
Sixteenth-Century Unitarian Interpretations of Psalm 2 in Sermons by György Enyedi (1597)

BORBÁLA LOVAS (Budapest, Hungary)

The diversity of Christianity by the time of the Reformation resulted in the urgent need for different readings and translations of scripture. One of the most disputed verses, Psalm 2:7, was the source of conflict between Trinitarians and Antitrinitarians regarding the existence of the Eternal Son, and the divinity of Christ. Within the Antitrinitarian movement in East Central Europe were two independent denominations: the Minor Reformed Church of Poland (popularly known as Socinians—after Fausto Sozzini— or as Polish Brethren) based in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, and the Unitarian Church, a seventeenth-century name for an active and determined community that existed from the middle of the sixteenth century in the semi-dependent principality of Transylvania and in the occupied territories of Ottoman Hungary. Of the latter, the most well-known figure in church history and scholarship is Ferenc Dávid, the first bishop (or superintendent).¹ With the support of the young Unitarian convert, Prince John Sigismund, Dávid published dozens of books near the end of the 1560s in both Latin and Hungarian. The focus of this study, however, concerns the work in the 1590s of the third bishop, György Enyedi. Though strict printing regulations prevented the publication of important Antitrinitarian works from the 1570s onwards, the Unitarian elite managed to create and transmit a substantial manuscript tradition that includes songs, prayers, other everyday texts, didactic stories (biblical, historical, and romantic), theological works and records of debates, biblical translations (particularly psalms), and, most importantly, sermons.

György Enyedi was born in 1555 in Enyed (today Aiud, Romania). After studying in Geneva and in Padua, teaching dialectics and philosophy, and assuming the role of rector of the Unitarian college



St. Michael's Church in Kolozsvár (today Cluj/Napoca).
 During the bishopry of György Enyedi this was a Unitarian church.
 György Enyedi preached here till his death in 1597.

of Cluj, he was elected bishop from 1592 and occupied that role until his early death in 1597. Though some of his texts did not survive (such as his schoolbooks, and his funeral oration for the second bishop, Demeter Hunyadi), many remain:

- a translation from Boccaccio's *Decameron*, IV/1 (*Historia elegantissima Gismundae, regis Tancredi filiae...*), in several print editions and manuscripts;
- his notes on the books of the New Testament written during his studies in Geneva (*Annotationes Georgii Enyedini in Novum Testamentum*), in a manuscript copy;
- his Latin translation of Heliodorus's *Aethiopica* (finished 1592), in a manuscript copy;
- his pamphlets against Mihály Cserényi, and János Szilvási (*Responsio ad Michaelis Cserényi de Balásfalva Assertiones Scholasticas De Sanctissima et Individua Trinitate; Concio Georgij Eniedini opposita Johannes Zilvasii, Defensio concionis Georgij [Eniedini] adversus Apolog[iam Johannis Zilvasii], Concionis Examen, Brevis*

responsio, Contra Antiquitatem et perpetuam durationem fidei Romanae brevis dissertatio), all in manuscripts;

- the *Explicationes locorum Veteris et Novi Testamenti*, in Latin and Hungarian printed editions;
- his epigram dedicated to Jacobus Palaeologus (*In apocalypsin a Jacobo Paleologo Commenta*), in a manuscript;
- and a substantial sermon collection in diverse manuscripts, though not in his own hand.

The final item, the largest manuscript corpus of Transylvanian Unitarian sermons, has a complex textual tradition. The two hundred individual pieces comprise seven sections (called triacas), each containing thirty-three sermons, except the seventh, fragmented section, unfinished because of the bishop's death. Written by Enyedi during his bishopric (1592-1597), they were copied by various preachers and scribes until the end of the seventeenth century. Uniquely for the period, Enyedi drew from a wide range of biblical verses for his textus or themes (including canonical and apocryphal books of the Old and New Testament, from the books of Moses to the Book of Revelation). He also incorporated theological questions relevant to the contemporary behaviour of the citizens of Cluj. Regarding dogmatic questions on important historical and political matters and the most discussed passages of the Bible, he made connections with a moderately critical attitude on, for example: Ps. 2:7, Micah 5:2, John 8:58, 1 John 5:7-8 concerning the Johannine Comma, and Rev. 1:8.² In addition to presenting a wide arsenal of arguments in favour of Antitrinitarian dogmas and the Unitarian community, the bishop also criticized and explained fundamental ideas and challenged his people to take sides after understanding the arguments. The tolerant tone of the sermons, an essential feature of the Transylvanian environment, was however limited to the Reformed denominations and dogmas. Consequently, Enyedi did not adhere to the views of Jacobus Palaeologus, the Italian radical thinker who dreamed of broad religious tolerance amongst all the churches that were monotheistic. Otherwise Enyedi used the ideas of Palaeologus, who had spent time in Transylvania and whose work survives only in manuscript copies made by Transylvanian Unitarians like Enyedi, who were connected to the interpretation of the Bible from the earliest period. Thus, we can find notes about Palaeologus already in Enyedi's *Annotationes*, but he

limits this influence to the manuscripts that can be easily connected to the Reformed theology. Beyond this, Enyedi distances himself not only from the too radicalized direction of theological openness, but also from the Catholic dogmas.

With Psalm 2, Enyedi reflects on the question of the Trinity. The first two of the three sermons in which he discusses Ps. 2:1-6, Ps. 2:7, and Ps. 2:8 accompany and precede this article.³ These sermons survive in two sources: 5. Kolozsvári Kódex (5th Codex of Cluj/Kolozsvár) copied in the middle of the seventeenth century,⁴ and Székelykeresztúri Kódex (Codex of Cristuru Secuiesc/Székelykeresztúr) copied by Gergely Fejérdi in 1629.⁵ Both volumes are handbooks for preaching. Further, there exists a compiled Latin variant first published in 1598, a year after Enyedi's death, in his detailed exegetical work, the *Explicationes*.⁶ This version appears in a Hungarian translation printed in 1619 and 1620 in Cluj,⁷ and in a second Latin edition, printed in ca. 1669 in Amsterdam.⁸ As a consequence, the compiled variant, appearing in the *Explicationes*, appears in copies held not only in East Central Europe (mainly in Transylvania, Hungary, Poland, and Germany), but also in Western Europe (the Netherlands, Great Britain, Ireland), and in North America.⁹ In contrast, the Hungarian sermons that remain in handwritten codices received little attention until recently.¹⁰

These three-part sermons require further study. The form itself is unique even in the collection, in which single and two-part sermons are more common, and their connection to a Latin exegetical explanation is similarly provocative. Despite the key presence of psalms (and specifically Ps. 2) in contemporary theological debates, their use was long neglected in scholarship. Róbert Dán first noted Enyedi's thoughts on Ps. 2 as found in the *Explicationes*, which he connected to his study of Miklós Bogáti Fazakas's psalm translations.¹¹ Enyedi had used and interpreted the messianic passages of the Old Testament in the manner of well-known sixteenth-century Hungarian Protestant and Unitarian authors (such as Péter Melius Juhász, Gáspár Heltai, and György Válaszúti),¹² and from postbiblical Jewish polemics (like David Kimhi).¹³ From the beginning, the chapter of the *Explicationes* based on Ps. 2:7 shows a clear textual connection with the sermons.¹⁴ The sermons however follow a different structure: a frame text of a princely mirror, a literary device designed to instruct princes how to rule,¹⁵ is included. As Enyedi states:

The testimonies of saints and countless other examples clearly demonstrate how futile and dangerous it is to tussle with God and to resist His will. Mighty nations, powerful empires, all counsels, all knowledge, all wisdom are nothing when compared to our almighty Lord, as Solomon says in Pro. 21 (Prov. 21:30): “There is no wisdom nor understanding nor counsel against the LORD.” Saint David, too, proclaimed and affirmed that in the first lines of our chosen psalm; he demonstrates that those who kick and fight against God’s decisions bring onto themselves dishonor and peril, instead of achieving their goals.

This psalm has three main parts. The first part is where the prophet describes how the mighty men of this world prepared to attack the Lord, and how the Lord treated them in response. In the second part, he describes the glory and splendor the Lord will hand out to those whom He takes under His protection. In the third part the prophet admonishes the rulers and the powerful sovereigns to serve the Lord with fear and obedience.¹⁶

After these lines, Enyedi inserts lines from the beginning of the sermon 192, based on Ps. 2:1-6, which he had used in the chapter of the *Explicationes* that commented on Ps. 2:7. In addition, Enyedi adds the comment that while some scholars prefer a literal reading of the psalm (a reference to David), others adopt a figurative reading (seeing a reference to Jesus Christ), and some accept both.¹⁷ While the attitude of Enyedi is less straightforward in the *Explicationes*,¹⁸ in the sermons he acknowledges the interpretations of both the sermon’s literal and spiritual readings. It is worthwhile quoting these paragraphs in full:

Before we can understand the meaning of those words and draw conclusions, we need to clarify about whom this psalm was written. According to some explanations it is about Christ, according to others it is about David. Yet others explain that it is about both of them: in the literal sense it is about David, and in the spiritual sense it is about Jesus Christ.

Among those explanations, the last one, the third one is the most accurate. The first explanation that this psalm was written about Jesus Christ literally, historically, and in the spiritual sense, cannot be accepted whatsoever. Here are the reasons for it: first, not only wise Jewish sages, but learned Christian scholars as well believe that this psalm befits David as well, so they explain it that way.

Second, this psalm was written long before our Lord Christ was born. Here the prophet talks about people who existed before then.

In the Old Testament, prophets declare when they speak about future events, or about the Messiah who is not present in their time. However, the prophet does not provide such declaration in this psalm.

The third reason why this psalm is not about Jesus in the literal and historical sense is that the psalm does not conform to the time period and to the acts of Jesus. The prophet writes that the heathen and kings rise up against the Christus of God. But we do not find evidence for that in the New Testament. Pilate, as mentioned in Acts 4 (Acts 4:27), was not a king, and it was the Jews and not the heathen who conspired against Jesus. Historical accounts and Pilate's own words tell us that in John 18 (John 18:35): "Thine own nation and the chief priests have delivered thee onto me." The other evidence is that the heathen were in counsel to break the cords of that Christus, and to throw his yoke off their backs. However, Jesus never ruled over the Romans or the heathens, thus no one could want to throw off the yoke of Jesus.¹⁹

The fourth reason why this psalm was not written literally about Jesus is that the writing is about a single person in a single time frame, as we can judge from the wording. But when the New Testament scholars associate this psalm with Jesus, they invoke two time periods. The beginning, (Ps. 2:1): "*Quare fremuerunt gentes, et populi meditati sunt inania?*" — is explained, according to Acts 4 (Acts 4:25), as the time after the ascension of our Lord Christ when the high priests forbade the apostles from teaching. The part (Psalm 2:7): "Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee" is placed by Saint Paul at the time of the resurrection of Christ. The part (Psalm 2:9): "Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron" is placed in Apoc. 2 (Revelation 2:27) at the time of the reign of Jesus, which is in the future, as it has not come yet. All these prove that this psalm was not written literally about our Lord Christ.

However, the explanation that this psalm is exclusively about David is also false. There are even some Jewish scholars who associate its spiritual meaning with the Messiah. And the scholars of the New Testament relate several statements from this psalm to Jesus Christ. Let us then accept that this psalm literally and historically is about David, but its spiritual meaning is about the Messiah and his disciples. We will be applying this explanation as we examine the words of our psalm.

Enyedí's additions to these three sermons — which were identical to the text of the *Explicationes* — served the church audiences to whom they were preached in sequence on the Sundays following the second Sunday of Epiphany in 1597. Visible in these sermons is evidence that

he adapted the topic to suit different audiences: sometimes with more detail, other times with more exhaustive exegesis. For example, in the *Explicationes* Enyedi mentioned Jewish scholars (like David Kimhi) and Christian writers (like Martin Bucer, John Calvin, Immanuel Tremellius, and Wolfgang Musculus); in the sermons these names were replaced with general references to “wise Jewish sages,” “learned Christian doctors,” or “wise doctors,” rendering the allusions in the main text better understandable for a sermon audience.

As we have seen, the first sermon gives us a brief summary of the topic and provides several readings of the tradition. In contrast, the second sermon is more polemic, expanded with the didactic teachings addressed to the prince and the nobility.²⁰ The manner in which the parallel texts of the sermon and the *Explicationes* diverge is telling. The *Explicationes* is typically more complex and more elaborated than the sermon, which keeps the fluent and clear wording of the oral performance (including vivid and detailed examples, and recurring reminders of the princely mirror). This second sermon is based on the actual line in focus, Psalm 2:7,²¹ and shares similar parts with the *Explicationes*. Beyond the parallelism, the main directions on the different paragraphs become visible. The sermons also show complex compilation throughout the texts. While, as we mentioned, Enyedi uses lines of the *Explicationes* in the first sermon, here parts of the second sermon can be found in the latter part of the *Explicationes* chapter, mixing up the order of the arguments in the explanation, and for long paragraphs the texts unravel different questions.

This second sermon is the heart of this sequence. It discusses key questions about the Antitrinitarian dogmas, and as we take a closer look on the textual tradition, it is also evident that the tradition of the late-sixteenth century differs a bit from the early texts. In *De falsa et vera*,²² one of the most significant works of Transylvanian Unitarianism, published by Ferenc Dávid in 1567, the first bishop interprets the Psalm 2:7 as the death and resurrection of Christ, following the apostolic tradition. This interpretation shows us how the death of Christ and his resurrection by God’s favour became a highly important part in the interpretation of his human and divine nature. In light of this interpretation, it was necessary for Enyedi to emphasize the common use of the word *Christus* in the Bible.²³ And it is just as important for him to show the difference

between the almighty and omnipotent God, and the earthly rulers. This latter argument also becomes the cornerstone of the frame of the princely mirror. Thus, in the first sermon, Enyedi focuses on how God punishes the rulers who do not obey him; in the second sermon, he shows how God glorifies and dignifies the ones in His grace.

The third sermon differs from the first two. The topic, *Regnum Christi* (Christ's rule), includes the conversion of the pagans, Christ's earthly empire, and discussions of issues like adoration. The framing of a princely mirror is constant, and the reminder of the ruling elite is echoing the moral of the second sermon.

(Psalm 2:10) "Be wise now, O ye kings, etc." This admonishment flows naturally from the words preceding it in this psalm. The prophet stated that all intent and effort against God's will by the powerful of this world is futile, because when He wants to anoint someone, He will do that despite any opposition. That is why the prophet admonishes them to be wise. He tells them do not be foolish, do not tussle with the Lord, but, rather, serve Him if they want to be blessed, and not to perish. At first, he only admonishes them (Psalm 2:10), "Be wise now, O ye kings etc." Rulers do need that kind of admonishment and instruction. Many rulers believe their reign is all about a life of splendor, about keeping multitudes of soldiers and horses, about feasting and drinking, and about imposing orders. All the while they give very little thought to — and do very little about — understanding God's truth, about governing their subjects kindly and wisely, and about becoming more learned and wise. These ought to be their main tasks, as the prophet states (Psalm 2:10) "Be wise now, be instructed."²⁴

Though these sermons, like other sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Unitarian sermons, address the ruling princes, the message was never received directly. After the reign of John Sigismund, that is, after 1571, with the exception of the short reign of Moses Székely (the Unitarian Szekler prince in 1603), the subsequent princes were Catholic (Stephen Báthory, Sigismund Báthory, and Andrew Báthory); Calvinist (Stephen Bocskai, Sigismund Rákóczi, Gabriel Bethlen, and George Rákóczi); or at times alternating Calvinist and Catholic (Gabriel Báthory). Despite Enyedi's open addresses to Sigismund Báthory and the Transylvanian nobility, it is highly unlikely that the prince was aware of the bishop's indications and teachings.

Enyedi's sermons are also unique regarding the chosen texts, since the contemporary preachers, irrespective of their denominations, followed the tradition of taking texts from the New Testament, in connection to the yearly circle of Christian feasts. In the sermon sequence, Enyedi provides an individual translation of the psalm that differs from other Unitarian (and Trinitarian) versions.²⁵ There are detailed studies analyzing the second psalm in the Unitarian textual tradition, showing how the Unitarian texts differ from the translations of the other denominations. These studies introduce such witty and provocative paraphrases, like the Lutheran András Szkhárosi Horvát's "Panasza Krisztusnak" [Complaint of Christ], written in 1549, involving (besides Christ himself) Luther and the corrupt papacy in the text, and published in Reformed songbooks as the singular translation of Psalm 2 lasting until the beginning of the seventeenth century.²⁶ Although the Unitarians did not have their own translation of the Bible, the wide use of the psalms in everyday church life inspired several poets to attempt versification, and provide them with a melody. Consequently, in addition to sermons, Hungarian variants of the psalm are known from songbooks and collections of translations. Manuscripts of the versed paraphrase translation of the Unitarian Miklós Bogáti Fazakas, one of the most popular in the period, survive in seventeenth-century Unitarian and Sabbatarian codices. Bogáti Fazakas's interpretation neglected the allegorical reading and singularly stressed the historical interpretation. I quote here only the paraphrase of Psalm 2:7-8:

Mikor koronáza engem, azt mondá:
 Én fiam vagy Dávid, mert szültelek ma.
 Minden ellenségtől mentettelek ma,
 ne félj semmi népet ennek utánna.

(When he crowned me that day, he said this to me:
 You are my son, David, I bore you this day,
 I saved you from every enemy today,
 Do not fear any nation from this time forth.)²⁷

János Thordai wrote the other widely known Unitarian paraphrase in 1627. One theory claims he re-translated the psalms because his predecessor's work had been co-opted by the strengthened Sabbatarians, although we found the psalms sometimes copied in the same Unitarian codex. The new Unitarian translations, using well-known melodies for

the psalms, were useful because of the strange French-style melodies used by the Calvinist Albert Szenci Molnár for his widely popular translations.²⁸ In comparison to Bogáti Fazakas, Thordai changes his translation from the theological point of view, and interprets the referenced lines with a focus on the ceremony of the enthronement, ignoring the *sensus litteralis*, such as the Christological prophecy:

Az Úr monda énnekem jó kedvében,
Megnyugodtam én az te hű szívedben,
Téged, fiam, atyai szerelmemben,
Felemelvén ültettelek székemben.

(The Lord God told me this in his good humour,
I am feeling reassured in your faithful heart,
Raising you, my son, in my fatherly love,
I did place you onto my own seat to rule.)²⁹

The translation of the words depends strongly on the interpretation of the text. Enyedi and other Unitarian translators used the word “szültelek” (‘I gave birth to you’) in both the psalm translations and in the theological debates, in a similar manner to the King James Version. Subsequently, this has been used in the translation of the sermons below: “this day have I begotten thee.” It is therefore no accident that Enyedi also includes the lines of Isa. 46:3: “Hearken unto me, O house of Jacob, and all the remnant of the house of Israel, which are borne by me from the belly, which are carried from the womb.” In the other contemporary and modern translations, variants can be found, like “I made you my son today,” or “today I have become your father.” Enyedi is well aware of the fact that the reference of birth does not signify procreation by nature in connection to God, and he shows textual examples that in the Bible, it is a regularly used idiom to describe God’s relation to his people. He also stresses that he does not agree with the obtrusive method of the interpreters to identify every single occurrence of this idiom as a reference to Christ or as evidence to prove the theological point of the Trinity.

It is important to notice that earlier secondary literature already raised the problem of the Unitarian interpretation, although detailed analysis of these texts is still a goal to reach. As Róbert Dán interpreted this special Unitarian view of the text, he mentioned that this approach, which can be seen most clearly in Bogáti Fazakas’s psalm

paraphrase, provides a theoretical opportunity to apply new theological combinations in place of the old ones, despite seeking the purest possible interpretation, the principally literal interpretation that adheres to the text.³⁰ Enyedi, following the same pattern, shows even richer and more interesting sources to prove his point is connected to important theological questions, while not constricting the possible interpretations of the literal meaning. It is not surprising then that he involves, in addition to the different translations and variants of the Bible itself, classical and contemporary theologians, and even writers like Aristotle, Plato, Homer, Vergil, Heliodorus of Emesa, Cicero, Pliny, Plutarch, and others. In the sermons on the psalm Enyedi relies on the interpretations of the biblical verses and uses the historical and contemporary examples of the imprudent warriors and rulers only to make his audience aware of the danger of acting against God. There is Capaneus marching up on the walls of Thebes, followed by Herod and Pilate, the popes, and the rulers of the Holy League. But as Gamaliel says: “If it is by God, you cannot overthrow it.” And although Enyedi’s sermons were forgotten because of the changes in the East Central European political scene, his messages in these theologically unique impressions of sixteenth-century Unitarianism still teach us and delight us.

Notes

The research for this article was financed by the National Research, Development and Innovation Office, Hungary, project FK 135165. It is part of a four-year research project, titled: “A kora újkori unitárius prédikációirodalom története Erdélyben és Magyarországon” [The History of Early Modern Unitarian Sermon Literature in Transylvania and Hungary].

¹ About the life and works of the first bishop: Mihály Balázs, *Ferenc Dávid*, Ungarländische Antitrinitarier IV, Bibliotheca Dissidentium XXVI (Baden-Baden: Editions Valentin Koerner, 2008). About the discussed period and Ferenc Dávid’s theological debates: Antal Pirnát, *Die Ideologie der siebenbürger Antitrinitarier in den 1570er Jahren* (Budapest: Verlag der Ungarischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1961), and *Antitrinitarianism in the second half of the 16th century*, eds. R. Dán, A. Pirnát (Leiden–Budapest: Brill–Akadémiai, 1982).

² The Johannine Comma refers to a passage in the first epistle of John (1 John 5: 7-8) that makes claim for a trinity of holy offices in heaven: “the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost. These three are one.” Once eliminated by Erasmus in his translation, this passage was contested between Protestants and Catholics over the doctrine of the Trinity in the Early Modern period. The Unitarians opposed all Trinitarians on this point.

³ Sermons 192, 193, and 194, from which quotations are found in this paper, are translated from Hungarian by Robert Kokenyesi. Sermons 192 and 193, translated by Robert Kokenyesi and Borbála Lovas, are published in full length on the preceding pages of this volume.

⁴ 5. Kolozsvári Kódex: Biblioteca Academiei Române, Filiala Cluj, MS. U. 1228. (Romania) Henceforward abbreviated as K5.

⁵ Székelykeresztúri Kódex: Biblioteca Teleki-Bolyai, Târgu Mureș, 0439. (Romania)

⁶ György Enyedi, *Explicationes locorum Veteris et Novi Testamenti, ex quibus Trinitatis dogma stabiliri solet* (Cluj, [Heltai, 1598]). USTC 305892.

⁷ György Enyedi, *Az ó és új testamentum-beli helyeknek, melyekbe az az Háromságról való tudománt szokták állatni, magyarázattok* (Cluj, [typ. Heltai, Makai Nyíró], 1619, 1620). [Henceforward: *Az ó és új testamentum-beli helyeknek*, 1619.]

⁸ György Enyedi, *Explicationes locorum Veteris et Novi Testamenti, ex quibus Trinitatis dogma stabiliri solet* ([Amsterdam, Johannes van Ravesteyn, ca. 1669]). [Henceforward: *Explicationes*, ca. 1669.]

⁹ In the U.S. and Canada copies are known in the libraries of Harvard University, Brown University, Pittsburgh Theological Seminary, Massachusetts Center for Renaissance Studies, University of Tennessee, University of California, Starr King School for the Ministry, in the New York Public Library, and in the University of Toronto Library. About the history of the editions see also: Borbála Lovas, "The Posthumous Reception of an Antitrinitarian Bishop at Home and Abroad: The Afterlife of György Enyedi's *Explicationes*" in *Print Culture at the Crossroads: The Book and Central Europe*, ed. Elizabeth Dillenburg, Howard Paul Louthan, and Drew B. Thomas (Leiden: Brill, 2021), pp. 72-96. A shorter variant published in Hungarian: Borbála Lovas, "Enyedi György: *Explicationes locorum Veteris et Novi Testamenti*. Egy erdélyi egezetikai munka a nyugat-európai könyvpiacón" [György Enyedi: *Explicationes locorum Veteris et Novi Testamenti*. A Transylvanian exegetical work in Western European book market], *Keresztény Magvető* 125 (2019), pp. 153-169.

¹⁰ The first printed editions of the sermons were recently published: *Enyedi György prédikációi* vols. 1-3, ed. B. Lovas (Budapest: MTA-ELTE HECE-Magyar Unitárius Egyház, 2016-2018). A fourth volume is in preparation.

¹¹ Róbert Dán, *Humanizmus, reformáció, antitrinitarizmus és a héber nyelv Magyarországon* [Humanism, Reformation, Antitrinitarism, and Hebrew language in Hungary] (Budapest: Akadémiai, 1973), p. 109.

¹² See, e.g. the text of the Dispute of Pécs: György Válaszúti, *Pécsi disputa*, preface and notes R. Dán, ed. K. Németh S. (Budapest: Akadémiai, 1981), pp. 301-311. About this text and its connection to Ps. 2 see a recently published article: Réka Varga, "Kik Isten fiai? A második zsoltár a Pécsi Disputában" [Who are the sons of God? The Ps. 2 in the Dispute of Pécs]. *Keresztény Magvető* 122 (2016), pp. 441-452.

¹³ About this see also: Róbert Dán, *Humanizmus, reformáció, antitrinitarizmus...*, p. 112. Dán analyses passages of Enyedi based on the works of David Kimhi and Michael Servetus. Pál Ács also raises attention to the Medieval Jewish and Christian psalm interpreters, like Rasi, Kimhi, or Nicolaus de Lyra, who tried to argue against the too allegorical interpretations of the psalms based on Origen. This tradition is living forward in many Antitrinitarian

writings, amongst others in the works of the radical thinker Matthias Vehe-Glirius, who had an important impact on the formation of the later Szekler Sabbatarianism. Pál Ács, "Én fiam vagy, Dávid... A historikus értelmezés korlátai a 2. zsoltár unitárius fordításában" in *A zsoltár a régi magyar irodalomban.*, ed. É. Petrőczy, A. Szabó (Budapest: Károli Gáspár Református Egyetem – L'Harmattan, 2011), pp. 63-64. Published also in English: Pál Ács, "'Thou art my Son, David' : The limits of historical interpretation in the Unitarian translation of Psalm 2" in P. Á., *Reformation in Hungary in the Age of the Ottoman Conquest* (Göttingen: Vanderhoeck & Ruprecht, 2019), pp. 124-125.

¹⁴ *Explicationes*, ca. 1669, pp. 56-63. *Az ó és új testamentum-beli helyeknek*, 1619, pp. 82-111.

¹⁵ The princely mirror, or mirrors for princes, the *specula principum*, is a part of the speculum literature genre, and was widely common in the Medieval and Early Modern periods. The works or manuals addressed the rulers, or their heirs, were designed to introduce and instruct the princes on how to rule, and had clear political intentions, while presenting the conventional typology of princely virtues and vices. By using the princely mirror in a sermon, Enyedi creates a public occasion for the exposition of his political thoughts.

¹⁶ Sermon 192 (K5, f. 130v).

¹⁷ About the different readings of the psalm in the sixteenth- to seventeenth-century Hungary: Pál Ács, "Én fiam vagy, Dávid...", pp. 61-76. Pál Ács, "Thou art my Son, David" ..., pp. 121-133.

¹⁸ See: *Explicationes*, ca. 1669, pp. 56-58. *Az ó és új testamentum-beli helyeknek*, 1619, pp. 83-86.

¹⁹ Sermon 192 (K5, ff. 130v-131r). To picture and present better the nuances of Enyedi's explanations, we used the word *Christus*, the variant of Χριστός (Krisztosz), which Enyedi uses to refer to the kings as anointed ones, chosen ones, and here especially to David. To differ it from Jesus, in the cases Enyedi refers to the Messiah, we used the word *Christ*. In the Hungarian text they are used as *krisztus* and *Krisztus*.

²⁰ These lines of the Sermon 193 give an impression of the tone of the text: "From that we learn the nature and the obligations of the mortal and true rulers, that they are expected to recognize that their power is granted by God, that they ought to be grateful for it, and that they ought not assert that their rule is of their own doing. Very much like David acknowledged and praised the grace of God towards him. People holding powerful positions ought to follow that example, and not the actions of those godless and ungrateful people like Nebuchadnezzar or Sennacherib, who declared that their empires came about because of their deeds: We created all this with the labour of our own hands, with our wisdom, with our shrewdness, we broke down the borders of other nations. Now, the Lord God usually demonstrates to those ungrateful people that the empire is His own, that the countries are His own, the glory is His own, and that He grants that glory according to His will, and He takes away that glory from those who claim it for themselves." Sermon 193 (K5, ff. 136v-137r).

²¹ The passage is not unknown in the context of the bible, its echoes can be found in Ps. 89:28, and more importantly in Act. 13:33, and Heb. 1:5 and 5:5.

²² Ferenc Dávid, *De falsa et vera unius Dei patris, Filii et Spiritus Sancti cognitione ...* [On the false and true knowledge of the unity of God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost] ([s.n.]: Alba Iulia, 1567). This edition is famous for its provocative woodcuts, of the three-headed God,

the Janus-faced one, the tricephalus and triphons images, the mockery of the Eucharist and the transubstantiation, other mocking illustrations on the Holy Trinity, or the whore of Babylon with the signs referring to the papacy. A detailed study published about the illustrations: Tímea N. Kis, "Olyan Istent... hordoznak lelkükben, amilyent meg is festettek: Illusztrációk két 16. századi antitrinitárius kiadványban" [They are carrying such a God in their souls as they painted: Illustrations in two sixteenth-century anti-Trinitarian publications] in *Ars Perennis*, ed. Anna Tüskés (CentrArt Egyesület: Budapest, 2010), pp. 71-80. About the interpretation of Dávid on Ps. 2, see also: Pál Ács, "Én fiam vagy, Dávid...", p. 71. Pál Ács, "Thou art my Son, David" ..., p. 131.

²³ The biblical verses he quotes as examples are Isaiah 45:1 and Psalm 18:51.

²⁴ Sermon 194 (K5, ff. 146v-147r).

²⁵ Borbála Lovas, "Hozzátenni vagy elvenni? Enyedi-prédikációk másolatai és azok kompilációs jegyei" [To add or to take away? The copies of the Enyedi sermons, and their sign of compilation] in *Közkincs. Műhelykonferencia a régi magyarországi prédikációk kompilációjáról*, ed. I. Maczák (Budapest, MTA-PPKE Barokk Irodalom és Lelkiség Kutatócsoport, 2014), pp. 53-71.

²⁶ Balázs Pap, "A második zsoltár, Enyedi György és egyéb unitáriusok" [Psalm 2, György Enyedi, and other Unitarians] in *Enyedi 460*, ed. B. Lovas, K. K. Kaposi (Budapest: MTA-ELTE HECE, 2015), pp. 209-218. And a recently published paper: Balázs Pap, "Gyülekezeti ének és zsoltárparafrázis" [Ecclesiastical song and psalm paraphrase] in *Imitáció és parafrázis. Szövegváltozatok a magyar régiségben*, ed. I. Bartók, L. Jankovits, B. Pap (Pécs: Verso Könyv, 2020), pp. 195-204. About Szkhárosi Horvát's translation: László Szilasi, "Az ítélet sürgetése. A panasz retorikája: Szemrehányás és bevádolás XVI. századi panasz-versekben" [Urging of judgment. Rhetoric of the complaint: Reprimand and accusation in sixteenth-century complaint poems] in *Szolgálatomat ajánlom a 60 éves Jankovics Józsefnek*, ed. T. Császtvay, J. Nyerges (Budapest: MTA ITI, 2009), 417-426. The sixteenth-century rhymed translations and paraphrases are catalogued in the *Répertoire de la poésie hongroise ancienne* (RPHA). Szkhárosi Horvát's translation is registered under RPHA 0948.

²⁷ The modern transcription is based on the manuscript variant of the Szenterszébeti Bogáthi-kódex, Lucian Blaga Central University Library, Cluj, Ms 898, f. 35v. (Romania). RPHA 0594.

²⁸ Andrea Hevesi, "17. századi, csak unitárius forrásból ismert gyülekezeti énekek (Kiegészítések és megfi gyelések)" [New Findings About the Sources of Seventeenth-Century Unitarian Hymns (Amendments and Observations)]. *Keresztény Magvető* 121 (2015), p. 349.

²⁹ The modern transcription is based on the text published in the *Régi magyar költők tára* XVII/4, ed. B. Stoll, M. Tarnócz, I. Varga (Budapest: Akadémiai) p. 157. About Thordai's psalm translations see also: Botond Farcádi, "Neosztoicizmus és antitrinitarizmus Thordai János zsoltáraiban" [Neostoicism and Antitrinitarianism in the psalms of János Thordai] in *Szöveghagyomány és íráskultúra a korai újkorban*, ed. Cs. Gábor (Kolozsvár: Egyetemi Műhely Kiadó, 2007), 161-185.

³⁰ Róbert Dán, *Humanizmus, reformáció, antitrinitarizmus...*, pp. 169-170.