confirmed and also that it might be better pondered in human memory, then certainly the apostles and evangelists left behind in writing all those things which they had transmitted by living voice as necessary for faith and salvation.

But the antecedent is true.

Therefore the consequence also is true.⁹

This argument does not move from Old to New Testament but from speaking to writing: written testimony better transmits and confirms oral testimony by giving the memory fresh access to it repeatedly. The argument does not as such exclude the possibility that the writers of Scripture could have transmitted other things orally that were not written, but if they did, Chandieu would argue that such things were not necessary for salvation and for that very reason were not written.

⁸ “Visum est mihi omnia scribere ut agnoscas earum rerum veritatem quas auditione accepisti.” Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, p. 15.

⁹ “Si in eum finem Apostoli & Euangelistae doctrinam Euangelicam literis mandarunt, ut veritas earum rerum quae viva voce traditae fuerant magis magisque agnosceretur & confirmaretur, atque etiam hominum memoriae melius consultum esset: certè Apostoli & Euangelistae ea omnia scripta reliquerunt quae viva voce tradiderant ad fidem salutemque necessaria. Antecedens autem verum est. Verum igitur & consequens.” Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, p. 16.

For the third locus Chandieu draws on two Old Testament texts that warn against additions to the teachings given: Moses warned the Israelites not to add to his words (Deut 4:19) and a proverb warns the reader not to add to the flawless words of God, lest he rebuke you and prove you a liar (Prov 30:6). Chandieu's syllogism is:

If it was not lawful for humans to add anything to the writings of Moses, then surely, after the writings of the apostles were added to the writings of Moses and the prophets, it ought to be said that Holy Scripture contains all those things which knowledge and faith need for salvation.

But the antecedent is true.

Therefore one ought not to doubt the truth of the consequence.¹⁰

This particular argument, like the others, moves from the lesser to the greater (*a fortiori*). Standing alone, however, it could easily be challenged, for if the writings of the Apostles could be added in spite of Moses' warning, why not add further writings also after the Apostles? After all, if the Apostles moved from oral to written accounts, could not the church in Chandieu's own day still commit to writing those things which were as yet only known orally? Chandieu could, however, counter that his argument specifies that no *humans* could make additions whereas it was God himself who inspired the Apostles to write. Then, if his opponents claimed unwritten tradition as an authoritative doctrinal source, Chandieu would challenge them to claim that the conveyors and codifiers of the traditions were inspired and commissioned in the same sense as the Apostles.¹¹

¹⁰ "Si non licuit hominibus quidpiam addere scriptis Mosis: certè postquam ad scripta Mosis & Prophetarum scripta quoque Apostolica accesserunt, dicendum est Scripturam sacram ea omnia continere quorum cognitio & fides ad salutem necessaria." Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, p. 16.

¹¹ In fact, this is what he argues when he considers this objection in chapter four of *De verbo Dei*. See Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, p. 30.

The fourth locus derives from Isaiah 8:20, which Chandieu cites as follows: “To the law and to the testimony. If they do not speak in accord with this word, they have no light.”¹² He argues:

If under the law they were referred back to the Scriptures, and nothing was to be received in matters of faith which was not contained in the Scriptures, then certainly, by greater reason, after the doctrine of the Gospel – drawn up by the apostles who explained and presented the truth of the law – was added to the writings of the Old Testament, only those things are to be received in matters of faith which are contained in the writings of the Old and New Testament.

But the antecedent is true.

Therefore it is necessary that the consequence also be true.¹³

Chandieu explains that the force of the comparison makes the argument self-evident (*luceat sua luce propter vim comparationis*), for “no Christian has ever doubted” that God’s Word is more fully and clearly given in the New Testament. Therefore, whatever was true before Christ, is “much more” true afterward, unless explicitly superseded in the New Testament. He affirms the antecedent or *assumptum* based on Isaiah 8:20, with Acts 26:22-3 and Second Corinthians 3:7-18 supporting his statements that the doctrines of the New Testament were already contained in the Old and that the New Testament is more glorious and clear than the Old.

The fifth locus derives from Second Timothy 3:14-16 where the apostle Paul reminds Timothy that the Holy Scriptures are able to make him wise for salvation and “perfect” for every good work. If this is so, writes Chandieu, we must be content with the Scriptures in matters of faith. Once again he makes the argument hypothetically and

¹² “Ad legem & ad testimonium. Si non dixerint iuxta hoc verbum, nihil habent lucis. Hinc conficio sequentem conclusionem.” Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, p. 16.

¹³ “Si sub lege recurrendum fuit ad Scripturam, nihilque in causa fidei recipiendum quod non contineretur in Scriptura: certè, maiori ratione, postquam ad scripta veteris Testamenti accessit Euangelij doctrina conscripta ab Apostolis, qui veritatem legis explicarunt atque exhibuerunt, ea sola sunt in causa fidei recipienda quae continentur in scriptis veteris & noui Testamenti. Antecedens autem verum est. Quare consequens quoque verum sit necesse est.” Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, p. 16.

affirms the antecedent. He uses an argument from the nature of things when he appeals to the nature of perfection (*propter naturam perfectionis*) to ask what the purpose of unwritten traditions would be if the Scriptures already “make us perfect” (ἐξαρτισμένους). He closes the argument by listing a number of Scripture passages using the same Greek word ἐξαρτίζω, arguing that it denotes perfection and not just preparedness.¹⁴

In his sixth and seventh locuses, Chandieu employs several more hypothetical syllogisms. The sixth locus, based on John 5:39, “You examine the Scriptures because you consider that by them you have eternal life,” also depends upon the “force of comparison” and argues from lesser to greater, namely, that if the people rightly believed this with respect to the Old Testament in Jesus’ day, how much more should we in our day, since we possess the completed New Testament. The seventh locus is interesting for including three distinct syllogisms: the first and second are hypothetical whereas the third is demonstrative (categorical). Chandieu uses the text, “In order that you may learn not to be wise beyond what is written” (1Co 4:6).¹⁵ His first syllogism treats the text as if Paul has in view all the written Scriptures. His second syllogism acknowledges that some interpreters consider Paul to be referring only to his own writings to the Corinthians. In this case, he uses another *a fortiori* argument (i.e., if of Paul’s own letter, how much more all of Scripture). The demonstrative or ostensive (δεικτικός) syllogism with which

¹⁴ Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, p. 17.

¹⁵ “Ut discatis supra id quod scriptum est non sapere.” Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, p. 17.

he closes the argument is in the middle figure and denies that which is asserted.¹⁶ He formulates it thus:

Whoever grounds the dogmas of the faith in unwritten traditions acts wise beyond that which is written.
No person truly obeying the Christian and apostolic doctrines acts wise beyond that which is written.
Therefore no person truly obeying the Christian and apostolic doctrines grounds the dogmas of the faith in unwritten traditions.¹⁷

The key text wherein the Apostle John states the purpose of his written gospel forms the basis of the eighth locus: “Jesus produced many other signs which are not written in this book: these however are written that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God and that believing you may have eternal life through his name” (John 20:31).¹⁸ His argument builds on this text to argue that Scripture alone must be the foundation for the articles of faith.

If the apostles and evangelists wrote those things which seemed necessary, that believing them, we might have life, [then] surely the dogmas of the faith must be established out of Scripture rather than from unwritten traditions which the Papists call apostolic.
The antecedent is true.
Therefore the consequence also is true.

¹⁶ “Potest etiam confici syllogismus δεικτικὸς in media figura, quia negat ὅτι ἐστὶν in hunc modum.” Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, p. 17. The translation “demonstrative” or “ostensive” may in fact be more accurate to Aristotle’s meaning than “categorical” but for familiarity’s sake I will maintain the latter. See Aristotle, *The Organon*, trans. O. F. Owen (London: Henry G. Bohn, 1853), v. 1, p. 138, n. 1.

¹⁷ “Quisquis dogmata fidei statuit ex traditionibus non scriptis, sapit supra id quod scriptum est. Nullus verè Christianae & Apostolicae doctrinae obediens sapit supra id quod scriptum est. Quare nullus verè Christianae & Apostolicae doctrinae obediens dogmata fidei statuit ex traditionibus non scriptis.” Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, p. 17.

¹⁸ “Multa alia signa edidit Iesus quae non sunt scripta in hoc libro: haec autem sunt ut credatis Iesum esse Christum Filium Dei, & credentes vitam aeternam habeatis per nomen ipsius.” Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, p. 17. Chandieu provides a truncated translation of the Greek, which may be partly his own translation or a quotation drawn from memory. It does not exactly follow the Latin translations of his era.

Although Chandieu does not use the word *principium*, it is clear that his position is that Scripture is the sole *principium* of theology. He does not give any further reasons for this argument besides John 20:31.

The last locus, like the fifth on Second Timothy 3:17, appeals to the notion of “perfection” because Psalm 19:7 says that the law of the LORD is “perfect, reviving the soul.” Once again, he reasons *a fortiori* from the Old to the New Testament. He adds, with reference to Galatians 4:21, that “law” often connotes all God’s written revelation.

Following this observation, Chandieu advances the “true definition of Scripture,” based upon the *loci* of Scripture he has already collected: “Holy Scripture is the divinely inspired Word of God, and was written in the Old and New Testaments by the prophets, apostles, and evangelists who were breathed upon by the Spirit of God, in order that the truth of God might be free from the forgetfulness and corruption of men and the church be perfectly established and confirmed in all those things which are necessary for knowledge and faith unto eternal salvation.”¹⁹

The elements of the definition are lettered in the original, with reference to some twenty Scripture texts in the margin. Chandieu analyses his definition as being consistent with genus and species and containing the efficient cause (the Holy Spirit) with the instrumental causes serving under him (the human authors) as well as two final causes (the truth’s preservation and the church’s establishment).²⁰ When Chandieu begins by mentioning genus and species and follows by mentioning several causes, he demonstrates

¹⁹ “Scriptura sacra est verbum *a* Dei diuinitatus inspiratum, *b* & à Prophetis *c*, Apostolis & Evangelistis Spiritus Dei afflatus perscriptum in libris Canonicis veteris & noui Testamenti, ut *d* Dei veritas ab hominum oblivione & *e* Ecclesia perfectè institueretur ac confirmaretur in iis omnibus, quorum cognitio & fides ad salute aeternam necessaria est.” Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, p. 17.

²⁰ Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, pp. 17-18.

his familiarity with Aristotelian philosophy, for the genus was often paralleled with the material cause, out of which the formal cause brought about the species, particularizing it.²¹ In this case the material cause/genus would be the Word of God and the formal cause/species would be its written form. Thus he has presented a definition with all four Aristotelian causes, plus the medieval addition of the sub-species of the efficient cause, namely the instrumental cause.

With this definition in place, he issues a final demonstration (ἀπόδειξις)²² in the form of a demonstrative syllogism, which he states is “evident and necessary.”

“Whatever is the divinely inspired Word of God, written by the prophets, apostles, and evangelists who were breathed upon by the Spirit of God, etc., contains all the dogmas necessary for the Christian faith. But Holy Scripture is the divinely inspired Word of God, etc. Therefore Holy Scripture contains all the dogmas necessary for the Christian faith.”²³

The overall structure of chapter one – opening with a thesis, arguing the thesis, and then closing by re-stating the thesis with the declaration that it has been proved – reminds one of the argumentative structure of Chandieu’s 1566 *Confirmation de la discipline ecclesiastique*, studied in chapter 3 above. No doubt he thus observes a rule of structure that one was expected to follow in classroom disputations. Further elements of

²¹ Marjorie Grene, “Is Genus to Species as Matter to Form? Aristotle and Taxonomy,” in *Synthese* 28 (1974): pp. 51-69, esp. p. 66.

²² The ἀπόδειξις was sometimes called an ἐπίδειξις, which may explain why we once encounter the mistaken term ἀπίδειξις in Chandieu’s *Opera Theologica* (p. 18).

²³ “Quicquid est verbum Dei divinitatis inspiratum & à Prophetis, Apostolis, & Euangelistis Spiritus Dei afflatus perscriptum, &c. Id continens omnia dogmata fidei Christianae necessaria. At Scriptura sacra est verbum Dei divinitum inspiratum, &c. Quare Scriptura sacra continens omnia dogmata fidei Christianae necessaria.” Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, p. 18.

disputational structure, also found in the 1566 work, follow in the subsequent chapters of *De verbo Dei scripto*.

Chapter 3. The negative argument: Refuting the opposing thesis

Chandieu designates chapter three a *disputatio ἀνασκευαστικῶς*, that is, a negative argument, designed to demolish the opposing thesis, namely, that all the dogmas of the Christian faith are *not* found in Holy Scripture. It forms the necessary counterpart to the *disputatio κατασκευαστικῶς* that was chapter two.²⁴ He arranges eleven syllogistic arguments; ten of these are framed hypothetically and one is categorical. Of the ten hypothetical syllogisms, six affirm the antecedent (*modus ponens*) and four deny the consequent (*modus tollens*). The chapter closes with a final extended hypothetical syllogism that incorporates all of the previous eleven arguments in one over-arching summary.

Three times he uses a new method of proof, for he employs an induction. Besides some twenty Scripture texts, most of which appear in the induction that follows the first syllogism, Chandieu also advances a number of quotations from the writings of the church fathers. The latter provide proof that the church fathers disagreed about the apostolic traditions and thus are an uncertain foundation for faith.

In summary, his arguments are:

1. If Moses, the prophets, the Christ, and the apostles confirmed the dogmas by means of Scripture and if the Papists do so more often by appeal to an unwritten tradition, then truly the latter teach contrary to the former. Chandieu affirms the

²⁴ Chandieu also notes that most people have more eagerness for the refutation of errors than the advancing of the truth. Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, p. 18.

antecedent by means of an *inductio* – a collection of some sixteen Scripture texts wherein the authors appeal to written Scripture to back up their teachings.

2. If the Apostles had the Spirit and preached, yet referred to the Old Testament for their authority, how much more should the Papists refer their dogmas to Scripture! But they refer to an unwritten tradition instead of Scripture. Therefore people should not listen to them. Chandieu affirms the antecedent, arguing *a fortiori*.
3. If all necessary dogmas are not in Scripture (as his opponents argue), then the Spirit of God did not accomplish his purpose in giving the Scriptures. Chandieu denies the consequent, and therefore, secondarily, the antecedent. He points to the arguments of chapter two, that one of God's purposes was to free his message from human corruption. He then presents several more hypothetical arguments in enthymematic form for rhetorical effect: If this is why Scripture was written, would the Spirit have left some things necessary to salvation in and others out? If the Scriptures were to help memory, would the Spirit want only some things necessary to salvation committed to memory? If those things could have been remembered without Scripture, why have Scripture? If the Scriptures were to help memory, who can deny that such help must be in all matters necessary to salvation? If the Scriptures were given better to instruct us, would the Spirit omit things necessary to know? He concludes that the Papists seek to frustrate the Spirit's work of giving Scripture.
4. If the Spirit led the Apostles into all truth (as John 16 says) and yet they didn't write all the things necessary for salvation (as his opponents say), then this would

have to be because either they ought not, would not, or could not. Chandieu denies the consequent, stating that to say they ought not is false, would not is absurd, and could not is godless.

5. If the canonical Old Testament books contain all things pertinent to the Old Testament (as his opponents would say), and the canonical books of the New Testament do *not* contain all things pertinent to it (as his opponents also affirm), then it would follow that the Old Testament is more perfect than the New. Chandieu denies the consequent, stating that no Christian has ever affirmed this.
6. If the New Testament is a covenant, will, or testament, and nothing is to be added to such, then one cannot add to the New Testament. Chandieu affirms the antecedent based on its own terminology of “testament” and Galatians 3:15 where the apostle Paul states that no one adds to an agreed human covenant, as grounds for arguing that one may not add to God’s ratified covenant (*a fortiori*).
7. If to the world’s end, we should expect no other books than the canonical ones already in the Old and New Testaments, then Scripture is absolute in every way. Chandieu affirms the antecedent on the grounds that our time is called the fulness of time (Ga 4:4). He adds that the entire argument holds because God as author is most perfect.²⁵
8. If unwritten traditions are to be observed no less than Scripture, then we must believe the writings of the Doctors with same fullness of faith as Scripture. Chandieu denies the consequent, accusing his opponents of this error.

²⁵ This argument is weak, depending on a rather loose connection between “fulness of time” and “not expecting any other books.”

9. We may not believe any traditions that lack certainty. But all unwritten traditions are uncertain. Therefore we may not rely on them in matters of the faith.

Chandieu proves the minor by an induction – quotations from Clement, Tertullian (4x), Irenaeus (3x), Epiphanius, Augustine, Jerome, Cyprian, and Zepherius which exhibit the variety of their opinions on such topics as the place of traditions, fasting, the date of Easter, baptism practices, birthday celebrations, kneeling, adorning one's head with garlands, the age of Christ, and various ecclesiastical canons. The point of the quotations is to prove that appeal to such traditions is inherently uncertain, since the church fathers could not even agree about them.²⁶

10. If certain old heretics used arguments from tradition, claiming them to be apostolic, and if the Papists do the same today, then on this point the Papists are among the heretics. Chandieu affirms the antecedent, citing warnings in Scripture of this very phenomenon (Acts 15:24; 2Co 11:13; 2Th 2:2) and adding instances from church history.

11. Traditions that contradict the apostles are not apostolic. But the Papists' traditions do so. Therefore they are not apostolic. Chandieu speaks of an induction which his readers can easily assemble from the writings of "our teachers" who have proved that the dispute with the papists centres on unwritten traditions which disagree with the apostolic writings.²⁷ He adds that the overall argument could be

²⁶ This argument echoes that of part II of Chandieu's 1567 *Refutatio Claude de Saintes*.

²⁷ In this case Chandieu appears more to be affirming the consequent than the antecedent – a fallacy. This may be because his argument depends on something unstated which belongs to the antecedent. He could more fully phrase this, "If traditions that contradict the apostles are not apostolic, *and if the Papists' traditions contradict the apostles*, then the Papists' traditions are not apostolic." Then he could affirm the second part of his antecedent with reference to the induction and avoid the fallacy.

defeated if one held that the apostles wrote by a different spirit than they spoke, but he feels that no one should entertain such a thought.²⁸

When Chandieu points to the writings of “our teachers” in argument eleven, he shows his own awareness that he is not writing new arguments, but rather systematizing existing ones via syllogisms and arranging said syllogisms according to his disputational structure. We note also that since these syllogisms do not all contain Scripture in the antecedent, he is more likely to deny the consequent than he was in chapter two.

No doubt Chandieu’s Reformed colleagues found his disputation extremely convincing. Yet there are moments when the distinction between the *disputatio* κατασκευαστικῶς (ch. 2) and ἀνασκευαστικῶς (ch. 3) is not clear. Specifically, arguments six and seven prove the thesis of chapter two rather than disproving the thesis of chapter three, that “all things necessary for salvation are *not* contained in the Scriptures.”²⁹ Syllogism six argues on the basis of the New Testament understanding of “testament” or “covenant” based on Galatians 3:15 to conclude that no one may add to the New Testament, and syllogism seven affirms that Scripture is absolute and thus complete, with appeal to Galatians 4:4. The incongruity of these arguments for chapter three is indirectly acknowledged when Chandieu rephrases them for the final summary syllogism, for he restates them to argue that the *Papist position does not accord with the fact that the Bible is styled a “testament” or “covenant,”* and that *the Papist position infers that* Scripture is not absolute and complete in all its parts. Since one of the points

²⁸ These eleven “arguments” are found in the pages 18-21 of the *Opera*.

²⁹ Whereas the law of non-contradiction could be invoked in Chandieu’s defense, the form of his arguments is unfitting to the chapter.

of using syllogisms is to ensure that no part of the argument is left unsaid, his fuller rendition of these arguments earlier in the chapter could have been improved.

Chandieu employs an induction for three of his arguments in this chapter. The first contains a collection of some sixteen Scripture texts; the second contains a collection of at least thirteen quotations from the church fathers; the third is not actually given, but consists of an allusion to Protestant writers polemicizing with Papists. Generally speaking, an induction is a collection of particulars designed to lead to a universal. This seems to be the way Chandieu uses the term, without any one of the more specifically Aristotelian senses.³⁰ Like Aristotle, however, he did regard an induction to be suitable for true knowledge, for he states that his first induction is “most firm and could not be shaken with any alteration.”³¹

The conclusion to the chapter brings together all of its syllogisms in one lengthy argument, as follows (Chandieu combines arguments one and two):

If from the opinions of the Papists regarding unwritten traditions, these errors are the result: namely, that [1, 2] in the church one may teach differently than the prophets and apostles taught; that [3] the Holy Spirit did not achieve his purpose in publishing Scripture; that [4] the apostles neither ought to, nor wanted to, nor were able to write all the things necessary for salvation; that [5] the Scripture of the Old Testament is more perfect than that of the New Testament; that [6] the Holy Bible does not correspond to its title as a testament – so long as men be permitted to add to a testament of God; that [7] after Christ appeared and after the writings of the apostles, Holy Scripture is not absolute in all points; that [8] the same faith should be applied to the writings of the fathers as is applied to Holy Scripture; that [9] an assured faith should be put in those things of which there is no certainty; that [10] the cause of the old heretics was more than a little supported when they advanced it by the same unwritten traditions; and, finally,

³⁰ Dušan Gálik, “Induction in Aristotle’s System of Scientific Knowledge,” in *Organon* 13:4 (2006): pp. 495-505.

³¹ “Haec inductio est certissima & nulla ἐκστάσει labefactari potest.” Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, p. 18. Compare Gálik, “Induction in Aristotle’s System,” pp. 497, 501.

that [11] the apostles were speaking by a spirit other than that one by whom they wrote.

If, as I say, the above inconsistencies follow from the opinion of the Papists regarding unwritten traditions, [then] certainly the opinion of the Papists regarding unwritten traditions should truly be repudiated by all pious and orthodox Catholics.

The antecedent is true.

Therefore it is necessary that the consequence also be true.³²

In the author's view, then, this chapter argued against the Roman Catholic thesis by trying to discredit it due to the many absurdities and theological errors that apparently follow when its truth is assumed. Now that Chandieu has dealt with the opposing thesis on his own terms, he will examine how his opponents support it.

Chapter 4. Refuting the Papists' arguments

Chapter four is double the length of each of chapters two and three. Chandieu seeks to refute the actual arguments used by the Papists for reliance on an unwritten tradition.³³ These include twelve arguments from Scripture texts and four from more global considerations of theology and church history. He calls each of the sixteen positions "objections" of the Roman Catholic teachers (to his thesis of chapter two). In

³² "Si ex Pontificiorum sententia de Traditionibus non scriptis hi errores consequuntur: nempe, aliter in Ecclesia doceri quàm Prophetæ & Apostoli docuerint: Spiritum sanctum in proponenda Scriptura non fuisse finem suum assecutum: Apostolos omnia ad salutem necessaria, aut non debuisse scribere, aut noluisse, aut non potuisse: Scripturam veteris Testamenti esse noui Testamenti Scriptura perfectionem: Sacra Biblia non respondere suae inscriptioni διαθήκης: (siquidem licet hominibus addere Diuinæ διαθήκης) sacram Scripturam post Christum exhibitum & post scripta Apostolorum non esse numeris omnibus absolutam: eandem fidem esse scriptis veterum adhibendam, quae sacrae Scripturae adhibetur: certam fidem esse in iis rebus adhibendam, de quibus certò non constat: veterum haereticorum causam non parum subleuari qui eiusmodi traditionibus non scriptis nitebantur: denique Apostolos alio Spiritu fuisse locutos quàm quo scripserint. Si inquam, superiora absurda sententiam Pontificiorum de Traditionibus non scriptis consequuntur: certè Pontificiorum sententia de Traditionibus non scriptis est piis omnibus & orthodoxis ac verè Catholicis repudianda. Antecedens est verum. Quare verum quoque sit consequens necesse sit." Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, p. 21 (numbering added by the present author).

³³ Many of the arguments he opposes can be found in these two works: Wilhelmus Lindanus [Wilhelm van der Lindt], *Evangelicae panopliae, sive de verbo Dei evangelico* (Cologne: Cholinus, 1559); Stanislaus Hosius, *De expresso Dei verbo, libellus his temporibus accommodatissimus* (Louvain: Gravius, 1559).

every case he alleges either ambiguous terms, false premises, or logical fallacies of his opponents, frequently employing Greek technical terms for the fallacies. He also draws three new tools from his kit: (1) frequently he will reduce to an absurdity the argument of his opponents by showing what, in his opinion, would really follow from it;³⁴ (2) he will also continue by assuming the truth of at least one of his opponents' premises and then turning it against their own conclusion; and, (3) finally, he will offer a correction to the objection, that is, a restatement of the correct teaching, based on the same Scripture text. In summary, the structure is thus:

1. Objection: The objection of his opponents, in syllogistic form.
2. Response: Chandieu's answer to the theological substance of the objection.
3. Error: Statement of what error in logic has been committed by his opponents.
4. Absurdity: The opponents' argument reduced to an absurdity.
5. Retort: The opponents' grounds employed against their own objection.
6. Correction: The objection's grounds used in support of Chandieu's position.

Three examples from the twelve objections based on Scripture follow:

The refutation of the first objection is the most involved of all sixteen. The objection argues that the teaching of the gospel is really written in the heart, not on tables of stone or with ink. Therefore the church should seek the living voice of the apostles and not adhere so closely to the apostolic writings. The antecedent is based on Jeremiah 31, "I will write my law on their hearts," and Second Corinthians 3 where the apostle Paul

³⁴ Although chapter three essentially reduces the thesis of his opponents to an absurdity already (i.e., he has used this tool), nevertheless chapter four exhibits it as a distinct step in the process of answering his opponents' objections.

states that the Corinthian church is a “letter of Christ” for the apostles, written not with ink but by the Spirit of the living God.³⁵

To this Chandieu responds first by dividing his opponents: The medieval “scholastic and questionary doctors” or “papist scholastics” varied in their reasons why the gospel should be written in the mind.³⁶ Thomas said it was because the grace of God could not be written. But others said the reason was because the gospel began by preaching whereas the law first came on tablets of stone. Chandieu references Nicolas of Lyra’s commentary on Hebrews for this debate. He then advances his own view that both Jeremiah and Paul were addressing the question of the efficacy of the Holy Spirit and his spiritual gifts, not the matter of writing as such. They were making comparisons, stating that “more” of the Spirit and his gifts were given in the New Testament. Thus, the antecedent, which states that the gospel is only written on the heart, is denied, also because a multitude of Old Testament texts indicate that the law was already written on the hearts of God’s people (e.g., Is 51; Ps 1, 37, 51; Dt 30; Pr 3).

Chandieu names the fallacy of the antecedent in Aristotle’s Greek: τοῦ πρὸς τὸ ἀπλῶς λεγομένου, that is to say, *secundum quid*, where the argument extrapolates from a single or even unusual instance to make a false generalization. In his view

³⁵ See van der Lindt, *Evangelicae panopliae*, pp. 18ff. for an example of this argument.

³⁶ Chandieu uses these two phrases, “Scholasticos Pontificios,” and “Scholasticorum & Quaestionariorum.” Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, p. 22. Chandieu’s mention of the Quaestionarii could refer to those medieval teachers who conducted quodlibetal disputations but more likely refers to those who structured their theology (or law or medicine) treatises like Aquinas did, as a setting forth of questions beginning with *utrum* (that is: whether) and thus demanding a yes or no response. This is confirmed in the preface where, after mentioning the *Quaestionii* Chandieu singles out Scotus, Aquinas, and Ockham. Kreeft remarks that the *utrum*, requiring either yes or no, was Aquinas’s way of keeping an issue “finite and decidable, just as debaters do in formulating their ‘resolution’.” Peter Kreeft, *Summa Philosophica* (South Bend: St. Augustine’s Press, 2012), p. 4.

Jeremiah 31 and Second Corinthians 3 were being used as grounds by the Papists without due recognition of their meaning in light of a multitude of other texts.

He then names five fallacies of the consequent and explains each one. The consequent that he has in mind, however, is not exactly that of their original argument as he stated it – that the church should pay more attention to the living voice of the apostles – but the conclusion that the teachings of the gospel were unwritten. This conclusion, he states, is a *non sequitur* because it reasons from a universal affirmative (the gospel written on all believers' hearts) to a particular negative (thus certain things were not written by the apostles).³⁷ It also involves a fallacy in figures of speech (παρὰ τὸ σχῆμα τῆς λέξεως) because the tablets of stone refer to the literal stones whereon the Ten Commandments were inscribed whereas the tablet of the heart is figurative. Thirdly, he accuses his opponents of putting the efficient and instrumental causes in opposition by having God (efficient cause) write on tablets whereas Matthew, Paul, etc. (instrumental causes) write on hearts. Fourthly, their consequent does not agree with their antecedent inasmuch as, contrary to their argument, the visible presence of the gospel in writing in no way opposes the invisible presence of the gospel in human hearts; rather, the first assists the second. No false dilemma should be introduced. Finally, the fallacy of ignorance of the argument or an irrelevant conclusion (παρὰ τὴν ἄγνοιαν τοῦ ἐλέγχου) occurs because when his opponents appeal to Paul's words about the Corinthians being his letter written not with ink but by the Spirit of God, they ignore the

³⁷ Interestingly, the 1580 edition (p. 59) uses the Greek παρὰ τὸ ἐπόμενον whereas the 1592 *Opera Theologica* drops it here (p. 22).

fact that he says these very things to them by means of pen and ink, and thus is not at all abolishing the visible gospel!³⁸

Hypothetical syllogisms follow as he proposes a number of absurdities and difficulties (*absurda et incommoda*) that follow from the argument of the Papists. If, he writes, we should not hold to the Apostles' writings because God has written the gospel in pious souls, then it would follow that the Scriptures are not needed at all. Or, if the text from Jeremiah 31 is taken in context, and it is noted that after speaking of the gospel being written in the heart, the Lord also says that he will forgive sins in the coming new covenant and be their God, it would follow on the Papistic interpretation that sins in the old covenant were only partially forgiven and he was the Israelite's God only in part. This, he states, is a heresy (ἑτεροδοξον).³⁹

Then Chandieu advances his retort (*retorquor*). This motif is present in his 1567 refutation of Claude de Saintes as well as his 1577 refutation of Francisco Torres, both of which are reviewed above, in chapters 3 and 4. He writes,

And now at last we will throw back this argument of the Papists upon their head. Thus we say:

All the laws of God are written in pious souls, as the Papists say in the places cited above. "Not with ink," says Paul, "but by the Spirit of God." [But] no traditions of the Papists are written in pious souls, for they are in fact written with ink, but not by the Spirit of God. Therefore no traditions of the Papists are laws of God.⁴⁰

³⁸ Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, pp. 22-3.

³⁹ Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, p. 23.

⁴⁰ "Denique retorqueamus hoc argumentum Pontificiorum in ipsorum caput, atque ita dicamus. Omnes Leges Dei scripta sunt in animis piorum: ut dicant Pontificiis ex locis supra citatis. Non atramento, inquit, Paulus, sed Spiritu Dei. Nullae Pontificiorum traditiones scripta sunt in animis piorum. Sunt enim atramento quidem scripta, sed non Spiritu Dei. Quare nullae Pontificiorum traditiones sunt Leges Dei." Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, p. 23.

For the traditions written in ink, Chandieu may be thinking of Gratian's *Decretals*, but probably more of various subsequent decrees of popes and church councils in the medieval period.

Finally, as a "correction" Chandieu affirms that the Scriptures do contain the very same teachings of the gospel which the apostles taught by living voice, and which God has also written upon the minds of the pious.

Chandieu's reply to this first objection is the most involved of all sixteen in this chapter. Perhaps this was to make a show of force at the outset: naming fallacies, reducing to absurdities, turning arguments against their proponents (retorting), and offering "corrections" are remarkably powerful scholastic tools. They aim to achieve in short space – without slurs or reproaches – what would be much more expansive in the hands of the rhetoricians.

A more straightforward refutation is available with the third objection. Here the Papists argue that Christ taught his apostles about the kingdom of God for forty days after his resurrection and that such teachings were not extant in writing. Therefore, they concluded, not all things pertaining to the kingdom of God were written and information about these things must be sought from the unwritten traditions. Chandieu affirms the first part of the antecedent, based on Acts 1:3, but denies that such things are not extant in writing. The error is begging the question (*petitio principii*), since the part of the antecedent that speaks of such teachings not being extant in writing is the very thing needing to be proved. To make the argument an absurdity, Chandieu says that if Christ spoke of the kingdom as it says in Acts 1 but the apostles did not write it, then it would follow that the things they wrote do not pertain to the kingdom of God. He returns the

objection with a hypothetical syllogism: if the Lord fully instructed the apostles about his kingdom and if the Holy Spirit inspired them to write about it, then they must have written about it fully, leaving no need for unwritten traditions. Finally, Chandieu corrects the argument by stating that Christ fully taught the apostles during those forty days so that they might both preach and afterward accurately write all that he had revealed.⁴¹

The sixth objection raised by the Papists was based on First Corinthians 11 where Paul commends the Corinthians for holding to the traditions he has handed down. The Papists' conclusion was that Paul must have handed down many things orally which he did not write. Chandieu affirms the antecedent based on the Scripture given. But then he proceeds to probe its meaning with reference to Chrysostom, Ambrose, and Theophylact to determine what sorts of traditions were in view. Some said that they were only about certain rites and ceremonies. In that case, says Chandieu, we don't need to dispute about it, since our disputation is about the things necessary for salvation. However, if the Papists argue that Paul is writing about certain doctrines, Chandieu will argue that the consequence is false: there is no proof that any of these traditions were unwritten. The error is drawing a conclusion from a false assumption (παρὰ τὸ ἐπόμενον). These "traditions" are described in the following verses in First Corinthians 11 and have to do with the difference between men and women's head coverings while prophesying. Moreover, if other traditions are in view, they could have been penned in another letter by Paul, or recorded by other apostles. He adds three other passages used by the Papists for the same argument and shows in each case that the traditions in view were written in

⁴¹ Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, p. 24.

Scripture, sometimes immediately adjoining the given verses (1Th 3:6; Ac 16:4 [he compares Ac 15:23-4]; 1Co 11:23; and 1Co 15:3).

For the absurdity, Chandieu reasons hypothetically, that if Paul passed on traditions by his living voice, then such traditions are not written. If so, Paul did not write about women's head coverings or men prophesying bare-headed. How absurd, he reasons, for these matters clearly are written in First Corinthians 11 (he had already brought up these in 1566 as examples of changing cultural patterns which are not bound upon the church of all time).⁴² To turn the argument against his opponents, he points out that if even his Roman Catholic opponents (monks) do wear their cowls when preaching, they are not obeying the written apostolic traditions, and so how much more lawful ought it to be for the Reformed to neglect the unwritten Roman traditions. Finally, he corrects the argument by arguing that Paul reminds the Corinthians of the traditions he had handed down orally because he knew how forgetful and fickle they were. And, if this was his purpose, we are pointed all the more strongly to the apostles' writings for that same reason.

The other objections refuted by Chandieu usually have recourse to Scripture texts where the author spoke of his desire to write more, or of the possibility of doing so. For instance, in Romans 15:15, Paul spoke of writing "in part." Chandieu counters that Paul wrote more than this letter, and thus support for the legitimacy of an unwritten tradition is not warranted (objection four). Likewise John said he had many things to communicate, but would not use pen and ink (2Jo 1:12; 3Jo 1:13). Chandieu counters that these are not matters of faith, for he commends each recipient as being full of faith (objection 10). At

⁴² [Antoine de Chandieu], *La confirmation de la discipline ecclesiastique, observee es eglises reformees du royaume de France. Avec la response aux obiectiones proposees alencontre* ([Geneva: Henri II Estienne], 1566), pp. 224-5.

the end of his gospel, John wrote that if he had recorded all the things Jesus did, the world probably could not contain all the books. Chandieu says that this argument draws an irrelevant conclusion (*ignorantio elenchi*) because John was not discussing matters of salvation, but the record of all Jesus' miracles (objection eleven). Similarly, shortly before his trial and death, Jesus said that he had many things to say which his disciples could not bear (John 16:12). Chandieu refutes the Papists by saying that they ignore the time and occasion when this was said as well as the fact that Jesus promised the Holy Spirit to reveal these things to his disciples later, and this in no way precluded their later act of recording these things in Scripture (objection five).

Noteworthy is Chandieu's attention to literary and historical details, for this reflects the *mos gallicus* in his Toulousian law training. He does not resolve differences merely by systematic or logical considerations, but also by historical analysis.

Four objections raised by his Roman Catholic opponents were based on theology and church history. Two are reviewed here:

The first objection argues that it was necessary to appeal to the unwritten tradition because heretics misused Scripture.⁴³ Whereas Chandieu agrees that not only heretics, but even Satan misused Scripture (2Pe 3; Mt 4), yet he calls the conclusion an error of false cause (παρὰ τὸ μὴ αἴτιον ὥς αἴτιον) because the fathers used the very Scriptures to refute the heretics' misuse, just as Jesus used the same Scriptures to refute Satan's misuse. Chandieu advances an absurdity as follows: If the heretics' misuse of Scripture means that we should not simply cling to the Scriptures, then the heretics' misuse of apostolic traditions means that we must not cling to apostolic traditions such as the

⁴³ See Hosius, *De expresso Dei verbo*, pp. 14ff.

Papists advance. He then turns things around with his retort, “If just as Satan abused Scripture before Christ, so also the heretics abuse Scripture against the orthodox, then certainly just as Christ used Scripture alone to refute Satan, so also the orthodox ought to use Scripture alone to refute the heretics.”⁴⁴ Finally, his “correction” argues that if the heretics abused Scripture, we ought to conclude that it is our sacred duty to guard Scripture’s authority and purity carefully, interpreting the more obscure texts in light of the more clear ones.

Objection fourteen brings up the origin and authority of theological words not found in Scripture such as Trinity, substance, persons, homoousios, sacrament, as well as doctrines not spelled out in Scripture such as the baptism of infants. The Papist objection would be that such words pertain to the dogmas of the faith and thus not all things pertaining to the faith are found in Scripture.⁴⁵ Chandieu agrees that the words are lacking in Scripture but argues that their substance and idea are present. “However, the Christian faith does not rest upon terms, but things; not in pages of words (as Jerome said), but in the root of reason.”⁴⁶ For the absurdity Chandieu says that if because said *words* were absent from Scripture it would follow that the doctrines themselves, necessary to salvation, are absent from Scripture, then it would also follow that certain things necessary to salvation were actually unknown to the apostles. Finally, to retort, Chandieu argues that if the church fathers took such pains to ensure that all their theological expressions were firmly grounded in Scripture, then his opponents certainly

⁴⁴ “Si quemadmodum Satan adversus Christum Scriptura abusus est, ita haeretici adversus Orthodoxos Scriptura abutuntur. Certè quemadmodum Christus sola Scriptura usus est ad Satanam repellendum, ita Orthodoxi sola Scriptura uti debent, ad haeticos repellendos.” Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, p. 29.

⁴⁵ See Hosius, *De expresso Dei verbo*, pp. 26ff; van der Lindt, *Panopliae evangelicae*, pp. 14-16.

⁴⁶ “Fides autem Christiana non sita est in vocabulis, sed in rebus: non in verborum foliis (dicebat Heironymus) sed in radice rationis.” Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, p. 29.

should not advance words, much less whole teachings, which are not grounded in Scripture.

Chapter four is fascinating in its disputational structure. Anyone who could carry out an oral disputation with this level of structure would be a formidable foe. Certainly Chandieu's abundant use of Greek terms for the fallacies he detects exudes learnedness. He appears to do something similar as did Aquinas, whose *Summa Theologiae* begins each section with a *quaestio*, follows with *objectiones*, then asserts a brief *sed contra* followed by the lengthier body of the article (*respondo dicens*), and finally finishes with answers to each of the objections with which the article began.⁴⁷ Chandieu's structure is even more intricate than Aquinas's. Perhaps it derives from a scholastic law textbook in his university days or perhaps his writing approximated a structure recommended for use in oral classroom disputations at the universities. This matter will be further investigated.

Chapter 5. How (not) to use the Church Fathers

Having refuted four arguments of his opponents from Scripture, theology, and church history in the last chapter, Chandieu now, for his fifth disputation in this book, takes up the hotly debated question of the authority of the church fathers' writings. In the eyes of his opponents one needed the post-apostolic traditions and Councils to be of equal authority with Scripture in order to have a doctrine of the Trinity and in order to oppose heretics such as Arius, as noted above. Indeed, part of the explanation for Pierre Caroli's charge some decades earlier that Farel and Calvin were anti-Trinitarians was due to their

⁴⁷ See the brief but helpful explanation in Kreeft, *Summa Philosophica*, pp. 4-6.

stand against tradition in favour of Scripture alone.⁴⁸ Chapter five of *De verbo Dei scripto* advances six rules for the right use of the fathers. Chandieu notes how his opponents heap up many testimonies from church history and he describes the many writings of the fathers as a “labyrinth.” The following six rules are given by him to assist us in evaluating them.

1. The writings of the old doctors are to be received for the confirmation of our faith insofar as they agree with the sacred writings.⁴⁹
2. By the term “tradition” the old doctors often understood those dogmas which are contained in the apostolic writings.⁵⁰
3. The ancients often call an unwritten tradition that which is not found in so many words in the sacred writings, but nevertheless, if one looks for the thing itself, it is found in Scripture.⁵¹
4. The ancients very frequently do not mean dogmas by the term “tradition” but ecclesiastical rites, and in order to commend the ecclesiastical order more, they commonly refer those rites to the apostles as authors.⁵²
5. Some of the ancients, inasmuch as they had their faults, granted too much to these sorts of unwritten traditions and for that reason sometimes yielded to the heretics.⁵³
6. Many books have been fabricated under the name of the ancients, which nevertheless are forged.⁵⁴

⁴⁸ Herman J. Selderhuis, *John Calvin: A Pilgrim's Life*, trans. Albert Gootjes (Downers Grove: Intervarsity, 2009), pp. 77-9.

⁴⁹ “Ad fidem nostram confirmandam, veterum Doctorum scripta eatenus sunt recipienda, quatenus cum Sacris literis conueniunt.” Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, p. 31.

⁵⁰ “Veteres Doctores seape nomine traditionis significant ea dogmata quae scriptis Apostolicis continentur.” Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, p. 31.

⁵¹ “Veteres saepe vocant traditionem non scriptam id, quod totidem verbis in Sacris literis non reperitur, sed tamen si rem ipsam spectes, extat in Scriptura.” Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, p. 31.

⁵² “Veteres saepissimè nomine Traditionis non significant Dogmata, sed ritus Ecclesiasticos, & ut magis commendent ordinem Ecclesiasticum, ritus ipsos ad Apostolos autores vulgò referunt.” Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, p. 32.

⁵³ “Quidam ex veteribus, quum naeuos quoque suos haberent, nimis indulserunt eiusmodi traditionibus non scriptis, ac propterea se aliquando ad haereticos inclinarunt.” Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, p. 32.

Chandieu advances supporting testimony from Scripture and various church fathers after each rule. Gratian's *Decretals* are an important authority, receiving mention as the last proof for rule one – Chandieu is delighted to have canon law on his side. We also note the humanist concern conveyed in rule six – a motif we noted in his five rules for Scripture interpretation as well.

He employs these six rules to evaluate nine objections (to his thesis) raised by the Papists out of the writings of the church fathers. In each case, Chandieu quotes the passage from the church father in question; all speak overtly about unwritten traditions. Clement of Alexandria is judged to be mistaken, as is Tertullian, whereas the passages from Irenaeus, Basil, Chrysostom, Gregory of Nazianzus, Epiphanius, Jerome, and Augustine have been misunderstood and misused by the Papists, according to Chandieu's reasoning. Some were merely about changeable rites that do not belong to salvation whereas others were using the word "tradition" for what is actually revealed in Scripture. The treatment of these quotations is simply written out in prose, without syllogisms.

Chapter 6. Church fathers in support of Reformed teaching

Chandieu ends *De verbo Dei scripto* by citing some fifteen church fathers and medieval theologians in support of the Reformed position on Scripture. He cites Irenaeus, Tertullian, Origen, Justin Martyr, Athanasius, Hilary, Cyril, Chrysostom, Basil, Jerome, Augustine, John of Damascus, Scotus, Peter Stelliaco, and Gratian. Noteworthy are the latter three, whom Chandieu introduces as "scholastics," saying that he does not want to

⁵⁴ "Multi libri nomina veterum ementiuntur, quum tamen sint suppositi." Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, p. 32.

ignore them. It appears, however, that support from the medieval scholastics for his position was plentiful.

The arguments over the church fathers close with one final syllogism to pull together all the Roman Catholic arguments and then refute them. Chandieu summarizes his opponents' view: "The ancient doctors of the church supposed that besides Scripture, unwritten traditions ought also to be received. Therefore not everything necessary for faith and salvation are contained in Scripture."⁵⁵ Our author proceeds with a response, a statement of their error, and a correction.

In response, he first admits that the church fathers do not speak unequivocally. Then he distinguishes those things that pertain to the dogmas and ethics of the faith from those things that are merely rites and ceremonies. The former are most fully contained in Scripture either in express words or in the substance of the teaching. As for the latter, Chandieu does not expressly admit that some have come as unwritten traditions, but he states the conditions under which they should be accepted: they must agree with Scripture; edify the church; and be received by the "common consent" of the church.⁵⁶ He believes this was the view of the ancients.

The errors are two: first, a misunderstanding of the church fathers occurs in the antecedent, leading Chandieu to deny the consequent; second, begging the question. This latter charge stems from the fact that the Papists use the church fathers to prove that the

⁵⁵ "Veteres Ecclesiae Doctores censuerunt, praeter Scripturam traditiones quoque non scriptas esse recipiendas. Ergo non omnia quae sunt ad fidem salutemque necessaria in Scriptura continentur." Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, p. 35.

⁵⁶ "communi Ecclesiae consensus recepta sint." Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, p. 35. Note the importance of the phrase "by common consent" in the church polity decisions of the French Reformed Churches. See, for instance, a pertinent addition to the *Discipline ecclesiastique* made in 1563. Jean Aymon, *Tous les synodes nationaux des églises réformées de France* (Den Haag: Charles Deloo, 1710), vol. 1, p. 33; compare p. 36. See also Chandieu, *Confirmation de la discipline ecclesiastique*, pp. 35, 73.

Scriptures alone are insufficient. He writes, “For if this dogma about which we are disputing can be decided based on the writings of the ancients, it follows that Scripture alone ought not to be accepted for determining the dogmas of the faith. Therefore the Papists do not dispute satisfactorily, but they beg the question.”⁵⁷ Whereas Chandieu’s opponents could respond that his own argument is also circular, for he is determining out of Scripture that the dogmas of the church may only be proved from Scripture, his response would be to go back to his preface where he had explained the role of principles in theological arguments and had asserted that “no Christian ever doubted” that the Word of God is inspired and authoritative. Then he would return to the point where he challenges his opponents to openly claim unwritten tradition to be equally authoritative with inspired Scripture, and, if they would, he would proceed to show that the tradition is equivocal, that many of its teachings disagree with Scripture, and that the limits of what is the tradition are fluid, probably including heretics. Thus, it could not be inspired and authoritative.

Finally, our author offers a “correction” and then finishes the entire treatise with the conclusion that he has proved his thesis.

I have here brought together from the writings of the most learned men those things of which I was disputing regarding the written Word of God over against human traditions, and treated [them] theologically and at the same time scholastically by our method . . . so that it may be clear to everyone that most well-founded is this dogma of ours – which, on the basis of the Word of God, the Reformed – and therefore orthodox and truly catholic – Church professes: ‘All the dogmas necessary for the Christian faith are contained in the Holy Scripture.’⁵⁸

⁵⁷ “Nam si hoc dogma de quo disputamus statui potest ex Veterum scriptis, sequitur non solam Scripturam instatuendis fidei dogmatibus, esse audiendam. Quare non satis rectè Pontificii disputant, τὸ ἐξ ἀρχῆς αἰτούμενοι.” Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, p. 35.

⁵⁸ “Haec habui quae disputarem de Verbo Dei scripto adversus humanas traditiones ex doctissimorum hominum scriptis collecta: atque ex nostra methodo, theologicè simul, & scholasticè tractata . . . ut omnibus pateat verissimum esse hoc dogma, quod nostra, hoc est, ex verbo Dei reformata, ac propeterea orthodoxa,

Chandieu's Doctrine of Scripture Drives His Method

An area of agreement: All of Scripture is inspired by God

In the 1566 *Confirmation* we noted the nuanced approach to Scripture, where Chandieu singled out the particular commands and commissions as having greatest weight, then the express doctrines and teachings, then the biblical examples, then the authority of the ancient teachers or examples from post-apostolic church history, and then arguments such as what proceeds from “necessity itself” or what confusion might follow from the alternative.⁵⁹ This hierarchy of authorities kept Scripture pre-eminent, yet recognized that its contents include ambiguous examples of adherence to God's commands and teachings. The arguments in *De verbo Dei scripto* observe these principles as necessary, but do not need to be arranged explicitly in this way because Chandieu and his opponents in *De verbo Dei* are disputing about the very place of Scripture as such, not on the minutiae within it (its particulars are used only with respect to the wider question of Scripture's authority and role in the church). In other words, there is less agreement or less of a common foundation between Chandieu and the Papists than there was between Chandieu and Morély. If Chandieu convinced a Roman Catholic opponent of his position on Scripture, he might, if necessary, follow that up with the arguments about church government which he made against Morély, but he would not advance his church polity arguments before he has agreement with his interlocutor on what authorities can function in the argument.

veréque Catholica Ecclesia profitetur. *Omnia dogmata fidei Christiana necessaria in Scriptura sacra contineri.*” Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, p. 36.

⁵⁹ See above, chapter 3, pp. 114-16.

The most important foundation for the arguments in *De verbo Dei scripto* is that all Scripture is inspired by God (2Ti 3:16). Both sides share this view, which Chandieu calls an indubitable and self-credible axiom, “of which no Christians express doubt . . . that [axiom] is true because God said it and it shall please no one to go beyond this.”⁶⁰ The same statement about divine inspiration receives first place in his definition of Scripture.⁶¹ His final demonstration in chapter two directly moves from the divine inspiration of Scripture to the conclusion that all the dogmas necessary for the Christian faith are found in Scripture. Chandieu’s overall *modus operandi* thus is to argue from this commonly held axiom to an inconsistency in his opponents’ views, that is, they cannot hold Scripture to be divinely inspired *and* maintain the need for unwritten traditions in matters of salvation. Hereby he follows one of the rules of scholastic disputation, namely that a disputant had no obligation to prove any axiom which was self-credible and that no other position should call such axioms into doubt.⁶²

The locus method and deductive reasoning

Perhaps Chandieu’s treatise has a glaring lacuna, for he never identifies what particular matters of salvation his opponents are propounding on the basis of an unwritten tradition. This absence, however, is simply due to the limited scope of his disputation and will be addressed in the coming volumes, where he disputes regarding the mass, purgatory, and meritorious good works – doctrines for which traditions outside of and

⁶⁰ Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, p. 9.

⁶¹ Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, p. 17.

⁶² “The *opponens* is under no obligation to prove anything that is a *manifestum* and *maxime verum principium*. The rule says that in such a case the *opponens* should point out to his partner that such principles are not to be doubted.” Ignacio Angelelli, “The Techniques of Disputation in the History of Logic,” *The Journal of Philosophy* 67:20 (1970): p.807.

after Scripture played an important role. He also does not quote or reference the works of any of his opponents, but this is explained by the fact that he is engaging a general position held by virtually all his Roman Catholic opponents and probably also by the fact that the disputations in this treatise may have first seen life as the basis for oral classroom disputation (more on this later).

Extremely important for the consideration of historians is Chandieu's view that his method does justice to the authority of Scripture. While on the one hand, Aristotelian analytical logic was gaining ground in the higher faculties of law, medicine, and theology, on the other hand, Chandieu employed Aristotle's analytic and demonstrative method of reasoning in order to make as explicit as possible the kinds of deductions that theologians – Roman Catholic, Reformed, or other – were making from Scripture. He felt that this was the best way to test the arguments against the authority of God's Word. Realizing that all theologians purport to be arguing validly on the basis of Scripture, he attempted to test both the validity (scholastic) and the truth (theological) of the arguments.

The combination of scriptural *loci* as *sedes argumentorum* in chapter two with careful syllogistic reasoning also highlights the intersection of "theological" (the *loci*) with "scholastic" (the syllogisms). Whereas some theologians consider these two to be at odds, Chandieu and his contemporaries would call this a false dilemma, pointing out that the communication of ideas is intrinsically propositional.⁶³ Indeed, the locus method was not invented to avoid logical analysis, but to bring together the many considerations that would inform one's considerations of an idea. In the case of Scripture, this was to ensure

⁶³ Aristotle wrote that all people employ dialectic, rhetoric, and the peirastic arts, even if they do so in an unskilled way. *Sophistical Refutations*, ch. 11 (172a27-36), and *Rhetoric*, Book 1, ch. 1 (1354a1-11).

that the theologian's considerations on one text did not contradict statements of another text or valid deductions from it. After all, Scripture in its entirety was authored by God! In other words, the locus method itself was a way of pursuing a doctrinal orthodoxy firmly embedded in the reading of the whole Scripture. As such, it in no way precluded the use of syllogisms to test arguments.

True faith must be firm and certain

Chandieu's view of Scripture's authority, his view of theology as a science, and his view of faith as a certainty fit together hand in glove. Both in his 1567 *Refutatio libelli quem Claudius de Sainctes* and here in his 1580 *De verbo Dei*, he objects to those medieval theologians who treated theological questions in ways that incurred doubt, whether by always presenting two sides to a question without necessarily offering a resolution or by entertaining frivolous questions.⁶⁴ Because Scripture itself is the *principium* of theology and because it as a whole and its teaching passages in particular are indubitable axioms, faith itself, which rests upon them, must be firm and certain.

One could hardly claim such certainty for faith if the texts of Scripture were ambiguous and equivocal. Thus, Chandieu clearly considers Scripture to be perspicuous in its teaching of doctrine as well as in its teaching of the principles of church polity (as we have seen from his 1566 publication). Given its ultimate divine authorship, he interprets the less clear texts in light of the more clear ones.⁶⁵ He recommended this both in 1566 and in 1580, as well as in his rules of 1581.⁶⁶

⁶⁴ On de Sainctes' work, see above, chapter 3, pp. 126-31.

⁶⁵ We find this rule expressed well in Augustine, *Teaching Christianity: De Doctrina Christiana*, trans. Edmund Hill (New York: New City Press, 1996). pp. 177-80. This is quite different from the redemptive movement hermeneutic today – taking certain texts as thematic and then interpreting the others so that they

Certainty of faith is also one of Chandieu's justifications for using the Aristotelian/Thomistic analytical and demonstrative method of reasoning. His opening letter to the French pastors, his lengthy preface, and the body of the volume all include references to the need for theological conclusions to be firm and certain, so that they are worthy of faith. Not surprisingly, given the historical nature of the narrative of Scripture, it is likewise obvious that Chandieu adheres to a literal interpretation. Whereas the application of Scripture in a sermon might well expound the text spiritually in terms of faith, hope, and love – as recommended by Augustine and practiced in the *quadrige* – yet in the construction of his theology, Chandieu sticks to the literal meaning of the text.

Chandieu's repeated recommendation for the analytical method suggests that he thinks that the use of merely topical reasoning in theology doesn't provide conclusions which can be held with full conviction. It would be surprising if Chandieu were castigating Melancthon's or Calvin's theologizing just because they didn't use Aristotle's *Analytics*, for they, like all Protestant theologians, regarded the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments to be the infallible and authoritative Word of God. Further, we noted in chapter two above Chandieu's efforts on behalf of the French churches to secure good ecumenical relations with the churches in Germany, the Netherlands, and Switzerland, and certainly they did not all follow his method. Thus, as the preface of *De verbo Dei* shows, Chandieu's target when he speaks out against probable reasoning is mostly the medieval scholastic doctors who treated both sides of a question without

will agree with the thematic texts (e.g., Galatians 3:28). See for instance, William Webb, *Slaves, Women & Homosexuals: Exploring the Hermeneutics of Cultural Analysis* (Downers Grove: Intervarsity, 2001).

⁶⁶ Chandieu, *Confirmation*, p. 84; Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, pp. 29, 705.

taking a clear stand upon Scripture. At the same time, Chandieu is calling upon his fellow Protestant theologians to strengthen their conclusions by way of a more solid method.

Chapter 7

Reflection on Chandieu's Scholastic Method 1580-1589

The Disputational Structure

We have now seen that the methodological circumspection observed in Chandieu's 1566 *Confirmation* finds even stronger expression in his 1580 *De verbo Dei*. Where the overall structure in 1566 took on different opponents in turn and then divided into a series of arguments, particularly in part four (against Morély), the overall structure in 1580 is even more logical-disputational. The entire 1580 treatise revolves around one thesis. Each chapter represented a different logical-disputational contribution to the overall argument:

Chapter 1: Introduction of Reformed thesis and opposing Roman Catholic thesis

Chapter 2: Arguments to support the Reformed thesis

Chapter 3: Arguments to oppose the Roman Catholic thesis, showing its absurdity

Chapter 4: Objections to the Reformed thesis answered

Chapter 5: Rebuttal of arguments from church fathers against the Reformed thesis

Chapter 6: Exhibition of church fathers in support of the Reformed thesis

Of note is the distinction between chapters three and four: the former addresses the opposing thesis as such with arguments constructed by Chandieu while the latter dismantles the actual arguments advanced by his opponents against his thesis and in support of theirs. Chapter four in particular followed its own meticulous substructure of:

(1) objection of his opponents stated – which is at the same time a supporting argument for their own thesis;

- (2) theological response argued against the objection;
- (3) logical error of the objection identified and explained briefly;
- (4) objection reduced to the absurd or impossible;
- (5) a retort offered using the opponents' own grounds, turning their argument upon them; and,
- (6) a correction advanced which also uses the opposing grounds, but now in favour of Chandieu's thesis.

This intricate structure deserves close study, for published classroom disputations did not regularly follow such a rigid pattern.¹ Of course arguments such as any of the six immediately above arose quite naturally in many disputations – it all depends which arguments arise from one or the other side. But highly remarkable is the kind of analysis that groups all of the arguments as rigidly as does Chandieu and that adheres to this structure for all six of his treatises from 1580 to 1589.

Although it is impossible to know the relationship between Chandieu's classroom lectures and his theological and scholastic treatises, we should take note that his preface mentioned "candidates of theology" and described them as those who "excel in the study of theology and in the discipline of logic/philosophy (τρόπου ἐπιστήμης scientia)."² We know for certain that he taught as professor of theology at the Academy of Lausanne from 1577 to at least 1580 and perhaps as far forward as 1583. Later, in 1589-1591, he may have had a teaching role at the Academy of Geneva. The educative purpose he

¹ Consult, for example, any of the published theses in notes 32, 35, and 37 to 40 of the present chapter.

² "Ac tantisper dum illi qui & Theologiae studio & τρόπου ἐπιστήμης scientia excellunt, id praestandum suscipiant, ego in eorum adolescentum gratiam, qui sunt Theologiae candidati non dubitabo aliquid ea de re leuiter adumbrare . . ." Antonio Sadele [Antoine de Chandieu], *Opera Theologica* (Geneva: Jean le Preux, 1593), p. 9.

mentions in 1580 ties Chandieu's written disputations to the practices of classroom instruction and leads us to examine briefly the history of this practice.

Medieval sources: two kinds of disputation

The origins, development, and influence of the university disputation from medieval times into the modern era – in distinction from a general history of logic such as Risse's, of rhetoric such as Mack's, or of theological scholastic method such as Leinsle's – has yet to be written.³ Technical procedures in particular have eluded extensive study.⁴ Scholars posit different sources for the origins of disputations.⁵ Analyses of disputational practices often assume conclusions for all kinds of disputations when actually the author is describing only one type.⁶ Further progress will depend upon cross-disciplinary work by historians of medicine, law, theology, as well as the arts, since disputations occurred in all these faculties. We will first review the more accessible and commonly cited scholarship before turning to the recent valuable work of Olga Weijers.

³ A more global addition to the literature will be Alex J. Novikoff, *The Medieval Culture of Disputation: Pedagogy, Practice, and Performance* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, forthcoming in 2013). Brian Lawn's comment that "much work still remains to be done especially in connection with the seventeenth-century *quaestiones disputatae*" was indicative of what could be said in more subsections of the history of the disputation. Brian Lawn, *The Rise and Decline of the Scholastic 'Quaestio Disputata' with Special Emphasis on its Use in the Teaching of Medicine and Science* (Leiden: Brill, 1993), p. 145.

⁴ For many years the best short study was: Ignacio Angelelli, "The Techniques of Disputation in the History of Logic," in *The Journal of Philosophy* 67:20 (Oct. 1970): pp. 800-815. This article must be read carefully to avoid anachronisms. Angelelli reviews valuable early modern literature on disputations.

⁵ Scholars point to Abelard's *sic et non* method of reconciling authorities, to Aristotle's *corpus*, especially the re-discovery of the *logica nova* in the 1100s, the *quaestio* tradition, polemics with Jews, as well as influence from Islamic philosopher-theologians. Alex J. Novikoff, "Toward a Cultural History of Scholastic Disputation," in *The American Historical Review* 117:2 (2012): pp. 331-64; George Makdisi, "The Scholastic Method in Medieval Education: an Inquiry into its Origin in Law and Theology," in *Speculum* 49:4 (1974): pp. 640-61.

⁶ Most authors distinguish the *disputatio ordinaria* from the *disputatio de quolibet*. This distinguishes occasions for disputation and types of questions, but not different ways of disputing as such.

Medieval scholastic logic built upon Aristotle, and elaborated further. An anonymous fifteenth century author identified seven medieval subjects upon which Aristotle had not composed treatises, namely regarding amplification, appellation, obligations, insolubles, consequences, distributives, and syncategorematics.⁷ The middle three of these were vital to the technical development of the disputation as well as the function of the hypothetical syllogism.

Ignacio Angelelli's 1970 study on the techniques of disputation in the history of logic correctly distinguishes two methods, which he calls the "old" and "modern" methods. These terms, however, are misleading, for the "modern" method was known long before modern times. The "old" method he calls the "question method" and links it to the *Topica* of Aristotle and the medieval *ars obligatoria*. (As will be seen, we would do better calling this method 'dialectical' than 'question'.) This probably was the favoured technique in early medieval times because disputes needed to have "disputable" topics wherein probability could play a role and more than one position was possible. Via the numerous medieval manuals on the *ars obligatoria* students learned the rules or "obligations" of this exercise. Alan Perreiah has provided an accessible summary:

In this procedure a teacher, "the opponent," tenders a statement. If the pupil, called "the respondent," wants to be exercised or examined on the logical properties of the statement, he consents by accepting it. Once this is granted, the opponent fires a volley of other statements. To each of these the student responds by affirming, by denying, or by doubting. The aim of the student is to reply in no way which will make him contradict the original statement. Within the obligation format a number of variations are possible . . . The exchange ends when the

⁷ Philotheus Boehner, *Medieval Logic: An Outline of Its Development from 1250 to c. 1400* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1952), pp. 16-18. Compare Alan Perreiah, "Humanist Critiques of Scholastic Dialectic," in *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 13:3 (1982): pp. 12-19. Perreiah especially notes medieval contributions on supposition and inference (consequences, obligations, and insolubles).

student falls into inconsistency, the teacher goes on to a new initial statement or simply declares that the time for the obligation is over [*hora est!*].⁸

As for the so-called “modern” style, Angelelli calls it the “argument method” and states that it “may be recognized in the literary style of medieval philosophers and theologians.”⁹ He continues, “A study of exactly when a *theory* of the argument method originated should be the object of further empirical research.” He concludes that this method “prevailed” only with the “second scholastics,” that is, those arising after c. 1590. However, the statutes of the University of Paris in 1215 – which he does not mention – clearly stipulate something very close to the so-called “new” method. In fact, this method appears to be an exercise in disputing guided by Aristotle’s *Analytics* and therefore potentially equally primitive to the “question” method. Novikoff – without distinguishing this method from the question method – describes the “argument” method in the University of Paris after A.D. 1215.

The formalized practice of disputation in Paris took root in the faculty of arts as well as in the faculties of advanced learning: theology, medicine, and canon law. Several different forms of university disputations developed in the period following 1215. The *disputatio ordinaria* was held at regular intervals, usually in the morning, for the benefit of the bachelors and students. It was presided over by a master, who announced beforehand the question that would be asked. One bachelor, the *opponens*, supplied arguments against the thesis, while another, the *respondens*, attempted to answer the objections that were raised and to demonstrate their weakness. The master typically gave a summing-up or *determinatio* at the end, but not in all cases, and sometimes not at the time of the disputation, but rather at a later date.¹⁰

⁸ Perreiah, “Humanist Critiques of Scholastic Dialectic,” pp. 18-19. According to Perreiah these exercises in logic were for youngsters eleven or twelve years of age. *Ibid.*, p. 20. However, it would be reductionistic to conclude that *only* youngsters of this age disputed. The techniques for the “question method” are carefully described by Angelelli also. Angelelli, “Techniques of Disputation,” pp. 802-806. Compare Paul Moraux, “La Joute dialectique d’après le huitième livre des Topiques,” in *Aristotle on Dialectic: The Topics*, ed. G. E. L. Owen (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968), pp. 287-306.

⁹ Angelelli, “Techniques of Disputation,” p. 802.

¹⁰ Novikoff, “Toward a Cultural History of Scholastic Disputation,” pp. 352-3.

Clearly this is a different method than the dialectical one stemming from Aristotle's *Topics*. What Novikoff describes ought to be considered an antecedent to the practice that Angelelli gleaned from several eighteenth century textbooks, one which certainly does derive from the *Analytics*, not only because of the theses, but especially in view of the closing comment about not doubting *principia*:

In the new method the *respondens* starts the game by asserting a thesis A. Next the *opponens* must produce an argument whose conclusion is not-A . . . The *respondens* may then reject the argument: in particular, he may deny its premises. Then "the *opponens* assumes new propositions and by means of them he proves the denied proposition" . . . This is the essential scheme of the disputation, which goes on until propositions are reached that belong to a set accepted by both partners. The *opponens* is under no obligation to prove anything that is a *manifestum* and *maxime verum principium* (*cap.* III, 27-28). The rule says that in such a case the *opponens* should point out to his partner that such principles are not to be doubted.¹¹

Normally a student was the respondent, so he would have to start the exercise, usually with a thesis given by the professor. The opponent was either a fellow student or students, while the professor served as *praeses*, that is, president, supervisor, or referee. Once the respondent had set forth his thesis and the opponent(s) had taken some time to prepare and express his (their) anti-thesis, the respondent repeated the thesis three times and then made his move with respect to the anti-thesis, either to affirm what was true or deny what was false in it, or to make a distinction in case of ambiguity (*concede, nego, distingo*). Also possible was a retort, positing that the opponent's argument proved the respondent's.¹² Ideally, the opponent would posit a contradictory thesis to the respondent, not a contrary one, lest the listeners gather that both the respondent and opponent were

¹¹ Angelelli, "Techniques of Disputation," pp. 806-807. This matches the simpler description of medieval disputation in: Frederick Christian Bauerschmidt, *Holy Teaching: Introducing the Summa Theologiae of St. Thomas Aquinas* (Grand Rapids: Brazos, 2005), p. 23.

¹² Angelelli, "Techniques of Disputation," p. 808.

wrong.¹³ This method was recommended in Chandieu's day, judging by the manual on disputation by Augustin Huens, published in 1551.¹⁴ Regulations for the Latin School of Duisburg, written by Hendrik van Geldorp and published in 1561, recommend the dialectical method, almost certainly because younger students are in view.¹⁵

The reconstruction offered above suggests that scholars have sometimes studied only one kind of disputation and treated it as the whole (Novikoff, Makdisi, Lawn) or – if the two types were noticed – have made anachronistic claims or applied misleading terms (Angelelli). In fact, this is precisely what recent scholarship by Olga Weijers and Jenny Ashworth proves. According to Weijers, “It is not possible to speak of ‘the’ Medieval *disputatio*.”¹⁶ She clearly distinguishes the dialectical disputation from the scholastic disputation without falling into anachronism.

Within the world of schools and universities, two types of disputation are to be distinguished: the dialectic and the scholastic *disputatio*. The former is a process whose description dates back to the *Topica* by Aristotle, which one can also find in Cicero and which lived on in the Middle Ages in the schools that taught dialectics. This gave rise to the dialectic genre of the *obligationes*, which was

¹³ Angelelli, “Techniques of Disputation,” pp. 807-808.

¹⁴ Augustin Huens, *De Disputatione inter disceptantes, Dialectice instituenda, libellus* (Louvain: Verhasselt, 1551), b5v-d6r; compare Augustin Huens, *Logices fundamentum. Seu prodidagmata de dialecticis vocum affectionibus & proprietatibus* (Antwerp: Silvius, 1563). Angelelli, Ashworth, and Freedman note another manual of Huens from 1552. Angelelli, “Techniques of Disputation,” p. 808, n. 18; E. J. Ashworth, “Traditional logic,” in *Cambridge History of Renaissance Philosophy*, ed. Charles B. Schmitt and Quentin Skinner (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), p. 167; Joseph S. Freedman, “Published academic disputations in the context of other information formats utilized primarily in Central Europe (c. 1550-c.1700),” in *Trends in Medieval Philology: Disputatio 1200-1800* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2010), pp. 94-5, 120.

¹⁵ Hendrik van Geldorp, *De Optimo genere interpretandae philosophiae, in quo explicatur simul ratio atque ordo Scholae Dusbürgensis* (s.l.: s.n., 1561).

¹⁶ Olga Weijers, “The various kinds of disputation in the faculties of arts, theology, and law (c. 1200-1400),” in *Disputatio 1200-1800: Form, Funktion und Wirkung eines Leitmediums universitärer Wissenskultur*, ed. Marion Gindhard and Ursula Kundert (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2010), p. 21. Novikoff has two references to Weijers, both to a 1995 essay. Novikoff, “Toward a Cultural History of Scholastic Disputation,” p. 334, n. 19 and p. 352, n. 94. The distinction made by Weijers was also made by Josse Clichtove in his commentary on Jacques Lefevre's *Obligationes* commentary. E. J. Ashworth, “Traditional logic,” p. 166; E. J. Ashworth, “Renaissance man as logician: Josse Clichtove (1472-1543) on disputations,” in *History of Philosophy and Logic* 7 (1986): pp. 15-29.

taught in the *Artes* faculty or in the schools associated with that faculty. These were basically duels between two opponents according to strict dialectical rules, in which one tries to get the other to contradict a statement which he initially accepted, and thus to win the debate. This *disputatio* differs from the better known scholastic disputation in both purpose and structure. One of the major differences is that it aims to test logical rules and to create a winner of a debate, not to find (or teach) the truth or to solve a problem, as is the case in scholastic disputations. This scholastic disputation concerns a question which can be answered affirmatively or negatively . . . The scholastic *disputatio*, which was applied in all faculties, had various functions. It was an educational method, a research method and an instrument for testing knowledge and skills.¹⁷

Elsewhere Weijers specifies that the scholastic disputation grew out of the *quaestio* method, which itself grew out of *lectio*. At first the simple reading and commenting on the text occurred. Then the master began taking questions and offering answers at the end of each lecture. In time the questions moved to a separate time slot and became an alternate pedagogical method.¹⁸ She acknowledges how easy it is to mix up the two kinds of disputation, given that both are called disputations and both use respondents and opponents.¹⁹ Overall, one could think of the dialectical disputation as preparatory for the

¹⁷ Olga Weijers, "The medieval *disputatio*," in *Hora Est! On Dissertations* (Leiden: Universiteitsbibliotheek Leiden, 2005), pp. 23-4. Compare, "First, we have to make a distinction between two completely different kinds of disputation within the arts faculty: on the one hand the dialectical disputation, which was practiced in the schools of the dialecticians and culminated in the genre of the *obligations*, on the other hand what I will call the scholastic disputation, which developed out of the *questio* during lectures and which existed in all the faculties." Olga Weijers, "The various kinds of disputation," p. 21. Compare also Olga Weijers, "De la joute dialectique à la dispute scolastique," in *Comptes-rendus des séances de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* 143:2 (1999): pp. 513-17. On the obligations treatises, which studied the rules for the dialectical disputations, see Eleonore Stump, "Obligations: From the beginning to the early fourteenth century," in *The Cambridge History of Later Medieval Philosophy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), pp. 315-34; Anthony Kenny and Jan Pinborg, "Medieval philosophical literature," *The Cambridge History of Later Medieval Philosophy: From the Rediscovery of Aristotle to the Disintegration of Scholasticism 1100-1600*, ed. Norman Kretzmann, Anthony Kenny, and Jan Pinborg (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), pp. 26-7.

¹⁸ Weijers, "De la joute dialectique à la dispute scolastique," pp. 513-14.e

¹⁹ Weijers, "De la joute dialectique à la dispute scolastique," p. 517. Brian Lawn's account of the mechanics of disputations is generally helpful, but he too does not keep clear the distinction of kinds. Lawn, *Rise and Decline of the Scholastic 'Quaestio Disputata'*, pp. 137-141.

more serious pursuit of actual truths in the scholastic disputation.²⁰ The former is more ancient, but the latter certainly is not as late as Angelelli suggests.²¹

If we are to relate either of these disputational methods to Chandieu's dominant analytical method, it would clearly be the scholastic disputation, not the dialectical.

Written "for the better practice of disputations"

As noted in chapter 1 above, disputations were a regular part of university life, also in the Reformed academies of Geneva, Lausanne, and Basel. Although we cannot ascertain the details of the practice in every case, we do possess many of the theses that were defended, as well as written disputations. Ideally, a strong measure of continuity exists between the written disputations and the shape of classroom disputations, though this is an area requiring more study.²²

In Chandieu's case, we find an important remark by Simon Goulart (1543-1628) in his French translation of Chandieu's *De unico Christi sacerdotio*. In the opening letter Goulart states, "But the books that this noble and learned person left us in Latin, because they were written in terms used in schools of theology, made for the better practice of disputations, remain enclosed in a great collection of his works which was made after his death."²³ Goulart was a contemporary of Chandieu, pastor in Geneva from 1571 onward,

²⁰ A useful description of the scholastic disputation can also be found in Kenny and Pinborg, "Medieval philosophical literature," pp. 21-2.

²¹ "La dispute dialectique a certainement les racines les plus anciennes. Mais la dispute scolastique, tout en se servant de la dialectique et des techniques d'argumentation développées dans la dispute dialectique, l'a dépassée et est devenue un instrument pour l'analyse de problèmes réels et la principale méthode de recherche des universités médiévales." Weijers, "De la joute dialectique à la dispute scolastique," p. 517.

²² Weijers, "The medieval *disputatio*," p. 24.

²³ "Or les livres que ce Noble & docte personnage nous a laissez en lain, pour estre escrits en termes usitez es escholes de Theologie, faits pour les mieux exercez es disputes, demeuroyent enclos au grand recueil qui

and well acquainted with the work of the Reformed academies. He translated three of Chandieu's theological and scholastic treatises into French. Though he clearly stated that their proper setting was academic and their purpose was to help the students exercise their disputational skills, he also considered them useful for the general public because of the truths contained in them, and thus produced the French translations. He does not specify in what way the written disputations of Chandieu were used in the classrooms, but we can imagine the students memorizing some of the arguments or writing out similar disputations on the same model. At any rate, Goulart's description speaks for a remarkable affinity between Chandieu's teaching and writing. It also accords well with the history of the term *tractatus*, which Chandieu used in his titles.²⁴

Goulart's remark may be supported from a glance at Chandieu's publication record and his time in the classroom. He began teaching in Lausanne in 1577 and probably continued till at least 1583, in spite of having to move to Aubonne just outside Lausanne from 1580 to 1583 due to the plague. In this time he published three theological and scholastic treatises plus other works against Torres and the Polish Jesuits. The fourth theological and scholastic work appeared in 1585 and may indicate that he was lecturing in Geneva at the time, since the family probably moved there. The silence that followed during 1586 to 1588 is easily explained by the fact that Chandieu was travelling to Germany in service of the French churches and then travelling with Henri de Navarre as chaplain while the latter fought for the French throne. Chandieu's writing did not cease entirely in this period, for he wrote a celebratory poem for the king. But the last two

a esté fait de ses oeuvres aupres son trespas." Antoine de Chandieu, *Traicté theologic et scholastique, De l'unique Sacrificature & Sacrifice de Iesus Christ*, trans. Simon Goulart (Geneva: Jean le Preux, 1595), a3r.

²⁴ "Tractatus" was used for systematic expositions of doctrine, often at an introductory level. See above, pp. 174-5.

theological and scholastic treatises, as well as a scholastic piece against Gregory of Valentia would not appear until he was again involved in theological education at some level in Geneva, for his 1590 treatise exposing Gregory's errors was written for theological candidates there. There seems, then, to be a connection between his scholastic output and his teaching duties.

Further remarks on disputational practices in the Reformed context will help us appreciate Chandieu's milieu in greater detail, underlining the continuity that was adumbrated in chapter 1 – both of Chandieu to his context and of his context to the medieval academic setting.

Back to Geneva, Lausanne, Basel, Berne, and Nîmes

Antoine Saulnier indicated that Geneva's educational system in 1538 included public disputations. Later, in theology, the *congrégations* occurred – an institution similar to Zwingli's *prophezei* in Zurich. Logically speaking, these were much simpler than either the *Topical* or *Analytical* disputations. They focused more on philology and until 1564 were usually led by Calvin.²⁵ Their style reflects a time when rhetorical declamations and logical disputations sometimes vied for hegemony, when the meta-language analysis of the medieval scholastics had been set aside mainly due to the humanist desire for a polished Latin more like Cicero's and a more readily accessible and

²⁵ Erik A. de Boer, "Doing Theology in Geneva: Biblical and Systematic Theology in the *congrégations* and *disputationes* before and besides the Academy," in *Calvinus clarissimus theologus*, ed. Herman J. Selderhuis (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2012), pp. 79-93. De Boer's work – here and elsewhere – shows that the theological disputations held in Geneva before the institution of the Academy in 1559 were mainly biblical-expositional. Yet doctrine could be – and at times was – gathered from various places in Scripture and organized into theses or propositions for disputation.

practical study of logic, in service of rhetoric.²⁶ All this was not enough, however, to do away with the disputation but only to alter its content or sometimes curtail its practice. Rarely would the rules again reach the complexity of the medieval era, but rarely also would the disputation actually be displaced.²⁷

Disputations regularly occurred in the Academy of Lausanne between 1537 and 1560, as already noted in chapter 1 above. Recently Karine Crousaz studied these and reported that “[i]t is the professor of theology who drafts the ‘theses’ or ‘conclusions’ that are disputed. He has to submit them to the two pastors of Lausanne for approval before announcing them publicly at the meeting of the Colloquy which precedes the disputation, probably a week before it. He then mandates a student in theology to defend these theses and to supply the arguments for them, the laws [regulations of the Academy of Lausanne] stipulating ‘the weapons’ necessary for this.”²⁸ Either the professor of theology or one of the pastors directed the disputation. Crousaz consulted the log book of Jean Ribit, who taught first Greek and then theology at Lausanne from 1540 to 1559. She found more than eighty theses were disputed between September 1547 and February 1548. At this time an objection was lodged against the disputational practices by André Zébédée and

²⁶ The University of Marburg (Protestant) was established in 1527 and its regulations, which mention declamations and disputations as alternative exercises, date from 1531. Bruno Hildebrand, ed., *Urkundensammlung über die Verfassung und Verwaltung der Universität Marburg unter Philipp dem Grossmüthigen* (Marburg: Elwert'sche Universitäts-Buchhandlung, 1848), pp. 21-2. The regulations of the Latin School of Duisburg also discuss declamations and disputations side by side, though the bulk of the regulations at this point concern disputations. Van Geldorp, *De optimo genere . . . ratio atque ordo Scholae Duisburgensis*, h1r-h3v. Sturm's diagram of his regulations are like those of Duisburg. Johan Sturm, *Schola Argentinenensis* (Strasbourg: Rihelius, 1571), c3r-v. On the declamation as an exercise in rhetoric, see Robert J. Penella, "The *Progymnasmata* in Imperial Greek Education," in *Classical World* 105.1 (2011): pp. 77-9, 85.

²⁷ The manuals for disputation from the eighteenth century, studied by Angelelli, suggest that a very robust system of disputations continued until at least 1700.

²⁸ Karine Crousaz, *L'Académie de Lausanne entre Humanisme et Réforme (ca. 1537-1560)* (Leiden: Brill, 2012), p. 403.

adjudicated by the ruling Canton of Berne. Simon Sulzer (1508-1585) and Pierre Viret (1511-1571) vigorously defended the practice for its value in teaching the students how to defend the truth and repel whatever opposed it (this description suggests the scholastic disputation, not the dialectical).²⁹ Contrary to the charges of Zébédée and company, they also declared that their disputations were far from “Aristotelian sophistry.”³⁰ In spite of the disruptions this brought to the Berne company of pastors, the disputations at Lausanne continued.

Between 1570 and 1580 Reformed disputations began to be published.³¹ Frequently they simply contained the theses as such, usually written by the presiding professor and defended by one or more of his students.³² Also for Basel, Burnett traces a line from Zurich’s *Prophezei* to the early model by which Simon Sulzer was trained (he had moved from Berne to Basel in the wake of the dispute with Zébédée in 1548).³³ The Zurich model had already been followed in Basel in the 1530s.³⁴ Thus we see continuity

²⁹ Crousaz, *L’Académie de Lausanne*, pp. 404-406. Crousaz argues that the academic regulations for the Academy of Lausanne resulted from the combined efforts of Sulzer, Viret, Cordier, and Ribit. *Ibid.*, p. 90.

³⁰ “Sulzer défend encore la manière dont les Lausannois pratiquent les disputes scolaires, qui serait bien ordonnée et très éloignée de la ‘sophisterie aristotélicienne’.” Crousaz, *L’Académie de Lausanne*, p. 405; compare pp. 91-7.

³¹ This fits the wider phenomenon: “From about the year 1550 onwards, disputations began to be published in limited quantities in Central Europe. Jesuit academic institutions appear to have taken the lead in doing so, though some disputations were also published in connection with academic instruction held at Protestant schools and universities.” Joseph Freedman, “Disputations in Europe in the early modern period,” in *Hora Est! On Dissertations* (Leiden: Universiteitsbibliotheek Leiden, 2005), p. 34.

³² Johan Jacob Grynaeus, *De Certa electorum salute, theses sexaginta* (Basel: Ostein brs, 1575); Johan Jacob Grynaeus, *De quarta parte symboli Apostolici, theses analyticae* (Basel: Ostein, 1577); Jerome Zanchi, *De Dispensatione salutis per Christum* (Neustadt: Harnisch, 1580); Simon Sulzer, *Theses theologiae de precatone* (Basel: Ostein, 1580); Simon Sulzer, *Disputatio theologica de Meschia* (Basel: Froben, 1580); Theodore Beza and Antoine de la Faye, *Theses theologiae in Schola genevensi* (Geneva: Vignon, 1586); Compare theses of Auberi’s friend, Theodor Zwinger, *Theses has de phrenitide* (Basel: Ostein, 1583).

³³ Amy Nelson Burnett, *Teaching the Reformation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), pp. 130-31.

³⁴ Burnett, *Teaching the Reformation*, p. 80.

from the earliest forms of Reformed education and disputational exercises to Sulzer and Johan Jacob Grynaeus (1540-1617) in Basel.³⁵

Grynaeus got into the habit of publishing the theological disputations over which he presided at the University of Basel.³⁶ Some of these were sophisticated logically, containing entire syllogisms, presenting *demonstrationes*, and utilizing Aristotelian terms from the *Analytics* such as ἀντιφάνσις (contradiction), ἀπόδειξις κατασκευαστική (supporting demonstration), and ἀνασκευαστικῶς (destructively [argued]). Grynaeus also made use of hypothetical syllogisms, making them structurally visible to the reader much like Chandieu and his printers had been doing.³⁷ Other scholastic motifs, such as four-fold causality, were widely accepted and thus not as remarkable.³⁸

Mention could also be made of Christian Amport (1540-1590), a Reformed theologian of Berne, who in 1586 published a response to Sebastian Verro (1555-1614) of neighbouring Fribourg, a Roman Catholic canton.³⁹ With a foreword by Beza, the work engages in full syllogistic disputation with Verro and its title indicates that it participates in the increased appeal to the *Analytics* of Aristotle. Finally, a fellow French pastor of Chandieu's, and professor of theology at the Academy of Nîmes, Jean de Serres

³⁵ Late in his career Sulzer published some broadsides of theses disputed under him. Sulzer, *Theses theologiae de precatone* (Basel: Ostein, 1580); Simon Sulzer, *θεσις και Αντιθεσις, De vera Catholica Dei ecclesia* (Basel: Ostein, 1581).

³⁶ Burnett, *Teaching the Reformation*, p. 139, and pp. 134-9 generally on Grynaeus's method.

³⁷ Johan Jacob Grynaeus, *Theses de vetustate doctrinae papisticae* (Basel: Oporinus, 1582); Johan Jacob Grynaeus, *De Deo redemptore theologia* (Basel: Ostein, 1583); Johan Jacob Grynaeus, *Censura Theologica, de prima antichristianorum errorum origine et praecipuis capitibus, ac de horum confutatione, conscripta à Iohanne Iacobo Grynaeo . . . respondent Quirino Reuttero* (Heidelberg: Mylius, 1584); Johan Jacob Grynaeus, *De Iustificatione, quae fit per fidem* (Basel: Ostein, 1583).

³⁸ Johan Jacob Grynaeus, *De Christianae religionis veritate* (Heidelberg: Mylius, 1584).

³⁹ Christian Amport, *Ad Sebastiani Verronis Friburgensium apud Helvetios Parochi ac Sacerdotis Iesuastri, quaestiones de Verbo Dei, S. Scriptura comprehenso, responsiones analyticae & ἀνασκευαστικαί* (Geneva: Vignon, 1586).

(c. 1540-1598), carried on a quite scholastic disputation with the Jesuit Jean Hay (1546-1618). He too employed axioms, full syllogisms, and followed the analytical method. This four-round exchange, lasting from about 1582 to 1586, is interesting for the increased scholastic method between the first and last round – a characteristic which suggests that the polemical needs of the day required more recourse to detailed analytical arguments.⁴⁰

Chandieu's and Thomas's disputational structures

The particular structure employed by Chandieu reminds us of Thomas Aquinas's *Summa Theologiae*, noted briefly above in chapter 6. Thomas's overall structure has been the subject of debate for much of the 20th century, but our interest is in the disputational structure of each *quaestio*.⁴¹ Thomas seems to have followed a version of the common medieval "argument" (Angelelli) or "scholastic" (Weijers) method. According to Bauerschmidt, he tried to keep the written disputations from becoming unwieldy by retaining only those objections which he really considered pertinent. Leinsle calls Thomas's presentation, "the simplest form of disputed questions," thereby suggesting for the present study that a more complex form such as Chandieu's was not without

⁴⁰ The first work was: [Jean de Serres], *Academiae Nemausensis brevis & modesta responsio, ad professorum Turnoniorum societatis, ut aiunt Jesu assertiones quas theologicas & philosophicas appellant* (Nîmes: s.n., 1582). The fourth: Jean de Serres, *Quartus Anti-Iesuita, sive, pro verbo Dei scripto et vere Catholica Ecclesia, adversus Ioannis Hayi Monachi Iesuitae commenta & convitia: Responionis prior*, in *Doctrinae Iesuiticae* (La Rochelle [Geneva]: Theophilum Regium [Eustache Vignon], 1586), vol. 4, pp. 1-398. On the fictitious place and publisher see, Theodore G. Van Raalte, "'Noster Theophilus': The Fictitious 'Printer' Whose Anti-Jesuit Volumes Issued from Various Presses in Geneva between 1580 and 1589," in *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance* 74:3 (2012): pp. 569-91.

⁴¹ Brian V. Johnstone, "The Debate on the Structure of the *Summa Theologiae* of St. Thomas Aquinas: From Chenu (1939) to Metz (1998), in *Aquinas as Authority*, ed. Paul Van Geest, Harm Goris, Carlo Leget (Leuven: Peeters, 2002), pp. 187-200.

precedent.⁴² Thomas always states the thesis in the form of a question that requires a yes or no answer, to limit his scope. His structure is:

1. Thesis stated as a question requiring yes or no (*utrum* – whether).
2. Objections stated against the answer he will give (*oportet* – it seems that).
3. Authorities in support of his answer (*sed contra* – on the contrary).
4. Argument for his own answer (*respondo dicens* – I answer that).
5. Replies to the objections stated under 2. These show wherein the objections were mistaken logically or conceptually.⁴³

By comparison, Chandieu’s structure employs two opposing theses instead of answering a “whether” question. It is possible to state Chandieu’s thesis as a question, “Whether the all the dogmas necessary for the salvation of the church are contained in the Word of God.” His answer would be yes; his opponents’ no. But a different issue emerges in Thomas’s portrayal of the authorities which he seeks to reconcile: Chandieu would be troubled that Thomas does not in practice clearly distinguish the levels of authority of Scripture, the church fathers, previous scholastics, and Aristotle – distinctions Chandieu was keen to make already in 1566.

Recall also that Chandieu had disapproved of the *Questionarii* or “questionary doctors.”⁴⁴ This referred to those teachers who debated both sides of a question but who in Chandieu’s opinion either wasted time considering frivolous things or failed to reach faith-worthy conclusions. In the preface of his *Opera Theologica*, Chandieu mentions

⁴² Ulrich Leinsle, *Introduction to Scholastic Theology*, trans. Michael J. Miller (Washington: Catholic University Press, 2010), p. 42.

⁴³ This reconstruction depends not only upon reading Thomas but also draws on Peter Kreeft, *Summa Philosophica* (South Bend: St. Augustine’s Press, 2012), pp. 4-5; Bauerschmidt, *Holy Teaching*, p. 23.

⁴⁴ See above, p. 220, n. 36.

Scotus, Aquinas, and Ockham as such.⁴⁵ Opposition to such theologizing characterizes part two of Chandieu's 1567 *Refutatio Cl. de Sainctes*.⁴⁶ The medieval genre of *quaestiones et responsiones*, utilized by Beza and others, cannot as such have been of concern to Chandieu. He was concerned with its abuse, as when the *responsiones* were little more than exercises in probability.⁴⁷ At any rate, although Thomas did not merely offer exercises in probability – and also considered himself to be avoiding frivolous questions – yet his *Summa theologiae* employs a method not as firmly rooted in Aristotle's *Analytics* as is Chandieu's.⁴⁸ Thomas's structure arises from a combination of the *sic et non* and *quaestio* methods by which he – omitting syllogisms and certainly at times supplying more probable than certain answers – may lean a bit more towards Aristotle's recommendations in the *Topics*.⁴⁹

As a Protestant searching for certainty, Chandieu wanted conclusions worthy of faith. Thus, in contrast to Aquinas, he exclusively uses scriptural *axiomata* in support of a thesis, against a counterthesis – all treated in a disputation, with appeal to the *Analytics*. He also makes a more clear separation of authorities by putting Scripture arguments up front while leaving support from the church fathers later. Chandieu's way of dealing with

⁴⁵ Antonio Sadele [Antoine de Chandieu], *Opera Theologica* (Geneva: Jean le Preux, 1593), p. 8.

⁴⁶ See above, ch. 3, pp. 129-31.

⁴⁷ Brian Lawn mentions the genre of *quaestiones et responsiones* or *problemata* which was also much employed in the medieval period. He mentions both Peter of Spain and Taddeo Alderotti as two authors of these "non-scholastic problemata." Lawn, *Rise and Decline of the Scholastic 'Quaestio Disputata'*, pp. 71-72; compare pp. 5, 21, 130.

⁴⁸ Given Thomas's dates (1225-1274) he certainly had access to the *logica nova* and in fact wrote commentaries on Aristotle's *Analytics*. In his prologue Thomas expresses concern that other authors have made matters difficult for beginner students, in part by "the multiplication of useless questions, articles, and arguments." Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*, trans. Fathers of the English Dominican Province (London: Burns Oates and Washbourne, 1920), preface.

⁴⁹ Aristotle teaches that a "dialectical proposition," i.e., one involved in probabilities and arising from the *Topics*, is one to which we can reply yes or no. *Topics*, Book VIII, Ch. 2 (158a15-24), and *Sophistical Refutations*, ch. 11 (171b3-8).

his opponents' arguments in his fourth chapter is particularly intricate. On the one hand his method is more scholastic than Aquinas's, but on the other hand his adherence to Scripture alone as *principium* is more obvious and consistent.

A parallel to Chandieu's overall structure

A structure closer to Chandieu's can be found prior to Thomas, though Chandieu could not have read it, since it was in Arabic. George Makdisi presents to us the dialectic work of Ibn 'Aqil (c. A.D. 1040-1119) in comparison with that of Aquinas. He states that Ibn 'Aqil used a method closer to that which one would use in *reading* Thomas's *Summa*: generally one reads the opening question, scans down to Thomas's answer and his own arguments, and then goes up to the objections and back down to the replies to the objections. Certainly readers do not all approach Thomas in the same way, but Makdisi's observation about how Thomas is often read gives us a structure close to Chandieu's. Makdisi describes Ibn 'Aqil's method when the latter reaches differences in opinion or when he writes out a disputation:

At one time he will begin by giving a thesis and a counter-thesis. This is followed by the arguments for the thesis; then the objections to these arguments; then the replies to these objections; then the arguments for the counter-thesis; then the refutation of these arguments.

At another time the article or unit of disputation is more elaborate, but it is reducible to the basic schema namely, (1) thesis and counter-thesis, (2) arguments for the thesis, (3) objections to the arguments, (4) replies to the objections, (5) pseudo-arguments for the counter-thesis, and (6) replies in refutation of these pseudo-arguments.⁵⁰

⁵⁰ George Makdisi, "The Scholastic Method in Medieval Education: an Inquiry into its Origin in Law and Theology," in *Speculum* 49:4 (1974): p. 652.

Remarkable is the proximity of this structure to that of Chandieu. However, direct influence of Ibn ‘Aqil upon Chandieu is out of the question given their dates and languages. The likelihood of an intermediary influence between the two men is also unlikely, since European study of Arabic awaited the next generation of theologians, especially in the seventeenth century.⁵¹ Thus, the most likely explanations for the parallels are either that both have a common source in Aristotle or simply that the nature of logical and scholastic analysis lends itself to the development of such structures.

Examples of disputations nearer to Chandieu’s era and of like complexity to his may exist but if so, they are few. The works of Amport and de Serres have been noted already but are not as rigidly structured.

Chandieu employs the genre of the medieval quaestio disputata

De verbo Dei scripto, published in 1580, begins with Hebrews 1:1-2. From this passage in particular Chandieu draws his thesis that “All the dogmas necessary for the Christian faith are contained in the Holy Scriptures.” We must connect this to the remark of Beza in June 1579 that Chandieu was giving lectures on the Letter to the Hebrews.⁵² This means that he was teaching theology by way of the Letter to the Hebrews. While it is quite likely that Chandieu lectured by going through Hebrews verse by verse, it is also highly likely that he oversaw disputations among the students on various parts of the very thesis that was based on Hebrews 1:1-2 and saw publication in *De verbo Dei scripto*. In fact, we may be quite sure of this given the remarks of Simon Goulart about Chandieu’s treatises being written “for the better practice of disputations” (see above). Lecturing on

⁵¹ Richard Muller, *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2003), vol. 2, p. 397.

⁵² See above, p. 72.

the opening verses of Hebrews naturally led him to treat the sufficiency of the written scriptures.

The link of classroom disputations to written treatises began in the medieval period with the publication of *quaestiones disputatae* (disputed questions). Weijers describes this briefly and clearly.

The texts containing this type of disputations may be the result of real disputation. In that case they have been edited by the *magister* leading the discussion, who has used the report of his assistant as one of his sources. But this is not always the case. It is often difficult to discern whether the text of a *questio disputata* is based on an actual disputation or whether it is a separately edited treatise that may be partly based on earlier disputes. In the context of the fourteenth century the *disputatio* partly changed into a literary genre. While disputations continued to be used in schools – although their significance seemed to decrease – a tradition emerged of writing fundamental, sometimes polemical treatises in the form of a *questio disputata*, maintaining the basic structure (the arguments and counterarguments, the argumentation leading to the conclusion, which can be very lengthy in this type of treatise and which contains an extensive discussion on the opinions of others and, finally, the refutation of the initial arguments that did not support the conclusion). In other words, in this case the procedure of the *disputatio* was used for personal research, to discuss a problem or to carry on polemics with colleagues. Many treatises from the late Middle Ages were written in this form.⁵³

It seems, then, that Chandieu was reaching back to a traditional medieval genre when he wrote his six “theological and scholastic” treatises in the 1580s. Likely he considered his own treatments an improvement on past *quaestiones disputatae* insofar as he reasoned axiomatically, treated matters which were of fundamental importance to the Christian faith, and stayed close to Scripture rather than being side-tracked into philosophy. At the same time, he appears to divide his theological and logical arguments more rigorously than did the medieval *quaestiones disputatae*.⁵⁴ This is not to say that Chandieu was

⁵³ Weijers, “The medieval *disputatio*,” pp. 25-6.

⁵⁴ Compare the examples given in the appendices in Lawn, *The Rise & Decline of the Scholastic ‘Quaestio Disputata’*, pp. 150-54.

simply trying to resurrect a forgotten genre, for he encountered a pedagogical situation similar to his medieval forbears, and this in itself suggested the need to write out his disputation.

If the conclusion is correct that Chandieu is employing – perhaps even in some sense resurrecting – the written *quaestiones disputatae* genre, it underlines once again the important connection of Protestant theologians to the past. In spite of discontinuities in soteriology and ecclesiology, they were willing to learn from previous theologians in matters both of content and method. Lawn’s study of the *quaestio disputata* in medicine and ‘science’ underlines the continuity in method as well. Although his account is unclear on just when and how long the genre took for its decline, he does conclude that, “demise of the *quaestio disputata* did not finally take place until towards the end of the 18th century.”⁵⁵ This claim has recently received strong support from Donald Felipe and Joseph Freedman in their detailed studies of disputation handbooks and published disputations, mostly of the period after Chandieu. Their work underlines the thesis of continuity in university curricula and pedagogy across the range of European cultures and religious settings, as well as the broad use of the disputation in all the university faculties. Freedman even compares the use of disputations in the sixteenth and seventeenth century

⁵⁵ Lawn, *Rise and Decline of the Scholastic ‘Quaestio Disputata’*, p. 148. Lawn’s account suffers from unclear definitions and contradictory statements. For instance, on p. 126 we read that state that “no important additions were made to this type of literature [*sophismata*] after the mid sixteenth century . . . so that one can say with reasonable certainty that by the end of the century this form of exercise had virtually disappeared from the curricula of schools and universities.” Yet on p. 133 he raises examples which contradict this. The introduction to the work speaks rather oddly of the disputation arising in the 13th and 14th centuries to supplant “the older, more traditional, non-logical forms of question technique.”

to the use of the internet today – a broad medium suitable to convey ideas and arguments in a broad range of disciplines.⁵⁶

Sources of Chandieu's unique disputational elements

As for the more intricate analysis of Chandieu's chapter four, it appears to derive in part from his clear distinction between "scholastic" and "theological," for he itemizes errors in logic as distinct from errors in doctrine by first presenting a theological response to the objection, then stating its logical errors.

His last three moves – reducing the objection to an absurdity, offering a retort, and proffering a correction – seem to be extra steps partly derived from Aristotle and probably mediated to Chandieu through medieval sources in law and/or theology. For instance, his *reductio ad absurdum* certainly accords with Aristotle's *Prior Analytics*, where it is translated either as a reduction to the impossible or a reduction to the absurd.⁵⁷ Aristotle recommends that the contradictory (not identical to the contrary, but actually the negation of a proposition⁵⁸) of one's own position be assumed – for Chandieu the view that Scripture does not contain all the dogmas necessary for the Christian faith – and then absurd or impossible conclusions be logically made to follow from this assumption. Bobzien describes this: "a reduction to the impossible proves a proposition, say *q*, by

⁵⁶ Donald Felipe, "Ways of disputing and *principia* in 17th century German disputation handbooks," in *Trends in Medieval Philology: Disputatio 1200-1800* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2010), pp. 33-61; Freedman, "Published academic disputations in Central Europe (c. 1550-c.1700)," pp. 63-128, esp. p. 107.

⁵⁷ For example, Aristotle, *Prior Analytics*, 1:29 (45a23-46a1); 2:14,20 (62b29-63b21, 66b4-17).

⁵⁸ For example, Aristotle, *Posterior Analytics*, 1:2 (72a12-14).

showing that the assumption of its contradictory leads to an impossibility.”⁵⁹ One achieves this by using a “syllogism from a hypothesis,” that is, by hypothesizing the truth of an opponent’s premise or conclusion.⁶⁰ Though direct demonstration is preferable, yet an exercise *ad absurdum*, if carried out logically, also proves one’s own proposition, provided the two positions are truly antithetical.⁶¹ Indeed, according to Aristotle, it was the duty of the *opponens* to make the *respondens* assert absurdities, so Chandieu is carrying out a key part of disputation.⁶²

Offering a retort so as to turn the opponent’s premises against him was a practice Angelelli found recommended by the Lutheran Friedrich Dedekind (17th c.). Angelelli writes, “Some authors mention a fourth possibility [for the *respondens*’ retort to the *opponens*]: to show that the *opponens*’ argument actually *proves* the thesis claimed by the *respondens*. This is *retorsio* or *inversio*.”⁶³ It seems, then, that this move was known in Chandieu’s time. We find it somewhat recommended by Aristotle in his *Prior Analytics* and worked out more fully in his *Metaphysics*.⁶⁴ No doubt medieval manuals on obligations and consequences also studied the retort.

⁵⁹ Suzanne Bobzien, “The Development of *Modus Ponens* in Antiquity,” in *Phronesis* 47:4 (2002): p. 365. This, of course, depends on a ‘principle of nature’ which Chandieu also identifies: that, opposite assertions cannot be true at the same time. See above, pp. 183-4.

⁶⁰ We shall have occasion momentarily to study Aristotle’s συλλογισμοὶ ἐξ ὑποθέσεως as part of the background of hypothetical syllogisms.

⁶¹ Aristotle, *Prior Analytics*, Book 2, ch. 12-14 (62a20-63b21), *Topics*, Book 8, ch. 2 (157b34-158a3).

⁶² Aristotle, *Topics*, Book 8, ch. 4 (159a15-24).

⁶³ Angelelli, “Techniques of Disputation,” p. 808. The earliest record of the recommended publication dates from 1675 and the author must be distinguished from others of the same name from the century before. Friedrich Dedekind, *Artificium disputandi contractum* (n.l.: Griefswald, 1675). I have not seen this work.

⁶⁴ For example, Aristotle, *Prior Analytics* 2:20 (66b4-17); Aristotle, *Metaphysics* 4:4 (1006a1-1009a4). The latter is a lengthy discussion of negative demonstration in connection with the principle of non-contradiction. See also Marc Leclerc, “La confirmation performative des premiers principes,” in *Revue Philosophique de Louvain* 96:1 (1998): pp. 69-85.

Proffering a correction by showing how an opponent's premises might support one's own thesis is possible when the premises are texts of Scripture and one has the view that all of Scripture is in agreement. In a different situation, such as in arguments between Muslims and Christians, this sort of move would not be nearly as possible.

One other lesser used strategy of Chandieu is the induction. In the *Topics*, Aristotle describes it as an alternative to the syllogism and as a convincing proof especially for the 'multitudes'.⁶⁵ He writes, "induction, on the other hand, is most useful against the crowd."⁶⁶ This seems to be the sense in which Chandieu uses the induction, and not according to the more technical sense described in the *Prior Analytics*.⁶⁷ Given the lengthy developments in logic since Aristotle, it should not surprise us that his account of disputation in the *Topics* is one of the sources for the medieval scholastic disputations and is also used by Chandieu, in spite of his stated aim to reason analytically. Whatever could help solve the disputational question and arrive closer to the truth – the aim of the scholastic in contrast to the dialectical disputation – could be used.

Chandieu's sense of "newness" of method

We noted above that Chandieu conveys some sense of newness with respect to his method, for he recommends it several times – in his letter to the French pastors, in his preface, and in the body of the treatise. Suggesting that his own contribution is rather modest, he urges more qualified theologians to improve on his meagre efforts. This

⁶⁵ For example, Aristotle, *Topics* 8:1 (155b34-156a7). Aristotle also speaks of induction in the *Prior Analytics* 2:23 (68b15-37) but possibly in a different way. It would be fair to say that Chandieu uses the word in the sense we find it in the *Topics*. See above, ch. 6, pp. 215-16.

⁶⁶ Aristotle, *Topics* 8:2 (157a19-20).

⁶⁷ Aristotle, *Prior Analytics* 2:23 (68b12-36). Compare Dušan Gálik, "Induction in Aristotle's System of Scientific Knowledge," in *Organon* 13:4 (2006): pp. 495-505.

strongly suggests that his treatise is more than a written record of existing classroom disputations, for then he could have pointed to these as antecedents. Given that the humanist rhetorical declamation and the more scholastic logical disputation were equally acceptable exercises in some university regulations of the early to mid sixteenth century, Chandieu's recommendations for a somewhat new method may reflect the fact that the disputations had lost some of their logical rigour in the last four decades. In fact, the craft of his overall structure and of chapter four suggests a lawyer arguing in the courtroom. Given the scholastic nature of learning in the higher faculties of law, medicine, and theology, and given Chandieu's legal training at Toulouse, the suggestion of some cross-pollination between legal and theological scholastic method is reasonable. In conclusion, then, his appeal to Aristotle as such is not at all unique or new, but his appeal to Aristotle's *Analytics*, his recourse to the neglected genre of the *quaestio disputata*, and the precise structure of his disputations may be new in the sense that prior Reformed theologians had not openly advocated or published the same. In its details, the disputational structure may be something he himself devised for theology, possibly under the influence of previous legal training.

We may summarize the newness of Chandieu's method by suggesting that it is the application of the analytical method to particular doctrinal loci of theology in the post-reformation Reformed setting. He has taken a method he had already considered useful in one-on-one disputation and applied it for the production of doctrinal textbooks.

Important to recognize is the third generation Reformed setting of Chandieu's theological and scholastic treatises. That is to say, these treatises fit best in a setting where many, most, or even all of the arguments made within them had already been made

more voluminously in earlier publications, whether by Chandieu or by others – though not necessarily with full syllogisms. His treatments of these disputed doctrines summarize what was becoming a body of literature too big for candidates of theology in the Reformed academies to grasp entirely. They needed more pointed summaries. If he wished, Chandieu could refer to other interpreters. However, he rarely does so, perhaps because his opponents would not consider these writings authoritative.

Looking back: 1566 to 1580

Now that we have more fully situated Chandieu's 1580 treatise as an example of a *quaestio disputata* and have studied his structure and strategies, we will look back and compare it to his previous scholastic works.

Various of the elements in 1580 were already present in 1566, 1567, and 1577. For instance: In 1566 Chandieu relished the opportunity to point out the difficulties and absurdities which would ensue if his opponent's position was followed.⁶⁸ Similarly, he readily retorted, or, turned back an argument on his opponent.⁶⁹ His responses also distinguished whether a given Scripture passage was "poorly applied," "badly accommodated," or, "poorly understood." Further, in both 1566 and 1580 we encounter opening statements of his scope and aim in each subsection, followed by the actual arguments, and then closing statements of what he believes he has accomplished. As in 1580, so also in 1566 and 1577 sometimes whole sections were reviewed in lengthy summarizing arguments.⁷⁰ Not infrequently Chandieu imagines different ways Morély

⁶⁸ Chandieu, *Confirmation*, pp. 80-82, 104-108, 215-18, 232, 239-40.

⁶⁹ Chandieu, *Confirmation*, pp. 96-7, 116-17, 126, 176-9, 190-1.

⁷⁰ Chandieu, *Confirmation*, pp. 31-2, 38-9, 104; Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, pp. 542, 560.

and company (1566) or the Nicodemites (1577) or Torres (1577) could turn an argument, and then offers his response to each possible turn.⁷¹ This too occurs in 1580, as noted above. A good number of his arguments that explore possible opposing positions as well as a good number of the summarizing arguments are expressed hypothetically – in enthymemes, not syllogisms, but still hypothetically.⁷² We can also find an *a fortiori* argument in 1566 – something accommodated readily in his hypothetical syllogisms in 1580.⁷³ Finally, the *Confirmation* closes with an identification of the primary errors of Morély, though not of course with Greek philosophical terms, given the audience.⁷⁴

We may safely conclude that the structure of the theological and scholastic works of 1580-1589 represents the maturation of disputational and polemical motifs clearly present in 1566 and continued in 1567 and 1577.

Beyond doubt is Chandieu's concern in 1567 that Scripture serve as *principium* which makes possible a firm faith. The same work also probes the positions of the various medieval scholastics as a retort, to undermine the position of de Sainctes, who would have regarded these theologians to be his supporters. In addition, Chandieu presents the *utrum* questions in a logical order.⁷⁵

In 1577, in his response to Torres, Chandieu had already advanced the analytical method of Aristotle as a tool of logic most fitting to the scripturally-derived content of

⁷¹ Chandieu, *Confirmation*, pp. 30, 163-4, 176-8, 185-6, 199, 204, 217. Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, pp. 551, 560, 571, 578.

⁷² Chandieu, *Confirmation*, pp. 38-9, 104, 154, 163, 177, 185, 199, 209, 210-11, 230, 231. Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, pp. 542, 558, 560, 571, 577.

⁷³ Chandieu, *Confirmation*, p. 179.

⁷⁴ Chandieu, *Confirmation*, pp. 234-9.

⁷⁵ See above, chapter 3, p. 129.

theology.⁷⁶ Overt syllogisms occur regularly. Introductory statements followed by actual arguments and closing statements also feature, including an ἀνακεφαλαίωσις.⁷⁷ The identification of fallacies with Greek terms, the distinction between a *disputatio* ἀνασκευαστικῶς and κατασκευαστικῶς, and distinct rhetorical moves such as rebuttal, response, and retort all occur in this work of 1577.⁷⁸ *De legitima vocatione pastorum*, of the same year, also includes an argument by induction as well as the lengthy summarizing argument in hypothetical form, already noted.

Thus, the new tools of 1580 are few, if any. Perhaps the use of “corrections” is new, but not very significant. More significant is the sheer number of syllogisms and the predominance of hypothetical syllogisms. Beyond these elements, the overall structure certainly represents a development towards a more finely-tooled disputation, reaching back to the *quaestio disputata*. Yet, as noted above, the use of Aristotle’s logic, with specific appeal to his *Analytics*, indicates that Chandieu was part of the wider trajectory of adherence to a more “pure” Aristotle. He and Claude Auberi appear to have participated in this together, either with relatively equal priority or with Chandieu leading the way. Certainly Chandieu set the precedent in terms of publications, for nothing was published by Auberi recommending this method until 1584, whereas Chandieu had been recommending it and employing it since 1577.

⁷⁶ See above, chapter, 4, pp. 146-7.

⁷⁷ See above, chapter 4, p. 151.

⁷⁸ See above, chapter 4, pp. 151-2.

Looking forward: 1580 to 1590

Before examining the history and character of the hypothetical syllogism, we will select a few noteworthy structural and methodological elements from the five “theological and scholastic” treatises that followed in 1581-1589.

First of all, Chandieu adhered remarkably closely to the chosen structure of 1580. All six treatises are divided into the same six chapters of positive and negative arguments. He introduces a noteworthy change in the second treatise when he writes that he is going to omit a multitude of syllogisms in chapter two lest they should annoy his readers.⁷⁹ Thereafter all of his treatises present chapter two differently than he did in 1580: instead of allocating a syllogism to each important Scripture passage, he lays out a host of Scripture passages – sometimes with only the briefest of comments – followed by a single syllogistic *demonstratio* in categorical form.⁸⁰ This concession to his readers suggests that Chandieu had in mind more than the candidates of theology when he published the theological and scholastic treatises. It also acknowledges what may be a perennial complaint against scholastic method both by its students and by those who read such treatises outside of their classroom setting – the pedantry can tax one’s patience. Similar concessions are not made in the chapters that follow.

Secondly, the treatises reference each other in the sense that Chandieu follows a logical progression of topics. For instance, his second treatise, regarding the unique high priesthood and sacrifice of Christ, states that the foundation for it was set the previous year in *De verbo Dei scripto*.⁸¹ Similarly, the treatise on the spiritual eating of Christ’s

⁷⁹ Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, p. 43.

⁸⁰ Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, pp. 92, 143, 221, 253-4

⁸¹ Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, p. 37; see also p. 77.

body recalls that of four years prior, on the human nature of Christ, calling it the foundation of both theological and scholastic treatises on the Lord's Supper.⁸²

Thirdly, philosophical and disputational-methodological remarks continue to be made by Chandieu, often with reference to the church fathers.⁸³ In the second treatise, on Christ's high priesthood and sacrifice, he invokes a principle of the medieval scholastic theologians that one cannot build arguments in metaphorical terms, but only in proper ones.⁸⁴ Similarly, he names a "theorem," that when a universal statement is found in Scripture, no distinction can be set against it unless the express, clear, and certain words of Scripture support the distinction. Otherwise no theological dogma could be fixed and certain.⁸⁵ The sixth treatise also advances three theorems, the last with reference to Thomas and Scotus. All of these have to do with what a theologian may or may not conclude on the basis of God's omnipotence.⁸⁶ He also claims the pedigree of Augustine for the distinction between probable and exact disputations.⁸⁷ In the fourth treatise, on Christ's human nature in opposition to the Lutheran view of the ubiquity of Christ's human nature upon his ascension, Chandieu refutes eight key Lutheran *distinctiones* at length in the third chapter.⁸⁸ These are part of a special excursus on the *communicatio idiomatum*. This fourth theological and scholastic treatise is the lengthiest. In one place

⁸² Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, p. 216.

⁸³ For instance, in the fifth treatise, Chandieu references Jerome for the metaphor of ascending the mountain or reason to fell its structure and build in its place the house of wisdom, using the solid wooden beams of Scripture. Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, pp. 219, 222.

⁸⁴ Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, p. 74. Thomas's works *Opusc.* 70 art. II are referenced.

⁸⁵ Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, pp. 60-61.

⁸⁶ Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, p. 272. That is to say, one may not argue theologically from God's omnipotence to something contrary to his will, something contrary to his Word, or something that contains a contradiction.

⁸⁷ Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, p. 83.

⁸⁸ Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, pp. 161-72; see also p. 147.

Chandieu provides a small diagram to contrast his view with the teaching of the Roman Catholics, especially as regards the Lord's Supper. Reformed teaching fills one column, with contrary Roman Catholic beliefs in a second column beside the first.⁸⁹ The treatises also typically close with a summary of the key errors of his opponents. He introduces these in the second treatise by stating that the philosophers speak of the benefit of probing an opponent's view to disclose its most fundamental errors.⁹⁰

Fourthly, Chandieu sometimes takes special note of the scholastic theologians, adding their views to his numerous quotations of the church fathers. For example, he features the Scripture commentaries of Thomas, stating that he does not want to appear to be neglecting the scholastics.⁹¹ Quotations from Scotus, Gratian, and Bonaventure also occur.⁹²

Fifthly, though the treatises are clearly scholastic, humanist influences are notable, such as lengthy discussions of Greek and Hebrew terms, especially where he considers the Vulgate to be inferior. Considerations of historical context also play out in the discussion, with a careful distinction between the literal and figurative senses of the text.⁹³ Other motifs that vouch for humanist influences include Chandieu's copious use of the church fathers, along with considerations here and there of whether a given treatise was spurious or was composed by someone other than the named author.

⁸⁹ Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, p. 217; see also p. 118.

⁹⁰ Six errors are listed at the end of the second treatise and third treatise. Most argue the lack of some distinction: his opponents either "confound" one thing with another or fail to "distinguish." Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, pp. 86, 136. See also pp. 329-30.

⁹¹ For example, Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, pp. 66, 67, 78, 85.

⁹² For example, Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, p. 136.

⁹³ For example, Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, pp. 72, 75-6.

Finally, the number of hypothetical syllogisms compared to categorical continues to be significant:

1580 <i>De verbo Dei scripto</i> :	about 36 to 22
1581 <i>De unico Christi sacerdotio</i> :	about 33 to 20
1582 <i>De vera peccatorum remissione</i> :	about 35 to 35
1585 <i>De veritatae humanae naturae</i> :	about 21 to 36
1589 <i>De spirituali manduactione</i> :	about 16 to 8
1589 <i>De sacramentali manducatione</i> :	about 25 to 15

Highly noteworthy are two things: First, in every case chapter three, which contains Chandieu's positive arguments for his own position, overwhelmingly argues by way of hypothetical syllogisms (the ratio is always at least two to one and in one case twenty to one); secondly, a host of hypothetical enthymemes fill the pages of his prose, as he explains his arguments. There is no question that Chandieu loved to reason by way of the hypothetical syllogistic. The greater number of categorical syllogisms in the 1585 treatise is explained by the very lengthy treatment of Lutheran views in chapter four. Most of their views are syllogized categorically.

In sum, the methodology established in 1580 is maintained. This makes sense if we keep in mind that Chandieu's purpose was not only polemical but also educative – Goulart stated that the treatises functioned in part as helps for disputational practice in the academic setting. In addition, because each treatise dealt with disputed doctrines already treated by other theologians, and not just pedantic pet peeves of Chandieu, he had ample material to bring together for each treatise.

Chandieu and the Hypothetical Syllogistic

Chandieu's inclination toward the hypothetical syllogistic is a highly remarkable motif which bears exploration, especially for its relation to Aristotle. Here one must observe the distinction between Aristotle's logic and Aristotelian logic, and further, what was considered to be Aristotelian in a given era.

The vast majority of Chandieu's hypothetical syllogisms are argued *modus ponens*, that is, by affirming the antecedent, because it is simply a text of Scripture.

Chandieu himself realized that his use of the hypothetical syllogistic warranted an explanation. After employing the first hypothetical syllogism in 1580, he wrote,

[This] syllogism is hypothetical according to quality, whose use is chief as often as one is concerned with things that ought to be compared. Moreover, it is well known that hypothetical syllogisms are well suited to theological disputations, not only from the ancients, but also from the scholastics, who very frequently used them. And so I likewise did not hesitate to use these and the demonstrative [syllogisms], seeing that the hypotheses are not from the Topics, but depend upon express places of Scripture, and therefore are not inferior to strict syllogisms of that sort.⁹⁴

The reason why Chandieu mentions that his use of the hypothetical syllogisms is not inferior to the use of categorical syllogisms is probably because Aristotle had not recommended hypothetical syllogisms for positive demonstration in his *Analytics*. In fact, Aristotle hardly treats hypothetical syllogisms at all – and this alerts us to an important nuance to the characterization of Chandieu as an “old Aristotelian.” This characterization holds with respect to Chandieu's adherence to the distinction between the *Analytics* and

⁹⁴ “Syllogismus est hypotheticus κατὰ ποιότητα cuius usus maximus quoties de rebus comparandis agitur. Syllogismos autem hypotheticos esse disputationibus Theologicis valde accommodatos patet cum ex Veteribus tum ex Scholasticis, qui illis frequentissime uti sunt. Itaque non dubitavi aeque illis uti ac δεικτικῶς, quandoquidem hypotheses non sunt Topicae, sed nituntur expressis Scripturae locis, ac propterea huiusmodi syllogismi hic non sunt directis inferiores.” Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, p. 15.

the *Topics*. However, it certainly does not mean that his methods were entirely Aristotelian. The history of the hypothetical syllogistic will make this clear.

Aristotle's "syllogism from a hypothesis" and the Stoics

Aristotle never speaks of a "hypothetical syllogism" but does mention a συλλογισμὸς ἐξ ὑποθέσεως several times in his *Analytics* and *Topics*.⁹⁵ Still less does he have a treatise on the hypothetical syllogistic. His "syllogism from a hypothesis" does not function as an alternative to a categorical syllogism, but as a proposition with a hypothesis "because of its *function as a supposition in a particular piece of discourse*."⁹⁶ The hypothesis is "not part of any syllogism proper," but is "part of an agreement."⁹⁷ In some sense this fits Chandieu's method, for all of his hypothetical syllogisms contain an antecedent that derives from a source that both he and his opponents agree upon – the words of Scripture. However, Aristotle never used syllogisms from a hypothesis for demonstrations, but only for things that would hold "*on the agreement* that if *p* is proved, *q* is proved. The partners of the agreement are bound to accept *q* not because of the truth of the hypothesis, but because they entered into the agreement."⁹⁸ Syllogisms from a hypothesis are thus not syllogisms in the strict sense, according to Aristotle. They do not demonstrate truth, but can be used to undermine an opponent's argument. If used to support a truthful argument, their value would at best be probable, since they depend on hypothetically asserted premises.

⁹⁵ The references are given in: Susanne Bobzien, "The Development of the *Modus Ponens* in Antiquity: From Aristotle to the 2nd Century AD," in *Phronesis* 47:4 (2002): p. 364, n. 20.

⁹⁶ Bobzien, "Development of *Modus Ponens*," p. 366 (*italics original*).

⁹⁷ Bobzien, "Development of *Modus Ponens*," p. 371.

⁹⁸ Bobzien, "Development of *Modus Ponens*," p. 371.

Given the time between Aristotle and Chandieu, we cannot simply treat his extended recourse to hypothetical syllogisms as something Aristotelian. Indeed, Chandieu himself spoke of the “scholastics, who very frequently used them,” and did not suggest an Aristotelian origin. Rather, he defends their use as an analytical tool precisely because Aristotle did not present them as such. Generally speaking, the elevation of the hypothetical syllogism to the status of a syllogism *per se*, on a level with the categorical syllogism, is attributed to the Stoics. Whereas Bobzien and Barnes find evidence of a development of the hypothetical syllogism among some Peripatetics, so that by about the second century A.D. we encounter the four types (*modus ponens*, *modus tollens*, *modus ponendo tollens*, and *modus tollendo ponens*), still the extended treatment of it was Stoic.⁹⁹ In fact, the Peripatetics most likely borrowed it from earlier Stoics, not from Aristotle.¹⁰⁰ Marcia Colish convincingly argues that the hypothetical syllogism grew out of the entire philosophical worldview of the Stoics, which eschewed fixed physical realities and did not consider logic “as a means of proof about the real world.”¹⁰¹ She adds, “Although the Stoic approach to syllogistic reasoning was rooted in a highly specific and firmly anti-Aristotelian physics, the hypothetical mode of analysis could be and was detached from its moorings and taken over by other schools of later Greek

⁹⁹ Bobzien, “Development of *Modus Ponens*,” pp. 376-93; Jonathan Barnes, “Theophrastus and the Hypothetical Syllogistic,” in *Theophrastus of Eresus*, ed. William W. Fortenbaugh, Pamela M. Huby, and Anthony A. Long (Oxford: Transactions Publishers, 1985), pp. 125-6. See also William W. Fortenbaugh, *Theophrastean Studies* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 2003), pp. 35-50.

¹⁰⁰ Bobzien’s account of the “syllogism from a hypothesis” in Aristotle is learned and helpful, but could be misleading if taken alone, for her conclusions are quite far reaching when one considers how little Aristotle actually wrote on the matter, plus she does not situate Aristotle’s few remarks on the “syllogism from a hypothesis” into the wider history of the hypothetical syllogism.

¹⁰¹ Marcia L. Colish, “The Stoic Hypothetical Syllogisms and Their Transmission in the Latin West through the Early Middle Ages,” in *Res publica litterum* 2 (1979): p. 19.

philosophy, including the Peripatetics.”¹⁰² Stoics such as Cicero and Boethius were responsible for transmitting the hypothetical syllogistic to the medieval logicians. Boethius in particular treated it *in extenso*, though neither Cicero nor Boethius themselves were entirely accurate in describing the history of the hypothetical syllogistic up to their own day.¹⁰³ As a result, the medieval era was given conflated accounts of the history of the hypothetical syllogistic. Some authors, such as Cicero and Capella, incorrectly attributed it to Aristotle while others such as Cassiodorus correctly attributed it to the Stoics.¹⁰⁴ Whatever philosophers of the medieval era may have concluded about the origins of the hypothetical syllogistic, it had become clear by Chandieu’s day – especially with Greek editions of Aristotle being published, such as Hospinian’s – that the hypothetical syllogistic was not part of Aristotle’s logic.

The medieval scholastics and the hypothetical syllogistic

Chandieu stated that the medieval scholastics had very frequently or most frequently used hypothetical syllogisms.¹⁰⁵ Remarkably, he provides no positive reference to those humanist-influenced rhetoricians who discussed the hypothetical syllogism in connection with Cicero and Boethius – namely, Agricola, Trebizond, and Ramus (discussion of their contributions appears below). Why ignore them? Because Chandieu uses the hypothetical syllogisms for demonstrative truth whereas the

¹⁰² Colish, “The Stoic Hypothetical Syllogisms and Their Transmission,” p. 20.

¹⁰³ Colish, “The Stoic Hypothetical Syllogisms and Their Transmission,” pp. 21-22; Martha Kneale, *The Development of Logic* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984), pp. 99-105, 110-12, 190-93; Barnes, “Theophrastus and the Hypothetical Syllogistic,” pp. 128-9; John Marenbon, “Boethius: from antiquity to the Middle Ages,” in *Routledge History of Philosophy, volume III: Medieval Philosophy*, ed. John Marenbon (New York: Routledge, 1998), p. 14.

¹⁰⁴ Colish, “The Stoic Hypothetical Syllogisms and Their Transmission,” pp. 22-3.

¹⁰⁵ *Frequentissime* may mean “very frequently” or “most frequently.”

just mentioned rhetoricians did not follow the distinction between the analytical and the probable. This is a key observation, suggesting that where the humanists jumped over the whole medieval era to connect their discussions and practices to the classical era, Chandieu plays the part of a scholastic and ignores the more recent rhetoricians so as to relate his practices back to the precision of the medieval scholastics.

Conditionals or hypotheticals became an indispensable part of the consequences theory, discussed in so many medieval *De consequentiis* treatises.¹⁰⁶ Boehner writes, “In our consideration of the theory of consequences we approach that field in which we discover some of the finest achievements of scholastic logic. It is in the logic of consequences that the scholastics have reached the highest degree of formality.”¹⁰⁷ He also believes that the *Topics* of Aristotle were the main impetus for this development, not the *Analytics*.¹⁰⁸ This agrees with Stump’s presentation of the *Dialectica* of Garlandus Compotista (c. 12th c.): “Garlandus is interested in the Topics because he thinks they are useful in the study of hypothetical syllogisms, which appear to be his main interest in the *Dialectica*. His chapter on hypothetical syllogisms is more than five times as long as his chapter on categorical syllogisms and more than twice as long as the next longest chapter in the book.”¹⁰⁹ Reviewing William of Ockham’s (c. 1288-1347) *Summa logicae*, Boehner reminds the reader that the consequences began as further study of the

¹⁰⁶ “Hypothetical reasoning later became a subject of discussion in treatises on consequences.” Sten Ebbesen, “Ancient Scholastic Logic as the Source of Medieval Scholastic Logic,” in *The Cambridge History of Later Medieval Philosophy: From the Rediscovery of Aristotle to the Disintegration of Scholasticism 1100-1600*, ed. Norman Kretzmann, Anthony Kenny, and Jan Pinborg (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), pp. 107-108.

¹⁰⁷ Boehner, *Medieval Logic*, p. 52.

¹⁰⁸ Boehner, *Medieval Logic*, p. 53.

¹⁰⁹ Eleonore Stump, “Topics: Their development and absorption into consequences,” in *The Cambridge History of Later Medieval Philosophy*, p. 276.

“dialectical syllogisms, or enthymematic references, or that part of medieval logic which corresponds to Aristotle’s *Topics*” but gradually became independent from this origin and, we may add, took on the character of analytical arguments suitable for demonstration.¹¹⁰ Boehner explains, “According to Ockham, a consequence is an hypothetical, conditional proposition. That means that a consequence is composed of at least two categorical propositions which are joined by the syncategorematic terms ‘if-then’ or their equivalents . . . we speak of a true consequence or conditional proposition only then when the antecedent infers the consequent.”¹¹¹ He then summarizes the discussion of Ockham regarding consequences, most of which has to do with the hypothetical syllogism.¹¹²

In terms of textbooks on the hypothetical syllogistic, it seems that the use of Boethius diminished in the later medieval era, at least in the University of Paris. After the statutes of 1215, the accounts of Abelard (1079-1142) and Compotista (12th c.) were used instead.¹¹³ Peter of Spain (13th c.), in his popular *Summulae Logicales*, wrote only a few lines on hypothetical syllogisms. But the fourteenth century witnessed great concentration on the hypothetical syllogistic: later medieval philosophers such as Walter Burley (c. 1275-1344), Jean Buridan (c. 1295-1358), Albert of Saxony (c. 1316-1390), and John Wyclif (c. 1328-1384) published extensive commentaries.¹¹⁴

¹¹⁰ Boehner, *Medieval Logic*, p. 54; see also Stump, “Topics: Their Development,” pp. 287-9.

¹¹¹ Boehner, *Medieval Logic*, p. 55.

¹¹² Boehner, *Medieval Logic*, pp. 55-70.

¹¹³ Christopher J. Martin, “Denying Conditionals: Abaelard and the Failure of Boethius’ Account of the Hypothetical Syllogism,” in *Vivarium* 45 (2007): pp. 153-4. Various present day philosophers call Boethius’ work a “mistake” for mixing term logic and sentential or propositional logic.

¹¹⁴ Walter Burley, *On The Purity of the Art of Logic: The Shorter and Longer Treatises*, trans. Paul Vincent Spade (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000), pp. 145-200; John Wyclif, *Tractatus de logica* (London: Wyclif Society, 1896, repr. 1966), vol. 2, pp. 1-22, 182-227. On Buridan and Albert, see Boehner,

In conclusion, the hypothetical syllogism is mainly Stoic in origin but saw major development in the medieval era. Chandieu's defense of his use of it – while otherwise strongly appealing to Aristotle's *Analytics* in support of certain rather than probable truth – shows that he realized that Aristotle did not consider it to be on par with the categorical syllogism for demonstrating truth. Only because Chandieu used the express words of Scripture for his antecedent could he ascribe demonstrative power to hypothetical syllogisms. This allowed him to employ them for arguments of certainty and not for the merely probable – something that separates his practice from the humanist rhetoricians.

A fortiori: the hypothetical syllogistic useful in comparisons

Another explanation of Chandieu hints at his own philosophical knowledge of the hypothetical syllogism. After pointing out that his hypothetical syllogisms have the same truth value as categorical syllogisms because the hypotheses depend upon the express passages of Scripture, he adds,

For in these [syllogisms] the particular “if” is not to be doubted but asserted: not only does it have in this place joining power [and] is properly connecting several things, but it also takes the form of an axiom, that is, the axiom carries forward and establishes [the syllogism]. Therefore the hypothesis of this syllogism or the hypothetical consequence is self-evident from nature, which states that *a like thing ought to be established by like things*. For, this principle – which we draw out and elicit from nature itself – the apostle teaches ought not to be repudiated when he calls the Corinthians back to nature itself.¹¹⁵ Tertullian says, “Thus, as a student of nature, you will more easily believe the prophets.”¹¹⁶

Medieval Logic, pp. 84, 70-75; 89-93. An edition of Albert of Saxony's *Logica Albertucii perutilis* was published in Venice in 1522. See also Ivan Boh, “Consequences,” in *The Cambridge History of Later Medieval Philosophy*, pp. 306-311. A taste of the lively fourteenth century discussion can be found in Dale Jacquette, “Burleigh's Paradox,” in *Philosophy* 82 (2007): pp. 437-448.

¹¹⁵ Chandieu is referring to such passages as First Corinthians 11:14 and possibly 15:39-41, 44 where the apostle Paul appeals to the “nature of things” to back up his apostolic teaching.

¹¹⁶ “Nam in iis, particula, si, non est dubitandi, sed asserendi: nec tantum habet hinc vim συναπτικὴν, id est plura commodè connectendi: sed etiam σχηματίζει ἀξίωμα, hoc est prae se fert & constituit Axioma. Huius ergo syllogismi hypothesis sive connexum hypotheticum patet luce naturae quae dictat *De iisdem*

Chandieu's recognition of the kind of "if" he is employing indicates more than accidental inseparability of antecedent and consequent. There is an essential inseparability of the two, with some explanatory connections included, such as perhaps a relation of genus and species or cause and effect.¹¹⁷ The word "if" pretty well means "since" or because" in these cases.¹¹⁸ Recognition of this point is limited to scholastic manuals and is not found in the humanist-influenced dialectical manuals that I have seen (more of these will be reviewed below).

When Chandieu characterizes his use of the hypothetical syllogistic as *κατὰ ποιότητα*, that is, in accordance with quality, and speaks of its usefulness in comparing things, he also relies upon past accounts.¹¹⁹ In common with others, Wyclif classifies these as type II hypotheticals.¹²⁰ The term *κατὰ ποιότητα*, found already in Aristotle, was glossed by Alexander of Aphrodisius (c. A.D. 200) when the hypothetical syllogistic was already more developed, as, "arguments from what is more so or less so or equally so." Barnes explains that,

Earlier Alexander had explained that "arguments are called 'qualitative' if they prove from what is more so or less so or equally so: Since this is the case, what is similar (or what is more so, or what is less so) follows the quality" (*In Apr*

idem esse statuendum. Haec autem principia quae ex natura ipsa hausimus atque expressimus, non esse repudianda docuit Apostolus, quum Corinthios ad naturam ipsam revocaret. Facilius enim, inquit Tertullianus, credes Prophetiae, discipulus naturae." Chandieu, *Opera Theologica*, p. 15. Note that the first of these two sentences was added in the 1592 *Opera* and does not appear in earlier editions of *De verbo Dei scripto*. Like the additions to the preface, it does not substantially add to Chandieu's arguments, but increases their clarity and sophistication slightly.

¹¹⁷ Boethius made a distinction between using *si* or *cum* to indicate conditionality. Abelard made this even more clear. See Martin, "Denying Conditionals," pp. 157, 161-2. See also René van den Driessche, "Sur le 'De syllogismo hypothetico,' de Boèce," in *Methodus* 1 (1949): pp. 293-307; Boh, "Consequences," *The Cambridge History of Later Medieval Philosophy*, p. 304.

¹¹⁸ See John Wyclif, *Tractatus de logica*, pp. 182-3.

¹¹⁹ For the designation *κατὰ ποιότητα* see n. 94 of the present chapter.

¹²⁰ Wyclif, *Tractatus de logica*, pp. 9, 16-20.

324.19-22). The function of the “since” clause is to give a schematic representation of qualitative arguments, thus, “Since such-and-such has a given property, then what is equally (or more, or less) possessed of that property follows the quality [i.e., also possess the property].” . . . Some qualitative arguments “from what is more so” thus contain a universal premiss of the form “If x is more F than y, and x is not F, then y is not F”; from that premiss and two singular propositions – “a is more F than b,” “a is not F” – they infer the singular conclusion “b is not F.”¹²¹

Chandieu’s *a fortiori* style arguments were thus well-suited to the hypothetical form.¹²² If the Old Testament possesses the same quality as the New Testament with respect to being the Word of God, then what was true of the composition, reception, and use of the Old must likewise be true of the reception and use of the New. And, no Christian has ever doubted that the New Testament is more perfect (complete) than the Old! Thus, by way of comparing the New Testament canon to the Old, further conclusions could be reached about the role of tradition.¹²³

Chandieu’s terminology for the parts of the syllogism

Chandieu consistently speaks of the first part of the syllogism – the “if” statement – as the antecedent (*antecedens*) or assumption (*assumptum*). The “then” statement he calls the consequent (*consequens*). Most commonly he affirms the antecedent (modus ponens). Another technical term to which he has repeated recourse is *hypotheticum connexum*. As such, this term is uncommon; indeed, I have not yet found an exact match elsewhere. Typically Chandieu will write something like, “The *hypotheticum connexum*

¹²¹ Barnes, “Theophrastus and the Hypothetical Syllogistic,” pp. 132-3; compare Bobzien, “Development of *Modus Ponens*,” p. 367. The term is found in Aristotle’s *Prior Analytics*, Book 1, Ch. 29 (45b17).

¹²² Aristotle also makes much of arguing from similarities, greater and lesser similarities, etc. See *Topics*, Book 1, Ch. 17 and Book 2, Ch. 10, and Book 3, Ch. 6 (108a7-16, 114b25-115a24, 119b16-30).

¹²³ On this point Breen did not recognize well enough how it was possible for the Reformed to use Aristotle’s dialectical logic from the *Topics* and yet attribute certainty to their conclusions. Quirinius Breen, *Christianity and Humanism* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1968), pp. 95-7, 103.

is self-evident (*per se lucet*),” or, “The *hypotheticum connexum* is clear (*perspicuum est*).”

Chandieu’s contemporary translators simply took it to mean the first of the three parts of the syllogism, encompassing both protasis and apodosis. Coxe’s English translation (1583) sometimes uses “the first part of our sylogisme” or “the first part of our argument,” whereas Goulart’s French (1596) translates, “L’Argument en sa proposition entiere” or “la proposition du Syllogisme.” Both translators thus refer it to the whole composite proposition that begins with *si* (if) as distinct from the second part of the syllogism that begins with *at* (but) and the third that begins with *quare* (therefore).¹²⁴ This is not incorrect, but it is not quite precise. It is correct insofar as the *si* or if-then statement is the “first part” and not the entire syllogism, for two further steps follow to make the syllogism complete: one must either affirm the antecedent or deny the consequent in step two and then draw a conclusion in step three. The precision of the term *hypotheticum connexum* will emerge from the following discussion.

A term close to *hypotheticum connexum*, namely *sylogismus connexus*, was used by the Jesuit Jean Herbet (c. 1528-1578) as a type or kind of the composite syllogism. He used the term “composite” for what we call the hypothetical syllogism and by *sylogismus connexus* he was referring to a particular mode of the hypothetical syllogism, namely the “if-then” consequence mode – the very one Chandieu uses – as contrasted with the disjunctive “either-or” mode.¹²⁵ (Two other authors who do nearly the same will be noted momentarily.) We thus have a source contemporary with Chandieu, and based on the comparison we can be fairly certain that with the term *hypotheticum connexum*

¹²⁴ See our chapter 6 above, pp. 203-209.

¹²⁵ Jean Herbet, *De Oratore libri quinque* (Paris: Ruellius, 1574), 46v-47r.

Chandieu is distinguishing the particular mode of the hypothetical syllogism that he uses, even if he doesn't make use of the other modes. This is his precision.

At the same time, the translations of Coxe and Goulart are understandable because in the case of these hypothetical syllogisms, the whole content of the syllogism is pretty well contained in step one of the syllogism. In effect the second two steps of the syllogism simply repeat parts a and b of step one. Thus: "If this, then that" (step one); "but this" (step two); "therefore that" (step three). The entire argument revolves around the nature of consequences and this is precisely what Chandieu must work out in the prose section after each syllogism. As such, it now appears that he reasons in the way we might expect of one who has been reading the late medieval scholastic theologians and philosophers on consequences.

Renaissance manuals of dialectic and the hypothetical syllogism

By and large, the Renaissance manuals of dialectic give only scant attention to hypothetical syllogisms. Typically they mention the four modes in about a half page, starting with, "If it is light, it is day."¹²⁶ Most of these were probably intended for younger arts students. The fullest treatment of the hypothetical syllogism may be that of one of the earliest humanist dialecticians: that of George Trebizond (Trapezuntius: c. 1395-1472) in his *De re dialectica libellus perutilis*. He calls it the "conditional

¹²⁶ For example, Johann Caesarius, *Dialectica* (Cologne: Fabritio, 1564), p3r-v (a widely used and frequently reprinted manual); Bartholomaeus Latomus, *Summa rationis disserendi* (Cologne: Gymnicus, 1542), e6v-e7r; Joachim van Rengenberg, *Dialectica & Rhetorica* (Antwerp: Gryphium, 1538), 18r; Francisco de Toledo, *Introductio in dialecticam Aristotelis* (Cologne: Birckmann, 1574), pp. 165-7; Philip Melanchthon, *Erotemata Dialectices* (Leipzig: Valentinus Papa, 1549), pp. 212-20. It appears that Melanchthon added material on the hypothetical syllogism only in the third edition of 1548.

proposition” and treats all its modes, covering some forty-two pages.¹²⁷ Lengthy discussions of the history of the hypothetical syllogistic follow, beginning with the acknowledgement that Aristotle did not write about it.¹²⁸ He writes about “connected propositions” (*in connexis propositionibus*) but not of a *hypotheticum connexum*. He calls the three parts of the syllogism the proposition, assumption, and conclusion.¹²⁹ Interestingly, whereas Chandieu wrote that the medieval scholastics most frequently used these syllogisms, Trebizond flies the humanist flag inasmuch as he passes over the scholastics in silence, limiting his discussion to classical authors such as Cicero, aside from one mention of the humanist Rudolph Agricola.¹³⁰

Earlier in the present work we had wondered whether Pedro Nuñez Vela’s *Dialectics* (published 1570 and 1578) might have influenced Chandieu, since Nuñez Vela taught at the University of Lausanne from 1567 to 1580.¹³¹ Nuñez Vela does treat the hypothetical syllogism, calling it the copulative syllogism because it joins two propositions. His treatment takes about six pages, covers the four modes, and uses Cicero mainly. It is possible that Chandieu’s language of *connexum* comes from him, for, similar to Herbet, he distinguishes three kinds of copulative syllogisms: the *connexus*, *disiunctus*, and *coniunctus*. He further distinguishes three modes of the *connexorum*.¹³² But deeper

¹²⁷ George Trebizond, *De re dialectica libellus perutilis, cum scholiis Ioannis Novio magi* (Cologne: Cruphthanius, 1538), g3v-k1r. This title reminds us of Albert of Saxony’s title for his work on logic.

¹²⁸ Trebizond, *De re dialectica*, g5v.

¹²⁹ Trebizond, *De re dialectica*, h1r.

¹³⁰ For Agricola, see Trebizond, *De re dialectica*, i6r. John Monfasani argues that Trebizond had incorporated the medieval teaching on consequences inasmuch as he develops a propositional logic in contrast to Aristotle’s class logic. However, Monfasani also states, “I am not arguing that Trebizond incorporated a great amount of late scholastic logic into his manual.” John Monfasani, *George of Trebizond: A Biography and a Study of His Rhetoric and Logic* (Leiden: Brill, 1976), pp. 310-313.

¹³¹ See above, p. 41.

¹³² Pedro Nuñez Vela, *Dialecticorum Libri III* (Geneva: Stoer, 1578), pp. 53-9.

discussion of Aristotle, axioms, or the *Analytics* in relation hypothetical syllogisms and certainty does not occur. Chandieu was more likely to be familiar with Nuñez Vela than with Herbet.

The longer discussion of Thomas Erastus (1524-1583) has little that is original and says nothing about using hypothetical syllogisms for demonstration.¹³³ Johannes Hospinian of Basel distinguishes six modes but questions their usefulness.¹³⁴ The Jesuit Pedro da Fonseca (1528-1599) provides a more positive scholastic account, but does not describe the different senses of *si*, upon which Chandieu relies.¹³⁵

Pierre de la Ramée and the hypothetical syllogism

Some historians may be surprised to learn that Pierre de la Ramée (Ramus), the most notorious anti-Aristotelian philosopher of the sixteenth century (apparently) and nemesis of Chandieu in the affair of Morély, treated the hypothetical syllogism in extenso.¹³⁶ Wide variations exist between the many editions and translations of his work on dialectic, with the Latin text that also names Omer Talon as co-author being by far the most extensive with respect to the hypothetical syllogism.¹³⁷ This work went through at

¹³³ Thomas Erastus, *Ratio formandorum syllogismorum, brevissima & facilima* (Hamburg: Forster, 1564), pp. 38-57. Erastus was a professor in medicine at Heidelberg until 1580, then taught ethics at Basel.

¹³⁴ Johannes Hospinian, *Quaestionum dialecticarum, libri sex* (Basel: 1543), pp. 117-25.

¹³⁵ Pedro da Fonseca, *Institutionum dialecticarum libri octo* (Cologne: Cholinus, 1567), pp. 308-312. This manual also saw numerous printings.

¹³⁶ Of interest is the remark of Bianci that the adage “Aristotle was a man and could err,” was actually borrowed from Aristotelian philosophers themselves, who used it from the 13th and into the 16th centuries. Luca Bianci, “Continuity and change in the Aristotelian tradition,” in *The Cambridge Companion to Renaissance Philosophy*, ed. James Hankins (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), p. 63. Kusakawa also points to Ramus’s dependence on Aristotle. Sachiko Kusakawa, “Petrus Ramus,” in *Philosophies of the Renaissance*, ed. Paul Richard Blum (Washington, DC: Catholic University Press, 2010), pp. 163, 166.

¹³⁷ On the various editions, see Walter J. Ong, *Ramus and Talon inventory; a short-title inventory of the published works of Peter Ramus (1515-1572) and of Omer Talon (ca. 1510-1562) in their original and in*

least four printings in the 1570s.¹³⁸ The lengthy section on syllogisms in general, found already in the 1560 edition of Ramus's *Dialectica*, belies the claims of Perry Miller and Howard Hotson regarding Ramus's apparent excising of the doctrine of the syllogism and replacing of syllogisms with definitions and divisions.¹³⁹

Like Herbet, Ramus uses *compositus* for the hypothetical syllogism because it contains two propositions. Like both Herbet and Nuñez Vela, Ramus also speaks of a *sylogismus connexus* as a subcategory of the *sylogismus compositus*.¹⁴⁰ Then Ramus takes issue with Aristotle's distinction between demonstrative and hypothetical syllogisms. He argues several points, beginning with the statement that Aristotle did not understand the latter kind of syllogism.¹⁴¹ Next he argues that Aristotle's successors mistook Aristotle's "hypothetical" for "composite" and misused Aristotle, knowingly or

their variously altered forms (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1958). For more simplicity, compare Peter Mack, *Renaissance Argument: Valla and Agricola in the Traditions of Rhetoric and Dialectic* (Leiden: Brill, 1993), p. 335, n. 5.

¹³⁸ I am working with a later copy. Pierre de la Ramée, *Dialectica, Audomari Talaei praelectionibus illustrate* (Basel: Episcopium, 1585). Printings of Ramus's works spiked in France in about 1555 at more than 75 printings that year. In Germany the spike was much later, beginning in 1575 and spiking at about 70 printings in 1595. See the graph in James Veazie Skalnik, *Ramus and Reform* (Kirkville: Truman State University Press, 2002), p. 162. Ramus died in 1572 at the tail end of the St. Bartholomew's massacre.

¹³⁹ Perry Miller, *The New England Mind: The Seventeenth Century* (Harvard: Harvard University Press, 1983); Howard Hotson, *Commonplace Learning: Ramism and its German Ramifications 1543-1630* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007). Miller's work, originally from 1939, stated, "The logic of Ramus hoped to put an end to the interminable making of syllogisms that flourished in the schools" (134). While multiple problems exist with this statement, at least Miller also acknowledged that "Ramus did not mean to dislodge the syllogism in its entirety" (134) and Miller cannot help but note extensive recourse to syllogisms by Ramists (e.g., 191-3). But his discussion in general seems to oppose "the syllogism" to Baconian scientific discovery by observation. Hotson goes further than Miller in stating, "Among the sections of the *Organon* which Ramus had excised from his *Dialectica* were the two most indispensable to the polemical theologian: the doctrine of the syllogism . . . and the treatment of fallacies" (143; compare pp. 144, 149). Elsewhere he asserts that Ramus replaced the syllogism with definitions and divisions (pp. 46-7). In fact, the idea of definitions and divisions is not contradictory to syllogisms, the former belonging indeed to Aristotle's *Organon* as well, in his discussion of categories. For Ramus's treatment of syllogisms in 1560, see Pierre de la Ramée, *Dialecticae Libri Duo* (Paris: Wechel, 1560), vol. 2, pp. 147-208.

¹⁴⁰ de la Ramée, *Dialectica*, p. 420. Hypothetical syllogisms are treated in the pp. 420-55.

¹⁴¹ de la Ramée, *Dialectica*, pp. 423-4. Compare p. 434. Generally speaking, Ramus's account suffers from reading Aristotle's corpus as if he is dealing with hypothetical syllogisms of the same sort as the Stoics. The purpose of Aristotle's "syllogism from a hypothesis" was quite different from the Stoic argument, "If it is light, it is day." This has already been reviewed in the present chapter.

unknowingly.¹⁴² He adds that for Aristotle the hypothetical syllogism is opposed to demonstration and correctly points out that it is based on an agreement or condition. According to him, in many cases Aristotle's syllogism from a hypothesis is actually a simple syllogism, not composite, but in other instances (Ramus gives references) Aristotle was properly using them as composite syllogisms.¹⁴³ Yet Aristotle did not really classify these as syllogisms and missed the real art of the syllogism.¹⁴⁴ This analysis supports Ramus's own terminology of composite rather than hypothetical. Ramus then makes some very pertinent arguments, as far as Chandieu's project would later be concerned. He quotes Aristotle's remarks in the *Prior Analytics*, Book 1, Section 44, where Aristotle states that we should not try to reduce hypothetical deductions because "they have not been proved by deduction, but assented to by agreement."¹⁴⁵ Ramus objects that,

Nevertheless, composite syllogisms are not hypothetical, if the proposition and assumption are true and certain, as in: "If man is an animal, he senses; but man is animal; therefore he senses." In this instance everything is true and certain; nothing is hypothetical. Moreover, the same difference of demonstration and hypothetical is repeated in the twenty-third chapter of the *Prior Analytics*. However all these differences between demonstration and hypothetical have nothing to do with the art of logic: rather, the one is common to the other; a teaching of both invention and judgement.¹⁴⁶

¹⁴² Ramus also states that any good material on the hypothetical syllogism is not from Aristotle but from Theophrastus, Eudemus, and Boethius. de la Ramée, *Dialecticae*, p. 424.

¹⁴³ de la Ramée, *Dialectica*, p. 424. Ramus appears to be analyzing the arguments Aristotle himself used in the prose of the *Prior Analytics* rather than simply reading Aristotle for content.

¹⁴⁴ de la Ramée, *Dialectica*, p. 425, 427.

¹⁴⁵ In fact he refers to 1:40, but in the Oxford edition this is 1:44, Bekker numbers 50a17-25.

¹⁴⁶ "Nec tamen syllogismi compositi sunt hypothetici, si propositio assumptioque verae sunt & certae: ut, Si homo est animal, sentit: Sed homo est animal: Sentit igitur: hinc vera & certa sunt omnia, nil est hypotheticum. Eadem porro differentia δεικτικουν καὶ ὑποθετικουν repetitur vicesimo tertio capite primi Priorum. Sed tamen tota haec δεικτικουν καὶ ὑποθετικουν differentia, nihil ad artem logicam: una enim est communis utrisque inventionis & iudicii doctrina." de la Ramée, *Dialectica*, p. 425.

This highly remarkable critique of Aristotle by Ramus is partly rejected by Chandieu and partly agreed with. Chandieu rejects the “muddy rivers” of philosophers like Ramus who fudge the distinction between the *Analytics* and *Topics*.¹⁴⁷ Ramus very openly rejected this distinction. Melancthon did so discreetly, perhaps even unknowingly. However, like Chandieu, Ramus does agree that hypothetical syllogisms can be completely true and certain if the premises are true and certain. Yet Chandieu never makes this argument on the same grounds as Ramus, for Ramus says it has to do with the nature of “If it is light, it is day” – a thing that is true simply, and not based on a prior agreement.¹⁴⁸ In contrast, Chandieu roots the truth of the premises of his theological arguments in the dogma that all the Word of God is inspired. While on the one hand he considers this to be universally true, on the other hand he realizes that not all people agree on this, and so the truth of the argument is based on a prior agreement, at least so far as the disputation is concerned.

Furthermore, where Ramus argues against the terminology “hypothetical” and prefers “composite,” Chandieu uses the former. Nevertheless, it is highly remarkable that Ramus has commented on the truth value of composite syllogisms, and Chandieu has defended his use of them also on the grounds that they can convey firm and certain truth.¹⁴⁹

Another remark of Ramus pertains to the frequency of the consequential mode of composite reasoning. He states,

¹⁴⁷ See above, ch. 4, p. 178. Ramus clearly followed the Agricolan humanist oriented direction in dialectics. See Walter J. Ong, *Ramus, Method, and the Decay of Dialogue* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004), pp. 92-130.

¹⁴⁸ A few pages later Ramus critiques a hypothetical syllogism of which he finds the premise to be “self-credible” (αὐτοπιστον). Throughout this section, however, his examples are all classical and not scriptural. de la Ramée, *Dialectica*, pp. 429-30.

¹⁴⁹ This motif of Ramus is also noted in Marie-Luce Demonet, ““Si les signes vous fâchent . . .”: Natural Inference and the Science of Signs in the Renaissance,” trans. Nancy Virtue in *South Central Review* 10:2 (1993): p. 83.

Most common: The two consequence modes [modus ponens and modus tollens] are the most frequently occurring of all syllogisms, because they are the two most common instruments of all arguments; whatever therefore can be concluded by argument in other syllogisms can also be by these consequence [arguments]. Indeed, many arguments prove that this [kind] is inferred much more easily than in the other syllogism. For equals, greater, lessers, and similars chiefly fall under this arrangement.¹⁵⁰

Once again, this is not exactly what Chandieu said, since he referenced the more academic “scholastics, who most frequently used” hypothetical syllogisms, whereas Ramus highlights the frequent popular use of these types of arguments. Other dialecticians, whose works are noted in the present chapter, do not speak of the frequent use of hypothetical syllogisms. Remarkably, then, both Ramus and Chandieu take note of the truth value of hypothetical syllogisms and their frequent use. The latter is a shared historical observation; the former a position they share, but on different grounds. Yet the different overall frameworks and nuances of each author, as well as Chandieu’s open rejection of the “muddy rivers” of philosophers like Ramus, prevent us from concluding that Ramus’s logic as such exerted a positive influence on Chandieu.¹⁵¹

Claude Auberi and hypothetical syllogisms

Given past scholarship’s claims about the influence of Chandieu’s friend, the philosopher Claude Auberi, we must now ask whether he promoted the use of the

¹⁵⁰ “*Usitatissime*] Duo modi connexi, frequentissimi sunt omnium syllogismorum, quia duo sint organa maximé omnium argumentorum communia: quocunque enim argumento in caeteris syllogismis concludi potest, potest etiam his connexis: tum vero ex plerisque argumentis multó facilius hic concluditur, quam in aliis syllogismis. Paria enim, majora, minora, similia, hanc praecipue dispositionem subeunt.” de la Ramée, *Dialecticae*, pp. 433-4.

¹⁵¹ Note also that Jacob Schegk, whom we have identified as the best source for Chandieu’s adherence to the distinction between the analytical and the dialectical, openly opposed Ramus, debating strongly with him in 1569-1571. Sachiko Kusukawa, “Uses of Philosophy in Reformation Thought: Melanchthon, Schegk, and Crellius,” in *The Medieval Heritage in Early Modern Metaphysics and Modal Theory, 1400-1700*, ed. Russell L. Friedman and Lauge O. Nielsen (Dordrecht: Kluwer, 2003), p. 149.

hypothetical syllogism for demonstration. He did not. In his writings he strongly and repeatedly maintains the distinction between the *Analytics* and the *Topics*, between demonstration and dialectic, in opposition to Agricola and Cicero and “those new academics and boorish dialecticians” (that is, Ramus and followers) who adulterate these.¹⁵² He also makes a strong link between demonstration and theological axioms.¹⁵³ One author describes his work as adhering closely to Aristotle’s *Organon*, “while adding his own broad developments and, above all, examples of his own invention.”¹⁵⁴ Most of these examples were biblical, leading Henri Meylan to point to Auberi’s *Organon* as witness to Auberi’s interest in theological questions already before his more overt theological treatises.¹⁵⁵ Auberi does speak of Aristotle’s syllogism from a hypothesis and presents hypotheses of his own from time to time, but these are not hypothetical syllogisms in the order of, “If it is light, it is day.”¹⁵⁶ Rather, as he notes, they are based on an agreement or pact and so do not have the power of syllogisms as such.¹⁵⁷ They are only for the sake of argument, the hypotheses being used to test existing syllogisms by positing their opposite.¹⁵⁸ He discusses contingent syllogisms, but here too he avoids

¹⁵² “à Cicerone, Rodolpho Agricola, & à reliquis istis nouis Academicis & vulgaribus Dialecticis.” Claude Auberi, *Organon: id est instrumentum omnium* (Morges: Jean le Preux, 1584), p. 371. Compare p. 299. The distinction is found throughout his commentary. See, for example, pp. 180-81, 269-70, 369-73, 648-51.

¹⁵³ His concern for theology recurs frequently. The pages 1-15 recommend the analytical method while the pages 348-66 form an excursus dedicated to axioms or principles in theology. On p. 198 he even discusses disputations at colloquies and synods.

¹⁵⁴ Demonet, “Natural Inference and the Science of Signs,” pp. 78-9.

¹⁵⁵ Henri Meylan, “Claude Aubery: l’affaire des *Orationes*,” *Recueil des travaux* (Lausanne: F. Rouge, 1937), pp. 15-16. Many examples, such as whether the Pope is the true successor of Peter, were drawn from polemics with the Roman Catholics. Others were based on Scripture, such as the very frequently repeated use of Romans 8:28-30 (v. 30 a sorites), or of John 1:1-3 about the Word being God being used for various modes of the categorical syllogism.

¹⁵⁶ For example Auberi, *Organon*, pp. 98, 125-6.

¹⁵⁷ Auberi, *Organon*, pp. 98-9. Compare pp. 76, 418, 468-9, 625-6, 632, 643, 649.

¹⁵⁸ Auberi, *Organon*, pp. 125-6.

hypothetical syllogisms that would aim at actually finding truth, for every part of the syllogism begins with *contingit* (it is contingent that) and the arrangement of the actual syllogisms is categorical.¹⁵⁹ In other words, these are contingent categorical syllogisms.

Most of his hypothetical enthymemes and syllogisms occur in his presentation of the *Topics*, precisely where he considers the conclusions to reach only probable truth, not certain.¹⁶⁰ He also briefly explains Aristotle's syllogism from a hypothesis.¹⁶¹ But he does not write about hypothetical syllogisms at any length. His own theological treatises do not use hypothetical syllogisms or even hypothetical enthymemes frequently.¹⁶² Even in his treatise on the resurrection of the body, where one could reasonably expect hypothetical arguments given the style of the Apostle Paul's arguments in First Corinthians 15, Auberi does not use them in his arguments.¹⁶³ Throughout his theological treatises his main concern is to present insurmountable analytical arguments conveying absolutely certain conclusions.

We must conclude that Chandieu's recourse to the hypothetical syllogism is not due to the influence of Claude Auberi. Nor is Chandieu's intricate disputational structure due to Auberi. With Auberi we find only a parallel in terms of maintaining the distinction between the dialectical as probable and the analytical as certain and recommending the analytical method for academic theology. This parallel, as noted in chapter 4, could be the influence of Chandieu on Auberi rather than the other way around. More likely,

¹⁵⁹ Auberi, *Organon*, pp. 78-83.

¹⁶⁰ Auberi, *Organon*, pp. 432-502; 518, 535-653.

¹⁶¹ Auberi, *Organon*, pp. 468-9.

¹⁶² For example, Claude Auberi, *De Immortalitate animae, oratio apodictica* ([Morges]: Jean le Preux, 1586).

¹⁶³ Claude Auberi, *Deux traitez, in forme d'harangue. L'un de la resurrection des morts. L'autre, du tremblement de terre*, trans. I.R.G. (Lausanne: Jean Chiquelle, 1586).

however, is the explanation that both men were participating in a fairly rigorous reading of Aristotle that paid closer attention to the basic structures of Aristotle's works on logic.

Various parallels between Auberi and Chandieu would not be hard to find, since Auberi's commentary on the *Organon* covers all of the Prior and Posterior Analytics and the Topics. Thus he addresses matters of disputation and various logical elements as inductions, syllogisms, theses, axioms, etc. But we cannot ignore the dates of publication: Auberi's *Organon* appeared in 1584 whereas Chandieu pretty well had all of these logical and disputational elements in place by 1577, and he certainly did by 1580. Moreover, since Chandieu could have and almost certainly would have gathered these points from multiple other texts as well as from his legal training in Toulouse or even his pre-law preparatory studies, the influence of Auberi should be downplayed.¹⁶⁴ With Meylan, we find an "analogy" and parallels, but no evidence of causation.¹⁶⁵ An "Old Aristotelian" textbook somewhat closer to Chandieu's method would be that of Fortunatus Crell of Heidelberg, for he does treat hypothetical syllogisms more fully, including the conversion of hypothetical and categorical syllogisms.¹⁶⁶ Yet he does not discuss using Scripture texts as premises in hypothetical syllogisms. Moreover, his work, though earlier than Auberi's, also appeared after Chandieu's 1580 *De verbo Dei*.¹⁶⁷

¹⁶⁴ Contrary to Sinnema's suggestions.

¹⁶⁵ "La méthode qu'il emploie, à l'encontre des arguments des Jésuites, n'est pas sans analogie avec celle qu'Aubery allait préconiser dans son *Organon* (1584)." Henri Meylan, *La Haute École de Lausanne 1537-1937* (Lausanne: University of Lausanne, 1986), pp. 29-30.

¹⁶⁶ Fortunatus Crell, *Isagoge logica* (Neustadt: Matthæus Harnisch, 1584), pp. 237-46.

¹⁶⁷ Kusakawa notes that the earliest imprint she had found was from 1581. Sachiko Kusakawa, "Uses of Philosophy in Reformation Thought: Melanchthon, Schegk, and Crellius," in *The Medieval Heritage in Early Modern Metaphysics and Modal Theory, 1400-1700*, ed. Russell L. Friedman and Lauge O. Nielsen (Dordrecht: Kluwer, 2003), p. 153, n. 46.

Jacob Schegk and hypothetical syllogisms

One more early modern theologian/philosopher must detain us for his remarks about hypothetical syllogisms – the Lutheran Jacob Schegk (1511-1587). His recommendation of the analytical method of Aristotle was the best source we could find in the years immediately prior to Chandieu’s scholastic output, based on *De Demonstratione* which Schegk published in 1564.¹⁶⁸ In this respect Schegk likely was a source for both Auberi and Chandieu – certainly he is a promotor of the “Old Aristotelian” approach to logic, perhaps the first Protestant philosopher to do so.¹⁶⁹ The fact that both his *De Demonstratione* and his *Organi Aristotelei* were published in Basel puts them in Auberi’s vicinity (he was trained there) and Chandieu’s (he sent his sons there for education and was friends with Johan Jacob Grynaeus).

Schegk’s *De Demonstratione* includes a programmatic distinction between hypothetical and non-hypothetical reasoning. Reasoning which has its starting point in the senses he characterizes as “hypothetical” and therefore of merely probable truth value, since the senses can be deceived. However, the $\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ – for Aristotle that faculty of the soul “with which first principles were intuitively grasped” – is able to distinguish “the principles from the senses, and turn what is probable into what is certain . . . A principle in the mind [$\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$], therefore, cannot but be true.”¹⁷⁰ According to Kusukawa, Schegk followed Aristotle in explaining the “syllogism from a hypothesis” which could be

¹⁶⁸ Jacob Schegk, *De Demonstratione libri XV, novum opus . . . in duos posteriorum analyticorum Aristotelis libros commentarium* (Basel: Joannes Oporinus, 1564).

¹⁶⁹ Wilhelm Risse, *Die Logik der Neuzeit* (Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Frommann, 1964), vol. 1, pp. 256-60.

¹⁷⁰ Kusukawa, “Uses of Philosophy in Reformation Thought,” p. 150.

advanced to undermine an opponent's argument.¹⁷¹ At the same time Schegk obviously gives a far greater role to hypothetical syllogisms than did Aristotle: besides the important distinction just mentioned, he dedicated at least six pages of his 1564 work and at least forty pages of his 1577 work to contingent statements and hypothetical syllogisms.¹⁷²

Schegk considered hypothetically asserted but true premises to lead to demonstratively true conclusions. He also considered theology superior to philosophy in terms of truth content, since the principles of the former were non-hypothetical, being drawn from the most holy Word of God.¹⁷³ Such a position obviously goes beyond Aristotle and accords better with the medieval developments. Thus although in 1564 he describes the normal Aristotelian position: "From which it is evident that such principles are hypothesized or postulated; they are not per se or by necessity true,"¹⁷⁴ he also states near the end of the same discussion that, "Many principles are true demonstratively, of which Democritus or Anaxagoras in the *Physics* [say], 'if [philosophers] wish to accept demonstrations, then they put forward postulates' – which among the learned in Aristotelian philosophy are most persuasive and esteemed."¹⁷⁵ These postulates were hypothetical statements designed to test whether a thing existed or not by postulating it

¹⁷¹ "Schegk followed Aristotle's definition of an hypothesis as a 'supposed' proposition from which necessary arguments should be derived, and, taken in this way, principles could also be called hypotheses." Kusakawa, "Uses of Philosophy in Reformation Thought," p. 150.

¹⁷² Schegk, *De Demonstratione*, pp. 125-31; Jacob Schegk, *Organi Aristotelei* (Basel: Eusebius Episcopius, 1577), pp. 191-225, 232-50.

¹⁷³ Kusakawa, "Uses of Philosophy in Reformation Thought," p. 151, n. 34.

¹⁷⁴ "Ex quo est evidens, principia quoad sunt ὑποθέσεις vel αἰτήματα, non esse per se & ex necessitate vera." Schegk, *De Demonstratione*, p. 125.

¹⁷⁵ "Multa sunt vera principia ἀναπόδεικτα, quae Democrito aut Anaxagorae in *Physicis*, si audite principia velint demonstrations, ut αἰτήματα proponuntur: quae in Aristotelica philosophia eruditis, sunt persuassima atque notissima." Schegk, *De Demonstratione*, p. 130.

and hypothesizing what would follow from this. Schegk also writes that, “A hypothesis in fact is this: from what is posited, it is necessary that another thing follow, by which reason we likewise call the principles of demonstration hypotheses. When they are definitions as such, they are in fact non-hypothetical principles, and for that reason hypotheses cannot be from demonstrations, unless by reason of the assumptions of the syllogisms, composed from these premises.”¹⁷⁶

In 1577 Schegk published his commentary on the *Organon*. His lengthy discussion of contingent statements and hypothetical syllogisms is itself remarkable for the fact that Aristotle barely treats hypothetical syllogisms in the *Organon*. Even more remarkable is the truth value that hypothetical syllogisms can convey, if their premises are true. Schegk writes, “But what is the reason why by producing true premises, it is necessary that the conclusion be true? The syllogistic axiom is the reason.”¹⁷⁷ This statement alone would have been sufficient to plant in Chandieu’s mind the idea of using the texts of Scripture as axioms for many hypothetical syllogisms, based on the central axiom that “all Scripture is inspired by God.” Schegk also uses the term *connexum* for the hypothetical mode that follows the pattern, “If . . . then.”¹⁷⁸

Schegk’s lengthy works deserve far more study than what one presently finds in the scholarship, especially for his important role in championing Aristotle’s *Analytics* for Protestant theologians. As Kusukawa has shown, Schegk has some unique views of the

¹⁷⁶ “Hypothesis enim est, quo posito, aliud sequi est necesse: qua ratione principia quoque demonstrationum appellamus hypotheses, quum ipsae per se finitiones, sint prorsus ἀνυπόθετα principia: quare nec hypotheses esse possunt demonstrationum, nisi causa propositionum syllogismi, compositae sint ex his premissis.” Schegk, *De Demonstratione*, p. 131.

¹⁷⁷ “Sed quae causa est, quod veris existentibus praemissis, necesse est esse verum conclusum? Axioma syllogisticum in causa est.” Schegk, *Organi Aristotelei*, p. 310.

¹⁷⁸ For example, Schegk, *Organi Aristotelei*, p. 244.

soul and its way of knowing and makes much of the distinction between hypothetical and non-hypothetical reasoning. For our purposes he appears to be the best source prior to Chandieu for an argument that hypothetical syllogisms could carry the same weight as categoricals, if only the premises are undoubtedly true.

Although both Ramus and Schegk treat hypothetical syllogisms as worthy of demonstration, yet because of the shared Old Aristotelian framework of Chandieu and Schegk, it would be more fitting to link Chandieu's use of the hypothetical syllogism for arguments of certainty to Schegk rather than to Ramus.

Conclusion

In conclusion, two key points emerge from the analyses of this chapter. First, Chandieu's written treatise *De verbo Dei scripto* and his five theological and scholastic treatises that followed in that decade should be considered the self-conscious effort of the author to utilize the medieval *quaestio disputata* genre to express the Protestant polemic against the Roman Catholic Church on the most fundamental questions: particularly in 1580 regarding the role of the Word of God in the life of the church. While he may employ elements of the dialectical disputation, for instance, when identifying fallacies, clearly he is following the model of the scholastic disputation, in written form. This is an important and specific observation of continuity from the medieval to early modern era, even if in some methodological respects it jumps over some of the earlier Reformers, especially Luther and Calvin. While Chandieu may be one of the first theologians of the sixteenth century to utilize – and perhaps resurrect – the genre in such an exact and comprehensive way, yet his use of it was not entirely unexpected inasmuch as it arose

precisely in the 1570s and 1580s when the benefits of careful study of Aristotle were appearing and when Protestant theologians needed to craft sophisticated responses to the academically advanced arguments of the Jesuits.

An additional point regarding these disputations emerges from the observation that Chandieu developed them “for the better practice of disputations” of those students who “excel[led] in the study of theology and in the discipline of logic/philosophy (τρόπου ἐπιστήμης scientia)” at the Academies of Lausanne and Geneva.¹⁷⁹ Learning two disciplines at once – theology and logic – fits well into the Renaissance era and the humanist cry for practicality. In contrast to many of the late medieval manuals that used outlandish counter examples to teach logical points, the humanists wanted a philosophy stripped of sophisms. Jenny Ashworth supplies this counter example used by Dolz as late as 1511 for teaching the categorical syllogism (*Barbara* form): “Only what begins to be every man’s begins to be a man’s donkey, and every braying thing except Brownie is beginning to be a man’s or will be immediately after this, therefore every braying thing except Brownie begins to be a man’s donkey.” Ashworth points out that by the late sixteenth century there is a complete absence of such sophisms in the textbooks, sophisms “which had formed so prominent a feature of earlier texts, whatever the topic.”¹⁸⁰

We may add that Auberi’s *Organon* and Ramus’s logic texts as well as Chandieu’s theological and scholastic treatises all fit into the new trajectory inasmuch as

¹⁷⁹ See earlier in the present chapter, notes 2 and 23.

¹⁸⁰ E. J. Ashworth, “Traditional Logic,” in *The Cambridge History of Renaissance Philosophy*, p. 164; Lawn, *The Rise and Decline of the Scholastic ‘Quaestio Disputata’*, pp. 99, 103-128. Lawn shows that such sophisms occurred in spite of the widespread regulations against them and much opposition, first from various medieval scholastic theologians, then from humanists. See also above, ch. 1, p. 35.

the examples used in the former two texts either deal with real questions of doctrine (Auberi) or employ actual classical quotations as illustrations (Ramus), and the latter seeks to improve students' knowledge of logic in the context of real doctrinal debate. Chandieu found the medieval *quaestio disputata* ideally suited for this combination, since this genre dealt with actual disputed doctrinal questions at a high logical level. On the one hand he divides the theological and logical sections of his disputations, yet on the other hand he puts them side by side in one treatise so as to teach both disciplines simultaneously.

For several reasons Luther and Calvin had not written out disputations of this level: first, because their eras were part of a trend away from what may be called the excesses of the scholastic method, such as the example of "Brownie" just noted; second, because their opponents' treatises were not yet at such a sophisticated level; third, because they were more influenced by humanists than were a multitude of their fellow theologians; and, fourth because Luther and Calvin left this work to others such as Melancthon and Beza. Many of the motifs of scholastic method in Luther and Calvin are evidence of how much this method was still integral to their era, so that they used it even while speaking against it (for example, Luther's published theses for disputation). In time Chandieu would become prominent among those Protestant theologians who were purposively sorting out what elements of the scholastic method to retain or resurrect and what to leave.

Second, Chandieu's recourse to the hypothetical syllogistic as useful for arguments of certainty stands out as a remarkable and unique element for which we have not found a precise source or parallel. Jacob Schegk seems to be the most likely impetus.

Chandieu's short defense of the use of hypothetical syllogisms suggests that he himself was aware of a certain measure of novelty in his method. Our study of this matter alerted us to the differences between Stoic and Aristotelian logic as well as the distinction between Aristotle's logic and Aristotelian logic. Chandieu's awareness of these distinctions emerges also from the defense just mentioned, inasmuch as he defended the hypothetical syllogism as a vehicle for arriving at truths with the same level of certainty as recommended by Aristotle in non-hypothetical, analytical reasoning. He also correctly pointed to the medieval scholastic theologians as the most frequent users of these syllogisms. His remark about this – almost off-hand – accords well with his not infrequent quotations from the medieval scholastic theologians. He was familiar with them, especially Gratian.

Remarkable is the sophistication of Chandieu compared to the many humanist textbooks of dialectic in his era: whereas these texts frequently treated the categorical and hypothetical syllogisms one after the other without any concern over their suitability to either certain or probable truth, Chandieu makes remarks and carries out practices which derive from a deeper knowledge. He has recourse to basic philosophical and mathematical principles about reality. He clearly distinguishes Scripture as source from logic as method. He uses precise terms such as *hypotheticum connexum*. He distinguishes the different logical senses of "if." His mention of the usefulness of hypothetical syllogisms in comparisons also indicates a fairly sophisticated level of philosophical expertise. He makes abundant use of it in comparing the Old and New Testaments. As we have seen, he wants to be able to say with certainty that his theological reasoning reaches conclusions that are truly biblical.

In the overall picture these conclusions confirm the view that Reformed theologians – while being on the whole Aristotelian in their logic – were eclectic in many elements of their logic and philosophy. The connection of the Lutheran Schegk to both Chandieu and Auberi also confirms the widespread view in scholarship that theologians from the various traditions shared philosophical and logical commitments. Chandieu seems to have known his logic and philosophy well enough to venture at least a few novel elements, put them all together in one powerful theological and scholastic package, and arguably succeed at it. He did so in support of a faith that must be certain, a theology that is scientific, and a Scripture that carried divine authority.

We can now summarize our findings in ten specific conclusions to describe *what* Chandieu was doing.

1. Chandieu resurrects the medieval written *quaestio disputata* for Reformed Protestants.
2. Chandieu seeks to integrate his theology and logic so as to teach both at the same time, keep his use of logic practical, and yet keep clear their distinctive roles as *principium* and *instrumentum*.
3. Chandieu closely follows the programmatic Aristotelian distinction between probable and certain truth, seeking to *demonstrate* the truth of his arguments. In this respect, he takes his part in a return to the more pure Aristotle, as occurred in the 1570s and 1580s in many places of Europe and England, especially the Swiss cantons.
4. Chandieu utilizes the scholastic (as opposed to dialectic) disputation with unmatched intricacy – more detail even than what one finds in

Thomas's *Summa Theologiae*.

5. Chandieu's utilization of the hypothetical syllogism for arguments that are certain and not merely probable depends heavily upon the medieval development of the Stoic hypothetical syllogistic, specifically the medieval manuals on consequences. He references "the scholastics, who most frequently used them" rather than the more recent dialecticians.
6. Chandieu's extended recourse to the hypothetical syllogism allowed him to make obvious his commitment to Scripture as *principium* and its texts as *principia* for the content of theology, and thus keep his theological reasoning as close to Scripture as possible so that his conclusions could legitimately demand the trust and submission of believers' hearts.
7. Chandieu's recognition of the different uses of *si* (if) has its source in the medieval texts on logic, not in the humanist-influenced dialectic texts.
8. Chandieu's use of both the *quaestio disputata* and the hypothetical syllogism depend decidedly on medieval developments which go beyond and in some respects even against Aristotle. This confirms that although he is fundamentally Aristotelian in his logic, he is not slavishly such, but is, like other Reformed theologians, somewhat eclectic.
9. Chandieu's use of the hypothetical syllogism for arguments of certainty most likely depends upon Jacob Schegk but seems, on slightly different grounds, also to have been endorsed by Peter Ramus.

10. Finally, contrary to what has been argued in the past, one need not claim Auberi as general source for Chandieu's scholastic method, since most of its motifs were in place in works of Chandieu's prior to any contact with Auberi, and certainly prior to any publication of Auberi's that recommends any of the moves Chandieu makes.

Chapter 8

Conclusion: *One of the Fathers of Reformed Scholastic Theology*

Paeans and Poems Contemporary to Chandieu

Although most historians of the last four centuries forgot Chandieu even while they studied Calvin and Beza, contemporaries of Chandieu were known to put the three men side by side as equals. Besides the paeans of Théodore de Bèze (1519-1605), Jean Jacquemot (1543-1615), Isaac Casaubon (1559-1614), and Jacques Lect (1558-1611) in the opening pages of Chandieu's posthumous *Opera Theologica*, one can elsewhere find poems by Pierre Poupo (1552-1590), Thierry Gautier (16th c.), Gaspar Laurent (1556-1636), and Jean de Chalas (fl. 1595-1625), as well as remarks by Jacques August de Thou (1553-1617), Antoine de la Faye (1540-1615), and Jacob Stoer, a printer (c. 1542-1610). These epitaphs and dirges (epicediums) were part of the humanist resurgence of classical culture in the era – learned theologians, philosophers, and doctors honoured the memory of each other in Latin, Greek, and even Hebrew poems.

We have already reviewed remarks by Jean de Serres (c. 1540-1598) in chapter 2, who called Chandieu “a gentleman of singular piety and a very learned theologian.”¹ The venerable historian De Thou described Chandieu in 1562 as a young man known for his “noble birth, fine appearance, elegant manners, learning, eloquence, and rare modesty.”² De la Faye simply spoke of him as that, “most nobled and learned theologian, Antonio

¹ Note that “gentleman” is a technical designation for a man of the second estate, a nobleman.

² This is the somewhat loose translation of Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom* (Grand Rapids: Baker, repr. 1993), vol. 1, p. 494. The original states, “Antonius Chandeus ecclesiae Parisiensis pastor, adolescens, in quo praeter gentis nobilitatem, otis venusta facies, eruditio, eloquentia cum singulari modestia certabant.” Jacques-August de Thou, *Historiarum sui temporis* (Frankfurt: Hoffmann, 1614), vol. 2, p. 88. The French translation was, “Chandieu, Ministre de l'Eglise de Paris, jeune homme distingué par sa naissance, in qui la noblesse, les graces, la bonne mine, la science & la éloquence, dispuoient avec sa rare modestie à qu le rendroit plus recommandable.” Jacques-August de Thou, *Histoire universelle* (London [Paris]: Rollin, 1734), vol. 4, pp. 205-206.

Sadeel.”³ Jacob Stoer was publishing a translated work of Jean de l’Espine when Chandieu passed away, and so he hurriedly dedicated an epitaph, “to Antonio Sadeel, or Campo-Dei, a most excellent pastor and teacher of the church of the Lord, and also a most noble and humble man.”⁴ He follows these remarks with a ten line poem composed by Thierry Gautier and offered to the pious memory of Chandieu (in 1590 Gautier had translated Chandieu’s work against the monks of Bordeaux). Gautier begins and ends the poem with the theme of grief, “Alas, we who do not carry the iron hearts of Stoics, to us, alas, it is permitted to lament, though moderately . . .” In the middle he plays on the name of Chandieu as a fruitful “field of God.”⁵ This short poem does not mention Chandieu alongside any other theologians, but it is noteworthy that the publisher inserted this epitaph as the work was going to print and that he maintained it in further editions of 1594 and 1600.

As far as we know, the last event of Pierre Poupo’s life of which we can be certain is the writing of a poem upon the death of Antoine de Chandieu.⁶ Poupo was a Protestant poet of Champagne who died later in the same year as Chandieu (1591). At

³ “Nobilissimo Doctissimoque Theologo Antonio Chandaeo.” Antoine de la Faye, *De Vita et obitu clarissima viri, D. Theodori Bezae Vezelii* (Geneva: Jacob Chouet, 1606), p. 56.

⁴ “Epitaphium. Antonio Sadeeli, seu a Campo Dei, Ecclesiae Domini prasantissimo pastori & doctore, eidemque nobilissimo & modestissimo viro.” Jean de l’Espine, *De Tranquillitate animi, libri vij*, trans. Thierry Gautier ([Geneva]: Jacob Stoer, 1591), b3r.

⁵ Heu! qui ferrea non Stoicorum corda geramus,
 Nobis (heu!) liceat, sed moderata, queri.
 Quid moderata queri, dico? moderamine nam quis
 In tantis uti luctibus hisce queat?
 Ille DEI-CAMPUS, virtute aequalior ipsa,
 Divinos fructus omnigenosque ferens,
 A nobis (agro indignis haeredibus ille)
 Ad rerum Dominum transiit. Ecquis ager,
 Quis campus nobis, quae praedia chara supersint?
 Moerori Omnipotens, ah, moderare meo!

⁶ Ralph M. Hester, *A Protestant Baroque Poet: Pierre Poupo* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1970), p. 40.

some time when Chandieu was still alive Poupo dedicated a sonnet to him, which was published in 1592 together with a mix of other poems, including the one written upon news of Chandieu's death. Poupo's sonnet is noteworthy for including such scholarly concepts as the probable, the true, the demonstrative, and the analytical. In the last six lines he writes, "Here by the three-legged stool of the analytical circle of the probable, of the true, and of the demonstrative, Chandieu examined the hypocrisy of the Antichrist, teaching the way to a firm knowledge. And just as it was necessary to set Hagar to her servant's duties, so also philosophy to divine reason."⁷ Poupo's poems upon the death of Chandieu form eight quatrains. He highlights the clarity of Chandieu's thinking, couples his work of routing the church's opponents with the comforting of the believers, praises his modesty, and compares him to Elijah by wishing for an Elisha to take his place. He evokes the imagery of silver in stanza two: "Who will again sound this silver horn, which put to fear all the field of Babel? And comforted the heart of believing Israel on their way to the feasts of the Lord by its divine song?"⁸

The tie of Chandieu to silver returns with emphasis in a rather lengthy poem (37 pages, about 1400 lines) by Jean de Chalas, a Genevan lawyer. Published the year after

⁷ "Icy par le trepied du cercle analytic
Du probable, du vray, & de l'apodictic,
Champdieu de l'Antechrist l'imposture examine,
Enseignant les moyens d'un solide sçavoir,
Et comme il faut ranger Agar à son devoir,
Et la Philosophie à la raison divine."

Pierre Poupo, *La Muse Chrestienne*, Book 3 (Paris: Barhelemy le Franc, 1592), p. 46. This work is bound with books 1 and 2, which were published in 1590.

⁸ "Qui entonnera plus ceste trompe argentine,
Qui mettoit en effroy tout le camp de Babel?
Et consolait le Coeur du fidele Israel
Aux festes du Seigneur par sa chanson divine?"

Poupo, *La Muse Chrestienne*, Book 3, p. 56. Note the implied contrast of the "field of Babel" with the "field of God" (Sadeel), as well as the allusion to Chandieu's poetry, some of which was perhaps already being put to song (the "silver trumpet" and the "divine song").

Beza's death, he dedicates the poem to Philip du Plessis Mornay (1549-1623). Whereas it is a panegyric to the departed Beza, Chalas calls it his honour or crown (*Besze*) to compose it and dedicate it to Plessis Mornay.⁹ Throughout, the focus is on Beza, but already on the seventh page Chalas adds mention of Calvin and Chandieu and concludes that he has a triple misery.¹⁰ He plays with both Beza's first and last name for some pages, mentions a good number of Beza's contemporaries, and then at the end of the poem comes back to the threesome of Calvin, Chandieu, and Beza. Addressing Geneva, he writes about a burning lamp close to gold vase and beside it a silver vase, "You seem . . . to have three celebreties/gems, of which the one is this great Beza, the other a great Chandieu, and the other a great Calvin: a lamp of whatever their rank; the other silver; the other fine gold."¹¹ Chalas thus styles Calvin as gold, Chandieu as silver, and Beza as fire – a burning lamp. A few lines later he calls them kings, "These kings, kings of

⁹ Jean de Chalas, *L'Honneur ou le Besze du Sieur de Chalas. A Messire Philippes de Mornay Seigneur du Plessis-Marly. Avec quelques stances & sonnets sur le trespas de Monsieur de Besze* ([Geneva]: Gabriel Cartier, 1606). On the authorship of this work, see Roméo Arbour, *L'ère baroque en France: Répertoire chronologique des éditions de textes littéraires. Première partie, 1585-1615*, book 2 (Geneva: Droz, 1977), p. 13. See also Eugène and Émile Haag, *La France Protestante*, 2nd ed. (Paris: Sandoz and Fischbacher, 1881), vol. 3, col. 1005-1006.

¹⁰ "Quel heur! Si ie veux voir qu'ainsi ne sit point Dieu
 Me pregnant au mi-cours mon Calvin, mon Chandieu.
 Miserable, o trois fois! qui point ne se contente
 Et ne va benissant la longue, longue attente,
 Longue attente où ce Beze apoüe des longs ans."
 Chalas, *L'Honneur ou le Besze*, a4v.

¹¹ "Et se disoit, GENEVE on dit qu'autour d'Ateste
 On descouvrit une urne où depuis long temps reste
 Une lampe enflambee au-pres d'un vase d'or,
 Et au-pres d'un argent formant un vase encor,
 Tu sembles or' ceste urne, & enterrante as l'aise
 D'avoir trois raretez, don't l'une est ce grand BEZE,
 Un grand SADEEL l'autre, & l'autre un grand CALVIN,
 Lampe qui que soit d'eux, l'autre argent, l'autre or fin."
 Chalas, *L'Honneur ou le Besze*, e3r.

power, are this great Chandieu, this Calvin and this Beza of solemn renown.”¹² This hyperbolic poetry cites Calvin, Chandieu, and Beza (in order of their deaths) as three leading lights, each with their own unique contribution. Striking is the inclusion of Chandieu, for he lived in Geneva only for the last five or six years of his life (he was granted citizenship in 1589).¹³ It is true that in 1572 he had been spokesman there for a great number of fleeing French pastors, but shortly thereafter he took up residence in Lausanne, and it was at their academy, not Geneva’s, that he served first and longest as professor of theology. Perhaps Chalas is pursuing a line of pro-Geneva historiography, whether in contrast to other Swiss cantons or other republics across Europe. No doubt the high social class of Chandieu made him a desirable prize (Beza and Chandieu were of the same social class).¹⁴ At any rate, Chandieu’s Reformed contemporaries held him in high regard. His *Opera Theologica* was reprinted numerous times, as were some of his individual works.

Chalas was not alone in mentioning Calvin, Chandieu, and Beza together. The sometime tutor of several of Chandieu’s sons, Gaspar Laurent, did the same. His Greek language dirge to all three men is published with Antoine de la Faye’s biography of Beza, published in 1606. Laurent writes of the three eminent theologians as brothers, believers in Christ, yoked together for service. Eighty six years Beza labored, fifty six years Chandieu, he recalls. It seems, then, that the early seventeenth century Reformed

¹² “Ces Rois, Rois des Vertus sont ce grand SADEEL.
Ce CALVIN, & ce BEZE au renom solemnel.”
Chalas, *L'Honneur ou le Besze*, e3r.

¹³ Jean Senebier, *Histoire littéraire de Geneve* (Geneva: Barde, Manget & Company, 1806), p. 321.

¹⁴ It is highly remarkable that we have so little correspondence of Chandieu’s. I surmise that he regularly ordered his letters to be destroyed, perhaps especially following the aftermath of the Conspiracy of Amboise.

theologians associated with Geneva considered Beza's death in 1605 to be a turning point. They looked back wistfully to their three great past theologians. Indeed, in a second, shorter poem, Laurent writes, "Believers, lament over Calvin, Beza, and Chandieu! Believers living in heaven, lament from there!"¹⁵ The loss to Geneva is considered to be enormous, and all the world should lament this. Of course, these humanist spawned poems are rhetorical and overstate the matter. Nevertheless, the concurrence of the three theologians is repeated and noteworthy.

Two centuries later, Senebier stated that Chandieu won the friendship of many other theologians, lawyers, and learned men, "by his profound knowledge of antiquity, of philosophy, of law and of theology; he maintained it by his politeness, his humility, his selflessness, and his wisdom."¹⁶

The present work has shown why Chandieu's contemporaries praised him so highly. The argument for his unique contribution has been made and must now be concluded.

Conclusions: The Contributions of This Study

The concurrence of scholastic theology and the hyperbolic humanist-spawned poetry just presented should no longer surprise us. We began by familiarizing ourselves with the definitions of scholastic method and the program of the humanists, arguing that

¹⁵ Καλβινον, Βηζαν, Χανδαῖον κλαίετε πιστοί,
Κλαίετε δ'οὐ, πιστοὶ ζῶσιν ἐν οὐρανίοις.

Gaspar Laurent, "Epitaphium D. Calvini, Bezae, Chandaei," *Epicedia quae clarissimi aliquot viri, et D. Theodoro Bezae charissimi* (Geneva: Jacob Chouet, 1606), b4v. Bound with: Antoine de la Faye, *De Vita et obitu clarissima viri, D. Theodori Bezae Vezelii* (Geneva: Jacob Chouet, 1606).

¹⁶ "[I]l gagna leur attachement par ses connoissances approfondies de l'antiquité, de la philosophie, du droit & de la théologie; il le conserva par sa politesse, sa modestie, son désintéressement & sa sensibilité." Senebier, *Histoire littéraire de Geneve*, p. 323

as such the two phenomena could integrate and did. Although we have not probed Chandieu's poetry, it was obvious from chapter 2 that he was a master of genres, who succeeded remarkably both in his poetry and in his scholastic theological works. In an era rampant with concern about the proper method of teaching, Chandieu did not consider one method to be contradictory to the other; he merely argued for the most suitable application of each method.¹⁷

In continuity with his era, he argued that scholastic method was useful precisely in the context whence it arose – the academy. His theological and scholastic works forged a Reformed way of appropriating scholastic method for theological candidates while maintaining the Scriptures as the sole foundation of theology. Chandieu first utilized scholastic method in ecclesiastical polemics regarding the organization and leadership of the Reformed churches, especially in opposition to Jean Morély (1566). He showed his familiarity with the medieval schoolmen in the following year's publication against Claude de Saintes. A decade later Chandieu engaged more opponents in scholastic fashion, in his two works of 1577. These four works showed that he was at home in writing disputations. By the time 1580 came, he was ready to roll out a carefully ordered and intricately argued theological and scholastic treatise on the most basic issue at question between Roman Catholics and Protestants – the relationship of Scripture and tradition. This treatise – and the five that followed in that decade – represents the renewal of the medieval *quaestio disputata*. It goes beyond the one-on-one polemics such as occurred between Chandieu and Torres, allowing the author complete command of the field. He can deploy his arguments when and where he chooses, maintaining focus, and

¹⁷ On method in the era, see Walter J. Ong, *Ramus, Method, and the Decay of Dialogue* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004), pp. 225-69; Richard A. Muller, *The Unaccommodated Calvin* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), *passim*.

methodically reaching for victory in a logical fashion, step by step. All six “theological and scholastic” treatises are complete disputations with all aspects covered.

The candidates of theology would have lots of opportunity to read more prosaic treatments of theological loci, but while going to class, their time was limited and there was a lot of ground to cover. Besides, it was essential that they hone their disputational skills, especially when the Reformed churches were fighting for recognition in multiple countries and territories and when the Jesuits were showing themselves to be worthy opponents by focusing on a better theological and philosophical education. Thus the educative and polemical needs of the day called for Chandieu to master this genre also, for the sake of the Reformed churches. He assembled a host of Scripture arguments together with a wide selection of logical points to show the students of theology the right way to sustain their own arguments and to dismantle their opponents’. This was not merely to teach them how to write scholastic disputations, but to teach them how to reason generally. As such, they could use these tools in writing, in the pulpit, in the classroom, and even in public disputation, should the need arise.

Noteworthy is the cross-pollination of subjects, for Chandieu does not neatly compartmentalize the teaching of philosophy and logic and theology. Rather, the right use of logic is taught in the act, as it were, in the very process of developing and defending one’s theological views. Logic is thus not an end in itself, but understood to serve the church. Where Claude Auberi taught Aristotle’s logic in his *Organon* by paraphrasing Aristotle and adding examples from Scripture, Chandieu taught theology from Scripture but also utilized his knowledge of Aristotle, of syllogisms and fallacies, etc., to ensure that theological conclusions arrived at by deduction and inference would

be both “good” and “necessary.”¹⁸ He expected his students to bring prior knowledge of Aristotle’s logic into the classroom when they studied the Scriptures. None of this was, of course, very unique in his era.

This study has confirmed the urgent need to look back to the medieval era when treating Reformed theology. It has also added detail to the characterization of the Reformed theologians as Aristotelian in their logic. Many were. Some sought for a simplified Aristotelianism by following Ramus. But for most an overall Aristotelian bent with eclectic elements marked their philosophy and logic. The eclecticism was largely a result of the incorporation of humanist elements into the wider scholastic field of logic and disputations; thus historians rightly speak of a multiplicity of Aristotelianisms. The categories of Wilhelm Risse are very helpful, and Chandieu certainly does fit into the “Old Aristotelian” category in terms of his distinction between analytical and dialectical reasoning. However, his utilization of the hypothetical syllogistic is a unique element which he himself draws into the circle of analytical truth. No precise precursor or contemporary parallel to Chandieu’s employment of hypothetical syllogisms for firm and certain truth has been found in this study, though a hint of this was detected in Schegk’s commentary on Aristotle in 1577. Beyond this source, Chandieu appears to have initiated this move himself. We must therefore nuance our description of his Aristotelianism, marking out his views on the syllogism as a mixture of Stoic and Aristotelian, shaped by the medieval scholastics who developed in intricate detail their views on the syllogism in their treatises on consequences, and who most frequently used hypothetical syllogisms.

¹⁸ The Westminster Confession of Faith (1647), ch. 1:6 would later state, “The whole counsel of God, concerning all things necessary for his own glory, man’s salvation, faith, and life, is either expressly set down in Scripture, or by good and necessary consequence may be deduced from Scripture.” Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1983), vol. 3, p. 603.

After adding this much detail to our knowledge of Chandieu, is it still fair to characterize Chandieu as “one of the fathers of Reformed scholasticism,” as Olivier Fatio did? I would answer affirmatively. Although the designation “father of” runs the risk of treating such persons as origins-in-themselves and thus fountainheads, we know from Fatio’s fine historical work that he did not intend this. Children have not only fathers but also grandfathers and great-grandfathers. Sometimes a genetic trait skips a generation. Always variation and change occur. Yet there must be some suitable designation for the promotion of scholastic method such as we find in Chandieu, plus some way to generalize his unique contributions to theological method in the Reformed tradition. He was one of the important sources in the Reformed tradition for an increased use of scholastic method, per the observations of Lect and Fatio. At the same time, we would emphasize the words *one of*, for, as chapter 1 has shown, there were many Reformers before and around Chandieu who took their scholastic training with them and pressed it into the service of Reformed theology.

Chandieu did not start something new, but lived and worked in his own context when adherence to a more pure Aristotle was on the rise and when the Reformed academies were becoming more established and needed to prepare candidates for theology who could serve the Reformed Churches as well or better than the priest of a nearby town served his Roman Catholic parish. The distinction between the Reformed and the Lutherans – the Gnesio-Lutherans in particular – had by now also become quite obvious, and this matter required very careful treatment. Chandieu’s treatise on the true humanity of Christ (1585) was thus the longest of all his theological and scholastic works.

To ‘see things their way’ we should not overstate the significance of Chandieu as a source for scholastic method. After all, the poets who celebrated his and Beza’s work, placed both of them side by side with Calvin. They did not drive an artificial wedge between these theologians on account of their nuances in theological methodology. Further, those who lived through the era wanted and arguably needed a more analytical and precise treatment of the doctrines at issue with the Roman Catholics, particularly after the Council of Trent and with the rise of the Jesuits. They did not regard Chandieu’s contributions to be unusual, particularly ‘new’, or greatly different from the contributions of the earlier reformers. Rather, for the most part they – take Beza as an example – rejoiced to see their opponents rebutted and their own position seemingly strengthened. They wanted their theological candidates to be well trained in theology – both in its contents and in its methodology. Scholastic method was needed in the classrooms and in the public theological square. Chandieu helped fill this need, but was far from the only theologian to do so. His unique contributions were the return of the written *quaestio disputata* and the abundant use of the hypothetical syllogism. Thus, so long as we do not misuse the designation, we may call him one of the fathers of Reformed scholasticism.

By studying earlier scholastic works of Chandieu, we have been able to show that most or all of his scholastic method was in place prior to his contact with Claude Auberi. Further, the publications of Auberi have nothing on disputation, syllogisms, or even on the analytical method as such until 1584. The difference between the work of Chandieu prior to and after 1580 has mostly to do with the rigid structure of his “theological and scholastic” treatises, such as their careful separation of positive and negative arguments as well as the distinction between treating the theological content of his opponents’

arguments and their logical errors. The distinction between the analytical and dialectical ways of treating a topic appears to have been passed on by Jacob Schegk, who may also be the source for the idea that hypothetical syllogisms could be used for arguments of certainty if they depended on indubitable axioms. Thus one need not press the parallels between Auberi and Chandieu too far, and certainly the later problems that Auberi made for himself by pressing his Aristotelian philosophy too far need not in any way taint Chandieu, let alone Auberi's much later renunciation of his Protestant faith.¹⁹ Auberi was a good friend of many other Reformed theologians as well, no doubt leaving sadness in their hearts for his late-life change.

Chandieu would not have claimed to be an original thinker. Like other Reformed theologians, his aim was to be a scriptural thinker. But he appreciated that Scripture follows the laws of logic in its form of reasoning and use of language, and he felt free to appropriate that logic which seemed most suited to Scripture – a logic which attempts to describe reality as it is (Aristotelian) and not that which was unwilling to use logic as a means of proof about the real world (Stoic).²⁰

At the same time, Chandieu did not merely sit back and observe two competing philosophies and choose one. Rather, as a child of his time, he absorbed both through the medium of the medieval period before him. He recognized something useful for a scriptural theology in the medieval discussions on consequences, obligations, and suppositions. While he did not enter into this deeper meta-linguistic discussion, he did

¹⁹ Henri Meylan, "Claude Aubery: l'affaire des *Orationes*," in *Recueil des travaux* (Lausanne: F. Rouge, 1937), pp. 9-84.

²⁰ Marcia Colish, "The Stoic Hypothetical Syllogisms and Their Transmission in the Latin West through the Early Middle Ages," in *Res publica litterarum* 2 (1976): pp.19-20; Eileen Serene, "Demonstrative Science," in *The Cambridge History of Later Medieval Philosophy: From the Rediscovery of Aristotle to the Disintegration of Scholasticism 1100-1600*, ed. Norman Kretzmann, Anthony Kenny, and Jan Pinborg (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), pp. 496-514, esp. 504-507.

utilize its results for the benefit, arguably, of Reformed theology. He also considered the genre of the *quaestio disputata* useful for teaching theology at a sophisticated logical level. Although, like all learned men of his era, he obviously studied Aristotle as such, this did not mean he restricted himself to Aristotle. We find, rather, developments of medieval theology and philosophy combining with the re-reading of Aristotle's original works and leading to a mixture of motifs such as a very intricate written disputational structure which is more medieval than Aristotelian and the use of hypothetical syllogisms which again depends more on the medieval era than Aristotle. All of this Chandieu puts within the overall distinction between the analytical and dialectical/rhetorical.

Why follow this analytical method? Chandieu's fundamental reason was his belief that all Scripture is inspired by God and must be believed. Working from Second Timothy 3:16 he considered Scripture to be self-authenticating. Next, he desired to keep his theological reasoning as close to this *fundamentum* as possible. He wouldn't speak of the "spirit" or "trajectory" of Scripture without first getting the details right. In addition to the two aforesaid reasons, he believed this method would expose errors more readily. Finally, for the sake of his students, he could use this method to summarize truth and error, march through arguments quickly, and teach the requisite categories and distinctions of both theology and logic.

Given that reason seems to be embedded universally in the human mind – whether implanted or innate – no doubt further academic attention to the role of Scripture and logic in Reformed theology will still benefit theologians, pastors, and churches today.²¹ Those who have criticized scholastic theology in past eras and in our own have

²¹ The first seminary at which I was trained (Canadian Reformed Theological Seminary) still uses a textbook in theology from the 1930s which has been reprinted numerous times, most recently in 1996. The

often misunderstood its purpose or applied it to situations for which it is not suited.

Scholastic theology is meant for the classroom and the disputation, not for the sermon or for popular level books and tracts. It is meant to be a logical tour de force while being clear and succinct. In our era of information glut, it could have a very worthwhile place, and indeed we do see scholastic style discourse in many settings, from computer manuals to science textbooks to frequently asked question pages on websites.

If we are willing to jettison unsatisfactory historical paradigms and assumptions in favour of study that ‘sees things their way’ and reaches the requisite level of detail to make era-accurate conclusions, we can continue to be challenged by and learn from the past. For the sixteenth century, historians need an appreciation of just how embedded into the culture theological discussions were and how widespread was the use of Aristotle. This study has taken that as an overall datum and has offered finer detail, especially for the Reformed academies in the 1570s and 1580s, to ascertain the increase of scholastic method. It has confirmed the paradigm of the last several decades while adding nuance and detail.

work has proved hard to replace precisely because it is scholastic. It meets the students at the right level and fits its purpose well, succinctly marching through all the categories, distinctions, and historical discussions. Louis Berkhof, *Systematic Theology: New Combined Edition* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996). The Introduction was first published in 1932 and the main body first appeared in 1938. Richard Muller concludes the new preface he wrote for the 1996 publication, “It remains the best modern English-language introduction to doctrinal theology of the Reformed tradition” (viii). Though one could point to the subsequent English translation of Bavinck’s magisterial four volume *Reformed Dogmatics* as a replacement, in fact Bavinck’s work is too long for most M.Div. students. Berkhof’s work is more scholastic.

APPENDIX 1

Publications of Antoine de Chandieu (1534-1591)

Title	Date	Genre	Name Used
<i>Remonstrance au roi</i>	1557	Apologetic Letter	Anonymous
<i>Apologie ou defense</i>	1557	Apologetic Letter	Anonymous
<i>Confession de foi</i>	1559	Confession of Faith	[editor]
<i>Discipline ecclesiastique</i>	1559	Legal Document	[co-author]
<i>Epitre au roi</i>	1560	Apologetic Letter	Anonymous
<i>Advertissement au fideles</i>	1561	Pastoral Letter	Anonymous
<i>Tragi-comedie</i>	1561	Stage Play	A. de la Croix
<i>Palinodies de Ronsard</i>	1563	Satirical Poetry	Ronsard!
<i>Histoire des persecutions</i>	1563	Martyrology	Zamariel
<i>Response aux Calomnies</i>	1563	Polemical Poetry	Zamariel
<i>Tumbaeu a Iean Calvin</i>	1564	Memorial Poetry	Zamariel
<i>Confirmation de la discipline</i>	1566	Scholastic Disputation	Anonymous
<i>Refutatio Claude de Saintes</i>	1567	Scholastic Disputation	Theopsaltes
<i>Epitaph Prince Wolfgang</i>	1569	Memorial Poetry	Zamariel
<i>Ode sur les misères des Eglises</i>	1569	Songs	Zamariel
<i>Cantique de sa fille</i>	1571	Memorial Poetry	Zamariel
<i>Discours et Advertissemens</i>	1571	Hortatory Poetry	A. Z.
<i>Sur la morte de Coligny</i>	1572	Memorial Poetry	A.D.C.
<i>Meditationes Psalmum 32</i>	1573/8	Devotional Prose	Sadeel Theopsal.
<i>Octonnaires sur la vanité du monde</i>	1576-83	Devotional Poetry	Zamariel
<i>De legitima vocatione pastorum</i>	1577	Scholastic Disputation	Sadeele
<i>Sophismata F. Turriani</i>	1577	Scholastic Disputation	Sadeele
<i>Ad repetita F. Turriani</i>	1580	Scholastic Disputation	Sadeele
<i>De verbo Dei scripto</i>	1580	Scholastic Disputation	Sadeele
<i>De unico Christi sacerdotio</i>	1581	Scholastic Disputation	Sadeele
<i>Responsionis F. Turriani</i>	1581	Scholastic Disputation	Sadeele
<i>Centum flosculi F. Turriani</i>	1581	Satire – Collected Errors	Sadeele
<i>Harmonia Confessionum</i>	1581	Confession of Faith	[co-editor]
<i>De vera peccatorum</i>	1582	Scholastic Disputation	Sadeele
<i>Posnaniensium . . . ecclesia</i>	1583	Scholastic Disputation	Sadeele
<i>Index ἐλεγκτικος Turriani</i>	1583	Scholastic Disputation	Sadeele
<i>De veritate humanae naturae Iesu</i>	1585	Scholastic Disputation	Sadeele
<i>Response a la profession de foy</i>	1585	Scholastic Polemic	Sadeele
<i>Cantique pour le Roy</i>	1587	Celebratory Poetry	Anonymous
<i>De spirituali manducatione</i>	1589	Scholastic Disputation	Sadeele
<i>De sacramentali manducatione</i>	1589	Scholastic Disputation	Sadeele
<i>Index errorum Gregorii</i>	1590	Scholastic Disputation	Sadeele
<i>Epistre in Response a la profession 2nd</i>	1590	Scholastic Disputation	Sadeel
<i>Index secundus ἐλεγκτικος</i>	1592	Scholastic Disputation	[posthumous]

APPENDIX 2

Organization and Structure of the *Opera Theologica* (1592, etc.)

- A. By genre, *theologicae et scholasticae tractationes*, in logical dogmatic order of *loci*
 - B. By topic, overlapping with treatises 4, 5, and 6 of part A, on the Lord's Supper
 - C. Transition between topics: More comprehensive treatment of all those Reformed doctrines which had been attacked by the monks of Bordeaux
 - D. By topic, on the lawful calling and ordination of Reformed ministers, and on the true church.
 - E. By genre, a closing set of mediations.
-
- | | | |
|---|---|--|
| <p>A. Organized by genre, in logical dogmatic order: Chandieu's Theological and Scholastic works</p> | } | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>De Verbo Dei scripto</i> 2. <i>De vnico Christi Sacerdotio et Sacrificio</i> 3. <i>De vera peccatorum Remissione</i> 4. <i>De Veritate humanae Naturae Iesu Christi</i> 5. <i>De Spirituali manducatione corporis Christi</i> 6. <i>De Sacramentali manudactione Corporis Christi</i> |
| <p>B. On the topic of the Lord's Supper (overlaps with previous)</p> | } | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4. <i>De Veritate humanae Naturae Iesu Christi</i> 5. <i>De Spirituali manducatione corporis Christi</i> 6. <i>De Sacramentali manudactione Corporis Christi</i> 7. <i>Refutatio Libelli quem Claudius de Sainctes</i> 8. <i>Index errorum Gregorij de Valentia</i> 9. <i>Index secundus ἐλενγτικος errorum Gregorij</i> |
| <p>C. Transitional text: more comprehensive polemical work on all the Reformed doctrines which the monks of Bordeaux had attacked</p> | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 10. <i>Antonij Sadeelis responsio... monachis Burdegalensibus</i> |
| <p>D. On the topic of the lawful <i>Ordinationibus</i> calling and ordaining of Reformed ministers and on the true church</p> | } | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 11. <i>De Legitima vocatione Pastorum Ecclesiae Reformatae</i> 12. <i>Sophismata F. Turriani...de Ecclesia &</i> 13. <i>Ad omnia repetita F. Turriani...de Ecclesia & Ordin.</i> 14. <i>Centum flosculi Turrianicae disputationis</i> 15. <i>Index ἐλενγτικος repetitionum & ταπτολογιων</i> 16. <i>Analysis & Refutatio... de Christi in terris Ecclesia</i> 17. <i>Ad tres Libros Laurentij Arturi... Ecclesia Christi</i> |
| <p>E. Closing Meditation</p> | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 18. <i>Meditationes in Psalmum XXXII</i> |

APPENDIX 3

Schematic of the structure of *Confirmation de la discipline ecclesiastique* (1566)

*The Confirmation of Ecclesiastical Discipline,
observed in the Reformed Churches of the kingdom of France,
with a response to the objections raised against it*

First Part: How much ecclesiastical discipline is necessary and concerning four kinds of men who blaspheme that which has been reinstituted in the French Reformed Churches in our time.

Chapter 1 [Introduction] (p. 3).

Chapter 2. Response to the objections of the first adversaries, who want to abolish the discipline entirely

- I. Objection 1: That one must be satisfied with the Gospel (6).
 - a. Response: That the discipline is a part of the Gospel.
- II. Objection 2: That the discipline takes away from the power of the magistrates (7).
 - a. Response 1: That by the same argument it would be necessary to charge the apostles and all the early church with sedition.
 - b. Response 2: That to the contrary, the discipline maintains the obedience due to the magistrate (8).
 - c. Response 3: That the authority of the magistrate and ecclesiastical discipline are entirely distinct things and agree with each other well, when they are rightly ordered (10).
 - d. Response 4: That the abuse which derogates from the authority of the magistrates is not part of the Reformed churches (13).

Second Part: Response to the second group of adversaries who do not approve the calling of the ministers of the Reformed churches, because (they say) they are not from the continual succession since the time of the Apostles (15).

Chapter 1.

- I. Response 1: That the calling of our ministers is ordinary and legitimate (16)
- II. Response 2: That a continual succession was never and is no longer so simply necessary to make for lawful calling (18).
- III. Response 3: That succession is rather on our side than on the part of the Roman church (33).
- IV. Response 4: That in the Roman Church there is no well-ordered calling and therefore there is no succession: that is, if one wishes to follow the ancient Canons and Doctors (38).
 - a. [Includes a lengthy summarizing argument, argued hypothetically.]

Third Part: Response to the third kind of adversaries who intrude into the ministry.

Chapter 1. [Introduction]

- I. Argument 1: An argument against them, that is to say that the order established by God in his church cannot be perverted in good conscience (42).
- II. Argument 2: That one cannot be too assured of his calling (45).
- III. Argument 3: That the order established by the Lord being in place, it is not a question of being grounded upon some extraordinary calling (47).

Chapter 2. Objections of the adversaries:

- I. They are consumed with zeal for the house of God. Response: That true zeal is guided by knowledge, as much of doctrine as of the order established by the Word of God (53).
- II. Taken from a passage of St. Paul to the Philippians, but very badly applied. Phlp. 1:18 (55).
- III. Taken from a passage of St. Mark but very badly accommodated. Mark 9:39 (57).

A warning to lend the ear only to those who are sent by good and lawful calling (58. Chap III).

Fourth Part, divided into two articles.

I. Article One: Containing the response to the fourth adversaries, namely those who desire to establish another manner of discipline than that which is received and practiced in the French Reformed Churches (68).

- a. Chapter 1: [introduces Morély's *De la discipline & police de l'Eglise*]
- b. Chapter 2: How the existing form of discipline was established in France and what is its form (70).
- c. Chapter 3: The principal points which provide the proof in this matter (73).
- d. Chapter 3 [4]: That the general government of the church belongs to the Consistory, composed of the pastors, elders, and deacons, and not all the people (75).
 - i. Argument 1: on the express passages of Scripture (76-7).
 - ii. Argument 2: founded upon what the Apostles practiced in the early church (78).
 - iii. Argument 3: founded upon the authority of the ancient doctors (79).
 - iv. Argument 4: that such a popular government as some want to establish never existed nor may it without horrible confusion (80).
- e. Chapter 4 [5]: A reply to what they allege from the assistance that God promised to his church (82).

II. Article Two: Divided into three points (85).

- a. *First Point [of Article Two of the Fourth Part]: That all the parts of the discipline are expressly attributed to the consistory and not confused with all the people (85).*
 - i. Chapter 1. And first of all from the determination of the teaching pertaining properly to those who have charge in the Church, and singularly to the ministers of the Word of God (85).
 1. Argument 1: taken from the *express commands* of the Lord (88).
 2. Argument 2: founded upon the examples of the Old and New Testament (96).
 3. Argument 3: taken from the examples of the ancient Bishops (99).
 4. Argument 4: founded upon the confusions resulting from such a confusion of the popular state (104).
 - ii. Chapter 2: Replies to the contrary objections (108).
 1. Objection 1: Firstly to what they say, that it was said to each one that he keep from false teaching (108).
 - a. Response 1: That it does not follow from this that each one be permitted to rule the others (108).
 - b. He *distinguishes* callings. He compares to earthly kingdoms. All the subjects must obey, but not all enforce obedience.
 2. Objection 2: That it is said that all can prophesy (111).
 - a. Response 1: That this is understood of all those who have the gift of prophecy.
 - b. Response 2: that one must *distinguish* the times (113).
 - c. Response 3: That without introducing a certain confusion, one can and must pay attention to the particular gifts of each (115).
 - d. Response 4: taken from a passage of St. Paul [1Co 14], that the spirits of prophets are subject to the prophets.
 3. Objection 3: That the Scriptures do not admit of private interpretation.
 - a. Response 1: That this is not at all to the point (119).

4. Objection 4: That all the people were called to the choosing of magistrates (120).
 - a. Response 1: That it is not orderly to confuse ecclesiastical discipline with the civil jurisdiction (121).
 - b. Response 2: That just the same the civil state of Israel was never governed by the plurality of voices of all the multitude (121).
5. Objection 5: That David took advice from the people to bring back the ark of the covenant (125).
 - a. Response 1: That it is there a question of carrying out a task dependent on the political authority, however, the deed concerns the service of God (125).
 - b. Response 2: That David assembled the people not to ask for advice, but to command them [to do] what he had decided [a passage of Morély is turned against him] (126).
6. Objection 6: Taken from the example of Josiah (127).
 - a. Response 1: As below.
7. Objection 7: Taken from the example of Joshua (128).
 - a. Response 1: That in this deed it was a question of civil punishment even though there was a false pretension concerning the service of God (128).
8. Objection 8: Taken from the judgment established against Jeremiah, accused of being a false prophet.
 - a. Response 1: as below (127).
9. Objection 9: Taken from the example of Esdras (131).
 - a. Response 1: As below, that the execution was civil.
 - b. Response 2: That the people assembled not to give advice but to receive the commandment of the High Priest.
10. Objection 10: That Saint Peter justifies his act before those who had been offended by it [in Acts 11:4].
 - a. Response 1: That it is not a question in this deed either of the assembly of the people or of an ecclesiastical assembly.
 - b. Response 2: That this assembly did not meet to pass judgment on the action of Saint Peter, rather, to be instructed by him.
 - c. Response 3: When all the people would have been assembled to reprove Saint Peter, this would have been for a public censure, the fault requiring this because of the circumstance.
11. Objection 11: From the Council held in Jerusalem in the time of the Apostles (137).
 - a. Response 1: That the church of Antioch sent Paul and Barnabas to the Apostles and Elders and not to all the people in Jerusalem.
 - b. Response 2: The Apostles and Elders assembled for the determination of this question, and not all the people.
 - c. Response 3: The Apostles and Elders alone discussed it and their helpers listen to be instructed; beyond this it was not said that all the church had been called together there (139).

- d. Response 4: That it is not astonishing when the Apostles and Elders speak and write in the name of the whole church, seeing that they represent it, having charge of it (142).
 - e. Response 5: that there is a great difference between giving advice personally and agreeing to some advice according to one's office (145).
 - f. Response 6: That just the same this example [of the Council of Jerusalem in Acts 15] condemns those who say that the doubts which arise about the teaching must be decided by the plurality of voices of all the churches (146).
 - 12. General Response to several other objections from passages very poorly applied (148).
- b. *Second Point of Article Two [of the Fourth Part] (150)*
 - i. Chapter 1: That the censure of scandals belongs to the governors of the church and not to all of its multitude.
 - 1. Argument 1: Taken from the things proved above.
 - 2. Argument 2: That ecclesiastical rebukes and corrections are dependent on the ministry of the Word, as the Scriptures testify (151).
 - 3. Argument 3: That the governors must give account of the souls of their flocks.
 - ii. [Chapter 2:] That according to the Word of God the same charge of excommunication is given to the Pastors assisted by the elders and not to all the multitude (155).
 - 1. Argument 1: Taken from the express passages of Scripture.
 - 2. Argument 2: That excommunication does not depend on the will or judgment of men, but [proceeds] from the authority of the Word of God, and therefore is committed to the lawful ministers (administrators) of this word (157).
 - 3. Argument 3: That those who have the duty to determine who may participate in the sacraments, have also the duty to determine who is unworthy. But both of these must be lawfully performed.
 - 4. Argument 4: Taken from an express passage of Saint Paul, by which it seems that the accusation, knowledge of cause, and ecclesiastical rebuke belong to the governors and not to all the multitude, and that all ecclesiastical rebuke need not be done in public (160).
 - 5. Argument 5: Taken from the examples of the early church (166).
 - 6. Argument 6: That the necessity itself requires us to commit ecclesiastical censures to the governors and not to all the people (171).
 - iii. Chapter 2 [*sic.* 3]. Response to the objections of the adversaries (174).
 - 1. Objection 1: First of all regarding to the foundation/beginning that they take on these words, 'Say it to the Church' (176)
 - a. Response 1: That our adversaries themselves are constrained to limit this general name "Church" to those who are capable of sense and of [a certain] sex, [thus] speaking against themselves.
 - b. Response 2: That this name "Church" is often taken for one part of the whole body of it, and namely for the governors, and that it is even a common manner of speaking (179).

- c. Response 3: That Jesus Christ wanted to fit his purpose/meaning and the discipline of his Church in this passage to the manner of working established among the Jews and therefore understood by this word Church, only the consistory (181).
 - d. Response 4: That Jesus Christ approved the Sanhedrin of the Jews and that the Apostles, following his precept, have followed this pattern in ecclesiastical discipline (184).
 - e. Response 5: That what follows [the text] shows the true sense of this word 'Church;' to which the most prominent theologians agree, both ancient and modern (188).
 - f. Response 6: That there is no absurdity in sometimes granting that the name of the whole body [is put] for a single part of it (191).
 - g. Response 7: That when nevertheless the word 'Church' would signify the entire assembly, the practice of discipline presently observed in the French Reformed Churches will be found to conform to the ordinance of Jesus Christ (191).
2. Objection 2: Taken from the first letter to the Corinthians (195).
- a. Response 1: That not everything Saint Paul writes in his letters belongs to the generality of the churches to which he writes (196).
 - b. Response 2: That the words of the Apostle in no way serve to introduce the plurality of the people's voices and what is more, they confirm the discipline already received and practiced (196).
 - c. Response 3: That there is a great difference between the ordinary rule and some particular deed (200).
3. Objection 3: From the same passage of Saint Paul, very poorly understood (202).
- c. *Third Point of Article Two of the Fourth Part.*
- i. Chapter 1. That the elections and depositions belong to well regulated consistories, and not to all the body of the Church (205).
 - 1. Argument 1: Which is taken from the express passages of Scripture and from the practice of the Apostles (205).
 - 2. Argument 2: Taken from the examples of the early church (211).
 - 3. Argument 3: Founded upon the inconveniences which follow necessarily from the authority of the popular estate (215).
 - ii. Chapter 2: Response to the objections of the adversaries
 - 1. Objection 1: That they allege the election of Matthias (218).
 - 2. Objection 2: From the election of the deacons.
 - a. Response 1: That in this election the apostles had the prime authority (219).
 - b. Response 2: That one must establish the difference between the substance which is certain and unchanging, and the form which can and must be accommodated to the circumstances (222-3).
 - c. Response 3: That one must establish the difference between the rule and the ordinary form, founded upon the commandments of God, and the deeds or particular examples (227).

- d. Response 4: That under the same circumstances and necessity the French Churches are following this example of the apostles (230).
- ii. Objection 3: From the example of Saint Paul and of Barnabas.
 - 1. Response 1: That this passage wholly disposes of all the contrariety of our adversaries (232).
 - 2. Response 2: That our discipline is conformed to this example (232).

Fifth Part: Conclusion.

- I. Chapter 1: Conclusion of all that precedes (233).
- II. Chapter 2: The principal errors of those who want to change our discipline.
 - i. Error 1: That they do not distinguish between the principle or substance of the discipline and the form which can and must be accommodated to the circumstances (234).
 - ii. Error 2: In which they introduce a second council, without [the authority of the] Word of God or the example of the early Church (237).
 - iii. Error 3: In which they adulterate ecclesiastical discipline with civil authority, by which one sees the great difference there is between what the Apostles ordained and practiced and what these here imagine (237).
- III. Chapter 3: That the discipline forged by these adversaries is not only false and dangerous, but also impossible (239).
- IV. Chapter 4: Response to the slander/malice/calumny of those who call the yoke imposed by the Lord slavery and to the contrary name an unbridled license liberty (240).
- V. Chapter 5: Response to those who think that the consistories, such as are established, do not fall into pride and away from the true remedies to stop this evil (432 [*sic*; 243]).
- VI. Chapter 6: Exhortation to the adversaries to stop troubling the churches (245).
- VII. Chapter 7: Exhortation to the faithful, to remain united as much from the doctrine as from the discipline.

APPENDIX 4

Theses for Disputation

1. Antoine de Chandieu's hermeneutic recognized a hierarchy of authorities from greater to lesser: explicit commands of Scripture; express teachings of Scripture; biblical examples; church historical examples; and, necessity itself.
2. Chandieu presented his treatises as "theological and at the same time scholastic" to indicate that conclusions reached by consequence or deduction ought to be both good and necessary.
3. The more likely source for Chandieu's "Old Aristotelian" emphasis is not Claude Auberi but Jacob Schegk.
4. There was no one university "disputation" in the medieval and early modern eras. Rather, we must distinguish the dialectic and scholastic disputation. Generally, one could think of the dialectical disputation as preparatory for the more serious pursuit of actual truths in the scholastic disputation.
5. By the designation *hypotheticum connexum* Chandieu intends a technical term for the *modus ponens* and *modus tollens* modes of the hypothetical syllogism.
6. "Physical premotion" was a designation developed by sixteenth-century Thomist commentators in the context of seeking to understand God's predetermination of contingent events, to designate God's motion upon the human will. The word helps distinguish God's moving the will from his creating and preserving it.
7. For the continuity of personal human existence between this life and the next it is critical that Christians affirm the ongoing, albeit reduced existence of persons in the soul during the intermediate state.
8. Atonement theologies that present Christ only as the great example are more open to the charge of divine child abuse than those that appeal to penal substitutionary atonement.
9. Luther's theology of vocation, contrary to Wingren's influential work, was predominately positive, for Luther was adamant that the preaching of the gospel must precede one's call to vocation. Thus, vocation in Luther is primarily linked to the gospel, not to the law.
10. Atheists live in self-deception, for their atheism presupposes theism inasmuch as their use of logic, living by moral standards, expectation of nature's uniformity, fear of death, and assumption of freedom of thought all manifest an otherwise hidden belief in the true God of Christianity.

11. Klaas Schilder's debate with Herman Hoeksema demonstrates the familiarity of the former with the Reformed Scholastics, particularly when Schilder endorses (without mentioning the terms as such) the difference between the compounded and divided senses of propositions as part of his argument that one must distinguish God's will as absolute and as conditional. "For God himself wills that certain things absolutely happen and that other things happen under certain conditions."
12. A renewed search ought to be undertaken for the personal journal of Chandieu, last known to reside with the M. L. Tscharner family of Berne, and studied by the Reformed pastor August Bernus in the late 1880s, but never published.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Adam, Melchior. *Vitae germanorum theologorum, qui superiori seculo ecclesiam Christi voce scriptisque propagarunt et propugnarunt congestae et ad annum usque 1618 deductae*. Frankfurt: Jonae Rosae, 1653.

Agricola, Franciscus. *De Verbo Dei scripto, et non scripto; seu de Scriptura Sacra, et viva tantum, sed certo divina, et Apostolica traditione*. n. pl.: Henricum Houium, 1597.

Agricola, Rudolphus. *De inventione dialectica libri tres*. Paris: Simon Colineus, 1529.

Albert [of Saxony]. *Logica Albertucii perutilis*. Venice: s.n., 1522.

Alesius, Alexander. *Contra Horrendas Serveti blasphemias . . . disputatio*. Leipzig: Hantzsch, 1554.

Amport, Christiann. *Ad Sebastiani Verronis Friburgensium apud Helvetios Parochi ac Sacerdotis Iesuastri, quaestiones de Verbo Dei, S. Scriptura comprehenso, responsiones analyticae & ἀνασκευαστικαί*. Geneva: Vignon, 1586.

Aretius, Benedict. *Examen theologicum brevi et perspicua method conscriptum*. Lausanne: François le Preux, 1574.

Aristotle. Ἀριστοτελούς Ἀσκληριαδου του σταγειριτου ὄργανον. Edited by Johannes Hospinian. Basel: Ioannes Oporinus, 1564.

———. *The Complete Works of Aristotle: The Revised Oxford Translation*. Edited by Jonathan Barnes, 2 vols. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984.

———. *The Organon*, trans. O. F. Owen. London: Henry G. Bohn, 1853.

———. *A New Aristotle Reader*. Edited by J. L. Ackrill. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1987.

Aquinas, Thomas. *Summa contra Gentiles. Commentariis Francisci de Sylvestra*. Paris: Foucherium, 1552.

———. *Summa Sacrae Theologiae in tres partes divisa*. s.l.: Comini Venturae, 1590.

———. *The Summa Theologica of St. Thomas Aquinas*, 2nd rev. ed. Translated by the Fathers of the English Dominican Province. Benziger Brothers, 1947.

- . *The Commentary of St. Thomas Aquinas on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*. Translated by Fabian Larcher. Online at <http://www.aquinas.avemaria.edu/Aquinas-Corinthians.pdf>
- . *The Commentary of St. Thomas Aquinas on the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Translated by Vives & RSV. Online at <http://www.aquinas.avemaria.edu/Aquinas-Hebrews.pdf>
- Arturus, Laurentius Faunteus. *De Christi in terrisecclesia quanam et penes quos existat Libri tres, in quibus Calvinianos, Lutheranos et ceteros, quise Evangelicos nominant, alienos a Christi ecclesia esse, argumentis, signisque, clarissimis demonstratur, et simul Apologia Assertionum quousdem inscriptionis contra falsas Antonii Sadeelis criminationes continetur. Auctore Laurentis Arturo Faunteo Soc. Jesu Theologo*. Ivan Wolrab., 1584.
- Auberi, Claude [Alberi]. *Categoriae quae vulgo praedicamenta. In usum scholae Lausannesnsis*. Berne: Franciscus le Preux, 1576.
- . *Deux traitez, in forme d'harangue. L'un de la resurrection des morts. L'autre, du tremblement de terre*, trans. I.R.G. Lausanne: Jean Chiquelle, 1586.
- . *De Immortalitate animae, oratio apodictica*. [Morges]: Jean le Preux, 1586.
- . *Organon, id est: Instrumentum doctrinarum omnium*. Morges: J. Le Preux, 1584.
- . *Περὶ ἐρμηνείας, seu de Enuntiationibus, quas propositiones vocant, in quibus verum & falsam primò diiudicantur. In usum scholae Lausannensis*. Berne: Franciscus le Preux, 1577.
- . *Posteriorum notionum quas secundas intentiones & Praedicabilia vocant, Brevis & luculenta explicatio. In usum scholae Lausannensis*. Berne: Franciscus le Preux, 1576.
- Augustine Aurelius. *Teaching Christianity: De Doctrina Christiana*. Translated by Edmund Hill. New York: New City Press, 1996.
- Aymon, Jean. *Tous les synodes nationaux des églises réformées de France*. Vol. 1. Den Haag: Charles Deloo, 1710.
- Bayle, Pierre. *Dictionaire historique et critique*. 2nd ed. Vol 3. Rotterdam: Reinier Leers, 1702.
- Bellarmino, Robert. *De verbo Dei scripto et non scripto: disputatio Roberti Bellarmini*

quatuor libris proposita, perlustrata notis Johannis Urbani ministri Hattemensis, quae partim liberae sunt, partim liberatae ab ijs, quae Iacobus Gretserus Iesuita Ingolstadiensis anno 1607 adversus omnes Bellarmini edidit. Zacharias Heyns, 1609.

———. *Disputatio de verbo Dei scripto et non scripto*. 1618.

Bèze, Théodore de. *Abraham sacrificiant*. [Geneva: Jean Crespin] and Conrad Badius, 1550.

———. *Apologia Th. Bezae Vezelii, ad libellum Sorbonici Theologastri F. Claudii de Xaintes*. Geneva: Jean Crespin, 1567.

———. *Correspondence de Theodore de Beze, Vols I-31*. Edited by H. Meylan, F. Aubert, A. Dufour, et. al. Geneva: Droz, 1960-2010.

———. *Confession Christianae Fidei in Volumen tractationum theologicarum*. Geneva: Jean Crespin, 1570.

———. *Histoire ecclesiastique des eglises reformees au royaume de France*. Vol. 2. Anvers: Iean Remy, 1580.

———. *Propositions and Principles of Divinitie Propounded and Disputed in the University of Geneva under M. Theod. Beza and M. Anthonie Faius*. Trans. John Perry. Edinburgh: Robert Waldegrae, 1591.

———. *Tractatio de polygamia*. Geneva: Jean Crespin, 1568.

Bèze, Théodore de, Antoine de Chandieu [Zamariel], and Guy de Pibrac, *Poemes Chrestiens & Moraux*. s. l.: s. n., c. 1600.

Bèze, Théodore de, and Antoine de la Faye, *Theses theologicae in Schola genevensi*. Geneva: Vignon, 1586.

Bernus, August. "Le ministre Antoine de Chandieu d'après son journal autographe inédit (1534-1591), cinq parties." *Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire du Protestantisme Français* 37 (1888): pp. 2-13, 57-69, 124-36, 169-91, 393-415, 449-62, 561-77, 617-35.

———. *Le ministre Antoine de Chandieu d'après son journal autographe inédit*. Paris: Imprimeries réunies, 1889.

Biblia Veteris ac Novi Testamenti, trans. Sanctes Pagninus. Basel: Thomas Guarinus, 1564.

Burley, Walter. *On The Purity of the Art of Logic: The Shorter and Longer Treatises*, trans. Paul Vincent Spade. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000.

Caesarius, Johann. *Dialectica*. Cologne: Fabritio, 1564.

Calvin, Jean. *Commentary on a Harmony of the Evangelists, Matthew, Mark, and Luke*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1993.

———. *Ioannis Calvini Opera Quae Supersunt Omnia*. Edited by G. Baum, E. Cunitz, and E. Reuss. Brunswick and Berlin: C. A. Schwetschke & Son, 1863-1900.

———. *L'ordre du College de Geneve*. Geneva: Estienne, 1559.

———. *Selected Works of John Calvin: Tracts and Letters*, Vols 1-7. Edited by Henry Beveridge and Jules Bonnet. Translated by Henry Beveridge. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1983.

Chalas, Jean de. *L'Honneur ou le Besze du Sieur de Chalas. A Messire Philippes de Mornay Seigneur du Plessis-Marly. Avec quelques stances & sonnets sur le trespas de Monsieur de Besze*. [Geneva]: Gabriel Cartier, 1606.

[Chandieu, Antoine de]. *Advertissement aux fideles*. s.l.: s.n., 1561.

[Chandieu, Antoine de] Antoine de la Croix. *Tragi-comedie. L'argument pris due troisieme chapitre de Daniel: avec le Cantique des trois enfans, chanté en la fournaise*. s.l.: s.n., 1561.

[Chandieu, Antoine de] A. Zamariel. *Histoire des persecutions et martyrs de l'eglise de Paris, depuis l'an 1557 iusques au temps due Roy Charles neufiesme . . .* Lyon: [Sébastien Honorat], 1563.

[Chandieu, Antoine de] Pierre de Ronsard. *Palinodies de Pierre de Ronsard, sur les discours des misères de ce temps*. [Lyon: Jean Saugrain], 1563.

[Chandieu, Antoine de, and Bernard de Montmeja] A. Zamariel and B. Mont-Dieu. *Reponse aux Calomnies continues au Discours & Suyte du Discours sur les Misères de ce Temps*. Orleans, s.n., 1563.

[Chandieu, Antoine de]. *La confirmation de la discipline ecclésiastique, observée es églises reformées du royaume de France, avec la response aux obiections proposées alencontre*. [Geneva]: [Henri II Estienne], 1566.

[Chandieu, Antoine de] A. Theopsaltes. *Refutatio libelli quem Claudius de Saintes*

Monachus nuper edidit cum hac inscriptione: Examen doctrinae Calvinianae et Bezanae de Coena Domini, ex scriptis authorum eiusdem collectum. Geneva: [Jean Crespin], 1567.

[Chandieu, Antoine de] A. Zamariel. *Epithaphe de la Mort de Tresillustre Prince Wolfgang and Un Ode sur les misères des Eglises Françaises.* [Geneva]: Jean Durant, 1569.

[Chandieu, Antoine de] A. Z. *Discours et advertissemens notables fais par le Lac Lemman aux villes et lieux circonuoisins.* s.l.: s.n., 1571.

Chandieu, Antoine de. “Vers sur la mort de Coligny.” *Bulletin de la Société de l’histoire du protestantisme français* 24 (1875), pp. 83-6 [from 1572].

[Chandieu, Antoine de] A. Sadeele. *De legitima vocatione pastorum ecclesiae Reformatae. Aduersus eos qui in hoc tantum capite se ab Ecclesia Reformata dissentire profitentur. Ex libro de Disciplina Ecclesiastica.* [Geneva]: s.n., 1577.

———. *Sophismata F. Turriani Monachi ex eorum sodalitate qui sacrosanct Iesv nomine ad suae sectae inscriptionem abutuntur: Collecta ex eius libro De Ecclesia, & Ordinationibus Ministrorum Ecclesiae, adversus capita disputationis Lipsica. Quibus singulis svbiecta est perspicua & vera Solutio ex praeceptis rectè & Theologicè disputandi petita.* Geneva: Pierre de Saint-André, 1577.

[Chandieu, Antoine de] A. Sadeele Theopsaltes. *Meditationes in psalmum xxxii.* Lausanne: François Le Preux, 1578.

[Chandieu, Antoine de] Antonie Sadel. *Moste excellent Meditations vyppon the xxxii. Psalme,* trans. William Watkinson. London: Cooke and Man, 1579.

[Chandieu, Antoine de] A. Sadeele. *Locus de Verbo Dei scripto, adversus humanas traditiones, theologicæ et scholasticæ tractatus.* Morges: J. Le Preux, 1580.

———. *Ad repetita F. Turriani Monachi Iesuitae sophismata de Ecclesia et ordinationibus Ministrorum ecclesiae, Responsio. In qua refelluntur omnes tum responsionis, tum objectiones à Turriane propositae in libro Defensionis Sophismatum, quem ille perperam, Defensionem locorum Scripturae, inscripsit.* Morges: Jean le Preux, 1580.

———. *Responsionis ad repetita F. Turriani Monachi Iesuitae sophismata de Ecclesia et ordinationibus Ministrorum ecclesiae, Responsio. In qua refelluntur omnes tum responsionis, tum objectiones à Turriane propositae in libro Defensionis Sophismatum, quem ille perperam, Defensionem locorum Scripturae, inscripsit, pars altera.* Morges: Jean le Preux, 1581.

- . *Centum flosculi Turrianicae disputationis ex utroque eius libro decerpti, & in Iesuitarum gratiam collecti*. Morges: Jean le Preux, 1581.
- . *De unico Christi sacerdotio et sacrificio, adversus commentitium missae sacrificium*. Geneva: J. Le Preux, 1581.
- . *De vera peccatorum remissione, adversus humanas satisfactiones et commentitium Ecclesiae Romanae purgatorium, theologica et scholastica disputatio*. Morges: J. Le Preux, 1582.
- [Chandieu, Antoine de] A. Zamariel. *Méditations sur le psalme XXXII*, trans. from Latin. [Geneva]: J. Laimarie, 1583.
- [Chandieu, Antoine de] A. Sadeele. *A treatise touching the Word of God written, against the traditions of men: handled both schoolelike, and divineline, where also is set downe a true method to dispute divinely and schoolelike*, trans. Iohn Cox. London: Iohn Harison, 1583.
- . *Index ἐλεγκτικος repetitionum & ταπτολογιων Turriani ex Tertio eius libro quem δίδιβλον inscripsit, collectus*. Morges: Jean le Preux, 1583.
- . *Posnaniensium assertionum de Christi in terris Ecclesia, quaenam & penes quos existat: propositarum in Collegio Posnaniensi, à Monachis nouae Societatis, Quam illi Societatem Iesu, non sine blasphemia nominant, nisi forte unius Iudae Iscariotae posterius, ac haeredes haberi velint, Analysis et Refutatio*. Geneva: Jacob Chouet, 1583.
- Chandieu, Antoine de. *Octonnaires sur la Vanité et Inconstance du Monde*, ed. François Bonali-Fiquet. Geneva: Droz, 1979 [from 1583].
- [Chandieu, Antoine de] A. Sadeele. *Disputationes accuratae theologice et scholastice tractatae*. Cambridge: Thomas Thomson, 1584.
- . *De veritate humanae naturae Jesu Christi: theologica et scholastica disputatio . . .* Geneva and Morges: Joannis Le Preux, 1585.
- . *La response a la profession de foy publiée contre ceux de l'Eglise Reformée: Avec la refutation tant des calomnies qui y sont contenues, que generalmente des erreurs de l'Eglise Romaine pretendue Catholique*. [La Rochelle: Pierre Haultin], 1585.

- . *De spirituali manducatione corporis Christi et spirituali potu sanguinis ipsius in Sacra Coena Domini: theologica et scholastica tractatio*. Jean Le Preux: Geneva, 1589.
- . *De sacramentali manducatione corporis Christi et sacramentali potu sanguinis ipsius in Sacra Coena Domini: theologica et scholastica tractatio*. Jean Le Preux: Geneva, 1589.
- [Chandieu, Antoine de]. *Index errorum Gregorij de Valentia monachi blasphemae Societatis. Ex eo libro quem inscripsit, Examen praecipui mysterij doctrinae Calvinistarum, etc. Confectus à nonnullis Theologiae & Philosophiae Candidatis in Schola Genevensi*. Geneva: Jean le Preux, 1590.
- [Chandieu, Antoine de] A. Sadeele. *Responsio ad Fidei (quam vocant), professionem a monachis Burdegalensibus editam... anno 1585, ut esset verae religionis abjurandae formula, quae, antea non semel excusa gallice et ab authore locupletata, nunc primum Theodori Gauteri studio . . . latine prodit . . .*, trans. Thierry Gautier. Geneva: Jean le Preux, 1591.
- . *Ad tres Libros Laurentii Arturi quos inscripsit de Ecclesia Christi in terries: seu Apologia Assertionum Posnaniensium de Ecclesia*. [Geneva]: Jean le Preux, 1592.
- . *Opera Theologica*, Geneva: Jean le Preux, 1592.
- . *Index secundus ελεγκτικός errorum Gregorij de Valentia, blasphemae societatis monachi. In quo agitur de Causa Formali unionis nostrae cum Christo*, ed. Gaspar Laurent. In *Opera Theologica*, Geneva: Jean le Preux, 1592, pp. 362-95.
- . *Opera Theologica*, 2nd ed. Geneva: Jean le Preux, 1593.
- Chandieu, Antoine de. “Cantique pour le Roy, sur la victoire par luy obtenue a Coutras.” *Cantique sur la victoire d’Yvry*, ed. G. de Saluste. Lyon: Jean Tholoson, 1594.
- [Chandieu, Antoine de] A. Sadeele. *Operum Theologicorum*. 4 vols. Geneva: Jean le Preux, 1596.
- . *Traité theologic et scholastique de l’unique sacrifice & sacrifice de Iesus Christ*. Trans. Simon Goulart. Geneva: Jean le Preux, 1595.
- . *Traité theologic et scholastique, de la vraye Remission des pechez*. Trans. Simon Goulart. Geneva: Jean le Preux, 1595.
- . *Traité theologic et scholastique, de la Parole de Dieu*. Trans. Simon Goulart. Geneva: Jean le Preux, 1596.

- . *Opera Theologica*, 3rd ed. Geneva: Jean le Preux, 1599.
- . *Tractatus de nostra in sacramentis cum Domino Iesu Christo coniunctione. In quo agitur de Causa Formali & Instrumentali unionis cum Iesu Christo*, ed. Gaspar Laurent. In *Opera Theologica*, 3rd ed. Geneva: Jean le Preux, 1599 [new title for *Index secundus ελεγκτικος errorum Gregorij de Valentia* of 1592].
- Chandieu, Antoine de. “Cantique à la Memoire de sa fille.” *Poemes Chrestiens & Moraux*. s. l.: s. n., c. 1600.
- [Chandieu, Antoine de] A. Zamariel. “Tumbeau a Iean Calvin.” *Recueil des opuscules* Geneva: Jacob Stoer, 1611.
- [Chandieu, Antoine de] A. Sadeele. *Opera Theologica*. 4th ed. Geneva: Isaiah le Preux, 1614.
- . *Opera Theologica*. 5th ed. Geneva: Peter and Jacob Chouët, 1620.
- Chandieu, Antoine de la Roche, Theodore Beza, Jean-François Salvard, Simon Goulart, and Lambert Daneau. *Harmonia confessionum fidei*. Geneva: Petrum Santandreanum, 1581.
- Coyffier, Gilbert. *Defence de la verité de la foy catholicque contre les erreurs de Calvin*. Paris: Guillaume Chaudière, 1586.
- Crell, Fortunatus. *Isagoge logica*. Neustadt: Matthæus Harnisch, 1584.
- Crespin, Jean, ed. *Le livre des martyrs*. [Geneva]: Jean Crespin, 1554.
- d’Huisseau, Isaac. *La Discipline des eglises pretendues reformees*. Paris: Vendosme, 1663.
- Daneau, Lambert. *Methodus Sacrae Scripturae in publicis tum praelectionibus tum concionibus utiliter tractandae*. Geneva: Pierre de St. André, 1579.
- de Thou, Jacques-Auguste. *Historiarum sui temporis*. Vol. 2. Frankfurt: Hoffmann, 1614.
- . *Histoire universelle*. Translated from the Latin. Vol 4. London [Paris]: Rollin 1734.
- . *Memoires de Condé, servant d’éclaircissement*. Vol. 1. London [Paris]: Rollin, 1743.
- Dedekind, Friedrich. *Artificium disputandi contractum*. n.l.: Griefswald, 1675.

- Driessche, René van den. "Sur le 'De syllogismo hypothetico,' de Boèce." *Methodus* 1 (1949): pp. 293-307.
- Dufour, Théophile. "Un Opusculé Inédit de Farel: le résumé des actes de la Dispute de Rive (1535)." *Mémoires et Documents publiés par la Société d'histoire et d'archéologie de Genève*, 1886 (v. 22), pp. 201-40.
- Erastus, Thomas. *Ratio formandorum syllogismorum, brevissima & facilima*. Hamburg: Forster, 1564.
- Eymeric, Nicholaus. *Directorium Inquisitorum*. Venice: Simeon Vasalin, 1595.
- Faunt, Laurent [Laurentius Faunteus Arturus]. *De Christi in terris ecclesia quam et penes quos existat Libri tres, in quibus Calvinianos, Lutheranos et ceteros, quise Evangelicos nominant, alienos a Christi ecclesia esse, argumentis, signisque, clarissimis demonstratur, et simul Apologia Assertionum quosdam inscriptionis contra falsas Antonii Sadeelis criminationes continetur* (Poznan: Ivan Wolrab, 1584).
- Faye, Antoine de la. *De Vita et obitu clarissima viri, D. Theodori Bezae Vezelii*. Geneva: Jacob Chouet, 1606.
- Fonseca, Pedro da. *Institutionum dialecticarum libri octo*. Cologne: Cholinus, 1567.
- Foxe, John. *The Actes and Monuments of these Latter and Perillous Days, Touching Matters of the Church*. London: John Day, 1563.
- . *Commentarii rerum in ecclesia gestarum, maximarumque, per totam Europam, persecutionum*. Strasbourg: Rihelius, 1554.
- Freyhub, Andreas. *Capita Disputationis in qua asseritur Ius Vocandi & Ordinandi ministros verbi Dei . . . Et simul breviter respondetur ad praecipua Argumenta, quae contra hanc recens à quidam Francisco Turriano sunt emissa*. Leipzig: Rambau, 1571.
- Geldorp, Hendrik van. *De Optimo genere interpretandae philosophiae, in quo explicatur simul ratio atque ordo Scholae Dusbürgensis*. s.l.: s.n., 1561.
- Grynaeus, Johan Jacob. *Censura Theologica, de prima antichristianorum errorum origine et praecipuis capitibus, ac de horum confutatione, conscripta à Iohanne Iacobo Grynaeo . . . respondent Quirino Reuttero*. Heidelberg: Mylius, 1584.
- . *De Certa electorum salute, theses sexaginta*. Basel: Ostein brs, 1575.

- . *De Christianae religionis veritate*. Heidelberg: Mylius, 1584.
- . *De Deo redemptore theologa*. Basel: Ostein, 1583.
- . *De Iustificatione, quae fit per fidem*. Basel: Ostein, 1583.
- . *De quarta parte symboli Apostolici, theses analyticae*. Basel: Ostein, 1577.
- . *Theses de vetustate doctrinae papisticae*. Basel: Oporinus, 1582.
- Herbet, Jean. *De Oratore libri quinque*. Paris: Ruellius, 1574.
- Hildebrand, Bruno, ed. *Urkundensammlung über die Verfassung und Verwaltung der Universität Marburg unter Philipp dem Grossmüthigen*. Marburg: Elwert'sche Universitäts-Buchhandlung, 1848.
- [Himmel, Enoch] Chanocus Uranus. *De verbo Dei scripto, libri quatuor. Qui legitimam vendicationem praecipue continent disputationis theologica et scholastica, D. Antonii Sadeelis, De verbo Dei scripto adversus humanas traditiones: Oppositam instantiis et accusationibus Joannis Lensei, regii professoris in Academia Iovaniensi, quibus labefactare conatus fuit illam D. Sadeelis disputationem*. Geneva: Héritiers d'Eustache Vignon, 1594.
- Hosius, Stanislaus. *De expresso Dei verbo, libellus his temporibus accommodatissimus*. Louvain: Gravius, 1559.
- Hospinian, Johannes. *Quaestionum dialecticarum, libri sex*. Basel: 1543.
- Huens, Augustin. *De Disputatione inter disceptantes, Dialectice instituenda, libellus*. Louvain: Verhasselt, 1551.
- . *Logices fundamentum. Seu prodidagmata de dialecticis vocum affectionibus & proprietatibus*. Antwerp: Silvius, 1563.
- Hutter, Leonhard. *Sadeel Elenchomenos. Siue Tractatio Theologica, De Veritate Et Maiestate Humanae Naturae Iesu Christi. Opposita Sophismatis Antonii Sadeelis Chandel Quibus In sua de eâdem materiâ, Theologica & Scholastica Tractatione, contra sanam & Orthodoxam veritatem (sed irritò conatu) pugnare voluit*. Impensis Clementis Bergeri Bibliopola: Cratonianis, 1602.
- Hyperius, Andreas. *De theologo, seu de ratione studii Theologici*. Basel: Oporinum, [1556].

Illustrations of Popery. New York: J. P. Callender, 1838.

Jaquemot, Jean, trans. *Selectorum carminum ex doctiss. poetis collectorum*. [Geneva]:
Israelem Taurinum [Jacob Stoer], 1590.

l'Espine, Jean de. *De Tranquillitate animi, Libri VII*, trans. Thierry Gautier. [Geneva]:
Stoer, 1594.

l'Estocart, Paschal de. *Octonaires sur la vanité du monde [of Antoine de Chandieu]*.
Ensemble Clément Janequin. France: Harmonia Mundi, 1983 and 2006. Compact
disc audio.

Lambert, François. *Farrago omnium fere rerum theologicarum*. [Strasbourg: Jo.
Hervagen, 1525].

———. *In primum duodecim prophetarum, nempe Oseam . . . commentarii. Eiusdem
libellus de Arbitrio hominis vere captivo*. Strasbourg: Jo. Hervagen, 1525.

———. *In regulum Minoritarum, et contra universas perditionis sectas, Fransisci Lamberti
Avenioneni. Commentarii vere Evangelici, denuo per ipsum recogniti &
locupletati. Sectarum Regni filii catalogum in prologo habes*. [Strassburg]: s.n.,
1523.

Lambert, Francis. *The minde and judgement of maister Fraunces Lambert of Auenna of
the wyil of man*. London: John Day, 1548.

Lambert, Thomas A., and Isabella M. Watt, eds. *Registres du consistoire de Genève au
temps de Calvin*. Tome I (1542-1544), vol. XXII. Geneva: Droz, 1996.

Lascaris, Theodore Duca. *De Communicatione naturali libri VI*, trans. Claude Auberi.
Basel: s.n., 1571.

Latomus, Bartholomaeus. *Summa rationis disserendi*. Cologne: Gymnicus, 1542.

[Laurent, Gaspar, ed.]. *Catholicus et orthodoxus ecclesiae consensus, ex verbo Dei,
patrum scriptis, Ecclesiae reformatae Confessionum harmonia*. [Geneva]:
Eustache Vignon, 1595.

Laurent, Gaspar. "Epitaphium D. Calvini, Bezae, Chandaei." *Epicedia quae clarissimi
aliquot viri, et D. Theodoro Bezae charissimi*. Geneva: Jacob Chouet, 1606.

Le Jeune, Claude. *Octonaires de la vanite et inconstance du monde [of Antoine de
Chandieu]*. Ensemble Jacques Feuillie. Paris: Arion, 1999. Compact disc audio.

Le Laboureur, J. *Additions aux memoires de Messire Michel de Castelnau*, vol. 2. Brussels: Jean Leonard, 1731.

Laurent, Gaspard. *De nostra in sacramentis cum Domino Jesu Christo conjunctione tractatus: adversa sophismata quae contra S. hoc mysterium proferuntur, praesertim in libro cujus titulus Redargutio inscitiarum & fraudum quibus nonnulli theologi & philosophi Genevenses, subsidiarii Antonii Sadeelis eum librum cavillati sunt quo precipium mysterium doctrina Calvinistarum convictum est*. Geneva. Jean le Preux, 1598.

[Lens, Jean de] Lensaeus, Joannes. *De verbo Dei non scripto, seu Traditionibus ecclesiasticis, contra scholasticam Antonii Sadeelis De verbo Dei scripto disputationem, libri III*. Antwerp: Ioannem Moretum, 1591.

[Lindt, Wilhelm van der] Wilhelmus Lindanus. *Christomachia calvinistica et sacramentariorum omnium vere sathanica, qua invidus diabolus nunc Antichristo suo in dies adventurienti certum preparat iter. Hic insertus Anti-Sadelius, sive Viginti sophismatum Anton. Sadelii contra propitiatorium Christi . . . in Ecclesia catholica sacrificium refutatio*. M. Cholinus, 1584.

———. *Evangelicae panopliae, sive de verbo Dei evangelico*. Cologne: Cholinus, 1559.

Litterae illustriss. principiis [Geneva: Henri Estienne, 1569].

Luther, Martin. *The Bondage of the Will*. Translated by J. I. Packer and O. R. Johnston. Old Tappan, NJ: Revell, 1957.

———. *De servo arbitrio*. Wittenberg: Lufft, 1525.

Martinus, Matthias. *Excussio placidae responsionis Phil. Nicolai ad Ant. Sadeelis Tractat. de spirituali manducatione*. Christoff Rab, 1597.

———. *Spicarum spinarumque Balthasaris Mentzeri collectio et examen, per ipsius elenchos oppositos Antonii Sadeelis p. m. libello de veritate humanae naturae Jesu Christi*. 1597.

———. *Contusio confusionum praecipuarum Balth. Mentzeri quas fecit in refutatione libelli Ant. Sadeelis de Sacramentali Manducatione*. 1597.

Melanchthon, Philipp. *Erotemata Dialectices*. Leipzig: Valentinus Papa, 1549.

———. *Erotemata dialecticae et rhetoricae in Philippi Melanthonis opera quae supersunt omnia*. Vol. 13. Halle an der Salle: C. A. Schwetschke et filium, 1846.

- Mentzer, Balthasar. *Elenchus errorum Antonii Sadeelis in libello De veritate humanae naturae Iesu Christi*. Matthaei VVelaci, 1593.
- . *Elenchus alter errorum Antonii Sadeelis in libello de sacramentali manducatione carnis Christi*. Mullerus, 1594.
- . *Modesta et solida responsio Mentzeri, qua defendit elenchum errorum Antonii Sadeelis de persona Christi contra futes Matth. Martinii*. 1604.
- . *Elenchus errorum Antonii Sadeelis in libello De sacramentali manducatione carnis Christi: cum annexa tractatione De spirituali manducatione*. Giessen: Nicolai Hampelii, 1609.
- . *Elenchus errorum Antonii Sadeelis [pseud.] in libello De veritate humanae naturae Iesu Christi . . .* Giessen: Nicolai Hampelii, 1609.
- Morely, Jean. *Traicte de la discipline et police Chrestienne*. Lyon: Ian de Tournes, 1562.
- Nicolai, Philip. *Ad duos Antonii Sadeelis libellos, quorum alterum de Spirituali: alterum de Sacramentali fruitione Corporis et Sanguinis Iesu Christi inscripsit. Responsum . . . quo Calvinianos in verbis coenae metonymia interpolatis, nullam fruitionem Corporis et Sanguinis Domini . . .* Francius, 1595.
- . *Methodus controversiae de omniapraesentia Christi secundum naturam eius humanam ...: Add. est responsum ... ad duos Antonii Sadeelis libellos*. Spies, 1596.
- Novum Jesu Chrii Domini nostri Testamentum latine*, trans. Théodore de Bèze. Basel [Geneva]: Barbir and Courteau, 1559.
- Nuñez Vela, Pedro. *Dialecticorum Libri III*. Geneva: Stoer, 1578.
- Perkins, William. *Βασκανολογία, hoc est tractatio de nefaria arte venefica*. Hanover: G. Antonium, 1610.
- Piscator, Johannes. *Aphorismi Doctrinae Christianae, ex Institutiones Calvini excerpti*. Herborn: Corvinus, 1589.
- Poupo, Pierre. *La Muse Chrestienne*, Book 3. Paris: Barhelemy le Franc, 1592.
- Quick, John. *Synodicon in Gallia reformata, or, The acts, decisions, decrees, and canons of those famous national councils of the reformed churches in France*. London: T. Parkhurst and J. Robinson, 1692.

- Quentin, Anne Delafosse. *Inconstance et vanité du Monde: Musique aux cours de France et de Savoie en 1601*. France: Astrée Naïve, 2000. Compact disc audio.
- Raemon, Florimond de. *Histoire de la naissance de l'hérésie*, Rouen: Estienne Vereul, 1622.
- Ramée, Pierre de la. *Dialectica libri duo*. Paris: Wechel, 1560.
- . *Dialectica, Audomari Talaei praelectionibus illustrate*. Basel: Episcopium, 1585.
- The Ratio Studiorum: The Official Plan for Jesuit Education*. Translated by Claude Paur. Saint Louis: Institute of Jesuit Sources, 2005.
- Rengelberg, Joachim van. *Dialectica & Rhetorica*. Antwerp: Gryphium, 1538.
- Rivaudeau, Andre de. *Aman: tragedie sainte tiree du VII. Chapitre d'Esther*. Edited by C. Mourain de Sourdeval. Paris: Auguste Aubry, 1859.
- Roussel, Bernard. "La 'Discipline' des Eglises réformées de France en 1559." In *De l'Humanisme aux Lumières, Bayle et le protestantisme: Mélanges en l'honneur d'Elisabeth Labrousse*, edited by M. Magdelaine, M-C. Pitassi, R. Whelan, and A. McKenna, pp. 186-91. Paris: Universitas, 1996.
- Sainctes, Claude de. *Confession de la foy catholique, contenant en brief la reformation de celle que les ministres de Calvin presentèrent au roy, en l'assemblée de Poissy*. Paris: Claude Fremy, 1561.
- . *Declaration d'avcuns atheisms de la doctrine de Caluin et Beze contre les premiers fondemens de la Chrestientés*. Paris: Claude Fremy, 1568.
- . *Responsio F. Claudii de Sainctes Parisien. Theologi ad Apologiam Theodori Bezae*. Paris: Claude Fremy, 1567.
- Sainctes, Claude de, et. al. *Actes de la dispute & conference tenue à Paris, és mois de Juillet, & Aoust, 1566, etre deux doctevrs de Sorbonne, & deux Ministres de l'Eglise reformee. Distinguez selon les iournees*. Strasbourg: Pierre Estiard, 1566.
- . *Actes of conference in religion, holden at Paris, betweene two papist doctors of the Sorbonne, and two godlie ministers of the Church*, transl. Geffraie Fenton. London: H. Bynneman, 1571.
- Saulnier, Antoine. *L'ordre et manière d'enseigner en la ville de Genève au college*. Geneva: Jean Gera[r]d, 1538.

- Schegk, Jacob. *De Demonstratione libri XV, novum opus . . . in duos posteriorum analyticorum Aristotelis libros commentarium*. Basel: Joannes Oporinus, 1564.
- . *Organi Aristotelei*. Basel: Eusebius Episcopus, 1577.
- [Serres, Jean de]. *Academiae Nemausensis brevis & modesta responsio, ad professorum Turnoniorum societatis, ut aiunt Jesu assertiones quas theologicas & philosophicas appellant*. Nîmes: s.n., 1582.
- Serres, Jean de. *Quartus Anti-Iesuita, sive, pro verbo Dei scripto et vere Catholica Ecclesia, adversus Ioannis Hayi Monachi Iesuitae commenta & convitia: Responionis prior*, in *Doctrinae Iesuiticae*, vol. 4, pp. 1-398. La Rochelle [Geneva]: Theophilum Regium [Eustache Vignon], 1586.
- . *Recueil des choses memorables . . . depuis l'an M.D.XLVII iusques au commencement du mois d'Aoust M.D.LXXXIX*. [Geneva: Jean le Preux], 1595.
- Sturm, Johann. *Schola Argentinensis*. Strasbourg: Iosias Rihelius, 1571.
- Sulzer, Simon. *Disputatio theologica de Meschia*. Basel: Froben, 1580.
- . *Theses theologicae de precatone*. Basel: Ostein, 1580.
- . *θεσις και Αντιθεσις, De vera Catholica Dei ecclesia*. Basel: Ostein, 1581.
- Tilenus, Daniel. *A defence of the sufficiency and perfection of the holy Scripture: against the cavillations of the Lord Du Perron, Bishop of Eureux : by the which hee endevoureth to maintaine his Treatise of the unsufficiencie and imperfection of the holy Scripture*. London: Nathanaell Butter, 1606.
- Toledo, Francisco de. *Introductio in dialecticam Aristotelis*. Cologne: Birckmann, 1574.
- Torres, Francisco. *Adversus capita disputationis Lipsicae Andreae Freyhub, De ecclesia, et de ordinationibus ministrorum ecclesiae*. Cologne: Calenius & Quentil, 1574.
- . *Defensio locorum S. Scripturae de ecclesia catholica et eius pastore episcopo romano B. Petri principis Apostolorum successore libri duo: aduersus nugatorias cauillationes Antonij Sadeelis lutherani*. Book 1. Arnold Birckmann, 1580.
- . *Defensio locorum S. Scripturae de ecclesia catholica et eius pastore episcopo romano B. Petri principis Apostolorum successore libri duo: aduersus nugatorias cavillationes Antonij Sadeelis lutherani* [Books 1 and 2]. Arnold Birckmann, 1580.

- . *Liber III. Bipartitus, contra epistolam Antonii Sadeelis ad eundem illustrissimum principem, et contra eiusdem Sadeelis repetitas cavillationes de Ecclesia Catholica visibili, & de primatu episcopi romani* [Book 3]. Sartorius, 1581.
- . *Posterioris Defensionis Lororum Scripturae De Una Ecclesia Catholica in terris visibili & de Episcopo eius Pontifice Romano: Contra secundas cavillationes Antonii Sadeelis Lutherani, Liber Primus Et Secundus*. Ederus, 1583.
- . *Aduersus tertias in librum bipartitum cauillationes Antonii Sadeelis Lutherani Ἐλέγκος Δυσωπητικὸς, sive idonea ad erubescendum deprehensio confessionum & mendaciorum eiusdem*. Sartorius, 1584.
- Tossanus, Daniel. *Theses theol. de scrutandis scripturis sacris, et earum sufficientia ad veram Dei et vitae aeternae cognitionem in quibus examinantur aliquot instantiae et exceptiones Joh. Lensei pro traditionibus, et verbo non scripto, contra D. Ant. Sadeelem P. M.* Heidelberg: Smesmannus, 1591.
- Trebizond, George. *De re dialectica libellus perutilis, cum scholiis Ioannis Novio magi*. Cologne: Cruphthanius, 1538.
- Valentia, Gregorius de. *De Reali Christi Praesentia In Eucharistia, Et De Transubstantiatione Panis Et Vini In Corpus Et Sanguinem Christi: Libri tres: In quorum postremo nominatim respondetur Fortunato cuidam, Caluini discipulo*. Ingolstadt: Sartorius, 1587.
- . *Examen Et Refvtatio Praecipvi Mysterii Doctrinae Calvinistarvm, De Re Eucharistica: cum Responsione ad Obiectiones Antonii Sadeelis & Fortunati Crellii*. Ingolstadt: Sartorius, 1589.
- . *Redargutio Inscitiarvm Et Fravdvm, Qvibus Nonnvlli Theologi Et Philosophi Genevenses, Svbsidiarii Antonii Sadeelis, itemque Fortvnatus Crellius Haidelbergensis, eum librum cauillati sunt: quo praecipuum mysterium doctrinae Caluinistarum superiore anno examinatum & conuictum est*. Ingolstadt: Sartorius, 1590.
- Vermigli, Peter Martyr. *Disputatio de Eucharistia Sacra Sacramento*. Zurich: Gessner, 1552.
- . *De sacramento eucharistiae tractatio*. Zurich: Gessner and Wyssenbach, 1552.
- Winckelmann, Johannes. *Modesta responsio ad conciliationem pugnae sacramentariae, quae est inter Lutheranos et Calvinianos, sub nomine Antonii Sadeelis ... ante annos 19. conscripta*. 1606.

———. *Responsio ad Conciliationem pugnae Sacramentariae, sub nomine Antonii Sadeelis: præter veritatem nuper a quod, anonymo in lucem editam, ante annos 19 conscripta, et directa ad verum autorem*. 1606.

Wyclif, John. *Tractatus de logica*. Vol. 2. London: Wyclif Society, 1896, repr. 1966.

Zabarella, Jacopo. *Opera Logica*, 1578.

Zanchi, Jerome. *De Aperiendis in ecclesia scholis, deque opera sacrarum literarum studiis cumprimis danda*. Neustadt: Meyer, 1579.

———. *De Dispensatione salutis per Christum*. Neustadt: Harnisch, 1580.

Zwingli, Ulrich. *Ratio studiorum, sive De institutione eorum, qui studia literarum sequuntur, libellus aureus . . .* Johannes Wolphius, 1594.

Secondary Sources

Angelelli, Ignacio. “The Techniques of Disputation in the History of Logic.” In *The Journal of Philosophy* 67:20 (Oct. 1970): pp. 800-815.

Appold, Kenneth G. “Academic Life and Teaching in Post-Reformation.” In *Lutheran Ecclesiastical Culture, 1550-1675*, edited by Robert Kolb, pp. 65-116. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

Arabeyre, Patrick. “Un enseignement de science politique dans les facultés de droit canonique françaises de la fin du XV^e et au début du XVI^e siècle (Paris, Cahors, Toulouse).” In *Science politique et droit public dans les facultés de droit européenne (XIII^e-XVIII^e siècle)*, edited by J. Krynen and M. Stolleis, pp. 299-324. Frankfurt am Main: V. Klostermann, 2008.

Arabeyre, Patrick, Jean-Louis Halpérin, and Jacques Krynen, eds. *Dictionnaire historique des jurists français XII^e—XX^e siècle*. Paris: Quadrige/Puf, 2007.

Arbour, Roméo. *L'ère baroque en France: Répertoire chronologique des éditions de textes littéraires. Première partie, 1585-1615*, book 2. Geneva: Droz, 1977.

Ashworth, E. Jenny. “Changes in logic textbooks from 1500 to 1650: the new Aristotelianism.” In *Aristotelismus und Renaissance: In memoriam Charles B. Schmitt*, edited by E. Kessler, C. Lohr, and W. Sparn, pp. 75-87. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1988.

- . “Editor’s Introduction.” In *Logicae Artis Compendium* [by Robert Sanderson, 1618], pp. i-iv. Bologna: Clueb, 1985.
- . “Renaissance man as logician: Josse Clichtove (1472-1543) on disputations.” In *History of Philosophy and Logic* 7 (1986): pp. 15-29.
- . “Traditional Logic.” In *The Cambridge History of Renaissance Philosophy*, edited by C. B. Schmitt, Quentin Skinner, Eckhard Kessler, and Jill Kraye, pp. 143-71. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Asselt, Willem J. van. “‘Open Hand and Fist’: Humanism and Scholasticism.” In *Introduction to Reformed Scholasticism* edited by Willem J. van Asselt and translated by Albert Gootjes, pp. 73-85. Grand Rapids, MI: Reformation Heritage Books, 2010.
- , ed. *Introduction to Reformed Scholasticism*, trans. Albert Gootjes. Grand Rapids, MI: Reformation Heritage Books, 2011.
- . “Scholasticism Revisited: Methodological Reflections on the Study of Seventeenth-century Reformed Thought. *Seeing Things Their Way: Intellectual History and the Return of Religion*, eds Alister Chapman, John Coffey, and Brad S. Gregory, pp. 154-74. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2009.
- Asselt, Willem J. van, and Eef Dekker, eds. *Reformation and Scholasticism: An Ecumenical Enterprise*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2001.
- Backus, Irena D. “‘Aristotelianism’ in some of Calvin’s and Beza’s expository and exegetical writings on the doctrine of the Trinity, with particular reference to the terms οὐσία and ὑποστάσις.” In *Histoire de l’exégèse au XVIe siècle*, edited by Olivier Fatio, pp. 351-60. Geneva: Droz, 1978.
- . “Bullinger and Humanism.” In *Heinrich Bullinger – Life, Thought, Influence*, edited by Emidio Campi and Peter Opitz, vol. 2, pp. 639-60. Zurich: TVZ, 2007.
- . “L’enseignement à Genève au temps de l’Escalade.” In *Recueil de l’Escalade 1602-2012*, pp. 33-47. Genève: Compagnie de 1602, 2012.
- . “L’enseignement de la logique à l’Académie de Genève entre 1559 et 1565.” In *Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie* 3 (1979): pp. 153-63.
- . *Historical Method and Confessional Identity in The Era of The Reformation: 1378-1615*. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- . “Jacques Lefèvre d’Étaples: a Humanist or a Reformist View of Paul and His

- Theology?" In *Companion to Paul in the Reformation*, edited by R. Ward Holder, pp. 61-90. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- . "La Théorie logique de Martin Bucer." In *Logique et théologie au XVI^e siècle: aux sources de l'argumentation de Martin Bucer*, pp. 27-39. Geneva: Cahiers de la Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie, 1980.
- . "*Loci communes*, and the Role of Ramism in the European Diffusion of Calvin's Reformation." In *Giovanni Calvino e il calvinismo*, edited by Laura Ronchi De Michelis and Lothar Vogel, pp. 233-47. Rome: Carocci, 2010.
- . "The Teaching of Logic in two Protestant Academies at the End of the 16th Century: The Reception of Zabarella in Strasbourg and Geneva." In *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 80 (1989): pp. 240-51.
- Bagchi, David V. N. "Sic et Non: Luther and Scholasticism." In *Protestant Scholasticism*, edited by Carl R. Trueman and R. Scott Clark, pp. 3-15. Carlisle, Cumbria: Paternoster, 1999.
- Barker, Sara K. *Protestantism, Poetry and Protest: The Vernacular Writings of Antoine de Chandieu (c. 1534-1591)*. Farnham: Ashgate, 2009.
- . "Developing French Protestant Identity: the political and religious writings of Antoine de Chandieu (1534-1591)." Ph. D. dissertation, University of St. Andrews, 2006.
- Barnes, Jonathan. "Theophrastus and Hypothetical Syllogistic." In *Theophrastus of Eresus*, edited by William W. Fortenbaugh, Pamela M. Huby, and Anthony A. Long, pp. 125-41. Oxford: Transactions Publishers, 1985.
- Bauerschmidt, Frederick Christian. *Holy Teaching: Introducing the Summa Theologiae of St. Thomas Aquinas*. Grand Rapids: Brazos, 2005.
- Belt, Henk van den. *The Authority of Scripture in Reformed Theology: Truth and Trust*. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Benedict, Philip. *Christ's Churches Purely Reformed; A Social History of Calvinism*. New York: Yale University Press, 2002.
- . "Propaganda, Print, and Persuasion in the French Reformation: A Review Article." In *Bibliothèque d'humanisme et renaissance* 69, no. 2 (2007): pp. 447-72.
- . "What is Post-Confessional History?" In *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 97 (2006): pp. 277-83.

- Benedict, Philip, and Nicolas Fornerod. "Les 2150 églises' réformées de France de 1561-1562." In *Revue Historique* 651 (July 2009): pp. 551-6.
- Benedict, Philip, and Nicolas Fornerod, eds. *L'organisation et l'action des églises réformées de France (1557-1563): Synodes provinciaux et autre documents*. Geneva: Droz, 2012.
- Berkhof, Louis. *Systematic Theology: New Combined Edition*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996.
- Bianchi, Luca. "Continuity and change in the Aristotelian tradition." In *The Cambridge Companion to Renaissance Philosophy*, edited by James Hankins, pp. 49-71. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Blair, Ann, and Anthony Grafton, "Reassessing Humanism and Science." In *Journal of the History of Ideas* 53:4 (Oct.-Dec. 1992): pp. 535-40.
- Bobzien, Susanne. "The Development of *Modus Ponens* in Antiquity: From Aristotle to the 2nd Century AD." In *Phronesis* 47:4 (2002): pp. 359-94.
- Boehmer, Edward. *Spanish Reformers of Two Centuries from 1520*. Vol. 2. London: Trübner, 1883.
- Boehner, Philotheus. *Medieval Logic: An Outline of Its Development from 1250 to c. 1400*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1952.
- Boer, Erik de. "Calvin and Colleagues. Propositions and Disputations in the Context of the Congrégations in Geneva." In *Calvinus Praeceptor Ecclesiae*, ed. Herman Selderhuis, pp. 331-42. Geneva: Droz, 2004.
- , ed. *Congrégations et disputations*. Ioannis Calvini opera omnia. Geneva: Droz, forthcoming, 2013.
- . "Doing Theology in Geneva: Biblical and Systematic Theology in the *congregations* and *disputationes* before and besides the Academy." In *Calvinus clarissimus theologus*, edited by Herman J. Selderhuis, pp. 79-93. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2012.
- . "The 'Consensus Genevensis' Revisited: The Genesis of the Genevan Consensus on Divine Election in 1551." In *Acta Theologica Supplementum* 5 (2004): pp. 51-77.

- . *The Genevan School of the Prophets. The Congrégations of the Company of Pastors and Their Influence in the 16th century*. Geneva: Droz, 2012.
- . “The Presence and Participation of Laypeople in the Congrégations of the Company of Pastors in Geneva.” In *Sixteenth Century Journal* 35:3 (Fall 2004): pp. 651-70.
- Boh, Ivan. “Consequences.” In *The Cambridge History of Later Medieval Philosophy: From the Rediscovery of Aristotle to the Disintegration of Scholasticism 1100-1600*, pp. 300-314, edited by Norman Kretzmann, Anthony Kenny, and Jan Pinborg, pp. 300-314. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- Bredenhof, Wes. “Guy de Brès and The Apocrypha.” *Westminster Theological Journal* 74:2 (2012): pp. 305-21.
- Breen, Quirinius. *Christianity and Humanism*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1968.
- Broeyer, Fritz G. M. “Traces of the Rise of Reformed Scholasticism in the Polemical Theologian William Whitaker (1548-1595).” In *Reformation and Scholasticism*, eds Willem J. van Asselt and Eef Dekker, pp. 155-80. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2001.
- Burnett, Amy Nelson. “The Educational Roots of Reformed Scholasticism: Dialectic and Scriptural Exegesis in the Sixteenth Century.” In *Nederlands Archief voor Kerkgeschiedenis* 84 (2004): pp. 299-317.
- . *Teaching the Reformation: Ministers and Their Message in Basel, 1529-1629*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Campagnolo, Matteo. “Jacques Lect, juriste et magistrat, ‘théologien et évêque’.” In *Jacques Godefroy (1587-1652) et l’humanisme juridique à Genève*, edited by B. Schmidlin and A. Dufour, pp. 149-73. Helbing & Lichtenhahn: Basel, 1991.
- Cazenove, Raoul de. “Chandieu et ses seigneurs – Antoine de la Roche-Chandieu.” In *BSHPF* 39 (1890): pp. 271-6.
- Chalmers, Alexander. *A New General Biographical Dictionary*. Vol. 27. London: J. Nichols, 1816.
- Chapman, Alistair, John Coffey, and Brad S. Gregory, eds. *Seeing Things Their Way: Intellectual History and the Return of Religion*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2009.
- Chevalier, Alice. “La Famille Chandieu et la Réforme.” In *Divers Aspects de la Réforme*

aux XVI^e et XVII^e siècles, pp. 635-45. Paris: Société de l'histoire de la protestantisme français, 1975.

Clark, R. Scott. "The Authority of Reason in the Later Reformation: Scholasticism in Caspar Olevian and Antoine de la Faye." In *Protestant Scholasticism: Essays in Reassessment*, edited by Carl R. Trueman and R. S. Clark, pp. 111-26. Carlisle, Cumbria: Paternoster, 1999.

———. *Caspar Olevian and the Substance of the Covenant: The Double Benefit of Christ*. Grand Rapids, MI: Reformation Heritage Books, 2008.

Clifford, Alan C. *Atonement and Justification: English Evangelical Theology, 1640-1790: An Evaluation*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000.

Coffey, John, and Alistair Chapman. "Introduction: Intellectual History and the Return of Religion." In *Seeing Things Their Way: Intellectual History and the Return of Religion*, edited by Chapman, Coffey, and Gregory, pp. 1-23. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2009.

Colish, Marcia L. "The Stoic Hypothetical Syllogisms and Their Transmission in the Latin West through the Early Middle Ages." In *Res publica litterum* 2 (1979): pp. 19-26.

Copenhaver, Brian, and Charles B. Schmitt. *Renaissance Philosophy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Corbett, Edward P. J. "The Rhetoric of the Open Hand and the Rhetoric of the Closed Fist." In *College Composition and Communication* 20:5 (1969): pp. 288-96.

Cottret, Bernard. *Calvin: A Biography*. Translated by M. Wallace McDonald. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2000.

Crousaz, Karine. *L'Académie de Lausanne entre Humanisme et Réforme (ca. 1537-1560)*. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

Dauvois, Nathalie. "'Jura sanctissima fabulis et carminibus miscere.' La concorde de la poésie et du droit dans quelques traités d'Etienne Forcadel." In *L'Humanisme à Toulouse (1480-1596)*, edited by Nathalie Dauvois, pp. 91-106. Paris: Honoré Champion, 2006.

DeJong, Jack, ed. *Bound Yet Free: Readings in Church Polity*. Winnipeg: Premier, 1995.

Demonet, Marie-Luce, and Nancy Virtue. "'Si les signes vous fâchent . . .': Natural Inference and the Science of Signs in the Renaissance," translated by Nancy

- Virtue. *South Central Review* 10:2 (Summer, 1993): pp. 76-99.
- Denis, Philippe, and Jean Rott. *Jean Morély et l'utopie d'une démocratie dans l'Eglise*. Geneva: Droz, 1993.
- Di Mauro, Damon. "Antoine de Chandieu, auteur d'un drame biblique?" In *BSHPF* 151 (2005): pp. 219-29.
- . "Les *Octonnaires* . . . d'Antoine de Chandieu et les 'Trois concupiscences'," In *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance* 68:3 (2006): pp. 563-9.
- Donnelly, John Patrick. *Calvinism and Scholasticism in Vermigli's Doctrine of Man and Grace*. Leiden: Brill, 1976.
- . "Calvinistic Thomism." *Viator* 7 (1976): pp. 441-55.
- Doumergue, Emile. *Jean Calvin: Les hommes et les choses de son temps*. 7 vols. Lausanne: G. Bridel, 1899-1927.
- Droz, Eugénie. "Auteur de l'affaire Morély: La Roche Chandieu et Barth. Berton." In *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance* 22:3 (1960): pp. 570-77.
- Dupré, Louis. *The Enlightenment and the Intellectual Foundations of Modern Culture*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2004.
- Ebbesen, Sten. "Ancient Scholastic Logic as the Source of Medieval Scholastic Logic." In *The Cambridge History of Later Medieval Philosophy: From the Rediscovery of Aristotle to the Disintegration of Scholasticism 1100-1600*, edited by Norman Kretzmann, Anthony Kenny, and Jan Pinborg, pp. 101-27. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- Ehrstine, Glenn. *Theater, Culture, and Community in Reformation Berne, 1523-1555*. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Fatio, Olivier. "Chandieu, Antoine de." In *Dictionnaire Historique Suisse*. Accessed July 04, 2012. <http://www.hls-dhs-dss.ch/textes/f/F11077.php>.
- . "Hyperius Plagié par Flacius: La Destinée d'une Méthode Exégétique," In *Histoire de l'exégèse au XVIe siècle*, edited by Olivier Fatio and Pierre Fraenkel, pp. 362-81. Geneva: Droz, 1978.
- . *Méthode et Théologie: Lambert Daneau et les débuts de la scolastique réformée*. Droz: Geneva, 1976.

- Felipe, Donald. "Ways of disputing and *principia* in 17th century German disputation handbooks." In *Trends in Medieval Philology: Disputatio 1200-1800*, edited by I. Kasten, N. Largier, and M. Schnyder, pp. 33-61. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2010.
- Foote, William Henry. *The Huguenots*. Richmond: Presbyterian Committee of Education, 1870.
- Fortenbaugh, William W. *Theophrastean Studies*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 2003.
- Fortenbaugh, William W., Pamela M. Huby, and Anthony A. Long. *Theophrastus of Eresus*. Oxford: Transactions Publishers, 1985.
- Fraenkel, Pierre. *De L'écriture à la dispute: le cas de l'Académie de Genève sous Théodore de Bèze*. Lausanne: Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie, 1977.
- Frank, Gunter. "Philipp Melanchthon (1497-1560): Reformer and Philosopher." In *Philosophies of the Renaissance*, edited by Paul Richard Blum, translated by Brian McNeil, pp. 148-62. Washington, DC: Catholic University Press of America, 2010.
- Freedman, Joseph S. "Aristotle and the Content of Philosophy Instruction at Central European Schools and Universities during the Reformation Era (1500-1650)." In *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 137:2 (1993): pp. 213-53.
- . "The Career and Writings of Bartholomew Keckermann." In *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 141 (1997): pp. 505-64.
- . "Disputations in Europe in the early modern period." In *Hora Est! On Dissertations*, translated by Aad Janssen and Marleen Hofstede, edited by Jos Damen and Anton van der Lem, pp. 30-50. Leiden: Universiteitsbibliotheek Leiden, 2005.
- . *Philosophy and the Arts in Central Europe, 1500-1700: Teaching and Texts at Schools and Universities*. Farnham: Ashgate, 1999.
- . "Published academic disputations in the context of other information formats utilized primarily in Central Europe (c. 1550-c.1700)." In *Trends in Medieval Philology: Disputatio 1200-1800*, edited by I. Kasten, N. Largier, and M. Schnyder, pp. 63-128. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2010.
- Fuller, Thomas. "Chandieu, Antoine de." In *Abel Redevivus*, vol. 2, pp. 105-109. London: William Tegg, 1867.

- Gabriel, Astrik L. "The Ideal Master of the Mediaeval University." In *The Catholic Historical Review* 60:1 (1974): pp. 1-37.
- Gálik, Dušan. "Induction in Aristotle's System of Scientific Knowledge." In *Organon* 13:4 (2006): pp. 495-505.
- Gerhard, Dietrich. "Periodization in European History." In *The American Historical Review* 61:4 (July 1956): pp. 900-913.
- Gieseler, John C. L. *A Text-book of Church History*. Translated by Henry B. Smith. Vol. 4. New York: Harper, 1862.
- Gilmont, Jean François. *Bibliographie des éditions de Jean Crespin, 1550-1571*. Geneva: Droz, 1981.
- . *John Calvin and the Printed Book*, translated by Karin Maag. Kirksville, MO: Truman State University Press, 2005.
- . *Le livre réformé au XVIe siècle*. [Paris]: Bibliothèque nationale de France, 2005.
- . *The Reformation and The Book*. Translated by Karin Maag. Farnham: Ashgate, 1998.
- Gilmont, Jean-François, and William Kemp, eds. *Le livre évangélique en français avant Calvin*. Turnhout: Brepols, 2004.
- Goris, Harm. "Thomism in Zanchi's Doctrine of God." In *Reformation and Scholasticism: An Ecumenical Enterprise*, edited by Willem J. van Asselt and Eef Dekker, pp. 121-39. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2001.
- Grafton, Anthony. *Worlds Made by Words: Scholarship and Community in the Modern West*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2009.
- Grafton, Anthony, and Suzanne Marchand. "Proof and Persuasion in History: A Preface." In *History and Theory* 33:4 (Dec 1994): pp. 3-4.
- Grene, Marjorie. "Is Genus to Species as Matter to Form? Aristotle and Taxonomy." In *Synthese* 28 (1974): pp. 51-69.
- Gregory, Brad S. "Can We 'See Things Their Way'? Should We Try?" In *Seeing Things Their Way: Intellectual History and the Return of Religion*, edited by Chapman, Coffey, and Gregory, pp. 24-45. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2009.

- Grendler, Paul F. "The Universities of the Renaissance and Reformation." In *Renaissance Quarterly* 57 (2004): pp. 1-42.
- Haag, Eugène, and Émile Haag. *La France Protestante*. Paris: J. Cherbuliez, 1856.
- . *La France Protestante*. 2nd ed. Vol. 3. Paris: Fischbacher, 1883.
- Halvorson, Michael J. *Heinrich Heshusius and Confessional Polemic in Early Lutheran Orthodoxy*. Farnham: Ashgate, 2010.
- Hankins, James. "Humanism, Scholasticism, and Renaissance Philosophy." In *The Cambridge Companion to Renaissance Philosophy*, edited by James Hankins, pp. 30-48. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Hendrix, Scott. "Post-Confessional Research and Confessional Commitment." In *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 97 (2006): pp. 284-8.
- Hester, Ralph M. *A Protestant Baroque Poet: Pierre Poupo*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1970.
- Heubli, William. *L'Academie de Lausanne à la fin du XVI^{me} siècle*. Lausanne: Rouge, 1916.
- Higman, Francis M. "1350-1750? The Perspective of Intellectual History." In *Journal of Early Modern History* 1:2 (1997): pp. 95-106.
- . "L'Harmonia confessionum fidei de 1581." In *Actes du VIII^e Colloque Jean Boisset: Catéchismes et Confessions de foi*, edited by Marie-Madeleine Fragonard and Michel Peronnet, pp. 243-62. Montpellier: Université Paul Valéry, 1995.
- . *Piety and the People: Religious Printing in French, 1511–1551*. Aldershot: Scholar Press, 1996.
- Hobbins, Daniel. "Gerson on Lay Devotion." In *A Companion to Jean Gerson*, edited by B. P. McGuire, pp. 41-78. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- . "The Schoolman as Public Intellectual: Jean Gerson and the Late Medieval Tract." In *The American Historical Review* 108:5 (Dec 2003): pp. 1308-37.
- Holt, Mack. "Historical Writing in English on the French Reformation: The Last Thirty Years." In *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 100 (2009): pp. 256-70.
- Hotson, Howard. *Commonplace Learning: Ramism and its German Ramifications 1543-1630*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

- Jacquette, Dale. "Burleigh's Paradox." In *Philosophy* 82 (2007): pp. 437-448.
- James, Frank A. III. "Peter Marytr Vermigli: At the Crossroads of Late Medieval Scholasticism, Christian Humanism and Resurgent Augustinianism." In *Protestant Scholasticism: Essays in Reassessment*, edited by Carl R. Trueman and R. S. Clark, pp. 62-78. Carlisle, Cumbria: Paternoster, 1999.
- Jardine, Lisa. "Humanism and the Teaching of Logic." In *The Cambridge History of Later Medieval Philosophy: From the Rediscovery of Aristotle to the Disintegration of Scholasticism 1100-1600*, edited by Norman Kretzmann, Anthony Kenny, and Jan Pinborg, pp. 797-807. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- Jimre & co. "Chandieu." In *Rhone-Medieval.fr*, accessed July 04, 2012, <http://rhone.medieval.free.fr/index.php?page=accueil&dept=69&chateau=22>.
- Johnstone, Brian V. "The Debate on the Structure of the *Summa Theologiae* of St. Thomas Aquinas: From Chenu (1939) to Metz (1998)." In *Aquinas as Authority*, edited by Paul Van Geest, Harm Goris, Carlo Leget, pp. 187-200. Leuven: Peeters, 2002.
- Kelley, Donald R. "What Is Happening to the History of Ideas?" In *Journal of the History of Ideas* 51:1 (Jan. – Mar. 1990): pp. 3-25.
- Kendall, R.T. *Calvin and English Calvinism to 1649*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980.
- Kenny, Anthony, and Jan Pinborg. "Medieval philosophical literature." In *The Cambridge History of Later Medieval Philosophy: From the Rediscovery of Aristotle to the Disintegration of Scholasticism 1100-1600*, edited by Norman Kretzmann, Anthony Kenny, and Jan Pinborg, pp.11-42. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- Kieffer, J. S. *Galen's Instituto Logica*. Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins, 1964.
- Kiener, Marc. *Dictionnaire des professeurs de l'Académie de Lausanne (1537-1890)*. Lausanne: University of Lausanne, 2005.
- Kingdon, Robert M. *Geneva and the Coming of the Wars of Religion 1555-1563*. 2nd ed. Geneva: Droz, 2007.
- . *Geneva and the Consolidation of the French Protestant Movement 1564—1572*. Geneva: Droz, 1967.

- Kneale, Martha. *The Development of Logic*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984.
- Kreeft, Peter. *Summa Philosophica*. South Bend: St. Augustine's Press, 2012.
- Kristeller, Paul Oskar. "Humanism." In *The Cambridge History of Renaissance Philosophy*, edited by Charles B. Schmitt and Quentin Skinner, pp. 113-137. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Kusukawa, Sachiko. "Lutheran uses of Aristotle: A comparison between Jacob Schegk and Philip Melanchthon." In *Philosophy in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries*, edited by Constance Blackwell and Sachiko Kusukawa, pp. 169-88. Aldershot: Ashgate, 1999.
- . "Petrus Ramus." In *Philosophies of the Renaissance*, edited by Paul Richard Blum, pp. 163-7. Washington, DC: Catholic University Press, 2010.
- . "Uses of Philosophy in Reformation Thought: Melanchthon, Schegk, and Crellius." In *The Medieval Heritage in Early Modern Metaphysics and Modal Theory, 1400-1700*, edited by Russell L. Friedman and Lauge O. Nielsen, pp. 143-63. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 2003.
- . "Vinculum Concordiae: Lutheran Method by Philip Melanchthon." In *Method and Order in Renaissance Philosophy of Nature*, edited by Daniel A. Di Liscia, Eckhard Kessler, and Charlotte Methuen, pp. 337-54. Aldershot: Ashgate, 1997.
- Lane, Anthony N. S. *John Calvin, Student of the Church Fathers*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1999.
- Lawn, Brian. *The Rise & Decline of the Scholastic 'Quaestio Disputata' with Special Emphasis on Its Use in the Teaching of Medicine and Science*. Leiden: Brill, 1993.
- Leclerc, Marc. "La confirmation performative des premiers principes." In *Revue Philosophique de Louvain* 96:1 (1998): pp. 69-85.
- Leijssen, Lambert. "Martin Bucer und Thomas von Aquin." In *Ephemerides theologicae Lovanienses* 555:4 (1979): pp. 266-96.
- Leinsle, Ulrich G. *Introduction to Scholastic Theology*. Translated Michael J. Miller. Washington, DC: Catholic University Press, 2010.
- Linder, Robert D. "The French Calvinist Response to the Formula of Concord." In *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 19:1 (Winter 1992): pp. 18-37.

- Lohr, Charles H. "The Medieval Interpretation of Aristotle." In *The Cambridge History of Later Medieval Philosophy: From the Rediscovery of Aristotle to the Disintegration of Scholasticism 1100-1600*, edited by Norman Kretzmann, Anthony Kenny, and Jan Pinborg, pp. 80-98. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- . "Renaissance Latin Aristotle Commentaries." In *Studies in the Renaissance* 21 (1974): pp. 228-89; In *Renaissance Quarterly*, 28:4 (Winter 1975): pp. 689-741; 29:4 (Winter 1976): pp. 714-45; 30:4 (Winter 1977): pp. 681-741; 31:4 (Winter 1978): pp. 532-603; 32:4 (Winter 1979): pp. 529-80; 33:4 (Winter 1980): pp. 623-734; 35:2 (Summer 1982): pp. 164-256.
- . "Latin Aristotle Commentaries: Supplementary Renaissance Authors." In *Freiburger Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Theologie* 40:1-2 (1993): pp. 161-8.
- Mack, Peter. *A History of Renaissance Rhetoric 1380-1620*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- . *Renaissance Argument: Valla and Agricola in the Traditions of Rhetoric and Dialectic*. Leiden: Brill, 1993.
- Maclean, Ian. "Philippist hermeneutics after the Formula of Concord: the case of George Sohn (1551-1589)." In *Hermeneutik, Methodenlehre Exegese*, edited by Günter Frank and Stephan Meier-Oeser, pp. 147-71. Stuttgart-Bad: frommmam-holzbooog, 2011.
- Makdisi, George. "The Scholastic Method in Medieval Education: An Inquiry into Its Origins in Law and Theology." *Speculum* 49:4 (1974): pp. 640-61.
- Manetsch, Scott M. Review of *Protestantism, Poetry and Protest: The Vernacular Writings of Antoine de Chandieu (c. 1534-1591)*, by Sara Barker. In *Renaissance Quarterly* 63:1 (2010): pp. 212-13.
- . *Theodore Beza and the Quest for Peace in France, 1572-1598*. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- Marenbon, John. "Boethius: from antiquity to the Middle Ages." In *Medieval Philosophy*, edited by John Marenbon, vol. 3 of *Routledge History of Philosophy*, pp. 11-28. New York: Routledge, 1998.
- Martin, Christopher J. "Denying Conditionals: Abelard and the Failure of Boethius' Account of the Hypothetical Syllogism." In *Viviarum* 45:2-3 (2007): pp. 153-68.

- Mège, Alexander Louis Charles André du. *Histoire des Institutions Religieuses, Politiques, Judiciaires et Littéraires de la Ville de Toulouse*. 5 vols. Toulouse: Laurent Chapelle, 1844-1846.
- Mercer, Christia. "Leibniz, Aristotle, and Ethical Knowledge." In *The Impact of Aristotelianism on Modern Philosophy*, edited by Ricardo Pozzo, pp. 113-47. Washington DC: Catholic University Press of America, 2004.
- Methuen, Charlotte. "The teaching of Aristotle in late sixteenth-century Tübingen." In *Philosophy in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries*, edited by Constance Blackwell and Sachiko Kusukawa, pp. 189-205. Aldershot: Ashgate, 1999.
- Meylan, Henri. *La Haute École de Lausanne 1537-1937*. Lausanne: Rouge, 1937.
- Meylan, Henri. "Claude Aubery: L'Affaire des 'Orationes'." Université de Lausanne. Faculté de théologie. *Recueil des travaux publiés à l'occasion du quatrième centenaire de la fondation de l'Université, juin 1937*. Lausanne: Le Concorde, 1937. Tirage à part, pp. 9-88.
- Monfasani, John. *George of Trebizond: A Biography and a Study of His Rhetoric and Logic*. Leiden: Brill, 1976.
- Monter, E. William. *Judging the French Reformation: Heresy Trials by Sixteenth-Century Parlements*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999.
- Morau, Paul. "La Joute dialectique d'après le huitième livre des Topiques." In *Aristotle on Dialectic: The Topics*, edited by G. E. L. Owen, pp. 287-306. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968.
- Muller, Richard A. *After Calvin: Studies in the Development of a Theological Tradition*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- . "Calvin and the 'Calvinists': Assessing Continuities and Discontinuities between the Reformation and Orthodoxy." *Calvin Theological Journal* 30 (1995): pp. 345-75 and 31 (1996): pp. 125-60.
- . "Giving Direction to Theology: The Scholastic Dimension." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 28:2 (1985): pp. 183-93.
- . *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics*. 4 vols. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2003.
- . "The Problem of Protestant Scholasticism – A Review and Definition." In *Reformation and Scholasticism*, edited by Willem J. van Asselt and Eef Dekker, pp. 45-64. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2001.

- . “Reflections on Persistent Whiggism and Its Antidotes to the Study of Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century Intellectual History.” In *Seeing Things Their Way: Intellectual History and the Return of Religion*, edited by Chapman, Coffey, and Gregory, pp. 134-53. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2009.
- . “Reformation, Orthodoxy, ‘Christian Aristotelianism,’ and the Eclecticism of Early Modern Philosophy.” In *Nederlands Archief voor Kerkgeschiedenis*, 81:3 (2001): pp. 306-25.
- . *Scholasticism and Orthodoxy in the Reformed Tradition: An Attempt at Definition*. Grand Rapids, MI: Calvin Theological Seminary, 1995.
- . “Scholasticism Protestant and Catholic: Frances Turretin on the Object and Principles of Theology.” In *Church History* 55:2 (1986): pp. 193-205.
- . “Scholasticism, Reformation, Orthodoxy, and the Persistence of Christian Aristotelianism.” In *Trinity Journal* 19:1 (Spring 1998): pp. 81-96.
- . *The Unaccommodated Calvin: Studies in the Foundation of a Theological Tradition*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- . “*Vera philosophia cum sacra theologia nusquam pugnat*: Keckermann on philosophy, theology, and the problem of double truth.” In *Sixteenth Century Journal* 15:3 (1984): pp. 341-65.
- Murray, Robert Malcolm, and Nebojsa Kujundzic. *Critical Reflection: A Textbook for Critical Thinking*. Montreal: McGill-Queen’s Press, 2004.
- Nauert, Charles G. “The Clash of Humanists and Scholastics: An Approach to Pre-Reformation Controversies.” In *Sixteenth Century Journal* 4:1 (1973): pp. 1-18.
- . “Humanism as Method: Roots of Conflict with the Scholastics.” In *Sixteenth Century Journal* 29:2 (1998): pp. 427-38.
- Neuser, Wilhelm. “Dogma und Bekenntnis in der Reformation: Von Zwingli und Calvin bis zur Synode von Westminster.” In *Handbuch der Dogmen- und Theologiegeschichte*, edited by Carl Andresen, vol. 2, pp. 167-352. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980.
- Novikoff, Alex J. *The Medieval Culture of Disputation: Pedagogy, Practice, and Performance*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, forthcoming in 2013.

- . “Toward a Cultural History of Scholastic Disputation.” In *The American Historical Review* 117:2 (2012): pp. 331-64.
- Nugent, Donald. *Ecumenism in the age of the Reformation: the Colloquy of Poissy*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1974.
- Ong, Walter J. *Ramus and Talon inventory; a short-title inventory of the published works of Peter Ramus (1515-1572) and of Omer Talon (ca. 1510-1562) in their original and in their variously altered forms*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1958.
- . *Ramus, Method, and the Decay of Dialogue*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, repr. 2004.
- Overfield, James H. *Humanism and Scholasticism in Late Medieval Germany*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985.
- . “Scholastic Opposition to Humanism in Pre-Reformation Germany.” *Viator* 7 (1976): pp. 391-420.
- Pabel, Hilmar M. Review of *Biblical Humanism and Scholasticism in The Age of Erasmus*, edited by Erika Rummel. *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 61 (2010): pp. 183-5.
- Pannier, Jacques. *Les origines de la Confession de Foi et la Discipline des Églises Réformées de France*. Paris: Alcan, 1936.
- Pendergrass, Jan. “Jean de Pins et l’humanisme en region toulousaine.” In *L’Humanisme à Toulouse (1480-1596)*, edited by Nathalie Dauvois, pp. 187-201. Paris: Honoré Champion, 2006.
- Penella, Robert J. “The *Progymnasmata* in Imperial Greek Education.” In *Classical World* 105.1 (2011): pp. 77-90.
- Perreiah, Alan. “Humanist Critiques of Scholastic Dialectic.” In *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 13:3 (1982): pp. 3-22.
- Petris, Loris. “Foi, éthique et politique dans *Les Quatrains* de Pibrac.” In *L’Humanisme à Toulouse (1480-1596)*, edited by Nathalie Dauvois, pp. 509-33. Paris: Honoré Champion, 2006.
- Pettegree, Andrew. *Reformation and the Culture of Persuasion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

- . *The French Book and the European Book World*. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Pettegree, Andrew, Malcolm Walsby, and Alexander Wilkinson, eds. *French Vernacular Books: Books Published in the French Language Before 1601*. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Pleizier, T. Theo J., and Maarten Wisse. “‘As the Philosopher Says’: Aristotle.” In *Introduction to Reformed Scholasticism*, edited by Willem J. van Asselt, translated by Albert Gootjes, pp. 26-43. Grand Rapids, MI: Reformation Heritage Books, 2010.
- Puyroche, A. de. “Le Chateau de Chandieu et les Protestants de Lyon a la fin du XVI^e siècle.” In *BSHPF* 39 (1890): pp. 276-83.
- Ramminger, J. “Iesuitaster.” In *Neulateinische Wortliste. Ein Wörterbuch des Lateinischen von Petrarca bis 1700*, accessed August 09, 2012, www.neulatein.de/words/0/007536.htm.
- Rehnman, Sebastian. *Divine Discourse: The Theological Methodology of John Owen*. Grand Rapids, MI: BakerAcademic, 2002.
- Richter, Mario. *La poesia lirica in Francia nel secolo XVI*. Milan: Instituto Editoriale Cisalpino, 1983.
- Risse, Wilhelm. *Die Logik der Neuzeit*. Vol. 1. Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Frommann, 1964.
- Robbins, Kevin C. *City on the Ocean Sea: La Rochelle, 1530-1650*. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Roper, Lyndal. “Allegiance and Reformation History.” In *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 97 (2006): pp. 289-97.
- Ross, Kelly L. “Gottfried Wilhelm Leibnitz (1646-1716).” In *The Proceedings of the Frisian School, Fourth Series*. Accessed July 04, 2012, <http://www.friesian.com/leibniz.htm>.
- Racaut, Luc “Religious Polemic and Huguenot Self-Perception and Identity, 1554-1619.” *Society and Culture in the Huguenot World, 1559-1685*, edited by Raymond A. Mentzer and Andrew Spicer. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Rose, Hugh James. *A New General Biographical Dictionary*. Vol. 11. London: B. Fellowes, 1850.
- Rüegg, Walter, and Hilde de Ridder-Symoens, eds. *Universities in Early Modern Europe*

- (1500-1800). Vol 2 of *A History of the University in Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Rummel, Erika. "Et cum theologo bella poeta gerit: The Conflict between Humanists and Scholastics Revisited." In *Sixteenth Century Journal* 23:4 (1992): pp. 713–26.
- Schaff, Philip. *The Creeds of Christendom*. 3 vols. Grand Rapids: Baker, repr. 1993.
- Schmitt, Charles B. "Aristotle as a Cuttlefish: the Origin and Development of a Renaissance Image." In *The Aristotelian Tradition and Renaissance Universities*, pp. 60-72. London: Variorum, 1984.
- . *John Case and Aristotelianism in Renaissance England*. Montreal: McGill-Queens University Press, 1983.
- . "Towards a Reassessment of Renaissance Aristotelianism." In *History of Science* 2 (1973): pp. 159-93.
- Schneider, Robert Alan. *Public Life in Toulouse, 1463-1789: From Municipal Republic to Cosmopolitan City*. New York: Cornell University Press, 1989.
- Scott, John C. "The Mission of the University: Medieval to Postmodern Transformations." In *The Journal of Higher Education* 77:1 (Jan-Feb 2006): pp. 1-39.
- Selderhuis, Herman. *John Calvin: A Pilgrim's Life*. Translated by Albert Gootjes. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2009.
- Senebier, Jean. *Histoire littéraire de Geneve*. Geneva: Barde, Manget & Company, 1806.
- Serene, Eileen. "Demonstrative Science." In *The Cambridge History of Later Medieval Philosophy: From the Rediscovery of Aristotle to the Disintegration of Scholasticism 1100-1600*, edited by Norman Kretzmann, Anthony Kenny, and Jan Pinborg, pp. 496-514. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- Shagan, Ethan H. "Can Historians End the Reformation?" *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 97 (2006): pp. 298-306.
- Sinnema, Donald. "Antoine de Chandieu's Call for a Scholastic Reformed Theology (1580)." In *Later Calvinism: International Perspectives*, ed. W. Fred Graham, pp. 159-90. Kirksville, MO: Sixteenth Century, 1994.
- . "The Distinction Between Scholastic and Popular: Andreas Hyperius and Reformed Scholasticism." In *Protestant Scholasticism*, edited by Trueman and

- Clark, pp. 127-43. Carlisle, Cumbria: Paternoster, 1999.
- . “Aristotle and Early Reformed Orthodoxy.” In *Christianity and the Classics: The Acceptance of a Heritage*, edited by Wendy Helleman. New York: University Press of America, 1990, pp. 119-48.
- Skalnik, James Veazie. *Ramus and Reform: University and Church at the End of the Renaissance*. Kirksville, MO: Truman State University Press, 2002.
- Skinner, Quentin. “Meaning and Understanding in the History of Ideas.” *History and Theory* 8:1 (1969): pp. 3-53.
- Smith, Malcolm. “Early French Advocates of Religious Freedom.” In *Sixteenth Century Journal* 25 (1994): pp. 29-51.
- . “Looking for Rome in Rome: Janus Vitalis and his Disciples.” In *Revue de Littérature Comparée* 51 (1977): pp. 510-27.
- Smith, Robin. “Aristotle’s Logic.” In *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Spring 2012 Edition), edited by Edward N. Zalta, accessed July 04, 2012, <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/aristotle-logic/#DiaArgArtDia>.
- Soulié, Margaret. “Le théâtre et la Bible au XVI^e siècle.” In *Le temps des Réformes et la Bible*, edited by Guy Bedouelle and Bernard Roussel, pp. 635-58. Paris: Beauchesne, 1989.
- Specia, Anthony J. *Hypothetical Syllogistic and Stoic Logic*. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- Spijker, Willem van’t. *Democratisering van de kerk anno 1562: Het Conflict-Morély in de begintijd van de Gereformeerde Kerk in Frankrijk*. Kampen: Kok, [1974].
- . *Principe, methode en functie van de theologie bij Andreas Hyperius*. Kampen: Kok, 1990.
- . “Reformation and Scholasticism.” In *Reformation and Scholasticism*, edited by Willem J. van Asselt and Eef Dekker, pp. 79-98. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2001.
- . *The Ecclesiastical Offices in the Thought of Martin Bucer*, translated by John Vriend and Lyle D. Bierma. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- Stump, Eleonore. “Obligations: From the beginning to the early fourteenth century.” In *The Cambridge History of Later Medieval Philosophy: From the Rediscovery of Aristotle to the Disintegration of Scholasticism 1100-1600*, edited by Norman Kretzmann, Anthony Kenny, and Jan Pinborg, pp. 315-34. Cambridge:

- Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- . “Topics: Their development and absorption into consequences.” In *The Cambridge History of Later Medieval Philosophy: From the Rediscovery of Aristotle to the Disintegration of Scholasticism 1100-1600*, edited by Norman Kretzmann, Anthony Kenny, and Jan Pinborg, pp. 273-99. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- Sunshine, Glenn S. *Reforming French Protestantism: The Development of Huguenot Ecclesiastical Institutions, 1557-1572*. Kirksville, MO: Truman State, 2003.
- Sytsma, David S. “Herman Bavinck’s Thomistic Epistemology: The Argument and Sources of His *Principia* of Science.” In *Five Studies in the Thought of Herman Bavinck, a Creator of Modern Dutch Theology*, edited by John Bolt, pp. 1-56. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen, 2011.
- Tinsley, Barbara Sher. “Johann Sturm’s Method for Humanistic Pedagogy.” *Sixteenth Century Journal* 20:1 (1989): pp. 23-40.
- Trinkaus, Charles E. *In Our Image and Likeness: Humanity and Divinity in Italian Humanist Thought*. Vol. 1. University of Chicago Press, 1970.
- Trueman, Carl R. *Histories and Fallacies: Problems Faced in the Writing of History*. Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2010.
- Trueman, Carl R., and R. Scott Clark, eds. *Protestant Scholasticism: Essays in Reassessment*. Carlisle, Cumbria: Paternoster Press, 1999.
- Van Raalte, Theodore G. Review of *Protestantism, Poetry and Protest: The Vernacular Writings of Antoine de Chandieu (c. 1534-1591)*, by Sara Barker. *Calvin Theological Journal* 46:1 (2011): pp. 182-4.
- . “‘Noster Theophilus’: The Fictitious ‘Printer’ Whose Anti-Jesuit Volumes Issued from Various Presses in Geneva between 1580 and 1589.” In *Bibliothèque d’Humanisme et Renaissance* 74:3 (2012): pp. 569-91.
- Velde, Dolf te. *Paths Beyond Tracing Out*. Delft: Eburon, 2010.
- Vos, Antonie. “Scholasticism and Reformation.” In *Reformation and Scholasticism: An Academic Enterprise*, edited by Willem J. van Asselt and Eef Dekker, pp. 99-120. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2001.
- Webb, William. *Slaves, Women & Homosexuals: Exploring the Hermeneutics of Cultural Analysis*. Downers Grove: Intervarsity, 2001.

- Weijers, Olga. "De la joute dialectique à la dispute scolastique." In *Comptes-rendus des séances de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* 143:2 (1999): pp. 513-17.
- . "The medieval *disputatio*." In *Hora Est! On Dissertations*, translated by Aad Janssen and Marleen Hofstede, edited by Jos Damen and Anton van der Lem, pp. 23-9. Leiden: Universiteitsbibliotheek Leiden, 2005.
- . "The various kinds of disputation in the faculties of arts, theology, and law (c. 1200-1400)." In *Disputatio 1200-1800: Form, Funktion und Wirkung eines Leitmediums universitärer Wissenskultur*, edited by Marion Gindhard and Ursula Kundert, pp. 17-31. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2010.
- Winks, Robin W., and Lee Palmer Wandel. *Europe in a Wider World 1250-1550*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Wisse, Maarten, Marcel Sarot, and Willemien Otten, eds. *Scholasticism Reformed: Essays in Honour of Willem J. van Asselt*. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Zuidema, Jason. "Piety in Print: Mapping the Contours of the Spirituality of Jean de l'Espine." In *Calvin Theological Journal* 47:1 (April 2012): pp. 138-44.
- Zuidema, Jason, and Theodore Van Raalte. *Early French Reform: The Theology and Spirituality of Guillaume Farel*. Farnham: Ashgate, 2011.