### CALL #: BX801 .D66
### LOCATION: RBN :: Main Library :: ROCK
### TYPE: Article  CC:CCL
### JOURNAL TITLE: Downside review
### USER JOURNAL TITLE: Downside review
### RBN CATALOG TITLE: The Downside review
### ARTICLE TITLE: Submission or Fidelity? The Unity of Church and Mysticism in Walter Hilton's Scale of Perfection
### ARTICLE AUTHOR: Ross, Eileen
### VOLUME: 106
### ISSUE: 363
### MONTH: 
### YEAR: 1988
### PAGES: 134-144
### ISSN: 0012-5806
### OCLC #: [TN:345520][ODYSSEY:136.167.69.76/BXM]
### CROSS REFERENCE ID: 
### VERIFIED: 

### BORROWER: BXM :: Main Library
### PATRON: Robert Stanton
### PATRON ID: stantoro

---

This material may be protected by copyright law (Title 17 U.S. Code)
System Date/Time: 1/31/2011 11:27:31 AM MST
SUBMISSION OR FIDELITY?
THE UNITY OF CHURCH AND MYSTICISM IN WALTER HILTON'S SCALE OF PERFECTION

by

ELLEN M. ROSS

Scholars frequently characterize mystics as attending almost exclusively to private spiritual life with little or no concern for the participation of individuals in the institutional Church. Careful readings of mystical texts, however, cast such depictions into serious question. Students of mysticism like Steven T. Katz have argued persuasively against understanding mysticism as the 'paradigm of religious individualism and radicalism'. Katz's primary evidence emerges from reflection on the nature of mystical experiences, which, he claims, are never pure and unmediated, but always shaped by the mystic's religious tradition, and specifically by the mystic's particular 'ontological commitments'. Mystics, he argues, 'attain knowledge by acquaintance [with] what their communities [have already] taught as knowledge by description'.

What Katz calls 'ontological commitment' may, in Christian circles, be best expressed as 'theological commitment'. While many scholars would agree that the separation of Christian mysticism from Christian theology is artificial, few have explored the nature of the interaction or interdependence of the two. I will argue in this paper, using the example of one mystic, that in order to explain the relationship of an individual mystic to his church we must understand the theological conception of Church which lies behind the mystic's work. Once we recognize the relevant ecclesiological claims, we can begin to develop a typology to refine our conception of the relationship between individual mystics and religious institutions or traditions.

Katz suggests a fourfold schema for categorizing how mystics perceived their own teachings, and for categorizing how they were perceived by others: (1) the older teachings in a new guise; (2) a personal confirmation of existing doctrine; (3) a legitimate extension of traditional teaching; and (4) a development of a new, but authoritative, stage of tradition. In this paper I consider a fourteenth-century, middle-English mystic, Walter Hilton, whose work is aptly described according to the second category here. A vast number of Christian mystics (including, e.g., Julian of Norwich and Hildegard of Bingen) might also be so categorized, but I begin with this particular example in order to help refine an understanding of this second category (mysticism as a personal confirmation of doctrine) and to point to the important theological commitments lying behind such a stance.

I explore here the Church's role in Walter Hilton's middle-English text The Scale of Perfection. By 'Church' Hilton means the historic, institutional, sacramental and hierarchical Church which transmits the Scriptures and writings of Church doctors including Augustine, Gregory the Great and Bernard of Clairvaux — teachers who also experienced the mystical way. Essential to such a discussion, it must be noted that for Hilton, as for most mediaeval mystics, mysticism is not identified with any one or another momentary experience; in particular, it is not characterized by frequency of visions or ecstatic experiences. Rather, mysticism refers to a journey — a life-long process of faith seeking understanding and experience. The journey may at some point include a particularly vivid experience of Jesus as spouse, lover or friend, but Hilton is primarily concerned to guide his readers through the step-by-step spiritual process of reconciliation in knowledge and love to God. Contrary to the popular misconceptions of mysticism as anti-church, Walter Hilton's Scale of Perfection reveals a mystical writer and spiritual guide theologically committed to the crucial role of 'Holy Church' in the soul's journey to God.

My reading of the Scale indicates that while Hilton's attitude toward the Church is certainly not one of antipathy (this is immediately clear), nor one of disinterested neutrality; it is also not, as some have suggested, including the Hilton scholar Joseph Milosh, an attitude of 'submission' to the Church. Hilton's understanding of the Church's role in the spiritual journey is far more integrated and positive than an attitude of 'submission' would imply. My central point is that Hilton's reflections on the contemplative life occur explicitly within an ecclesial context and presuppose a theological understanding of the Church's integral role in the mystical journey: for Hilton the mystical journey is by definition the process by which the individual comes to experience what the Church teaches publicly.

In order to illuminate this point I explore three aspects in Hilton of the interaction between the institutional Church and the individual embarking on the contemplative life: (1) the contrast between those within the Church and those outside it; (2) the Church's function at the beginning stages of contemplation; and (3) the convergence between Church teachings and our experiences in the highest stages of contemplation. Hilton's Scale, I argue,
suggests a model for one type of mediaeval mysticism which understood itself not as standing over and against the institutional Church, or as having simply to conform to Church teachings, but rather as drawing from and fully supported by the corporate life of 'Holy Church'.

Gershom Scholem in his excellent 1967 article, 'Mysticism and Society', has gone a long way toward showing that there is an interrelationship between the mystic and his or her social group, and toward isolating and illustrating the central aspects of that interrelationship. Although Scholem's characterization of tendencies in mysticism is in general insightful and tremendously helpful for reading mystical texts, I will consider here one of his observations about mysticism and society which, I think, needs to be amended in the light of mystics such as Walter Hilton.

Scholem understands mysticism as 'a secondary state of religious development which evolves in visible tension to the traditional forms of religion, in ritual as well as in theology.' He suggests that the mystic's quest for a 'living experience of God' grows, at least in part, out of a dissatisfaction with the experience offered us through the commandments and institutions of our traditional Church structure. He maintains that we have 'two contradictory and at the same time complementary aspects of mysticism, a conservative and a revolutionary one'; social circumstances may encourage the mystic to emphasize one or the other of these poles of mysticism. The conservative sees 'no discrepancy' between the tradition and the mystical perspective; the revolutionary either becomes a vocal critic of the tradition and its expression in the community, or may simply distance himself from the institutional structure of the Church and associate only with likeminded individuals in a church of 'the pure'.

We will surely classify Walter Hilton as a conservative according to the terms of Scholem's discussion: Hilton was an avid defender of the Christian faith and its ecclesiastical heritage. But we need a further division of conservatives in order to do justice to a type of mystic represented by the fourteenth-century Walter Hilton (and even by the twentieth-century Thomas Merton). Indeed, these mystics, in Scholem's words, saw 'no discrepancy between the tradition and the mystical perspective'. I agree, they saw no discrepancy, but in order to understand fully what they were doing we must make a stronger and more positive claim, namely, that the tradition and its expression in the institutional Church empowers believers to seek a living experience of God. For a Walter Hilton or a Thomas Merton, the tradition actively encourages the faithful to embark on the mystical quest, to enter the living conversation with the Church's rich heritage, and not simply to maintain a blind and wooden obedience to the Church's teaching and institutional life.

H. P. Owen makes a similar argument for the mystic's positive guidance by ecclesiastical teachings, but weakens his point by suggesting that figures like Hilton might have unreflectingly followed the teaching of the Church:

[These mystics] assume that this truth [of Christian dogmas] is established by the teaching of the Scriptures and the Church. This, of course, is a large assumption that they do not examine. They are not to be blamed for not examining it; for the truth of dogmas was, in the light of their experience, self-evident; and in any case, their aim was to engage in spiritual contemplation, not philosophical reflection.

Hilton's ecclesiological commitments are much more explicitly and consistently formulated than Owen would suggest. As I will indicate, the fact that Hilton works with these commitments as assumptions does not imply that they are unreflectingly adopted. There were contemporary understandings of the Church and her teachings which contrasted with those of Hilton and with which he was certainly familiar (for example, the teachings of Wycliffe and the Lollards). We should not assume that one concerned about spiritual contemplation (like a Hilton) would not have engaged in conscious and fundamental philosophical and theological reflection concerning the choices of the Christian tradition.

The central claim about the Church underlying Hilton's work is that God and Holy Church are so united that whoever goes against one goes against both. This claim is repeated in many ways and contexts throughout The Scale of Perfection. The claim of harmony between God and the Church is not simply an authoritative demand for obedience; rather, it is a dynamic theological witness to the power of the Church in enabling the mystical quest, a faith-statement about how God has chosen the Church to engender and inform the spiritual journey. This theological assertion of the harmony of God and Church is Hilton's starting-point, an axiom or assumption, not a matter for debate; it is a starting-point expressed in the further theological claim that the Church is the mystical body of Christ. The Church's intimate relationship to God, formulated in an understanding of the Church as the mystical body of Christ, is evident in the interpretation of Scripture. The mystical meaning of Scripture, the third degree of Scriptural interpretation in Hilton's schema of literal, moral, mystical (or allegorical) and heavenly (anagogical) meanings of Scripture, speaks to the relationship between God and the Church.
By the mystical meaning of Scripture, the soul is illumined that [it/he] may be able to see the works of God in Holy Church and is made ready to apply the words of Holy Scripture to Christ our Head and to Holy Church which is mystically his body.¹⁵

We must keep in mind that Hilton begins from a theological claim about the nature of the unity between God and the Church when we read commentators like J. Milosh on Hilton, or G. Scholem on mysticism in general, who seem to say that mystics like Hilton merely ‘submit’ themselves and their work to the teachings of the Church. The term ‘submit’ as used by such commentators conveys up images of limitation or slavish obedience. Scholars like Milosh and Scholem have not recognized how integral a positive theology of the Church can be to understanding the mystical journey to God in some writers like Hilton.

The consequences of such a misinterpretation of the harmony between God and the Church emerge in Milosh’s further comments which suggest that there is a contrast between the soul’s natural pursuit of prayer and the pursuit of prayer permitted within the context of the Church. Milosh writes: ‘The emphasis on submission to the Church here [in Hilton] is in direct contrast to the freedom which a soul would naturally have to follow grace to a higher form of prayer’. When understood in the broader context of Hilton’s construal of the relationship between God and the Church, ‘submit’ does not have the negative and limiting connotations Milosh suggests in his contrast between the soul’s natural pursuit of prayer and the pursuit of prayer within the context of the Church. *Pace* Milosh, for Hilton it is explicitly within the context of the Church that we have the most guidance and support possible to assist us in following grace to a higher form of prayer. ‘Submission’ to the Church is not, as some would seem to suggest, ‘limiting’; rather ‘submission’ (if we even want to use the term) to the Church puts us in the position of being most likely to reach our goals. The Church transmits the collective experience of the Christian tradition; in so far as we learn from that experience and apply it in the form of faith to our own lives, we can achieve the goals set before us.

Hilton’s theological position states unequivocally that we are led astray when we seek guidance outside the structures of the Church; this is entirely consistent with his explicitly stated beliefs. For him, temptation from the devil appears as a strong desire to doubt the articles of faith or the necessity of the Sacraments.¹⁶ Discrepancy between one’s personal teaching and the teaching of the institution constitutes grounds for charges of heresy; Hilton defines a heretic as one who imagines his teachings to be true ‘even if what he says goes against what God and Holy Church teach’.¹⁷ For one with his ecclesiological commitments it is inconceivable that one could simultaneously affirm love for God and ‘despise Holy Church’ in beliefs and actions. But there was a long tradition of mystics claiming to be in the Christian Church who had articulated a very different ecclesiology, one with which Hilton was undoubtedly familiar.

Brief consideration of the ecclesiology of a revolutionary mystic, in Scholem’s terms, will point to a rather different understanding of ‘Church’ present in the Middle Ages. Na Prous Boneta, a Spiritual Franciscan and popular spiritual leader, was burned at the stake in 1325, condemned by the hierarchy of the Church for a number of reasons, including her denunciation of the Papacy, anticlericalism, and claims to be a spokesman for the Holy Spirit. Despite the hierarchy’s opposition to her, the definition of Church and the understanding of the relationship of the individual to God underlying Boneta’s work reflects Katz’s fourth category of mystics’ self perceptions — that is, the mystic as presenting a new, but authoritative stage of tradition.

The autonomy of the individual mystic’s relationship to God stands as Boneta’s primary theological commitment:

… if this Pope … and the cardinals, prelates and doctors of the sacred page should say to her and demonstrate by reasonings and by the authority of holy scripture that the aforesaid things, which … she claims herself to believe and hold, are erroneous and heretical, and if they were to warn her to revoke the aforesaid errors, she would neither believe nor obey them, for … the Lord Jesus Christ, who told her the aforesaid things, is more experienced and more prudent than all the men of the whole world.¹⁸

A number of features of Boneta’s testimony at her trial witness to the cultivated spiritual dimension of her life. She describes her visions, for example, as happening not in private, but in public, often at or closely associated with the celebration of Mass or liturgical hours. Although identifying with aspects of the institutional Church, Boneta denies that the historical, institutional and hierarchical Church is the mystical body of Christ, the primary mediator of God to the world. Individual Christian commitment alone, and not office or institutional tradition, determines one’s religious standing before God.

Christ told her that this present Pope, John XXII, is like Caiaphas, who crucified Christ. The poor Beguines who were burned, and also the burned lepers, were like the innocents beheaded by the command of Herod; likewise just as Herod procured the death of innocent boy children, thus this Herod … procured the death of these burned Beguines and lepers.¹⁹
Her individual experience, while emergent in a communal setting, replaces Scripture and the hierarchically-defined Church as the primary locus of God's communication to the world:

...the Lord told her that in the same way as ... God ruled the Church through the two bodies of flesh, that is, the bodies of Christ and of his mother, the Virgin Mary, so he rules in the same way henceforth the Church through the two bodies of the spirit given to the ... friar Peter John [Olivier] and ... to Na Prous.20

II

Clearly articulating a position in opposition to that represented by a figure like Boneta, Hilton's theological claim concerning the harmony between God and the Church is nevertheless consistent with his further theological position concerning the relationship between Church and mystic. Hilton understands the contemplative life as the process by which the individual comes to experience what the Church teaches publicly. This is a theological claim, a crucial starting-point. He directs his readers to set their faith on the faith of Holy Church ('[T]he Faith of the Holy Church is your faith ...'), and he writes that we must believe before we will come to understand ('[W]e believe without spiritual experience ... and [i]f we should first believe it, [we] will later experience through grace and understand that it is true ...').21

Consideration of the institutional Church's specific functions at various stages of the mystical journey illustrates that for mystics like Walter Hilton the mystical life is the process by which we come to understand and experience what the Church teaches. Hilton counsels his readers from the beginning to identify their faith with the faith of the Church.

Set your faith in general on the faith of Holy Church and pay no attention to the movements which seem to you contrary to your faith. For the movements are not your faith, but the Faith of the Holy Church is your faith, though you neither see it nor feel it.22

The Church guides people through the early stages of ascent to God by means of practices, the most important of which are prayer and participation in the sacraments of baptism and penance; these practices draw attention away from worldly pursuits, they uproot vices and cultivate virtues.

The Church provides forms and circumstances for prayer which not only comforts believers but also assists the process of reorienting their wills towards God. We pray '... to make [ourselves] able and ready, like a clean container, to receive the grace our Lord will freely give [us]'.23 The Church provides language for prayer spoken according to set patterns, especially important in the early stages of the journey. In describing the possibilities for spoken prayer, which he calls a 'staff ... ordained by God and Holy Church as a help for men's souls',24 Hilton writes,

There is prayer composed especially by God, the Our Father, and more generally, the prayer ordained by Holy Church — Matins, Vespers, the Divine Office. There are also prayers composed by devout men to our Lord and our Lady and to his saints.25

In teaching his readers about specific prayers and proper attitudes when praying, Hilton emphasizes the significance of prayer ordained by the Church.

You should gather your affections and your thoughts together in order to say them more seriously and devoutly than you say any other special prayer of devotion, taking it for a truth that, since this is the prayer of Holy Church, there is no vocal prayer as profitable for you to use commonly as this.26

Sacraments are a second important form of assistance Holy Church offers for the early stages of the journey. Baptism and Penance cleanse from sin. While they do not prevent further sinning, they assure that we will not be damned for experiencing the tendency to sin; '... provided we do not pursue the movements of the flesh by fulfilling them in deeds'.27 Although the Church calls for expressions of contrition and outward confessions of repentance and intention not to repeat the deeds, we may not experience any noticeable change in ourselves at the time of confession. With practice, though, we can come to experience the change we believe first by faith.

Hilton establishes the institutional Church as the primary theological guide for believers who seek a process of conversion of heart and mind. He recommends personal knowledge and experience for his readers, but it is always personal experience and knowledge of what the Church as theological guide teaches. Hilton assesses the soul's progress on the journey to God according to whether we are reformed in faith, reformed in faith and experience, or reformed in experience alone. All who will be saved attain at least the first level of reformation in faith; we can neither be saved nor come to the stage of reformation in experience unless we are first reformed in faith. 'Reforming in faith' occurs when we 'believe[s] in God as Holy Church teaches [us] but [we] do not know from experience what we believe'.28 Battle with the internal image of sin may continue, but we now have confidence in our own reformation. For those intent upon seeking God, occasional weakness will not disrupt the more basic orientation, and if we truly believe, our practice and
experience will begin to reflect our beliefs. Again, the teachings of Holy Church provide the primary models:

Among these [who have faith] are simple souls who do not experience the gift of special devotion, nor that spiritual knowledge of God . . . but believe in general as Holy Church believes, though they don’t entirely understand what that is. . . . In that faith they keep themselves in love and charity toward their fellow-Christians as much as they can, flee all mortal sins as best they can and perform deeds of mercy for their fellow-Christians. All these belong to the bliss of heaven.39

First, we are reformed in faith alone; that is, we believe, although we do not fully understand what the Church teaches. Hilton measures growth in faith according to how much we come to understand and experience what we first believed. Growth in imitation of Christ through cultivation of meekness and charity is a process of growth from faith to experience and deeper comprehension of what our faith means.

. . . believe without spiritual experience . . . and [if] we should first believe it, [we] will later experience through grace and understand that it is true. . . . Belief goes first and understanding follows after it.30

The faith we may eventually experience is also Holy Church’s faith. At the higher levels of contemplation our experiences coincide with the teachings of the Church. What we experience and understand are the truths to which Scripture attests and about which the Doctors of the Church have written. For example, we begin to understand the mysteries of the Trinity; we begin to perceive truths about the Trinity, truths ‘which have been openly declared and showed in the writings of the holy doctors of the Holy Church’.31 Our experiences are in direct continuity with the wisdom of the tradition.

And be well-assured that the same essential truths about the blessed Trinity that the holy doctors, inspired through grace, have written about in their books, to strengthen our faith, a pure soul may see and know through the same light of grace.32

From beginning to end we are guided and confirmed on our journey by the teachings and faith of the Church. Hilton encourages his readers repeatedly to do all things within the context of, and guided by, Holy Church.

Whether you pray or think or do any other deed . . . or feel, hear, smell or taste outwardly through your physical senses, or imagine, know or experience in your reason, bring it all within the rules of Holy Church and cast it all into the mortar of meekness. . . .33

Given the significant interaction between the institutional Church and the individual mystic indicated above, it should not be surprising that the Church’s support for a quest of inwardsness in no way endorses the mystic’s sustained distancing from the Church’s social context. Quite the contrary, for Hilton the mystical life is a life ‘rooted in love and charity’, where charity refers not only to love of God but also to love of neighbour.34 We are judged according to how much we love our neighbours: ‘If you love them little, your soul is small, and if you do not love them at all, your soul is nothing . . . as far as good is concerned, but it is great in sin’.35 Reformation of our relationship to God evokes also a transformation of our love of neighbours36 so that love of neighbour does not distract us from God, but, rather, becomes a way of being engaged in relationship with God: ‘. . . if you are wise, you will not leave God but will find him and possess him and see him in your fellow-Christians; as you do in prayer, but you will have him in another way’.37 The central importance of love of one’s neighbour is also indicated by Hilton’s claim that our reward in heaven corresponds to the measure of our charity on earth.38

Hilton urges us repeatedly to love our neighbours; the higher levels of knowledge and love of God call not for a retreat from the world around us, but rather for a rethinking of the nature of present relationships. As is the case with many mystics, so also for Walter Hilton, the return into the social sphere after experience of union with the Divine is an essential part of the mystical way and is itself a way of expressing union with God.

III

In conclusion, then, the mystical journey is inextricably linked with the historic spiritual wisdom the Church mediates to us. We must amend Scholem’s assessment that the conservative sees no discrepancy between the teaching of the Church and mystical experience and his claim that the mystic is driven to pursue the mystical life out of dissatisfaction with the experience available through the structure of the traditional Church. Rather the positive point should be made that for at least some conservative mystics (like Hilton) we will live to the fullest of our capacities if we exercise thoughtful fidelity to the teachings of the Church at all stages of the mystical way. Milosh’s position, on the other hand, that the mystic simply submits to the Church, does not adequately recognize the positive theology of the Church implicit in Hilton’s description of the soul’s mystical journey to God. For Hilton, the mystic is not coerced into a mould prescribed by the Church; rather, the spiritual heritage embodied in the Church is marshalled by the mystic as the primary resource and impetus for the spiritual journey.
Active fidelity, not unthinking submission, is the governing rubric of Hilton’s mystical theology. The goal of the mystical journey is to realize internally what the Church teaches publicly. In this realization, guided by the wisdom of Holy Church, the mystic can actualize her or his faith in experiencing a living relationship of love and knowledge to God and the world.
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JOHN 21 REVISITED ONCE MORE
by PROFESSOR PAUL TRUDING

I wish to give attention to both the opening and the close of this last chapter of John’s Gospel with particularity; these sections may tell us about the relationship of John to the rest of the Gospel. For it seems to have been the majority of New Testament scholars that this chapter is an awkward addition to an otherwise well rounded book clearly not from the hand of ‘the beloved disciple’. But that conclusion and argue for the integrity of the book we have it (and, for that matter, have had it from the earliest manuscript and onward).

‘The book is finished, very well finished.’ Thus John, in his celebrated statement about John 20, 30-31. Likewise, I call these verses a satisfying and indeed triumph over Gospel, chapter 21 being a clumsy addendum. Several places, argues that chapter 21 is clearly a later writing of which was definitely not the author of the Gospel. Now I believe it to be almost certainly true that chapter 21 is a later addition. I wish to make the case, however, that it is a clumsy addendum but an imaginative and subtle one, deemed necessary at a later date to bring John’s story and all of a piece stylistically and thematically with the rest of the book. Later in this paper, as we look at the closing chapter, I wish to suggest that the text does not support the doubt that the writer of this additional chapter must be a person from the author of the rest of the Gospel. Perhaps he made a similar point years ago when he wrote chapter 21 was an integral part of the origin of the Gospel, in its earliest design the Gospel was intended to conclude with the final verses of chapter 20.

I want to suggest that it is precisely v. 31 of chapter 21 provides us with a subtle clue to the author’s later work. In other words, I am suggesting that John what he had intended to be a completed Gospel and then considerably later date, by the very wording of v. 31 of chapter 20. I’m not through yet!’ I believe John is making a significant point an anagram based on the Greek word for ‘fish’ (i.e., ‘(esous) CH(risostos) TH(eou) U(ios) S(ieýer)’, that is Son of God, Saviour’. No one knows just how 21:30 of an early Christian symbol, is. Clearly, fish is the...