

Bartholomaeus Holzhauser

Epistola Fundamentalis

A Critical Edition with Introduction, Textual Notes,
English Translation and Commentary by Michael Dormandy

ROMBACH WISSENSCHAFTEN • REIHE PARADEIGMATA

herausgegeben von Bernhard Zimmermann
in Zusammenarbeit mit Karlheinz Stierle und Bernd Seidensticker

Band 32

TIROLENSIA LATINA

herausgegeben von Martin Korenjak (Universität Innsbruck)

Band 10

Bartholomaeus Holzhauser

Epistola Fundamentalis

A Critical Edition with Introduction, Textual Notes,
English Translation and Commentary by Michael Dormandy

Tirolensia Latina 10

Gedruckt mit freundlicher Unterstützung
des Ludwig Boltzmann Instituts für Neulateinische Studien
des Vizerektorats für Forschung der Leopold-Franzens-Universität Innsbruck
und des Landes Tirol, Abteilung Kultur



Ludwig Boltzmann Institut
Neulateinische Studien



Gefördert von



Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Bibliothek
Die Deutsche Bibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen
Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet
über <<http://dnb.d-nb.de>> abrufbar.

© 2016. Rombach Verlag KG, Freiburg i.Br./Berlin/Wien
1. Auflage. Alle Rechte vorbehalten
Umschlag: Bärbel Engler, Rombach Verlag KG, Freiburg i.Br./Berlin/Wien
Satz: Rombach Druck- und Verlagshaus GmbH & Co. KG, Freiburg im Breisgau
Herstellung: Rombach Druck- und Verlagshaus GmbH & Co. KG, Freiburg im Breisgau
Printed in Germany
ISBN 978-3-7930-9842-3

Table of Contents

Preface	7
Introduction	9
Biographical Sketch and Historical Background	9
The Text and the Editions	12
Notes on the Text	15
Introduction to the English Translation	17
Overview	17
Style of Writing	22
Holzhauser's <i>Epistola</i> and Other Paraenetic Literature	24
Holzhauser's <i>Epistola</i> and his British Protestant Contemporaries ...	27
Latin Text	32
Primum Fundamentum	34
Secundum Fundamentum	38
Tertium Fundamentum	42
Quartum Fundamentum	46
Sectio Finalis	50
English Translation	33
The First Foundation	35
The Second Foundation	39
The Third Foundation	43
The Fourth Foundation	47
Conclusion	49
Final Section	51
Commentary	57
Bibliography	87
Historical Sources	87
Secondary Literature	87

Preface

Bartholomaeus Holzhauser's *Epistola Fundamentalis* is an interesting example of Counter-Reformation paraenetic literature, in a Christian tradition that stretches back ultimately to Ignatius of Antioch and the Apostle Paul.¹ This work aims to explore and make available this neglected text. It is my hope that this edition will be timely, because Holzhauser's *Epistola* can still speak interestingly to the academy and relevantly to the church. The text is evidence of the vitality of Counter-Reformation Catholic piety and of the extent to which it was sometimes sadly resisted by the established Church. It is also a significant example of Latin being used as a language, not merely of communication, but of passionate spiritual exhortation, well into the early modern period. For much of his life, including when this letter was written, Holzhauser was Pfarrer of St. Johann in Tirol, making this text significant in Tyrolean culture and history. Finally, it is a typical expression of Christian paraenetic letter writing, a genre which has found many expressions from the time of the Apostle Paul to the present day. With his stress on freedom from fear of human opinion and confidence in God's ultimate victory, Holzhauser speaks powerfully to Christians and others today.

I thank the Ludwig Boltzmann Institute for Neo-Latin Studies, Innsbruck, for funding and hosting the project and to all its staff for making it such a pleasant and convivial place to work. In particular, I would like to thank Dr. Stefan Tilg, Prof. Martin Korenjak and Prof. Lav Šubarić for their helpful input and expertise (including graciously correcting me in my own native language!). My thanks also to the Rev. Steve Smith and the congregation of the Church of the Ascension, Munich, where I spent several happy and rewarding weeks on placement, whilst finishing this project. To pursue scholarship whilst remaining active in a local church was a privilege. I thank Monika Datterl for informing me of the LBI (among many other helpful pieces of information on Innsbruck life!) and Ranti Williams for introducing me to Samuel Rutherford (among many other sagacious book recommendations!). Peter Sanlon has provided lots of encouragement to use my Latin education to work on early modern Christian literature and gave valuable support in applying for the LBI fellowship. I am also thankful to the staff of

¹ It is highly unlikely that Holzhauser would have questioned the authorship of any of the documents in the New Testament traditionally attributed to Paul, so I shall refer to those documents as »Paul's letters« throughout this work.

the Collection jésuite des Fontaines and the Bibliothèque municipale, Lyon, the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Munich, and the Biblioteca della Soprintendenza per i beni librari e archivistici, Trento, for their prompt and helpful answers to all my questions. My warm and tender thanks go to my wife Katherine for all her patience, love and enthusiasm throughout this project. Her thoughtful advice, gentle encouragement and faithful friendship lie behind everything I do.

This work is dedicated with profound love and gratitude to the memory of my Father, Thomas Dormandy, a scholar of the highest rigour and noblest character, who provided everything to help me follow in his footsteps.

Soli Deo Gloria.

*Michael Dormandy
Keble College, Oxford, January 2016*

Introduction

Biographical Sketch and Historical Background

The only modern biography of Holzhauser is that of Michael Arneth.¹ Whilst Arneth gives a thorough and comprehensive treatment, he is of a similar religious outlook to his subject and is reluctant to criticise him. This must be born in mind in attempting to reconstruct Holzhauser's life, as I do below, based on Arneth's work.

Holzhauser was born in Laugna, South Germany, on 24 August 1613, to Leonhard Holzhauser, a shoemaker, and his wife, Katharina. We can reasonably assume he owes his name to being born on St Bartholomew's Day. The family's life was marked by poverty, but also spiritual devotion, as evidenced by their donating a picture to their local church. The church in Holzhauser's time, by contrast, was characterised by immorality: 20 members of the local chapter are supposed to have lived with concubines! It was apparently said of the typical priest:

Er spielt und trinkt gern, flucht und schwört wie ein Soldat, geht viel zu Spiel und Tanz, ist bei allen Taufen und Hochzeiten roh und ausgelassen

He plays and drinks freely and curses and swears like a soldier, he goes often to games and dances and is rough and wild at every baptism and wedding²

Despite this, young Bartholomaeus came under the care of two godly local priests, Johann Kleinle and Caspar Gall. He attended the village church school and then a school in Wertingen, Bavaria, where he learnt music, arithmetic and the Latin with which he wrote the present work. It was apparently only with reluctance that his father was able to distract him from his studies to help in the family workshop. At age 13, he was sent to a school for the poor in Augsburg. However, his studies were interrupted when, in 1627, the plague broke out in the town. The boy Holzhauser was afflicted and near death, but managed to carry himself to the Holy Cross Church, where the host was said to have miracle working powers. As he knelt there, he was laid low by a sudden sensation of being struck and, as he lay on the floor, began to recover. The school however had to

¹ Arneth 1993

² Arneth 1993, 1. My translation.

close on account of the plague and there followed spells at several other schools and a period in 1633 as an assistant to a Pfarrer, Leonhard Mayr (a period Arneth considers to be significant in forming Holzhauser's ideas about pastoral ministry). Holzhauser ended up studying at the university of Ingolstadt, but it seems he was not as enthusiastic a student as he might have been: his colleague, Sebastian Seiden, commented he preferred his prayers to his books. He set several hours each day aside for prayer and when Protestant refugees from Swabia were passing through Ingolstadt, they were so enraged by his Biblical counter-arguments to their points that they threw him in the river. Towards the end of his time in Ingolstadt, he conceived the idea of founding his order, a community of »secular« priests (i.e. priests in parishes rather than monasteries), to remedy the sorry state of the contemporary church.

Holzhauser was ordained on Pentecost, 1639. He was Pfarrer of St. Johann in Tirol and Rural Dean of Chiemsee and as such had practical and pastoral oversight of the churches in the area. At one time, he had to arbitrate over what seems to have been a drunken brawl between the Pfarrer of Söll and his Frühmesser (the priest with responsibility for saying early Mass). He was also absorbed in a complex dispute over clerical tax, in which feelings ran high on all sides. When praying the *Te Deum* during this period, Holzhauser is said to have said the line *in te Domine speravi* (»I have put my hope in you, O Lord«) with tears in his eyes. This and other such disputes reveal him as a man of stubborn determination, something which the *Epistola* reveals he expected from others.

From about 1640, Holzhauser began to gather members to his Fraternity of priests, known as the *Institutum Clericorum Saecularium In Communi Viventium* or Bartholomites. There were a number of similar groups in France, such as the Oratorium Jesu, under Pierre Bérulle (founded 1611), and the Secular Priests' Fellowship, based at the Church of Saint-Nicolas du Chardonnet, Paris, under Adrien Bourdoise (1613), but none in Germany.

Holzhauser's group encountered significant difficulties in 1644, »ein Jahr der Mißerfolge und Prüfungen« (»a year of disappointments and tests«).³ On 9 November 1643, a letter from Holzhauser, setting out his proposal for the Fraternity, was being considered by the Arch-episcopal Curia (council) for the Salzburg area. The Bishop of Chiemsee, Johann Christoph, Graf von Lichtenstein, was severely ill and not in attendance at the Curia meeting. However, he separately gave his blessing to the Fraternity, before his

³ Arneth 1993, 65-66. My translation.

death on 1 December. His passing both deprived the Fraternity of a key supporter and benefactor and allowed the Direktor des Geistlichen Rates, Christoph Schreff, the complete freedom to express hostility to Holzhauser, at one point reputedly turning him out on the steps outside his house. The Fraternity was also subjected to frequent and costly inspections. Holzhauser was obstructed from becoming Dean of Tittmoning, because the Direktor held back key documents, so that the Bartholomites resided there without legal rights. They were expelled from buildings and lost financial benefits. Events of this nature led to a significant loss of morale in the Fraternity and to numbers of members falling to below viable levels.

It was at this point that Holzhauser wrote the present document (or at least all of it except § Finalis), to encourage his supporters to persevere despite the harassment. It appears to have had the desired effect, inasmuch as on 20 July 1644, seventeen former members re-pledged their support. Holzhauser was then able to re-establish the organisation in Feldkirch, through the support of Johann Ulrich Rieger, a landowner and priest in Jestetten, and Johann Weisenrieder, who had been tutor to the nephews of Holzhauser's supporter, the Bishop of Chiemsee. However the Feldkirch undertaking also failed, forcing Holzhauser to make attempts to establish the Fraternity in Ingolstadt and Augsburg. In order to strengthen the order, Rieger travelled to Rome, to secure the approval of the Pope, Innocent X, which was given on 10 May 1647. Doors appeared to open to start the Fraternity in Erding and Regensburg. Holzhauser's colleague, Michael Khotmayr, was even called »Esdras von Erding« (»the Ezra of Erding«), apparently because he was as active in preaching and leadership as the Biblical Ezra.⁴ However none of these attempts to establish a base for the Fraternity proved as successful as doing so in Mainz. Johann Philipp, the Archbishop-Elector was sympathetic and Holzhauser moved to the Mainz area, becoming Pfarrer of Bingen am Rhein.

Holzhauser and his movement seem to have flourished in Mainz, under Philipp's support. When the exiled English King, Charles II, stayed with Philipp, Holzhauser had opportunity to meet him. He was apparently hopeful of travelling to England to propagate the Fraternity, perhaps hoping that the restored Charles would prove more tolerant than his superiors in the 1640s. At any rate, he was prevented by his death in 1658, shortly before the Restoration of the English monarchy. As he expired, he supposedly repeated »ich glaube...ich hoffe...ich liebe...« (»I believe...I hope...I love«).⁵

⁴ Arneth 1993, 89. My translation.

⁵ Arneth 1993, 115. My translation.

The Text and the Editions

This text of the *Epistola* has been produced using digitisations of three copies, each of a different printed edition, one published in Mainz, Germany, one in Rovereto, Italy and the other with no place of publication given, but stored now in the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek in Munich, Germany, so henceforth referred to as the BSB edition.

The Mainz edition has no indication of date on its title page, but is dated to 1723 by its current librarians. It is bound with an earlier work by Holzhauser, *Constitutiones et Exercitia Spiritualia Clericorum Saecularium In Communi Viventium*. This was also printed in Mainz, but by a different printer and is dated 1716. This gives credence to the librarians' date of slightly after this. The volume passed into the possession of a Jesuit seminary in Heidelberg and is now in Lyon. The *Epistola* runs to twenty pages.

In the Lyon copy of the Mainz edition, the text is followed by several pages of handwriting, which are liturgical directions and prayers, added by a member of the Caroline seminary in Heidelberg that was at one time in possession of the copy of the book, acquiring it in 1761.⁶ The handwriting is mostly readable but the prayers are of limited relevance to the *Epistola*, though they make some contribution to its reception history.

The Rovereto edition also has no date given and is bound together with the same text as the Mainz version. It has been dated by its current librarians to around 1700, but they admit that they are uncertain. The two texts in the Rovereto volume, the *Constitutiones* and the *Epistola*, have publication details given on their respective title pages, but those two sets of publication details differ between the texts. This means that the two texts must have been bound in the same volume after printing, which means that knowing the printing date for the *Constitutiones* does not help us to ascertain the date for the *Epistola*. The *Constitutiones* is dated 1735. It is unlikely that the *Epistola* was published significantly before or after this, which lends credibility to the librarians' estimate of the early eighteenth century. The *Epistola* is twenty-three pages in the Rovereto edition.

The BSB edition is undated. An authority on early modern books suggests the seventeenth, rather than eighteenth, century.⁷ It is bound with a variety of other works (none of which is the one bound with the other two

⁶ Personal Communication, Sandrine Cunnac, Collection jésuite des Fontaines, Bibliothèque municipale de Lyon (1 August 2013).

⁷ Personal communication with Dr Lav Šubarić, Ludwig Boltzmann Institute for Neo-Latin Studies, (31 July 2013).

copies of the *Epistola*), dating from centuries before and after Holzhauser, suggesting that it also must have been rebound after its initial publication. It is the only edition which contains a note on the origins of a part of the text called § *Finalis* (»Final Section«), which seems, from this note and the content of § *Finalis*, to have been written later than the rest of the *Epistola*, but subsequently included with the rest of the text as a standard part of the whole (see pp. 21-22). It seems that the BSB edition was published before this convention became standard practise (because of the evident need to explain the origins of § *Finalis*), which suggests that it is earlier than the other two, i.e. probably seventeenth or very early eighteenth century. Its publication is likely to be posthumous, because of the grandiloquent epithet given to Holzhauser (*Venerabilis viri...Restitutoris Vitae Communis Clericorum Saecularium in Germania* or »The Venerable Man...Restorer Of The Common Life Of Secular Priests In Germany«) in the title of the text. This suggests that the title was printed when the author was enjoying a time of widespread favour. The fact that the other two editions have the same title (apart from some minor variation in one word – see textual notes) suggest that this had become the standard title of the text and therefore sufficient time had passed from the start of Holzhauser's period of favour for this to be established as a convention. The *Epistola* however was originally written for the 1644 crisis, a situation of fear and criticism, when Holzhauser was held in low regard. I therefore date the BSB edition to the later seventeenth or very early eighteenth century, after the Bartholomites were well established in Mainz. The BSB edition is thirty pages long and obviously therefore has fewer words to a page than the others.

Thus we have at least two and probably three post-mortem editions. This is unsurprising, since it is easy to suppose that circulation of the *Epistola* grew significantly, when the Fraternity, which it addresses, had begun to flourish and interest in its founding documents presumably had become more widespread.

Assuming my datings are correct, either Mainz or Rovereto could have been copied from BSB. However, there are times when each possible pairing of the editions agrees against the third and in the title, all three say something slightly different (see textual notes). This means that if Mainz or Rovereto were copied from BSB, the copier likely used the third edition (or a closely related one) as a source as well and sometimes departed from both his exemplars, even when they agreed with each other, either because he had a third exemplar or because he made a number of changes of his own. Given the large amount of time between Holzhauser's composition

of the letter and our editions, the relative ease of book production and the likely popularity of the text, it is likely that we are dealing with three isolated and probably only distantly related elements of what is, by the standards of Classical Latin texts, a large and complex open recension. This makes it impossible to posit a *stemma* or even, where the editions differ, to establish what Holzhauser himself wrote with any degree of certainty. All that can be said is that a variant in §17 suggests that BSB and Mainz have a closer relationship to each other than either does to Rovereto, a point born out by the fact that BSB and Mainz agree against Rovereto in unusual punctuation of a long sentence in §26. Further, a variant in §11 suggests that BSB may be a direct or indirect ancestor of Mainz. Details of all these variants are given in the textual notes and discussed in the commentary. The fact that there are three differing editions allows the textual critic at least to correct printing errors and resolve similar small difficulties, which creep into one or another. Because its year and place of publication are known and because it comes from a place in which Holzhauser and the Bartholomites flourished, I have followed the Mainz edition apart from passages where either or both of the others has an obviously better reading, due to a misprint or some such error in Mainz.

I have followed IJsewijn's advice in removing all the accents and modernising the spelling, punctuation and orthography, since in all three editions, these features are typical of the early modern period and so difficult for a twenty-first-century reader to understand.⁸ In particular, the editions capitalise *Spiritus* even when it is clear that a human spirit is intended, not the Holy Spirit. In each case, I have made a judgement based on sense as to what is meant and have then capitalised or not accordingly. I have tended, where possible, to place participle phrases and relative clauses within commas. I have also added section numbers in Arabic numerals, not found in any of the three editions, but following the Rovereto paragraph divisions, to provide a referencing system. I use the paragraph divisions of Rovereto, since the paragraphs in Mainz and BSB are too large for easy comprehension by a modern reader.

⁸ IJsewijn with Sacré 1998, 472-474.