Orsolya BÁTHORY*

THE ISSUE OF BIBLICAL HERMENEUTICS IN PÉTER PÁZMÁNY'S *KALAUZ*

„Azok-közöt, kik keresztyén nevet viselnek, Majd minden viszsza-vonyás
a szent Írás értelmirűl vagyon"
"Among Christians, almost all disputes are
about the sense of Scriptures"[1]

By the beginning of the 17th century, the controversial issues between Catholics and Protestants centered around two cardinal points: the authority of Scripture and its framework for interpretation, and the authority and function of the Church in the process of interpreting.[2] The dispute was mainly about the interpretive community. Protestant theologians had asserted that the Scriptures were perspicuous, enabling every Christian to learn easily all those truths necessary salvation, thereby eliminating the need for a magisterium to teach the true meaning of Sacred Scripture.[3] For Catholics, the final basis for the authority of Scripture is the authority of the Chruch, only it was called upon to judge whether some particular interpretation of Scripture is the truth of Scripture.[4]

Péter Pázmány – the former Jesuit, Archbishop of Esztergom (Gran), Cardinal, who gained fame as a politician as well as a writer in Hungarian language – is rightly considered the most important figure of the Catholic Reformation (or Counter-Reformation) in Royal Hungary, therefore his views on Catholic biblical hermeneutics certainly

* The author is senior research fellow of ELKH–PPKE Research Group of Baroque Literature and Spirituality. Supported by NKFIH/OTKA K 137815.

1 Péter Pázmány, *Hodoegus. Igazsagra-vezerlö Kalavz…* (Pozsony, 1637), 97.

2 János Heltai, „Rövid esettanulmány az irodalomtörténet-írás működési mechanizmusáról", in József Bessenyei [et al.], eds. *Kabdebó Lóránt köszöntése 65. születésnapja alkalmából,* (Miskolc: Miskolci Egyetem Bölcsészettudományi Kar, Összehasonlító Irodalomtörténeti és Művészettörténeti Tanszék, 2001), 239–240.

3 Christian D. Washburn, "St. Robert Bellarmine on the Authoritative Interpretation of Sacred Scripture", *Gregorianum* 94, 1 (2013), 58.

4 H. van den Belt, *The authority of Scripture in Reformed theology: truth and trust,* (Leiden; Boston, MA: Brill, 2008),127. Christian D. Washburn, "St. Robert Bellarmine on the Authoritative Interpretation of Sacred Scripture", 69.

deserve attention.[5] Pázmány summarized his thoughts on the topic in Book VII of the *Kalauz*.[6] One of Pázmány's two highly influential works was the 1083-page *Isteni Igazságra vezérlő Kalauz* (Guide to Divine Truth), or *Kalauz* (Guide), which was first printed in 1613, then after a major revision in 1623, and finally in 1637.[7] I will consider only on the last edition of the *Kalauz*. This work is a typical representative of post-Tridentine theological compendiums, insofar it communicates the redefined Roman Catholic doctrine and theology of the Council of Trent in a systematic form. The *Kalauz* is one of these dogmatic works of controversial theological character, which they were created as a result of the spread of Protestant doctrines, and even specifically as collections of theological debates with Protestants. In the German-speaking area, to which the Hungarian Jesuits also belonged due to their Austrian Province, the most significant controversalist was Gregory de Valencia (c. 1550–1603), a Spanish-born Jesuit of the University of Ingolstadt, who was referred to by his contemporaries as the "Doctor of Doctors".[8] In 1591, he published his *De rebus fidei hoc tempore controversiis* (On the Controversies of Our Time regarding Matters of Faith), which included the influential *Analysis fidei catholicae* (Analysis of Catholic Faith) first printed in 1585.[9]

Thomas Stapleton's *Principiorum doctrinalium relectio scholastica et compendiaria* (The Short and Scholastic Lecture of Doctrinal Principles, Antwerpen, 1596) was also a great controversial theological compendium of the time.[10] Like Valencia, Stapleton (1535–1598) expounded the fundamental principles of Catholic doctrine in *controversiae*. The works of Gregorio de Valencia and Stapleton also influenced Pázmány's *Kalauz*.[11] However, Pázmány as a person and his work was influenced even more by Roberto Bellarmino (1542–1621). Pázmány, who completed his theology

---

[5] For a short biography of Péter Pázmány, see the study by Csilla Gábor in this volume. A biographical sketch: Tadhg Ó hAnnracháin, "Péter Pázmány", in Howard Louthan and Graeme Murdock, eds. *A companion to the Reformation in Central Europe,* (Leiden–Boston: Brill, 2015), 210–213. Detailed biographies: Miklós Őry and Ferenc Szabó, "Pázmány Péter: 1570–1637", in *Pázmány Péter, Válogatás műveiből,* 1 (Budapest: Szent István Társulat, 1983). Carlos Sommervogel, *Bibliothèque de la Compagnie de Jésus,* VI (Bruxelles–Paris, 1895), 404–413.

[6] See the comprehensive analysis of Pázmány's views on the interpretation of Scripture: István Bitskey, „A konciliarista tradíció Pázmány Péter Szentírás-értelmezésében", *Irodalomtörténeti Közlemények* 121/3 (2017): 300–314.

[7] Péter Pázmány, *Hodoegus. Igazsagra-vezerlö Kalavz* … (Pozsony, 1637). Another work of Pázmány with a wide reception is the *Prédikációk* (Sermons) published in 1636. Pázmány's sermons served as model for priests in their homiletical practice.

[8] LThK³ 10 (2001), 516. Sándor Sík, *Pázmány: Az ember és az író* (Budapest: Szent István-Társulat, 1939), 85.

[9] Carlos Sommervogel, *Bibliothèque de la Compagnie de Jésus,* VIII (Bruxelles–Paris, 1898), 393, 396. Sándor Sík, *Pázmány: Az ember és az író,* 85. John J. Burkhard, *The "sense of the faith" in history: its sources, reception, and theology* (Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press Academic, 2022), 14.

[10] Michael Richards, "Thomas Stapleton", *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 18, 2 (October 1967), 194. Miklós Őry és Ferenc Szabó, „Pázmány Péter: 1570–1637", 70.

[11] Miklós Őry és Ferenc Szabó, „Pázmány Péter: 1570–1637", 70.

course in Rome, met Bellarmine personally in the Collegio Romano (today the Pontifical Gregorian University) and became an unconditional supporter of the "Prince of Apologists", as Pope Pius XI. once called Bellarmine.[12] His huge work was *Disputationes de contorversiis Christianae fidei* (Disputations on Controversies of Christian Faith, Ingolstadt, 1586–1593), in which he discussed the main dogmatic questions of his time in 15 basic controversies.[13] Although the *Kalauz* also consists of 15 books, and Pázmány evidently adopts many arguments from the *Disputationes* in his own argumentations, these do not justify the contemporary Protestant accusation that Pázmány compiled the *Kalauz* from the works of other Jesuit writers.[14] The *Kalauz* is completely different from Bellarmino's work both in its structure and in its exposition of dogmatic questions. Bellarmino's opus, which as a textbook is intended to be read by seminarians, discusses the all dogmatic issues in much greater detail. The *Kalauz* is less didactic in its dogmatics, and emphasizes different things in a particular subject than the *Disputationes*. The table below shows the topics of the *Kalauz*.

Book I.	The human reason and Christian faith agree on the nature of God (one, infinite, omnipotent, etc.).
Book II.	The truth of the Christian faith is supported by ten arguments
Book III.	General phenomena showing that Protestant religions are not true
Book IV.	The Lutherans' creeds (Augustine Creed, Book of Concord) are not true doctrines
Book V.	The anti-God lies of the Helvetic Creed
Book VI.	On the Tradition
Book VII.	On the authentic interpretation of Sacred Scripture
Book VIII.	On the Church
Book IX.	Only the Roman Catholic Church is the true church
Book X.	The pope is not the antichrist
Book XI.	On the Blessed Sacrament
Book XII.	On the Justification
Book XIII.	On the cult of saints
Book XIV.	On purgatory
Book XV.	Three slanders of the Reformers (idolatry, marriage, celibacy) are refuted

[12] Miklós Őry, *Pázmány Péter tanulmányi évei,* Gergely Berzsényi ed. (Piliscsaba: Pázmány Péter Katolikus Egyetem Bölcsészettudományi Kar, 2006), 98.

[13] Christian D. Washburn, "St. Robert Bellarmine on the Authoritative Interpretation of Sacred Scripture", 58–76. Thomas Dietrich, "Roberto Bellarmino: De Verbi Dei interpretatione (1586)", Attila Németh, transl., in Oda Wischmeyer, ed. *A bibliai hermeneutikák kézikönyve Órigenésztől napjainkig.* (Szegedi Nemzetközi Biblikus Konferencia Alapítvány, 2022), 583–594. I thank Attila Németh for his kind help.

[14] Matthias Hafenreffer, *Az szentírásbeli hitünk ágainak…,* Imre Zvonarics transl. (Keresztúr: Farkas Imre, 1614).

Pázmány discusses the main dogmatic questions of the Catholic religion following his own individual logic, since most of the *Kalauz* is a compilation of his earlier polemical works. This self-compilation technique can be detected in Pázmány's entire oeuvre: he wrote on certain subjects in several different works, each time reformulating and rewriting the same subject.[15] The topic of Catholic interpretation of Scripture is no exception to this. In the *Kalauz* of 1637, we encounter teachings about the Bible in three places. In the 2nd Part of Book III, Pázmány analyzes how the Protestant doctrines lead the believers to despairing uncertainty. He believed that distorting the sense of Scripture is also part of questioning of the whole Catholic doctrine. In the 12th Part of Book III, the biblical canon and the native language translations of Bible are discussed, and it is mentioned that the true sense of Scriptures cannot be known by the Reformers. The topics of these two smaller thematic units were already written in Pázmány's earlier works (*Tíz bizonyság* – Ten Arguments, 1605; *Bizonyos okok* – Certain Reasons, 1631), and in the *Kalauz* they were rewritten. The topic of the authoritative biblical interpretation was also addressed by Pázmány in several of his treatises. This was one of the central issues of his oeuvre to which was linked the Catholic ecclesiology (the intrepretation of *ecclesia* concept, defining the characteristics of the true church etc.) as a "twin question."[16] Pázmány later published a separate volume on these two subjects (*Az Szentírásrúl és az Anyaszentegyházrúl két rövid könyvecskék* – Two Short Booklets on the Scripture and on the Church (Wien, 1626)). Pázmány was firmly convinced that if the Protestants accepted the Church as the only one authority for the interpretation of Scripture, then the dispute could be cut at the root.

As I mentioned, Pázmány actually explains his views on biblical hermeneutics in Book VII of the *Kalauz*. According to the rules of scholastic disputation, he discusses the hermeneutic topic in the form of answers which are given to main and sub-questions. The fundamental question is implied in the title of Book VII, "Where are we to get the true sense of Scripture and the interruption of the discords?"[17] The question suggests the hope, if the fundamental problem of Scripture interpretation could be solved, it would put an end to confessional conflicts. Pázmány opens the exposition with a classical rhetoric yes-or-no question: "Is there a certain way to know the sense

---

[15] Emil Hargittay dedicated a monographe to reveal Pázmány's special self-compilation technique in the *Kalauz*. Emil Hargittay, *Pázmány Péter írói módszere: A* Kalauz *és a vitairatok újraírása* (Budapest: Universitas Könyvkiadó, 2019).

[16] István Bitskey, „A konciliarista tradíció Pázmány Péter Szentírás-értelmezésében", 301. For Pázmány's treatises of ecclesiology see István Bitskey, „Ekkleziológia és retorika a hitvitákban", in *Hitvédelem, retorika, reprezentáció Pázmány Péter életművében* (Universitas Kiadó, 2015), 39–57. Emil Hargittay, „Pázmány Péter a Szentírásról és az Anyaszentegyházról", in János Heltai and Réka Tasi, eds. *„Tenger az igaz hitrül való egyenetlenségek vitatásának eláradott özöne…": Tanulmányok XVI–XIX. századi hitvitáinkról.* (Miskolc: ME BTK Régi Magyar Irodalomtörténeti Tanszék, 2005), 79–84.

[17] Péter Pázmány, *Hodoegus. Igazsagra-vezerlö Kalavz,* 596. „Honnan kel venni a sz. Irás igaz értelmét és a vetekedések magva-szakasztását?"

of Scriptures?"[18] He starts his explanation with this sentence: "The letter of Scripture is the word of God only in its true sense; and according to a false understanding, it is not the word of God, but the word of the devil."[19] Reading Scripture is in its true sense is essential to salvation: "Therefore the letter, without a true interpretation, brings death and destruction in them that receive it in a strange sense."[20] In support of his claim, he cites the words of St Paul: "The letter kills, but the Spirit gives life" (2 Cor 3:6).[21] To the question posed at the beginning of the first part of the book ("Is there a certain way to know the sense of Scriptures?") will be answered in the next chapter: "I say therefore, that God has given us a certain way of knowing the true sense of Scriptures, not only by giving us the letter, but also by showing us a perfect way of the undoubted interpretation of it."[22] A little later we read, "we must not from human reasoning, but from God's authentic teaching to get the true sense of Scripture."[23] Beyond the fact that this sentence echoes the decree of the Council of Trent (D783, DH1501),[24] it raises the question, what is the interpretive community: "by whom and in what way does the Holy Spirit now teach his believers the authentic meaning of the Word of God?"[25] The response is, of course, the Catholic Church. However, the interpretive community designated by Protestants is, as Pázmány writes, the community of all Christian believers: "every Christian can himself judge what is the true or false sense of the Word of God".[26] According to Pázmány the Protestants (or as he calls them: "rebellious persons") believe that there are three ways and means for them to know the true meaning of the Scripture. 1. The obvious clarity of Bible. 2. The inner teaching

---

18 Id., 597. „Vagyon-e bizonyos mód a sz. Irás Igaz értelmének ismerésében?"

19 Ibid. „a' sz. Irás bötűje, csak igaz értelme-szerént Isten szava; hamis értelem-szerént pedig nem Isten igéje, hanem ördög szava."

20 Ibid. „A bötű azért igaz magyarázat-nélkül halált és veszedelmet szerez azokban, kik azt idegen értelemben vészik."

21 Ibid.

22 Id., 599. „… az Isten bizonyos Módot hagyot, a sz. Írás igaz Ertelmének isméretiben: úgy, hogy nem csak a Bötűt adta előnkbe, de ennek kétségtelen magyarázasában-is tekélletes útat mutatot."

23 Id., 601. „Nem Emberi okoskodás erejéből, hanem Istennek minden hitelre méltó oktatásából kel a' Sz. Írás igaz Értelmét vennünk."

24 D786/DH 1507 "Furthermore, in order to curb impudent clever persons, the synod decrees that no one who relies on his own judgment in matters of faith and morals, which pertain to the building up of Christian doctrine, and that no one who distorts the Sacred Scripture according to his own opinions, shall dare to interpret the said Sacred Scripture contrary to that sense which is held by holy mother Church, whose duty it is to judge regarding the true sense and interpretation of holy Scriptures, or even contrary to the unanimous consent of the Fathers, even though interpretations of this kind were never intended to be brought to light." Henry Denzinger, *The Sources of Catholic Dogma,* Roy J. Deferrari transl. (Loreto Publications, 1955), 245.

25 Péter Pázmány, *Hodoegus. Igazsagra-vezerlö Kalavz,* 601. „De a' Kérdés abban vagyon; Mi módon és Ki-által adgya előnkbe Isten, az ő szavainak igaz magyarázattyát?"

26 Ibid. „minden Keresztyény maga megitilheti, mellyik igaz vagyhamis Ertelme az Isten Igéjének."

of the Holy Spirit. 3. The intense study of the Scripture texts.[27] Pázmány elaborates these topics in 3rd–5th Parts of Book VII. In what follows, I will focus on the first of these three points, as it is closely related to Pázmány's view on the Bible interpretation.

At the heart of the Pázmány's hermeneutic explanation lies the refutation of *claritas Scripturae,* the clarity or perspicuity of Scripture. As Pázmány writes, Protestants believe that the Scripture is "so bright, so clear that there is no obscurity, darkness or difficult meaning in it; rather, in its brightness his meaning is made known like the sunlight."[28] The doctrine of *claritas scripturae* closely related to the Reformation's principium formale, *sola Scriptura,* played an important role in Protestant biblical hermeneutics.[29] According to *claritas Scripturae,* since Scripture alone contains all things necessary for salvation, communicates them clearly and effectively to those who are enlightened by the Holy Spirit through faith.[30] Whatever is obscure in the Bible is not necessary for salvation, and since Scripture acts as its own interpreter (scriptura sui ipsius interpres), the obscure passages are interpreted by the clear, the intelligible ones.[31] However, he doctrine of *claritas Scripturae* was not an invention of the Reformation, the Church Fathers and the Apologists have widely referred to the clarity and intelligibility of Scripture.[32] The refutation of *claritas Scripturae* was a crucial point of the Catholic controversial theology, since this doctrine denied the authority of Church as an interpretive community. Pázmány devoted Part 3rd of Book VII to proving that the scriptural text is obscure in many passages, and does not show its true meaning by its own clarity.[33] Above all, he gives examples of how Scripture itself bears witness to its own incomprehensibility and obscurity (2Peter 3:15–16; Luke 18:34; Acts 8:30). Pázmány attributes the difficulties of Scripture interpretation to the limited capacity of the human intellect and the limits of linguistic expression. Pázmány believes that

---

27 Id., 603.

28 Ibid. „Mert a' Sz. Írás oly fényes, oly világos, hogy abban semmi *Obscuritas,* homály és nehéz értelem nincsen; hanem maga fényességénél úgy meg-ismértetik az ő értelme, mint a Nap-fény." The theory of *claritas Scripturae* is, of course, much more complicated than Pázmány's brief summary suggests. For example according to Luther the clarity of Scripture is double (duplex claritas Scripturae), there are external and an internal clarity. Friedrich Beisser, *Claritas Scripturae bei Martin Luther* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck&Ruprecht, 1966), 82.

29 James Patrick Callahan, "Claritas Scripturae: The Role of Perspicuity in Protestant Hermeneutics", *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society,* 3 (1996): 353–372, 355. Steven Nemes, "Claritas Scripturae, Theological Epistemology, and the Phenomenology of Christian Faith", *Journal of Analytic Theology* 7 (2019), 199.

30 Steven Nemes, "Claritas Scripturae, Theological Epistemology, and the Phenomenology of Christian Faith", 199.

31 James Patrick Callahan, "Claritas Scripturae: The Role of Perspicuity in Protestant Hermeneutics", 356.

32 Don A. Carson, "Is the doctrine of »claritas scripturae« still relevant today?", in *Collected Writings on Scripture* (Wheaton: Crossway, 2010),180–181.

33 Péter Pázmány, *Hodoegus. Igazsagra-vezerlö Kalavz,* 604. „A' Szent Iras bötűje , sok helyen homalyos és maga fényességével ki nem mutattya igaz értelmét."

obscurity can be caused by "the depth of what are in Scripture" and "the way of scriptural speaking".[34] On the depth of biblical texts Pázmány writes: "Many things in the Scripture are very difficult to understand. Because the Scripture includes the important fundamentals of the Christian faith, such as the divine Trinity, the incarnation of the divine nature, the eternal predestination and reprobation, the sacraments, the resurrection of the dead, the eternal beatitude etc. These are things that completely surpass human understanding."[35] At the same time, Pázmány blames the limits of the human word too for the obscurity. "But the way in which the Scripture speaks causes it to be obscure in many places in what it says. For the unthinkable and unspeakable God and divine things are given to us by our words. Therefore it is impossible that there should not be obscurity in speaking of such things."[36] Further interpretation problems can also arise from the fact that the human words can be understood literally or figuratively, and the Scripture itself does not inform us, which interpretation corresponds to the revealed sense.[37]

Pázmány then turns to the obscure speech and the resulting difficulties of interpretation, illustrating these semantic-rhetorical phenomena with a few brief examples (see the following table). Pázmány lists all the difficulties of interpretation into a single category which is the "prima facie contradiction", or – to use Pázmány's term – "színes ellenkedések", i. e. two biblical passages have an seemingly contradictory meanings. Pázmány seems to simplify the typification, because Roberto Bellarmino applying a more precise distinction lists six types of exegetical problems in *Disputationes* 1.3.1., and the first of these types also is the "prima facie contradiction". Pázmány gathers 38 passages from the Old and New Testaments as the examples for the seemingly contradictory claims. With these passages Pázmány proves, that the Scripture itself is not always clear, and that a judge is needed to decide what the authentic interpretation is. In the next subchapter Pázmány explains these discrepancies based on the commentaries authored by the Jesuit exegetes as Cornelius a Lapide, Juan de Pineda, Gaspar Sánchez and Juan Maldonado. A few examples of these "prima facie contradictions" are given, together with their explanation.

---

[34] Ibid., 606. „A' sz. Írásban foglalt dolgok mélysége, és a' Szóllásnak mi-vólta, magával hozza sok helyen a' nehéz Ertelmet."

[35] Ibid. „Egyéb sem lehet benne, hanem a' Sz. Írásban sokat igen nehéz megérteni. Mert a' Sz. Írás a keresztyén hitnek derék fondamentomirúl emlekezik, ugy-mint a Szent Háromságrúl, Az Isteni Személynek Testesűlésérűl, Az Istennek örö k Választásárúl, vagy Meg-vetésérűl, A' *sacramentomok* erejérűl, A' Halottak fel-támadásárúl, Az örök Bóldogságrúl, *etc.* Ezek oly dolgok, mellyek az Emberi értelmet tellyességgel meghaladgyák,…"

[36] Ibid. „A' Szent Írás szóllásinak mi-vólta-is azt hozza magával, hogy homályos légyen sok helyen az ő mondása. Mert I. A' meg-gondolhatatlan és ki-mondhatatlan Istent és Isteni dolgokat mí szavainkal adgya előnkbe. Azért lehetetlen, hogy homály ne légyen az illyen dolgokrúl-való szóllásban."

[37] Ibid. „A mí szónkat nemcsak egy értelemben szokták venni; hanem, *vel proprie, vel figurate,* néha tulajdon erejében hagyatik, néha idegen értelemre fordíttatik."

"Some examples of prima facie contradictions" VII.3.3. N°. 1.[38]	"Short explanations of these prima facie contradictions" VII.3.3. N°. 2.
4. "We read about Saul that he was one year old when he became king, and reigned two years; 1 Sam. 13:1. The same Scripture describes Saul as an old man when he was made king; 1 Sam. 10:21. and S. Paul names forty years in which he reigned, Acts. 13:21."[39]	4. When Saul was elected king, he was so innocent as a one year old child. He remained in that goodness two years. Then God rejected him and David was anointed king. From that time Saul was not a true king, but reigned by force and unjustly forty years, though some have divided these forty years between Samuel and Saul.[40]
9. We all read that there was nothing in Moses' ark but the two tables of stone, 1 King 8:9; It is written elsewhere that Aaron's rod and a basket of manna were with the tablets in it; Heb. 9:4, 10.[41]	9. It is sure that in the tabernacle with the cabinet were the manna and the rod, Exod. 16: 34 Num. 17: 10. And though in the days of the kings only the tables were kept in the ark, but because the manna and the rod were beside the ark, St Paul might say that they were in the cabinet, as we say that Christ died in Jerusalem; for near by was Calvary. Or perhaps St. Paul was looking at another time, in which, while the ark was under the tabernacle, the manna and the rod were kept in the ark; though after the temple was built they were kept in another decent place.[42]

[38] Id. 607–609.

[39] Id., 607. „4. Saulrúl olvassuk, hogy egyesztendős vólt, mikor királlyá lett, és két esztendeig király kodott; 1. Reg. 13, 1. Ugyan-azon sz. Írás öreglegénynek írja, hogy vólt Saul. mikor királlya választaték; 1. Reg. 10, 21. és sz. Pál negyven esztendőt nevez, melyben országlott, Actor. 13, 21."

[40] Id., 610. „4. Oly ártatlan vólt Saul, mikor királlya választatott, mint az esztendős gyermek. Két esztendeig maradott abban a jóságban. Akkor Istentűl megvettetett, és Dávid kenetett királyságra. Az üdőtűl-fogva nem vólt Saul igaz király, hanem erővel és hamissan királykodott negyven esztendeig, Jóllehet ezt a negyven esztendőt Samuelre és Saulra osztyák némellyek."

[41] Id., 607. „9. Eggyüt azt olvassuk, hogy a Moyses szekrényében egyéb nem vólt a két kő táblánál, 3. Reg. 8, 9. Másut az vagyon írva, hogy az Aaron veszszeje és egy kosár manna vólt a táblákkal eggyüt; Hebr. 9, 4. 10."

[42] Id., 610–611. „9. Bizonyos, hogy a sátorban a szekrénnyel eggyütt vólt a manna és a veszsző, Exodi 16, 34. Nummer. 17, 10. És noha a királyok idejében csak a táblákat tartották a szekrényben: de mivel a szekrény-mellet vólt a manna és a veszsző, azt mondhatta szent Pál, hogy a szekrényben vólt, miképpen mongyuk, hogy Christus Jerusalemben hólt-meg; mert közel mellette vólt a Calvaria. Vagy talám más üdőre nézett szent Pál, melyben, míg a szekrény sátor-alat vólt, a szekrényben tartatott a manna és veszsző; noha a templom éppűlete-után más tisztességes helyen tartattak."

21. Christ often commands the apostles not to take a staff or a purse, Matt. 10: 10. Luke 9:3, 10:4. Mark 6:8 commanded them to take a staff in their hands. Luke 22:36 forbids them to have purse and sword.[43]	21. To carry a staff for a weapon, Christ forbade; but that the apostles should have a staff to help them in walking the way, he did not forbid. Christ also permitted the carrying of swords and purses when necessity demanded.[44]

From these examples too, it seems that Pázmány obviously limits his scope of interpretation to the literal sense, and he distinguishes the proper or simple literal sense, and the figurative literal sense. However he does not mention the other three, spiritual senses of Scriptures, namely the allegorical, tropological and anagogical senses. The avoidance of this topic is thought-provoking, because Bellarmine himself discussed the fourfold interpretation in his *Disputationes,* and Pázmány largely followed the Italian Jesuit's argumentations in the biblical hermeneutics of the *Kalauz*. Pázmány deliberately simplified his biblical hermeneutic for ease of understanding. His pragmatic approach (which, incidentally, is a characteristic feature of his entire oeuvre) focuses on convincing the reader that any authentic Bible interpretation can only be achieved within the Church. The methodics of interpretation from this point of view would be an unnecessary academic digression. On the other hand, we should not rule out that Pázmány limited the interpretation platform to the literal sense in order to make it clear to potential Protestant readers that the Bible contains problematic and obscure passages even if we base the interpretation on the literal sense alone, to the exclusion of the spiritual sense. At the same time Pázmány is linked to Bellarmino and, indirectly, to the Dominican Melchior Cano in this way, who also identified the *sensus literalis* as a common interpretation platform in their disputes with Protestants.[45]

Among the few interpretations of Scripture in the *Kalauz,* there are those in which Pázmány refutes the arguments of Protestants who sought to prove *claritas Scripturae* by relying on certain biblical passages. These biblical verses were regarded as self-reflexive on the basis of the Protestant *sensus literalis,* in so far as Scripture in these passages reports its own clarity and intelligibility.

---

43 Id., 608. „21. Sokszor azt parancsollya Christus, hogy az apostolok veszszőt, erszényt ne hordozzanak, Matth. 10, 10. Lucae 9, 3. Cap. 10, 4. Maga, Marci 6, 8. megparancsolta, hogy veszszőt hordozzanak kezekben. Lucae 22, 36. azt hadgya, hogy erszényt és kardot visellyenek."

44 Id., 611. „21. Botot viselni fegyver-gyanánt, tíltotta Christus; de hogy úton-járások segítségére pálcza légyen az apostoloknál, nem tíltotta. A kard- és erszény-viselést-is megengedte Christus, mikor a szükség kívánta."

45 Ferenc Szabó SJ, „Deux théologiens du renouveau catholique aux XVI–XVIIe siècles Roberto Bellarmino et Péter Pázmány", in *La civiltà ungherese e il cristianesimo – A magyar művelődés és a kereszténység,* 1, István Monok and Péter Sárközy, eds. (Budapest–Szeged: Nemzetközi Magyar Filológiai Társaság – Scriptum Rt., 1998), 249.

Kalauz VII.3.7.

"The proof is based on passages of Scripture which the Word of God is called a light, a lamp, a brightness; 2 Pet. 1:19, Psalm. 18:9. Psalm. 118: 105, 130, Prov. 6:23.

ANSWER. It is of the whole Scripture, and not of a part of it, that God says it is a brightness and light, in which there is no falsehood, ignorance, obscurity and darkness of wickedness; … The Scripture is not therefore called light, because its meaning is easy, or because without a certain teacher ordained by God, its sense is open to all men; but because it is a light and illumination to him that truly understands the Scriptures. Neither God says, that the only letter, without perfect interpretation, brings light unto a man. In fact, St David, in the same place where he calls Scripture a burning lamp (Psal. 118:130), explains how it enlightens man; *Declaratio sermonum tuorum illuminat, et intellectum dat,* »The declaration of your words illuminates, and it gives understanding«"[46]

All in all, we have the general impression, that Pázmány does not discuss the Bible interpretation and its methods so accurately. He believes that individual Scripture examinations lead to various arbitrary interpretations and therefore rejects the Protestant hermeneutical methods based, among other things, on the study of Greek, Latin and Hebrew languages, on the stylistic and phraseological analysis, and on the consideration of the context of the biblical passages.[47] He handled the issue quite pragmatically, and was probably of the opinion that the average Hungarian reader does not need to be introduced deeply to exegesis. The point is that all believers accept the interpretation approved by the Catholic Church as the authentic interpretation. Pázmány was much more concerned with the spiritual responsibility that goes with the authentic interpretation of Scripture, since one of the conditions for the individual sanctification is that the clergy convey Scripture to their flock in its true sense. This sincere concern

[46] Péter Pázmány, *Hodoegus. Igazsagra-vezerlö Kalavz,* 617. „Bizonyságot azokból a' Sz. Írás mondásiból vésznek, mellyek az Isten igéjét világosnak, lámpásnak, fényességnek nevezik; 2. Pet. 1, 19. Psal. 18, 9. Psal. 118, 105, 130, Proverb. 6, 23. FELELET. Éppen az egész sz. Írásrúl, nem csak valamely darabjárúl mongya Isten, hogy ez fényesség és világosság, melyben nincsen semmi hamisság, tudatlanság, éktelenség homálya és setétsége; … Nem azért mondatik tehát a sz. Írás világosságnak, hogy az ő értelme künyű, vagy hogy Istentűl rendeltetett bizonyos tanító-nélkűl, minden embereknek nyitva az ő értelme; hanem azért, mert ha ki igazán érti az Írást, fényesség annak és megvilágosíttya őtet. Nem-is mongya Isten, hogy csak a puszta bötű, tekélletes magyarázás-nélkül, fényességet hoz az embernek. Sőt sz. David ugyanottan, a hol égő lámpásnak nevezé az Írást, megmagyarázza, mi Psal.118, 130. módon világosíttya az embert; *Declaratio sermonum tuorum illuminat, et intellectum dat,* a te igéd magyarázattya megvilágosít, úgy-mond, és okosságot ád.

[47] Id., 604.

for the salvation of the believers is an important element of Pázmány's oeuvre, and stems from the firm conviction that no one can be saved outside the Roman Catholic Church, which is the depository of authentic biblical interpretation.

As I mentioned, Pázmány dedicated a separate book to the scriptural interpretation and, in this context, to the Church. *A Szentírásrúl és az Anyaszentegyházrúl két rövid könyvecskék* (Two Short Books on the Scripture and the Mother Church) do not hold new information compared to the *Kalauz*. Pázmány's main statment also in this work that, it is not possible to interpret the Scriptures in isolation from the living tradition represented by the Church.

Bibliography

Primary Texts

Hafenreffer, Matthias. *Az szentírásbeli hitünk ágainak*…. transl. Zvonarics Imre. Keresztúr: Farkas Imre, 1614.

Pázmány Péter. *Hodoegus. Igazsagra-vezerlö Kalavz* mellyet irt, es most sok helyen jobbitván kibocsátott, cardinal Pazmany Peter, esztergami ersek (Pozsony, 1637).

Secondary Literature

Belt, H. van den. *The authority of Scripture in Reformed theology: truth and trust*. Studies in Reformed theology, v. 17. Leiden–Boston, MA: Brill, 2008.

Beisser, Friedrich. *Claritas Scripturae bei Martin Luther*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck&Ruprecht, 1966.

Bitskey, István. „A konciliarista tradíció Pázmány Péter Szentírás-értelmezésében". *Irodalomtörténeti Közlemények* 121/3 (2017): 300–314.

——. „Ekkleziológia és retorika a hitvitákban". In *Hitvédelem, retorika, reprezentáció Pázmány Péter életművében,* 39–57. Universitas Kiadó, 2015.

Burkhard, John J. *The "sense of the faith" in history: its sources, reception, and theology*. Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press Academic, 2022.

Callahan, James Patrick. "Claritas Scripturae: The Role of Perspicuity in Protestant Hermeneutics". *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society,* 3. (1996): 353–372.

Carson, Don A. "Is the doctrine of »claritas scripturae« still relevant today?" In *Collected Writings on Scripture*. Wheaton: Crossway, 2010.

Denzinger, Henry. *The Sources of Catholic Dogma*. Fordította Roy J. Deferrari. Loreto Publications, 1955.

Dietrich, Thomas. "Roberto Bellarmino: De Verbi Dei interpretatione (1586)", Attila Németh transl., in Oda Wischmeyer, ed. *A bibliai hermeneutikák kézikönyve Órigenésztől napjainkig,* 583–594. Szegedi Nemzetközi Biblikus Konferencia Alapítvány, 2022.

Hargittay, Emil. „Pázmány Péter a Szentírásról és az Anyaszentegyházról", in János Heltai, Réka Tasi, eds. *„Tenger az igaz hitrül való egyenetlenségek vitatásának eláradott özöne…": Ta-*

nulmányok XVI–XIX. századi hitvitáinkról. Miskolc: ME BTK Régi Magyar Irodalomtörténeti Tanszék, 2005, 79–84..

— —. *Pázmány Péter írói módszere: A Kalauz és a vitairatok újraírása*. Budapest: Universitas Könyvkiadó, 2019.

Heltai, János. „Rövid esettanulmány az irodalomtörténet-írás működési mechanizmusáról", in József Bessenyei [et al.], eds. *Kabdebó Lóránt köszöntése 65. születésnapja alkalmából*. Miskolc: Miskolci Egyetem Bölcsészettudományi Kar, Összehasonlító Irodalomtörténeti és Művészettörténeti Tanszék, 2001, 236–241.

Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche, Bd. 10. Freiburg–Basel–Rom–Wien: Herder, 2001.

Nemes, Steven. "Claritas Scripturae, Theological Epistemology, and the Phenomenology of Christian Faith". *Journal of Analytic Theology* 7 (2019): 199–218. https://doi.org/10.12978/jat.2019–7.181913130418.

Ó hAnnracháin, Tadhg. "Péter Pázmány", in Louthan, Howard and Murdock, Graeme, eds. *A companion to the Reformation in Central Europe*. Leiden–Boston: Brill, 2015, 210–220..

Őry, Miklós. *Pázmány Péter tanulmányi évei*. Gergely Berzsényi, ed. Pázmány Irodalmi Műhely, Tanulmányok, 5. Piliscsaba: Pázmány Péter Katolikus Egyetem Bölcsészettudományi Kar, 2006.

Őry, Miklós and Szabó, Ferenc. „Pázmány Péter: 1570–1637". In *Pázmány Péter, Válogatás műveiből,* 1. Budapest: Szent István Társulat, 1983.

Richards, Michael. "Thomas Stapleton". *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 18, 2 (1967. október): 187–199. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022046900070998.

Sík, Sándor. *Pázmány: Az ember és az író*. Budapest: Szent István-Társulat, 1939.

Sommervogel, Carlos. *Bibliothèque de la Compagnie de Jésus*. Köt. VI. Bruxelles–Paris, 1895.

— —. *Bibliothèque de la Compagnie de Jésus*. Köt. VIII. Bruxelles–Paris, 1898.

Szabó, Ferenc SJ. „Deux théologiens du renouveau catholique aux XVI–XVIIe siècles Roberto Bellarmino et Péter Pázmány", in István Monok and Péter Sárközy, eds. *La civiltà ungherese e il cristianesimo – A magyar művelődés és a kereszténység*. Budapest–Szeged: Nemzetközi Magyar Filológiai Társaság – Scriptum Rt., 1998, 1:248–255.

Washburn, Christian D. "St. Robert Bellarmine on the Authoritative Interpretation of Sacred Scripture". *Gregorianum* 94, 1 (2013): 55–77.