Perichoresis

THE THEOLOGICAL JOURNAL *of* EMANUEL UNIVERSITY

VOLUME 17 | Issue 4 | Winter 2019

Patristic Thought in Byzantine & Protestant Theology

From Gregory Palamas and George Pachymeres *to* Luther, Calvin, Anglicans, and Anabaptists

Andre A. Gazal

Issue Editor

EMANUEL UNIVERSITY PRESS | SCIENDO

OVERVIEW

Perichoresis is the theological journal of Emanuel University. Published quarterly in conjunction with De Gruyter Open and occasionally with Refo500, *Perichoresis* focuses on historical, systematic, biblical, exegetic, pastoral, and applied theology, but also on religious studies, religious philosophy, and the history of Christianity.

INDEXING

Perichoresis is covered by ATLA Religion Database, Bibliographic Information Base in Patristics (BIBP), The Central European Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities (CEJSH), Celdes, Clarivate Analytics (formerly Thomson Reuters) in Emerging Sources Citation Index (ESCI), Clarivate Analytics (Web of Science, WoS), CNKI Scholar (China National Knowledge Infrastructure), China National Publications Import & Export Corporation (CNPIEC), Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ), Elton Bryson Stephens Company (EBSCO relevant databases, EBSCO Delivery Service), Elsevier SCOPUS, European Reference Index for the Humanities and Social Sciences (ERIH Plus), Google Scholar, Index Theologicus (University of Tübingen), J-Gate, JournalGuide, Microsoft Academic, Naviga (Softweco), Philosophy Documentation Center (Philosophy Research Index), PhilPapers, Primo Central (ExLibris), SCImago (SJR), Summon (Serial Solutions/ProQuest), Ulrich's Periodicals Directory/ulrichsweb, WorldCat (OCLC).

CONTENTS

sciendo

Perichoresis
Volume 17.4 (2019): 3–21
DOI: 10.2478/perc-2019-0025

ASPECTS OF THE REVELATION OF THE DIVINE IN ST. GREGORY PALAMAS' TREATISE *DE OPERATIONIBUS DIVINIS*

CHRISTOS TEREZIS, ELIAS TEMPELIS*

University of Patras, Hellenic Naval Academy

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we examine the concepts 'destination', 'revelation', 'foreknowledge', 'will', 'transmission', 'motion', and 'grace', as they appear in Gregory Palamas' treatise *De operationibus divinis*. According to the Christian theologian, these terms correspond to specific ways of God's manifestation, i.e. His natural and supernatural revelation. Since they illuminate God's energies, but not His essence, they are participated by the beings of the natural world. The first two terms mainly refer to a general version of the revelation, while the third contains epistemological elements as well and the fourth contains elements referring also to the divine will. The fifth term condenses the content of the afore-mentioned terms seen as an *ad extra* bestowment. By means of these concepts, Palamas preserves the ontological difference between the supernatural and the natural, while, at the same time, he defines the exact way of their communion, which excludes pantheism. He introduces into the divine realm the state of distinction, which, however, does not restrict its unity at all. He accepts the development of a metaphysical multitude, which is regulated by the divine uniqueness. What emerges is not a kind of Neoplatonic polytheism, but the infinite richness of the divine existence. Thus, Palamas steadily moves within the tradition founded by Ps.-Dionysius the Areopagite, Maximus the Confessor, John Damascene, and George Pachymeres, the main characteristic of which is ontological monism. This is a tradition which formulated common places as to the content, the concepts and the relevant methodology, while the distinction between negative and affirmative theology is dominant.

KEY WORDS: Destination, Revelation, Foreknowledge, Will, Transmission, Motion, Grace, Divine essence, Divine energies, Monism

Introduction

Gregory Palamas' treatise *De operationibus divinis* ('Περὶ θείων ἐνεργειῶν καὶ τῆς κατ' αὐτὰς μεθέξεως') was of particular interest concerning the Hesychast controversy. At the same time, this treatise consists in a scientific effort towards the absolutely exact specification of major Christian ontological and

* CHRISTOS TEREZIS (PhD 1985, University of Ioannina) is Professor of Ancient Greek and Byzantine Philosophy at the University of Patras, Greece. Email: terezis@upatras.gr. ELIAS TEMPELIS (PhD 1994, University College London) is Professor of Greek Philosophy at the Hellenic Naval Academy. Email: chrisdar@otenet.gr.

epistemological doctrines. As is known, it is one of those treatises, which the Archbishop of Thessalonica composed in 1342 with the same topic as to the general theoretical premises, while the second phase of the controversy was in full development with the consecutive persecutions by the Patriarch John Kalekas against him. [Concerning the history of the controversy, cf. Jugie 1931; Meyendorff 1953. For a combination of Gregory Palamas' historical and systematic approach with the era, during which he is active both ecclesiastically and as an author, see Podskalsky 1977: 124-173. As a great achievement of this researcher we stress the exactness of the points he made as to the way Palamas utilized the tradition prior to himself and mainly the tradition of Ps.-Dionysius the Areopagite. More generally, in the above pages we see the whole spiritual construction, which was formulated by the Byzantine thinker.] The main view which is formulated in its contents is that not only the essence of God but also His energies can be called 'deity', without implying the belief in the existence of two or many gods. In what follows we will examine the concepts 'Προορισμός' (Destination), 'Φανέρωσις' (Revelation), 'Πρόγνωσις' (Foreknowledge), 'Θέλησις' (Will), 'Μετάδοσις' (Transmission), 'Κίνησις' (Motion), and 'Χάρις' (Grace), as they appear in Palamas' treatise. All seven terms correspond to specific ways of God's manifestation, i.e. His natural and supernatural revelation or His procession ('πρόοδος') according to the terminology of the Neoplatonists and Ps.-Dionysius the Areopagite. [Within the frame of the Neoplatonic School, the term 'πρόοδος' (procession) was systematically dealt with by Proclus (412-485 A.D.). For instance, cf. Proclus 1963: pr. 25-39, pp. 28.21-42.7 (also Dodds, comm. *ad loc*., pp. 212-223); Trouillard 1972: 78-106 and 1982: 53-91; Beierwaltes 1979: 118-163. Within the frame of Christianity, Ps.-Dionysius the Areopagite systematically introduced the concept of 'procession' by means of his treatise *De divinis nominibus*. Cf. Gersh 1978: 217-229; Corsini 1962: 40-44; Roques 1983: 74-81, 101-111]. They do not denote the essence of God, but His energies manifested through His will and as to their intentional projection, they are participated by the beings of the created world. The first two terms mainly refer to a general version of the revelation, while the third contains epistemological elements as well and the fourth contains elements referring also to the divine will. In the fifth term the content of the first four terms is condensed and is capitalized as an *ad extra* bestowment. By means of these concepts, Gregory Palamas preserves the ontological difference between the supernatural and the created world, while, at the same time, he defines the exact way of their communion. This is a communion which definitely excludes pantheism. Therefore, the discussion is not about participation, which would introduce the mutation of the same ontological factor into a new kind of hypostasis. All this does not lead to the construction of an ontological pyramid with a hierarchy of superior

and inferior hypostases, according to the degree they possess a common essential substratum. Thus, Palamas simultaneously introduces into the divine realm the state of distinction, which, however, does not restrict its unity at all. We could, therefore, argue that he accepts the development of a metaphysical multitude. This, however, is regulated by the divine uniqueness, which is founded by means of self-constitutive terms, without external additions. What emerges, after all, is not a kind of Neoplatonic polytheism, but the infinite richness of the divine existence, not only in itself, but also concerning its *ad extra* renewable projections. Thus, the Hesychast theologian steadily moves within the tradition founded by Ps.-Dionysius the Areopagite, Maximus the Confessor, John Chrysostom, and George Pachymeres. The main characteristic of this tradition is not the naïve ontological monism, but the monism, the energy of which is manifest in many ways, determined by the infinity of the divine (cf., for instance, Hussey 1974). It should be noted that the manifestation of the divine infinity is not subject to any external or internal necessity, but is the projection of an unconditional freedom.

At the same time, our research aims at the formulation of a methodological proposal towards an analytic and synthetic approach to the abovementioned treatise, even within the microcosm of a restricted number of concepts. The proposal refers to the way concepts belonging to the same thematic field, as defined by the author and the tradition he represents, could be classified and analyzed consecutively on the basis of the principles of logic and coherent sequence. According to our proposed classification, we will examine whether each prior concept can consist in the source of the posterior one, which will be considered as the further development of its own source. In accordance with this line of thought, the first two concepts form a unity mainly based on the ontological factor, while the last three form another unity based on the intentional factor. It should be stressed here that within the frame of Eastern Christianity there is no hierarchy but succession between being and will. Such a sequence, anyway, however, clearly reduces a text to a system, to a research project with an internal causation. It should be noted that the treatise *De operationibus divinis* contains more than forty theological and philosophical concepts, thus proving its theoretical depth. The terms analyzed in Palamas' treatise *De operationibus divinis* more or less depict his theoretical principles and are mainly divided into two groups. The first group contains terms, like "Ἕν" (One), 'Μονάς' (Monad), 'Ἀγαθότης' (Goodness), 'Ἀιδιότης' (Eternity), 'Οὐσία' (Essence), 'Φύσις' (Nature), "Ὕπαρξις' (Existence), "Ἐνέργεια' (Energy), 'Διαίρεσις' (Division), 'Γέννεσις' (Generation), 'Ἐκπόρευσις' (Derivation), "Ὄν' (Being), 'Νοῦς' (Intellect), 'Πρόοδος' (Procession), and 'Αἰτία' (Cause), which are commonly found in the texts of Neoplatonist philosophers. The second

group consists of terms with a Christian content, like 'Ἀθανασία' (Immortality), 'Θεός' (God), 'Πρόσωπον' (Person), 'Θεότης' (Deity), 'Βασιλεία Θεοῦ' (Reign of God), 'Θέωσις' (Divination), and the terms examined in this paper. Our proposal is characterized as a 'conceptual restructuring' of a text, which possesses a systematic structure and theoretical foundations and formations the content of which is coherent and complete. Through our methodological proposal, we do not attempt to substitute it, but to highlight the possibilities concerning the meanings it contains.

Destination

A clearly theological term appearing in Palamas' text is 'προορισμός' (destination). Having a Neoplatonic content, as well, concerning its correspondence to 'providence' (cf. Proclus 1963: pr. 141, pp. 124.19-26), this term denotes the end of a human being which has been imposed by God and appears in the form of the predetermined course which the human being must follow. Its normative function, however, does not at all abolish the human free will. In its heretic version, it is presented as the absolute destination, according to which God absolutely predetermines whom he will vindicate and whom he will condemn, a distinction which excludes human freedom to an absolute degree in all activities and introduces deterministic schemes of salvation. This is a version which finally does not recognize the right of a human being to take any initiative at all, so the authentic moral 'labeling', either positive or negative, is marginalized. Within such a frame, every development is predetermined from the beginning, but this version is absolutely absent from the tradition represented by Palamas.

In his analysis of the term 'προορισμός', Palamas correlates it with the name of God, but stresses that it mainly denotes His properties and energies. This clarification is necessary, since every name used to describe God names some energy and refers to the supernatural being which contemplates and intervenes appropriately according to its own judgment in the totality of what exists. Contemplation consists in some energy, which is a destination and its initial specification is to be realized by the transcendent deity at a time defined by the deity itself. This is the principle of theological kairicity or of the kairicity of divine economy. The destination eternally exists together with the essence of God and is beginningless, uncreated, but not identical with it, because, apart from other metaphysical deviations, pantheism would be introduced (Cf. Palamas 1988b: chapter 8, 102.17-24. The term also appears in Ps.-Cyril of Alexandria 1864: 11, 1145b). The activating demiurgic divine energy would transfer divine essence to the created beings, even indirectly. This would result in the formation of a pyramid-like ontological climax of the same genus, simply constructed in terms of gradations.

Formulating his syllogism, Gregory Palamas renders clear that God's essence is uncreated, without making His grace as a result consist either in His suprasubstantial essence or in a created being. This distinction is an explicit clause for the avoidance both of simplifying identifications and of any possible downgrading. This remark has a clear ontological purpose, since Barlaam's followers and successors, following a different line of thought, hold that the destination or the destinations are either God's essence or created entities. (Cf. Palamas 1988b: 132.23-133.1. Concerning the theory of Eastern Christianity about unity and distinction within the frame of the Trinity, see Palamas 1988a: 65-95. Cf. Lison 1994: 57-60. With reference to the presence of this theory in Maximus the Confessor, see Töröner 2007). The Byzantine thinker considers this view to be unsubstantiated and unfounded and recalls to memory that the Church Fathers argue with no reservations that the destinations by nature accompany God, i.e. surround His existence and, at the same time, they are uncreated and belong not to the essence, but to the energy of God, as a consequence of the basic belief that God transcends them due to His natural superiority with reference to any relation (chapter 47). As derives from the particular analysis in the following passage, Palamas, after referring to Barlaam's successors, clarifies that he is in accordance with the Fathers:

> Οὕτω τοὺς προορισμούς, οὕτω τὴν σοφίαν, τὴν ἁγιότητα, τὴν ἀγαθότητα, τὴν θεότητα, ἃ πάντα φύσει μὲν οἱ ἅγιοι περὶ τὸν Θεόν φασι, καὶ ἄκτιστα οὐκ οὐσίας, ἀλλ' ἐνεργείας θείας ὄντα (διὸ καὶ τούτων ὑπερκεῖσθαί φασι κατ' οὐσίαν τὸν Θεόν, ὡς τῶν ὀνομαζομένων τὸ ὑπερώνυμον, καὶ τῶν αἰτιατῶν τὸ αἴτιον, καὶ τῶν μεθεκτῶν τὸ ὑπὲρ μετοχὴν παντάπασιν ὑπάρχον, καὶ τῶν ἀρχῶν τὸ ὑπεράρχιον), αὐτοὶ δὲ κτίσμα τούτων ἕκαστον, εἰ μὴ οὐσίαν αὐτὸ φαῖμεν, ἀποφαίνονται, καὶ ὡς ἄκτιστα ταῦτα λεγόντων ἡμῶν κατηγοροῦσιν. [The topic has already been posited in the fifth chapter of Ps.-Dionysius the Areopagite 1857: 821c. Cf. Semmelroth 1950.]

The human destination is a course predefined by God, but without being compulsory or strictly deterministic. Its main and primary aim is the revelation of His supernatural gifts to the world, a perspective which reaches its summit through the humanization of His Son. The revelation, however, consists, according to the cosmological example of Christianity, in the energy of God's revelation to those people who have the disposition to familiarize themselves with His principles—projections, even though not everybody absorbs it in a mechanistic way.

Revelation

The term 'φανέρωσις' (revelation) is one of the less usable terms in Palamas, generally denoting the state of every thing's emergence to being or becom-

ing, the revelation, the transition to a new level of presence. The author in fact identifies the revelation with God's arrival to the world of the created beings. It is the energy of God's revelation particularly to the saints and secondarily to the faithful people (chapter 49). Through this process, the ontological reality which is revealed here, too, is not God as His essence, but His grace and energy through the Holy Spirit, thus showing the divine presence in the natural and historical becoming. Palamas' relevant argumentation derives from the following passage:

> Ἀλλὰ καὶ ἡ τοῦ πανταχοῦ παρόντος ἔλευσις τί ἂν εἴη ἄλλο ἢ φανέρωσις ἀποκαλυπτομένου τοῖς ἀξίοις μυστικῶς; Οὐ γὰρ ἄλλοτε ἄλλοθεν ἥξει ἡ πανταχοῦ παροῦσα δύναμις, οὐδὲ μενεῖ που ἡ μηδαμοῦ. Ἀλλὰ τοῦτο ἔλευσίς ἐστι πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἐκείνου καὶ μονή, ἡ πρὸς αὐτὸν ἡμῶν δι' ἀποκαλύψεως ἄνοδος. Ἀποκαλύπτεται δὲ καὶ φανεροῦται τίς; Ἡ οὐσία τοῦ Θεοῦ; Ἄπαγε. Τοιγαροῦν ἡ χάρις ἐστὶ καὶ ἡ ἐνέργεια τοῦ Πνεύματος, δι' ἧς ἐπιφαίνεται καὶ ἐνοικεῖ τοῖς ἀξίοις ὁ Θεός. (Cf. Palamas 1988b: 134.1-2. Concerning the presence of the term 'φανέρωσις' in Neoplatonism, cf., for instance, Proclus 1968-97: II, 23.14-25.6.)

The first proof of the revelation of the Holy Spirit in the world of sense-perception took place on the river Jordan on the day Jesus Christ was baptized by John, where, apart from the Son and the Holy Spirit 'like a dove', the Father participated as well.

The second proof is on the day of Pentecost, during the descent of the Holy Spirit upon the disciples of Christ and the official foundation of Church, i.e. the historical institution where God and humans meet dialectically and give rise to a new perspective with reference to the eschatological completeness.

It should also be noted that, according to the Church doctrine, the revelation of God takes place continuously, when every faithful person can use in the most appropriate way the gifts of the Holy Spirit, cultivating in their consciousness the thorough acceptance of the benefaction on behalf of the Father—God.

The term 'φανέρωσις' gives shape to the optimistic message concerning God's permanent presence, in the frame of which humans both in the present and the future meet Him and fully participate in His love and providence. This is a condition which broadens the existential horizons of the humans.

The revelation of God to the faithful is considered to be the outcome of His foreknowledge of what He has created. As a whole, the general scheme of divine presence for Gregory Palamas moves within the frame of the personal energy, which derives from the divine nature and is uncreated and without beginning.

Foreknowledge

The term 'πρόγνωσις' (foreknowledge), as used by Palamas, refers to the transcendent reality and epistemology, while its application is universal. From a generally Christian point of view, 'πρόγνωσις' is defined as the complete knowledge of the future, an epistemological category which exclusively belongs to an absolute degree to God. Given certain conceptual transformations, the term was used by the Neoplatonic School as well, in a way similar to the use employed by the Christians. [Concerning the presence of this term in the texts of the Neoplatonists, cf., for instance, Proclus 1985-86: 88.3; 1908: 123.17; 1960: 37.17, 39.8. Proclus (1968-97: I, 69.9-77.4) presents the thorough knowledge of the supreme principle and the particular gods as connected with their providence for the beings of the world of sense-perception].

Examining the term, Basil the Great analyzes it as expressing the predestined course decided by God with reference to a phenomenon relating to a being. In particular, he argues that God's foreknowledge concerning a particular being consists in the existence of a certain beginning as a constitutive starting point, under the presupposition that there exists an end, which consists in the realization of what was known in advance (Palamas 1988b: chapter 8, 102.25-28. Cf. Basil the Great 1857: 4, 680b). According to this line of thought, we observe by means of specific transformations the course of human history, as an implementation or a non-implementation of this planning. Mankind commences with a preexisting principle, which offers it the logical foundation of creation and its subsequent course. This is human history and will have a particularly conventional end, which at the same time consists in the starting point of future life and of the encounter with God, the divinization at 'the very end of the age'. The teleological—eschatological example is present here and is reduced to the particular content of the continuously renewed dialectic between the divine and the humans.

Based on his previous reference to one aspect of the term, Gregory Palamas formulates his syllogism by examining the constitutive status of foreknowledge, arguing that it is one of God's natural energies (chapter 9). Foreknowledge is uncreated, without, however, being an essence—nature. It contains all concomitant properties of the divine nature, which are not natures and do not result in even an elementary composition in its internal self. Due to His self-constitutive terms, God is an absolute unity. Consisting in an energy of God, foreknowledge is proven to be without beginning and is not subject to hierarchical specifications (chapter 46). This proof is contained in the following passage in a coherent and concise way: 'Ἀλλ' ὡς ἐκ γεωμετρικοῦ πορίσματος κἀντεῦθεν ἄναρχος ἡ τοῖς ἁγίοις ἐγγινομένη πρὸς Θεοῦ ἐνέργεια δείκνυται· τῆς γὰρ τῶν μηδαμῶς ὄντων προγνώσεως, μόνου

τοῦ εἰδότος πάντα πρὶν γενέσεως αὐτῶν ἀνάρχως οὔσης, μεταλαγχάνουσιν οἱ ἔνθεοι προφῆται.' Based on this ontological clause, the Christian theologian underlines that Barlaam's followers appear to be hesitant concerning this view and formulate their doubts in the form of the following question: «Is foreknowledge a divine essence, which the Lord transmitted to David, as well?». However, in order to prove the absurdity of their views, Gregory Palamas argues that the illuminated prophets accept the gifts from divine foreknowledge. This is distinguished as a way of manifestation only in the transcendent field of the ontological reality which knows everything before its own generation, i.e. of God Himself. The reference is made in order to be shown that the wrong usage of theological terms, whether on purpose or not, leads to an epistemological impasse and to heresies, as in the case of Barlaam the Calabrian and his followers (Palamas 1988b: 132.12-15. Cf. Meyendorff 1959, which is a classical study about Gregory Palamas). As with the other concepts, the Archbishop of Thessalonica posits as a normative principle the implementation of strict epistemological criteria, which are subject to the specifications imposed by the ontological realism, as a distinction in unity.

Since God's foreknowledge expresses the complete knowledge of the future as to the totality of the created world, it entails an intention on his behalf as an agent, the primary goal of which is the realization of a certain fact with specific meanings, in a way analogous to the prevailing circumstances. Thus, His energy or act is proven to be 'purposeful', aiming at securing the domination of the Good in the world of natural and historical becoming, within the perspective of the teleological—eschatological example adopted by the Christian doctrine.

Will

Palamas also uses 'θἐλησις' (will), a theological term with a clear philosophical meaning since Antiquity. It mainly belongs to the field of moral philosophy denoting that a certain goal is striven for and distinguishing the efforts on behalf of a particular subject or the means the subject uses for the realization of the goal. [For a philosophical examination of will implemented on the way the relation between the divine and the natural universe is defined, cf. Proclus 1903-06: II, 410.8-412.10]. Commencing his syllogisms, the Hesychast theologian tries to correlate God's essence and energy with His will. God's name is of an energy, in the sense that as a metaphysical entity it exists eternally and acts continuously and incessantly. The effects of His energies include whatever can be observed in the surrounding world, i.e. everything that becomes or is a phenomenon. That which becomes is created and the presupposition for its existence is the will of God. The will coexists eternally with God's essence, is beginningless and uncreated, but not the es-

sence of God, as is accepted by Barlaam's followers, who thus adopt a strict monism (cf. Palamas 1988b: chapter 8, 102.6-103.4).

Examining the topic in a wider sense, we would note that the will denotes a predetermined course, which has been defined on the basis of internal functions to be followed by a subject or an object. However, it belongs to the field of relations, as well. Concerning human beings, God is the supreme agent who defines the course of their existence, the temporal duration of this course and its aim. As this course unfolds, the human subject will go through a series of transitory phases, which are characterized by a mutability attributing correspondingly a degree of relative easiness or difficulty as to the realization of what has been striven for. God's will finally aims at the divination of the humans by grace, their union with their establishing source. Anyway, the possibility of divination will be judged beforehand from the degree the humans themselves will treat these phases from the point of view of their interpretation and action. The continuous struggle for the qualitative improvement of the personal evolution and the denial of the autonomy of the 'self' will lead humans as faithful persons to perfection and, thus, to the realization of the goal of the will.

The theoretical position concerning the divine energies as including the will and the willed, finally aims at expressing the non-existence of the twofold deity and at stressing that through their presence and the way they take place, every Christian must strive by means of their way of life to be reduced to the one, indivisible and con-substantial Trinity, avoiding every subjectively dogmatic or heretic disposition. At the same time, they reflect God's desire to transmit to humans whatever is necessary for their existential fullness. As derives from the following passage, Palamas, in accordance with the doctrine of Maximus the Confessor in the treatise *Ad Marinum*, accepts that '«τοῦ φυσικοῦ θελήματος καὶ τῆς οὐσιώδους ἐνεργείας ἀναιρουμένης οὔτε Θεὸς ἔσται οὔτε ἄνθρωπος»˙ ὅθεν καὶ σαφῶς ἐλέγχονται δεινῶς ἀθεΐᾳ περιπίπτοντες οἱ διὰ τὸ τῆς θείας ἐνεργείας ἄκτιστον καὶ οὐσιῶδες ἡμῖν διθεΐαν ἐγκαλοῦντες, ὡς αὐτοὶ ταύτην ἀθετοῦντες' (*op. cit.*, 103.16-23; cf. Maximus the Confessor 1865b: 201 a-b). The transition from will to transmission is identified as the most natural outcome.

Transmission

Palamas also deals with the term 'μετάδοσις' (transmission), the specification of which is clearly Neoplatonic. It denotes the transfer of motion from a particular subject or object to another. Developing his argumentation, the Christian theologian relates transmission with the way of God's existence. He argues that God presents Himself by means of His providential procession. This revelation, however, means that to one He appears as a message of wisdom, to another as a message of knowledge, to another as faith and

gift of healing and so on with reference to any particular gift. The form of these distinctions consists in the multifaceted energy of God, which is analogically multiplied by means of His self-sufficient and inexhaustible goodness. What comes to the fore is not a mechanistic standard example implemented in theology and anthropology, and, of course, no strict standardizations apply. Due to the above distinctions, the transmissions have the presuppositions to characterize the properties of Jesus Christ's divine activity as a human, i.e. His ability as a God-man to attribute divine character as well to His works. In the case, we refer to works of this kind, the Father and the Spirit do not participate, apart from their philanthropy and favor, which took place in the Incarnation, the most important phase of divine economy. This means that the other two persons of the Holy Trinity do not acquire temporality or historicity (Palamas 1988b: Chapter 3, 97.18-98.27; cf. Ps.-Dionysius the Areopagite 1857: II, 6, 644c). This is a topic systematically dealt with by Palamas (1988a), where the Incarnation is characterized as a distinction within the frame of the Trinity.

Alternatively, the term 'μετάδοσις' is examined from the point of view of the reign of God, the content of which is both timely and eschatological. Utilizing fragments from Maximus the Confessor's *Capita Theologica*, Palamas argues:

> Ἄκουε δὴ καὶ τοῦ τὰ θεῖα σοφοῦ Μαξίμου λέγοντος· 'ἔστι τι πρᾶγμα ὑπὲρ αἰῶνας ἡ τοῦ Θεοῦ βασιλεία· οὐ γὰρ θέμις φθάνεσθαι ὑπὸ αἰώνων ἢ χρόνων τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ βασιλείαν· ταύτην δὲ πιστεύομεν εἶναι τὴν τῶν σῳζομένων κληρονομίαν', ἣν ἀλλαχοῦ φησι, 'τῶν προσόντων τῷ Θεῷ φυσικῶς κατὰ χάριν μετάδοσιν', ἀλλαχοῦ δ' αὖθις, 'τὸ εἶδος αὐτὸ τῆς θεϊκῆς ὡραιότητος'.

According to Maximus the Confessor, the reign of God is a state which transcends even the centuries, i.e. the absolute transcendent states, and thus is not subject to temporal restrictions (Maximus the Confessor 1865a: 2, 86, 1165a-b. In the same text, however, it is stressed that despite its transcendence, the divine reign will be participated by those who will deserve to conquer their salvation and existential fullness). From the anthropological point of view, in essence it is the heritage, so to say, of those who acquire their existential fullness and participate in divine providence. This heritage is called 'natural transmission of the properties of God by grace' or 'divine beauty', because the heavenly Father sends His people through the Holy Spirit gifts, which contain elements of the Beauty, the Good, and, as such, they prove that every Christian is prepared to accept divine salvation. Of particular interest here is that the ontological element is combined with the aesthetic, so that the selected example concerning divine economy is not univocal, but holistic (chapter 17). Formal mechanisms, chance and automations are always absent (Palamas 1988b: 110.1-3. Cf. Maximus the Confessor

1865a: 2, 93, 1169a, a passage which is cited *verbatim*. Concerning the presence of the term 'μετάδοσις' in Neoplatonism, cf., for instance, Proclus 1968-87: VI, 8.6-9.9).

Thus, it has become clear that for Gregory Palamas the transmission as manifestation of bestowment cannot but be related to the manifestation of God in actuality and appear in many ways, each time aiming at a particular outcome. By means of the plurality of these divine revelations, the participation of all faithful people in the divine energy is possible, a process continuously taking place within the frame of divine economy through the bestowment of gifts by the Holy Spirit.

Motion

For the transmission of the divine bestowments to the natural world 'motion' needs to be activated. In one of his references to affirmative theology or divine economy, Gregory Palamas uses the term 'motion', thus bringing through its content to the fore the *ad extra* momentum of the Holy Trinity. In the field of the world of sense-experience this term denotes the propellent energy which contributes to the change of the standpoint of a body in relation to the other bodies, which at that time remain unmoved within space. Evidently, however, such content cannot be attributed to divine motion, which is independent from and transcendent to every condition of space and change. As in other cases, as well, the term receives broader meanings included in the perspective posited by theology, which excludes the transitory processes within the Holy Trinity. At the beginning of his thoughts about motion, the Byzantine thinker relates it with energy, which is equivalent to and not depended upon divine nature-essence. For this reason, he argues that it is the drastic and essential of the divine nature-essence. Thus, a form of distinction within the divine comes to the fore, where nature-essence is characterized as active (Palamas 1988b: 112.29-32). It should be noted that Gregory Palamas cites John Damascene (1864: 1048a): 'Ἰστέον ὡς ἄλλο ἐνέργεια καὶ ἄλλο ἐνεργητικόν. Ἐνέργεια μὲν οὖν ἐστιν ἡ δραστικὴ καὶ οὐσιώδης τῆς φύσεως κίνησις, ἐνεργητικὸν δὲ ἡ φύσις, ἐξ ἧς καὶ ἡ ἐνέργεια πρόεισιν'. Through these relations hierarchy is excluded.

In another thematic unit, Gregory Palamas relates divine motion with divine energy again, attempting at showing that the term 'differentia' cannot be attributed to both these conditions. Of course, this attribution is possible within the natural world, since the effects of motion are various and cause differentiae as to whatever did not previously exist. It brings to the fore new conditions and changes what was already granted as given. Such a transition to a new ontological condition or development is not logical to appear either in the divine essence or in the manifestations of divine grace,

which are characterized for their absolute ontological integrity, the foundation of their own selves. Divine motion in this case possesses the place of a way of existence of divine essence, just as it happens exactly with divine power and divine energy. It should be again stressed that it is nowhere underlined that these three conditions are inferior to divine nature-essence. It should be noted that the divine power-energy-motion is not impelled by a certain external factor and does not suffer any intervention, that is, it is not subject to necessities. Its absolute character is preserved, as it exactly also happens with the divine nature-essence (cf. Palamas 1988b: 114.10-14). Here, too, citation is made to the same treatise by John Damascene (1864: 949a). It should be noted that the term 'motion' appears exhaustively in the Neoplatonist Proclus with similar meanings (cf. the emblematic study by Gersh 1973).

Finally, Gregory Palamas relates motion with Jesus Christ's twofold nature, the divine and the human. Therefore, the Incarnated Divine Word has two motions, the justification being that there is no nature without power, energy and motion. It is activated through both motions and, thus, expresses the supreme condition of the divine supernatural Revelation, which functions as a salvation for humans (cf. Palamas 1988b: 114.14-19). Once again, citation is made to the same treatise by John Damascene (1864: 1057a). [Concerning the concept of motion in Christianity, see, indicatively, Gersh 1978: 243-253].

On the basis of what has been exposed so far, it follows that motion, as a dynamic mode of existence of the divine, will be accompanied by personal and intentional conditions. These will clearly be manifested by means of bestowments, which will depict the freedom of their bearer and will aim at the existential fulfillment of their recipients. An expression of this is the term 'grace', by means of which motion is filled by qualitative characteristics and thus any neutral ontology is excluded. On the other hand, the Christian exemplar is teleological in all respects.

Grace of God

The 'grace of God' ('χάρις Θεοῦ') is basically a theological term without specific philosophical meanings, which is used by Gregory Palamas particularly in his work *De operationibus divinis*. According to the Christian doctrine this term generally denotes the eternal manifestation of God's love and mercy to humans, already since the time of their creation as a natural species of a particular constructive nature, evidently rational. Simultaneously and in a specific way there is an expression of the salvational—teleological work which takes place in every human being through Jesus Christ, as depicting the historified Son and Word of God. It is a bestowment which increasingly cultivates the existential quality through the exemplar of Christ, which pre-

pares for every human being particularly the presuppositions to conquer eternal life. In a way, it is the intervening condition through which the dialectics between the divine and the human develops and enhances, having intentional characteristics far from mechanistic or neutral communications. The Christian theologian initially mentions that the Spirit of God poured out to any natural entity and thus its grace became hypostatized within the created world. However, this ontological 'opening' takes place under the condition that the grace of the Holy Spirit is and eternally remains created and that conclusively it will belong to the ontological category of divine energy and not to that of effects. In order to reaffirm this, Gregory Palamas cites Basil the Great of Caesarea and John the Chrysostom, according to whom the grace of God which pours out is not a produced reality. By means of the utilization of these positions he is led to the conclusive estimation that the divine grace is uncreated, as deriving from the uncreated essence of the three uncreated divine Persons.

> Πῶς οὖν κτίσμα τὸ ἐκ τοῦ πληρώματος ἐκείνου τῆς θεότητος, εἰ μὴ καὶ τὸ πλήρωμα ἐκεῖνο κτίσμα, ὃ συμβαίνει, φεῦ, τοῖς κτιστὴν τὴν θεοποιὸν χάριν λέγουσι τοῦ πνεύματος; Πῶς δ' αὖ τὸ ἐκχεόμενον ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος οὐκ ἄκτιστον, εἰ μὴ καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ πνεῦμα; Καίτοι Βασίλειος ὁ μέγας, «ἐξέχεε τοῦτο», φησίν, «ὁ θεός, οὐκ ἔκτισεν, ἐχαρίσατο, οὐκ ἐδημιούργησεν, ἔδωκεν, οὐκ ἐποίησεν». Ὁ δὲ Χρυσόστομος πατήρ, «οὐχ ὁ θεός», φησίν, «ἀλλ' ἡ χάρις ἐκχεῖται». Οὕτως ὁμολογουμένως ἄκτιστος ἡ χάρις (Palamas 1988b: 121.17-26).

In this passage, Palamas following his usual practice combines the historical and the systematic elements striving by means of this holistic way to reinforce the objectivity of the views he defends. He thus appears as a consistent follower of a formed tradition without any tendency of innovation.

Advancing his syllogisms, Palamas approaches the concept under the anthropological prism and refers to those people who participate in the deifying grace of God. Initially, he argues that, in order to avoid pantheism, every man who receives divine grace possesses its properties by means of participation. Without ceasing to be created and finite according to nature, he becomes uncreated, beginningless and endless according to grace. As Maximus the Confessor emphatically notes, those who are worth participating in this divine projection, become small gods exactly because of the leading ontological content of the grace of God which is emitted. In other words, the timeless becomes immanent in the timely. But those who do not accept the grace of God, exactly on the basis of what the followers of Barlaam argue about themselves, downgrade the deifying donation of the Holy Spirit to something created. In his estimation, these thinkers recognize under such a prism the revelations of this divine Person and, consequently, its supra-

essential essence. Here the Byzantine thinker is based on the factor of the non-hierarchical distinction of the divine in its unity.

> καὶ τοὺς μὲν ἀπὸ τούτων αὐτὸν εἰδότας καὶ ὑμνοῦντας θεοσεβεῖς, τοὺς δὲ καὶ μετέχοντας αὐτῶν καὶ ἐνεργοῦντας τῇ μετουσίᾳ κατ' αὐτὰς θεοὺς ἀπεργαζόμενον κατὰ χάριν ἀνάρχους καὶ ἀτελευτήτους, ὡς ὁ πολὺς τὰ θεῖα Μάξιμος ἐν πολλοῖς καὶ διὰ πολλῶν ἀποδείκνυσι λόγων (...) Ἐκ τούτων τοίνυν τῶν λόγων οἱ τῇ τοῦ θεοῦ χάριτι ἀντικείμενοι καὶ εἰς κτίσμα κατασπῶντες τὴν καὶ τοὺς μετόχους ὑπερφυεῖς ποιοῦσαν καὶ ἀξίας θείας μεταδιδοῦσαν θεοποιὸν δωρεὰν τοῦ πνεύματος κραταιῶς ἐξελεγχόμενοι, χάριν ἄκτιστον τὴν ὑπερούσιον οὐσίαν τοῦ θεοῦ φασι (Palamas 1988b: 122.27-123.2, 123.18-22).

In this passage the concepts used by Palamas are already encountered in the Neoplatonic texts, where the concept of 'participation' is dominant and defines relations and distinctions between the two worlds. However, from the point of view of cosmotheory, the difference of the Christian thinker from the Neoplatonists is clear, since he insists on monotheism and does not adopt polytheism at all.

On the basis of this line of thought, Palamas continues his analysis by stressing that the uncreated grace is not identical as to its particularity with the essence of God, exactly as an extension of the way that his essence is not identical with his uncreated energy. This distinction, in accordance with the context of his general positions, makes clear that ultimately grace is common to the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit and that through its common manifestation takes place the divinisation of man, which evidently is not due only to one Person.

> Κοινῆς οὖν καὶ μιᾶς ὑπαρχούσης χάριτος πατρός, υἱοῦ καὶ πνεύματος, καὶ μάλιστα καθ' ἣν ἡ θέωσις τελεῖται, ὁ χάριν θεοῦ περιφραστικῶς τὸν θεὸν εἰπών, τὸν ἐν τρισὶ γνωριζόμενον ὑποστάσεσι περιφραστικῶς ἐδήλωσε (Palamas 1988b: 133.12-16).

Apart from having clear ontological orientations referring to the relations of the three Persons of the Holy Trinity, this passage is interesting from the epistemological point of view as well, since it refers to the limits of the human abilities of conceptualizing and naming. The adverb 'περιφραστικῶς' denotes that the most profound being of the divine cannot be depicted by means of exact terms by humans.

He clarifies that Akindynos, as a follower of Barlaam and responsible for more serious theological and logical fallacies, argues that the divine grace is only the Son or the Holy Spirit. We would note that by means of this view these two Persons of the Holy Trinity are clearly downgraded ontologically in relation to the Father. The deviations of Akindynos continue since he cites the argumentation of Maximus the Confessor and estimates that by

means of a typical denoting of his readings, those who receive the divine grace could be characterized as becoming uncreated. The Hesychast theologian stresses that uncreated is only the divine grace as divine energy and that its distinction from the divine essence is that it functions as participated.

> ἀμεθέκτου τῆς οὐσίας οὔσης τοῦ υἱοῦ, λείπεται κἀνταῦθα τὴν χάριν εἶναι τὴν μετεχομένην, δηλονότι τὴν θεοποιὸν ἐνέργειαν. Ταύτην ἄρα θείαν καὶ ἄκτιστον καὶ ἀεὶ οὖσαν ἐκ τοῦ ἀεὶ ὄντος ὁ ἅγιος προεῖπεν (Palamas 1988b: 133.31-34).

This text excludes any relation of hierarchy within the divine mode of existence.

It should be added that the spiritual circle of Akindynos excludes the uncreated also from the divine grace. He simply uses texts from the Christian tradition in order to underline the theological issues according to his view. According to Palamas the participation in the uncreated does not also denote reception of this property. Man does not cease to remain a man.

In his following syllogism, Palamas moves within the same direction. Initially, he definitely excludes the revelation or the manifestation of the divine essence by any Person of the Holy Trinity. In any case, this is a distinction between the imparticibility of the divine essence—divine Persons and the particibility of the divine grace, which is shown to be established to all those who are worth to participate in the divine charismas. In order to bring to the fore a, so to say, divine functionalism, he stresses that grace derives from the Father and is bestowed by means of the Son.

> Ἀποκαλύπτεται δὲ καὶ φανεροῦται τίς; Ἡ οὐσία τοῦ θεοῦ; Ἄπαγε. Τοιγαροῦν ἡ χάρις ἐστὶ καὶ ἡ ἐνέργεια τοῦ πνεύματος, δι' ἧς ἐπιφαίνεται καὶ ἐνοικεῖ τοῖς ἀξίοις ὁ θεός. Χάριν μὲν οὖν θεοῦ περιφραστικῶς φαίη ἄν τις τὸν ἐν τρισὶν ὑποστάσεσι προσκυνούμενον θεόν. Ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐπειδὰν προσκέηται τὸ εἶναι ταύτην ἐκ θεοῦ. Καὶ χάριν δὲ υἱοῦ τὸν υἱὸν λέγειν περιφραστικῶς, καὶ χάριν πνεύματος τὸ πνεῦμα, τὸ προσιστάμενον οὐδέν (Palamas 1988b: 134.6-13).

Here, too, Palamas by means of the adverb 'περιφραστικῶς' touches upon the limits of the human capabilities of cognition and expression.

In any way, however, grace, despite its participable character, preserves its absolutely divine content and is registered, from a certain point onwards, in what we would define as metaphysics of immanence, i.e. within the perspective of divine economy, which by moving in a salvational way, aims at the qualitative transformation of man towards the better.

> Ἡμῶν οὖν λεγόντων ὡς ἡ τῆς θεώσεως χάρις ἔστιν ὅτε καὶ θεότης παρὰ τῶν πατέρων λέγεται, ἐπεὶ καὶ θεοὶ ἀπὸ ταύτης οἱ ταύτης εὐμοιρήσαντες τῆς χάριτος, αὕτη δὲ οὔτε οὐσία τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστι κατ' αὐτοὺς ἐκείνους τοὺς πατέρας οὔτε ἄγγελος

> οὔτε τι τῶν τὴν χάριν δεχομένων—χάρις γὰρ καὶ θεοποιὸς δωρεά ἐστι τοῦ πνεύματος. (Palamas 1988b: 135.31-136.2).

It should be noted that according to a standard tradition in Christianity founded in a structurally systematic way already since Ps.-Dionysius the Areopagite, angels are not gods, but created beings, the cognitive capabilities of which as to the knowledge of the divine are restricted. It should generally be noted that the tradition of the Christian Church has dealt with the grace of God already since its beginning and this topic is connected with the totality of its theoretical objects. As an indication only, we cite the studies by Lossky (1962), where the grace of God is connected with wider epistemological matters, and Gilson (1969: 85-109, 154-174), where the grace of God is mainly connected with divine providence. It should be noted that the latter researcher mainly uses theologians from the Christianity of the West, while frequent and well-targeted are his references to the ancient Greek philosophy, as well.

Conclusions

The following conclusions can be drawn from the present study:

(a) Palamas' dogmatic and at the same time apologetic treatise *De operationibus divinis* could consist in a complete and coherent theological and, to some extent, philosophical handbook, throughout a certain conceptual and thematic restructuring. It contains all those terms which are necessary for the foundation of the dogmatic doctrine of Eastern Christianity, with its necessary logical branches. The conceptual richness was particularly important at an opportune time, since this treatise was composed during a period in which the Christian Orthodox tradition had exactly clarified its aims and had incorporated its teaching in its necessary conceptual frames. Thus, it consists in a system of knowledge with a solid foundation and an internal causation; therefore, it possesses the presuppositions to formulate its argumentation, in contrast to all other Christians who choose different theoretical routes.

(b) As a whole, the treatise is to a large extent based on philosophical material from the Platonic, the Aristotelian and the Neoplatonic tradition, even though the character of the concepts we have examined in this paper is rather clearly Christian. This support is undoubtedly necessary. Even though Christianity has very carefully defined its own references, the assistance on behalf of the Greek thought was necessary at least in terms of language. On the other hand, topics like negative and affirmative theology, the difference between Hence and Thence, the distinction between the transcendent and the productive aspect of the divine are *loci communi* within the ancient Greek and the theological tradition, while their elaboration reached its summit in the frame of the Neoplatonic School. Thus, one could indirectly but neces-

sarily include among the *desiderata* concerning research the question as to whether Palamas' acquaintance with this tradition was immediate or intermediate. This topic should be dealt with carefully concerning all Church Fathers, since the dialogue between Hellenism and Christianity in its broad sense is necessary to be exactly defined, even for the sake of the history of philosophy. It should be noted, however, that the existing evidence about his study of a wide range of subjects in Aristotelian philosophy can be easily verified due to the exactness of his use of what belongs to the Aristotelian *Organon*.

(c) Palamas' theoretical aim which was at stake could be characterized as the rational structuring of metaphysics. His exhaustive use of the terms is not accidental. His text is far beyond the perspective and the requirements of a treatise restricted to dogmatic issues and consists in an essay of a wider range with philosophical ambitions and an insistence on methodology. In this sense, we would hesitate to accept that he is absolutely bound by the restrictions of negative and affirmative theology. He formulates premises and syllogisms which can be logically analyzed and are based on argumentation. Therefore, despite the undeniable priority of theological realism, the thinking subject does not remain inactive, but elaborates on the issues of faith with emphasis on details. This elaboration, however, never transcends human limits. It simply touches the transcendent by means of an analogy, which renders the ambivalences legitimate. The mystical dimensions of faith belong to the responsibility of intuitive reduction. This is a topic which the Archbishop of Thessalonica deals with mainly in his treatises under the title *Defensio Hesychastarum*. Our estimation is that the treatise *De operationibus divinis* as a whole is of major philosophical interest concerning a topic which, of course, does not abolish at all its divine presuppositions and reductions. Therefore, the presence of the same terms both in the Neoplatonic texts, for instance, and the Christian ones does not mean that they serve the same theoretical purpose. After all, the Neoplatonists adopt the polytheistic system, while the Christians adhere to monotheism.

As a general epilogue, we cite Vladimir Lossky's following remark, which defines the range of human knowledge as is affirmed in the Christianity both of the East and the West:

> L'intellect ne pourra montrer in via sa superiorité sur la volonté, s'il ne renonce à la connaissance. En effet, comme fin dernière où les êtres doués d'intelligence trouveront leur repos, Dieu ne peut être connu que dans la ténèbre et par l'inconnaissance. Dans cette perspective de l'ascension vers un terme transcendant toujours cherché et jamais trouvé, la théognosie de Maître Eckhart se rencontre avec l'apophase extatique de Gregoire de Nysse, inconnue aux occidentaux du vive siècle (Lossky 1998: 196).

The Hesychast theologian moves with strict consistency within this frame, without abolishing the efforts of human composition. He preserves exactly what we would characterize as theological realism.

Bibliography

Basil the Great (1857) Contra Eunomium. In Migne JP (ed) *Patrologia Cursus Completus* (Series Graeca), Paris: Imprimerie Catholique, volume 29, pp. 497-774.

Beierwaltes W (1979) *Proklos: Grundzüge seiner Metaphysik*. Philosophische Abhandlungen. Frankfurt am Main: Klostermann.

Corsini E (1962) *Il trattato de divinis nominibus dello Pseudo-Dionigi e i commenti neoplatonici al Parmenide*. Torino: Università de Torino.

Gersh S (1973) *Κίνησις ἀκίνητος: a study of spiritual motion in the philosophy of Proclus*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.

Gersh S (1978) *From Iamblichus to Eriugena*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.

Gilson É (1969) *L' esprit de la philosophie médiévale*. Paris: J. Vrin.

Hussey HE (1974) The Persons—Energy Structure in the Theology of St. Gregory Palamas. *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 18: 22-43.

John Damascene (1864) Expositio fidei orthodoxae. In Migne JP (ed) *Patrologia Cursus Completus* (Series Graeca), Paris: Imprimerie Catholique, volume 94, pp. 790-1227.

Jugie M (1931) La controverse palamite (1341-1368). *Échos d' Orient* 30: 397-421.

Lison J (1994) *L'esprit répandu*. Paris: Cerf.

Lossky V (1962) *Vision de Dieu*. Neuchâtel: Delachaux and Nestlé.

Lossky V (1998) *Théologie Négative et Connaissance de Dieu chez Maître Eckhart*. Paris: J. Vrin.

Maximus the Confessor (1865a) Capita Theologica. In Migne JP (ed) *Patrologia Cursus Completus* (Series Graeca). Paris: Imprimerie Catholique, volume 90, pp. 1124-1173.

Maximus the Confessor (1865b) Opuscula theologica et polemica ad Marinum. In Migne JP (ed) *Patrologia Cursus Completus* (Series Graeca). Paris: Imprimerie Catholique, volume 91, pp. 9-285.

Meyendorff J (1953) Les débuts de la controverse hésychaste. *Byzantion* 23: 87-120.

Meyendorff J (1959) *Introduction à l'étude de Grégoire Palamas*. Paris: Éditions de Seuil.

Palamas G (1988a) Περὶ ἑνώσεως καὶ διακρίσεως. In Χρήστου Π (ed) *Γρηγορίου του Παλαμά, Συγγράμματα*, volume 2 (first edition published in 1966), Θεσσαλονίκη: Κυρομάνος, pp. 69-95.

Palamas G (1988b) De operationibus divinis. In Χρήστου Π (ed) *Γρηγορίου του Παλαμά, Συγγράμματα*, volume 2 (first edition published in 1966), Θεσσαλονίκη: Κυρομάνος, pp. 96-136.

Podskalsky G. (1977) *Theologie und Philosophie in Byzanz*, München: Becksche Verlagsbuchhandlung.

Proclus (1903-06) In Platonis Timaeum Commentaria. Diehl E (ed). Vols. 1-3. Leipzig: Teubner, (repr. Hakkert, Amsterdam 1965).

Proclus (1908) In Platonis Cratylum commentaria. Pasquali G (ed). Leipzig: Teubner.

Proclus (1960) De providentia et fato et eo quod in nobis ad Theodorum Mechanicum. In Boese H (ed) *Procli Diadochi Tria Opuscula*, Berlin: W. de Gruyter, pp. 117-171.

Proclus (1963) Elementatio Theologica. In Dodds ER (ed) *The Elements of Theology* (repr. 1992). Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Proclus (1968-97) *Theologia Platonica*. In Saffrey HD and Westerink LG (eds) *Théologie platonicienne*, vols. 1-6. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Proclus (1985-86) In Platonis Alcibiadem I. In Segonds AP (ed) *Sur le premier Alcibiade de Platon*, Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Ps.-Cyril of Alexandria (1864) De Trinitate. In Migne JP (ed) *Patrologia Cursus Completus* (Series Graeca), Paris: Imprimerie Catholique, volume 77, pp. 1119-1174.

Ps.-Dionysius the Areopagite (1857) De divinis nominibus. In Migne JP (ed) *Patrologia Cursus Completus* (Series Graeca), Paris: Imprimerie Catholique, volume 3, pp. 585-996.

Roques R (1983) *L' univers dionysien: Structure hiérarchique du monde selon le Pseudo-Denys*. Paris: Aubier.

Semmelroth O (1950) Gottes geeinte Vielheit. Zur Gotteslehre des Ps.-Dionysius Areopagita. *Scholastik* 25: 209-234.

Töröner M (2007) *Union and Distinction in the Thought of St. Maximus the Confessor*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Trouillard J (1972) *L' Un et l'âme selon Proclos*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Trouillard J (1982) *La mystagogie de Proclus*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

sciendo

Perichoresis
Volume 17.4 (2019): 23–40
DOI: 10.2478/perc-2019-0026

ASPECTS OF THE THEORY ON 'IDEAS', 'EIDE' AND 'LOGOI' OF BEINGS IN GEORGE PACHYMERES

LYDIA PETRIDOU*

ABSTRACT. In this study, we are discussing the terms 'idea', 'eidos', and 'logos' in George Pachymeres' *Paraphrase* of Dionysius the Areopagite's *De divinis nominibus*. This is a very important topic, at least from the ontological point of view. Many questions come to the fore, such as whether the three terms are as to their meaning the same, whether their non-autonomous character is mentioned, what their relation with the divine energies is and whether and how they are connected to the divine will. The structure of our study is based on the fact that the terms come from the Platonic, Aristotelian, and Patristic tradition respectively. Considering that both God and the created beings are objective realities, which the human consciousness is asked to investigate, we attempt to extrapolate ontology to the gnoseological level as well. I.e. we attempt to explain the matter of 'universals' relying on two questions. Specifically, from the ontological point of view: do they exist independently? And, from the gnoseological point of view: what is their relation to the human thinking?

KEYWORDS: George Pachymeres, ideas, eide, logoi of beings, universals

Introduction

George Pachymeres (1242-1310) is one of the main representatives of the Palaiologian Renaissance in literature and the arts. He was a polymath personality with broad interests, which he approached in a synthetic light, oftentimes determined exclusively by specific theoretical goals. He dealt with quite a lot of sciences and kinds of knowledge and delivered an impressive work, founded with the requirements of a rigorous epistemology, both general and specialized; so we can also find in his thought valid suggestions of methodological examples. Moreover, the concepts used by him clearly represent the previous theoretical development. As a matter of fact, everything that was established since the beginning of the ninth century set methodology as a research criterion for validity and objectivity.

As to his work specifically, he was the first to include in the history that he wrote a detailed exposition of the dogmatic contradictions of his time; so, he also brought to the light the terms that they formed it. In this histori-

* LYDIA PETRIDOU (PhD 2016, University of Patras) specializes in Ancient Greek and Byzantine philosophy and works as Academic Staff member at the Hellenic Open University. E-mail: petridoulydia@yahoo.gr.

ography, Pachymeres particularly insisted on the full description of the events, providing in this way the requirements for understanding the causal terms that bring to the light the research concerns. He was interested so much in presenting the truth that he tried to be as objective as he could, having in mind that this is something quite important for history, i.e. for the science of the human facts and choices. This choice of his could be included in the context of a scientific moderation, which actualizes a clear dialectic relation between intellectual developments and the external terms of the conditions.

He also composed an extensive synopsis of the Aristotelian philosophical system, choosing the right each time ways to present the texts, which in the catalogs of the manuscripts is entitled *Paraphrasis in universam philosophiam Aristotelis*. This text survives only in a Latin translation and includes several treatises on mathematical sciences. Whether he may be included in the Aristotelian tradition or not, we are of the opinion that he actually may, and not only because of the obvious references that he makes to Aristotle's works. All of his work shows the Aristotelian thought. And *Paraphrase*—very much like the Areopagite's works—means to offer a text for teaching purposes or as an answer that provides explanations to questions that have been already raised; these aspects of course are quite systematic. And speaking of systematicity, we do not only mean the obvious internal one but also the one that connects one issue to another and shows their succession.

This was another methodology he used while paraphrasing the Areopagite's works. And this attempt of his is one of the most typical cases of showing the combination between Christianity and Greek philosophy, especially the Neoplatonic one. In fact, in his *Paraphrase* of Dionysius the Areopagite's *De divinis nominibus* we find quite intensively an eclecticistic philosopher, who establishes a complete system of theognosy and of ascribing attributes-names with explanations and foundation of its principles. We have to mention here that, while Maximus the Confessor's comments deal with some expressions quite critical for the Christian doctrine, Pachymeres, mainly in direct speech, presents the entire work of Dionysius, with an exciting as to its internal compositions encyclopedism.

He also knew thoroughly the Platonic ontology and cosmology, against which he kept a critical Christian attitude, especially when he commented an extensive part on Plato's treatise entitled *Parmenides* (Pachymeres 1989), the one that is actually included in the second hypothesis, from which he receives the preconditions in order to establish his affirmative theology. For example, we could mention his approaches on time, which philosophically and theologically are quite remarkable, since he finds similarities between Christianity and Platonism. In a similar way to which he paraphrased Dionysius the Areopagite's works, he also paraphrased the first book of the

mathematician Diophantus. From the epistemological point of view, also important may be considered his treatise on music or harmony.

His main, however, contribution lies on the fact that he established the philosophical and theological terms for the scientific, rational and clearly compatible with the principles of the Christian faith understanding of the sensible world, in the sense of a renewed theophany. He presented Christian God being the One who dynamically expresses its providence and continuously creates beautiful beings-things. So, given his abilities, he managed to provide a synthetic presentation of the past tradition and to show a non-static cosmological system, which requires the necessary changes of the scientific examples to take place, depending each time on a particular case. More specifically, following with precision the tradition, he made a distinction with rarely detailed limits between, on the one hand, human wisdom and science and, on the other hand, theology. He also pointed out that the latter should rely firstly and mostly on Christian thinkers' / the Church Fathers' works and secondly on scientific philosophical principles and evidence. He was quite interested in the Christian worldview and the normativity set by it and he was actually thinking of it as a historical-cultural construct. That is why he set accurate limits, and not only concerning the history, but also regarding the way in which the reasoning works, which was formed according to the principles of a long tradition, which he himself also represented. But even when he was choosing the second option, he was remaining theoretically consistent providing the necessary priorities into his texts.

This was a great contribution of his; that being clarified, one may say that he attempted to form a strict epistemology, under the criteria set by the Christian thought, which, despite the fact that it was self-formed, it was necessary to be supported with further additions in order to provide answers to new questions. In this way, he established a natural theology system, strictly limited against supernatural theology, which is considered the most authentic for the formation of the Christian worldview, which is extremely realistic. Of course, gnoseology sets also some demands and the more expanded the reality seemed, the more it caused for more mature research questions. Pachymeres starts from a basic Christian principle: that, despite that God creates the natural world and is the only cause for it, he does not emanate his essence, but only his energies, or more correctly, he emanates through what occurs from the infinite quantitatively combinations of them. According to this dominant position, which sets pantheism—and polytheism too—out of the question, the ontological and structural parallelisms between the created nature and God are excluded by definition.

That is why a special methodology is required to explain both what causality is and how it works. And here one may find the great achievement

both in Christianity and Neoplatonism: superlative theology, which is associated with unutterable conditions in which a human being works; this is a matter found also in other, historically similar, traditions of the Eastern Mediterranean world. However, we should not assume that superlative names are just an expanded self-confirmation of theology; they are furthermore an increasingly extensive maturation of self-knowledge and thing-knowledge on the part of the research subject. I.e. theology, except from the empirical experiential elements, takes into account rationality as well.

Focusing our attention on Pachymeres' *Paraphrase* of Dionysius the Areopagite's *De divinis nominibus*, a very important issue, at least from the ontological point of view, which emerges, is about the creative projection of the One-Good and results from the discussion about Plato's 'ideas' or Aristotle's 'eide'. The most important matter that we will discuss in this study is whether their non-self-existent/non-autonomous character is pointed out by the Byzantine thinker. The answer to this question will prove first of all a creation without preconditions and, consequently, the absolute ontological freedom of the supreme Principle from any external necessity. Furthermore, it will confirm, through the 'image of God' doctrine, the created beings' self-determination and will highlight the prospect of the 'likeness'. We will also attempt to approach the issue about 'logoi' of beings, which together with the 'ideas' and the 'eide' constitute what theoretically one could define as *universals*. In this early stage of our analysis, we should mention that the 'logoi' are the formatted cores from the combination of which the natural universe will arise. We will also pay special attention to whether the 'logoi' of beings differentiate from the divine energies. This is a very important distinction, since probably the 'logoi' appear to be the products of the divine energies. In this direction, we will explore whether Pachymeres speaks about combinations either between the divine energies or the 'logoi' of beings, so that the natural universe with its own specificities to arise. Finally, it is necessary to see whether the 'logoi' of beings are associated with volitional elements, i.e. whether they have a strictly ontological content or whether they simply mediate through their specificities for transferring the volitional character of the divine creation into the natural universe.

As for the structure of our study, we will follow this systematic way: we will discuss the matter of the archetypes in different chapters that will be formed according to the philosophical origin of every term and the way in which Pachymeres interprets them in his *Paraphrase*. So, we will first focus our attention on passages in which the Platonic 'idea' is found. Then, we will attempt to approach the Christian exegesis of the Aristotelian 'eidos'. Finally, we will show the way in which the 'logoi' of beings are explained, which refer to a patristic reading of the ancient Greek philosophy and, especially, of Neoplatonism. Bearing in mind that both God and his creatures

are objective realities, which the human consciousness is asked to study with the proper methodology, it becomes clear from the outset that we should extrapolate ontology in the gnoseological level as well. So, we believe that it is necessary to discuss the matter on *universals*, focusing our attention on two questions: ontologically speaking, do they have an autonomous existence; and, gnoseologically speaking, what is their relation with the human thinking?

A Brief Presentation of the Platonic Theory on 'Ideas' and the Aristotelian Theory on 'Eide': a Comparison

The main point of the Platonic theory on 'ideas' is the distinction between the world of being, which is eternal and unchanged, and the world of becoming, which is related to the development and includes the beings that are subject to the necessity caused by matter. Specifically, there is a distinction between, on the one hand, the real world and the paradigmatic metaphysical archetypes of every produced condition, which since they are ways in which the true beings appear have no will or energy and, on the other hand, the world of the images and the imitations of these archetypes. However, the produced beings, because of their similarity to their archetypes, participate in the way in which they exist. Or, in other words one may consider, on the one hand, *universals* as general substances and, on the other hand, the multitude of beings which fall under generation and corruption.

In Aristotle, 'eide', as synonyms of the Platonic 'ideas', are found in a potentially existing condition within matter and, axiologically speaking, they come before it. They are the models by which things gain their form. Despite this function of them and their unchanged ontological texture, they are not divided or separated from the matter. Therefore, no individual, separate, metaphysical existence is acknowledged for 'eide'. They may just form the non-formed. This is proved from the fact that they constitute the common property of many and different to each other beings. According to Aristotle, their ontological function is formative. This form is not found outside the sensible things, but exists in them as a tendency to perfection. I.e. form is a general principle that gives meaning and provides existence in the sensible world.

Exactly at this point, one may find the main difference between the Aristotelian and the Platonic theory: bearing in mind that Aristotle approaches the materialistic worldview, turns out that he sets the fact to be performed as more important than the Platonic 'idea'. Specifically, in Aristotle, the most important thing is the developing sensible forms, which do not constitute a second world, but together with the matter compose a single whole. The matter is both under the effect of the 'eidos' and the interdependent cosmic motions that come from the prime unmoved mover. By combining

the 'eidos' with the matter every essence arises, which may be approached and interpreted in two ways: it is either the essence of each thing or—from a realistic point of view—it is its own existence. On this basis, Aristotle shows that reality is by itself able to become sensible by receiving specific forms. In other words, he speaks about a materially sensible formation of the being, while his basic theory is that the world is a united and finite reality.

In Pachymeres both Platonism and Aristotelianism are found throughout the whole *Paraphrase* of *De divinis nominibus*. The Platonic aspect results from what is said about the reduction-ascent to God, who is the founder and the cause of every productive process. This is the theory on transcendence, which is required for the theory on immanence. The Aristotelian aspect comes to the fore mainly because of the insistence to the immanence. Particularly interesting is that Pachymeres attempts to combine these two aspects, without ever ignoring the intermediate Neoplatonic tradition, which has crucially influenced both the philosophical and the theological approaches-theories. We ought to mention that this kind of attempt, i.e. combining the Platonic and Aristotelian theories, is—after Antiochus of Ascalon—Neoplatonic. Actually, Plutarch, Syrianus, Proclus, and Damascius made quite a progress and provided impressive results. Especially in the Byzantine thought, this is a typical combination (Podskalsky 1977: 107-124, Benakis 2002: 249-258, 335-338, 359-387, 425-456), which also brings to the fore the discussion about 'logoi' of beings, the source of which is systematically found in Maximus the Confessor (Maximus the Confessor 1857: 332 A, Gersh 1978: 160). Admittedly, the concept 'logoi' was also used in the ancient Greek thought and that is why we may speak about a Christian transformation of the Neoplatonic terminology and about an inclusion of it in a different worldview.

Aspects of the Issue on 'Ideas' in George Pachymeres: the Christian Approach of Platonism

The combination of Platonism and Aristotelianism in George Pachymeres comes to the fore in the discussion about the divine goodness. As indicated, the good as a divine projection provides the form while, at the same time, preserves its transcendence. It is not separated either from the supreme Principle or from beings. As a volitionally provided divine energy, makes good and gives form to the created beings, without revealing or emanating the divine energy (Pachymeres 1857: 832 C, 852 A). This is the leading divine property that includes absolutely everything. On one condition: the provision is not subsequent, since otherwise there would be a deficiency in the original creation. In this context, the theory on archetypical 'ideas' arises, according to which, after some changes, the divine energies can be identified—not absolutely—with the 'ideas'. However, we need to pay attention

here: a divine energy, which is always good, as a 'procession' may also be considered an archetype, in the sense that it may have as a result in a specific way the rational formation of the natural universe.

Going deeper in the question on the divine goodness, G. Pachymeres brings more dynamically to the fore the issue of the 'ideas' while specifically discussing the principles in which the process of the creation works. In his opinion, God is a paradigmatic, final, creative and material principle (Pachymeres 1857: 769 B-C, Maximus the Confessor 1857: 260 C). Focusing our attention on the paradigmatic principles, we would say that in Pachymeres' view the product comes into existence according to them. Their meaning is creative and multiplicative, since they come out of their pure condition. So, a paradigmatic principle is equivalent to the 'idea', which, as the Christian philosopher explains, is an independent and eternal thought of the eternal God (Pachymeres 1857: 769B-C, 860 C, 861 A, 861 B, 888 B). Platonism here is quite obvious; actually, we speak about its historical phase from Antiochus of Ascalon and thence, by whom, as well as the subsequent discussions, middle Platonism is clearly inspired. Certainly, Pachymeres' Christian approach on 'ideas' does not suggest at this point a specific standard according to which God actually thought and acted. Such a view would result in a necessity, in the sense that it would set unconditional requirements, which should have been available for God while creating the world and he would necessarily have to take account of them. In other words, God's self-activation—freedom would no longer exist and that is why we would end up to a divine will which is forced and limited by the external data. Finally, there would be implicitly a superior than God or equivalent to him 'idea', so the result would be to accept that there are two or more principles and causes. The consequences of such a view would be basically two: (a) A Neoplatonic multi-causality would be introduced and (b) a supreme Principle would be continuously searched for.

With the intention to make clearer the distinction between God, who ontologically and axiologically comes first, and the following 'ideas'—as well as the paradigms, which are the projections of the 'ideas'—Pachymeres expresses his opposition to the view of the ancient philosophers, who say that the 'ideas' are enhypostatic within beings (Pachymeres 1857: 849 C-D). We must mention here that is not clear whether he refers to Platonism, Aristotelianism, Stoicism or Neoplatonism. The most likely is that he refers to Aristotelianism and Stoicism. Moreover, regarding the meaning of 'enhypostatic', we should say that this is a term frequently found in Christian texts, for instance in Leontius Byzantinus. Pachymeres' main purpose is not to allow any external ontological preconditions to relate with the creative fact and to highlight the absolute autonomy and the free will of the supreme Principle. So, in his view, if the 'ideas' did not exist in a simple and uniform way as the

absolutely hyper-extended thoughts of the absolutely hyper-extended and absolutely united God, this state of theirs would mean that God is composite and that he consists of, first, the 'idea'-paradigm and, secondly, himself. This kind of view would confirm an ontological duality. Therefore, to exclude this possibility, every ontological condition should be assigned to the supreme Principle; this is an issue that also relates to the Christian approach of the first two hypotheses of the Platonic *Parmenides* (Gersh 153-165; Corsini 77-165). Thus, in Pachymeres, union exceeds anything that already exists or will exist and every creative action should be assigned only to God. Now, the matter of God's hyper-simplicity comes to the fore, which gathers to itself everything in a pre-determining way (Pachymeres 1857: 849 D). I.e. the 'procession' and the production of beings start exclusively from the good activation of the divine energy, which is not subject to any precondition.

G. Pachymeres is also close to Platonic 'ideas' in his remarks about time and its relation to eternity, which is considered the archetypical 'idea' of time, or, in other words, the incorruptible state of a finite measure (Pachymeres 1857: 837 A-B). Of particular interest is, however, that God is considered to be himself the eternity. He is the entity that has no beginning and no end, but constantly *is*. He is the archetype of the created world (Pachymeres 1857: 853 B). Furthermore, thinking in a Christian way, the sensible world is subject to the corruption and its complete annihilation is not prevented because of the extra-cosmic 'ideas', which are self-constituted—according to the Platonic example—and independent from the ontological reality of the Demiurge, but is assigned to the Demiurge, who is not subject to any necessity and acts in an absolutely free way (Pachymeres 1857: 837 D). The ex nihilo creation doctrine comes again to the fore and eliminates the possibility 'ideas' to work as requirements in God's action. Therefore, any reference made—either explicit or implicit—on the Platonic 'ideas', in Pachymeres shows the unchanging quality, the immutability and the regulatory role of God, who absolutely determines the ontology of the entire created world.

Aspects of the Issue on 'Eide' in George Pachymeres: the Christian Approach of Aristotelianism

The question on 'potentiality', which refers to the created beings, shows the Aristotelian orientation of George Pachymeres. And speaking about created beings, here we mean knowable beings, which are totally subject to God, even before their creation (Pachymeres 1857: 836 C-D). Specifically, according to the Christian thinker, God, since he is a paradigmatic cause, possesses in himself all the substances of beings that existed, exist and will exist (Pachymeres 1857: 764 B, 885 B-C). I.e. in contrast to the potentially exist-

ing beings, God exists in actuality. And speaking about existing 'in actuality' in a strict Christian context, as it is Pachymeres', we mean the ontological factor that fits in God who is considered to be the self-founding power, which acts in a 'processional' way for the production of all the creatures (Gersh 27-49; 204-217). In short, in Pachymeres the potentially existing leads to a development and development is not possible to be found in the transcendent plane of God. We have to mention that the divine 'procession' is not a development. It is considered to be an exit from the status of 'remaining' and an internal—kat' oekonomia—development.

The discussion about the states of 'potentially existing' and 'actually existing' makes us to examine the Christian interpretation of the Aristotelian term 'eidos'. This is a term that requires special attention, since, when it works as a paradigmatic concept, i.e. as an archetype, it is not clear what the differences from the usage of the Platonic 'idea' or Maximus the Confessor's 'logoi' of beings are. In order to understand the meaning of it, we have to approach first the different meanings in which the term is presented in Pachymeres' *Paraphrase*.

So, 'eidos' as a cosmological concept means the sensible form that the changeable matter can receive. Under this view, something unspecified becomes definable, while matter is the substrate, which gets its specific form and becomes a certain being, when it accepts the intervention of the 'eidos' (Pachymeres 1857: 748 A). So, it is clear that the intervention of the 'eidos' gives in each case a specific content. However, if a being has no 'eidos', it disappears, it becomes *aneideo*, i.e. without 'eidos'. This is corruption, since it moves towards non-being. The Platonic influence here is quite obvious, but with one difference: in Christianity, the monistic example is dominant, while in Plato we find a dualism. We need to clarify, however, that the way in which Pachymeres presents the intervention of the 'eidos' into matter is strictly technical, since in the Christian worldview matter appears together with its 'eidos'. And this is the point where we find the Aristotelian theory, to which there is a clear reference in the *Paraphrase* (Pachymeres 1857: 805 C). As a general conclusion, we may say that matter gradually displays its countless forms according to a developmental planning. This development has nothing to do with the One-Good, since it represents only the kinetic presence of matter, during in fact its continuous active development.

The above perspective leads to the interpretation of 'eidos' in the sense of an ontological concept. Thus, the 'eidos' may indicate a certain category or a particular nature and, consequently, describes an individual being created by God. For instance, in the discussion about angels Pachymeres says that the being itself, which is an 'eidos' of life, through which angels acquire their essence, life and intellect, is considered to be matter (Pachymeres 1857: 840 A). We have to mention that in the case of angels, matter is not

identified with the corruptible matter of the sensible beings. Matter here is the act of creation by a supreme Principle, to which angels are entirely subject. So, when we say that angels are immaterial, we do not just mean that they are not sensibly conceivable, but also that they are pure energies.

The 'eidos' may also have a henological meaning. Note here that when a concept is included in the category of Henology, refers to the completely unanticipated nature of the supreme Principle and to the fact that this is the only requirement for the existence of the rest of the beings and of the constitution of the reasoning—mainly the negative one—about God. Pay however attention to this: despite the negative expression, the resulting metaphysics remains firmly onto-theological, in the sense that the objectivity of God's manifestations is not disputed at all. Furthermore, God is a personal being regarding both his triadic relations and his communication with the creation (Pachymeres 1857: 836 C, 840 C). Thus, according to Pachymeres God is the 'eidos' of the things without 'eidos', he is the creator and the principle of every 'eidos' but he is without 'eidos' compared with the beings that have received a form (Pachymeres 1857: 673 C). At this point, the apophatic theology arises to declare that God is the essence which is above any created substance (Lossky 1973: 25, Roques 1957: 99). In personal terms, he is 'ὁ ὤν', the above-being being and the self-founding hypostatic cause of being according to the power of its ontological texture. And coming back to the question on the potentially existing and the actually existing, God has created or will continue to create all the beings, so we speak about a divine active causality, which comes exclusively from the supreme Principle and has no beginning and no end. In general, there is a clear combination of the One's transcendence and productivity. So, there is a developmental type transition and a permanent distinction between the essence and the energy. In this context, the terms do not exclude one another.

The most important, however, meaning of the 'eidos' in Pachymeres' *Paraphrase* is the paradigmatic one. In this case, 'eidos' is placed together with the creative 'logoi' of beings. What needs consideration is that there is no explanation about what the exact difference between 'eide' and 'logoi' of beings is (Pachymeres 1857: 844 A-B). Hypothetically speaking, we could suggest that the 'eide' result from the combinations of the 'logoi' and, in this way, the paradigmatic cause is prolifically combined with the archetypical paradigm, which is a general 'eidos' projected in many ways in the sensible world. The 'logoi' or the 'eide', however, are not able to function autonomously against the supreme Principle, since they are not self-constituted, but they are included into God who is the Creator. And exactly at this point one may identify in Christian thought the Aristotelian 'eide' with the Platonic 'Ideas'. As for what the similarity between the 'eide' and the 'logoi' is, in a wide perspective, we could say that they are identified-inhere to some ex-

tent within God in a united way and that their most important ascertainable difference is found into the natural universe. In this sense, the 'eide' are considered to be the productive archetypes, which, although being distinct, inhere as 'logoi' of beings that are to be manifested-applied in God's thought in complete unity, function paradigmatically and 'feed' the process of the emergence and development of the sensible world. Thus, the 'eide' are the creative causes of the created beings and are gathered together as the creative 'logoi' within the productive way in which God exists and is projected. So, the created beings are directly created by the 'logoi'; therefore, their metaphysical eidetic content lies in themselves (Pachymeres 1857: 841 C-844 B). Either way, the divine reality establishes all the creative requirements by its extended immanence, which is actually shown in many ways.

Aspects of the Issue on 'Logoi' of Beings in George Pachymeres: the Patristic Approach of the Ancient Greek Philosophy

In the fourth chapter of his *Paraphrase* (Pachymeres 1857: 801 C-D), Pachymeres introduces the idea of a stable model for the creation of the natural universe. This is the 'logoi' of beings. We have to pay, however, special attention at this point. When we speak about the creation in Christianity, we mean a process of production of both intangible and material entities, which from the patristic point of view and according to the Byzantine texts, is far from, on the one hand, Platonism, according to which matter and the 'ideas' function independently from the Creator who creates using already existing elements and, on the other, Aristotelianism, which also sets requirements in the sense, however, of Hylomorphism. This is quite important remark, since in Pachymeres the 'logoi' of beings, as a paradigmatic concept, refers to archetypes. These archetypes, however, are not independent beings, i.e. they do not own metaphysical ontological hypostasis in the sense that they are distinct or individually existent. Furthermore, they are not considered to be the requirements in which the Creator's productive externalizations would be set in action.

Specifically, according to Pachymeres, the 'logoi' of beings exist within God without beginning and in a united way (Pachymeres 1857: 932 B-C), before any productive or archetypical externalization of theirs (Terezis 2004: 133; Brons 1976: 154). They are not self-determined, but are simply the divine wills during their projection. In this sense, the 'logoi' are the way in which the providential divine will is manifested, which is revealed only because of the divine goodness (Pachymeres 1857: 852 C). In other words, the 'logoi' of beings not only do not exist in an independent way, but also work as intermediates for the transfer of the volitional character of the divine creation into the natural universe (Pachymeres 1857: 848 C-D). Re-

garding whether the paradigms of all the beings pre-exist into God, Pachymeres says that these 'logoi' are the providences, the bestowments, the motions, so, in this sense, the 'logoi' are identical to the energies, not absolutely but as to their projected-formed states. The most important is that the divine 'logoi' are inferior to the divine energies.

Relying on the above, one could argue that the 'logoi' are clearly ontologically defined by God as somehow cores with clear and eternal ontological possibilities. In order to understand this, we have to keep in mind that for Pachymeres the created world was created by God's absolutely free will and ex nihilo. So, any chance the sensible world to pre-exist and, consequently, to exist since ever, even just within the divine thought, is totally out of the question. This is an issue that is explained in a quite impressive way by Maximus the Confessor, who makes a distinction between the 'volition' and the 'existence', or, in other words, between the 'will' and the 'actualization of the will' (Maximus the Confessor 1865: 293D-296 D). Specifically, the pre-eternal will does not mean an automatic creation too. This is a very important remark, so that any necessity, which could relate to a mandatory extension of the pre-eternity of the divine volition, to be excluded. Otherwise, the world would be considered eternal, since this specific volition by which it is produced would be pre-eternal. On this basis, finally a clear distinction between the divine thought, the divine will and the actualization of the divine will arises. It seems that Pachymeres, as a consistent Christian thinker, adopts this distinction by naming the 'logoi' as 'productive divine wills', a term which, on the one hand, differentiates the action from the will and, on the other hand, shows their successful, developmentally speaking, combinations, so that the formed universe should actually come into existence (Pachymeres 1857: 848 B-C).

At this point, we could also discuss the term Logos, which in Eastern Christianity is identical to the supreme Principle and, thus, it is completely placed into the area of the uncreated. Parenthetically, we have to mention that the Logos might mean Cause-of-everything, Logic and Speech. The leading, however, meaning is that the Logos is the constitutive and cohesive power, the primary cause, the 'reverting'—and consciously actualized—end of the created beings (Pachymeres 1857: 852 D-853 A). Quite important here is to understand the creation 'in the Logos' and 'by the Logos' or, as Pachymeres says, '*everyhting was created by him, from him, and in him*' (Pachymeres 1857: 853 C). These are wordings that implicitly refer to the triadic relations and in the case discussed to the relation between Father-Son. In this sense of the projection, the pre-eternal volition is actualized here too willingly, i.e. it is the result of a free connection. This is a view that is clearly different from an actually necessary extension of divine thought.

Being more specific, God's thoughts become the 'logoi' of beings, not only as thoughts, but also as volitions. So, the 'logoi' of beings are identical to the volitions as projections. Volitions are not subject to any necessity and are identical to the primary causes of the created beings (Pachymeres 1857: 849 A). Furthermore, the world as the result of God's creative action is actually the product of the divine will, or, in other words, of the divine energies. This view proves the absolute divine freedom too. Therefore, all the creatures of the natural world are considered created beings, since they have been created by God. They are created but they were always existed into Him as 'logoi' of beings, not, however, in the sense of a complete co-eternity. On this basis, the act of creation means the actualization of the divine will, which of course is co-eternal with the essence. So, the 'logoi' of beings are the manifestations of the Logos as the results of his energies and powers and, consequently, all the created world is a kind of embodiments of the Logos, provided that the 'logoi' of beings indicate the uncreated creative causes of beings, or, in other words, the natural 'logoi' are the products of the uncreated divine 'logoi' (Pachymeres 1857: 848 D-849 A). This is an approach which in Pachymeres appears quite clearly, especially as regards its general principles. We should mention here that the individual 'logoi' reduce to universal 'logoi' and all together are gathered to the Logos, who is the supreme Principle and the point to which everything returns, according to the original planning (Pachymeres 1857: 833 D-836 A, 836 A-C). For the opposite motion, one should see the discussion about angels in the fourth chapter of the *Paraphrase* (Pachymeres 1857: 748 C), where the following is explained: 'Διὸ νοοῦνται μὲν ὡς ἄϋλοι, νοοῦσι δὲ τὰ ὄντα, ὡς νόες ἀσώματοι καὶ ὑπερκόσμιοι, ἄνωθεν ἐλλαμτομένοι τοὺς περὶ τῶν ὄ ντων τῶν λόγους, καὶ διαβιβάζοντες αὐτοὺς μυστικῶς εἰς τοὺς ὑποβεβηκότας ἀγγέλους.' We have to mention that here one may also see the cognitive function of the 'logoi'.

Through the relation between the 'logoi' of beings and triune God's creative volition the inconceivable relation between the created beings and the uncreated God is proved, which accordingly reveals God's internal unity, permanence and coherence. By accepting this theory, we actually reject any version of diarchy or automatism, since the world, on the one hand, is subject to the divine reality and, on the other hand, is a continually moving under development organic whole. Its main elements are the 'logoi' of beings, which compose its theoretical part, and the laws of nature, which define the action that takes place. Both the concepts of dependence and freedom come quite intensively to the fore. Thus, the world turns out to be the proof of a supreme being that works as a supreme Principle, while the internal structure of every being becomes consistent with the pre-eternal will for the creation of the world. We have to mention that the 'logoi', since they

are gathered together in an unconfused way in order the creative nature of the universe to emerge, they are combined, so that the natural universe and its specificities to come into existence and to function properly (Pachymeres 1857: 840 A, 844 A-B). We should, however, pay attention to this: under no circumstances should we think that in Pachymeres there is a mechanistic naturalistic subjection of the created beings, since the relation between God and the created beings does not leave any space for such a possibility. I.e. this is a special kind of dependence, a personal one that establishes freedom.

In fact, the divine universal structure is emphasized, which, however, is differentiated according to each being's receptivity. Based on this view, the knowledge of the 'logoi' of beings leads to the knowledge of the divine will, which is found to be corporeal in the 'logos' of each being. Thus, we may say that gnoseology meets ontology, since the relation by grace—and clearly not the substantial one—between God and his creatures, in the light of the 'logoi' of beings, becomes the source of the knowledge of the divine will. Consequently, the 'logoi' of beings as being-producing terms of the creation are the determining factors of the constitution of the created world and that is why they are called 'paradigms' and 'pre-determinations' (Pachymeres 1857: 848 B). Clearly, they do not have autonomy or independence in the archetypical sense that they have in Plato. Note also that the 'logoi' of beings not only relate to the personal beings, but, also refer and relate to all the creatures, from the inferior to the superior ones (Pachymeres 1857: 833 A).

Thus, both the rational and the irrational realm possess a coherent constitution; this is a structural parameter that indicates the dynamic connection between the divine world and the created world, which might be change only after the dissolving intervention of a personal being to the impersonal nature. Furthermore, even the entirely rational beings do not participate to the divine energies in themselves but to their projections; this is a version which shows once again that the divine energies are seen as superior to the 'logoi'. Otherwise, i.e. if there was a direct participation, we would be speaking about an exceedance of the ontological boundaries and an inherency of the beings within what God is, even as energy. For instance, the self-being is the creative and the paradigmatic 'logos' of being (Pachymeres 1857: 832 A-853 C), the self-life is the creative and the paradigmatic 'logos' of life (Pachymeres 1857: 860 A-865 A), and the self-intellect is the creative and the paradigmatic 'logos' of intellect (Pachymeres 1857: 877 A-889 A).

The concepts with the 'self-' prefix refer to archetypes and clearly connect to the metaphysics of immanence, without however never to negate the divine transcendence. I.e. they show that the unparticipated supreme reality becomes participated because of the divine energies, which with the 'self-' prefix are presented before any manifestation, as things in themselves. I.e.

they are the properties that we find into the creation. Note that only the supreme Principle possesses them in an absolute degree (Pachymeres 1857: 840 A-841 B).

Aspects of the Issue on Universals in George Pachymeres

Considering all the above, it becomes necessary to study the position of *universals* in the *Paraphrase* of *De divinis nominibus*. George Pachymeres here is clearly thinking according to a moderate Conceptual Realism. He rejects a pre-existence of the 'ideas' in the sense of a requirement for the creation of the beings and suggests the inseparability of the divine unity, within which the created world is gathered in a united and seminal way. Thus, for the Byzantine thinker, universals are found: (1) *before the multitude* (*universalia ante res*), as creative divine 'logoi', i.e. as God's simple thoughts, which however are found all over the natural world as expressions of his power. This is a point of view that highlights the creative function of the 'ideas' and is related to a rather Platonic reading (Pachymeres 1857: 848 B-C). (2) *Within the multitude* (*universalia in rebus*), a term in which the particularity of the beings in relation to the wholeness arises, with the concepts of 'genus' and 'species' to combine in a successful way. This is an approach found in the Aristotelian theory on the first substance. (3) *After the multitude* (*universalia post res*), a term which is not only related to the '*post res*' of the nominalists, but also relates to Aristotle's theory on the second substance, a posteriori and by abstraction into human being's mind. So, the knowledge of the genera and the species brings also to the fore what emerges into the human consciousness with concepts (Pachymeres 1957: 833 C, 840 A-841 B, 844 A-B, 844 C-848 D, 848 D-852 A, 852 D-853 A, 853 C, 989 B-D).

Therefore, for Pachymeres *Universals* are not considered to be just separated, like the—ante res—Platonic 'ideas'; they are not considered to be exclusively unseparated from the beings, like the—in rebus—Aristotelian 'eide'; they are considered to be separated in the souls, since they are formed a posteriori, and unseparated from things (Benakis 1978-79: 311-340). I.e. for Pachymeres, *universals* are (1) the logoi and the causes of the things, (2) immanent in the sensible beings, and (3) the knowledge of the genera and species or, in other words, the cognitive approach of the general entities. From this point of view, every individual thing is a special expression-appearance of the *universal*, which is deemed that possesses unchangeable properties, which do not depend on the amount that the universal is received. It is remarkable the fact that the Byzantine thinker excludes from the outset an absolute—but not relevant—nominalist approach and considers to be actually true its relation with all the individual beings. This is an approach that, together with the theory on archetypes, not only combines realism and nominalism, but also describes the way in which the transition

from Henology to Cosmology is accomplished (Pachymeres 1857: 832 A, 836 C-837 D). And by extending this thought, the above mentioned 'logoi' of beings, which derive from the divine energies, come in close connection with the corporeal conditions; this approach shows more clearly Pachymeres moderate Conceptual Realism (Pachymeres 1857: 844 C).

Conclusions

Two are the systematic directions, which are clearly interesting from the historical point of view too, in which this study was elaborated: (1) the relationship between Theology and Philosophy in Byzantium and, more specifically, in the late Palaiologian Renaissance, when the terms of the debate among different theoretical systems was not under construction, but both the similarities and the differences were quite clear, and (2) the influence of the Neoplatonic—and indirectly of the Platonic and Aristotelian—theory on Pachymeres' *Paraphrase* of Dionysius the Areopagite's *De divinis nominibus*, a treatise which is one of the most typical examples of the connection between Christianity and Neoplatonism.

The method that we followed was determined by Pachymeres' special personality. Two are the facts that guided our reasoning: (1) the fact that the *Paraphrase* is an extension of a period of major importance, which may be described as Byzantine humanism and which had reestablished the significance of the ancient Greek though regarding the formation not only of the human mind, but also in general of the human existence, and (2) the fact that Pachymeres has an excellent knowledge of the Platonic, Aristotelian and Neoplatonic thought. So, our attempt was determined by the requirements set by the definition of the similarities and the differences between what he was traditionally representing and what theoretically influenced him, by consequence, between two different worldviews, Christianity and Neoplatonism. One must never ignore the fact that Pachymeres was a Christian man and that he was following a strictly defined worldview. Thus, in any analysis we made regarding what the meaning of the concepts is and how they are used, i.e. what is the actual theoretical framework in which Pachymeres includes them, what the chosen research perspective of his is and which are the objections raised by him, we found that he was following all the time the main principles of Christianity, which worked as preconditions for his arguments, despite the fact that he utilized all the concepts of the ancient Greek philosophy. I.e. we realized that Greek philosophy was just a useful tool which helped him achieve his goals and that the concepts 'Idea', 'eidos', and 'logoi of beings' do not keep their original meaning, but fall under the purposes set by the ideological area in which they are placed. We chose to examine the terms separately, in order to focus our attention firstly on the Christian transformations of the Platonic and the Aristotelian

theory and secondly on the Patristic reading of the ancient Greek philosophy. Therefore, regarding specifically the three concepts, we came to the following conclusions.

First, all of them may be considered paradigmatic, since they are related to archetypes.

Second, regarding specifically the 'ideas': they exist in a simple and uniform way as the absolutely hyper-extended thoughts of the absolutely hyper-extended and absolutely united God. They show the stability, the immutability and the regulatory role that God holds, who absolutely determines the ontology of the created world.

Third, regarding specifically the 'eidos': this term has a lot of meanings and appears often together with the 'logoi', without, however, the difference between the two concepts to be clear. Hypothetically speaking, we could suggest that the 'eide' result from the combinations of the 'logoi' and show the paradigmatic cause in an archetypical way. Either way, through the words used, Pachymeres presents the 'processional' activation of God, who is the Cause and the Creator of the entire created world.

Fourth, regarding the 'logoi' of beings: they also show the 'processional' function of God as creator of the entire created world. Since God includes in him the 'logoi'—together with the 'eide'—any suggestion about an independent existence of them is totally rejected. Thus, the 'logoi' of beings are not self-existent causes; they are the 'pre-existent logoi', which contribute to the formation process of the divine planning, so that the created world with its particular beings to come into existence. Furthermore, we may consider 'logoi' to be the providences and the bestowments, which show the way in which the divine energies function in relation with the way in which they manifest.

Bibliography

Benakis L (1978-79) Το πρόβλημα των γενικών εννοιών και ο εννοιολογικός ρεαλισμός των Βυζαντινών. *Φιλοσοφια* 8-9: 311-340.

Benakis LG (2002) *Byzantine Philosophy: Texts and Studies on Byzantine Philosophy*. Athens: Parousia.

Brons B (1976) *Gott und die Seienden*: *Untersuchungen zum Verhältnis von neuplatonischer Metaphysik und christlicher tradition bei Dionysius Areopagita*. Göttingen.

Corsini E (1962) *Il trattato 'De divinis nominibus' dello Pseudo-Dionigi e i commenti neoplatonici al Parmenide*. Torino: Publicazioni della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia' XIII 4.

Gersh S (1978) *From Iamblichus to Eriugena*: *An investigation of the prehistory and evolution of the pseudo-Dionysian tradition*. Leiden: EJ Brill.

Lossky Vl (1973) *Theologie mystique de L'Église d'Orient*. In Plevraki SK (translated in Greek) Thessaloniki.

Maximus the Confessor (1857) In Librum de Divinis Nominibus Scholia. In Migne JP (ed) *Patrologia Cursus Completus* (Series Creaeca), volume 4. Paris: Imprimerie Catholique.

Maximus the Confessor (1865) Questiones ad Thalassium de Scritpura sacra. In Migne JP (ed) *Patrologia Cursus Completus* (Series Creaeca), volume 90. Paris: Imprimerie Catholique.

Pachymeres G (1857) Paraphrasis in De Divinis Nominibus. In Migne JP (ed) *Patrologia Cursus Completus* (Series Creaeca), volume 3. Paris: Imprimerie.

Pachymeres G (1989) Commentary on Plato's Parmenides. In Garda ThA., Honea SM, Stinger PM, Unholtz G (editor and translator), Westerink LG (introduction) *Commentary on Plato's Parmenides [Anonymous Sequel to Proclus' Commentary]*. Athens-Paris-Bruxelles: The Academy of Athens and J. Vrin-Ousia.

Podskalsky G (1977) *Theologie und Philosophie in Byzanz: Den Streit um die theologische Methodik in der spätbyzantinischen Geistesgeschichte (14./15.Jh), seine systematischen Grundlagen und seine historische Entwicklung*. Munich: CH Beck.

Roques R (1957) Symbolisme et théologie negative chez le Pseudo-Denys. *Bulletin de l'Association Guillaume Budé* (1): 97-112.

Térézis Ch (2004) Aspects de la théorie des 'Formes' chez G. Pachymère. *Byzantion* 54: 491-507.

sciendo

Perichoresis
Volume 17.4 (2019): 41–56
DOI: 10.2478/perc-2019-0027

THE DAUGHTER OF THE WORD: WHAT LUTHER LEARNED FROM THE EARLY CHURCH AND THE FATHERS

GLEN L. THOMPSON*

Asia Lutheran Seminary

ABSTRACT. All the major sixteenth-century Reformers knew something about the early church and used the early Fathers. As an Augustinian monk and professor of theology, however, Luther's knowledge and use of the great Father was both deeper and more nuanced. While indebted to Augustine, Luther went further in defining what it meant for theology to be 'scriptural'. He saw history as the interaction of God's two regimes, and the church of every age as weak and flawed but conquering through the cross of Christ. This led him to a free use of the Fathers without being constrained to always agree with or imitate them. The comfort he received from the Apostles' Creed in particular led him to appreciate the early creedal statements, and so it was natural for him to use them as models when formulating the new confessions required in his own day. The sixteenth-century heritage of written confessions of faith is a heritage under-appreciated but still vital for church bodies today.[1]

KEYWORDS: Luther, Augustine, Church Fathers, History, Creeds, Confessions

Ecclesia enim est filia, nata ex verbo, non est mater verbi.
'For the Church is the daughter born from the Word;
she is not the mother of the Word.'
Luther, Lecture on Genesis 7:17-24
(AE 2: 101; WA 42: 334)

In January of 1505, the 21-year old Martin Luther was promoted to Master of Arts at the University of Erfurt. By May he had begun his doctoral studies in secular law while lecturing undergraduates. By mid-summer, however, the spiritually-troubled young Master gave it all up and entered a monas-

* GLEN L. THOMPSON (PhD 1990, Columbia University) is Academic Dean and Professor of New Testament and Historical Theology at Asia Lutheran Seminary. Email: Glen.Thompson@als.org.hk.

1 All English citations of Luther's writings, unless otherwise specified, are taken from the 54-volume American Edition of Luther's Works (AE); where no English translation was available, I have supplied my own and I give reference to the authoritative German Weimar Edition (WA, WBr, WTr).

tery. In the seven years that followed, he was ordained a priest, taught at both Erfurt and Wittenberg universities, and studied theology intensively, being promoted to Doctor of Theology in October of 1512. Therefore, it can surprise no one that the future reformer would have an intimate knowledge of the Roman Catholic Church's traditions and teachings. However, although the Renaissance had begun bringing to light the resources of the early church through the study of Greek, and editions of the early Greek and Latin Fathers began appearing through the agency of the still-nascent printing industry, theological study in Luther's day was still primarily the study of the Medieval *Glossa ordinaria*, canon law (especially Gratian), and the scholastic masters—Lombard, Dun Scotus, Aquinas, and Bernard, to name just a few. So, it is legitimate for us to ask both just how much Luther did learn *about* the foundational centuries of the church and its leading writers, and what he learned *from* such study. We can then assess how valuable this was for the work and legacy of both the reformer and his reformation.

The Early Augustinians

We see the first glimmer of Luther's interest in the early church when he intentionally chose to enter the Augustinian Order of Hermits. Yet the great bishop of Hippo was not the first father to have made a deep impression upon him, but rather Athanasius of Alexandria. Already during his first year, while still a novice, he became familiar with a dialogue between Athanasius and Arius and came to admire the former's stand for doctrinal truth. In actuality, the dialogue was the composition of Vigilius of Thapsus from a century later and was falsely attributed to Athanasius (Beer and von Stockhausen 1999). But the impression was deep and lasting, and Luther cited this work numerous times over the course of his career. In 1532, Luther's admiration of Athanasius would still be evident (and he would mention the *Dialogue* yet again) in the introduction he wrote for his friend Bugenhagen's edition of Athanasius's *Contra gentes* (Luther 1532: 530-532).

It was the great bishop of Hippo, however, who would become and remain the most influential and oft-quoted church Father throughout Luther's life. Veit Dietrich quotes him as saying, 'At first I devoured, not merely read, Augustine' (Luther 1532: 49). His own annotations in the margins of a volume of Augustine's writings (*Opuscula plurima,* Strassburg 1489) prove that as early as 1509, Luther was absorbed in the works of the great African bishop. There were several reasons for this. First of all, the works of this Father were regularly used in the theological and spiritual training of the German monks named after him. By 1516 Luther had progressed at least as far as the eighth volume of the *Opera omnia* of Augustine (Basel 1506), as he writes in a letter to George Spalatin (Luther 1516: 24). The

young Augustinian monk was in the right location to access this first attempt at a complete edition of the bishop of Hippo's works.

Secondly, Luther's confessor and mentor, Johann von Staupitz, was himself heavily influenced by Augustine in his own life and theology. Appointed by Frederick the Wise as the first provost (*Probst*) of Wittenberg University upon its foundation in 1502, Staupitz ensured that Augustine became patron saint both of the theological faculty and of the university as a whole (Posset 2003: 71, 74). This is where Luther was destined to spend his entire career. Furthermore, from 1503 on Staupitz also served as vicar general for the Observant Augustinian monasteries in Germany. In this position, he oversaw the *studia generalia*, the training programs used by the order to train priests from among its members. Staupitz's own Augustinian theology may have tinged the curriculum which Luther completed in his own study for the priesthood in Erfurt; and Luther himself was assigned in 1512 to oversee the *studium generale* in Wittenberg after his move there.

Yet neither of these reasons suffice. The study of Augustine was not a mandatory part of the Augustinian rule (Obermann 1989: 161); nor did all Staupitz's associates or disciples become Augustine scholars. Already, in 1516, he would write (somewhat hyperbolically): 'Devotion to my Order does not compel me to approve of the blessed Augustine; before I had stumbled upon his books I had no regard for him in the least' (Luther 1516: 24). It was both Augustine's approach to theology and his answers which created sympathetic vibrations when the young Luther opened the bishop of Hippo's writings. It was Augustine who taught Luther that good theology is the product of a heart-felt spiritual quest for answers combined with careful and prayerful biblical exegesis. The young monk was tormented by the question of how a wretched sinner could find forgiveness before a righteous God. While Augustine's writings did not answer this question to the young professor's satisfaction, they began pointing him in the right direction. Later, after he found the answer through his own struggle with the scriptural texts, Luther read Augustine's *The Spirit and the Letter* and rejoiced that Augustine also had come to understand that it was the righteousness of Christ 'with which God clothes us when he justifies us' (Luther 1545: 337).

The breadth of his early acquaintance with the Fathers is revealed in that early letter to Spalatin in which he asks his friend to contact Erasmus and point out to him that he is depending too much on Jerome's interpretations. As a result, he writes, Erasmus is neglecting Augustine whose theology is not 'of his own wisdom but is rather that of the most outstanding Fathers, such as Cyprian, [Gregory of] Nazianzus, Reticius [of Autun], Irenaeus, Hilary, [Methodius] Olympius, Innocent, and Ambrose' (Luther 1516: 24). However, since fragments of the works of Reticius and Methodius have

survived only as citations in the works of other Fathers, we should not assume Luther had read all of these first hand. Two years later Luther would state in his introduction to the *German Theology* of Johannes Tauler that 'no book except the Bible and St. Augustine has come to my attention from which I have learned more about God, Christ, man, and all things' (Luther 1518: 75). Earlier the same year he had written again to Spalatin, 'If you like my course of study, begin by reading Augustine's *On the Spirit and the Letter* … Then take the book *Against Julian* and likewise the book *Against the Two Letters of the Pelagians*. Add blessed Ambrose's work on the calling of all heathen, although this book appears… to have been written by someone other than Ambrose… If these suggestions appeal to you, I shall send you more later on' (Luther 1518b: 54).

Thus, we see that from the very beginning Luther used the Fathers critically. This can be seen in an incident in 1516 involving his colleague Andreas Bodenstein von Karlstadt, the senior theology professor at Wittenberg. In a debate that centered on Augustine, Luther showed that a tract on *True and False Penance* did not agree with Augustine's theology and therefore could not have been penned by him. This drove Karlstadt to a deeper study of Augustine and he became 'in certain respects a more faithful Augustinian than Luther himself' (Steinmetz 1881: 123-124). Luther would not be put into a theological straight-jacket even by the writings of Augustine himself. Yet Oberman can still describe Luther's approach to theology as 'an unusual medieval alliance between Augustinianism and nominalism' (Oberman 1989: 161).

The Early Church and Luther's View of History

Luther's knowledge of the Church Fathers, as well as several of Luther's well-known emphases, become entwined in his view of history in general, and, therefore, also in his broader evaluation of the early church. The first is his concept of the hiddenness of God in the playing out of history; a second is his understanding of the two 'regimes' which make up God's creation; a third is Luther's strong belief in the divine vocation given to Christians in all walks of life. The result is that Augustine's 'two cities' image is developed into a more complex metanarrative.

Luther stresses that God chose to conceal himself in the historical process, and thus invisibly oversees the created world through two 'regimes' (German—*Regiment*). These two entities can be thought of as God's two hands, working separately and in different ways but not opposed to each other. The first is the worldly regime (*politia*) by which God uses the natural means of government, the family, and other institutions to direct, manage, and order the outward course of world history. In that regime, man serves as a *cooperator Dei* when he functions within his secular vocation using his

God-given human reason. In this function both institutions and individuals serve as masks for God's hidden operation. The religious or spiritual regime (*religio*), on the other hand, is that by which God oversees salvation history. In this realm, he works not through human reason, but through the humiliation of the cross and via the Means of Grace (the preached Word and the Sacraments). While the worldly regime is outwardly visible, the spiritual one is apprehended solely by faith. Every human being lives in both regimes simultaneously, and the Devil uses all his power to pervert and stymie these regimes and confuse them in the minds of men.

These regimes are also distinct from the 'two kingdoms'—that of the Devil who controls the unconverted in the world, and that of Christ and all his true believers. Every human belongs to but one of these realms. While the depiction of these two kingdoms has close parallels with Augustine's understanding of the two cities, the concept of the two regimes appears to come more directly from Luther's own study. Headley's first chapter (1963), replete with citations and references, is essential reading for understanding the further nuances of Luther's view of history. With these concepts as background, one can understand that Luther's view of the early church and the role of the Fathers would itself be complex.

For Luther, the Fathers provided excellent illustrations of the Christian's struggles within the two regimes. They were pointedly not exemplars to imitate in all details of their doctrine or devotional life. He did not come to this conclusion merely because of his growing aversion to the veneration of saints and their relics, something common among all the reformers. Rather, as John Headley notes, it was because Luther firmly believed that 'any imitation of a saint or great religious figure not only obscures the redemptive action of Christ but leads inevitably to a fatal righteousness from good works' (Headley 1963: 50). Each Christian, including the Fathers, has a God-given vocation which he is to live out faithfully to the best of his ability. However, Augustine's vocation is not mine, and Jerome's is not yours. As Luther put it when speaking of Daniel, his holy life 'should not be followed as an example in these things, but should be avoided as sheer miracles, which merely deserve praise and honor. For God does not desire to perform miracles in the fiery furnace for every single one of us; nor is it his will to make a Bernard, a Francis, a Gregory, a Benedict, or an Augustine out of each one of us' (Luther 1522: 192).

Luther did see great value in the Fathers and the early councils as historical witnesses to scriptural teaching. They too were masks of God in his spiritual regime when they faithfully witnessed to the gospel message. In his mature work *On the Councils and the Church* (1539), Luther makes this point clear. The main value of the early councils was not that they served as authoritative assemblies, but rather that they witnessed to the scriptural teach-

ing that the early church shares with us. In the first half of the treatise, he argues that councils have no authority to establish new articles of faith, to command specific good works, to impose ceremonies, or to interfere in secular governmental affairs (i.e., take part in God's first regime). On the other hand, they did have the duty to condemn and suppress new articles of faith, evil works, and ceremonies that conflicted with Scripture, and they could legitimately institute ceremonies that were useful and profitable to the church.

Shortcomings of the Fathers

The conception of God's divine but hidden direction of history allowed Luther in his 1539 opus on the councils to face head on several crucial weaknesses in both the early Fathers and the councils. First of all, they were so obviously fallible. At times, they were inconsistent, and at other times they were totally contradictory. This was no new insight of Luther's. After all, as Luther himself points out, Gratian had named his great twelfth-century collection of canon law *Concordia discordantium canonum* (*Harmonization of the Disagreeing Canons*) (Luther 1539: 20-21), and Peter Lombard's *Sentences* attempted a similar project with theology in general. As we know, both attempts ended in synchronizations to the image of medieval Roman Catholicism. Many well-meaning attempts by modern Protestants to appropriate the Fathers end with equally distorted images as a result of their own theological cherry-picking. Headley rightly concludes: 'The significance of Luther's consideration of the papal decretals lay not in any overthrow of canon law or the magisterium of the Roman Church, for such was not his intention at this juncture; it lay in his effort to preserve the integrity of Scripture and to assert its sufficiency as a single ground and source of authority by which conflicting authorities might be measured' (Headley 1963: 80).

Secondly, Luther pointed out that if we are to honor the Fathers properly, we should also honor their own warnings against accepting as ultimate authorities their own works or any opinions apart from Scripture. Augustine was the supreme role model here. Luther gives two quotes from a letter of Augustine to Jerome in this regard: 'I have learned to hold the Scriptures alone inerrant. Therefore, I read all the others, as holy and learned as they may be, with the reservation that I regard their teaching true only if they can prove their statements through Scripture or reason.' And, 'Dear brother, I hope that you do not expect your books to be regarded as equal to those of the Apostles and Prophets' (Augustine, *Ep.* 82.3; Luther 1539: 25). Luther came across the first of these quotes in Gratian's *Decretum* and it was there that he found a further statement of Augustine in the preface to *On the Trinity* (3.2): 'My dear man, do not follow my writing as you do Holy Scripture. Instead, whatever you find in Holy Scripture that you did not

previously believe, believe it without doubt. But in my writings, you should regard nothing as certain that you were uncertain about before, unless I have proved its truth' (*Decretum*, Dist. 9, c. 5). Furthermore, the inconsistency and fallibility of the Fathers was further illustrated by Augustine's *Retractiones*, the book he wrote in later life to supply corrections and additions to his earlier writings.

A third weakness of the Fathers and councils was their incompleteness. Luther says that one cannot efficiently cull all Christian teaching from the Fathers and councils. They tend to deal with the issues, problems, and controversies of their own day, rather than the whole counsel of God which is found in Scripture (Luther 1539: 52). Since we do have Scripture, this weakness of the Fathers is not fatal for us and for our salvation, he notes. Yet this incompleteness in knowledge of the Fathers and councils was especially telling in his own generation. Early printed editions of various Fathers were appearing throughout his lifetime, but there were still many gaps and many poor editions. The same could be said of the early church historians.

Luther himself, while increasingly interested in the early church as his career progressed, seems to have depended for a connected picture of the period almost solely on the history of Eusebius for the first three centuries, and on the *Tripartita*, the Latin translation of portions of Socrates, Sozomen and Theodoret, for his knowledge of the fourth century. Thus, when surveying the four early Ecumenical Councils, he has to admit that he has rather limited information on the first two, and even less on the third and fourth (both occurring in the fifth century) (Luther 1539: 106-107).

Yet even if he had possessed the more critical and complete editions of the Fathers that we have today, Luther would still have repeated this criticism of incompleteness. For Luther, true theology had to center on Christ's salvific work, the proper distinction and use of law and gospel, and an understanding of the theology of the cross as the theological essentials of the church's *kerygma*. While these can all be found in the Fathers, they are not found as consistently and as abundantly as one would like. This weakness is evident yet today when one consults the wonderful multi-volume resource entitled *Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture*. While it seeks to gather the 'best' quotations from the Fathers on each section of Scripture, the excerpts on some key gospel passages contain little gospel in their exposition and application. This of course, would have come as no great shock to Luther, for he often expostulated on how every Christian, himself included, still had the natural human penchant for the *opinio legis*—the sinful inclination to let the law rather than the gospel predominate in one's heart, mind, and life. Luther constantly opined that we must all be constantly battling that urge, and often will lose; and so, the early Fathers were no different from us in

having to fight (often unsuccessfully) that battle as well. Again, the Christians of the past served as object lessons rather than models.

Such 'flaws' in the early church, as well as its spiritual triumphs, were something that Luther was never afraid to use as illustrations and admonitions in his preaching and teaching. He was free to use any Father of any period, or equally free to disregard them. As he said in 1521 in his debate with Latomus, 'the fathers are to be tested by the judgment of the divine Scriptures so that it may be known who has clarified and who has obscured them. Thus, Paul orders us to "test everything; hold fast to what is good"… He commands that all be tested and that there be no exceptions—neither Augustine, nor Origen, nor any man, not even the Antichrist, the pope' (Luther 1521: 217). The inconsistencies of the Fathers were a warning about their use, not necessarily a prohibition, as he pointed out when the reformer Martin Bucer attacked him: 'As is known to the whole world, we do not condemn the statements of the fathers, even if they conflict with one another ([though they do] not [conflict] at this point), as long as they are not quoted to oppose true piety' (Luther 1528: 200). Martin Schulze says that by this method of using the Fathers, Luther 'rendered an inestimable scholarly service to the church, to theology, and to historiography: he freed the Fathers from tradition. At long last it was possible for them to be mistaken' (Schulze 1996: 625).

Understanding and Using History

One result of Luther's conviction about the clarity and sufficiency of Scripture was that Scripture could be its own interpreter, and 'insofar as Scripture was the Word of God, the Church existed as its creature' (Headley 1963: 80). So, as the opening quotation indicates, the Word is supreme and infallible, the invisible Church is its holy offspring, and the visible church is but the latter's pale and still-flawed image. But this did not stop Luther from using the early church in his argumentation in support of scriptural theology. Already at the Leipzig debate in 1519 he put forth a historical argument that the Fathers, the ecumenical councils and the most accurate church histories all showed that papal primacy was not an ancient divinely appointed doctrine but was the result of canonical legislation originating in the previous four centuries, i.e., the late Middle Ages (Headley 1963: 44-45; Koehler 1900: 363). In the process, he continued to show his historical acumen, seeing a Pseudo-Dionysian canon attributed to Anacletus as a medieval forgery, reasoning that a majority of bishops did not ensure truth since at one period the Arian clergy had such a majority at councils, and the like. He went so far as to call history 'the mother of truth' (Luther 1519: 289; Headley 1963: 45). Such a statement must be interpreted within Luther's larger understanding of history (as described above) by which he viewed

history as one of the masks behind which God controls all things. Thus, those with the vocation of historian must be held to the highest of standards: 'For since histories describe nothing else than God's work, that is, grace and wrath, it is only right that one should believe them, as though they were in the Bible. They should therefore indeed be written with the very greatest diligence, honesty, and truthfulness' (Luther 1538: 277-278). Such thoughts only grew within Luther over the course of his lifetime, and they explain why he published several chronological tables of world events in his later years.

Luther's nuanced view of church tradition was thus formed by melding his historical sensibility with his biblical and theological *Weltanschaung*. He approached early church customs and practices, and disputed doctrines, from his 'big picture' of history. Any doctrines or traditions which were contrary to the teachings of Scripture, or interfered with a devotional life that had Christ and his cross at its center, had to be rejected. On the other hand, other customs which had no direct biblical antecedents but which supported Christian devotion could be retained. This position led to the Lutheran church's preservation of customs that were labeled by Anabaptist and Reformed camps as 'popery'. For them purity could only come from a radical break with all man-made rites, images, and practices.

Luther saw such attitudes as a misunderstanding of the authority of the Word and of the Church. In mid-1530 Luther waited at the Coburg Castle, just within the safety of Saxony, as messages were ferried back and forth between him and Philip Melanchton, the head of the Lutheran delegation at the Diet of Augsburg. The milder Melanchton still had hopes of an agreement with the Roman church, if only a few concessions to tradition were made. Luther responded to him as follows:

> I might inquire what these pious or permitted observances are which are necessarily established by traditions; you would answer--the Eucharist, the ordering of religious life, etc. But these have long been established by the divine Word. For God prescribes praying, preaching, giving thanks, disciplining the flesh, instructing the people and boys. List for me then some other works subject to traditions. Will you offer purgatory, pilgrimages, brotherhoods, the cult of saints? These indeed are beyond the Word of God and at the same time also impious (Luther 1530: 525-526; trans. of Headley 1963: 91-92).

This, then, is why Luther could view some church tradition as 'scriptural'. His version of sola Scriptura was not limited solely to what was specifically taught in Scripture, but it could include all the customs and practices that were in agreement with Scripture.

This is also what allowed him to retain teachings such as infant baptism while admitting that there is no single statement in Scripture one can point

to as confirmation. Yet, for Luther as for Lutherans yet today, the practice is 100% 'scriptural' because it follows from all the other teachings of Scripture (original sin, that all need salvation) without the need to invent new teachings (an age of accountability, the necessity for a human decision). In the same way as those who rightly preach the gospel continue in the succession of the Apostles, so they can develop new customs which assist Christians in leading a pious and godly life. He proclaims later in a sermon:

> Therefore, although [Christ] has ascended to heaven and no longer personally or physically preaches on earth, he has not yet nor will in the future cease speaking through the Apostles and their successors; nor will he stop extending his Gospel ever farther and farther and working powerfully in it by means of the Holy Spirit (Luther 1535: 196).

While Luther hit out hard against the new revelations of the Anabaptists, such new revelations were not to be confused with customs that had grown out of the biblical faith of the church. Luther often clearly equates the proliferation of heresies with the multiplication of human traditions. But useful and pious traditions that undergird the simple gospel message should not be thrown out in an attempt to start from scratch. That would truly be dishonoring the Fathers.

Creedal Christianity, Sixteenth-Century-Style

Among the most important *traditiones* (things handed down) from the Fathers were the Creeds. The Nicene Creed was the central creed of the Roman Catholic liturgy in the sixteenth century, but it was the Apostles' Creed that Luther first seized upon in his spiritual struggles. Already in his first years in the Erfurt monastery, the Apostles' Creed, recited by the Augustinians in the prime and compline services, brought him comfort. He meditated deeply on the connection between 'the holy Christian church, the communion of saints' and 'the forgiveness of sins' (Koehler 1900: 77-78). When in a Latin sermon on the Creed in 1523, Luther turned to the *ecclesiam catholicam, communionem sanctorum*, he glossed *ecclesiam* with *Christenheit*, rather than *Kirche*; for Christ's kingdom consists in 'the entire multitude of Christians' and 'all the faithful around the world', i.e., those made faithful by the Holy Spirit (Luther 11: 53). One might say that Luther's great Reformation conversion over the coming decade involved finding the correct relationship between Christ, the Church and the forgiveness of sins.

When Luther issued the forerunner of his Small Catechism (the first evangelical catechism published in Europe) in 1520, it included explanations of the Ten Commandments, the Lord's Prayer, and the Apostles' Creed (rather than the more well-known Nicene Creed). This creed was not chosen because Luther believed the legend of its Apostolic origin, thus pre-

ferring it to the conciliar origin of the Nicene Creed. Yet he placed it side by side with the commandments and Lord's Prayer which both came directly from Scripture. Luther also came to believe that 'the communion of saints' was an early gloss on the holy Christian church and thus a later addition to the text. He argued for this interpretation in part after reading Rufinus' *Expositio symboli* which does not mention the phrase (Koehler 1900: 86). Thus it was, beginning with Luther's Catechism, that the Apostles' Creed came into liturgical and catechetical use not just by Lutherans, but by Anglicans as well.

It is instructive to note, however, the somewhat surprising 1538 booklet of Luther entitled *The Three Symbols or Creeds of the Christian Faith*. This straightforward title is followed by the Apostles' Creed, the Athanasian Creed, and the *Te Deum* (which was used by Ambrose and Augustine, and sung at the latter's baptism, according to Luther's introduction). After his one-page introduction, the three texts are given (6 pages) followed by a combined explanation of their teaching (20 pages). The Nicene Creed was then added at the very end with the simple comment: 'Let us in conclusion add to these three symbols also the Nicene Symbol, which, like the Athanasian, is directed against Arius. It is sung in the mass every Sunday' (Luther 1538b: 228). Thus, the beautiful early liturgical hymn that Luther treasured was seemingly elevated to equal status with two of the ecumenical creeds (perhaps for its pedagogical value?), while the Nicene Creed is presented more as an afterthought. This illustrates Luther's open attitude towards harvesting the fruits of the church's orthodox heritage.

However, it appears to have been Luther's acquaintance with the early creeds that began the development of one of the Reformation's most important inheritances from the early church—not only adopting the Three Ecumenical Creeds as their own, but also the idea that creedal statements of faith were important tools in defining, confessing and preserving the Scriptural faith of the Church. In the early church, the one 'rule of faith' had been formulated differently by different Fathers. By the fourth century, though, it was necessary to agree on precise creedal statements that could be accepted by the entire orthodox church. These creeds became models for taking the various teachings of Luther and his compatriots and unifying them into more elaborate sixteenth-century apologetical statements. If the Creeds could be used to catechize the faithful, even children, about the difference between the true Christian faith and heretical positions like Arianism and Monophysitism, could not doctrinal statements also be written to ward off the sixteenth-century equivalents of the Arians?

While the *Ninety-Five Theses* against indulgences may have started the avalanche which shattered the Medieval Roman Catholic Church, it was not the foundational event of the Reformation Church, at least when viewed

through Lutheran eyes. Lutherans consistently choose June 25, 1530 as the birthdate of their church. They do so in full knowledge that the church of electoral Saxony had been, in effect, Lutheran for almost a decade before then, experiencing a slow and reasoned implementation of evangelical practices, the disappearance of monasteries, and the replacement of priests with newly trained pastors. But it was the public reading of the Augsburg Confession, with its written declaration and explanation of the primitive 'rule of faith' as it applied to the sixteenth-century church, that became the central symbol of Lutheranism (in both senses of the term, i.e., as a creedal statement [Latin *symbolum*] and as the most iconic Lutheran document).

Understanding the development of this central confession sheds light on how Luther and his colleagues used the model of the early Church Fathers in creating their own creedal statements. In 1526 a diet at Speyer had established an uneasy religious *status quo* in Germany that allowed Lutheran princes to at least temporarily permit Lutheran teaching within their own borders. But a follow-up meeting at Speyer in the spring of 1529 ended that agreement and promised harsher action against the opposition groups as well as the swift calling of a more general council to close the matter. This forced the reformers to prepare for battle, theologically and politically. In the fall of the year Luther and his colleagues drew up a list of their chief 'articles' of faith, especially as they related to the Swiss reformers, and these Schwabach Articles were adapted for discussions with Zwingli, Bucer and others at Marburg. Early the following year, in preparation for the Diet of Augsburg, Luther and his co-theologians drew up a similar list of twelve Torgau Articles that addressed the commonalities and differences they had with the Catholic position. As stated earlier, due to the inability of the outlawed Luther to leave Electoral Saxony, Philip Melanchthon headed the Lutheran theological delegation at Augsburg. It was he who made use of both the form and content of these two sets of articles in composing the Augsburg Confession.

The time-honored form of *theses*, which was familiar to all the Lutheran theologians from their university duties, was not used in any of the doctrinal statements produced at these convocations of 1529-1530. The time for debate had passed. Instead they developed a more systematic series of *articles* that elaborated theological statements of faith. The root meaning of *articulus* is 'a joint connecting various parts of the body' and then it assumes the more figurative meaning of a member or part of any larger whole. Thus, each article of faith delineated in the Augsburg Confession was seen as part of the larger body of doctrinal truth. The first group of twenty-one articles was entitled *Articuli fidei praecipui* (the chief articles of faith); the second section contained an additional seven entitled *Articuli in quibus recensentur abusus mutate* (articles reviewing the abuses that have been corrected).

While this Confession failed to achieve unity with the Catholics, its form worked admirably to define the Lutheran 'rule of faith'. As a result, Melanchton's lengthier defense (*Apology*) of the following year followed the same format. A few years later Luther himself penned the Smalcald Articles (1537); the final great Lutheran confession of the sixteenth century, the Formula of Concord (1577), would use an analogous form. The connection with the early creedal statements was retained throughout this period, which is seen in the Formula of Concord's beginning each article with affirmative statements, and ending with anathemas—clear and forceful rejections of false teachings. Such statements reflect the initial closing paragraph of the Nicene Creed and other creeds that followed.

The Augsburg Confession's form would in turn serve as a model for Archbishop Cranmer when he drew up his Thirteen Articles (1538) for use in doctrinal discussions with the Lutherans. Later he expanded these into the Forty-Two Articles (1553). After his death, these were re-worked into the Thirty-Nine Articles (1571), the confession that has remained the central doctrinal statement of the Anglican church. Similar confessions were produced by the Presbyterians (Westminster Confession, 1647), the Baptists (London Baptist Confession, 1644/1646), the Methodists (Articles of Religion, 1784), and other groups that were descendants of the Reformation.

Both the use of and the imitation of the early creeds, while not distinctively Lutheran, was pioneered by the Lutheran camp and fit exactly their theological view of the proper use of the early church, its Fathers, its councils, and its history. God's hidden hand could be seen only in retrospect in all that had happened. Just as the early Fathers provided countless examples of saints and sinners, of bold confessions of truth but also of the obstinate adoption of heresy, so the three ecumenical creeds had survived their many competitors because they stood the test of scriptural faithfulness. When things looked the darkest, and the truth seemed to be on the verge of extinction, there was nothing to fear, for Christians of all time, including Luther and his descendants, merely clung to the scriptural promises found in the creed: 'I believe in the holy Christian church, the communion of saints'.

It truly became an important Lutheran article of faith that both the Word and the Church will never perish (Headley 1963: 103). Luther wrote in his most famous hymn not only that 'The Word they shall allow to stand' but ends that verse with 'the kingdom ours remaineth' i.e., the Church will remain (Luther c.1528: 285). In the meantime, Lutherans use the Fathers, and cherish their help in interpreting Scripture, in witnessing to the faith, and in handing down salutary customs to the church—the church year, the liturgy, and the like. But they also use Christian discretion as they continue

to study the Fathers of all periods, and practice true Christian freedom in adopting or adapting customs that are useful in building up God's people.

Confessionalism Today

The importance of written confessions to a healthy church is one of the most important Reformation inheritances that is now in danger of being lost. Not only are our Christian distinctives derided by secular culture, but unity is also the mantra among mainline denominations as well as among many evangelicals seeking a non-denominational base for joint activities. Cooperation can be useful in many ways, as when discussing specific topics like the recent fourteen articles of the 'Nashville Statement on Biblical Sexuality'—each with a robust 'We Affirm' and 'We Deny'. But when churches, i.e., worshipping communities, seek to unite on the basis of a simplistic gospel unity, the brief statements of faith that such groups usually produce give evidence of a theological anemia that would have horrified all of the Reformers. The 4,000 words of the *Thirty-Nine Articles* or the 12,000-word *Westminster Confession* require additions rather than contractions today. The modern theological situation has only become more complex in the past four centuries and articulating the truth will take longer rather than shorter documents. Depth is not merely a matter of knowledge, but of belief and practice. Knowing the full counsel of God and standing up for it against all comers is not always pleasant, and certainly is out of fashion. But to Luther and the Reformers it was the only godly stance and thorough and precise confessions were an important tool in doing just that.

Speaking all the truth, yet doing so in love with respect for those who disagree, can be done yet today. We need to model this in our churches before we can expect anyone to model it in politics or society. Sacrificing one's confessional heritage in the interests of tolerance is unnecessary, unproductive, and unbiblical. True tolerance involves understanding and respectfully interacting with the divergent opinions of others; it must not become silence or obsequious submission of one's own beliefs. Evangelical organizations such as the Evangelical Theological Society are most useful and productive when they facilitate a healthy debate on Scripture and its interpretation between those who adhere to a complete belief system, whether that is encapsulated in the *Thirty-Nine Articles*, the *Westminster Confession*, or any other confession. While many of those in free church traditions may see such confessions as theological straightjackets, Lutheran see them as norms—norms that have been normed (*norma normata*) by Scripture (the *norma normans*) to be sure; but still norms that can keep the church building God's kingdom solid and straight.

The lack of a historical sense, of a continuity with the early church, has led in part to an evangelical revival of interest in and study of the Fathers

over the past three decades. Those who have taken part have found that such study also can help one avoid succumbing to the latest trends in theology and practice. Almost every new aberration is just a repackaging of an ancient heresy—Gnosticism, Montanism, Arianism, or Pelagianism, to name just the more common ones. If the heirs of the wider Reformation use the early church as Luther did, and remain confident in confessing its faith not only in the texts of the ancient creeds, but also those of the Reformation documents, there may yet be a revival in biblical confessionalism. To this Luther would have added a heartfelt, 'Amen. May it be so!'

Bibliography

AE—Luther, Martin (1955-1986) Pelikan J and Helmut L (eds) *Luther's Works, American Edition*, 54 vols. St. Louis: Concordia.

WA—Luther, Martin (1883-2009) *D. Martin Luthers Werke (Weimar Ausgabe)*, 56 vols. Weimar: Hermann Böhlau.

WBr—Luther, Martin (1930-1970) *D. Martin Luthers Werke, Briefwechsel (Weimar Ausgabe)*, 12 vols. Weimar: Hermann Böhlau.

WTr—Luther, Martin (1912-1921) *D. Martin Luthers Werke, Tischreden (Weimar Ausgabe)*, 6 vols. Weimar: Hermann Böhlau.

(1516) Letter to George Spalatin, October 19 (AE 41:23-26; WBr 1: 70-71).

(1518) Introduction to *A German Theology* (AE 31:75-76; WA 1:378-379).

(1518b) Letter to Spalatin, Jan.18 (AE 48:52-55; WBr 1:133-134).

(1519) Leipzig Debate (WA 2:250-383).

(1521) Against Latomus (AE 32:137-260; WA 8:36-128).

(1522) Christmas Postille, Gospel for the Day of the Three Kings (AE 52:159-286; WA 10.1:555-728).

(1523) Sermon on the Creed, March 6 (WA 11:53-54).

(1528) Letter to Nicholas Gerbel, July 28 (AE 49:199-202; WBr 4:508, no. 1290).

(c.1528) A Mighty Fortress is Our God (AE 53:284-285; WA 50:455-457).

(1530) Letter no. 1674, to Melanchton, August 4 (WBr 5:525-527).

(1532) 'Introduction' to *Athanasii libri contra idolatriam*, ed. J. Bugenhagen. Wittenberg (WA 30.3:530-532).

(1532) Table Talk,Veit Deitrich's edition: no. 347 (AE 54:49; WTr 1:140).

(1535) Sermon on Psalm 110, June 5 (WA 41:182-203).

(1535-38) Lectures on Genesis (AE 2; WA 42).

(1538) Preface to Galeatius Fapella's History (AE 34:275-278; WA 50:383-385).

(1538b) The Three Symbols or Creeds of the Christian Faith (AE 34:201-229; WA 50:262-283).

(1539) On the Councils and the Church (AE 41:9-178; WA 50:488-653).
(1545) Preface to the Latin Works of M. Luther (AE 34:323-338; WA 44:179-187).

Anderas P (2017, March 29) Martin Luther, Augustinianism, and Augustine. *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Religion. Ed*. Retrieved 1 Dec. 2018, from http://oxfordre.com/religion/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780199340378-8.001.0001/acrefore-9780199340378-e-268.

Beer T and von Stockhausen A (1999) *Die Disputation zwischen Arius und Athanasius: Luthers erste Klosterlektüre; ein Beitrag zur Lutherforschung*. Weilheim-Bierbronnen: Institut für Lutherforschung der Gustav-Siewerth-Akademie.

Headley JM (1963) *Luther's View of Church History*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Koehler W (1900) *Luther und die Kirchengeschichte nach senen Scrhiften, Zunächst bis 1521*. Erlangen.

Oberman H (1989) *Luther: Man between God and the Devil*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Posset F (2003) *The Front-Runner of the Catholic Reformation: The Life and Works of Johann von Staupitz*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate.

Schulze M (1996) Martin Luther and the Church Fathers. In Backus I (ed) *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West: From the Carolingians to the Maurists*. Lieden: Brill, pp. 573-626.

Steinmetz D (1981) *Reformers in the Wings*. Grand Rapids: Baker.

sciendo

Perichoresis
Volume 17.4 (2019): 57–72
DOI: 10.2478/perc-2019-0028

CALVIN'S PREFACE TO CHRYSOSTOM'S HOMILIES AS A WINDOW INTO CALVIN'S OWN PRIORITIES AND PERSPECTIVES

PAUL A. HARTOG*

Faith Baptist Theological Seminary

ABSTRACT. John Calvin drew from patristic authors in a selective manner. His preference for the theological perspectives of Augustine is readily evident. Nevertheless, while he resonated with the doctrine of Augustine, he touted the interpretive and homiletic labors of John Chrysostom. Even though Calvin's *Institutes of the Christian Religion* critiqued Chrysostom's understanding of grace and free will, the Antiochene bishop is the most frequently referenced patristic author within Calvin's commentaries. Calvin composed a preface to a projected edition of Chrysostom's homilies (*Praefatio in Chrysostomi Homilias*). This preface argued for the necessity of reaching the general public with secondary aids along with the scriptures, explained Calvin's esteem for Chrysostom's homilies above other patristic texts, and acknowledged the theological dissimilarities that separated his views from Chrysostom's. The *Praefatio*'s assessments reveal Calvin's own hermeneutical, pastoral, and theological priorities. Calvin's evaluations of Chrysostom and the other fathers are a window into his own interpretive concerns, homiletical aims, and dogmatic emphases.

KEYWORDS: biblical interpretation, Calvin, Chrysostom, hermeneutics

The church fathers undoubtedly influenced John Calvin's thought (Torrance 1988: 720). Back in 1964, William Newton Todd completed a doctoral dissertation that examined Calvin's use of patristic sources. 'In general', concluded Todd, 'his knowledge of the Fathers, councils, and history of Christian antiquity was outstanding for his day' (Todd 1964: 169). Todd added, 'His learning was broad and his patristic citations for the most part were naturally and logically woven into the text and context of his writings' (Todd 1964: 169). Over the last few decades, Calvin scholarship has witnessed a renewed interest in Calvin's reception of patristic sources (Lane 1981: 191-200; Steinmetz 1990; van Oort 1997: 61; Lane 1999; Backus 2000; Backus 2009; Steinmetz 2010). These contemporary scholars have often leaned toward more nuance in their assessment of the breadth and

* PAUL A. HARTOG (PhD 2000, Loyola University Chicago) is Professor of Theology at Faith Baptist Theological Seminary. Email: hartogp@faith.edu.

depth of Calvin's knowledge of the fathers and of his employment of their works (Backus 2000).

Calvin's usage of the fathers was 'primarily polemical' (van Oort 1997: 671, 698; cf. Lane 1981: 164). His knowledge of patristic literature reflects a fairly limited canon, focused primarily on post-Nicene authors (Backus 2000: 253, 276). Calvin's dedicatory letter to Simon Grynaeus referenced 'ancient commentators, whose godliness, learning, sanctity and age have secured them such great authority that we should not despise anything they have produced' (quoted in Steinmetz 1990: 100). In his reception of patristic sources, Calvin claimed to reflect burgeoning humanist emphases, such as the desire to separate genuine from spurious works, the intention to interpret the texts within their original historical contexts, and the willingness to consider mitigating circumstances (van Oort 1997: 673, 680, 687, 690). For example, Calvin accused Pighius of quoting Augustine out of context without consideration of real intention (van Oort 1997: 678). Nevertheless, Calvin did not always live up to these purported ideals (Backus 2000).

Calvin's reception of the fathers was selective, generally ignoring facets such as patristic spirituality, asceticism, and monasticism (Backus 2000). He demonstrated preference for specific authors and passages, based upon his personal perspectives (Backus 2000: 273). Calvin explicitly explained his tendencies in a preface to a proposed edition of John Chrysostom's homilies. The process of assessment often reveals as much about the one assessing as the one assessed. Calvin's preface not only describes Chrysostom's work, it also provides insights into Calvin's own theological and hermeneutical priorities. Calvin's assessments of Chrysostom and the other fathers within the preface are a window into his own interpretive concerns, homiletical aims, and dogmatic emphases. His values are recognized through his evaluations.

Augustine and Chrysostom

In a 1539 letter to Sadolet, Calvin declared, 'I ask you to place before your eyes the ancient form of the Church as their writings prove it to have been in the ages of Chrysostom and Basil among the Greeks, and of Cyprian, Ambrose and Augustine among the Latins' (quoted in Todd 1964: 172-173). Todd concluded that Calvin's special 'favorites' among the fathers were Augustine and Chrysostom, two authors who 'enjoyed a unique place' in his thought (Todd 1964: 173, 177; cf. Papp 2016: 423). While Chrysostom was a favored Greek father, his influence upon Calvin still lagged significantly behind the influence of the Bishop of Hippo (Warfield 1956; Smits 1958). For Calvin, Augustine was 'the patristic authority *par excellence*' (van Oort 1997: 682-783). He held the African bishop in 'the highest regard' (Lane 1981: 171). In his *Treatise on Predestination*, Calvin even declared, 'As for St.

Augustine, he agrees so well with us in everything and everywhere, that if I had to write a confession upon this matter it would be enough for me to compose it from evidences drawn from his books' (quoted in Wendel 2002: 125). Nevertheless, on occasion Calvin did express disagreements with Augustine's theology or conceptualizations (*Institutes III*.3.10-12). He could even name Augustine among those 'who build upon Christ, but in consequence of the weakness of the flesh, admit something that is man's or through ignorance turn aside to some extent from the strict purity of God's word' (Calvin, *Commentary* on 1 Corinthians 3:15).[1]

When it came to biblical exposition, however, Calvin summoned and praised the interpretive work of Chrysostom. In Calvin's estimation, Augustine and Chrysostom excelled at differing tasks. Calvin looked to Augustine for doctrinal support and to Chrysostom for interpretive insights (Zachman 2001: 15n45). As Michael Carl Armour surmises, '… Calvin adapted a style as reminiscent of Chrysostom expositionally as it was of Augustine theologically' (Armour 1992: 124). Because of this focus, Calvin exhibited great interest in Chrysostom's homilies. Calvin's access to the Latin Chevallon edition (1536) of Chrysostom is 'considered proven' (Kreijkes 2016b: 347; cf. Kreijkes 2016; Papp 2016: 428). Kreijkes has recently argued that Calvin used the Chevallon edition among others only during his last Genevan period, and that scholars must seek to establish which particular Chrysostomic edition Calvin used for each of his works (Kreijkes 2016). Kreijkes has further argued that Calvin might have also read Chrysostom in Greek (Kreijkes 2016b; contrast Papp 2016: 432). In spite of his respect for the exposition of the Antiochene commentator, Calvin disagreed with various scriptural interpretations found in Chrysostom (Ahn 1999: 230). Calvin could critique specific arguments from Chrysostom as 'excessively weak', and cases of his interpretation as 'poor' (Calvin, *Commentary* on Colossians 1:15; 2:16). Yet he refused to cast Chrysostom aside through a 'wholesale dismissal' (Armour 1992: 127).

While Calvin looked to Augustine for dogmatic instruction, he looked to Chrysostom for biblical interpretive guidance (Ganoczy & Scheld 1983: 179; Zachman 2006: 67n4). Calvin's dependence upon Augustine's theological insights readily appears in two works, his *Institutes of the Christian Religion* and his *Bondage and Liberation of the Will*. In the latter, Calvin quotes twenty-five of Augustine's works, along with thirty-three works from other authors (Lane 1997: 69, 83). Anthony Lane muses that 'those who read the treatise will be struck by the paucity of reference to other fathers compared to the wealth of material on Augustine' (Lane 1997: 79). Lane explains the lopsid-

1 English translations of Calvin's commentaries come from the Pringle editions (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans).

ed usage of Augustine based upon availability, compressed time of composition, and especially theological agreement (Lane 1997: 84).

Chrysostom barely appears within the *Bondage and Liberation of the Will*, and the few instances merely reflect prior employment in the *Institutes* (Lane 1997: 84, 94). Within the *Institutes* themselves, Calvin's patristic usage can basically be divided into two 'distinct halves', Augustine and the other fathers (Lane 1997: 88; cf. Lane 1981: 159). According to Johannes van Oort, Calvin's use of Gregory the Great within the *Institutes* comes in a distant second behind Augustine (van Oort 1997: 694). His employment of Chrysostom comes in third, with about forty-five citations, including references to Pseudo-Chrysostom (van Oort 1997: 684). Thirty-one of the citations relate to Chrysostom's interpretations of the Apostle Paul's Epistle to the Romans (van Oort 1997: 674; cf. the statistics in Lane 1981: 201-205).

Peter Moore maintains that three evidences demonstrate 'Calvin's enthusiasm for Chrysostom' (Moore 2009: 110). First, Calvin composed a preface to a proposed translation of Chrysostom's sermons into French (the focus of this present essay). Second, Calvin conspicuously referenced Chrysostom within his *Institutes of the Christian Religion*. The *Institutes* reflect Calvin's expectation that his readers would possess 'some familiarity with the writings of the church fathers, especially Augustine and Chrysostom' (Zachman 2006: 82). Third, Calvin annotated his personal copies of Chrysostom (still available in the Geneva Library) with *marginalia* notes and underlining, as discussed in the investigation of Alexandre Ganoczy and Klaus Müller (1981). A fourth evidence can be added, as reflected in one of Moore's discursive footnotes: Calvin employed Chrysostom's insights within his own biblical commentaries, and Chrysostom was the most frequently cited father in his New Testament commentaries (Kreijkes-van Esch 2017: 261). According to the index of the *Corpus Reformatorum*, Calvin's New Testament commentaries refer to Chrysostom 105 times and to Augustine 101 times (Steinmetz 1990: 116). Yet these statistics, which rely upon explicit references, do not reveal the full influence of Chrysostom upon Calvin's commentaries (Steinmetz 2010: 133).

John Walchenbach has examined Chrysostom's influence upon Calvin's Corinthian commentaries in particular (Walchenbach 2010: 47-116). More recently, Jeannette Kreijkes-van Esch has focused upon Chrysostom's and Calvin's exposition of Galatians (Kreijkes 2017). Interestingly, Kreijkes-van Esch concludes that 'Calvin's exegesis does not have much in common with Chrysostom's' (Kreijkes van-Esch 2017: 270). Although perhaps an overstatement, this assertion does signal an underlying issue. In Calvin's commentary, 'the exegesis produces *doctrina*, but *doctrina* also forms the frame-

work for the exegesis' (Kreijkes-van Esch 2017: 271; cf. d'Assonville 2009; Kreijkes 2017).[2] This dialectical movement reflects Calvin's own hermeneutical and theological emphases, which in turn are reflected in his personal assessment of Chrysostom, as presented below.

Calvin's Preface to Chrysostom's Homilies

Calvin composed a preface to a proposed edition of the sermons of John Chrysostom (*Praefatio in Chrysostomi Homilias*). Ian Hazlett has called the preface 'One of the traditional puzzles in Calvin studies' (Hazlett 1991: 129). Hazlett explains, 'The date, circumstances, and precise scope of this project have always been uncertain, chiefly because the only evidence for the plan is a substantial fragment of a prefatory introduction in Calvin's own hand' (Hazlett 1991: 129). The preface is a draft in Latin, and the proposed project of an edition of Chrysostom's sermons never came to publication. Most likely, Calvin intended the edition to be in French (Hazlett 1991: 130). Calvin labeled his proposed translation as 'unconventional (*inusitatum*)' (Hazlett 1991: 138), and he noted that not all church ministers were sufficiently versed in Greek and Latin (Kreijkes 2016b: 348). Hazlett argues (and reasonably so) that Calvin's intention was to transition the preface itself into French as well. 'What we have', explains Hazlett, 'is a first draft, with its errors, corrections, deletions, interlinear and marginal insertions, sometimes minor, sometimes major, its extensive abbreviations, and so on' (Hazlett 1991: 130-131).

While Walchenbach maintained that Calvin composed the preface in 1559 (Walchenbach 2010: 175), Hazlett built a case for the late 1530s (Hazlett 1991: 132-133). Kreijkes similarly landed upon 1538 (Kreijkes 2016b: 347). Hazlett's chronological placement relied upon paleographic evidence, as well as the watermark on the paper of the draft. Moreover, Calvin's personal copies of a 1536 Paris edition of Chrysostom's works contain the Reformer's marginal notes and reader's highlights. 'It would seem', comments Hazlett, 'that Calvin was using Chrysostom as a means of learning how to preach sermons with practical relevance' (Hazlett 1991: 133). Irena Backus sides with those who date the preface 'provisionally' at 1540, 'although that date can only be considered as approximate' (Backus 2000: 254).

The extant draft of Calvin's preface has been translated into English on two occasions. In a 1965 entry within *The Hartford Quarterly*, John H. McIndoe presented the first English translation of the Latin text (McIndoe 1965). In 1991, Hazlett re-translated Calvin's preface into English. Hazlett spelled out his rationale for the necessity of this re-translation. First, he

2 One could, of course, make a case that Chrysostom's own broader theological framework also informed his personal interpretation of the Galatian texts.

could only trace down one copy of McIndoe's work, in the Trinity College Collection of the Glasgow University Library.[3] Second, he desired to make McIndoe's translation 'more readily available on this side of the Atlantic' (Hazlett 1991: 131). Third, Hazlett reasoned that 'dubious and occasionally inexplicable renderings' in McIndoe's rendition warranted 'a fresh translation' (Hazlett 1991: 131). Fourth, McIndoe only worked with the Latin text found in the thirty-sixth volume of the *Corpus Reformatorum* (1870), while Hazlett took into account variant readings found in various transcripts. Fifth, McIndoe's work was 'completely devoid of an introduction and helpful footnotes' (Hazlett 1991: 131). By contrast, Hazlett purposed to provide 'generous annotation' (Hazlett 1991: 131).

In a key paragraph within his introduction, Hazlet delineated the importance of Calvin's preface to Chrysostom's sermons: 'Whatever the problems surrounding this Calvin fragment, its contents are a transparent testimony of the relationship between Christian humanism and the Reformation; between the rediscovery of the sources of Christian (and Jewish) Antiquity by reform-minded Catholics, which accompanied the Renaissance, and the theological and religious revolution initiated by Luther; and between patristic tradition and Scripture in the mind of a Reformer. Calvin's document is a miniature, embodying one of the most distinctive and potent amalgams of these forces' (Hazlett 1991: 129-130).

In sum, Hazlett wished to illuminate the socio-cultural forces of Christian humanism, the Renaissance, and the Reformation as they are reflected in Calvin's preface.

The purpose of this present article is to make a more foundational argument: Calvin's evaluations of Chrysostom and other patristic authors, as found in the preface, provide a window into his own personal interpretive concerns, homiletical aims, and dogmatic emphases. In his draft preface to Chrysostom's commentaries, Calvin constructs three major strands of argumentation (cf. Walchenbach 2010: 176-180).

First, Calvin justifies the necessity of publishing an edition of Chrysostom's sermons in the vernacular of the laity. Second, Calvin explains why Chrysostom's sermons outshine those of all other patristic preachers. Third, Calvin defends why Chrysostom is worth reading even though Calvin disagrees with important facets of his theology.

These three strands of evaluation reflect Calvin's own hermeneutical, pastoral, and theological values.

3 McIndoe's translation can now be accessed as a full-text PDF through the ATLA Religion Database.

The Necessity of Reaching the General Public

First, Calvin justifies the necessity of publishing an edition of Chrysostom's sermons in the vernacular of the laity. Calvin clearly wished 'to make Chrysostom's literature accessible to the wider sphere of society' (Awad 2010: 422). Yet he also surmised that his project would face opposition. He mused, 'For I am aware of what nearly always happens in the case of innovation, that there will be no lack of people who will not only condemn this work of mine as unnecessary, but also are of the opinion that it ought to be rejected out of hand as being of no particular benefit to the Church' (Hazlett 1991: 138).[4]

Hazlett reasons that Calvin may have been influenced by the 'popular rejection' of his Genevan *Confession of Faith* in 1537-1538. 'The person on the street was simply unmoved by it' (Hazlett 1991: 135-136). The views of radical Reformers may also have been lurking in the shadows. Thomas Müntzer decried those who relied upon the church fathers for biblical interpretation, calling such individuals 'mischievous scripture thieves', 'spiteful biblical scholars', and 'modern Pharisees' (see Awad 2010: 424).

In response, Calvin argued that secondary aids, such as Chrysostom's sermons, could assist with the study and interpretation of Scripture. While Calvin upheld the supremacy of Scripture, he also defended 'authentic and authoritative' secondary literature (Awad 201: 423). Calvin reasoned that the reader of Scripture benefits from reliable guides (Awad 2010: 425). The Holy Spirit's work cannot be boundaried or controlled, and he may freely choose to employ secondary aids to elucidate the meaning of scripture texts (Hazlett 1991: 141). Therefore, 'there is no reason', argues Calvin's preface, 'either to neglect [secondary means] as superfluous, or even to care less about them as if irrelevant' (Hazlett 1991: 141). In this manner, Calvin chooses a decidedly pneumatological framework to defend the Spirit's use of secondary means. As Najeeb George Awad notes, 'From a theological point of view, Calvin seeks through translating Chrysostom's homilies to show the Christian public that the Holy Spirit does not work only through the canonical texts' (Awad 2010: 426).

According to Randall Zachman, Calvin's general tactic was to target pastors as the primary audience for his *Institutes* and biblical commentaries, and to target ordinary Christians as the primary audience for his catechism and homilies (Zachman 2001: 6; Zachman 2006: 60). Zachman acknowledges that 'a watertight distinction' cannot be absolutely maintained between these audiences (Zachman 2001: 6n20). The 'primary audience' for the *Institutes*

4 English translations of Calvin's *Praefatio in Chrysostomi Homilias* come from the Hazlett edition (Oxford: Blackwell, 1991).

was future pastors and teachers, but the translation of the work into French reflects a secondary interest in 'ordinary Christians' (Zachman 2001: 12, n. 38). Calvin also contended that not all clerics were competent in the classical languages of Greek and Latin. Calvin pointed to the blessing accrued by making the Gospel available to the public. If the Word of God is the instrument of God's saving work, then it should not be 'hidden in the libraries of a select few, inaccessible to the general public' (Hazlett 1991: 140).

Calvin reasoned that Chrysostom himself was an exemplar of reaching the general public (*universum populum*) (see Walchenbach 2010: 21). In this sense, Calvin allied himself with Chrysostom in a 'common cause' (Walchenbach 2010: 22; cf. Hazlett 1991: 142-143). According to Calvin, Chrysostom's sermons target 'a wide public'—he 'plainly adjusts both [his] approach and language as if he had the instruction of the common people in mind' (Hazlett 1991: 142). In Calvin's estimation, Chrysostom exemplified 'a down-to-earth form of preaching which is reflective of God's infinite love and intimate presence in human existence' (Awad 2010: 426). Calvin desired to bring Chrysostom's homilies to a contemporary audience. 'All I have had in mind with this is to facilitate the reading of Holy Scripture for those who are humble and uneducated' (Hazlett 1991: 142). Calvin found his motto, 'Scripture for the people', echoed in the labor of the golden-mouthed preacher (Ganoczy & Scheld 1983: 118; Walchenbach 2010: 19).

Calvin's response in this first strand of argumentation reflects his own framework of pastoral values. Calvin valued bringing the Scriptures and helpful aids into the hands of the common populace (Backus 2000: 256). This priority is already evident in his Latin and French prefaces to Olivetan's French translation of the Bible (Zachman 2001: 2). At that early stage, he already brought Augustine and Chrysostom into the discussion: 'Chrysostom and Augustine—when do they not urge the common people to this study—how frequently they insist that what they hear in church they should apply in homes? Why is it that Chrysostom contends that the reading of Holy Scripture is more necessary for common people than monks?' (quoted in Zachman 2001: 2-3). Calvin not only wanted the Scriptures in the hands of the laity, he also desired to provide godly interpreters to guide them in Bible reading (Zachman 2001: 3). 'In sum', reasons Zachman, 'Calvin envisioned a church in which every Christian would read Scripture for her/himself, under the guidance of their pastors, who themselves would be guided by the teachers of the church catholic' (Zachman 2001: 10).

The Preference for Chrysostom's Homilies

Second, Calvin explains why Chrysostom's sermons surpass those of all other patristic preachers. As Hazlett notes, 'The interpreter and presenter of the Word *par excellence* in Antiquity is John Chrysostom, whose Homilies

and exegetical skill excel those of any other Church Father' (Hazlett 1991: 134). Not all Reformers shared Calvin's appreciation for Chrysostom. Luther criticized Chrysostom's work as a 'chaotic heap of words without substance… argumentative and garrulous' (quoted in Hazlett 1991: 137). Luther also castigated the loquacious oratory and verbosity of Chrysostom (Hazlett 1991: 137). Of course, Calvin's hermeneutical presuppositions differed from those of Luther (Armour 1992).

According to Calvin, praiseworthy biblical interpretation should also be 'profitable, useful, and edifying for the Church' (Hazlett 1991: 136). Calvin evaluated the patristic authors with this framework in place. Origen obscured 'the plain meaning of Scripture with constant allegories' (Hazlett 1991: 144). Basil and Gregory obscured the scripture's meaning through grandiloquence, having 'more of an aptitude for oratory than for literary exposition' (Hazlett 1991: 144). Hilary lacked lucidity, 'the most important faculty of an interpreter' (Hazlett 1991: 145). Jerome was 'almost completely bogged down in allegories', and he comes across as 'a man not sufficiently experienced in church affairs' (Hazlett 1991: 145). Ambrose's works, though 'very laconic', come 'closer to the plain sense of Scripture' (Hazlett 1991: 145). Even Augustine was 'far too ingenious', resulting in him being 'less sound and reliable' (Hazlett 1991: 145).

Calvin differentiates the work of Chrysostom, who manifested simplicity and lucidity. 'The chief merit of our Chrysostom is this: he took great pains everywhere not to deviate in the slightest from the genuine plain meaning of Scripture [*germana scripturae sinceritate*], and not to indulge in any license of twisting the straight forward sense of the words [*ac nullam sibi licentiam sumere in simplici verborum sensu contorquendo*]' (Hazlett 1991: 146). Calvin esteemed the *simplicitas* of Chrysostom's interpretive approach (Kreijkes-van Esch 2017: 262). Similar to the *Praefatio*, Calvin's other writings identify the 'natural (*germanus*)' and 'simple (*simplex*)' meaning of scripture with the 'literal sense (*sensus literalis*)' (Kreijkes-van Esch 2017: 264-265; cf. Burnett 2004).

Calvin defends Chrysostom as a thorough expositor and a practical preacher (Awad 2010: 426). In Calvin's view, Chrysostom 'was without peer among the ancients as an interpreter of the Bible' (Moore 2009: 111). 'Of all the Fathers, he awarded to Chrysostom the first place in the exposition of Scripture' (van Oort 1997: 691). According to Calvin, Cyril of Alexandria is 'someone who among the Greeks can be rated second to Chrysostom', although he cannot rival him (Hazlett 1991: 144). Therefore, Chrysostom stands at the 'apex' of Calvin's estimation of the Greek fathers (Backus 2000: 258).

Above all, Calvin's esteem for Chrysostom centered upon his 'simple, literal-historical approach to the text' (Bouwsma 1988: 119). This assessment

reveals Calvin's own framework of hermeneutical values. Calvin maintained that he and Chrysostom shared a 'common concern' or 'common cause [*causam communem*]' (Hazlett 1991: 142).[5] Two of Calvin's crucial tenets of exegesis were the principles of *perspicua brevitas* and *sensus genuinus* (Kraus 1968: 334, 336). As Zachman explains, '…Calvin sets forth the true, simple, and genuine meaning of Scripture, by showing how such meaning flows smoothly and naturally from the context, thereby revealing the mind of the author of Scripture with lucid brevity' (Zachman 2001: 11). In his dedicatory letter to Simon Grynaeus, Calvin felt that 'lucid brevity constituted the particular virtue of an interpreter' (quoted in Zachman 2001: 11n35). Chrysostom manifested Calvin's own hermeneutical ideal of *brevitas et facilitas* (Ahn 1999: 238; Walchenbach 2010: 165).

The Acknowledgement of Theological Differences

Third, Calvin defends why Chrysostom is worth reading even though he disagreed with important facets of his theology. Fascinatingly, the original manuscript of Calvin's preface reveals that this third discussion was an 'appended insertion' (Hazlett 1991: 134). Calvin pinpointed areas of disagreement residing within the doctrines of election, predestination, free will, human cooperation, grace, and merit. In Calvin's view, Chrysostom 'makes too much concession to human capacity and virtue' (Hazlett 1991: 134). In his *Institutes*, Calvin had commented that 'All ecclesiastical writers have recognized both that the soundness of reason in man is gravely wounded through sin, and that the will has been very much enslaved by evil desires. Despite this, many of them have come far too close to the philosophers' (Calvin, *Institutes* II.2.4).[6] According to Calvin's preface to Chrysostom's sermons, the philosophers had little room for 'the blindness of human nature, the perversity of the heart, the impotence of the mind, and the corruption of the entire character' (Hazlett 1991: 148).

Calvin's *inter alia* notes within the *Institutes* remind readers that Chrysostom had to contend with the contemporary philosophical emphases upon free will and also with moral laxity within the Church (*Institutes* II.5.2-3; van Oort 1997: 693). But in matters of grace, free will, election, and predestination, Calvin found a more trustworthy ally in Augustine (Todd 1964: 191; Ganoczy & Sheld 1983: 179). He contended, 'Further, even though the Greeks above the rest—and Chrysostom especially among them—extol the ability of the human will, yet all the ancients, save Augustine, so differ, wa-

5 Some textual witnesses have *causam coniunctam*. See Hazlett 1991: 142.

6 English translations of Calvin's *Institutes* come from the McNeill edition (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1960).

ver, or speak confusedly on this subject, that almost nothing certain can be derived from their writings' (*Institutes* II.2.4).

György Papp maintains that Calvin's critique of Chrysostom is 'not only rather sharp' but also 'very warped' (Papp 2016: 431). Within five chapters of the *Institutes* that focus upon the corruption of free will within humanity, Calvin includes eleven quotations attributed to Chrysostom—in a critical manner in nearly every case (Papp 2016: 424-425). In two instances, Calvin attributed spurious quotations to Chrysostom (cf. Steinmetz 1990: 113-114). Papp believes that Calvin was aware of doubts concerning the *Homilia prima in adventu* in particular but chose to overlook them, because 'he did not want to ascribe a thought he accepted as a good one to an unknown Arian author' (Papp 2016: 431). Of the remaining nine genuinely Chrysostomic quotations, only one could be considered a 'positive' estimation (Papp 2016: 431). Papp contends that a bad Latin translation contributed to Calvin's critical evaluation of Chrysostom in one of the eight 'negative' cases (Papp 2016: 429).

On occasion, Calvin even labeled Chrysostom's interpretations as 'absurd' and 'very constrained' (see van Oort 1997: 692). Yet Calvin refused to dismiss Chrysostom in a wholesale manner (Hazlett 1991: 137). He esteemed Chrysostom as a 'trusty minister of Christ' who 'did deviate somewhat from the right way, although he had the best of intentions' (Hazlett 1991: 149). Calvin tries to explain away theological differences based upon the extenuating 'circumstances of the times' and contextual pressures that Chrysostom faced (Hazlett 1991: 134, 136). In Walchenbach's judgment, Calvin's magnanimity 'stretches every nerve to exonerate Chrysostom's theological deficiencies' (Walchenbach 2010: 26).

In his *Treatise on Scandals*, Calvin claimed that most of the fathers caved into 'the common judgment of the flesh', suffering from 'desire to please the wise of the world, or at least from fear of annoying them' (quoted in Todd 1964: 192). Calvin's treatise added, 'Certainly Origen, Tertullian, Basil, Chrysostom and others like them would never have spoken as they do, if they had followed what judgment God had given them. … These good persons seek a means more in conformity with human understanding: that is to concede I know not what to free will, and allow some natural virtue to man; but meanwhile the purity of the doctrine is profaned' (quoted in Todd 1964: 192). On the other hand, Calvin declared of the fathers, 'Yet I dare affirm this: however excessive they sometimes are in extolling free will, they have this end in view—to teach man utterly to forsake confidence in his own virtue and to hold that all his strength rests in God alone' (*Institutes* II.2.9).

Calvin argues that even though Chrysostom falls short in his theological stances, his sermons remain instructive regarding the life, worship, and discipline of the early church (Hazlett 1991: 150). Chrysostom thus provides

an example of a 'model from the early church [*normam a veteri ecclesia*]' (Hazlett 1991: 150). Awad concludes, Chrysostom's 'exegetical method and pastoral concern override… his criticism of the theological content of Chrysostom's commentaries' (Awad 2010: 424). Nevertheless, Calvin explicitly warned that readers should exercise caution, lest they 'be diverted from the plain truth' by Chrysostom's 'authority' (Hazlett 1991: 150).

Calvin acknowledged that Chrysostom differed in theological emphases, but he claimed him as an ally in method of biblical exegesis (Awad 2010: 427). One senses some tension here. Calvin believes that doctrine should arise from the plain meaning of scripture, he concedes that Chrysostom excelled at such biblical interpretation, yet he disagreed with Chrysostom's theological conclusions. Todd reflects, 'On the one hand, Calvin states that in exegetical matters Augustine was too allegorical in his treatment of the text and excessively Platonic in some of his interpretations and that he preferred Chrysostom because his exegesis was more 'natural' and literal (in the grammatico-historical sense). On the other hand, Calvin states that Augustine's over-all interpretation of the economy and doctrine of Scripture is superior to that of Chrysostom' (Todd 1964: 179).

Chrysostom comes off as the 'perfect biblical commentator for the common man, but not to be followed in his teaching on free will' (Backus 2009: 136). Calvin does not elucidate how Chrysostom's 'superior exegetical method could result in inferior doctrine' (Todd 1964: 179). But such tensions are not uncommon in Calvin. As Armour noted, Calvin could 'compliment Augustine and simultaneously slap his wrist for improper exegesis' (Armour 1992: 132). On one occasion, Calvin praised Augustine's explanation of a text as being stated 'piously and judiciously' yet having 'nothing to do with the present passage' (Calvin, *Commentary* on John 1:16). On another occasion, Calvin declared, 'Augustine is quite delighted with his own acuteness, which throws no light on the subject' (Calvin, *Commentary* on Ephesians 3:18).

Hazlett argues that Calvin's approach is dressed in 'Erasmian, humanist clothes' (Hazlett 1991: 135; cf. Backus 2000: 257). Like Erasmus, Calvin's preface supports a return to the ethics of 'original Christianity' (Hazlett 1991: 135). Hazlett also maintains that Calvin's defense of Chrysostom reflects 'the Catholic Calvin', both his ecclesial concerns and his sense of the *communio sanctorum* (Hazlett 1991: 136; cf. Neuser & Armstrong 1997).

Conclusion

When it came to patristic sources, Calvin took 'an independent course' (Armour 1992: 135). 'Calvin's respect for the fathers was great, but not unqualified' (Lane 1981: 167). He treated the fathers as 'partners in conversation' but not as final authorities (Steinmetz 1990:117). He respected and

praised the fathers, yet he also challenged and sometimes even dismissed them (Armour 1992: 135). He recognized that the fathers sometimes contradicted themselves (Lane 1981: 167-168). Calvin's use of the fathers is open to the charge of selectivity (Lane 1981: 189; Backus 2009). Because of this independent and selective approach, his evaluations tend to teach us about the personal values embedded with his own evaluative framework. In particular, Calvin's assessment of John Chrysostom reveals Calvin's own hermeneutical, pastoral, and theological values.

Bibliography

Ahn MJ (1999) Calvin's Hermeneutic and the Development of His Method. *Hervormde Teologiese Studies* 55(1): 228-239.

Armour MC (1992) Calvin's Hermeneutic and the History of Christian Exegesis. Ph.D. dissertation. University of California, Los Angeles.

Awad NG (2010) The Influence of John Chrysostom's Hermeneutics on John Calvin's Exegetical Approach to Paul's *Epistle to the Romans*. *Scottish Journal of Theology* 63(4): 414-436.

Backus I (2000) Calvin and the Greek Fathers. In Bast RJ and Gow AC (eds) *Continuity and Change: The Harvest of Late Medieval and Reformation History*. Leiden: Brill, pp. 253-276.

Backus I (2009) Calvin and the Church Fathers. In Selderhuis HJ (ed) *The Calvin Handbook*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans: pp. 125-136.

Bouwsma WJ (1988) *John Calvin: A Sixteenth-Century Portrait*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Burnett R (2004) John Calvin and the *Sensus Literalis*. *Scottish Journal of Theology* 57(1): 1-3.

Büsser F (1984) Die Rolle der Kirchenväter in Calvins Exegetica. In Neuser WH (ed) *Calvinus ecclesiae Genevensis custos: Die Referate des Internationalen Kongresses für Calvinforschung vom 6. bis 9. September 1982 in Genf*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, pp. 163-164.

Calvin J (1863) *Praefatio in Chrysostomi Homilias*. In Baum G, Cunitz E, and Reuss E (eds) *Corpus Reformatorum: Ioannis Calvini Opera quae supersunt omnia*, vol. 37. Braunschweig: Schwetschke, cols. 831-838.

d'Assonville VE (2009) Exegesis and *Doctrina*. In Selderhuis HJ (ed) *The Calvin Handbook*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans: pp. 378-384.

Ganoczy A and Müller K (1981) *Calvins handschriftliche Annotationen zu Chrysostomus: Ein Beitrag Hermeneutik Calvins*. Wiesbaden: Steiner.

Ganoczy A and Scheld S (1983) *Die Hermeneutik Calvins: Geistesgeschichtliche Voraussetzungen und Grundzüge*. Wiesbaden: Steiner.

Hartog P (2018) John Chrysostom: Golden-Mouthed Preacher. In Forrest BK, King KL, Curtis B, and Milioni D (eds) *A Legacy of Preaching*, vol. 1: *Apostles to Revivalists*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, pp. 126-145.

Hazlett IP (1991): Calvin's Latin Preface to His Proposed French Edition of Chrysostom's Homilies: Translation and Commentary. In Kirk J (ed) *Humanism and Reform: The Church in Europe, England and Scotland, 1400-1643: Essays in Honour of James K. Cameron*. Studies in Church History Subsidia 8. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, pp. 129-150.

Johanson JW (1982) The Exegetical Technique of John Chrysostom and His Influence upon Calvin. M.Phil. thesis. Waterloo, ON: University of Waterloo.

Kraus H-J (1968) Calvins exegetische Prinzipien. *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 79(3): 329-341.

Kreijkes J (2016) Calvin's Use of the Chevallon Edition of Chrysostom's *Opera Omnia*: The Relationship between the Marked Sections and Calvin's Writings. *Church History and Religious Culture* 96(3): 237-265.

Kreijkes J (2016b) The *Praefatio in Chrysostomi Homilias* as an Indication that Calvin Read Chrysostom in Greek. In Selderhuis HJ and Huijgen A (eds) *Calvinus pastor ecclesiae: Papers of the Eleventh International Congress on Calvin Research*. Reformed Historical Theology 39. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, pp. 347-354.

Kreijkes J (2017) The Impact of Theological Concepts on Calvin's Reception of Chrysostom's Exegesis of *Galatians* 4:21-6. *Studia Patristica* 96: 57-63.

Kreijkes-van Esch J (2017) Sola Scriptura and Calvin's Appeal to Chrysostom's Exegesis. In Burger H, Huijgen A and Peels E (eds) *Sola Scriptura: Biblical and Theological Perspectives on Scripture, Authority, and Hermeneutics*. Studies in Reformed Theology 32. Leiden: Brill, pp. 260-275.

Lane ANS (1997) Calvin and the Fathers in *Bondage and Liberation of the Will*. In Neuser WH and Armstrong BG (eds) *Calvinus sincerioris religionis vindex: Calvin as Protector of the Purer Religion*. Sixteenth Century Essays and Studies 36. Kirksville, MO: Sixteenth Century Journal Publishers.

Lane ANS (1981) Calvin's Use of the Fathers and the Medievals. *Calvin Theological Journal* 16 (1981): 149-205.

Lane ANS (1999) *John Calvin: Student of the Church Fathers*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

McIndoe JH (1965) John Calvin: Preface to the Homilies of Chrysostom. *Hartford Quarterly* 5(2): 19-26.

Moore P (2009) Gold without Dross: Assessing the Debt of John Calvin to the Preaching of John Chrysostom. *Reformed Theological Review* 68(2): 109-129.

Moore P (2011) Plain Talk with a Gilt Edge: An Exploration of the Relation between 'Plain' Biblical Exposition and Persuasion in Chrysostom and Calvin. *Westminster Theological Journal* 73(1): 157-172.

Papp G. (2016) Aspects of Calvin's Use of Chrysostom—Quotations Concerning the Free Will: How did Calvin Quote Chrysostom in the Chapters Concerning the 'Free Will' of his *Institutes*? In Selderhuis HJ and Huijgen A (eds) *Calvinus pastor ecclesiae: Papers of the Eleventh International Congress on Calvin Research*. Reformed Historical Theology 39. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, pp. 423-434.

Pretila N (2006) The Influence of John Chrysostom and Cyril of Alexandria on Calvin's *Institutes*. Th.M. thesis. Dallas Theological Seminary.

Smits L (1958) *Saint Augustine dans l'oeuvre de Jean Calvin*, 2 vols. Assen: Van Gorcum.

Steinmetz DC (1990) Calvin and the Patristic Exegesis of Paul. In Steinmetz C (ed) *The Bible in the Sixteenth Century*. Durham: Duke University Press, pp. 100-118, 231-235.

Steinmetz DC (2010) Calvin and Patristic Exegesis. In *Calvin in Context*, second edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 120-138.

Todd WN (1964) The Function of the Patristic Writings in the Thought of John Calvin. Th.D. dissertation. Union Theological Seminary.

Torrance TF (1988) *The Hermeneutics of John Calvin*. Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press.

van Oort J (1997) John Calvin and the Church Fathers. In Backus I (ed) *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West: From the Carolingians to the Maurists*, vol. 2. Leiden: Brill, pp. 661-700.

Walchenbach J (2010) *John Calvin as Biblical Commentator: An Investigation into Calvin's Use of John Chrysostom as an Exegetical Tutor*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock.

Warfield BB (1956) *Calvin and Augustine*. Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed.

Wendel F (2002) *Calvin: Origins and Development of His Religious Thought*. Grand Rapids: Baker.

Zachman RC (2001) 'Do You Understand What You Are Reading?' Calvin's Guidance for the Reading of Scripture. *Scottish Journal of Theology* 54(1): 1-20.

Zachman RC (2006) *John Calvin as Teacher, Pastor, and Theologian: The Shape of His Writings and Thought*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.

Zillenbiller A (1993) *Die Einheit der katholischen Kirche: Calvins Cyprianrezeption in seinen ekklesiologischen Schriften*. Mainz: von Zabern.

sciendo

Perichoresis
Volume 17.3 (2019): 73–92
DOI: 10.2478/perc-2019-0029

'THAT ANCIENT AND CHRISTIAN LIBERTY': EARLY CHURCH COUNCILS IN REFORMATION ANGLICAN THOUGHT

ANDRE A. GAZAL*

Montana Bible College

ABSTRACT. This article will examine the role the first four ecumenical councils played in the controversial enterprises of John Jewel (1522-71) as well as two later early modern English theologians, Richard Hooker (1553-1600) and George Carleton (1559-1628). In three different polemical contexts, each divine portrays the councils as representing definitive catholic consensus not only for doctrine, but also ecclesiastical order and governance. For all three of these theologians, the manner in which the first four ecumenical councils were summoned and conducted, as well as their enactments touching the Church's life provided patristic norms for its rightful administration. Jewel, Hooker, and Carleton each argued that the English Protestant national Church as defined by the Elizabethan Settlement exemplified a faithful recovery of patristic conciliar ecclesiastical government as an essential component in England's overall endeavor to return to the true Church Catholic. Jewel employed these councils in order to impeach the Council of Trent's (1545-63) status as a general council, and to justify the transfer of the authority of general councils to national and regional synods under the direction of godly princes. Hooker proposes the recovery of general councils as a means of achieving Catholic consensus within a Christendom divided along national and confessional lines while at the same time employing the pronouncements of the first four general councils to uphold the authoritative patristic and catholic warrant for institutions and practices retained by the Elizabethan Church. Finally, amid the controversy surrounding the Oath of Allegiance during the reign of James VI/1 (r. 1603-25), George Carleton devoted his extensive examination of these councils to refute papal claims to coercive authority with which to depose monarchs as an extension of excommunication. In so doing, Carleton relocates this 'coactive jurisdiction' in the ecclesiastical authority divinely invested in the monarch, making the ruler the source of conciliar authority, and arguably of catholic consensus itself.

KEYWORDS: John Jewel, Richard Hooker, George Carleton, councils, royal supremacy

Introduction

In Part I of his *Apology of the Church of England* (1564), Bishop John Jewel (1522-1571), in defending the Elizabethan Settlement, justified England's

* ANDRE A. GAZAL (PhD 2009, Trinity Evangelical Divinity School) is Vice President of Academic Affairs at Montana Bible College. Email: agazal@montanabiblecollege.edu.

refusal to participate in the Council of Trent by excoriating Pope Pius IV's conduct of it:

> If so be that Pope Pius were the man (we say not, which he would so gladly be called), but if he were indeed a man that either would account us for his brethren, or at least would take us to be men, he would first diligently have examined our reasons and would have seen what might be said with us, what against us, and would not in his bull, whereby he lately pretended a council so rashly have condemned so great a part of the world, so many learned and godly men, so many commonwealths, so many kings, and so many princes, only upon his own blind prejudices and foredeterminations, and that without hearing of them speak, or without showing cause why (Jewel 2002: 17).

Although claiming the said council to be a general council of the Church whose purpose was to reform Christendom, the pope, Jewel contends, has rendered it otherwise. Whereas a general council was to be truly representative of the whole church by affording all parts of Christendom a voice in the solemn assembly, the pope has grievously compromised this essential characteristic of a council by deprecating entire sections of Christendom (i.e. those areas which are Protestant) by condemning their magistrates and clergy without giving them opportunity to be heard, thereby denying them any substantial voice in this council. Moreover, this premature censure of Protestant states, Jewel alleges, is based on malicious prejudices rather than equitable appraisal of Protestant arguments through a properly constituted council of the Church. Thus, because there are entire sections of Christendom excluded from involvement in this council, it is not, according to the bishop, a legitimate general council.

Church councils factor prominently in Jewel's defense of the English national church under Queen Elizabeth I. This is especially the case with the first four ecumenical councils [Nicaea I (325), Constantinople II (381), Ephesus (431), and Chalcedon (451)]. These particular councils formed part of the criteria (which also included the Scriptures, the writings of the church fathers, and the custom of the primitive church) which Jewel employed to determine orthodoxy. Although Jewel cites Scripture and these other sources together, he does not regard the other three as equal to Scripture, but rather as the most accurate expositions and appropriations of it. These other sources comprise the overall witness of the early church which not only in Jewel's estimation, but also that of the magisterial reformers, spanned the first six hundred years of the Christian Church. For Jewel, the first four ecumenical councils factored significantly among these criteria as definitions of the undivided Church's catholic consensus. Moreover, these councils established the pattern for communal governance throughout the Catholic world by means of national and regional synods.

Jewel's voluminous writings reveal not only a prodigious knowledge of the works of patristic authors, but also intimate familiarity with the ancient ecclesiastical councils, both general and regional. The apologist employed his knowledge of these councils to defend the orthodoxy of transferring the authority of general councils, (which in his estimation had become irreparably compromised) to that of national and regional synods. In so doing Jewel attempted to combine catholicity and the realty of the nation-state in the hope of advancing the comprehensive ecclesiastical reform of Western Christendom.

This article will examine the role the first four ecumenical councils played in the controversial enterprises of Jewel as well as two later early modern English theologians, Richard Hooker (1553-1600) and George Carleton (1559-1628). In three different polemical contexts, each divine portrays the councils as representing definitive catholic consensus not only for doctrine, but also ecclesiastical order and governance. For all three of these theologians, the manner in which the first four ecumenical councils were summoned and conducted, as well as their enactments touching the Church's life provided patristic norms for its rightful administration. Jewel, Hooker, and Carleton each argued that the English Protestant national Church as defined by the Elizabethan Settlement exemplified a faithful recovery of patristic conciliar ecclesiastical government as an essential component in England's overall endeavor to return to the true Church Catholic. At this point we will begin with Jewel's understanding of the role of councils based on his interpretation of the first four ecumenical councils in Part VI of his *Apology of the Church of England*.

Jewel's Appropriation of the First Four Councils and an Alternative Conciliarism

Part VI of Jewel's *Apology of the Church of England* details his doctrine of royal supremacy (the idea that the monarch exercises authority over the national church) and the role of councils. Among the objections leveled by Catholic opponents against the Elizabethan Settlement (which consisted fundamentally of the Act of Supremacy of 1559, which ascribed ecclesiastical authority to the monarch, and the Act of Uniformity of 1559 which mandated the use of a revised Book of Common Prayer which was essentially evangelical) was that the ecclesiastical changes enacted were done so without the approval of a general council, and in this case, the Council of Trent (Jewel, 2002: 103). Jewel counters the charge by contending that the Roman Church not only instituted changes that were not only without the consent of a general council, but actually broke 'the commandments of God and the decrees of the apostles' as well as nullified the ordinances and doctrines of the 'primitive church'. It is at this point that Jewel discusses the nature and

function of councils. As it was his usual rhetorical practice, Jewel speaks about this issue in the negative with his customary sarcastic wit. Specifically, the bishop describes functions for which councils are not intended. One of these is the ratification of clear Scriptural command. 'But yet should we do… fondly, when we may hear God himself plainly speak to us in the most Holy Scriptures, and may understand by them his will and meaning, if we would afterward (as though this were of none effect) bring our whole cause to be tired by a council; which were nothing else but to ask whether men would allow as God did, and whether men would confirm God's commandment by their authority' (Jewel 2002: 103-104). Submitting clear biblical mandates for ecclesiastical sanction before preaching them, Jewel contends, would make as much sense as Christ referring his doctrine to Annas and Caiaphas and Paul his to the Sanhedrin before proclaiming them.

After sarcastically illustrating what is not the intended purpose of councils, Jewel succinctly avers his belief regarding the nature and function of councils, appealing to the legislative processes in England:

> Yet truly we do not despise councils, assemblies, and conferences of bishops and learned men; neither have we done that we have done altogether without bishop or without a council. The matter hath been treated in open parliament, with long consultation and before a notable synod and convocation (Jewel 2002: 104).

Jewel acknowledges the necessary role of councils in affecting necessary changes for the Church. Like the ancient councils, present ones need to consist of bishops and theologians capable of achieving consensus in defining ecclesiastical doctrine and practice. Furthermore, Jewel maintains that the ecclesiastical settlement he is defending was one ordained by a church council. What is particularly striking about the bishop's statement here is the role he assigns to Parliament in the process. Jewel acknowledges Parliament's part in enacting the Elizabethan Settlement which fundamentally defined the Church of England (Jones 1982). In so doing, Jewel not only reports the fact of Parliament's legislative activity, but significantly, identifies this, the lawmaking body of the realm, as a church council itself. Part of the justification for this designation of Parliament as a church council significant is the fact that bishops like himself sat in the House of Lords as representatives of the Church as the 'Lords Spiritual'. Aside from this detail, what makes Jewel's identification of Parliament as a church council is the active involvement of the 'Lords Temporal' and the House of Commons in the delineation of the doctrine and worship of the Church.

Jewel proceeds to contrast the Council of Trent with the ancient councils, contending that Parliament, as a church council, reflected the ancient synods more accurately. The bishop does this first by asserting that Trent rashly condemned other Christians who 'have neither been called, heard,

nor seen' (Jewel 2002: 104). The pope's pretended council condemned entire sectors of Christendom while simultaneously excluding their voices from it. Jewel takes this opportunity to show how councils are subject to abuse when dominated by one person seeking to accumulate power for himself by calling attention to the church fathers' own candid acknowledgement of this fact, by noting Gregory of Nazianzus' cynical assessment of councils as often being more desirous of political victory than the discovery of truth (Jewel 2002: 104). This reference to a church father who presided over one of the first four ecumenical councils (Constantinople 1) serves to highlight the inherent limitations of councils generally, and the constituted purpose of these synods as vehicles for reaching communal consensus regarding orthodox truth. 'For at that time, though the matter were labored on all sides, yet the controversies were well heard and open errors were put clean away by the general voice of all parts' (Jewel 2002: 105). However, in order for the 'open errors' to be 'put clean away', and thus, for the truth to be uncovered, 'the general voice of all parts', or the entire communal voice of the *congregatio fidelium* must be heard. All of Christendom must participate in a truly ecumenical determination and definition of truth. This is because such councils, especially the four ancient general councils, represent the communal consensus, and hence judgment of the whole Church.

Communal consent, for Jewel, is the definitive characteristic for a true council. For a council to be truly representative of the entire Church, all members must be able to participate fully. This fact, according to Jewel, counters the present relationship between Pope and council in which many contemporary theorists assert his superiority to it:

> Well, yet then they will bring all matters before the Pope, who cannot err. To this I say, first, it is a madness to thinking that to think that the Holy Ghost, taketh his flight from a general council to run to Rome, to the end, if he doubt or stick in any matter and cannot expound it of himself, he may take counsel of some other spirit, I wot not what, that is better learned than himself. For, if this be true, what needed so many bishops, with so great charges and so far journeys, have assembled their convocation at this present at Trent? It had been more wisdom and better, at least it had been a much nearer way and handsomer, to have brought all things rather before the Pope and to have come straight forth and have asked counsel at his divine breast. Secondly, it is also an unlawful dealing to toss our matter from so many bishops and abbots and to bring it at last to the trial of one only man, specially of him who himself is appeached by us of so heinous and foul enormities and has not yet put in his answer; who has also aforehand condemned us without judgment by order pronounced and or ever we were called to be judged (Jewel 2002: 106).

High papalists, who held to papal infallibility (which would not become dogma until over three centuries later), supported papal claims to be above

councils because of the pope's unique indwelling of the Holy Spirit which enables him by virtue of his position as Vicar of Christ to ratify the decisions of councils, including the Council of Trent. The bishop of Salisbury scornfully shows the absurdity of this position regarding papal authority by calling into question the use of councils in the first place. If indeed the pope's approval is perquisite to the validity of a conciliar decree, then why not simply dispense with councils altogether in favor of direct divine guidance from his Holiness? Next, and perhaps more importantly, to subject a conciliar matter to the sole, arbitrary judgment of one person is 'unlawful'. It directly contravenes the pattern of ecclesiastical governance established by the early church councils. Jewel further accentuates this point by employing the principle of necessary rule by the whole over any one particular part as expressed by Jerome in his Epistle to Euagrius (Jewel 2002: 107). The apologist then illustrates from patristic authors the alleged disaster of relying on the singular doctrinal judgment of the bishop of Rome. Prominent among such instances, Jewel observes, was Pope Liberius' (310-66) adoption of Arian doctrine (Jewel 2002: 107).

Jewel impugns Trent's status as a legitimate general council because it excludes entire sections of Christendom from participating, thereby denying representation to the entire *congregatio fidelium*, and suppresses communal consent by means of total papal control of the synod. These deficiencies alone, evidence, in the bishop's estimation, that Trent falls short of the characteristics of a general council established by the first four ecumenical councils. However, the most conspicuous defect of Trent is its brazen denial to Christian rulers of their lawful role as canonically established by the four ancient general councils. 'Wherefore do they shut out Christian kings and good princes from their convocation? Why do they uncourteously leave them out, and, as though Christian men or else could not judge, will not have them made acquainted with the cause of Christian religion, nor understand the state of their own churches?' (Jewel 2002: 113) Church councils served as necessary instruments of divinely mandated and biblically prescribed royal ecclesiastical authority (Gazal 2013: 183-272):

> If the said kings and princes happen to intermeddle in such matters and take upon them to do that they may do, and the same things that we know both David and Solomon and other good princes have done, that is, they, whiles the Pope and his prelates slug and sleep or else mischievously withstand them, do bridle the priests' sensuality and drive them to do their duty and keep them still to it; if they do overthrow idols; if they take away superstition and set up again the true worshiping of God; why do they by and by make an outcry upon that such princes trouble all and press by violence into another body's office, and thereby wickedly and malaperty? What Scripture hath at any time forbidden a Christian prince to be made privy to such causes? Who but themselves alone made ever any such law? (Jewel 2002: 113)

Arguably this is where the four ancient general councils prove especially significant in functioning as part of Jewel's criteria for determining orthodoxy; for in defining on behalf of the Universal Church, true Catholic doctrine on the basis of Scripture, these same councils confirmed royal ecclesiastical oversight as divinely ordained governance predicated upon this same doctrine.

Upon establishing the biblical mandate for royal ecclesiastical authority based on the prescriptive and thus normative function of the historical books of the Old Testament (Gazal 2013: 219-42), Jewel then moves immediately to an account of Christian Roman emperors summoning the four councils so crucial for determining orthodoxy: '… let us… consider, since the birth of Christ, how the church hath been governed in the Gospel's time. The Christian emperors in old time appointed the councils of bishops. Constantine called the Council of Nicaea. Theodosius the First, called the council at Constantinople. Theodosius the Second, the council of Ephesus, and Marcian, the council at Chalcedon' (Jewel 2002:116). A question that emerges here is how does Jewel make this enormous leap from the historical books of the Old Testament to the Christian Roman emperors? First, Jewel, like his Continental friends and counterparts, Peter Martyr Vermigli, and Heinrich Bullinger, includes the Christian Roman emperors and all Christian kings past and present in the general era of the New Testament who together have exercised the same oversight of the Church as their Old Testament predecessors, the kings of Israel and Judah. Thus, Jewel regarded the Christian emperors and subsequent Christian rulers as heirs to the same ecclesiastical authority held and exercised by the kings of Israel and Judah. The narrative record of the Old Testament kings was the source from which the later Christian princes derived this authority granted by God. Finally, he included the Christian Roman emperors and later Christian rulers in the era of the New Testament.

While this may well account for the ecclesiastical authority exercised by the Christian Roman emperors, particularly in their summoning the first four general councils, how would this be normative for a Christendom divided into autonomous nation states and free cities? Jewel accounts for the continuing possession and exercise of this biblically prescribed ecclesiastical authority by the rulers of nation-states by employing a certain historical interpretation of imperial power employed by many contemporary and medieval theorists. When the Roman Empire in the West dissolved (with the papacy's assistance), the imperial authority passed on to the kings of the Christian nation-states, making the Holy Roman Emperor a first among equals (Jewel 2002: 117; Gazal 2013: 268-71; Bray 1994: 78-79). The transferal of imperial power to the rulers of Christian nation-states served to empower

them to perform their sacred duty towards the Church by means of that institution canonized by the early church, the church council.

Even though the council which the pope summoned nullifies its status as a general council by its unilateral papal control and exclusion of other Christians, the rulers of Christian states can still exercise their biblically mandated task of reforming the Church by enacting reform of the churches within their realms by summoning councils within their kingdoms:

> And, forsomuch as we heard God himself speaking unto us in his word, and saw also the notable examples of the old and primitive church; again, how uncertain a matter it was to wait for a general council and that the success thereof would be much more uncertain; but specially, forsomuch as we were most ascertained of God's will and counted it a wickedness to be too careful and overcumbered about the judgments of mortal men; we could no longer stand taking advice with flesh and blood but rather thought good to do the same thing that both might rightly be done and hath also many a time been done, as well of good men as of many catholic bishops; is, to remedy our own churches by a provincial synod (Jewel 2002: 123-124).

Since the Council of Trent does not qualify as a general council, and a legitimate one conducted according to ancient canons is not likely to convene soon, Christian rulers can accomplish the same objectives through an agency frequently utilized by the early church and advocated by the church fathers, the provincial, or national synod. Jewel notes that the same fathers themselves resorted to such assemblies before appealing to general councils (Jewel 2002: 124). In fact, the doctrines and practices defined by general councils were first determined by provincial synods. Moreover, such synods predate the general councils. For instance, as the bishop observes, Cyprian presided over several synods in Carthage which drafted canons for use of the church there and those in the surrounding areas (Jewel 2002: 124). Moreover, the local councils of Ancyra (314) and Gangra (340) convened to address standards of conduct and condemn the Manichaeans without any prior urging of a general council (Jewel 2002: 124). These local synods, like the third Council of Carthage obliged its attendees, who were mostly bishops, to meet as a synod at least once a year (Jewel 2002: 124). Furthermore, the general councils of Nicaea and Chalcedon decreed that the bishops meet in provincial synods regularly (Jewel 2002: 124). In relation to the first four general councils as among the criteria for determining orthodoxy, this is significant in that these councils, especially Nicaea and Chalcedon, prescribe the regular and consistent convening of regional and provincial synods.

Based upon his reading of the ancient councils, Jewel assigns extraordinary authority to provincial and national synods. Specifically, he ascribes to

them the power to correct enactments by higher judicatories which they deem erroneous. Jewel draws this idea from his examination of the patristic tradition (which for the bishop would be in addition to the first four councils, the writings of the fathers and the customs of the primitive church). In this regard, he calls attention to Ambrose, who, when the Emperor Constantius conferred some privileges to Auxentius, an Arian bishop, summoned a local synod in Milan to rebuke openly this action by the emperor (Jewel 2002: 124). If a local synod can rebuke the actions of an emperor, then it could, under the summons and direction of a secular ruler, correct the decisions of a general council as did Charlemagne, who in 794, convened the Synod of Frankfurt which opposed the Second Council of Nicaea's position on images (Jewel 2002: 125).

What makes Jewel's historical interpretation so astounding is that it enables him to transfer the power of general councils to regional and national ones thus effectively equating them with one another. This empowerment of national and regional councils enables them to amend or reject pronouncements by general councils. Furthermore, the bishop's exaltation of national and regional synods gives them an authority that is independent of general councils, making them effectively unnecessary, which, in Jewel's estimation, is the case since in the present world situation no true general council as prescribed by the canons and practice of the first four ecumenical councils could ever take place because of papal usurpation as well as sundry logistical impracticalities. Regional and national synods can therefore replace them because they would comply with the procedures of the ancient canons. Promotion of regional and national synods in this manner frees them to effect reform of the Church within their locales without the superfluous authorization of general councils. This virtual autonomy of regional and national synods helps ensure representation of the entire Church within a given realm. Furthermore, independent national regional synods lend themselves more as effective instruments through which the Christian ruler institutes ecclesiastical reform in conjunction with the bishops, and other clergy, as well as representatives of the laity. Finally, ascription to regional and national synods of the same authority heretofore possessed by general councils justifies the role of Parliament in legislating for the national church, thereby receiving from Jewel himself the designation of a church council operating under the supervision of the monarch as the Supreme Governor of the Church.

The existence of the separate Christian states reforming the churches within their realms through national and regional synods does not for Jewel, debase catholicity. This is because, according to Jewel, the Protestant states, by and large hold to the same doctrine, notwithstanding differences regarding nuances of specific aspects. As each realm confirms the gospel

and advances it within its borders and promotes necessary reforms with its church through its national synods according to the received criteria of Scripture, the four ecumenical councils, the writings of the church fathers, and the custom of the primitive church, then together they will emerge as a comprehensive reformed, truly catholic body of Christendom. This is because ultimately catholicity stands upon the common possession of biblical truth. Yet, in the closing years of the sixteenth century, another apologist for the Elizabethan Settlement, Richard Hooker (1553-1600) would appropriate the patristic conciliar legacy to promote a catholic concordance within a divided Christendom as well as defend the national church against domestic Protestant detractors.

Richard Hooker's Use of Patristic Conciliar Tradition

Whereas Jewel despaired of general councils as organs of effective reform due to their alleged dominance by the pope, Hooker, on the other hand, believed that they could be recovered for the sake of re-establishing and maintaining concord amid a now-divided Christendom. Hooker predicates his argument for the utility and necessity of general councils upon appropriation of the *ius gentium*, that aspect of natural law that applies to relationships among nations. 'Now as ther is great cause of communion, and consequently of laws for the maintenance of communion, amongst nations: So amongst nations Christian the like in regarde even of Christianitie hath bene always judged needful' (Hooker 1977a: 109). The need among nation-states to maintain cooperation for the sake of preserving the world order is even more pronounced among Christian nations. Though differing in forms of secular and ecclesiastical government as well as theological confession, the individual Christian states still comprise one Christendom, meaning that there is still fundamentally one Christianity: 'they al in that respect make one Church, as having all but *One Lord, one faith, and one baptisme*' (Hooker 1977a: 109). Amid diverse national theologies, at the core of Christendom is still the one faith which Christian nations must still maintain. General councils, according to Hooker, still stand as the premiere and necessary means of preserving genuine Catholic unity (Hooker 1977a: 109). In addition to the *ius gentium*, Hooker appeals to the divine institution of general councils as the most important reason for their continuance by the Church. 'A thing whereof Gods owne blessed spirit was the author, a thing practiced by the holy Apostles themselves, a thing always afterwards kept and observed throughout the world, a thing never otherwise then most highly esteemed of, til pride of ambition and tyrannie began by factious and vile endeavors to abuse that divine invention unto the furtherance of wicked purposes' (Hooker 1977a: 109). Next, Hooker disarms the arguments leveled by Jewel that general councils no longer serve as effective means of

catholic governance due to abuse by the papacy. 'But as the just authoritie of civil courtes and Parliaments is not therefore to bee abolished, because sometime there is cunning used to frame them according to the private intents of men over-potent in the common welth: so the grievous abuse which hath bene of councels should rather cause men to studie how so gratious a thing may againe be reduced to that first perfection, then in regard of staines and blemishes sithens growing be held for ever in extreme disgrace' (Hooker 1977a: 109). Though the many judicial and legislative bodies of Christian Europe are subject to corruption and abuse, the existence of these vices within such assemblies does not warrant their abolition, but reform. If this should be the case for secular parliaments, then certainly it should be even more so with the divinely instituted general synods of the Church.

Hooker soon moves from defending the possibility of recovering the early church's practice of convoking general councils to appealing to the first four to define an individual's standing in the Church. As part of what is largely his conception of a greater Catholic Church in which there are many communions, Hooker references the First Council of Nicaea (325) to argue that even those deemed as heretics were part of the Catholic Church. The polemical strategy in reporting this council's judgment is readily apparent as it serves to neutralize the Romanist contention that Protestant bodies, and particularly national Protestant churches were never part of the Catholic Church (Hooker 1977a: 201). Hooker then addresses the Roman Church's place within the universal Church: '…with Rome we dare not communicate concerning sundrie hir grosse and grievous abominations, yet touching those maine partes of Christian truth, wherein they constantlie still persist, we gladly acknowledge them to be of the familie of Jesus Christ, and our hartie prayer unto God almightie is, that being conjoyned so farre foorth with them, they may at the length, (if it be his will) so yield to frame and reforme them selves, that no distraction remaine in any thing, but that we all may with one hart and one mouth glorifie God the father of our Lord, and Saviour, whose Church we are' (Hooker 1977a: 202). The essentials of the Faith comprised the apostolic teaching expressed in the Creeds of the Church as drafted by the first four councils (Hooker 1977a: 206). Assent to the formulae expressed by the Creeds determined, for Hooker, membership in the one Church as they represented Apostolic teaching. Even if one part of the Church is greatly flawed in other areas as the Roman Church was for Hooker, subscription to the formularies of faith drafted by the Council of Nicaea, and the following three councils meant that it was still genuinely part of one catholic Church.

The theology of the Nicene Creed, according to Hooker, provides patristic warrant for the use of specific elements of the reformed liturgy contained in the Book of Common Prayer. Specifically, Hooker defended the citing of

the 'Gloria Patri' at the end of the Psalms as well as at other salient points of the liturgy. The regular repetition of this formula succinctly affirms the Trinitarian orthodoxy declared in the Creed within the same liturgy which functioned as the public vehicle through which the Church corporately confessed and learned the true faith (Hooker 1977b: 174). This is the reason why Hooker additionally defends the regular citation of the Nicено-Constanipolitan Creed in the communion service of the liturgy (Hooker 1977b: 211-213).

For Hooker, the first four ecumenical councils further provided authoritative catholic consensus for the manner in which the Church of England exercised spiritual jurisdiction, a central feature of which was the administration of church discipline in the form of penance. This is the prime subject of Book VI of Hooker's *Lawes of Ecclesiastical Politie*. Following his discussion concerning the nature of spiritual jurisdiction in chapter 1, Hooker, in chapters 2 and 3, distinguishes two types of penitence which this spiritual jurisdiction is to help induce. The first, and primary type of penitence is one's internal, 'private dutie towards God', and the second, an external expression of the first before the Church (Hooker 1981: 6). Throughout the remainder of chapter 3, and the whole of chapter 4, Hooker interacts extensively with the three parts of penance defined by medieval scholastic theology: contrition, confession, and satisfaction. It is in the section on satisfaction that Hooker makes considerable use of the Council of Nicaea's canon on penance (Hooker 1981: 54). It is this satisfaction, Hooker observes, that 'importeth Acceptation, Reconciliation and Amitie' (Hooker 1981: 54-55). Though, Hooker avers Christ's 'one "most pretious and proptiatorie sacrifice" hath thereby once reconciled us to God', 'wee are not for that cause to thinck any office of penitence, eyther needles, or fruitles, on our owne behalf: For then would not God require any such duties att our hands' (Hooker 1981: 55). Moreover, God, because of Christ's satisfaction and high priestly intercession, accepts such acts of pious devotion (Hooker 1981: 55). Among such deeds, Hooker specifically identifies prayers, fasts, and alms as works of satisfaction (Hooker 1981: 60). Although the penitent could perform such acts privately before God, there were other instances, however, in which the early church insisted they be exhibited publicly before the Church. 'Now although it suffise, that the offices wherewith wee pacifye God, or private men bee secretly done; yet in cases, where the Church must be alsoe satisfied, it was not to this end and purpose unnecessary, that the ancient discipline did further require outward signes of contrition to be shewed, confession of sinnes to be made openly, and those works to be apparent, which served as testimonies of Conversion before men' (Hooker 1981: 63). This is where Hooker specifically appropriates the canons of the Council of Nicaea as representing the patristic consensus regard-

ing the necessity of demonstrating the genuineness of repentance before the Church (Hooker 1981: 64). As interpreted by Hooker, the Council of Nicaea's purpose in emphasizing public penance was the restoration of the penitent to full standing in the Church by way of re-admission to the Eucharist. Moreover, the Council, according to Hooker, vested the bishop with the authority to regulate the severity of the prescribed acts of satisfaction according to the state of the individual penitent. It should be noted that Hooker's detailed discussion of this canon primarily serves the purpose of critiquing the Roman sacrament of penance, which obscured the force of canonical penance with its stress on auricular confession, as well as its use as a source of revenue. Hooker will, in the next book of the *Lawes* appeal to this same council as providing representative patristic authorization for the institution of episcopacy in which the exercise of spiritual jurisdiction is vested.

Book VII of the *Lawes* contains Hooker's defense of episcopacy against the objections of the Presbyterians. Both the composition of the Council of Nicaea and its canons serve as confirmation by the early church for this form of ecclesiastical government. This, according to Hooker, is evidenced by the fact that the council itself functioned as a vehicle of collective episcopal authority. Furthermore, this first of the ecumenical councils formally recognized gradations within the episcopal office as indicated by its ascription of greater dignity to Metropolitans than to other sees. 'The great Council of Nice, was after our Savior Christ but three hundred twenty-four years, and in that Council, certain Metropolitans are said even then to have had ancient pre-eminence and dignity above the rest namely the Primate of Alexandria, of Rome, and of Antioch' (Hooker 1981: 193). The next three councils defined varying degrees of rank among the Metropolitans themselves. 'Threescore years after this there were Synods under the Emperor Theodosius, which Synod was the first at Constantinople, whereat on hundred and fifty bishops were assembled: at which council it was decreed that the Bishop of Constantinople should not onely be added unto the former Primates, but also that his place should be second amongst them, the next to the Bishop of Rome in dignity. The same decree again renewed concerning Constantinople, and the reason thereof laid open in the Council of Chalcedon' (Hooker 1981: 193). By its regulatory acts, the Council of Nicaea did not institute episcopacy, but rather affirmed that form of ecclesiastical governance which the Church heretofore had generally maintained since apostolic times throughout most parts of the world. 'Let men therefore hereby judge of what continuance this order which upholdeth degrees of Bishops must needs have been, when a general Council of three hundred years after Christ doth reverence the same for antiquities sake, as a thing which has been even then of old observed in the most renowned parts of

the Christian World' (Hooker 1981: 195). The Council of Nicaea as well as the following three ecumenical councils expressed the Church's general consensus regarding an institution believed essential to its governance.

John Jewel and Richard Hooker appealed to the function and practice of the first four ecumenical councils as apologists for the Elizabethan Church. Jewel appropriated these councils as patristic models of consensus, which defined orthodoxy, thereby serving as an essential part of the criteria for determining correct doctrine and practice in an effort to impeach papal authority over church councils as well as much contemporary Roman doctrine and practice. Hooker, towards the end of the sixteenth century, appealed to the same councils to establish further the Elizabethan Church's continuity with the ancient Catholic Church over against the criticisms of its institutions and practices by the Puritans. Moreover, unlike Jewel, who gave up on the continuing usefulness of general councils, thereby transferring their authority to national and regional synods, Hooker sought to revive hope for the recovery of the ancient institution as a vehicle through which a diverse, but nevertheless 'catholic' Christendom could express its consensus on the basis of 'one Lord, one faith, and one baptism'.

With the passing of Elizabeth, the throne of England went to James VI of Scotland (Now James I of England as well) in 1603. By the time of his accession, royal supremacy was the law of the land. As a monarch deeply committed to the divine right of kings, James would earnestly strive to exercise the supremacy as the divinely appointed guardian of the Church. Moreover, he would eruditely defend his divinely invested ecclesiastical authority against Catholic objections in his own polemical works some of which were occasioned by the controversy over the Oath of Allegiance, which engulfed the early part of James' reign in England. To bolster the king's position regarding the Oath of Allegiance, polemicists again would utilize scholarship on the first four ecumenical councils. Representative of the appropriation of such scholarship was *Jurisdiction Regall, Epsicopall, Papall* (1610) by George Carleton.

Patristic Conciliar Consensus on Royal Coercive Ecclesiastical Authority: George Carleton's Exposition of the Councils

Published in 1610, at the height of the Oath of Allegiance controversy, the main argument of this work is that the pope's claim to 'coactive', or coercive power from which stems his authority to depose the civil magistrate is illegitimate. In substantiating his thesis, Carleton distinguishes the types of power lawfully possessed by kings and bishops while incisively critiquing that asserted by the pope. On biblical and historical grounds, Carleton contends that external, coercive power did not exist in the church during the period in which there were no Christian magistrates. Rather, the only pow-

er that the church possessed was that of spiritual jurisdiction, which did not in any way lead to coercive authority. Even the church's corrective power of excommunication, Carleton maintains, was not coercive. 'Coactive' authority, by divine appointment, has, and always will be the sole property of princes.

Carleton's treatise appears to represent employment of criteria for determining orthodoxy heretofore utilized by Jewel as the first major apologist of England's Protestant national church as established by the Elizabethan Settlement: Scripture, the first four ecumenical councils, the writings of the church fathers, and custom of the primitive church. Together these criteria form a potent institutional canon which defined and affirmed orthodoxy while exposing and rejecting heresy. In this regard, Carleton makes trenchant use of each criterion to establish the orthodoxy of royal coercive jurisdiction in ecclesiastical affairs, and to confirm as heresy the papal prerogative of 'coactive' jurisdiction. In prosecuting his case by skillfully applying this doctrinal canon, Carleton distinguished *Jurisdiction, Regall, Episcopall, Papall* as probably one of the principal, if not *the* principal work defending royal supremacy in the Jacobean period, thereby refining application of the official canon for a new era faced by England's national church.

Upon reviewing the state of the question of royal ecclesiastical authority at the beginning of the treatise, Carleton proceeds to argue on the basis of Scripture, ancient philosophers and historians that cultic authority resided in kings as a consequence of natural law (Carleton 1610: 1-16). From there taking as his point of departure the arguments of Tudor apologists for royal supremacy, Carleton contends that magisterial ecclesiastical jurisdiction was divinely prescribed by the historical narratives of the Old Testament (Carleton 1610: 16-36; Gazal 2013). However, throughout the New Testament period this authority was somewhat inoperative since the Church was without a Christian magistrate. Nevertheless, the Church possessed disciplinary authority over its members in the form of excommunication, but it was void of the coercive element added to it by papal apologists as a measure to subordinate secular rulers to the will of the clergy (Carleton 1610: 37-59). Even within a Christian Roman Empire, Carleton observes, the Church's jurisdiction remained solely spiritual with a godly emperor exercising coercive power over it as acknowledged by the four ecumenical councils as the communal vehicles of patristic judgment.

Carleton interacts extensively with the contexts, procedures, and canons of these ancient councils in chapter 5 of the treatise. The central theme running through this chapter is that royal coercive ecclesiastical authority produced the councils that defined catholic consensus. 'There was no Councell held in *Constantines* time, whether or Orthodoxe or heretikes, but

either by expresse commaundement, or license of the Emperour' (Carleton 1610: 62). Moreover, the emperor often utilized his 'coactive jurisdiction' to order re-examination of previous conciliar decisions. 'It was always held by all sober writers of the Church of Rome, as hereafter shall be further declared, that in the Church there is no power above the power of a Councell. And yet this authority of a Councell, so much and so worthily reverenced could not restraine *Constantine*, but he upon good and just causes brought the rash proceedings of some Councels to a new examination' (Carleton 1610: 61). Carleton states explicitly what previous apologists for royal supremacy like Jewel only implied: conciliar authority derives from royal ecclesiastical authority. Generally, the councils (especially the four ecumenical councils) performed two functions. First, they resolved theological disputes by defining doctrine, thereby providing the basis for orthodox, catholic unity. Secondly, the councils effected sundry disciplinary reforms for the church, an example of which is the First Nicene Council's formalization of public penance. Carleton construes both the doctrinal and disciplinary functions of the councils as having been essentially coercive which originated in the imperial or royal 'coactive' jurisdiction divinely invested in the emperor or the monarch. Thus, conciliar authority is delegated royal coercive ecclesiastical authority. For Carleton, the creation of councils by royal 'coactive jurisdiction' is one of the most conspicuous aspects of ancient church practice whose recovery is essential for the continuing reformation of Christendom, and the preservation of catholicity therein.

Carleton proceeds to substantiate his thesis by close examination of select ancient ecclesiastical historians, such as Rufinus of Aquileia and Theodoret. Appealing to Rufinus' *Historia Ecclesia*, Carleton contends that Constantine convoked Nicaea I at the request of Alexander, the Patriarch of Alexandria, to end the controversy provoked by the teaching of Arius, to show that ancient bishops willingly acknowledged the emperor's 'right and iurisdiction to call Councels' (Carleton 1610: 62). Moreover, Carleton interacts extensively with a dialogue between the Emperor Constans and Liberius, the bishop of Rome recorded by Theodoret in which the latter urges the former to call a council for the purpose of examining charges of heresy leveled against Athanasius so as to determine his guilt or innocence (Carleton 1610: 62). Undoubtedly with the intent to taunt Catholic opponents of James, Carleton is quick to point out that this bishop of Rome eventually acquiesced to pressure by Constans by helping to condemn Athanasius, and thus subscribe to Arianism (Carleton 1610: 62)—an episode confirmed by the Romanist historian Bartolomeo Platina (1421-1481) (Carleton 1610: 62). In elaborating on this dialogue, Carleton makes three observations. First, Liberius unambiguously confessed that 'Ecclesiastical iudgements are to be appointed and established by the Emperor' (Carleton 1610: 62). Since this

judicatory authority originated in imperial ecclesiastical jurisdiction, the emperor then exercised it by convoking a council to deal with a theological matter. Secondly, 'the Emperor cannot make a man an hereticke, but this must be done by a Councell or iudgement Ecclesiasticall' (Carleton 1610: 62). Even though the emperor, from his rightful ecclesiastical authority, appointed councils for the purpose of determining orthodoxy, he, himself did not directly define doctrine and heresy, but rather acknowledged this duty as the function of bishops. Hence, the magisterial exercise of coercive ecclesiastical authority in this case extended only to the institution of the judicatory body through which the bishops could exert their 'authority' of Scriptural knowledge. Thirdly, as admitted by Liberius, he, and hence any bishop of Rome during this period, had no singular authority to judge other bishops (Carleton 1610: 63). The delegation of imperial coercive authority to the bishops via his calling of councils augmented their spiritual authority so as to enable them to enforce their judgment. This is because the bishops were now empowered to perform their function under imperial auspices. Carleton interprets this account by Theodoret as well as similar ones so as to argue that episcopal coercive power is not endemic to the episcopal office, but rather allocated by the imperial in whom it is divinely vested.

Carleton next directs his argument against the papal prerogative of calling general councils. In this regard, he engages at length chapter 12 of Robert Bellarmine's *De Conciliis* (Carleton 1610: 66-69), where he attempts to refute the Jesuit's contention that general councils can only be summoned with the pope's consent. Specifically, Bellarmine maintained that the convoking of general councils properly belonged to the Roman Pontiff. (Bellarmine 1605: 57). Moreover, in order for a synod to qualify as a general council, the pope must have appointed its meeting place, and ratify its judgments (Bellarmine 1605: 57). Any assembly that convenes apart from papal consent or commandment is not a council (*concilium*), but rather an unlawful committee (*conciliabulum*) (Bellarmine 1605: 57). Carleton responds with a sustained examination of the Council of Chalcedon (451).

Carleton commences his discussion with the observation that bishop Leo of Rome had no role in determining the location or the agenda of the council, but instead the emperors Valentinian and Marcian chose the city of Chalcedon as its meeting place and prescribed the agenda (Carleton 1610: 66). Significantly, Carleton notes that the emperors issued these instructions by way of a *sacra*, an official directive regulating public religious matters, the use of which they inherited from their pre-Christian imperial predecessors (Carleton 1610: 66-67; Gordon 1997: 127-132). Promulgation of the *sacra* by Christian emperors, according to Carleton, is the clearest indication of their lawful possession and exercise of ecclesiastical jurisdiction. For by their use of the *sacra*, the emperors 'call councels, they punish offenders of the

Clergy, they establish Ecclesiasticall Courts', showing that 'they are acknowledged the nourcing Fathers of Religion, the keepers and preservers of both Tables, and of the discipline of the Church' (Carleton 1610: 67). Imperial decree via the *sacra* was the most conspicuous exertion of 'coactive' ecclesiastical authority possessed by the Christian emperors. Hence, by their issuance of the *sacrae,* the emperors produced the councils.

Drawing from the Acts of the Council of Chalcedon, Carleton demonstrates Leo's unambiguous acknowledgement of imperial ecclesiastical authority to initiate general councils by 'decree' (*sacra*) (Carleton 1610: 67). Furthermore, Carleton (himself bishop of Llandaff) advances affirmation by the fifth-century bishop of Rome of the emperor's divinely ordained role directly under Christ, 'the true rule of godlinesse', 'the head of the Church', 'to correct ungodly things in the Church' (Carleton 1610: 67).

From Leo the Great's deferential correspondence with the emperor, Carleton deduces four characteristics of imperial ecclesiastical power recognized by the early church and confirmed by the Fathers. First, a general council is to be called 'only by the authority of the Emperor, *imperiali decreto*' (Carleton 1610: 67). Secondly, to the emperor has been divinely committed the *custos disciplinae Ecclesiae*, which, Carleton notes, encompassed specifically ecclesiastical affairs. As part of his historical analysis, Carleton points out that even though ecclesiastical authors of the period did not employ the phrase, 'ecclesiastical jurisdiction', they all, and in this case, Leo the Great, conceded the substance of what it later denoted as something rightfully possessed and exercised by the emperor 'as the preserver of the discipline Ecclesiasticall' (Carleton 1610: 67). Thirdly, the maintenance of the Church and its government 'for establishing the truth' belongs to the magisterial office as much as the power to wage war (Carleton 1610: 68). Finally, Christ, as the only 'head of the Church', delegates disciplinary authority over the Church to the prince (Carleton 1610: 68).

Carleton's thorough examination of the convening of the Council of Chalcedon, and trenchant analysis of Leo the Great's correspondence with the emperors who convoked it functioned as the pivotal patristic witness testifying to imperial power as the divinely appointed source of the ecclesiastical authority producing the councils as the definitive, judicatory and doctrinal bodies of the Church. The emperor, and hence, all Christian magistrates, possessing by divine appointment all ecclesiastical 'coactive authority' stand as one of the prime, if not *the* prime source of universal Christendom's catholic consensus.

Conclusion

Though combatting within different polemical contexts, John Jewel, Richard Hooker, and George Carleton defended the reformed Church of Eng-

land established by the Elizabethan Settlement on the grounds of its fidelity to the ancient catholic Church as fundamentally defined by the first four general councils. These councils, which delineated the orthodoxy of the Church not only in terms of its doctrine, but also its governance. This is because they declared truth on behalf of the communal body of the Church as the *congregatio fidelium*. In Jewel's estimate, the Council of Trent negated its professed status as a general council because it contravened the first four general councils as expressions of the church's universal communal judgment.

In short, councils must encompass all sectors of the church in order for a genuine consensus regarding truth could be reached. Essential to this process was the biblical role of the godly prince in overseeing the process. Jewel disparaged the possibility of anymore true general councils since they have been supplanted by those dominated by the pope. However, councils as vehicles of consent could still take place because the ancient church provided the apparatus of national and regional synods. In highlighting national and regional synods, Jewel transferred to them the authority of general councils, effectively rendering them unnecessary.

About twenty-five years later Hooker parts with Jewel's pessimistic assessment of the continued utility of general councils by positing the restoration of this apostolic and ancient institution as a constructive means of establishing catholicity among different national churches, including Rome, on the basis of the common faith averred by the ecumenical creeds. Moreover, the first four general councils present an authoritative catholic consensus regarding penitential practice and the institution of episcopacy against which the Puritans stridently inveighed. Finally, during the reign of James VI/I amid the controversy surrounding the Oath of Allegiance, George Carleton sought to invalidate the pope's claim to 'coactive' jurisdiction which empowers him to depose a prince while excommunicating him/her.

To accomplish his purpose, Carleton located this 'coactive' jurisdiction in the divinely invested ecclesiastical authority of the prince. Throughout his examination of the first four general councils, Carleton argued that they derived directly from the emperors' 'coactive' jurisdiction which naturally stemmed from their ecclesiastical authority. Moreover, because these councils proceeded from imperial ecclesiastical authority, their enactments were subject to its approval.

Significantly, Carleton stressed the unqualified submission to this imperial ecclesiastical authority of convening general councils by the ancient bishops of Rome themselves. Because these councils that defined the Church's catholic consensus proceeded from imperial ecclesiastical authority, the Christian emperor himself by implication (and consequently Chris-

tian monarchs) stood as the source of catholicity. Thus, for Carleton as well as Jewel, by ancient order royal assent begets catholic consent.

References

Bellarmine R (1605) *De Controversiis Christianae Fidei, Adversus Huis Temporis Haereticos*, Tomus Secundus. Ingolstadt: Adam Sartorii.

Bray G (1994) *Documents of the English Reformation*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press.

Carleton G (1610) *Jurisdiction Regall, Episcopall, Papall*. London, UK: Printed by John Norton.

Gazal A (2013) *Scripture and Royal Supremacy in Tudor England: The Use of Old Testament Historical Narrative*. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press.

Gordon R (1997) The Veil of Power. In Horsley R (ed) *Paul and Empire Religion and Power in Roman Imperial Society*. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International.

Hooker R (1977a) The Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity. In Hill, WS and Edelen, G (eds) *The Folger Library Edition of the Works of Richard Hooker*, volume 1. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Hooker R (1977b) The Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity. In Hill, WS (ed) *The Folger Library Edition of the Works of Richard Hooker*, volume 2. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Hooker R (1981) The Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity. In Hill, WS (ed) *The Folger Library Edition of the Works of Richard Hooker*, volume 3. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Jewel J (2002) *An Apology of the Church of England*. New York, NY: Church Publishing.

Jones N (1982) *Faith by Statute: Parliament and the Settlement of Religion, 1559*. London, UK: Royal Historical Society.

sciendo

Perichoresis
Volume 17.4 (2019): 93–110
DOI: 10.2478/perc-2019-0030

'LEST I MAKE YOU A TERTULLIAN': EARLY ANABAPTIST BAPTISMAL NARRATIVES AND PATRISTICS

ANDY ALEXIS-BAKER*

Loyola University Chicago

ABSTRACT. Anabaptists have long been thought to have been 'biblicists' and shunned reading patristic literature. But a close analysis of the debates Anabaptists had with Magisterial Reformers shows that the Anabaptists developed an extensive history of baptism using church fathers. They attempted to show that adult baptism was the norm in the earliest centuries of the church and that infant baptism was the innovation away from the Bible. This debate was about who had inherited the biblical faith around baptism.

KEYWORDS: Anabaptists, baptism, Tertullian, Balthasar Hubmaier, Menno Simons

When looking back to the sixteenth-century Radical Reformation, scholars have often seen the radical reformers as breaking with tradition, eschewing traditional theology, and being primitivists and restorationists. George Hunston Williams, for example, writes, 'It is not yet possible to assess the extent to which different leaders in the Radical Reformation drew unconsciously on Tradition in one or another degree beyond their adherence to Scripture alone' (Williams 1992: 1260). In *The Theology of Anabaptism*, Robert Friedmann maintains that the Anabaptists 'were hardly familiar with the Church Fathers except perhaps to the extent that Sebastian Franck, their trusted contemporary, quoted them' (Friedmann 1973: 36). Stuart Murray writes that Anabaptists dismiss the church fathers and did not quote church fathers as much as Magisterial reformers (Murray 2000: 45). In other words, to the extent that Anabaptists quoted patristic authors at all, they relied on secondary summaries because they couldn't imagine taking time to read such superfluous literature when the Bible alone was necessary for salvation. The edited collection, *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West*, has detailed chapters on major sixteenth-century figures such as Martin Luther, Ulrich Zwingli, and John Calvin and their use of patristic literature, but

* ANDY ALEXIS-BAKER (PhD 2015, Marquette University) is Assistant Professor of Theology at Arrupe College, Loyola University Chicago. Email: aalexisbaker@luc.edu.

nothing on the Anabaptists (Backus 1997). The Anabaptists, scholars ostensibly have agreed, held to a distilled and purer version of *sola scriptura*.

Only recently have a few scholars began to question the previous scholarly consensus. Andrew Klager has studied Balthasar Hubmaier's interaction with patristic literature, but Klager's work is an exception and limited to one sixteenth-century theologian (Klager 2010). The same could be said for Antonia Lučić Gonzalez's dissertation on Hubmaier and patristics (Gonzalez 2008). I published an overview of Anabaptist use of patristic literature in 2011, and since that time nothing new on sixteenth-century Anabaptist use of patristic work has been published (Alexis-Baker 2011). This is still a relatively new area of study where historians and theologians can do detailed and creative work.

In this paper, therefore, I will detail how some of the earliest Anabaptists used patristic literature to argue with other sixteenth century reformers who accused them of being schismatic troublemakers at best and heretics at worst for denying all tradition. The early Anabaptists certainly thought that Scriptures were their final and sole authority for following Jesus. Yet they neither thought that the Holy Spirit had been inactive since the first century CE nor that their own positions were novel revelations unknown to previous generations. They argued, based on detailed historical narratives, that they were in a long line of faithful Christians through the centuries, and argued based on their interpretation of patristic authors within narratives of decline and faithfulness.

Using Patristics for Baptismal Apologetics

According to Geoffrey Dipple, sixteenth-century radical reformers used historical narratives about the fall of the church to support their arguments from scripture that they were reforming and restoring the church to its former faithfulness against contemporary corruption. Dipple argues that radical reformers such as Sebastian Franck and Caspar Schwenckfeld wrote the most complicated histories using patristic authors. But Franck and Schwenckfeld were spiritualists who argued that the rituals and organization of churches was unnecessary and unhelpful to Christian conversion and instead argued for a direct spiritual connection to God apart from ecclesial life. Dipple argues that Anabaptists such as Pilgram Marpeck and Menno Simons often used Franck and Schwenckfeld's histories while debating mainstream reformation adherents as well as turned Franck and Schwenckfeld's histories around on the spiritualist adherents (Dipple 2005). So, according to Dipple, most Anabaptists did not read patristic authors directly. They read Sebastaian Franck's and/or Caspar Schwenckfeld's summaries of early church authors' positions. Dipple's analysis aligns well with a long tradition of historical scholarship, quoted at the outset of this article,

which sees the Anabaptists as largely uninterested in patristic literature, favoring to read biblical passages alone. Dipple's argument, however, needs correction.

Swiss Anabaptists, I argue, not only used patristic literature in apologetic arguments with mainline reformers, but most likely read some of these authors in newly available editions. Many of the early Swiss Anabaptists had read Beatus Rhenanus's recently collection of Tertullian's works: *Opera Q. Septimii Florentis Tertuliani*, published in Basel in July 1521. This was the only edition of Tertullian's works available at that time. Grebel had a copy and read it.

We know that Grebel had a copy of the newly published edition of Tertullian because not long after Rhenanus published his edition Grebel promised to send a copy to his friend and brother-in-law, Joachim Vadian, in October 1521 (Grebel 1985: 155). And Zwingli likely had a copy in his personal library, to which Grebel may have had access as well. On January 30, 1522 Grebel wrote about how delighted he was that Vadian had finally received the copy Grebel sent, saying, 'Take heed, my Vadian, lest I make you a Tertullian' (Grebel 1985: 162). Rhenanus's edition of Tertullian was hot-off-the-press, being published a few months prior. Rhenanus's edition is one of the most extravagant of the editions from the time. It has numerous fine art engravings and broad margins, which would have made it an expensive book. Yet, Grebel landed a copy very quickly. This might say something about how he viewed Tertullian's importance. If he didn't think Tertullian was important, why did he get a copy of the latest edition of Tertullian's work so quickly after it was published and why would he disseminate this edition to friends and mentors? Why say he hoped to turn his professor into 'a Tertullian'?

Grebel's affinity with Tertullian is likely deliberate and underlines an anti-papal viewpoint from the radicals. At that time, most people believed that Pope Gelasius I (492-496 CE) had condemned Tertullian. Rhenanus's 1521 edition contained summaries and annotations that made the volume popular amongst reformers. For example, in the argument to the *De Praescriptione Haereticorum*, Rhenanus used Tertullian to argue against the primacy of the Roman bishop. Rhenanus provided ample commentary on how to use Tertullian (and others church fathers) to demonstrate the gap between medieval practices and theology and patristic practices and theology, which could then be used to directly connect the radical reformers to the ancient church. Grebel clearly thought that Rhenanus's 1521 edition of Tertullian's works could have a major impact on readers. Rhenanus himself seemed unaware of how his commentary might fuel Anabaptist theology in his 1521 and 1528 editions. By his third edition in 1539, however, he added a comment that compared Anabaptists to the undisciplined and opinionated sects

Tertullian opposed, ostensibly aware that Anabaptists had been using his translation and annotations.

Grebel not only had a copy of the first 1521 edition, evidence demonstrates that he read the edition and used it to refine emergent Anabaptist theological understanding and missionary work. In September 1524, a group of Zürich radical reformers—Conrad Grebel, Andreas Castelberger, Felix Mantz, Hans Ockenfuss, Bartlime Pur, Heinrich Aberli—wrote a letter to Thomas Müntzer in which they outlined a brief history of baptismal practices, claiming that in the earliest centuries the church had not baptized infants. They only baptized adults, 'for we learn through Cyprian and Augustine that for many years after the time of the apostles, for six hundred years, believers and unbelievers were baptized together, etc' (Grebel 1985: 291). Noting this statement, Dipple claims that Grebel 'was relatively unconcerned with elaborating on the history of the early church at this point' (Dipple 2005: 123-24). Yet Grebel and his coauthors took the time to state this history in a letter to a major figure of the Radical Reformation, Thomas Müntzer, whom the Zürich radicals thought it worth trying to discuss church reform and move in the direction they were headed on liturgical reforms, the Lord's Supper, tithes, discipline, baptism, and violence. Why would the authors attempt to buttress their argument with arguments from patristic history? And as we shall see, a great many Swiss Anabaptists would repeat this historical narrative and elaborate on it in detail. These five men may have made a short statement, but behind this statement there is likely a more in-depth historical narrative as evidenced from other Anabaptist writings. But from where did this historical narrative arise?

The authors mention a six-hundred-year period of faithfulness in baptizing adults rather than children. Rhenanus annotated his edition of Tertullian. Within Tertullian's *De Militis Corona*, Rhenanus wrote in his *argumentum*, an analysis and summary provided at the outset of each treatise: 'He [Tertullian] displays the rite of baptism which the ancients used. For at that time, adults were washed in the bath of regeneration. This ancient custom was still being kept in the time of Charlemagne and Louis the Fair' (Rhenanus 1521: 408).[1] Rhenanus not only claims that adult baptism was the norm at the time of Tertullian, but that from the time of Tertullian, who died around 220 CE, to the time of Charlemagne (d. 814 CE) and his son Louis the Fair (d. 840 CE), adult baptism continued. This is most likely the 'six hundred years' to which the authors refer. So here we have some good evidence that Grebel not only had a hot-off-the press edition of Tertullian

1 My translation: '*Baptizandi ritum ostendit qui in usu veterum fuit, nam tum adulti fere regenerationis lavacro tingebantur. Qui mos antiquus etia per tempora Charoli Magni et Ludouici Augusti servatus est.*'

which he disseminated to others, but that several years later he and his co-authors used what they learned from Rhenanus's annotations and Tertullian's treatises as evidence concerning adult baptism to convert Thomas Müntzer. This letter reflects a desire from the Zürich radicals to create a transnational consensus amongst reformers about restoring a church that would live faithfully according to Scripture as the early church did.

In December 1524—the same month and year of the letter to Müntzer—Mantz wrote a petition to the Zürich city council, refuting Zwingli's view of baptism, which Zwingli and the radicals were discussing weekly in informal reading groups for months. At the end of the petition, Mantz writes that the then current practice of infant baptism 'is even contrary to the earliest popes and their constitution as is clearly to be seen from the histories' (The Mantz Petition of Defense 1985: 315). The idea here is that Mantz and the other Anabaptists renew an earlier tradition, which was faithful to Scripture, and that Catholics and Reformers practice novelty. Mantz's statement is not proof he read Tertullian directly, but his co-authorship of the letter to Müntzer suggests that his statement in the defense petition has church fathers in the background as well. Yet he lets them stay in the background for the most part, preferring to argue mostly about how to interpret biblical passages.

Five months later in April 1525, Wolfgang Uolimann slightly expanded this historical account in his testimony before the city council in St. Gallen. Uolimann said that adult baptism was practiced almost exclusively, 'until Cyprian and Tertullian's time. These gave the water to sick infants and to those who could render the Lord's Prayer. A person could be baptized during Easter and Pentecost. But Augustine and Theophylact and those who came later baptized more and more from human reason and not from the Scriptures' (Uolimann 1973: 379. My translation.).[2] Uolimann seems to accept baptism for dying infants as a harmless practice in the time of Tertullian and Cyprian. He pinpoints the beginning of a change to infant baptism with Augustine and with Theophylact (1055-1107 CE). Even though the latter was an eleventh-century Orthodox bishop, sixteenth-century reformers commonly thought he was a patristic author (Klager 2010: 152). The Letter to Müntzer contains a reference to Theophylact, which suggests the Zürich radicals had read the recently published edition of Theophylact by Johannes Oecolampadius (Oecolampadius 1524).

2 My translation: '*Das hab gewert zwayhundert unnd ettlich jar bis zu zitten Cipriani und Tertulliani; die hand dem wasser zugeben die krancken kindlin unnd denen, die das pater noster hand könden, hat man toufft tempore pasce et penthecosten, darnach Augu[stin]us und Philactum unnd darnach für unnd für usß menschen vernunft unnd nit usß der geschrifft*.'

Interestingly, none of the Anabaptists cite Tertullian's *De Baptismo*. In this treatise, Tertullian notes that some Christians had begun to baptize infants, but Tertullian rejects this practice as novel and unnecessary. Concerning children, he says, 'It is better to wait, considering a person's circumstances and disposition, as well as age, especially where children are concerned' (Tertullian 1954: 18).[3] So Tertullian cautions, 'Let them come, when they have grown older, when they have learned, when you have taught them to know to whom they are coming: let them become Christians when they are able to recognize Christ' (Tertullian 1954: 18). Those who become Christians need to understand what they are getting into, and children do not know this. They are innocent. Tertullian strongly defends adult baptism. Yet no early Anabaptist cited Tertullian's treatise on baptism.

That they did not cite Tertullian's *De Baptismo* is strong evidence that they relied on Rhenanus's 1521 edition of Tertullian's work. His volume did not include *De Baptismo*. *De Baptismo* was first published by Mesnart at Paris in 1545 and then by Gelenius at Basel in 1550 (Evans 1964: xxxvi). So, the earliest Anabaptists were unaware that Tertullian defended adult baptism. Had they known of Tertullian's treatise, they undoubtedly would have used it in their polemics. Many of them had access to Tertullian's writings.

First Magisterial Responses to Anabaptist Baptismal History Using Patristic Authors

The published statements from Grebel, Mantz, and Uolimann caused Ulrich Zwingli to respond with his own treatises to refute Anabaptist baptismal history, which he published in May 1525 (Zwingli 1985: 367-74). He dedicated about 1/7 of this tract to refuting Anabaptist historical narrative that baptism was later medieval development. According to Zwingli, the Anabaptists claimed that Pope Nicholas II (misnamed, he means Nicholas I) had instituted infant baptism in the ninth century, which would make infant baptism a relatively recent innovation rather than an apostolic practice. Zwingli responded that Anabaptists contradict themselves because they also know that Augustine approved of infant baptism in the fourth century: 'You are not uninformed about Augustine's time and teaching' (Zwingli 1985: 368). Zwingli uses this to attack the character of Anabaptist preachers, saying they deliberately lie to people and distort history on purpose. Zwingli recounted confronting certain Anabaptists who claimed they had read papal decrees that would have been part of medieval law books that proved infant baptism was instituted by later popes. But since the person in question could not read Latin, it was impossible that he had actually read these de-

3 My translation: '*itaque pro cuiusque personae condicione ac dispositione, etiam aetate, cunctatio baptismi utilior est, praecipue tamen circa parvulos.*'

crees and when confronted, 'He blushed with embarrassment' (Zwingli 1985: 369). He also mocked another Anabaptist who, Zwingli said, is 'a big, tall fool, yea so rabid that he truly could not read the German Testament before the council' (Zwingli 1985: 373). So, Zwingli attacked several Anabaptists before the city council, claiming they were either illiterate or not literate enough to know what they were talking about when it comes to historical evidence. In these instances, he was not addressing Grebel or Uolimann who both had university educations in classical languages, and most certainly could read Greek, Hebrew, and Latin.

In 1525, Johannes Oecolampadius, a close theological associate of Zwingli's, published a book against the Anabaptists. The book is Oecolampadius's account of a conversation he had with Anabaptists in August 1525. He accused the Anabaptists of being schismatics, arrogantly separating themselves from other Christians, to which they responded that they were not bound to church traditions because they recognized only the authority of Scripture. At this point he gave a brief history of baptism, citing Cyprian, Origen, and Augustine, all of whom, he claimed, accepted infant baptism (Oecolampadius 1525).

Zwingli and Oecolampadius saw the burgeoning historical narrative of baptism from the radicals as threatening enough to answer. Both had humanist backgrounds and valued the early church fathers as important resources to think critically about sixteenth-century church practices and doctrines. The beginnings of an Anabaptist historical narrative about baptism had to be answered in the context of their generally humanist outlooks, since the sources could fuel the direction of the reforms. The Anabaptists knew this. In addition to their Scriptural interpretation, they began to call upon the witness of the earliest post-apostolic Christians as allies in their struggle to restore what they viewed as the original practice of baptism instituted by Jesus. Zwingli and Oecolampadius saw that this extra-biblical narrative could play a powerful role in missionary work, so they sought to shortcut it.

Anabaptist Deepening of Baptismal History through Patristics

While Zwingli and Oecolampadius might deride some Anabaptists as unlearned—even though most of the early Anabaptist leaders, such as Grebel, were well-educated—very quickly a different voice entered the debate that was not so easily dismissed. Balthasar Hubmaier had been a priest, educated first at the University of Freiburg where he received his B.A. and then at the University of Ingolstadt, where he received his doctorate in theology and was appointed as a professor of theology. Like Zwingli and Oecolampadius, Hubmaier knew and had discussions with leading humanists of his day. His university training included numerous humanist professors and

training in original languages. On June 23 1522, he wrote a letter to Adelphi chronicling his time at Basel where he had discussions with Erasmus, Rhenanus, Heinrich Glarean (1488-1563), and Hermann Busch (1468-1534). He maintained contact with Rhenanus through letters. It was, probably, his contact with humanists, particularly his friendship with Erasmus, that led him to study Scriptures and early church literature, because he admitted later that throughout his university education, he had not gone to these sources of theology but had a scholastic education (Hubmaier 1989: 343). Hubmaier was a highly-educated humanist, which at least meant he had a commitment to reading the ancient sources in their original languages as a critique of modern practices (See Williamson, 2005). Zwingli had publicly ridiculed some Anabaptists for not being able to read papal decrees in Latin, not knowing the original biblical languages, and barely having the reading skills to read a translation of the Bible in German. Hubmaier could do all of this.

In 1525 and 1526, Hubmaier responded to Zwingli and Oecolampadius specifically. In his *On the Christian Baptism of Believers* (July 11, 1525), written as a reply to Zwingli's *On Baptism, Rebaptism, and Infant Baptism*, Hubmaier states that we can learn from much earlier authors like Cyprian and Augustine that the practice of baptism changed to primarily infant baptism from primarily baptizing adults. He criticizes Augustine, who allowed infant baptism, and saying that children would be tortured in hell if they were not baptized as an unscriptural and abhorrent idea (Hubmaier 1989: 224-25). As for Zwingli's repeated claim that Anabaptists thought that Pope Nicholas II instituted infant baptism, Hubmaier responds, 'I have never said that… No one who has read the Decretal says that' (Hubmaier 1989: 212). He exhaustively cites *Decretum Gratiani*—the standard medieval text in canon law—citing the questions to be asked of a person to be baptized, the requirement to fast from animal flesh and wine, and that people who had been instructed in faith could be baptized in emergency situations outside of the Easter and Pentocost. By answering exhaustively from the standard text of canon law, Hubmaier not only answered Zwingli's historical claims, but did so in a way that showed off his own learning, seemingly to also answer Zwingli's mockery of an Anabaptist before the city council in his treatise.

At about the same time he published his reply to Zwingli in 1525, Hubmaier also wrote a reply to Oecolampadius's booklet. However, he was unable to publish his reply until 1527 because he had to flee persecution for being an Anabaptist (Hubmaier 1962: 256-57). Although Hubmaier criticizes Oecolampadius's overuse of church fathers rather than Scripture, Hubmaier repeatedly turns to church fathers in his reply and sees them as his allies in the practice of baptism: 'I want to let their own books be my witnesses' (Hubmaier 1989: 292). In response to Oecolampadius's charge

that the Anabaptists were being 'sectarian', Hubmaier calls up John Chrysostom's homily on Matthew 10:34, in which Jesus says families will divide over him, to argue that sometimes it might be good to be separate, which is not the fault of the 'sectarian' but the people who reject Jesus (Hubmaier 1989: 278). As for Augustine and baptism, he 'greatly erred', Hubmaier charged (Hubmaier 1989: 279). In response to Oecolampadius's citation of Origen, Hubmaier pulls different quotes from elsewhere in Origen showing either that Origen interpreted the passage on letting children come to Jesus spiritually, not literally as does Oecolampadius (Hubmaier 1989: 281).

In response to Oecolampadius's appeal to Augustine, Cyprian, and church councils, Hubmaier states, 'I will trust Cyprian, councils, and other teachings just as far as they use the Holy Scriptures, and not more' (Hubmaier 1989: 280). While many historians have used this statement to suggest Hubmaier did not value patristic theologians, he says nothing here that many other reformers and Catholics such as Erasmus and Beatus Rhenanus had not said previously: the church fathers should be tested in light of Scripture. Yet Hubmaier adds a statement suggesting that in doing so he is actually in line with the larger trajectory of patristic thinking: 'They themselves also desire nothing more than that from me' (Hubmaier 1989: 280). In denying church fathers authority on par with Scripture, Hubamier thought he was simply in line with the trajectory of their theology. That hermeneutic, Hubmaier argues, is patristic theology at its best.

At around the same time Hubmaier replied to Zwingli and Oecolampadius in mid-1525, he began work on a longer treatise that systematically examined church fathers and conciliary statements: *Old and New Teachers on Believer's Baptism*, which he published in July 1526.[4] Hubmaier released a second edition of this treatise a year later, showing how important he thought calling upon the church fathers and councils was to the radical reformation.

Hubmaier surveys the baptismal evidence for adult baptism from numerous authors through the time of Augustine, including Origen, Basil, Athanasius, Tertullian, Jerome, Cyril, and Eusebius, adding Clement, Donatus, Cyprian, Pelagius, and Ambrose in the second edition. In the first edition, he had a decided preference for Greek over Latin patristic theologians, which is also his preference in his other writings (Klager 2010: 337-44). This was also Erasmus's general view, and Hubmaier's preference for Jerome over Augustine also parallel's Erasmus's inclination, showing how important he was for Hubmaier's theology.

Drawing upon Gratian's *Decretum*, Hubmaier also cited a series of popes to the ninth century, including Pope Siricius, Pope Boniface, Pope Leo I,

4 On the early date for the first edition see Hubmaier, *Schriften*, 225-26.

and Pope Nicholas I, whose statements about baptism supported Hubmaier's view of adult baptism by mandating people wait till Easter or Pentecost, wrote a catechism, or argued about godparents. He may also have read humanist Bartolomeo Platina's *Vitae Pontificum Romanorum* since the numbers he gives for the popes generally correspond to Platina's numbering (See Platina 1485). He cited nine different church councils that took place between 311 and 710 CE, such as the Council of Nicaea in 325 CE, which said that heretics and those baptized by them should be rebaptized if they wanted to return to the Catholic Church (Hubmaier 1989: 272).

This was the first large treatise on the history of baptism that anybody had written during the Reformation, to this date. No other reformer had thought to return to patristic sources about baptism in any systematic way. Yet Hubmaier—and other Anabaptists who supposedly had no time for historical narratives outside of Scriptural interpretation—used patristic theologians, church councils, and canon law, to make his case that he was not creating novel practices by baptizing adults. For Hubmaier, the early sources generally conformed to Scripture and in doing so showed themselves to be part of the universal church through the ages, even if they made mistakes as Hubmaier thought all people did. They had authority because they lived extraordinary lives and the Anabaptists were living within this tradition. The Baptists are not heretics. The true heretics, Hubmaier argued, are those who harass, torture, and burn people to death over doctrinal matters.

Magisterial Responses to the More Thorough Anabaptist Baptismal History

Zwingli and Oecolampadius responded to Hubmaier. In July 1527, Zwingli published a 200-page book written in Latin, titled, *Refutation of the Tricks of the Baptists*. In it he once again cites Origen and Augustine. According to Zwingli, Origen said 'The church received from the apostles the tradition of giving baptism even to infants' (Zwingli 1901: 251). He is quick to add that he is not referring to Origen and Augustine 'to give them the authority of Scripture, but on account of faith in history (for Origen flourished about 150 years after the ascension of Christ), that we may not ignore the antiquity of infant baptism, and at the same time that we may attain to certainty that beyond all controversy the apostles baptized infants' (Zwingli 1901: 251). He does not directly respond to all of Hubmaier's patristic research. He simply states that the Anabaptists 'carry around a long document in their church, in which they show from the decrees of the pontiffs that infant baptism was begun under popish rule… I showed them before that in Origen's time, who live about 150 years after Christ's ascension, baptism, was in common use, and afterwards in Augustine's time, who flourished about 400

years after' (Zwingli 1901: 184). Zwingli might be referring to Hubmaier's more recent publications, or probably to his *On the Christian Baptism of Believers* where Hubmaier cites the *Decretum* and does not delve very much into patristic sources. Zwingli simply did not answer Hubmaier's response to Origen or Augustine, and never interacted with the plethora of sources Hubmaier cited. The tone of Zwingli's book is mocking and angry and he makes wild accusations against the Anabaptists (adultery, murder, theft, etc). For Zwingli, the dialogue was over, the time to force the Anabaptists to comply or die had come and passed, and he seems to have had no intent to review the patristic sources Hubmaier brought forward.

In May of 1528, Philip Melancthon wrote a refutation of Anabaptists in his treatise *Adversus Anabaptistas Philippi Melanthonis Iudicium*. He appealed to Origen, Cyprian, Chrysostom and Augustine, claiming that 'It is well known that infant baptism is accepted by the ancient authors of the church' (Melanchthon 1864: 962).[5] He does not interact with Anabaptist interpretations, he simply takes for granted the antiquity of infant baptism and asserts it. But he calls upon the Donatist controversy and canon laws from the Justinian code that meted out death to blasphemers, saying that Anabaptists should be executed like Donatists were executed at Augustine's urging.

Martin Luther, in his treatise 'Concerning Rebaptism' published in 1528, was furious that Hubmaier included Luther's name is his book, *Old and New Teachers no Believers Baptism*, and Luther claimed that by rejecting infant baptism 'the Anabaptists… act contrary to accepted tradition', and cited Augustine on infant baptism's apostolic origins (Luther 1989: 249). Hubmaier had cited Luther's statement that water does not save anyone, only faith matters. The clear implication that Hubmaier was trying to suggest is that if Luther's statement were followed to its conclusion, it would seem to suggest adult baptism is the best practice (Hubmaier 1989: 256). Luther does not answer Hubmaier's treatise any further than with a short summary dismissal, saying that it is too ridiculous to deserve an answer.

Yet Luther made a surprising concession in 1539 when he published *On the Councils and the Church*. Here he seems to answer Hubmaier's *Old and New Teachers on Believer's Baptism*. Luther says that Anabaptists can correctly call upon church fathers such as Cyprian and church councils like Nicaea. These early sources taught rebaptism (Luther 1966: 44-45). Cyprian, Luther laments, taught that people baptized by heretics must be rebaptized, even though various bishops at the time did not agree with Cyprian. Augustine, Luther says, condemned this aspect of Cyprian, but said it could be forgiven since Cyprian became a martyr. Luther argues that the Council of Iconium and the Council of Nicaea taught rebaptism as well. So, the Nicene

5 My translation: '*Baptismum infantium constat a veteribus scriptoribus Ecclesiae probari*.'

Council, and other councils before it, agreed with Cyprian. Hubmaier was right, says Luther. 'Thus, Anabaptism tries to justify itself against St. Augustine and us all, because the Nicene council and other earlier councils and fathers agreed with Cyprian' (Luther 1966: 45). Even the *Apostolic Canons*, an ancient and widely-circulated church manual, condones rebaptism.

Luther argued, however, that the church councils erred when they introduced matters unrelated to faith. The purpose of the Nicene Council was to clarify the divinity of Christ. The appended canons were not grounded in Scripture and dealt with 'matters pertaining to the temporal, external rule of the church… most of this was sheer clerical squabbling' (Luther 1966: 59). The canons do not deal with faith, so 'these we drop' (Luther 1966: 96). Neither the church fathers nor the church councils have bearing on the question of infant baptism, according to Luther because they do not agree: 'we both thus cull from the councils and the fathers, they what they like, and we what we like, and cannot reach an agreement—because the fathers themselves disagree as much as do the councils' (Luther 1966: 47). He repeatedly appeals to Augustine that only Scripture should be held inerrant. To read through all of the councils and church fathers as did Hubmaier is, according to Luther, 'a great waste of time' (Luther 1966: 48).

Yet in his previous writing on baptism, Luther conceded that there is actually no direct evidence for infant baptism: 'You say, this does not prove that child baptism is certain, because there is no passage in Scripture for it. My answer: that is true. From Scripture, we cannot clearly conclude that you could establish child baptism as a practice among the first Christians after the apostles. But you can well conclude that in our day no one may reject or neglect the practice of child baptism which has so long a tradition, since God actually not only has permitted it, but from the beginning so ordered, that is has not yet disappeared' (Luther 1989: 257). This is an odd appeal coming from Luther. Where Hubmaier tries to ground adult baptism in Scripture and then in church tradition to show that he is not a heretic, a schismatic, or doing anything 'novel', Luther suggests that even though Scripture, the sole authority for matters of faith in his view, and the earliest church fathers and church councils do not contain direct justification for infant baptism, that the practice has happened and continues is itself enough grounding to show that the Holy Spirit was involved and it should continue. Luther repeatedly appeals to Augustine on this matter, seemingly justifying Hubmaier's charge that it is Augustine who is primarily responsible for the shift from adult to infant baptism as normal practice. Luther's judgment about patristic literature and sources was far more negative than was the judgment of most early Anabaptists, especially Balthasar Hubmaier (see Hubmaier 1989: 248). Later, Menno Simons also noted that

church fathers 'were not unanimous' on these issues. Yet Menno's tenor does not come close to Luther's sneering and utterly negative tone.

Dutch and South German Anabaptists and Baptismal History

Dutch and South German Anabaptists modified this Swiss baptismal history. While the Swiss Anabaptists generally denied that infant baptism was practiced at all for the first few hundred years of Christianity, Menno Simons answered Magisterial appeals to Origen and Augustine—who, they claimed, proved infant baptism's ancient origins—by flatly affirming that 'infant baptism has been practiced ever since the time of the apostles' just as Origen and Augustine wrote; but the apostles did not institute it (Simons 1956: 276). Unfaithfulness to the gospel has been around as long as faithfulness to it. While some unfaithfully baptized infants in the early church, others faithfully baptized adults.

In various places, Menno pointed to Tertullian, who's *De Corona Militis* showed that baptismal candidates had to confess and renounce the devil. Menno referred to Beatus Rhenanus' edition and commented that Rhenanus himself annotated the passage stating that, 'It was the custom of the [church] fathers that adults, that is, grown persons, were baptized by the washing of regeneration' (Simons 1956: 137). Geoffrey Dipples claims that Menno's appeal to Rhenanus' editorial comments in his editions of Tertullian shows 'the sophistication of Menno's historical understanding and research' (Dipple 2005: 162). And Robert Kreider thinks that Menno read *De Corona Militis* (Kreider 1952: 133). However, it is unlikely that Menno read Rhenanus' edition, which was the only edition of Tertullian available at the time. Everything Menno says about Tertullian and Rhenanus can be found in Sebastian Franck's *Chronica* published in 1536 (See Franck 1969: Book 3, fol. CVr).[6] Menno had studied the *Chronica* and pointed readers to Franck's works. This seems his mostly likely source. Hubmaier was probably not his source since when Hubmaier quoted Rhenanus he did not connect the quotation to Tertullian as Menno does. Sebastian Frank, however, explicitly cited Rhenanus' comments within his section on Tertullian. All of this makes it

6 Menno had read the *Chronica*, as evidenced in his comments (which come after those quoted in this essay) that point his reader to the *Chronica* and other secondary works. Moreover, in *Christian Baptism* Menno explicitly cited Franck's *Chronica* concerning Erasmus. It is possible, but unlikely, that Menno received his knowledge of Tertullian and Rhenanus' comments from Hubmaier's 'Old and New Teachers on Believers Baptism' (270-71). However, while Hubmaier did cite Rhenanus' comments, he did not say that Rhenanus' comments had anything to do with Tertullian's text. Sebastian Frank, however, explicitly cited Rhenanus' comments within his section on Tertullian. All of this makes it likely that Menno depended on Sebastian Franck's *Chronica* rather than direct reading of Rhenanus' *Opera Q. Septimii Florentis Tertuliani* or Hubmaier's scholarship.

likely that Menno depended on Sebastian Franck's *Chronica* rather than direct reading of Rhenanus' *Opera Q. Septimii Florentis Tertuliani* or Hubmaier's works.

Menno, however, had a more optimistic view of the church than Franck, who had little use for churches. Franck stated: 'I believe that the outward Church of Christ, including all its gifts and sacraments, because of the breaking in and laying waste by antichrist right after the death of the Apostles, went up into heaven, and lies concealed in the Spirit and in truth. I am thus quite certain that for fourteen hundred years now there has existed no gathered Church nor any sacrament' (quoted in Williams 1992: 695). Menno agreed with Franck that the mainstream of Christianity had become corrupted and that this corruption began early. He claimed that in Tertullian's era, baptism had already become 'degenerated' because some people baptized infants. Yet Menno also cited Tertullian to show that the apostles had not instituted infant baptism or else 'the ancestors of Tertullian would not have baptized some infants but all the infants of true believing parents, without question' (Simons 1956: 248). So, in contrast with Franck, Menno saw faithfulness and unfaithfulness throughout Christian history and as a result he could not agree with Franck that the church only exists after Jesus after the Apostles.

Menno also appealed to the fourth-century historian Eusebius. Because Menno cited several aspects of Eusebius' work that neither Franck nor Hubmaier used, it is possible that his source for Eusebius was Rhenanus's 1523 edition of Eusebius's *Autores historiae ecclesiasticae* (Rhenanus 1523). If that were so, this would be direct reading of patristic literature rather than handbooks from others. In any case, Menno cited Eusebius's argument with the anti-Arian bishop, Alexander of Alexandria, who did not baptize infants and used the citation to prove that 'infant baptism was not apostolic' (Simons 1956: 248). The fact that early Christians even had to debate the issue of infant baptism raises doubts about infant baptism's antiquity, Menno argued. Because infant baptism was an innovation not found in the New Testament, early Christian theologians such as Tertullian were forced to make statements about the practice and defend the biblical practice of adult baptism in the face of contemporary practice. Therefore, Simons concluded along with Tertullian, 'We must hear and believe Christ and His apostles, and not Augustine and Origen' (Simons 1956: 137). Menno's backed up his appeal to Scripture in this case with appeals to early church theologians.

The Anabaptist historical narrative related to baptism was widespread and popular among Anabaptist theologians. Pilgram Marpeck cited Tertullian, Cyprian, Origen, Eusebius and other patristic writers to argue that adult baptism is not only biblical but was recognized as such by early Christians (Marpeck 1978: 197). Like other Anabaptists, Marpeck turned to Ter-

tullian on baptism, and likewise cited Rhenanus in support of his argument: 'Tertullian's *de Corona Militis* also supports this position. Therefore, Beatus Rhenanus, who is an exceptionally experienced historian, shows that, up to the time of Charlemagne and Kaiser Ludwig, only the willing and mature were baptized' (Marpeck 1978: 253-54). His likely source was Franck rather than Hubmaier (See Alexis-Baker 2011: 486).

Marpeck argued that even if infant baptism had been practiced at the time of the apostles, that would prove nothing. Even the apostles had to correct erroneous practices as seen repeatedly in Paul's letters. The antiquity of a practice proves nothing if it is not in line with Jesus. This was a common argument. After citing patristic sources for support of Anabaptist baptism, Hubmaier proclaimed, 'I will trust Cyprian, councils, and other teachings just as far as they use the Holy Scripture, and not more' (Hubmaier 1989: 280). The Magisterial Reformers viewed the church fathers in similar ways. But this critical attitude toward every theologian did not stop Marpeck from appreciating and using post-New Testament literature to make arguments for Anabaptist practices of adult baptism.

The popularity of the Anabaptist baptismal history narrative became most widespread through P. J. Twisk (1565-1636), who wrote a detailed baptismal history similar to Hubmaier's that occupies twenty pages of the *Martyrs Mirror*, a book that would be second only to the Scriptures for Anabaptists until the mid-twentieth century (see van Braght 1987: 153-70). The baptismal history developed by earlier Anabaptists here takes prominence as the introduction to a book of martyrdom that nearly every Anabaptist family would own and study for centuries. This shows the power of the narrative for Mennonites and other Anabaptists.

In the earliest decades of Anabaptism, Anabaptist leaders returned to patristic literature to help develop and hone their message about adult baptism. They developed this historical narrative with the express purpose of defending Anabaptists from the charge of innovation and heresy. The basic charges that were getting Anabaptists killed in those days were that they were unorthodox innovators. So, the Anabaptists tried to demonstrate that they were indeed orthodox Christians, indeed they argued, it is really only the Anabaptists who can claim to be biblically orthodox. For instance, Menno Simons stated: 'The learned ones call us Anabaptists because we baptize upon confession of faith as Christ commanded His disciples to do, and as the holy apostles taught and practiced; also, the worthy martyr Cyprian, all of the African bishops; and besides because we with the Nicene Council cannot accept the heretical baptism which is of Antichrist as Christian baptism… If for this reason we are to be called Anabaptists by the learned ones, then verily Christ and His apostles, Cyprian and his bishops, the Nicene Council and the holy apostle Paul must verily also have been Anabaptists'

(Simons 1956: 570-71). Here Simons draws upon Scripture, patristics, and councils to argue that it is the Anabaptists, not the Magesterial Reformers who have the best claim to antiquity and orthodoxy. They undercurrent of the entire debate was about heresy and orthodoxy, with the threat coming from one side—Magesterial Reformers—to kill those they deemed heretical. So, because the Anabaptists used patristics in their defense, their polemical narrative had to be answered.

The early Anabaptists use patristic sources to find sources about respecting the choices others make. People should be free to accept or reject the gospel. For the Anabaptists, baptism was not really a doctrinal matter dealing with intellectual assent, but a sign of a deep commitment to live a way of life that Jesus taught, which included respecting the decisions others make. None of the Anabaptist leaders argued that Magisterial Reformers should be outlawed or that laws should be passed that would jail, torture, and execute reformers or Catholics for continuing baptism. The Anabaptists were unafraid of that difference. The commitment to live a life in imitation of Jesus was most important. It was this commitment to a way of life that mattered to the Anabaptists, and they thought that the patristic sources provided some fuel and inspiration to live such a life. But they would respect the decision of others to continue in their way. They simply wanted to be able to provide an alternative, without fear of being jailed, tortured, and executed. The Magisterial appeal to Augustine was never going to do much for the Anabaptists, who could clearly see that Augustine called for the deaths of the Donatists, just like Zwingli, Melanchthon and others were doing in the sixteenth century to Anabaptists. They could not respect the free decisions of other adults, and so, like their patristic hero, Augustine, they called for suppression. The Anabaptist use of patristics was to call for a tradition that respects what others decide, even if we do not like that decision, and not to outlaw those decisions in the name of some abstracted theology outside the practices of loving one's enemies and neighbors.

Bibliography

Alexis-Baker A (2011) Anabaptist Use of Patristic Literature and Creeds. *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 85(3): 477-504.

Armour R (1966) *Anabaptist Baptism*. Scottdale, PA: Herald Press.

Backus ID, ed (1997) *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West*. Leiden: Brill.

Dipple G (2005) *'Just as in the Time of the Apostles': Uses of History in the Radical Reformation*. Kitchener, Ontario: Pandora Press.

Evans E (2016) *Tertullian's Homily on Baptism.* Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock.

Franck S (1969) *Chronica, Zeitbuch unnd Geschichtsbibel*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Friedmann R (1973) *The Theology of Anabaptism*. Scottdale, PA: Herald Press.

Gonzalez AL (2008) *Balthasar Hubmaier and Early Christian Tradition*. PhD Thesis, Fuller Theological Seminary.

Grebel C (1985) Grebel to Vadian, Zürich, End of October, 1521. In Harder L (ed) *Sources of Swiss Anabaptism* Scottdale, PA: Herald Press.

Grebel C (1985) Grebel to Vadian, Zürich, January 30, 1522. In Harder L (ed) *Sources of Swiss Anabaptism* Scottdale, PA: Herald Press.

Grebel C (1985) Grebel to Müntzer, Zürich, September 5, 1524. In Harder L (ed) *Sources of Swiss Anabaptism* Scottdale, PA: Herald Press.

Hubmaier B (1989) A Christian Catechism. In Pipkin W and Yoder JH (eds) *Balthasar Hubmaier: Theologian of Anabaptism*. Scottdale, PA: Herald Press.

Hubmaier B (1989) Old and New Teachers on Believers Baptism. In Pipkin W and Yoder JH (eds) *Balthasar Hubmaier: Theologian of Anabaptism*. Scottdale, PA: Herald Press.

Hubmaier B (1989) On Infant Baptism Against Oecolampad. In Pipkin W and Yoder JH (eds) *Balthasar Hubmaier: Theologian of Anabaptism*. Scottdale, PA: Herald Press.

Hubmaier B (1826) Letter to Adelphi on June 23, 1522. In Veesenmeyer G (ed) *Über Balthasar Hubmaier, einen der berühmtesten Wiedertäufer zur Zeit der Reformation*. Halle: Renger.

Hubmaier B (1962) *Schriften*. Westin G and Bergsten T (eds). Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn.

Klager A (2010) Hubmaier's Use of the Church Fathers. *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 84(1): 5-65.

Klager A (2010) 'Truth is Immortal': Balthasar Hubmaier (c. 1480-1528) and the Church Fathers. PhD Thesis, University of Glasgow.

Kreider R (1952) Anabaptism and Humanism: An Inquiry into the Relationship of Humanism to the Evangelical Anabaptists. *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 26(2): 123-41.

Luther M (1989) Concerning Rebaptism. In Lull T (ed) *Martin Luther's Basic Theological Writings*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

Luther M (1966) On the Councils and the Church. In Gritsch EW (ed) *Luther's Works*, volume 41. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

The Mantz Petition of Defense, Zürich, between December 13 and 28, 1524. In Harder L (ed) *Sources of Swiss Anabaptism* Scottdale, PA: Herald Press.

Marpeck P (1978) Admonition of 1542. In Klassen W and Klassen W (eds) *The Writings of Pilgram Marpeck*. Scottdale, PA: Herald Press.

Melancthon P (1864) Adversus Anabaptistas Philippi Melanthonis Iudicium. In Bretschneider CB and H.E. Bindseit HE (eds) *Philippi Melanthonis*

opera quae supersunt omnia, volume 1. Halle, Germany: C.A. Schwetschke and Sons.

Murray S (2000) *Biblical Interpretation in the Anabaptist Tradition*. Kitchener, Ontario: Pandora Press.

Oecolampadius J (1525) *Ain Gespräch etlicher Predicanten zu Basel gehalten mitt etlichen bekennern des widertouffs*. Basel: Cratander.

Oecolampadius J (1524) *Theophylacti*. Basel: Cratander.

Platinus (1485) *Vitae Pontificum Romanorum*. Treviso: Joannes Vercellensis.

Rhenanus B (1521) *Opera Q. Septimii Florentis Tertvliani*. Basel: Froben.

Rhenanus B (1523) *Eusebii Pamphili Caesariensis: Autores historiae ecclesiasticae*. Basel: Froben.

Simons M (1956) Christian Baptism. In Verduin L (ed) *The Complete Writings of Menno Simons*. Scottdale, PA: Herald Press.

Simons M (1956) Foundations of Christian Doctrine. In Verduin L (ed) *The Complete Writings of Menno Simons*. Scottdale, PA: Herald Press.

Simons M (1956) Reply to False Accusations 1552. In Verduin L (ed) *The Complete Writings of Menno Simons*. Scottdale, PA: Herald Press.

Tertullian (1954) De Baptismo. In Borleffs JGH (ed) *Quinti Septimi Florentis Tertulliani Opera Pars I: Opera Catholica* (Corpus Christianorum, series Latina). Turnhout: Brepols.

Uolimann W (1973) Ulimans Rechnschaft voer dem Kleinen, dann Großen Rat. In Fast H (ed) *Quellen zur Geschichte der Täufer in der Schweiz*, Band 2.

Van Braght TJ (1987) *The Bloody Theater or Martyrs Mirror of the Defenseless Christians who baptized only upon confession of faith, and who suffered and died for the testimony of Jesus, their Saviour, from the time of Christ to the year A.D. 166*, 15th edition. Scottdale, PA: Herald Press.

Weaver-Zercher D (2016) *Martyrs Mirror: A Social History*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Williams GH (1992) *The Radical Reformation*. 3rd edition Kirksville, MO: Truman State University Press.

Williamson D (2005) *Erasmus of Rotterdam's Influence Upon Anabaptism: The Case of Balthasar Hubmaier*, PhD Thesis, Vancouver: Simon Fraser University.

Zwingli H (1985) On Baptism, Rebaptism, and Infant Baptism. In Harder L (ed) *Sources of Swiss Anabaptism* Scottdale, PA: Herald Press.

Zwingli H (1901) Refutation of the Tricks of the Catabaptists. In Jackson SM (ed) *Selected Works of Huldreich Zwingli*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.

sciendo

Perichoresis
Volume 17.4 (2019): 111–131
DOI: 10.2478/perc-2019-0031

IS CHRIST PROCLAIMED TO CHRISTIANS? THE IMPACT OF SCOTTISH EVANGELICALISM ON HUNGARIAN THEOLOGY, PIETY, AND PRAXIS (1841-1945)

ÁBRAHÁM KOVÁCS* (Guest Author)

János Selye University, Slovakia

ABSTRACT. This paper offers a concise overview of the impact made by Scottish evangelicalism of the Free Church of Scotland on the theology, piety and practice of Hungarian Reformed faith within the Austro-Hungarian Empire. They planted a kind of piety that was foreign, at least in its language and expressions, to most of the Hungarian Reformed people until the arrival of Scottish missionaries in 1841. Their conduct of practical Christianity, *praxis pietatis* materialised itself in Christian evangelism and social action. In this paper the focus is on the period between 1865 and 1914. To demonstrate the nature and form of this impact, first the paper outlines some key features of Scottish evangelicalism. Then, it investigates the theological and ecclesiastical impact of Scottish evangelicalism made through the establishment of voluntary societies and examines influence on the piety and praxis of Reformed faith in Hungary.

KEYWORDS: Eschatology, biblicism, voluntarianism, conversionism, evangelicalism, Hungary

The Features of Scottish Evangelicalism: Eschatology, Election, Providence, and the Missionary Fervour

It is a well-known fact that extensive Scottish missionary endeavour was initiated amongst the people of Africa, Asia, the Americas or the Middle East but much less is known that they did the same also in Europe. This aspect is much neglected in mission history for number of reason that is not part of our paper. The Church of Scotland, later Free 'Kirk' initiated a curious but biblical mission to the Jews, the ancient people of God in Europe. Gavin White superbly illustrated why the Jewish mission differed from any of the other mission initiatives from the Scots in suggesting that it was an initiative of a national church not of societies (White 1977: 114-116). Nineteenth century Victorian evangelicalism, in which Scottish Reformed theologians played a vital role, primarily sought to bring the gospel to people 'living in darkness' outside Christian Europe (Randall 2001). Yet the Scots arrived to

* ABRAHAM KOVACS (PhD 2003, University of Edinburgh) is Professor of Historical and Systematic Theology at János Selye University, located in the city of Komárno, Slovakia. Email: abraham.kovacs@ptsem.edu.

the Christian country of Hungary which had Roman Catholics and Protestants as well. It remains an intriguing question why the Scottish Reformed people thought to preach Christ to Hungarian Christians. The answer lies in the fact that it was not their initial aim. When the first missionaries arrived to Budapest, Hungary in 1841, their primary concern was to convert the Jews. Promotion of an evangelical revival among the Protestants and nurturing of evangelical congregations were secondary to their primer aim. Before introducing the Hungarian situation, the paper describes some of major features of Scottish Evangelicalism that profoundly impacted Hungarian Reformed piety.

The Free Kirk Scottish missionaries were all part of British evangelicalism and many scholars argue that their Victorian evangelicalism was an heir of Puritanism. Scottish evangelicalism, with its emphasis on moral conduct, personal devotion, prayer, strict observance of the Sabbath and stress on abstinence from practicing 'sports' and attending balls, left an indelible imprint not only in Scotland but all over the world where they sent missionaries (Bebbington 1996: 23-36). Revivalism within 'Protestant religion' in Britain, taking shape in the form of renewal movements such as various forms of methods (do's and don'ts) and voluntary societies, paved the way for a broad evangelical movement. By the 1800s, Scottish evangelicals were strengthened in their belief that they were called to manifest God's grace, share the good news with people and combat Roman Catholicism and infidelity in the newly colonised lands. This mission was particularly evident during the reign of Queen Victoria (1837-1901). Thus, 'constrained by a fervent love for Jesus' to share the gospel became a strong characteristic mission of British Evangelicalism; the result of a great missionary input from Scottish reformed theology of the Free Kirk (Chalmers 1846). Scots participated in the establishment of mission, Bible and Tract societies as well as Christian voluntary organisations in great numbers (Walls 1993: 567-594). They also perceived themselves as a chosen nation to fulfil God's mandate to evangelise the world, convert the pagans and bring the Jews to Christ so as to hasten the return of Jesus Christ the Lord. In this carefully devised plan based on special interpretation of the difficult eschatological passages of the Bible, the conversion of the Jews was a prerequisite of Jesus' Second Coming (Scult 1978: 32-34). Behind this extraordinary phenomenon of intensified mission activity laid a conviction and deeply rooted belief in the partaking of God's salvific plan, where Scottish Christians were assigned a special role. Indeed, eschatology was a prevailing feature of evangelical theological thinking. The vast and popular eschatological literature produced by pre- and postmillennial Scottish theologians, ministers and laymen about the 'exact plans' of God's mission, Jesus's return and the arrival of the golden age, the millennium is chiefly responsible for carrying out

a really devout mission (Keith 1833). [Keith's books were best-sellers during his time since many of his massive and lengthy books were published more than forty times.]

Although the Scottish reformed people rarely encountered any Jews, since few of them resided in Scotland, the evangelical interpretation of eschatology rediscovered their special role in God's salvific plan (Kovács 2006). Thus, in 1838, Scottish Reformed evangelicalism initiated a mission to 'save' the Jews across Europe, including Hungary (White 1977: 111-124) Buda and Pest, the to-be-capital town of Hungary, became a thriving centre for European Jews migrating from the neighbouring lands. The Church of Scotland decided to establish a mission station to reach out to the Jews in Hungary. However, they soon realised that their aims could not be achieved without the support of Hungarian Reformed Church. John Duncan, the later famous New College professor, who was the first missionary in Pest, realised that if they wish to succeed in converting the Jews to Christ, they need to transplant evangelical faith into the very Hungarian Reformed soul. Only together could they reach out to the Jews. To the Scots, their coreligionist Hungarians were nominal Christians, who also needed to be evangelised and converted to Christ; just as it was a necessity to share the gospel with the Jews (White 1977: 45). The Scottish missionaries were aware of the fact that, if they wanted to preach the gospel successfully among the Jews, they needed to convert at least some Hungarian congregations to evangelical Christianity; which would allow them to exhibit the same kind of godly life they wished to see in the daily life and practice of all Christians. The Scots prayed for a revival to be spread among Hungarian Reformed congregations. To achieve this end, Scots missionaries established a strategic plan step-by-step to influence Hungarian Reformed piety and explain to them how and why they should act and behave differently as Christians, which was strange, unusual and alien to Hungarians (Kovács 2001). As a result, they failed to make an impact for some decades.

After some initial success in the 1840s, the Scots were expelled from Hungary by the Habsburg Monarchy as Protestant spies in 1852. This was the time of Neo-absolutism after the loss of Second War of Liberation fought by Hungarians between 1848 and 1849. While the Scots silently managed to resettle in Hungary from 1857 onwards, they failed to adapt to Hungarian culture and take the multi-religious and cultural dynamic of the society into account, in addition to being ignorant about the nature of Hungarian Calvinism (Kovács 2004). The Scots were not only unable to convert large number of Jews but were also unsuccessful in introducing evangelicalism in Hungary for decades. Their initial lack of success resulted from an unfavourable political situation as well as their inability to connect to the local culture. However, when the Scottish missionaries resettled in

Budapest from 1857, they realised that the best means to influence Hungarian Calvinism was to establish a bursary programme for students to study at New College, Edinburgh. It was realised only in 1865 but it did prove to be the key means that enabled the Scottish evangelicals to transplant their kind of piety and praxis into Hungarian Calvinism.

The Scottish Evangelical View on Hungarian Calvinism

Scottish missionaries were very slow to realise what accounted for the peculiarities of Hungarian Reformed piety, rational Christian belief and reluctance to embrace wholeheartedly *their way* of Christian life. The Scottish evangelicals, like many missionaries today, travelled to a country to share the good news, but often had little knowledge of, or sympathy with, the indigenous culture or previous kinds of Christianity to be found there. In Hungary, the Scots spent years and failed to make any headway before actually reaching their goal to revive the Reformed congregations of Hungary in a mission to convert the Jews. Duncan had a low view of the piety of Hungarian Calvinist. He wrote to the Church of Scotland: 'the mass of Protestant clergy, if not neologians, are careless men, dumb dogs that cannot bar' (Duncan 1842: 44). He realised that the Scots needed to proclaim Christ to the Reformed 'pagans' which he articulated in the following vein: 'Certain I am, that if we are by the blessing of God to succeed in our aim in this place, it must be by pursuing it, as the main object indeed, but by no means as the *sole* [Duncan's italics] object of our exertions. While matters are in so lamentable a state as they are here, as to religion and morals, even among professed Protestants, the most serious of all impediments remains in the way of Israel's conversion. I am therefore very decidedly of the opinion that whoever shall be stationed here must make it his study, as far as the Lord may vouchsafe opportunities, *to labour for the revival of true Religion* (both as regards sound doctrine and godly living) *in the Protestant Churches of the land* [italics added], which *would then become*, instead of a stumbling block, as now, *the best instruments for carrying on the blessed work of gathering in the lost sheep of the house of Israel* [italics added] to the Shepherd and Bishop of souls' (Duncan 1842: 45).

Nonetheless, the Scottish missionaries were isolated within the Reformed Church of Hungary due to their inability to learn Hungarian, the unfavourable political climate that disadvantaged Protestants from 1849 onwards almost till the mid-1860s and the emerging liberal thoughts in Budapest. It had taken three decades after their arrival for the Scots to make a tangible, significant theological impact on Hungarian Reformed faith. Debrecen Reformed College with its university became key place where British evangelicalism gradually made its effect and then it spread to other colleges of Reformed faith.

The Scottish evangelical influence was exerted in two areas in Hungary: theology, and the establishment of home mission societies. Theological influence felt its impact at scholarly level as well as among the ordinary church folk that was content with what I call theology of the people. The second, the introduction of Christian societies, previously completely unknown to Hungary served to provide a reaffirmation of the traditional belief that was expressed both in a neat, carefully articulated writings as well as in popular literature.

One of the most decisive Scottish influences on Reformed faith in Hungary was the establishment of a scholarship programme at New College, Edinburgh in 1865 (Gaál 2004: 177-186). This programme quickly bore its fruit when one of programme's graduating students, Ferenc Balogh, became professor of Church History at Debrecen Reformed College. Importantly, he integrated Scottish evangelical theology into his teaching and publications. Together with Imre Révész senior, the powerful minister of Great Church in Debrecen, he fought a battle against the extreme claims of liberal theology that imported ideas from German, Swiss, Dutch liberal theological schools (Kovács 2010). Scottish evangelical theology of the Free Kirk, which split off in 1843 from the Church of Scotland, lent support for and gave an impetus to the New Orthodoxy Movement from the mid-1860s. Debrecen Confession of Faith written and signed by professors of theology in 1875. The *Confession of Faith* was a protest against the liberal Protestant Union led by Mór Ballagi, a professor from Budapest. In Debrecen, Balogh and his colleagues emphasised the same fundamental doctrines spelled out in the Apostle Creed and evangelical Confession of Faith in 1846. This confessional statement marked a decisive turning point in the spiritual and theological history of the Reformed Church of Hungary and had a number of consequences. Firstly, it defended the orthodox faith and forced the so far dominant liberal theological forces to retreat. As a result, the Scottish evangelical theological impact within the Hungarian Reformed church began to advance faster. It did not mean that the Debrecen Confession of Faith cited words from the works of Scottish Free Kirk theologians but the text of the declaration is, as mentioned above, was in line with the traditional tenets of Christianity that was dear not only the Free Kirk church people but also to the New orthodoxy movement. Secondly, Scottish Free Kirk evangelicals began to make an impact only when they realised the need to establish a scholarship programme and their missionaries in Budapest need to adapt to Hungarian culture and learn the language (Kovács 2006). To achieve their aims, the Scots also employed some of the bursars who returned from Edinburgh at the mission school established to educate Jews with a view to convert them. On the top of that through opening to all the five centres of Calvinist learning in Hungary: Debrecen, Budapest,

Sárospatak, Pápa, and Kolozsvár, the Scots managed to successfully establish vital links with those key people through whom evangelicalism could advance.

Christology Defended: a Shared Theological Conviction

The main centre of liberal theology was at the Theological School in Budapest whereas Debrecen College became the forerunner of a neo-orthodox stance. Ferenc Balogh's role was crucial for New Orthodox movement. The Scottish impact is easily discernible from his letter: 'Last October there was founded an *anti-evangelical* [italics added] society under the name Hungarian Protestant Union… We reject the Unitarian principles of that Union, and adopt the true basis of the gospel, the principles of the Evangelical Alliance. There is now a great distance between their standpoint and ours. They call themselves modern, liberal; and they style us orthodox, and obscured. We are happy to be orthodox, because we do not shame the glorious name of Jesus Christ. There shall be a war, or rather a rupture, among us' (Moody-Stuart 1872: 95).

The conflict evoked a confessional response from Debrecen which was in accordance with the Apostle's Creed and shared the same doctrines of evangelicals spelled out as a Statement of Faith in 1846. The New Orthodoxy of Debrecen, which owed its name and emergence to the liberal theology provoking a response from confession orientated theologians and ministers 'awakening from their slumber' insisted on the divine inspiration, authority and sufficiency of the Scriptures. They maintained the right to private investigation and interpretation of the Bible but for them it was obvious that this exercise had to be in line with the confession of faith expressed in the symbolic writings of the church. The confession explicitly underlined the unity of the Godhead, and the Trinity of the persons therein and did not allow for Christological concessions made by liberal theologians whom they charged with repeating almost all the unorthodox teachings of the patristic period. The Confession of Debrecen highlighted that the utter corruption of human nature due to the Fall meant that every human being is born in sin, therefore is in need of salvation. The saving grace of God may come only though Christ's atonement and the work of the Holy Spirit enlightens us to recognise our fallen state. Liberal theology spoke only about a historical person named Jesus, who was either like God, or a god but less than God the Father, or was adopted and then elevated to the level of Godhead. It was never able to say that Jesus Christ is, was and will be God forever. Hungarian Reformed liberal theology rejected the basic tenets of Christian faith. Countless apologetics of Debrecen New Orthodoxy were quick to point out that is why liberal theology wished to discard the sacrament of the Lord Supper from worship as they did not believe in the salva-

tion through Christ's blood. Jesus was a historical figure for them and Christ was perceived as a legendary figure of Christian myth (Balogh 1875: 136). The shared core theological doctrines as well as the very fact that Debrecen considered to join the Evangelical Alliance bears testimony to their orientation toward Scottish evangelical theology.

Although liberal theology still held a grasp on some of the intellectual mind of the Reformed Church in Hungary after the mid-1870s, it was the Scottish Reformed theological impact coupled with German intermediating theology (*Vermittungstheologie* in German) that began to fertilise the soil of Hungarian Reformed spirituality to a degree that was perhaps last seen in the 1600s due to Puritanism. It could be stated that Reformed evangelicalism conveyed through a Scottish Reformed tradition, which also integrated continental Pietism because the leaders of the Scottish mission station were Dutch or German Pietist for decades. This impact permeated Hungarian Reformed piety decisively from 1860s till 1910s. It produced not only a new form of *praxis pietatis*, practice of piety and spirituality but it also proved to be—perhaps we can say without exaggeration—the most influential theological trend in the twentieth century. The small seed, which Scottish planted in 1841, bore its fruits in the long run chiefly owing to the bursary programme at New College, Edinburg which began in 1865. Ferenc Balogh's role was crucial to convince the Scots that there would be an interest from Hungarian Reformed centres of learning who would send students to study at New College. Throughout the next seven decades advanced not only into Hungarian Reformed theology but also into its ecclesiastical structures to which we shall turn our attention. First voluntary organisations were set up copying the Scottish evangelical sample that found its way to the very structure of the national church. To allude forward to the pinnacle of the fascinating development it is worth mentioned a remarkable fact that by 1933 the national synod of Reformed Church of Hungary introduced a mission law, (Gonda 2008: 46) thereby officially incorporated the revivalist, mission minded stance expressed by new orthodoxy of Debrecen and the emerging Reformed evangelical and Pietist movements embodying themselves in voluntary societies within the Reformed Church.

A Theological Impact through Books, Tracts, Establishment of Societies (YMCA, Sunday School, Women's Guild) and Periodicals

To offer a short overview of the means by which popular Scottish Reformed theology was spread one needs pay attention to the following fact: the Edinburgh scholarship fund proved to be the main channel (Hörcsik 1988: 161-182). Students who studied there often became evangelicals, or sympathetic to the movement. In three areas we may see their impact. First, in the ecclesiastical structures they exerted influence since many of them rose to

prominent positions in the church. They became church leaders like deans or even bishops, or secured jobs as professors at theological universities and colleges of Debrecen, Budapest, Pápa and to some extent Sárospatak and Kolozsvár. Secondly, the bursars occupied key positions in the newly established voluntary and home societies that became increasingly influential in the life of the church. Finally, all of these persons impacted Hungarian Reformed piety through translating evangelical theological books, tracts and songs. They also published articles about conversion, Biblicism and Christocentric life in newly established periodicals and wrote devotional books for the general publics and textbooks for students training for ministry.

At Debrecen Reformed College, Ferenc Balogh and his former student Lajos Csiky, professor of Practical Theology maintained close contacts with the Scottish theologians, church leaders and missionaries in Budapest. In 1869 Balogh modelled a Theological Self-Training Society (Hittanszaki Önképzőköri Társulat) on the Edinburgh missionary society for students which he saw in the spring of 1865 (Szombathy 1969). This society influenced generations of students who became 'evangelical' ministers, professors or layman of the Reformed Church carrying on the spirit of New Orthodoxy of Debrecen. Balogh became the first president of *MEKDSz* (Fellowship of Evangelical Students of Hungary) in Hungary in 1904 and had an impact on Gábor Kónya, the first travelling secretary of the YMCA (Forgács 1905: 295-296). He wrote many articles on the importance of Bible and supported the distribution of Bibles which proved to be a useful way of conveying the gospel. His Edinburgh diary which he wrote every single day during his stay in Edinburgh, witnesses how he admired the devotion of British Christians to the distribution of the Bible. For this end, he worked closely with the British and Foreign Bible Society for many years (Balogh 1864: 56). As recognition of Balogh's cooperation with the Bible Society, he was elected an honorary member of the society in 1904 (Ötvös 1997: 141). Lajos Csiky, who was also a bursar in Edinburgh, held a great sway on theological students in Debrecen. Having become a fellow professor to Balogh, Csiky produced many articles on mission and also translated Scottish and English evangelical literature. He also encouraged the bursars of Edinburgh to do likewise (Zoványi 1977: 128). For example, Antal Vargha, a bursar of 1908 translated a tract into Hungarian entitled '*Naámán megtisztulása*' (The Purification of Naaman). The bursars also produced articles about the life of the Scottish Church and naturally formed a circle of like-minded evangelicals.

In Budapest, the first dominant figure was Aladár Szabó. Just before the resettlement of Scottish Mission to Pest in 1857 liberal theology became the dominant power in the elite of Protestant circles of Budapest, which partially accounts for the unsuccessful endeavours of the Scottish Mission station

in Pest. Professor Mór Ballagi preferred German liberal theology to Scottish evangelicalism. However Szabó, who also became a bursar in Edinburgh, as a young student was instrumental in founding societies like YMCA and started Sunday schools for children in the 1880s. Together with many of his friends he began to plant new churches in Budapest and with the aid of the Scottish missionaries he launched evangelisations, supported the foundation of women's societies for the spread of the gospel. This had not escaped the eyes of the new ecclesiastical leadership who perceived his effort favourable and appointed him as a professor in 1888. By 1880s the most powerful figure of liberal theology, Mór Ballagi retired. He, as well as other liberal professors, was replaced by some moderate teachers at Reformed Theological Seminary in Budapest. Thus, there was a gradual shift from the liberal stance of the Ballagi era to a more confessional one represented by new professors such as Farkas Szőts and Elek Petri. Béla Kenessey's and Szabó's appointment ushered in the next new era of a more decided tone of revivalism. This trend grew stronger as several Edinburgh bursars were appointed to professorship between 1903 and 1914. Amongst the bursars from Budapest Szabó was the most prominent. Seventeen years at the Budapest Theological Seminary enabled him to influence an entire generation of students, including such characters as István Csűrös, who became the leader of the YMCA of the Reformed Church, Richard Biberauer, Gyula Forgács and other key figures in the newly established home mission organisations. Almost all the home mission societies, which made a lasting impact on Hungarian Reformed Christian thought and practice, were initiated by former Edinburgh bursars. In 1905, Szabó was elected to become one of the ministers of the prominent Kálvin tér church. There he established the most effective evangelical-pietist home mission society named Bethany Christian Endeavour. Through this association, he kept in close touch with leaders of other home mission organisations (Bodonhelyi 1955: 98). István Pap Bilkei, another bursar, became a professor of practical theology and canon law in Budapest in 1905 succeeding the liberal Albert Kovács. He received his first evangelical impetus from Szabó and the Scottish Mission while taking part in the establishment of the Sunday school movement in 1882. In Edinburgh, he came under the influence of J. G. Cunningham, minister of St. Luke's church and John Kerr whose '*Lectures on the History of Preaching*' proved to be a useful teaching tool for him (Csekey 1943: 7). Throughout his thirty-year professorship, Bilkei clearly stood for home mission and promoted evangelical revival. To achieve this, he drew on Scottish theology. One of his students, Sándor Csekey—who later became professor himself—remarked that he 'instilled the love for home mission in the students' (Csekey 1943: 7).

In Pápa Reformed Theological College, the third place where Scottish evangelicalism made an impact Lajos Csizmadia (1858-1928), translated a number of evangelical books such as Henry Drummond's '*Natural Law in the Spiritual Life*' and John Kerr's book mentioned earlier through which he imparted Scottish evangelicalism (Zoványi 1977:129). He was one of the earliest bursars (1883/4) and became professor of practical theology in 1901 (Hörcsik 1988: 22). Csizmadia was a member of the Bethany CE, and due to his strong ties with the Mission his young student József Pongrácz was put into contact with the missionaries. It is fascinating to see how the networking of revivalists functioned in the case of József Pongrácz a professor of New Testament. Before becoming a bursar of Edinburgh, he was already involved in the life of home mission representing Pápa in 1904 at the foundation of *MEKDSz* (Szabó 1941: 44). Pongrácz stayed for two years in Edinburgh from where he travelled to the WSCF (World Student Christian Federation) conference in Liverpool. Upon his return to Hungary he became secretary to the bishop of the Transdanubian Church Province, just like István Hamar in Pest and soon secured a professorship at Pápa Theological Seminary in 1910 (Zoványi 1977: 482). He was an expert on New Testament and emphasised the importance of reading the Bible daily just like Szabó (Pongrácz 1908: 2). Pongrácz regarded home mission organisations which were directly or indirectly all the fruits of Scottish evangelicals like Bethany C. E. and *MEKDSz* as a means of leading others to Christ (*Pongrácz* 1910, 2 October). He prompted his students to become involved in Sunday school work as well as prayer meetings for foreign mission. László Pataky, one of his students, mentioned in his memoirs how seriously Pongrácz took prayer life (Pataky 1988: 45-56). He, like Csizmadia, Bilkei, and Csiky was very productive in translating books from English into Hungarian. His correspondence with the retired Andrew Moody in Hungarian resulted in the publication of *Jézus és Zákeus* (originally Sought and Saved) (Pongrácz 1909: 16 April), *Az üdvösség napja* (The Day of Salvation) (Pongrácz 1909: 7 May), and *Diadalom* (Triumph) to mention just a few (Pongrácz 1909: 16 February). Finally, we must allude to the fact that the aftermath of World War II. forced the Reformed Churches to reorganise themselves under the new states emerging as an outcome of Treaty of Trianon. From Upper Hungary, which was occupied by Czech and Slovak forces and the Czechoslovakia was created, the minority Hungarians needed to start organising their own entirely new structures especially theological education. Béla Sörös, a former Edinburgh scholar established a Training College in Losonc and adapted the Scottish model of education. It meant that students were assigned to a minister who was outstanding in one of the theological disciplines and studied and work with him for a year or so (Somogyi 2014: 107).

The Impact of Scottish Evangelical Theology on the Personal Piety of the Reformed Hungarian

Here it is our concern to evaluate carefully the impact Scottish Reformed theology and piety made on the Reformed Churches of Hungary. It is what I label 'popular theology' where in the sway of Scottish evangelicalism made its presence felt mostly. Free Church of Scotland theologians and missionaries were imbued by evangelical spirit which maintained the old, traditional confessions and articulations of faith. Through this the newly arrived evangelical theology could connect to confession orientated mind-set of traditionalist theologians of Hungary as we referred to it when discussing the emergence of New Orthodoxy movement in Debrecen. This connection worked well in spite of the fact that the personal piety of the first figures such as Ferenc Balogh, or Imre Révész senirons was different in form and shape from Anglo-Saxon ones. Through this bridge that was provided by a shared theological conviction and view, as well as the means of influence such as devotional and theological books containing traditional theology, bursary programme, evangelisations and establishment of British originated Christian societies a like YMCA, Sunday school and medical outreach the evangelicalism took root in Hungarian Reformed piety to a varying degree. However, the question arises what were major features of this that were transplanted into Hungarian Reformed faith. David Bebbington identified four main qualities which could be useful in defining evangelical characteristics in Hungary: biblicism, crucicentrism, conversionism and voluntarianism. I make use of these categories but intend to reshape and extend them to describe the nature of the new Hungarian Reformed piety, evangelical-pietism brought about by Scottish evangelical Reformed faith.

Biblicism of Evangelical Piety

Biblicism was successfully transplanted into Reformed piety since Hungarian Calvinist always had a special regard and reverence for the Bible due to its spiritual message, and its importance for preserving national language. Owing to the affirmative stance of New Orthodoxy of Debrecen the authority and divine inspiration of the Bible was well guarded based on the Apostles Creed. Hungarian Reformed revivalist influenced by evangelicalism proclaimed that the Holy Scripture contains all essential spiritual truth which is to be found in its pages. The reverence for the Bible was not just a belief but it was visible through the actions of the converts. Former students of New College, Edinburgh eagerly supported the work of the British and Foreign Bible Society and began to announce the necessity to read the Bible daily for personal spiritual end. For them the Scripture was not just a textbook for theological study but the living word of God. In addition to this, a culture began to appear that believers took their Bibles to church not just

their hymnbooks or psalter books as it was customary in traditional Reformed piety. By the turn of the twentieth century a hymnbook was edited from English hymns named *Hozsánna* (1901) which was followed by *Hallelujah* hymnbook (1944). These were immensely popular among revivalist taking part in all kinds of societies and were in use parallel to the official hymnbook. Later many hymns made their way into the official songbooks of the Reformed Church. It is a remarkable fact that many modern Anglo-Saxon hymns were brought into the sphere of the Reformed congregations, which were in tone, text and melody very different from the ancient French, already accommodated Geneva Psalms which become 'Hungarian' and from the naturally home-grown songs of personal piety. In general, Hungarian songs mirrored the sorrowful experience of Hungarian Protestant faith whereas the British ones were more joyful and triumphant which may also be due to the national and successful political advancement of Great Britain and the USA. Through the Scots, a totally new phenomenon began to emerge. The powerful, rhythmical, ear-catching melodies of Sankey and Moody's revivalist songs took root in the revivalist circles swayed by Scottish piety. Hymns like 'How sweet this good news to us' (*Mily drága nékünk ez a jó hír?*) written by Fanny Crosby underlined the significance of the Gospel, and another song entitled 'The Opened Holy Bible', (*A megnyitott szent Biblia*) attest how dear the Bible was held by revivalist. Not only the establishment in Bible and Tract societies shows how much the Bible was treasured but also the revivalist songs bear witness to it. [It can be found in the revivalist and very popular Hallelujah, hymn number 138.]

Christ and Crucicentrism. Ancient Christology Upheld

The second feature of Scottish evangelicalism was its firm christological stance, its acceptance of the core belief about the divinity, incarnation and resurrection of Christ as it was articulated in the Creed (Bebbington 2004: 133-150). Evangelical theologians like William Cunningham, Thomas Chalmers and Robert Rainy (Cheyne 1983: 60-87) all subscribed to the Evangelical statement of faith which declared 'The Unity of the Godhead, and the Trinity of the persons therein, the incarnation of the Son of God, his work of atonement for the sins of mankind, and his mediatory intercession and reign' (McGrath-Marck 2004: 428). Similarly, the Debrecen Confession of faith clearly repeated this conviction adding to it the old age recognition of Reformation that 'the justification of the sinner is possible by faith alone' (Kovács 2010: 198). Lajos Kálmán, an orthodox theologian rejected the liberal stance of modern theology which denied the corruptness of human being naively thinking that it is innately good, a non-Christian teaching (Kálmán 1875: 293-284). Ferenc Balogh pointed out in his debate with the liberals that salvation through Christ and justification are essential

beliefs for the Christian faith (Balogh 1875: 135). Mihály Tóth, professor of Practical Theology in Debrecen articulated neatly that the divine redeemer is knocking on the door of the heart of human beings, and gives an answer to all concerns of the believers. He argued that through faith in Christ we shall be perceived just and spotless before God. However, God is able to work in us only if our hearts accept and acknowledge the testimony of the Scriptures (T. M. 1875: 64). The life of a born-again person will become virtuous life because he or she is justified in Christ. Such life seeks to follow and become like Christ following the words of the Holy Scriptures. Tóth supported his statement by biblical verses: 'since you have been born again, not of perishable seed but of imperishable, through the living and abiding word of God' (1 Peter 1:23), therefore 'You shall be holy, for I am holy' (1 Peter 1:16) and he encouraged the newly converted Christians to follow Jesus's step: 'You therefore must be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect' (Matthew 5:48). Here the emphasis is on the death of Christ's on the cross by saving the sinful man and is also on his grace which justifies us. It is a false calculation of liberal theology which takes man sinful nature easily and light-heartedly. Tóth argued that it is also a wrong to think as imaged by liberals that as science and culture advances sin gradually declines and eventually disappears, since it is not merely the result of fallible finite nature of human beings. The confessional theology of Debrecen firmly refused the pseudo theology of liberals offering a 'flattering self-salvation'. Moreover, it went further by claiming that all are anti-Christians, who deny Christ's salvific work, even if they openly do not say it. It threw light on the fact if someone denied the universality of sin that consequently led to the non-acceptance of Christ's salvation and 'it would also result in the denial of the historical facts of revelation' (T.M. 1875: 63). Finally, Sámuel Tóth a systematic theologian from Debrecen assigned what the main aim of a confessing Christian life for theological professors was: 'Our main vocation and responsibility is to lead the people, whose shepherd we are, to our sweet Redeemer. The Saviour—I believe—cannot be anybody else (neither in Budapest and Sárospatak theological seminaries) but Jesus Christ who was crucified and resurrected on the third day' (Tóth 1882: 153).

Clearly enough, theologians of the New Orthodoxy of Debrecen, just like Scottish evangelicals, affirmed that the 'the work of the Holy Spirit in the conversion and sanctification of the sinner' is an essential tenet of faith for the Christian believers. It is true that Mihály Tóth or Sámuel Tóth who studied in Germany were not influenced directly by Scottish Reformed faith, however, their traditional and orthodox stance was welcomed by Scottish evangelicals who knew about their publications through Ferenc Balogh. Thus, it has been demonstrated that a strong crucicentrism was dear in both Reformed traditions: the Hungarian Neo Orthodoxy and the Scottish

evangelicalism of the Free Kirk. With this observation, we arrive at the third feature.

A Salvation-Centred Preaching

The phenomena of conversionism started with the evangelisations of A. N. Sommerville, a Scottish evangelist of the United Presbyterian Church. It is claimed so as evangelising sermons appeared for the first time on a large scale in the Reformed congregations in Hungary during Sommerville's preaching campaign/crusade. He travelled across Hungary during the winter of 1887/88 escorted and hosted by former Edinburgh students who became professors like Balogh, Csiky and Szabó or ministers like József Szalay and Ferenc Kecskeméthy (both former bursars) working in large or small congregations in the countryside. Sommerville was the first person to preach a sermon for calling people to forward in the church to convert. The genre of preaching was to be named as evangelisation (*evangélizáció* in Hungarian), a form of preaching which was completely unknown to Hungarian Reformed piety in the nineteenth century. He also introduced Anglo-Saxon hymns of Ira Sankey and Moody using a portable organ and called for the conversion of heart which masses of lay people listened to (Révész 1943: 10-45). One of the songs was 'I know my Redeemer lives and has prepared a place' *(Tudom az én megválóm él)* that is still extremely popular in the official Hymnbook of the Reformed Church of Hungary. The ear-catching and melodic songs attracted the attention of people in which the texts talked about the need of conversion through Jesus's redeeming act. One of first evangelical revivals was among the peasants of Hungary as the population of Hungary mostly consisted of agricultural workers (Szalay 1893: 75). The need for a conversion of heart, a repentance of sin and a visible change of Christian life as norms for 'converted' Christians began to appear on the scene of Reformed piety due to Scottish evangelical and German pietist impact (Kovács 2006: 262). [Hymn nr. 421 is in the official Hymnbook of the Reformed Church of Hungary. About its reception into Hungarian hymnody see László Draskóczy's writing. http://egyhazzene.reformatus.hu/v/313/ downloaded 18 August, 2018.]

Evangelical hymns praising and glorifying Jesus, like 'What a friend we have in Jesus'(*Ó mily hű barátunk Jézus,* Hallelujah, 162), (Bailey 1950: 405-406), 'The Church's one foundation Is Jesus Christ her Lord' (*Az egyháznak a Jézus a fundamentuma)* written by Samuel John Stone, 'The Great Physician now is near, the sympathising Jesus' (*Az áldott orvos közeleg*,) or the song 'Love Divine, all loves excelling' (*Hittem benned most íme Zengem*) written by Charles Wesley all introduced terminologies, concepts like Jesus is a 'friend, 'captain', physician' and other popular religious expressions which were not typical expressions of personal piety in Hungarian Reformed faith at all.

Converts often used this new evangelical 'language' when they made a confession, or gave a public testimony. [The hymn was written by the Anglican priest Stone, and set to tune by the grandson of Charles Wesley, Samuel Sebastian Wesley. It can be found in Hallelujah hymnbook, number 15.]

Although doctrinally the Scottish and Hungarian Reformed traditions adhered to the same tenets, and their respective symbolic books rested on Calvin's teaching yet the consequent development of various trends of Calvinism were different. The constant self-flagellating language of evangelical preachers about sin in sermons was unusual in Hungarian piety since most of the preachers of nineteenth century Hungary interpreted the Bible as a social and moral guide for life but not as a book proclaiming the gospel that calls for repentance and turn to Christ (Kovács 2010: 155). This 'negligence' is due to the fact that it was assumed that church folk was already Christian and why to call for conversion. In this regard, Hungarian Reformed faith was closer to the moderate stance of the Church of Scotland and almost completely lacking such a phenomenon what Evangelicalism embodied in Scotland. But it began to change from 1865 onwards. Scottish evangelicalism, as presented by the former students, Scottish missionaries laid a heavy emphasis on the acknowledgement of sin, a personal conversion even of baptised Christians. Therefore, Scottish evangelical theology and praxis was responsible for introducing a new kind of spirituality into Hungarian Reformed Christianity. By doing so it also contributed to the creation of *ecclesiola, that is* a congregation/community of 'believers' within a local church who stood in sharp contrast with those of adhering to the valued religious tradition Calvinist faith (Gonda 2008: 39; 45). This created tensions in congregations. The newly shaping evangelical-pietist group favoured besides the traditional hymnbook the 'modern', Anglo-Saxon revivalist or Pietist songs like 'Would you love to be free from you sin?' (*Vágyol-e elhagyni bűneidet?*) or 'Oppressed with sin and woe' (*Bár bűn és kín gyötör)* which was written by Anne Bronte and the lyric composed by S. Howard. Both songs were translated by Aladár Szabó, the father of Hungarian home mission. Another song entitled 'Unto the Lamb of God I lay my sin' (*Az Isten bárányára*) written by Bonar Horatius. Similar debates between liberals, traditionalist and born again evangelical-pietist began to surface in congregations but a lot of people realised the need to bring in a fresh, lively and devout Christian life into the Reformed piety. This led to activities to proclaim the gospel, give testimonies and carry out charitable work in the name of Jesus. [It can be found in Hallelujah hymnbook, number 209. It can be found in Hallelujah hymns book number 21. It was translated by Mrs Gyula Vargha and Tamás Vargha. According to http://hu.scribd.com/doc/25046214/450-Draga-Dolog-Az-Ur-Istent-Dicserni, the tune of the hymn is attributed to Krisztina Roy (1861-1937). It is number 459 in the official hymnbook of the Reformed Church

of Hungary. Bonar was part of the Scottish revivalism which impacted Hungarian evangelicalism and pietism through various means.]

Voluntarianism. The Belief that the Gospel Needs to Be Expressed through Social and Spiritual Action

Word and action were held tightly together by contemporary evangelicals and Pietist. Preaching about the gospel's liberating message from sin and doing mission, offering spiritual counselling to fellow people as well as executing all kinds of social outreach (mission to orphans, sick, children, women, prostitutes, drunkards) went hand in hand. Action and spreading the Word of God did not exclude but complemented one another. We have already demonstrated how instrumental Scottish evangelicalism was through the former bursars to establish home mission organisations to revive the church. Biblicism, crucicentric Christology and conversionism was supplemented by voluntary actions. Songs played a crucial role in inciting religious fervours along with preaching. There are a number of lively English, Scottish or American evangelical hymns which call for doing something in return for the wondrous gift of love Jesus gave sinners, his life. One of the hymns calls for 'Should I go with empty hand and stand before the Lord?' (*Üres kézzel menjek é el?)* indicating the urgent need of the believer to offer his or her life us a life of sacrifice for the advancement of the Kingdom of God. Another song 'Hold the fort, for I am coming, Jesus signals still; Wave the answer back to Heaven, By Thy grace we will' (*Fel barátim drága Jézus*) (Molnár 2014: 62-70) became the most popular song of Evangelicals who started a voluntary movement, the YMCA movement in Hungary (Révész 1943: 29). [It can be found in Hallelujah hymnbook, number 322. It can be found in Hallelujah hymnbook, number 52.]

Through such songs, a new form of piety and religious mentality was introduced which revelled in the heroic act of mission. It defied the work of Satan identified with sins like excessive drinking, stealing, dishonesty, jealousy, bribing, lure to worldly goods or combatted anti-Christian ideologies such as Darwinism, materialism, and the like. The term 'born again' applied to converts recruited from the already baptised Christians' as a theological concept was introduced into Hungarian piety through popular Scottish evangelical theology. The incredible joy from being saved from eternal death had a strong grasp on the soul of the believers who were prompted to evangelise in the streets, arrange special events for giving testimonies and preach in congregations. Many prayer groups were formed which longed to see the church renewed. Thus, a new phenomenon featuring evangelisations, prayer groups, and home mission organisations came into being which all varied in their forms, shape, and content (Kovács 2006: 272-293). These activities were escorted by the itinerary preaching of the colporteurs

of Bible Society workers employed by Scottish Missionaries (Eibner 1983: 45-54). Many of the workers were Baptist including some Calvinist too. These simply but devout workers, or peasants made a deep impression on people in towns and the countryside. Voluntarianism became a feature of Hungarian Reformed piety through its first group of evangelicals.

Concluding Thoughts

By the middle of the twentieth century, the Scottish theological impact left its imprint on the piety of Reformed people of Hungary. It has been demonstrated that albeit liberal theology was strong in Hungary and, still there were others who found a common ground in their adherence to traditional doctrines of Christian faith. The Scottish Reformed evangelicalism and the New Orthodoxy of Debrecen both acknowledged the authority of the Bible, kept the Christological assertions found in the Creed. This commonly shared ground enabled them to build further bridges between Scottish and Hungarian Reformed people. One of the main channels was the scholarship programme which paved a way to popular evangelical Reformed theology from Scotland. The theological impact as well as the practices of daily Christian life with its emphasis on Bible, Christ, conversion and social action together with spiritual nourishment became integral part of Hungarian Calvinism to a degree that even a country like Hungary which was isolated since Reformation till the late nineteenth century began to develop a missionary awareness (Kool 1995). It is a remarkable fact that many top church leaders contributed to the renewal of the Reformed Church of Hungary and officially a mission law was passed by the national synod (Gonda 2008: 42). Surely evangelicals became a significant, influential minority which with its organised structures of societies, its presence in national church structures profoundly influenced the course of events in the life of the Reformed Church (Bucsay 1985: 222-224).

Bibliography

Bailey AE (1950) *The Gospel in Hymns,* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Balogh F (1864) Londoni Napló (London Diary of Ferenc Balogh) Debrecen: Debreceni Egyetemi Könyvtár Kézirattára. Ms 28/2.

Balogh F (1875) Nyilt válasz Ballagi Mór úr 2. nyílt levelére II (An Open Letter as a response to the 2. Open Letter of Sir Mór Ballagi) *EPL* 1. 15.

Barcza J (ed) *Tovább. Emlékkönyv Makkai László 75. születésének évfordulójára*. Debrecen: Debreceni Református Kollégium Nyomdája.

Bebbington DW (2004) Evangelical Theology in the English-speaking World during the Nineteenth Century. *Scottish Bulletin of Evangelical Theology* 22(2): 133-150.

Bebbington DW (1996) Scottish Cultural Influences on Evangelicalism. *Scottish Bulletin of Evangelical Theology* 14(*): 23-36.

Bodonhelyi J (1955) A belmisszió kora (1896-1918), (The Era of Home Mission). *A Budapesti Református Theológiai Akadémia története 1855-1955* (The History of the Reformed Theological University in Budapest). Budapest: A Református egyetemes konvent sajtóosztálya.

Brown D (1872) *Life of the Late John Duncan*, 2nd revised edition. Edinburgh: Edmonston and Douglas.

Bucsay Mihály (1985) 125 Jahre Deutsch-Sprachige Reformierte Gemeinde in Budapest (1859-1984). In Hauptmann P (ed) *Kirche im Osten. Studien Zur Osteuropaischen Kirchengeschichte Und Kirchenkunde* 28. Goettingen.

Bucsay M (1985) *A protestantizmus története Magyarországon 1521-1945* (The History of Protestantism in Hungary 1521-1945). In Auer K, Ádámné Révész G (trans) Budapest: Gondolat.

Chalmers T (1846) *On the Evangelical Alliance. Its Design, Its Difficulties, Its Proceedings, and Its Prospects, with Practical Suggestions.* Edinburgh.

Cheyne AC (1983) *The Transformation of the Kirk. Victorian Scotland's Religious Revolution.* Edinburgh: The Saint Andrews Press.

Coffey J (2003) *Puritanism, Evangelicalism, and the Evangelical Protestant Tradition* http://www.reclaimingthemind.org/papers/ets/2003/Coffey/Coffey.pdf (downloaded 2014.03.23).

Csekey S (1943) *Bilkei Pap István*, Budapesti Református Theologiai Könyvtár, 4. 2. Mezőtúr: Corvina Nyomda.

Drummond H (1895) *A természeti törvény a szellemi világban* (Natural Law in the Spiritual World). Budapest: Hornyánszky Viktor.

Duncan J (1842) Extract Letter from Rev. Dr. Duncan to Rev. Dr. Candlish Pesth, January 24, 1842. *Home and Foreign Missionary Record of the Church of Scotland* 2(4): 45-46.

Eibner JV (1983) British Evangelicals and Hungary 1800-1852. *The Journal of the United Reformed Church History Society* 3(2): 45-54.

Forgács Gy (1905) Titkári jelentés (A Report of the Secretary). *Protestáns Egyházi és Iskolai Lap (PEIL)*, 48.19.

Gaál S (2004) Két kálvinista centrum egymásra találása: a skóciai ösztöndíj létrehozása (The Meeting of two Centres of Calvinism and the Establishment of the Bursary in Scotland). *En Christo. Tanulmányok a 85 éves Dr. Bütösi János tiszteletére szerk.* Debrecen: Fábián Nyomda.

Gonda L (2008) *The Service of Evangelism, The Evangelism of Service.* Utrecht: Utrecht University Press.

Hörcsik R (1988) *Az edinburghi magyar peregrináció rövid története* (A Short History of Hungarian Peregrination to Edinburgh).

Isbell S (1993) Duncan, John. Camerun, N. M. de S. (ed) *Dictionary of Scottish Church History and Theology*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

Kálman L (1875) Észrevételek Kisantal Sámuel hitvallására II (Remarks regarding the creed of Sámuel Kisantal) *EPL* 1.4.

Keith A (1833) *Evidence of the Truth of the Christian Religion from the Literal Fulfilment of Prophecy; Particularly as Illustrated by the History of the Jews and by the Discoveries of Recent Travellers*. Edinburgh: Waugh and Innes.

Kerr J (1905) *Egyházi beszédek*. Pápa: Főiskolai Nyomda.

Kool AM (1995) *Az Úr csodásan működik*, 3 volumes. Budapest: Harmat-PMTI.

Kovács Á (2004) *A Budapesti Ev. Ref. Németajkú Leányegyház eredete és története 1858-1869* (The History of the German-speaking Reformed Affiliated Church of Budapest 1858-1869). D. Dr. Harsányi András Alapítvány Kiadványai 10, Debrecen: Fábián Nyomda.

Kovács Á (2010) *Hitvédelem és egyháziasság. A debreceni újortodoxia vitája a liberális teológiával* (Apologetics and Adherence to the Church. The Debate between the New Orthodoxy of Debrecen and Liberal Theology). Budapest: L'Harmattan.

Kovács Á (2006) *The History of Free Church of Scotland's Mission to the Jews and its Impact on the Reformed Church of Hungary 1841-1914*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Kovács Á (2001) *The Origin of the Scottish-Hungarian Church Relations: The Settlement and the First Years of the Scottish Mission in the 1840s*. 4, Debrecen: Debreceni Református Kollégium Nyomdája.

Kövy Zs (ed) *A Pápai Református Gyűjtemény évkönyve* (The Yearbook of Collections of Pápa Reformed College). Pápa: A Dunántúli Református Egyházkerület Nagykönyvtára.

McGrath A, Mark DC (2004) *The Blackwell Companion to Protestantism*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Molnár SK (2014) A Fel barátim drága Jézus kezdetű ének története Magyarországon (The History of the Song 'Hold the fort; Under the Banner of Jesus' Hungary). *Egyháztörténeti Szemle* 15(3): 62-70.

Moody-Stuart A (1872) Hungarian and Bohemian Bursaries. *Free Church of Scotland Missionary Records* 10(118): 93-95.

Ötvös L (1997) *Balogh Ferenc életműve (1836-1913)* (The Life and Work of Ferenc Balogh). Debrecen: Karcagi Nyomda.

Pápai Református Gyűjtemény (Pongrácz József Collection in Pápa Reformed College) DREL 22. d., Letter of József Pongrácz date 2 October, 1910.

Pápai Református Gyűjtemény (Pongrácz József Collection in Pápa Reformed College), DREL 22. d., Pápai Református Gyűjtemény (Pongrácz József Collection in Pápa Reformed College). Letter of József Pongrácz date 2 October, 1910.

Pápai Református Gyűjtemény (Pongrácz József Collection in Pápa Reformed College) DREL 22. d. Letter from Andrew Moody to Pongrácz 16 April 1909.

Pápai Református Gyűjtemény (Pongrácz József Collection in Pápa Reformed College) DREL 22. d. Letter from Andrew Moody to Pongrácz 7 May 1909.

PRGy, Pongrácz József Collection, DREL 22. d. Letter from Andrew Moody to Pongrácz 16 February 1909.

Pataky L (1988) Az imádkozó Pongrácz József. Pongrácz József emlékülés Pápán (An Anniversary of József Pongrácz. The Praying man: József Pongrácz), 1985 november 15.

Pongrácz J (1908) *Bibliaolvasás* (Studying the Bible), (n. p.) Klny.

Randall I (2001) *One body in Christ: the History and Significance of the Evangelical Alliance*. Carlisle: Paternoster.

Révész I (1943) *Egy fejezet a magyar református ébredés történetéből* (A Chapter from the History of Hungarian Reformed Awakenings). *Theológiai Szemle* 19.

Rooy SH (1965) *The Theology of Mission in Puritan Tradition*. Grand Rapids: MI.

Somogyi A (2014) Losonci Teológiai Akadémia tudományművelése (The Education at Theological Academy in Losonc) *Teológiai Fórum* 8(1): 92-124.

Scult M (1978) *Millennial Expectations and Jewish Liberties*. Neuser J (ed) Studies in Judaism in Modern Times 2. Leiden: Brill.

Sheldon CM (1903) *Az ő nyomdokain* (In His Footsteps). Budapest: Magyar Protestáns Irodalmi Lap.

Szalay J (1893) Sankey énekeiből. Ne félj csak higyj (From Sankey's Hymns. Do not Worry but Have Faith). *Keresztyén* 2(10): 75.

Szalay J (1893) Sankey énekeiből. Ó Boldog Nap. (From the Songs of Sankey. What a Happy Day) *Keresztyén* 2(9): 67.

Szombathy Gy (1975/1969) *A teológus ifjúság (Youth in the Theological Academy)*. Budapest: SNTM: Bűnösség és váltság (Sin and Atonement). *EPL* 1(7): 63-64.

Tóth S (1882) Húsvéti igazság kerdéséhez (About the Truth of Easter). *Debreceni Protestáns Lap* 2(16).

Walls AF (1993) Missions. Camerun, N. M. de S. (ed) *Dictionary of Scottish Church History and Theology*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

White G (1977) 'Highly Preposterous': Origins of Scottish Missions. *Records Scottish Church History Society 19*. Edinburgh.

Zoványi J (1977) *Magyarországi protestáns egyháztörténeti lexikon* (Protestant Lexicon for Hungarian Church History). Ladányi S (ed) third enlarged

edition. Budapest: A Magyarországi Református Egyház Zsinati Irodájának Sajtóosztálya.

NOTES FOR CONTRIBUTORS

Articles for *Perichoresis* must be submitted exclusively by email at perichoresis@emanuel.ro. Each submission will be acknowledged in this format.

The average length of articles should be 8.000 words. We are willing, however, to consider articles in excess of 8.000 words should such a length be absolutely necessary. All articles should be written at a single line spacing using the *Harvard Referencing System* (for Sage).

Greek and Hebrew words must be transliterated and, as a matter of preference, should not be used very often. Transliteration is accepted only if performed in accordance with current academic rules.

All articles must be preceded by a brief abstract (up to 200 words) and five key words.

Each submission is subject to blind peer-reviewing by a team of two international scholars. Consequently, all contributors will be informed in due course (usually within two to four weeks) on whether their articles are considered for publication or not.

Perichoresis

THE THEOLOGICAL JOURNAL *of* EMANUEL UNIVERSITY

Editura Universității Emanuel | Emanuel University Press
Str. Nufărului Nr. 87, 410597 Oradea, Bihor, România/Romania
Email: perichoresis@emanuel.ro
www.emanuel.ro

Sciendo | De Gruyter Poland
Headquarters: Sciendo | De Gruyter Poland, Bogumila Zuga 32a, 01-811 Warsaw, Poland
German Office: Walter de Gruyter GmbH, Genthiner Straße 13, D-10785 Berlin, Germany

ISSN: 1224-984X
ISSN-L: 1224-984X
ISSN (online): 2284-7308