

JOHAN TYBECK— A FIGHTER FOR RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

Harry Lenhammar*

In history there are people who exercise an influence in secret. You hardly know about them. Their names are not recorded for posterity and little significance is attached to them either in historical research or in reference books. Their efforts have once perhaps received attention but their continued activity has been neglected. This of course is a question of what basis you choose for writing history, and why you do so. A selection is always necessary, yet often this is made in such a way that the more noteworthy, highly individual achievements are ignored.

Such a highly individual personage is Johan Tybeck. It is true, he is not quite forgotten. He has space in some biographical manuals and reference books in church history in Sweden, but his efforts have not been depicted as they deserve. Who then is Johan Tybeck? A clergyman in the church of Sweden, who was deposed for his Swedenborgian opinions in 1818. Before then he had been an assiduous attender of Swedenborgian religious activity in the 1780s in the Swedish capital, Stockholm. His writings comprise about 60 printed booklets of which only about 10 are printed with his own name; the other remain anonymous. It is also probable that a number of his papers have never been printed. They were circulated as written copies. He was involved in 5 press-law suits because of his printed booklets, once before 1809, when the law changed, and four times after the rise of the new Constitution. In each of the cases he was found not guilty. These facts, however, tell very little about his influence. The large number of written papers can be said to give evidence of his great industry whilst the legal proceedings show his audacity and imprudence, perhaps it could even be said his lack of judgment.

Most interesting about Tybeck is the fact that he could develop his thoughts and attitudes toward religious problems during such a long and eventful period as from Gustavus the third to Charles XIV Johan, that is from the time of Enlightenment to the time of Liberalism. Tybeck was born in 1752 and died in 1837. We can follow his life in three parts.

*Prof. Dr. Harry Lenhammar is presently chairman of the Department of Church History at the University of Uppsala, specializing in Nordic History. (See the biographical sketch in *Emanuel Swedenborg, A Continuing Vision*, Swedenborg Foundation 1988.)

A. Swedenborg presents the key. 1780-1785.

The first period can be said to last until 1785. First the external features. In 1777 Tybeck matriculated at the university of Uppsala. Some aspects of his early life and development are unknown to us, but around 1760 he moved from his birthplace Askersund to Stockholm. There he worked as an apprentice. In 1772 he matriculated as a pupil in the senior high school at Strängnäs. So we know some details from his external biography at this time but very little about his religious opinions. From Uppsala he soon became a private tutor in the house of a Noble family. He became a minister shortly afterwards and his task was to serve as a minister in a Noble family. It was their class privilege to have a minister of their own. There was nothing particular in this course of events. Even his future career was that of a private minister. In 1782 he moved to the Liljencrantz family, who lived on the manorial estate Håsselbyholm situated near Strängnäs. Here his real history begins.

A maid, Sara Stina Schultz, was considered to be possessed by evil spirits. Thanks to the efforts of the ministers (it was Tybeck, who exercised the greatest influence over her), the maid was released from her tormentors. That the matter was brought to the chapter was due to the circumstance that two of the ministers—one of them was Tybeck—wished to give thanks in the parish-church for the girl. She was rid of her evil spirits. One of the other ministers, however, felt very dubious about giving such a thanks. He brought the issue to the chapter. The members did not think of the maid as a case of possession. They declared that the girl's condition had natural causes. They found the use the ministers had made of the Holy Writ and the name of Jesus really sinful. But Tybeck maintained his opinion that the maid was possessed by evil spirits. He rendered a detailed account of the case. He had considered naming Swedenborg in it, but he gave up the idea. For he had no doubts that the girl had been possessed and that her condition could only be interpreted from the ideas of Swedenborg about the influence of spirits on men.

This event of autumn 1782 demonstrates that the chapter saw the case as a manifestation of old popular superstition and argued from the enlightened mind of the time. Tybeck for his part held a quite different opinion, which the chapter presumably only considered as backwardness. He did not reveal that he had got his key to the explanation from the views of Emanuel Swedenborg. Surely he found it too dangerous. This was the first time Tybeck clashed with

the ecclesiastical authorities. But it would not be the last. This ends the first part of his life.

B. A new age has arrived. 1786-1818.

During the next years we can follow his activity in the circle of friends who became interested in the writings of Emanuel Swedenborg, but we don't meet any public critique of his life and thoughts. Tybeck grew more intrepid and thought that it was time to show the world that a new age was beginning, *nunc licet*. The caution he himself demonstrated earlier in the presence of the chapter in Strängnäs had vanished into thin air. He joined in the activities of the Exegetic and Philanthropic Society 1786/87. When it became clear that the Swedish laws, especially the decree on the freedom of the press, effectively prevented printing in Sweden, they tried to print abroad. In 1788 they printed in Copenhagen a paper of Tybeck's. It was entitled "The right to examine one's doctrine." It was printed as a preface to a translation of Swedenborg's *Summaria Expositio*. In this booklet Tybeck takes as his starting-point the spirit of freedom in the Enlightenment. We now live in the age of reason and liberty; therefore there are no problems about reading the words of the Scriptures and testing them against the doctrine of religion. The literal word is pure and remains equal for all ages and for all individuals. From this Tybeck drew his main argument which he was to repeat many times in his continued activity. The Holy Writ is to be read without the spectacles of the confessions of the church.

He developed similar opinions in a number of sermons. Some of them were even printed abroad. That he gave them the shape of sermons prevented a too inquisitive inspection of them.

In all his works he received support from Baron Liljencrantz, who even became partly involved in his own activity. This continued until 1797, when his job as minister to the Liljencrantz family ceased because the Baron died. Tybeck and his friends made an effort to take over the legacy and use it for the purpose of propagating Swedenborg's ideas, but failed. After this year Tybeck lived mostly without sacerdotal charges. He kept a comprehensive correspondence and wrote manuscripts which are often presented as sermons. The times had changed in other respects. King Gustav III had been murdered in 1792, and his son deposed in 1809. The duke Charles became king with the title Charles XIII. He showed very little

interest in his old friends. Once Tybeck and his friends had counted the prince as one of them. The French Revolution had put the emperor in a powerful position. A conservative wind was blowing. Culturally, Romanticism became dominant.

Anyhow, Tybeck could work without attracting any attention. He could sometimes even be on duty as minister in the parish somewhere around 1800, without reports to the chapter. He first attracted attention in 1817. It was about a sermon on the Atonement. The doctrine of Atonement had a central position at that time. Christianity was interpreted through a Moravian perspective. They stressed the importance of the Atonement more than in Orthodoxy or Pietism. It was given the name of subjective Atonement, by the historian of Christian ideas. With this interpretation, the doctrine was even supported by the king Gustavus IV Adolf. At the beginning of the 19th century he gave a golden cross to each bishop to remind him of the importance of the doctrine of Atonement. At the same time this doctrine received current interest just because 1817 was the year of a jubilee. Three hundred years before, Luther had signed his thesis in which the doctrine of Atonement was a cornerstone. As the passage for the sermon on the day of jubilee the archbishop, J. A. Lindblom, prescribed 2 Cor 5:19: "That is, that God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself, not imputing their trespasses to them, and has committed to us the word of reconciliation."

Tybeck wrote a sermon and printed it without giving his name. He divided his sermon into three parts, all initiated with questions. The first part starts: What do the Scriptures intend by the name of Christ? The Holy Writ maintains that Christ is the promised Messiah for whom the Jewish people longed. But Christ was only the human part. It was the Lord as man that died on the cross. The son of God is the humanity which God took upon Himself. "God in Christ," according to Tybeck, means that God was Christ. Through the resolution in Nicaea 325 A.D. this fact was obscured. But our age is much more enlightened and ought to understand more clearly than the apostles could. Here a person speaks in the era of the Enlightenment, you would think.

His second point is the doctrine of the Trinity. He answers the question about what we in our time ought to consider about "God in Christ" There is a divine Trinity in the person of Jesus. His inmost divinity is the Father, the human divinity is the Son, and that proceeding from his personality is the Holy Spirit. The apostles

made a distinction between the Lord and Him, but we understand the relationship better.

The third question was this: What does it mean to say that God in Christ has reconciled the world to Himself? The word "reconciled" ought not to be used. Better to use the word "alter" because the Atonement meant that a new way has been opened to Him. All obstacles have been removed. This the Apostles could not understand. Instead they took their words from the Jewish sacrifice when they described the connection. And they made mistakes. Tybeck continues, commenting adversely upon the Theology of Paul. He was, he maintains, too influenced by Jewish thinking. But for us it is very easy to go step by step to the truth. We should instead leave the writings of Paul and refer to the other books in the Scripture. In this sermon Tybeck stressed his theological opinions without directly criticizing or even touching upon the confession of the church.

Should this sermon pass without attracting any attention? There were a lot of sermons on that theme this year. Two of the newspapers in the capital reviewed his sermon. Its Theology did not agree with that of the church. The sermon was an expression for empty speculation, one newspaper wrote. The other reviewer saw in it an expression of the new philosophy, suspecting the thoughts of Schelling with his speculative understanding of the Trinity. This was the reaction of the papers. But would the sermon attract the responsible authority? After 1810 there was no longer any censoring at all in Sweden. The clerical order had argued in vain in the parliament for a partial censoring. They made a distinction between the writings of men of learning and those books which were designed for the general public. Only the latter should be read beforehand. This also applied to those books which claimed officially to present the confession of the Swedish Church. But the clerics were unable to vindicate their opinion. After the ruling of the 1809 Constitution, any kind of censoring was absolutely out of the question. There should be total freedom of the press. This freedom could, however, be misused. Printed books could be checked after printing. They had to be examined by a particular authority. In some cases he would have to bring an action against the book. If the book contained blasphemy, obvious denial of a God and a life after this or, and this was clearly an important issue for the church, a denial of the truth of the pure evangelic doctrine, action should be taken. Further, the printing of a book could be brought to action if its contents implicitly mocked the public service, the Holy Writ and the sacraments. This was called the section on mockery.

Tybeck's sermon obviously could be examined in relation to this law. And it was. At the same time as the first review appeared in the newspaper, the theologians had taken interest in the booklet. The chapter in Stockholm proposed an action should be undertaken. We don't know whether the authorities and journalists had planned it together, but the exact timing is evident, and an action was brought. Responsibility was charged for denial of the pure evangelical doctrine. It was the first case of this kind to be taken to the court after 1810. In his defence Tybeck makes a distinction between Lutheran doctrine and evangelical doctrine. If his printed opinions are against those opinions of Luther, it does not follow that they are against a doctrine based on the four Gospels, he declared. These were very daring words in 1817, the year of the reformation jubilee. Tybeck continued and developed his ideas of the oath at ordination. In fact it concerned two kinds of confessions as different as day and night, light and darkness. The apostolic creed cannot be associated with that of Nicaea. But the contrast is not conclusive, because the symbolic books themselves refer to the Scripture alone as the basis. When you get confused you have to go to the Scriptures. This was the perpetually recurring argument in doctrinal matters both for Tybeck and the pietistic revival movements during the 19th century. When they were held responsible for opinions which were against the confessions they always defended themselves with this. The creeds themselves refer to the Scripture. It is the supreme authority. This argument has a long tradition in the history of the church. Luther's Catholic critics already said that he like all heretics referred to the Scripture.

According to the law in Tybeck's case, the court had to hear a jury before they passed the sentence. In Swedish law, cases of freedom of the press were the only cases where a jury was used. The nine jurors (the court nominated only ministers) found Tybeck not guilty. So the court had ruled that opinions like Tybeck's in the accused sermon could not be said to deny pure evangelical doctrine.

Of course this success encouraged Tybeck to go on. In his defence he *inter alia* said that his sermon was not presented as teaching in the parish. He had not expressed these thoughts whilst working as a minister. He was still a minister after 1797 although he seldom acted in that capacity. Tybeck here carried on a discussion very well-known in the debate of the Enlightenment. There was a sharp division between the opinions and ideas the minister said as a teacher in the parish and his own private ideas. It was not necessary

that the latter were in accordance with the confession of the church. Also this distinction should be examined in Tybeck's case.

A large number of people found it shocking that it was a minister who had been declared not guilty for this booklet. The government was of the same opinion. The chapter in Stränganäs had to examine both the limits for a minister's freedom of doctrine, and the limits of the constitutional law—the law of freedom of the press was constitutional law—which acquitted him, and other laws especially for ministers. Could they proceed against a minister for his writings outside his tasks as minister in the parish? For the third time Tybeck had to appear in his chapter. The first time was in 1779 at his ordination, and three years later he was warned about his attitude to the maid Sara Stina Schultz, whom he believed to be possessed. And also in the spring of 1818 because of his printed sermon. And now the chapter had received a letter from the government to call him to this examination.

The bishop was Johan Adam Tingstadius, a well-known translator of the Holy Writ and famous scholar of oriental languages. He is not, however, known as a champion of orthodoxy. He himself presided at the examination. His first question shows that he tried to find an excuse. In fact he asked whether Tybeck intended to continue with his ministry if he was in good health (Tybeck had refused to be on duty because he was not in good health), or whether he intended to give up the ministry. With this the bishop created an opportunity for Tybeck to escape. To resign from the ministry at the age of 66 could not be said to be peculiar, especially when he seldom practised. But Tybeck made clear that he had no intention of resigning from the ministry.

Obviously fearless, he met the examination. Sometimes his answers were provocative. The bishop asked Tybeck whether he rejected the confessions of the church. He answered, 'Indeed I do. The first principle of the Lutheran doctrine is that the Holy Writ should serve as a standard of each thesis in religion. These are to be taken directly from the Scripture.' When Tybeck later published the proceedings he unfolded his opinions on the creeds. Once they had served as a protection against the pope and against internal division. From that perspective they have served their purpose and are no longer needed. In fact they are accepted by the church as law, but the kings never tested them according to the Scripture. Tybeck had earlier been satisfied with the statement that the creeds themselves refer to the Scripture. Now this was not enough. Their contents

needed to be examined. He made no secret that he wanted the creeds to be abolished as a result of the examination. As Luther had once done he appealed to a synod of the church. It would decide the doctrine of the Atonement in the Scripture. There are no doubts that Tybeck and many others thought the time ripe for a new reformation. A first step in the right direction was taken in the interpretation of the catechism of 1811, but more steps needed to be taken.

For him the whole examination in the chapter lent the possibility of drawing the attention to the necessity for a new reformation. The formality that he had promised at his ordination to follow the creeds of the church did not worry him. At that time he did not know their contents. When he examined the creeds he found that if a teacher in the parish took the truth in the Holy Writ directly from the Scripture he would necessarily come in conflict with the creeds of the church.

In this examination Tybeck declared that there are above all three principal mistakes in the current religion in the church. In it they speak of three separate Gods. To a direct question about the doctrine of the Trinity Tybeck answered very provocatively: "I deny this doctrine *de Trinitate personarum* totally. It does not exist. It is an inheritance from the synod of Nicaea. The Trinity is in Christ alone. It developed successively in him. The apostles did not understand it better than their teaching. They teach according to their time. Now we know more and better." These are the same thoughts he defended in his sermon and shared with many theologians in the time of Enlightenment, that is the belief in a continued reformation. This opinion could not be strange for Bishop Tingstadius himself. But for him it was unthinkable that this could be applied to the teaching in the parishes, for the public. Discussion of those things was more a matter for scholars.

The second mistake according to Tybeck was their belief in a faith which excluded all practical religion. Luther's conception of salvation by faith alone, *sola fida*, was a big mistake. It could be said to be the most deplorable shame for the church of the Lord. Tybeck here speaks very frankly with no hidden judgments. His opinion is clear.

But his thoughts had to be very provocative. They were expressed by a minister in a time when the teaching of the pietists and Moravians prevailed, and the revival movements in different parts of the country got inspiration from them. These opinions also got strong support from the governing bodies. This was probably behind the order to the chapter in Strängnäs to examine Tybeck.

The third principal mistake was the doctrine of a reconciliation—the idea that anyone could suffer punishment for another persons trespasses. The man himself is responsible for his deeds. He cannot ever be rid of them. The idea of the Trinity as a successive development in Christ makes the conventional doctrine on the Atonement impossible.

The examination directed by the Bishop more resembled the interrogation of an exegete than that of a dogmatician. The distinction Tybeck made between direct and indirect inspiration in the Scripture did not appeal to the bishop. According to Tybeck the prophets and the evangelists were writing under direct inspiration, the others not. About the apostles Tybeck in fact could say that they had written without permission.

In the argument for dismissal, the chapter touched upon the question of religious liberty. This must be limited if one belongs to a certain congregation. All congregations always are distinguished from others by a confession. This limitation applies especially to a person who acts as a minister and teacher in the church, since at his ordination he had promised to follow the doctrines of his church. He has no freedom in that respect. This does not imply that Theological research is impossible, but the principal doctrines cannot be changed. And it is these which Tybeck called into question. For people who held those beliefs which he himself upheld, it in fact only remained to find the liberty somewhere else. Expatriation was implied, a punishment which some decades later would fall upon Catholics and Baptists. By their activities they had created unrest in the society. This accusation was never made against Tybeck. A minister bound to the creeds of the church seemed to him to be a new papacy. At that time the reason was to prevent an examination of the Scriptures, he said. Instead of God the priesthood reigns, he wrote in his very provocative manner. Ministers are set apart from the rest of society. They become a separate order instead of acting as chosen tools of the Lord. Also he intimated that if it were possible to find out how many people held other beliefs than those written in the creeds it would surely turn out that it would be the bigger part of thinking people in the country—and among them more than a few ministers. Members of chapters even would be included in that group.

When he wrote this, the judgment already had been confirmed by supreme court. In August 1818—in fact 170 years ago—the dismissal was finished. Tybeck had to return his certificate of ordination. Now he was a layman again.

The dismissal must have astonished many. In itself it was not so uncommon that ministers were defrocked, but it was usually because of drunkenness or an immoral life. In this case it was a question of doctrine. For the chapter his opinions were manifestations of the same kind of mistakes which the radical pietists—they mentioned the names of Dippel and Arnold—had demonstrated a century earlier. Tybeck rejected resolutely all the attempts the members of the chapter made during the examination to tie his ideas to those condemned earlier in the history of the church. The name of Swedenborg had been mentioned neither by Tybeck nor the members of the chapter. The chapter had its suspicions nevertheless. They referred to the case in Gothenburg in 1770 against Beyer and Rosen. They wrote that Tybeck "probably" had got his ideas from Swedenborg's *Vera Christiana Religio* printed in 1771. They did not seize the opportunity to make a comparison with Swedenborg's views. Insinuations were enough.

C. The Scripture versus the creeds. 1819-1837.

The case gave cause for debate. Did a minister in fact have any freedom of religion? The lawyer S. L. Theorell wrote in a newspaper article that pure evangelic doctrine had to be defined as the Holy Writ. Its authority must not be denied. Whoever calls the Holy Writ into question must be prosecuted. This was not true of Tybeck. The chapter had sentenced only a dismissal, but Theorell found this really shocking. They did not have this right. They were only entitled to prepare the case. As a liberal, Theorell found the liberty the chapter had taken leading directly along the road to hierarchy and bureaucracy. They should not supervise the freedom of the press. When its administrator found him not guilty, then they had nothing to do but supervise the work of the minister in the church and parish. A minister's freedom could only be restricted compared to that of other citizens insofar as it concerned his official duties as a minister.

The chapter did not share this judgment. It joined the debate. It believed that the minister should always and in all his doings obey the oath he had once sworn. According to them he had made a contract with the church and any doctrinal freedom could not exist. Pure evangelic doctrine was very clearly defined in the current laws but could not be expressed as only the Holy Writ. The debate continued between Theorell and a member of the chapter. But here we leave their debate.

Others also gave their opinions. The liberal Theorell had defended Tybeck against the chapter, but it got support from the Romanticist Lorenzo Hammarskjöld. Each society has rules of its own, Hammarskjöld writes. In the church they are the creeds. They are important not only for the church but they are also the foundation of the whole society. For that reason its contents could not be indifferent to any citizen. Therefore, there cannot be any antagonism between the creeds and the Scripture. They are only a summation of the Scripture. From the creeds you have to read the Holy Writ. In later times the church expressed the truth in other words, in the Liturgy of the church and in the explanation of the Catechism. Hammarskjöld writes that in these books you will find the actual interpretations of the Scripture. Religion is Life. And in Life there are two expressions, concept and feeling. Neither of them should predominate. There could appear to be a tension between fixed authority and free development. But this tension is not in God Himself. In Him freedom and authority are one.

But he continues. There is a difference between the truth of the Holy Writ and our understanding of it, he writes. It is the same as the difference between the visible and invisible church. The creeds are the attempts of the visible church to explain its understanding of the Scripture. This will not prevent the research of the scholars. Every citizen has this liberty which is almost unlimited, but a minister is more restricted. So Hammarskjöld touched upon the contents of Tybeck's remarks. He has not understood the Trinity. We already meet this doctrine in Plato, in Philo, in the Kabbala and it is fully developed in the New Testament. Later Plotin and the Fathers of the church developed it further. This thinking lies behind the decision taken in Nicaea. Also Tybeck had not understood the doctrine of Atonement. This doctrine postulates faith. Only in faith the man experiences his freedom. Faith and deeds are not to be separated.

In this critical review the Romanticist Hammarskjöld defended the dismissal of Tybeck. He criticized his opinions from a very confused theology which refers more to the philosophy of Romanticism than to Orthodoxy in the church. But he was also concerned about the congregation as something specific, a society of its own. And the minister had to be its servant. Because of that his freedom must be limited.

This is the last period in Tybeck's life. It extends from his dismissal to his death in 1837. He became occupied enthusiastically as an author. He became a well-known writer urging the Scripture

against the creeds of the church. He defended the freedom of the minister in regard to doctrines. He hardly ran a risk since he was already dismissed, but he met three further actions for his printings.

The first of these after the dismissal came as early as in 1819. The Evangelical Society (Evangeliska Sällskapet) dominated by Moravians, distributed a lot of tracts all over the country. In these the readers were urged to leave the path of trespasses and flee to the cross of Jesus. In his Atonement they had their security. Tybeck took up his pen and anonymously printed a critical examination of the Society's activity. They had misunderstood Paul and also had a deluded understanding of law and gospel. Afterwards Luther reinforced this mistaken understanding. Human whims—Tybeck meant the confessions of course—are not the way to understand the Scripture in its purity. The truth of the gospel is that love and good deeds are of importance for salvation. Tybeck now recommended the members of the Evangelical Society to spread this truth.

The authorities proceeded against him. Tybeck was unveiled as the author. He unfolded his defence with his usual trust in progress. As Luther saw more clearly than Augustine so we see more clearly than he did. The confessions have no other purpose than to refer to the Scripture. If they with Atonement would say that the Lord defeated all the powers of the hell and created powers for salvation, then Tybeck should agree. If they meant instead that the Lord suffered and died to reconcile the Father and appease His wrath, it should be rejected, since it is not in the Holy Writ and presumes two Gods. Even this time Tybeck was declared not guilty, but it was not a matter of course. The jury discussed it for two hours.

As we have seen the doctrine on the Atonement had an advanced position in the church in the early 19th century. It gained a pietistic/Moravian interpretation, and criticism against this interpretation was denounced, as happened to the writing of Tybeck. And when the poet and historian Erik Gustave Geijer called the doctrine of Atonement a crass idea, proceedings were taken against him in 1821. Of course this prosecution roused greater attention than the cases against Tybeck. It gives the perspective that the authorities defended the doctrine of Atonement, whosoever attacked it. A connection between Geijer's view of the Atonement and that of Tybeck would, I think, be difficult to support.

The dismissal made Tybeck known, and contributions were given for him. We know the names of about 70 participants. Maybe Tybeck lost no money when he left the ministry, but with this

financial support he could continue printing his booklets and articles. A kind of circle of supporters formed around him and he wrote letters to many of them. I think it was the only connection between the friends of the New Church at that time. But not all of his friends were pleased by his manner of speaking. They thought that his polemical tone concealed the positive in the teaching of Swedenborg. His booklets were devoid of edification, they said. But he answered. If you will rouse people from false religion you have to use strong words. Also he was predominantly writing for ministers and they were so used to the polemical form that it was necessary, he said. And now he could speak with plain words. He was no longer so careful. Cautiousness takes all power away, he said.

He gave his opinions on what happened in the church. Earlier we touched upon his thoughts about the new explanation of the catechism. He wished to change it more in accordance with his views. He even commented on the proposal for a new book of the gospels. The word Trinity should disappear from the prayers. Otherwise the doctrine of the Atonement would be false. Sometimes the prayers are written so "that you must ask," he writes, "if our church has accepted the terrible ideas of blood" of the Moravians. The examination resulted in demands to change the constitution and banish the oath at ordination. As long as the confessions are there, there is no real freedom of research. To speak about a continued reformation would only be an empty phrase. Also he dared to say in 1824 that thanks to the books of Swedenborg, the spiritual meaning in the Scripture is revealed more clearly than before.

Tybeck continued his literary activity, and the authorities gave him attention. When he in 1826 printed a booklet (anonymously as usual) about the biblical creedal system, he was prosecuted once more. In this book he makes clear distinctions between a confession in which nothing but the words of Scripture are valid, and a confession in which the creeds are the frames within which you read the Holy Writ. He said directly that the creedal system is that established in the church. It is protected by the state, but false nevertheless. This is very serious, because the society is founded on religion and if the religion is false that must be injurious to the society.

This time the public prosecutor applied both for responsibility for denying the pure evangelic doctrine according to the law of freedom of the press, and for exile according to the law of penalty. But even this time he was declared not guilty. This was of the utmost importance, because the court or the jury said that this very clear criticism

of the connection of the Scripture and the creeds and the constitutional law of religion was not against the law of freedom of the press. This judgment raised a very animated debate about the connection between the Scripture and the creeds and the significance of the religion of the state. A Peter Wieselgren published a book titled *Which Is the Religion of Sweden?* In the debate there were different opinions on the question of how much importance the confessions really had for state and church in Sweden. We will not touch on this debate any further.

Tybeck did not cease with his criticism on the laws of religion in state and church. When he read a draft of a new law for the church in Sweden he took up his pen again. In this draft the minister at ordination was bound both to the Scripture and the Creeds. Tybeck wrote that the Holy Writ and the confessions are like day and night. He does not say now as he had earlier that the confessions refer to the Scripture. Now he is very clear in his opinion and in 1830 he is prosecuted again.

This time the public prosecutor had based his action thoroughly in Theology. Tybeck himself was not to make his defence. He got the lawyer S. L. Theorell, who in 1818 had criticized the chapter for his dismissal, to act as his defender. He developed the same argument in court. Pure evangelical doctrine is not the creed of the reformers, only the Scripture itself. The confessions are the tie for the church and the rule for the public service but not the well of the truth. Without freedom in religion all intellectual development would stop. Religion can't be devoid of freedom. Theorell concluded his speech with a statement that all could agree with. In his booklet Tybeck had expressed the same ideas for which he had three times before been declared not guilty. He could have added that the writer being nearly 80 years old would hardly change his mind. Even this time he was declared not guilty. This was in 1830, the same year that the triennial jubilee of Confessio Augustana was celebrated.

Tybeck continued his writings until 1834 and he also printed a little tract about religious libel cases, a topic he knew very well. Proceedings of this kind he found useless.

In 1837, the year when Tybeck died, the author Carl Jonas Love Almqvist was ordained. He also developed very critical ideas about the church, the creeds and the task the minister had in it, so the chapter had to take action. It is unlikely that he continued the line of argument from Tybeck. Tybeck had driven his ideas too provocatively to win supporters. Those who supported him did not always