Herman J. Selderhuis / J. Marius J. Lange van Ravenswaay (eds.)

Reformed Majorities in Early Modern Europe

Academic Studies 23

V&R

V&R Academic

ISBN Print: 9783525550830 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647550831

Refo500 Academic Studies

Volume 23

Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht

ISBN Print: 9783525550830 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647550831

Reformed Majorities in Early Modern Europe

edited by
Herman J. Selderhuis
and
J. Marius J. Lange van Ravenswaay

Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht

ISBN Print: 9783525550830 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647550831

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek
The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie;
detailed bibliographic data available online: http://dnb.d-nb.de.

ISBN 978-3-525-55083-0

You can find alternative editions of this book and additional material on our Website:
www.v-r.de

Printed in Germany.
Typesetting by Konrad Triltsch GmbH, Ochsenfurt
Printed and bound by Hubert & Co, Göttingen

Printed on non-aging paper.

ISBN Print: 9783525550830 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647550831

Table of Contents

ISBN Print: 9783525550830 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647550831

III German Territories

IV Dutch Republic

ISBN Print: 9783525550830 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647550831

V France, Scotland, Switzerland

ISBN Print: 9783525550830 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647550831

Zsombor Tóth

The Importance of Being (In)Tolerant: The Strange Case of Transylvanian Puritanism

I. Introduction

Any scholarly attempt to examine tolerance and its representations accessible in early modern times brings to surface unexpected disciplinary and methodologically conundrums. For, quite frequently, the critical observer will notice that the different disciplinary approaches, based upon their particular selection and use of sources, provide very different results about the same social cultural phenomenon. This is, I believe, the case of early modern tolerance as well. It is well-known the criticism pointing to that fact that some of the claims formulated by the history of ideas have never been confirmed by the findings of social history. Furthermore, there is a trenchant discrepancy between the so called *saga of early modern tolerance* (Oberman: 1996, 13) promoted by intellectual history and the perception of early modern society based upon the approaches of social history, microhistory and historical anthropology. Thus, the intricate relationship between early modern tolerance and religious freedom constitutes a most challenging but highly debated heritage, which involves a number of difficulties for those interested in deciphering its nature.

Further inconveniences in evaluating the relation between tolerance and religious freedom, apart from the applied method and the (ab)use/selection of sources, originate from the controversial conduct of early modern historical actors. It stands for a classic example, how Luther depending on the actual circumstances changed his attitude concerning tolerance. While an outsider, at the beginning of the Reformation, he cried out for the toleration and acceptation of the Evangelical religion, as the apparent advocate of denominational plurality, but at a later stage, as an insider, faced with the rebellion of peasants, he expressed his conviction that he would not tolerate anything endangering the new construction of the True Church. (Grell: 1996, 4–5). It seems to me that the issue of *libertas religionis* and its social acceptance, right from Tetullian's time, reiterates more or less the same mechanisms and attitudes. A religious minority, while persecuted, demands tolerance, but once it has gained social, political, or ecclesiastical control, in terms of ceasing to exist as minority and becomes majority, tends to act intolerantly, and use the very same devices for maintaining its positions. (Garnsey: 1984, 19). Peter

ISBN Print: 9783525550830 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647550831

Garnsey was justly asserting that "toleration theory was a by-product of persecution and came from those in a position of weakness." (1984, 25).

It is this interoperability between the victims and their persecutors that obliterate the clear-cut features of tolerance and its early modern practices. Furthermore, early modern political factors and interests induce additional contingencies concerning the actual function of tolerance in early modern churches and societies. Though we have to accept that in those societies, such as the Principality of Transylvania, where the denominational plurality was complemented by a specific social structure dominated by privileged communities, the only possible solution for coexistence and survival was to reach a political compromise between the involved parties. In this particular case tolerance became the equivalent for political necessity, even if it was formulated in theological terms as well. Therefore, I tend to agree with the assertion that religious freedom as an expression of tolerance in early modern Europe was more like a temporal arrangement rather than a timeless principle. (Oberman: 1996, 28).

Accordingly, my paper, in an attempt to illustrate the abovementioned claims, sets forth the example of early modern Transylvanian Puritanism, in order to ponder upon the issue of tolerance in early modern Eastern Europe. The aim of my case study is to reveal how the Calvinist majority reacted to the multiple impact caused by the reception of Puritanism in the principality. I shall endeavour to give a plausible, but not fully exhaustive account of the events from the 1630s to the early1660s, during which the reception proper took place, and brought about several conflicts between the Puritan faction as a minority, and their opponents, the conservative Orthodox majority bolstered by princely support as well. My approach will focus on the examination of this conflict but paying a particular attention to one outstanding ecclesiastical matter: the refusal of the Orthodox majority concerning the erection of presbyteries and the partial or total elimination of the episcopal system from the Calvinist Church of Transylvania. I shall conclude my argumentation pointing out the fact that early modern religious tolerance must have been a complex cultural, social, and historical phenomenon rather difficult to justly evaluate, for any scholarly venture, beyond its unavoidable biased character, is subject of an uncontrollable anachronism nurtured by our tolerance-oriented, but not necessarily more tolerant, culture.

ISBN Print: 9783525550830 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647550831

II. Historical Contexts: Reformation and the early modern Principality of Transylvania

Two major events determined the emergence of the Transylvanian state and the spread of Reformation. First, the lost battle of Mohács in 1526, then the occupation of Buda in 1541, which constituted the collapse of the late medieval Hungarian Kingdom, and brought about the formation of what historiography define as Tripartite Hungary. Consequently, the truncated body of the kingdom exhibited the territory of the state as divided in three major units: one third under Ottoman occupation, a semi-independent state, that is, the Principality of Transylvania), and Royal or Upper Hungary under Habsburg control and surveillance. Reformation as a movement had also profited of this territorial and administrative reorganization, for these new artificial state formations were not able to exercise a thorough social and ecclesiastical control. Moreover, the elite of the Hungarian aristocracy and high ranking clergymen killed in the battle of Mohács, represented such an enormous loss that neither the state, nor the Church could easily recover from it. Reformation, in this particular context, was the worst thing that could have happened to the Hungarian Catholic Church in the aftermath of the lost battle of Mohács.

It is possible to surmise that this particular historical context had also accelerated those social, cultural, and political processes which fostered the rapid spread and adoption of Reformed teaching and church organisation. The case of Transylvania is truly spectacular, for the impact of Reformation affected not the basis, but the very top of its society, since the first prince, János II. Zsigmond himself, embraced Lutheranism, and then, later on, antitrinitarianism. All in all, Reformation gained terrain without major conflicts, since the influential nobility favoured a decentralised church structure, let alone the fact that not a few of them, those unscrupulous ones, had seen an opportunity for social promotion as well by supporting the cause of the Reformation. The scholarly evaluation of these turbulent times, I am referring to the 1530s and 1540s, points out the lack of persecution or the outburst of popular anticlericalism. (cf. Péter: 1994; Tóth: 1998). Hence, one can justly conclude that Reformation was introduced in Hungary without the use of coercion. (Péter: 1996, 253).

II. 1. Reformation in the Principality of Transylvania

Having seen the account about the unimpeded reception of Reformation in Hungary, one can accurately suppose that in the newly emerged principality, under the rule of a reform-minded prince, the movement was granted a similar

ISBN Print: 9783525550830 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647550831

success. Indeed, 16th century Transylvania soon became a promised land for many European radicals persecuted and hunted, from Blandrata to Francken or the supporters of the Soccini brothers, who found refuge and protection in the principality. Due to the extant ethnic diversity and the particular construction of Transylvanian society based upon the privileged communities and territories of the three nations (Szeklers, Saxons, and Hungarians), apart from the already developed denominational plurality, it was an urgent need to formulate a political, social, and ecclesiastical compromise for a peaceful coexistence. Not later than 1560s the princely authority in cooperation with the leading clergy made efforts to impose a set of laws to ameliorate the situation. Even though there is some controversy in the Hungarian secondary literature about the precise dating of the promulgation of the laws granting religious freedom, it is clear that by the end of the 16th century, theoretically, the four major denominations enjoyed free practice and religious freedom. Mihály Balázs has justly questioned the fact, whether the Diet of Torda (1568) had already proclaimed religious freedom or not, (Balázs: 2006, 34) for it seems more plausible that only the 1595 Diet of Gyuafehérvár did so. Indeed, during the diet of Gyulafehérvár (1595), the estates reached to an important decision, expressed in a very clear statement:

"As for the matter of religion, we decided that all the four denominations such as catholica sive romana, Lutherana, Calvinistica et Ariana must be protected and freely professed all over in the principality."[1]

Incontestably, the legal and theological concept of the four *recepta religiones* constituted the most important political heritage of 16th century Reformation in the Principality of Transylvania. For the principality, while entering a golden age of stability under a series of Calvinists princes, such as Gábor Bethlen and the two Rákóczis, had always been adjusting its politics both internal and external affairs, to the rights, obligations or privileges granted by the laws supporting the idea of the four accepted denominations. Without overestimating its significance or proclaiming it the milestones of tolerance in Eastern Europe, it is worth admitting the fact that it reflects that particular political wisdom, which was necessary for the survival of the principality. For, being caught in the middle between two competing empires predisposed for continuous expansion, the internal stability in both political and ecclesiastical perspectives was compulsory. Strangely enough, having accepted the four religions, which can seemingly be qualified as an act of tolerance, with all its political implications, produced an equilibrium, which would be lasting provided that a ruthless intolerance complemented it. For the political will granting religious freedom for the four recognised religions as an act of the tolerance became meaningful, only if firmly refused the acceptation of a fifth or a sixth religion.

1 This is my translation, for the original Hungarian text see: Szilágyi: 1877, 472.

ISBN Print: 9783525550830 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647550831

It seems that under the Calvinists princes, during the first half of the 17th century, this conviction was unmistakably transposed into practice as often as it was needed. When the Sabbatarian movement seemed to get out of control, because of the repeated conflicts with Unitarians, under the pretext of an alleged treason, the leader of the "Judaizers/Blasphemers" was imprisoned, his supporters dissipated or charged. In point of the fact, the princely authority with the support of the estates during the famous Complanatio of Dézs 1638, eliminated a powerful challenger and opponent of the Unitarian confession, which refused to follow the more radical direction proposed by the Sabbatarians. The defence of the construction, which protected the four privileged confession had to be maintained by all means. This is the ultimate illustration of how the originating "tolerance" brought about the justified use of coercion that qualifies, beyond question, as intolerance.

II.1.1. The Reception of Puritanism in Transylvania

Early modern Transylvanian society, its prince, and most importantly, the Transylvanian Calvinist Church were put to a difficult test, when confronted with the appearance and spread of Puritanism[2] and its leading trends, such as Presbyterianism and Independentism. It was the seventeenth century during which the principality entered a golden age of stability, economic growth and territorial expansion. First of all, it was due to the succession of a series of Calvinist princes, Gábor Bethlen and the two Rákóczis, father and son, György I. and György II., who had the political power of creating and maintaining a strongly centralised state kept under the severe control of the princely might and authority. Their religious policy followed the same pattern; respecting the rights and privileges of the 4 recognised religions, they sought to eliminate any innovations or radical changes threatening the equilibrium of the multi-denominational construction. Furthermore, exercising their *summus epis-*

2 Though the term of "Puritan/Puritanism" may well seem elusive, still I prefer to rely upon this, for the other option would be the "religious nonconformity", which is a valid claim solely in the context of early modern English society and religious culture. Consequently in my discourse Puritanism and/or Puritan denote the community of those early modern Hungarian Calvinists, who chiefly under the influence of William Perkins and William Ames embraced their practical theology and/or proposed a non-episcopal pattern for Church organisation. This particular reception of Puritanism is sustained by the fact that some pieces from the Latin oeuvre of Ames had also been edited and republished in Hungary as well.(Ames: 1685a, 1685b). Yet, one has to admit that not everyone undertaking Puritan piety and religiosity proved herself or himself as a supporter of Presbyterianism. A clear illustration of this fact is the case of Miklós Bethlen (1647–1716), a devoted Puritan with a sound theological education a versatile reader of both Ames and Perkins, yet, as a representative of aristocracy, he never supported the Puritan-Presbyterian project. For a general treatment of the Hungarian Puritanism see: Zoványi: 1911; Bodonhelyi: 1942; Berg: 1946; Makkai: 1952; Tarnóc: 1978; Molnár: 1994; Ágoston: 1997; Murdock: 2000, 171–197; Keul: 2009, 187–218.

ISBN Print: 9783525550830 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647550831

copus right and status, it was their privilege to confirm the elected superintendent of the Calvinist Church, which was the largest and most important one amongst the four recognised religions. (Sipos: 2000, 8). Yet, performing this task was not totally unproblematic, as many had noticed that the court chaplains of the prince often had a carrier as bishops or superintendents of the Calvinist Church. The special relation between the superintendent and the prince was mutually advantageous, for the bishop functioned as the supreme leader of the church organisation having the support of the prince, but in return it was the bishop's duty to sacralise the princely power, that is to produce the necessary religious ideology, or political theology to validate the rule of the prince. (Heltai: 1994; Keul: 2009 266 – 267)

The interference of the princes in the internal affairs of the church was rather problematic. For the centralising efforts of the princes were obstructed by the significant autonomy and independence of the religious freedom granted by the legal concept of the four recognised religions. The princes as the supreme patrons of the Church were granted on the basis of canon law only two major rights: *ius advocatiae*, and *ius supreme inspectionis*, which warranted them the role of the highest protector and administrator. (Sipos 2000, 9) The princes, when consulted in ecclesiastical matters, had the final word only in issues strictly related to problems with social implications, but in doctrinal, liturgical and purely theological affairs they were not allowed to make decisions. It is quite clear that while the churches and the estates were preoccupied to defend themselves from the abuse of princely power and any kind of encroachment, the princes' best interest was to gain control within the limits of lawfulness upon the church. In order to achieve that, they persistently approached the superintendents, and developed a particular collaboration with them, much like a feudal patron and client relation, so that they could impose their wills through the legally accepted authority of the superintendents.

Puritanism with its Presbyterian concept of church reached the principality during the late 1630s in this abovementioned historical context and power configuration. The phenomenon of the *peregrinatio academica*, supported by the prince and the Transylvanian nobility, due to the military operation of the Thirty Years War, had a new direction focusing on the universities of the Dutch Republic and England. It was in these locations where the Hungarian and Szekler students from Transylvania had the chance of reaching and assimilating English and Dutch Puritanism. For instance, during the 1620s a significant number of Hungarian students were attending William Ames's lecture at the University of Franeker, and had the chance of learning Puritan practical theology. The edition and publication of the volume of theological debates confuting the Catholic Bellarminus's theology preserved the memory of this cooperation between Ames and his Hungarian students, who had substantially contributed to this popular volume (Ames: 1629).

Pál Medgyesi, a prominent actor and initiator of Hungarian Puritanism,

ISBN Print: 9783525550830 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647550831

spent enough time in England to embrace Puritanism, and advocate the cause of the Presbyterian church organisation, but the Puritan practice of piety as well.[3] János Tolnai Dali[4] was another key figure of the Puritan movement. While in England, he convinced his student compatriots to create a *league of piety* (1638), in fact to ritually take an oath and promise to serve the cause of Puritanism after their return to Transylvania (Ágoston: 1997, 68–69). Apart from Tolnai, not all of them managed to keep what they had promised. The scandal started with Tolnai's official activity at the Reformed College of Sárospatak, where he was appointed as a professor. He simply removed the obsolete textbook of logics written by Keckermann and replaced it with Ramus's dialectics. In addition, he felt the need of informing his students about his Puritan views concerning church organisation, personal piety and many other theological issues. The conflict was unleashed, the Transylvanian Church identifying herself as the representative of doctrinal orthodoxy, could not and did not tolerate the spread and promotions of ideas urging for innovations. In a first step, the archdeacon István Miskolczi Csulyak warned Tolnai, but without any result, thus the prolonged conflict was brought in front of the superintendent, István Geleji Katona, the bishop of the Transylvanian Calvinist Church, a severe and rather conservative man of orthodox convictions.

As the events were developing, Geleji, fearing the spread of the dangerous ideas, informed the prince about the emerged situation, who personally addressed Tolnai in 1640 to revise his attitude and give up his dangerous views. The situation became more complicated, for it seems that within the Calvinist church a certain schism had been occurring, not a few members and representatives of the clergy considered Puritanism and the proposed changes welcome. Moreover influential persons like Pál Medgyesi, the court chaplain, or Zsuzsánna Lorántffy, the wife of the prince and Zsigmond Rákóczi, the youngest son of the prince were also discretely supporting the Puritan cause. Having learnt about the state of affairs, superintendent Geleji, enjoying the total support of the prince, György I. Rákóczi, decided to promptly intervene. First, he had suspended Tolnai during the synod of Gönc (1646) upon charges of innovations in liturgy. Then, what was meant to be the final blow to Puritanism, he set up the organisation of an extraordinary national synod in Szatmár, in the 10 – 11th of June, 1646, under the supervision and attendance of the prince of Transylvania, György I. Rákóczi.

3 Pál Medgyesi (1604–1663) was one of the most prolific Hungarian Puritan writers, who started his career with the translation of Lewis Bayley's *Practice of Piety*, which would become the first bestseller of the early modern Hungarian devotional literature. (Medgyesi: 1636).

4 János Tolnai Dali (1606–1660) was one of the very first supporters of Puritanism. While in England as a student, he managed to create and sustain an excellent network of influential contacts. It seems that he was accepted in the famous Hartlib-Circle as well. As a writer, he contributed with a tractate about the proper interpretation of the Our Father (Tolnai: 1654) formulated as an answer to András Váci, who had initiated a debate upon this issue.

ISBN Print: 9783525550830 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647550831

It was during this assembly that after the second Helvetic Confession and Heidelberg Catechism as authoritative explanations of doctrine within the church had been accepted, the synod decided that the authority of superintendents was crucial in order to uphold standards of orthodoxy, to maintain church unity, and avoid dangerous variations of ceremony in church services. In addition, the synod asserted that, all suspected innovators were to be thoroughly investigated, and any proven attempts to introduce innovations were to result in a minister being suspended from office. The synod also patently condemned what was described as a sinister affectation of religious piety and purity originating in England, and the name 'puritan' was deemed disgraceful, scandalous and hateful, and the synod ordered that it was not to be used[5] in future within the Hungarian church." (Murdock 2000, 175–176).

Indeed, article number sixteenth, issued by this synod reads like this:

Nomen puritani nemo sibi amplius ausit usurpare, quia est scandalosum; secundo periculosum, quia innovationes sunt; qui enim hoc fecerit, privabitur. (Révész: 1860, 246).

The prince was resolute to eliminate the danger of innovation once for all. Consequently ordered Geleji to revise and compile the church canons so that the decisions took by the synod would have legal support. The final version of this canons submitted to the national assembly was accepted in 1649. These canons, reflecting the convictions of Geleji, confirmed and further emphasized the standpoint of the Orthodox majority, defending defended the rule of the clergy superiors. As for the presbyteries, the canons accepted their beneficial function, but dismissed their erection and organization within the Calvinist church claiming that the Transylvanian society was not ready for that (Maklári Pap: 1865, 678). It is possible to surmise that a first chapter in the Puritan vs. Orthodox affair came to an end during the late 1640s. The joint and determined intervention of superintendent Geleji and the prince György I Rákóczi, at least temporarily, decided the conflict giving the case for the Orthodox majority.

With György II. Rákóczi's succession to throne of Transylvania, the principality was to commence a new and tragic chapter of its existence towards the end of 1648. For the time being, the principality was under the rule of a much younger prince and many nurtured high hopes and expectations that both the state and the church would face positive changes. The Puritan faction at this stage was also hoping for approbatory changes, and Pál Medgyesi engaged on a campaign to demonstrate the utility and the urgent need for introducing the Presbyterian system to the Clavinist Church of

5 Once the term had been appropriated to denote exclusively something negative, the Hungarian Puritans had no problem in totally giving it up. They preferred to replace it with the orthodox adjective. Consequently, one of the most influential Hungarian Puritan devotional writing adopted the *orthodox* attribute right in its title: *Orthodoxus Christianus.* (Nagyari: 1651).

ISBN Print: 9783525550830 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647550831

Transylvania. He wrote an important book, dedicated to the controversial and much debated issue of presbyteries,[6] entitled: *Dialogus Politico-ecclesiasticus* and published in 1650 (Medgyesi 1650).

Nevertheless, Puritan hopes proved to be deceived expectations, for the new prince followed the same conservative line, when it came about the internal affairs of church organization. Furthermore, during the early 1650s it had already become clear that despite Medgyesi's and the other Puritans' best efforts they would not find necessary support from either Reformed ministers or noble patrons to succeed with the Presbyterian cause. Still, the conservative party was not satisfied, until the new prince did not intervene against the Puritan-Presbyterian faction. The diet held at Gyulafehérvár on the 23th of January, 1653 was the perfect occasion to impose those decisions, which once transposed into laws, would eliminate the chances for the Puritan-Presbyterian project. Accordingly, the Diet imposed a higher civil control on the churches of the principality. The articles of laws of the Transylvanian Diet were codified in the *Approbatae constitutiones regni Transsilvaniae et partium Hungariae eidem adnexarum*, and then they were adopted by the Diet of Gyulafehérvár on the 23rd of January, 1653 (Szenczi Kertész: 1653). Its first part contained the regulations concerning the religious affairs. Accordingly, in the second article were reinforced the equal rights of the four accepted religions. (1653, A4r). Thus, the continuity of the genuine Transylvanian practice of tolerance towards Calvinists, Lutherans, Unitarians and Catholics had been wisely preserved. The toleration of these denominations meant that no further sects or any kind of religious groups would be accepted. The third article reiterated the ban on any kind of innovations, and provided a detailed explanation of the procedures to be followed for proposing reforms (1653, A4v–B1r). It is quite clear that there had been a particular concern to impose a number of general and local authorities, from general synods to magistrates and patrons, to control any initiatives meant to alter the extant and accepted structures or hierarchies within the four accepted religions and their churches.

The conservative party having obtained the unconditional support of the new prince gained significant terrain, and was decided to eradicate the group of Puritan supporters. It was not difficult to persuade the new prince about the imminent or latent dangers provoked by Puritan, Presbyterian or Independentist ideas and their supporters, for the rumours generated by the consumption of those tragic and violent events from England were extremely convincing examples in the eyes of the prince. For instance, the execution of Charles I of England on the 30th of January, 1649, must have been a shocking fact, which did not go unnoticed by the prince and his entourage. Upon the arrival of Isaac Basire (30th of December, 1654) the court chaplain of the executed English king, the prince became obsessed with the idea that Independentists would cause the end of the principality. In this particular

6 For the scholarly evaluation of Medgyesi's book see: Zoványi: 1911, 249–255; Ágoston: 1997, 110.

ISBN Print: 9783525550830 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647550831

context, under the growing pressure exercised by the conservatives the Puritan-Presbyterian elite was delivered a final blow. The synod held at Debrecen in 1655 suspended the whole leadership of the Puritan cause starting with Medgyesi, Tolnai, and Keresszegi. A final theatrical episode consumed in Marosvásárhely, when the prince provoked János Csere Apáczai,[7] allegedly the most learned man of his time, to reveal his independents convictions, and attend an open debate against Isaac Basirius. Apáczai refused the charge of Independentism, but admitted his Presbyterian convictions, which caused the prince an access of rage.

The Puritan-Presbyterian cause as many other determining issues became secondary during the tragic period of 1658 – 1662. Not the Puritans, but the prince himself caused the decline of the principality, for he commanded a most unfortunate military expedition against Poland, ignoring the disallowance of the Ottoman Porte. The consequences were fatal for the prince and the principality as well. In these turbulent times from 1568 to 1661 four princes succeeded to the throne of the Principality as the events and fortune of war fluctuated. At one particular point prince Barcsay seemed to be interested in the Puritan project, probably in an attempt to gain the support of the reform-minded clergy, but his tragic end obstructed him to bring to fruition his promises. However, under the relative stability of Michael I Apafi, a Transylvanian synod in 1664 reinforced the decision that the accustomed form of church government, that is the episcopal system, had to be preserved.

It was not until 1702, after the principality had ceased to exist and became part of the Habsburg Empire, that a mixed body of lay people and clergymen, the so called *Consistorium Supremum* agreed that presbyteries should be erected and organised all over in Transylvania. Still, it is worth mentioning, that this Presbyterian system was not similar with the one demanded half a century before, for the participation of lay people was reduced to performing managerial tasks, and they had no legal power for exercising social control. Last, but not least it did not replace the episcopal system; for this type of presbytery was supposed to function under the supervision of the superintendent and other mixed councils.

7 János Csere Apáczai (1625–1659) was the greatest scholar of his age, the very first Hungarian student who obtained a doctorate at a foreign university. Despite his short life, he left a deep impact upon his students, friend or contemporaries. One of his famous students, also a man of Puritan convictions, was Miklós Bethlen, who was to become the chancellor of Transylvania, and who recalled Apáczai's memory in laudatory terms (Bernard: 2004, 107). His most important work was the Hungarian Encyclopaedia he published in 1655, and used it as a manual for its private students (Apáczai: 1655).

ISBN Print: 9783525550830 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647550831

II.1.2. Excursus: the Significance of Pál Medgyesi's Dialogus Politico-Ecclesiasticus

Having surveyed this schematic account of the history of Transylvanian Puritanism and Presbyterianism, I do consider important to dissect in depth as well this narrative, in order to reveal its doctrinal insights. Accordingly, the task of this subsection is to pinpoint to Medgyesi's perception of presbytery as an ecclesiological doctrine, laid down in his *Dialogus Politico-Ecclesiasticus*. In order to achieve this, I will focus on the 4th chapter of book one, which contains the theological fundaments of Medgyesi's understanding of the Presbyterian system. It is worth, I believe, mentioning some of the sources and authorities he relied upon, so that one could obtain a more detailed picture of the conflict within the Calvinist Church of the principality, and have a better understanding of how the principle of religious toleration could have influenced its outcome or aftermath.

Medgyesi's *Dialogus* was indisputably the most important manifesto[8] of the Hungarian Puritan-Presbyterian enterprise organically embedded in the theological, cultural, and political sequence of events, which nurtured the conflict within the Transylvanian Calvinist Church. Still, despite its impressive display of theological and political theological arguments of the *Dialogus*, neither the Orthodox party, nor in the least Geleji, were preoccupied to elaborate an answer matching the value of the challenge. Indeed, Medgyesi's text concerning the issue of the ecclesiastical policy, exhibits a remarkable assimilation of early modern Calvinist theological literature, with a special emphasis upon the most relevant English Puritan authors, or the doctrinal supporters of *Nadere Reformatie*. The opponents of the Presbyterian system of church organization seemingly preferred to preserve the debate within the sight and range of the princely authority, and not to relocate it in the imaginary battlefield of theological controversy.

Two important antecedents, both of them favouring the Orthodox party, have probably urged Medgyesi to contribute with a text to the on-going debate about the erection of presbyteries. The first event was the Synod of Szatmár (11th of June, 1646) and the anti-Puritan and anti-Presbyterian decisions proclaimed there. The second event was, as I have already referred to it, the appearance of the church canons compiled by Geleji and their ratification during the synod of Marosvásárhely (12th of June, 1649). The so-called Geleji-Canons were shortly published after the synod in 1649. Furthermore, there was also a personal context influencing the conduct of both leaders. As both of them were accurate and well-esteemed authors, there was a long-lasting rivalry

8 After the first edition of 1650, Medgyesi edited and printed out some 1000 specimen of a shortened version of the original. His intention was to find supporters for the Presbyterian cause amongst those not so versatile in theology (Medgyesi: 1653).

ISBN Print: 9783525550830 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647550831

between them. Their opinions differed not only on doctrinal matters concerning, for instance, ecclesiastical policy, but also upon issues of poetics, homiletics and style. Accordingly, Medgyesi, in the preface of his *Dialogus*, quite surprisingly, found the necessary space for mentioning some linguistic and stylistic criticism, alluding, of course, to the flaws in Geleji's writings and use of Hungarian language. (Medgyesi: 1650, IIIv – IVv).

However, Medgyesi probably felt the need to refute the major charge unjustly incriminated against the supporter of the Puritan-Presbyterian cause. The Orthodox opposition declared that Puritans had acted like reckless innovators. Accordingly, the decisions formulated during the Synod of Szathmár, not only prohibited the usage of the term of "Puritan," but clearly pointed out its dangerously innovating quintessence: "*quia innovationes sunt.*" Thus, Medgyesi's venture was to systematically deconstruct the allegedly innovating character of the Presbyterian-project, and illustrate the usefulness and almost effortless organisation of the church according to Presbyterian principles.

Medgyesi in his *Dialogus* strictly followed Calvin's political theology,[9] consequently the Calvinian definitions of secular government, civil order, magistrates, and obedience were posited in the very centre of Medgyesi's argumentation (Höpfl: 1991, xvi–xxiii). Furthermore, Medgyesi, before conceptualizing his very own discourse about the presbyteries and their uses, had certainly taken as a starting point the principle thesis of the Calvinian political theology, namely, that the ultimate aim to create and maintain a well organised and wisely supervised Christian polity was to build up God's kingdom in the world (Höpfl:1991, xxiii). It was this Calvinian political theology that constituted the very basic and determining context validating Medgyesi's ecclesiology concerning the participation of elders or elected lay individuals in organising and supervising local parishes.[10]

The *Dialogus* has been divided in two major parts preceded by a sort of introductory short chapter pondering upon the concept of elders relying on loci of the New Testament. (Medgyesi: 1650, 1–12). While the first book (Medgyesi: 1650, 12–147) exhibits the divine authority and ancient character of the institution of supervising elders, that is, the presbytery, the second book

9 This fact is illustrated by the overwhelming number of quotations throughout the *Dialogus*. Medgyesi was heavily relying on Calvin's *Institutes* and *Commentaries* when reflecting, basically, all the important conceptual components of his ecclesiology, in order to exhibit its biblical foundation. (Medgyesi: 1650, 5, 25, 39, 60, 86, 87, 89, 97, 100; and 130–131).

10 The Calvinist Medgyesi's commitment to Calvin needs no further probation; still, in the context of Calvin's Hungarian reception, it is remarkable how preoccupied Medgyesi was with the lack of interest towards the Hungarian translation of Calvin's *Institutes*. (Szenczi Molnár: 1624). In the *Dialogus* Medgyesi had his two imaginary interlocutors touch upon this issue: "Whose responsibility is that people are not reading such fine books like Calvin's *Institutio*, though they have it in Hungarian as well?" (Medgyesi: 1650, 89). One can hardly answer precisely, which edition of Calvin's *Institutes* Medgyesi was relying upon, but this aforementioned remark seems to suggest that he may have used the Hungarian translation of Albert Molnár Szenczi, as well..

ISBN Print: 9783525550830 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647550831

(Medgyesi: 1650, 147–224) focuses its attention on the presbyteries proper, elaborating upon its constitution, functions, and significance. Furthermore, Medgyesi recalls the cases of Geneva, Westphalia, and Emden as examples of reformed parishes, which have been profiting for quite some time of the Presbyterian church organization. He also added a short exempla, based on Lubbertus, which claims that Cruciger and Pezelius, after having inspected and studied the parish of Emden, were impressed to such an extent that they would confess that the image of the living apostolic church was reflected in what they had seen (Medgyesi, 1650, 183).

However, this particular structuring into two books correlated befittingly the answer to the main charge aforementioned, namely, the Presbyterian doctrine as innovation Hence, the first book's most important task was to convince its readership about the scripturally and doctrinally genuine character of the presbytery as a Christian institution and vital component of the Reformed Church. The innovation charge could have been refuted only by pointing out its "ante-Calvin" existence, acceptance, and usage in both the works of the theological authorities and the everyday life of early Christian communities. Calvin stands in this discourse as a point of reference, for it was the authority that none of the conflicting parties questioned. Still, Medgyesi needed to impose further reliable theological authorities to convincingly refute the claim of innovation. It was the 4th chapter of Book I that fulfilled this task, asserting that the most important theologians from the time of the early Church Fathers (Patres) and later on the contemporary, that is, early modern reformed confessions all over accepted the presbyteries as valid structures of the Reformed Church, liberated from the papist tyranny.(Medgyesi: 1650, 113–128) In doing so, Medgyesi seemed to follow the "standard procedure," in terms of employing a master narrative of ecclesiastical history, which claimed a direct *continuity* between the Primitive Church and the Reformed Church as *Vera Ecclesia* in order to attribute orthodoxy to the Reformed doctrines.[11] This ecclesiological narrative was specially designed to confute the charge of innovation. For designing this particular continuity with the Early Church a precious doctrinal antecedent has been created, thus the disputed doctrines gained the attribute of *orthodoxy*. For, thereby it has been demonstrated that the questioned doctrines were stemming from the works of the uncorrupted Primitive Church and its Fathers.

Accordingly, Medgyesi in order to cover the *ante-Calvin* period, set forth an impressive survey of the ancient authorities, providing his readers with arguments from the works of Irenaeus, Tertullian, Cyprian of Carthage, Augustine of Hippo, Chrysosthom, Ambrose, Hieronymus, and Eusebius, all of them expressing a viewpoint sustaining the need for incorporating lay people, elected elders, in managing the everyday life of the Church or the

11 For the special significance of this phenomenon in the context of Reformation see: Backhus: 2003, 326 – 390.

ISBN Print: 9783525550830 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647550831

parishes. In doing so, Medgyesi substantially relied on the *De Politia et Disciplina Civili et Ecclesiastica libri II*, written by an anonymous,[12] which should not suggest that the wildly read Medgyesi had not used other sources while compiling this particular chapter. Moreover, as a gesture demonstrating Medgyesi's commitment to the English Puritan tradition, he quoted extensively Thomas Cartwrigth, who was a highly-esteemed authority of the Presbyterian project (Cartwright: 1582). Following the same line, he also referred to Voetius borrowing from him the example of the African Church, where, as Voetius pointed out, the idea of involving elders in church management had also been accepted centuries before (Voetius: 1648). Recalling the example of the persecuted Waldensians, Medgyesi added further proofs to his main thesis, namely, that presbyteries were not dangerous inventions, for they were always on the agenda of the persecuted true Christians communities, who embodied the *Vera Ecclesia.* He depicted the Waldensians, quoting from the *Catalogus testium veritatis*, as ancient persecuted community, because of their refusal to assimilate or accommodate to papist innovations (Eisengrein: 1565).

The early modern and post-Calvin period comprised, again, numerous sources and authorities, often quoted from Voetius's theological treatise about the elders, or Gerson Bucerus's dissertation (Bucerus: 1618). However, Medgyesi mentioned a single Hungarian author, István Kis Szegedi, and his popular *Loci Communes*, referring to one particular passage, entitled *De Bonis Pastoribus.* Szegedi in his Loci Communes reflected upon the institution of the presbyteries asserting upon 1. Cor. 5. 4. that even the Apostles were familiar with this institution, where the elders had to perform the tasks of the presbyters (Szegedi Kis: 1585, 197). Moreover, Medgyesi went on quoting all the relevant passages of the early modern confessions sustaining the concept of presbyteries concluding with the *Christianus Lactens*, an augmented version of the Heidelberg Cathechism, which, despite its Orthodox Calvinist standpoint, was also acknowledging the tasks of the elders and the uses of the presbyteries (Keresztúri: 1637). Referring to the *Christianus Lactens*, it was, indeed, a real masterstroke delivered by Medgyesi, for he quoted that particular book, which constituted the primary theological material assimilated by the two princes, Sigismundus and George II in order to obtain their confirmation. Thus, Medgyesi poignantly revealed the wryness in the conduct of the acting prince, George II Rákóczi, who by his dismissive attitude concerning the issue of the presbyteries, contradicted himself as a Calvinist, acting against what was supposed to be his genuine Calvinist education and training achieved through the rite of confirmation.

All in all, the rationale behind this impressive survey of theological literature was to convincingly refute the charge of doctrinal innovation.

12 An attempt to identify the author has been undertaken by Starreveld. (Starreveld:1997, 145–157).

ISBN Print: 9783525550830 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647550831

Medgyesi's concluding remark closing this chapter of the *Dialogus* is overtly revealing:

"Pondering upon all that you could have read here, you can clearly see now, how unjust is the claim of innovation formulated by those, who lack the understanding and true knowledge of their own Religion." (Medgyesi: 1650, 128).

Notwithstanding Medgyesi's convincing effort to formulate a doctrinally accurate answer, the *Dialogus* did not achieved its main goal, for it did not arise the interest of the Orthodox party to the extent that they would engage in a theological debate upon this issue. Thus, only a Puritan-Presbyterian readership or the groups of those undecided, could have been addressed or influenced to support the cause. That was definitely not enough in front of the determined Orthodox opposition and the princely distrust.

III. Intolerance?

At a first glance, it may seem, that this is just another early modern case, which illustrates the thesis that whenever the reason of state clashes with the demand for tolerance, if there is a threat for the extant state or church structures, intolerance or persecution came as an automatic reaction. Indeed, the firm refusal or repression of the Transylvanian leading clergy first just assisted, then unreservedly manoeuvred by princely power suggests that the Puritan-Presbyterian movement was deemed to failure. For in the principality of Transylvania, the so-called, interest of the state very often coincided with the very personal interest of the ruling prince.

However, this narrative account cannot, of course, be totally equated with the reception of Puritan movement, for it deliberately focused solely upon the destiny of the Presbyterian enterprise. Though the opponents of Presbyterian system were not thrilled about the other innovations proposed by Puritans, in terms of rituals, ceremonies or the performance of religious life, there were a number of changes that resulted from Puritan efforts to implant them. The theological teaching of Puritanism the practical theology promoted by William Perkins and William Ames had a spectacular reception (Berg: 1946, 87–91 and 108–119; Tóth: 2008, 47). These two authors and their oeuvres had been translated, published, edited and compiled to such an impressive extent that in the second half of the 17th century theological training in the Calvinist colleges in Transylvania were strongly relying on Amesian theology. In a similar way, Ramist dialectics replaced Keckermann's textbook of logic after the 1650s; moreover the combination of Ames and Ramus was imposed as standard piece in the curriculum of the Reformed Colleges in Transylvania. A rich devotional literature and an equally consistent body of sermon literature stemmed from the reception of Puritan authors and the assimilation of their

ISBN Print: 9783525550830 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647550831

teaching. Furthermore, as ego-documents are testifying it, lay people's religiosity also bore the marks of Puritan piety (Tóth 2008; Tóth: 2012).

Hence, it seems plausible to suggest that the "intolerance" of the opponents had been efficient only to a certain extent, and might have been focused not on the overall movement, but only upon those demands, which seemed to alter the established standard structures of the church and the state. Consequently, I believe, that the main actors' refusal, though they may have well been conservatives or even narrow-minded, was not exclusively an expression of intolerance, and did not constitute the quintessence of their nature. I do believe that, they were to a remarkable extent constrained by the limited options they had. Though, the two princes György I and György II Rákóczi assimilated Orthodox Calvinism, both of them were educated and well-read persons, practising a religious life and devoted to the cause of the church. Besides the intricate relation between state and church, Calvinism was practically the official religion of the state, and the feudal type of interdependence between the superintendent of the Calvinist Church and the prince, constituted further political factors influencing the princes' decisions, in fact, intolerance. The principality, as an artificial state formation, was dangerously living between two great powers, thus its internal stability was the utmost condition for its survival. Furthermore, the Calvinist Church of Transylvania with the support of the prince undertook for almost 100 years the role of being the protector of Hungarian Calvinists all over, especially the ones inhabiting Royal Hungary. Sources are testifying to the fact that bishop Geleji was planning on the extension of the Transylvanian Calvinist Church, for he wanted to attract some Calvinist district from the territory of Royal Hungary under the jurisdiction of the Transylvanian superintendent. Consequently, an internal scandal in the Calvinist Church would seriously obstruct these plans. Finally, the particular terrifying set of events inseparably associated to the Puritan movement, I am referring to the execution of the first European monarch, Charles I of England, was a good enough reason for the prince, to be precautious with the Puritan-Presbyterian party. Hence, the arrival and stay of Isaac Basire had a determining impact upon the prince's resolution.

Superintendent Geleji, a gifted writer and well-educated man, had also remarkable political virtues. All his reactions reveal an unusually bright political discernment, something that was entirely missing on the Puritan side. None of their leaders, from Tolnai to Medgyesi had either the political talents or the abilities Geleji possessed. Still, it were unfair to declare him the villain of the piece, for he acted following his best conviction that he was serving the utmost interest of the Calvinist Church. Judging the situation from his perspective this could be hardly denied. However, the greatest handicap of the Puritan faction was that they did not manage to convince the majority of the Calvinist priests about the need of the Presbyterian system of church organization. Medgyesi sadly accepted the harsh truth during the 1650s that

ISBN Print: 9783525550830 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647550831

there was no substantial support helping the Puritan-Presbyterian agenda. Accordingly, no pressure from the large group of the Calvinist priest had ever been transmitted toward the high ranking clergy.

Lay people, were either not interested in particular, or did not have the right of interfering. It was the social strata of the nobility who could help the Puritan-Presbyterian cause. They were not attracted especially to the Presbyterian agenda, for as patrons of parishes, just like the prince, preferred to exercise a direct control over the priests they were paying. Besides, it was inaccurate to claim that the dismissal of the implant of presbyteries, totally excluded the participation of lay people in organising and managing the church. Nobility, especially the most influential families, apart from the patronage they had customarily been exercising, as the members in the counsel of the prince, they were also dealing with ecclesiastical affairs as well. The so called *mixta congregatio*, a mixed counsel of clergy and influential noblemen, with the occasion of the diets frequently had meetings and made decisions concerning non-dogmatic affairs of the Calvinist Church (Sipos: 2000, 18). Furthermore the practice of the *curatoratus*, in which influential nobles as curators were supervising the reformed colleges where student ministers were educated, was another form for lay people's implication. Finally the most important one, the *Consistorium Supremum*, which was also a mixed board that the Calvinist superintendent and the Calvinist members of the High Counsil of the principality could attend it (Sipos: 2000, 53). Its function and significance became extremely important after the death of the last prince and the transformation of the principality into the so called gubernium, for it had to perform the tasks and privileges of the passed prince, who used to be the highest patron and administrator of the Church. It was not a coincidence, maybe, that this mixed governing body of the Calvinist Church made a historical decision in May of 1702, when ordered the organization of the presbyteries with the participation of lay people.

IV. Conclusion

In order to fathom the historically accurate causes behind the failure of the Puritan-Presbyterian endeavour, we need to see it as a political act as well. Thus, it becomes clear that besides the questionable, arguable or acceptable *intolerance* of the high ranking clergy and the prince of Transylvania, there was a communicational failure on the Puritans' side, for the message of the Puritan and Presbyterian project had not been formulated properly in political terms. The discourse of the Puritans was lacking, what rhetoric define as *accomodatio*, for they flagrantly missed their opportunities of using the political liaisons they developed toward Zsuzsanna Lórántffy and Zsigmond Rákóczi, and articulate an efficient discourse. When they realised that, it was

ISBN Print: 9783525550830 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647550831

far too late. Medgyesi's excellent book came too late, well after the synod of Szatmár (1646) and the validations of the Geleji Canons (1649), which reconfirmed the validity of the episcopal system. It is my conviction that the political inefficiency of the Puritan-Presbyterian party was the precondition for the Orthodox majority to exercise an intolerant attitude, whatever that would mean. The Orthodox majority proved to be far too biased and preoccupied to preserve its actual positions giving credit to the traditional values, systems at the expense of the new ones, for there was neither a better option for them, nor any political constrain exercised by Puritans to start negotiations and reach a political compromise.

Bibliography

Ágoston, István (1997), A magyarországi puritanizmus gyökerei,[The Roots of the Hungarian Puritanism], Budapest: Kálvin Kiadó.

Backhus Irene (2003), Historical Method and Confessional Identity in the Era of Reformation (1378–1615), Leiden–Boston: Brill.

Balázs Mihály (2006), Felekezetiség és fikció. Tanulmányok 16–17 századi irodalmunkról [Fiction and Confessionality. Studies on the Hungarian Literature of the 16th–17th Century], Budapest: Balassi Kiadó.

Bernard Adams (transl.) (2004), The Autobiography of Miklós Bethlen, London/ New York-Bahrain: Kegan Paul Limited.

Berg, Pál. (1946), Angol hatások tizenhetedik századi irodalmunkban [English Influences on the Hungarian Literature during the Seventeenth Century], Budapest.

Bodonhelyi, József (1942), Az angol puritanizmus lelki élete és magyar hatásai [The Spirituality of English Puritanism and its Influences on Hungary]. Debrecen.

Garnsey, Peter (1984), Religious Tolerance in Classical Antiquity, in: Sheils, W. J., (ed.), Persecution and Toleration, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1–28.

Grell Ole Peter (1996), Introduction, in: Ole Peter Grell/Bob Scribner (eds.), Tolerance and Intolerance in the European Reformation, Cambridge: University Press,1–12.

Heltai János (1994), Alvinczi Péter és a heidelbergi peregrinusok [Péter Alvinczi and the Hungarian Students of Heidelberg], Budapest: Balassi Kiadó.

Höpfl, Harro (1991), Introduction, in Luther and Calvin on Secular Authority, Harro Höpfl (ed.), Cambridge: University Press, 7 – 24.

Keul István (2009), Early Modern Religious Communities in East Central Europe, Leiden–Boston: Brill.

Makkai, László (1952), A magyar puritánusok harca a feudalizmus ellen [The Fight of the Hungarian Puritans Against Feudalism], Budapest.

Makkári Pap Lajos (1865), A szatmárnémeti zsinat végzései [The Decisions of the National Synod of Szatmár], Sárospataki Fűzetek 2, 678–680.

ISBN Print: 9783525550830 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647550831

Molnár, Attila (1994), A "protestáns etika" Magyarországon [The "Protestant Ethic" in Hungary], Debrecen: Ethnica.

Murdock, Graeme (2000), Calvinism on the Frontier 1600 – 1660: International Calvinism and the Reformed Church in Hungary and Transylvania, New York: Oxford University Press.

Oberman, Heiko A. (1996), The Travail of Tolerance: Containing Chaos in Early Modern Europ, in: Ole Peter Grell/Bob Scribner (eds.), Tolerance and Intolerance in the European Reformation, Cambridge: University Press, 13–31.

Péter Katalin (1994), Hungary, in Bob Scribner/Roy Porter/ Mikuláaš Teich (eds.), The Reformation in National Context, Cambrdige. University Press, 155–167.

– (1996), Tolerance and Intolerance in Sixteenth Century Hungary in: Ole Peter Grell/Bob Scribner (eds.), Tolerance and Intolerance in the European Reformation, Cambridge: University Press, 249–261.

Révész Imre (1860), A szatmár-németii zsinat végzései, eddig ismeretlen eredeti szerkezetükben [The Unknown Originial Version of the Decisions of the National Synod of Szatmár], Sárospataki Fűzetek 4, 244–247.

Sipos Gábor (2000), Az erdélyi református főkonzisztórium kialakulása 1668–1713–(1736) [The Emergence of the Reformed Consistory in Transylvania 1668–1713–(1736)], Kolozsvár.

Starreveld, J.C.L. (1997), De Auteur Van De Politia Et Disciplina Civili Et Ecclesiastica (1585) [The Author of the De Politia et Disciplina Civili et Eccleiastica, 1585], Nederlands Archief voor Kerkgeschiedenis 77, 145 – 157.

Szilágyi Sándor (ed.) (1875), Monumenta Comitalia Regni Transylvaniae (1576–1596), [Monuments of the Transylvanian Diet from 1576 to 1596], vol. 3., Budapest: The Publishing House of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences.

Tarnóc Márton (1978), Erdély művelődése Bethlen Gábor és a két Rákóczi György korában.[The Cultural History of Transylvania during the Rules of Gábor Bethlen and theTwo Rákóczis] Budapest.

Tóth István György (1998), La Tolérance Religeuse au XVII^{e} Siécle en Hongrie, en Transylvanie et sur le territoire hongrois occupé par les Turcs, in Guy Saupin; Rémy Fabre; Marcel Launay (eds.), La tolérance : Colloque international de Nantes, mai 1998 : quatrième centenaire de l'Edit de Nantes, Nantes : Centre de recherche sur l'histoire du monde atlantique, 127–132.

Tóth Zsombor (2008), From the Cradle to the Grave: Representations of Confessional Identity in Mihály Cserei's Writings (1667 – 1647), Colloquia XV, 44 – 71.

– (2012), A Man for All Seasons: Exile, Suffering and Martyrdom in the Autobiography of Miklós Bethlen, Hungarian Studies 26, 273–282.

Zoványi Jenő (1911), Puritánus mozgalmak a magyar református egyházban,[Puritan Movements in the Hungarian Reformed Church] Budapest: Magyar Protestáns Irodalmi Társaság.

ISBN Print: 9783525550830 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647550831

Early Modern Prints

Amesius, Guilielmus (1630), Bellarminus Enervatus, Amstelodamum.
– (1685a), Medulla Theologica, Debrecen.
– (1685b), De Conscientia et ejus jure, vel Casibus libri quinque, Debrecen.
Apácai Csere János (1655), Magyar encyclopaedia [Hungarian Encyclopaedia], Utrecht.
(1653) Approbatae Constitutiones Regni Transylvaniae et Partium Hungariae, Várad.
Bucerus, Gerson (1618), Dissertatio de gubernatione Ecclesiae, maximeque de presbyterio et episcopatu, Middelburg.
Calabrensis, Aurellius Baptista Ioannes (?) (1585), De Politia et Disciplina Civili et Ecclesiastica, Leyden.
Cartwright, Thomas (1582), Confutatio Glossematum Rhemensium super Nóvum Testamentum, s.l.
Eysengrein Gvilielmus (1565), Catalogus testium veritatis, Dilingen.
Geleji Katona István (1649), Canones ecclesiastici ex veteribus qua Hungariensibus, qua Transylvaniensibus in unum collecti, plerisque tamen aliis etiam pro temporis ratione aucti ac in paulo meliorem ordinem redacti, Gyulafehérvár.
Keresztúri Pál (1637), Christianus lactens, Gyulafehérvár.
Medgyesi Pál (1650) Dialogus Politico-Ecclesiasticus, Bártfa.
– (1636), Praxis Pietatis, Lőcse.
– (1653), Rövid tanitas az presbyteriumrol [Brief Teaching about Presbyteries], Sárospatak.
Nagyari Benedek (1651), Orthodoxus Christianus…, Várad.
Szegedi Kis István (1585), Theologiae sincerae loci communes de Deo et Homine, Basel.
Szenczi Molnár Albert [transl.] (1624), Az keresztyeni religiora es igaz hitre valo tanitas, mellyet deakúl irt Calvinus Janos [Teaching of Christian Religion and True Faith, Which Has First Been Written in Latin by Joannes Calvinus], Frankfurt am Main.
Tolnai Dali János (1654), Dáneus Ráca-I, az az a Mi-atyánk felöl igaz értelmü tanitóknak magok mentsége Vaci-Andrásnak usorás vádja és szidalma ellen [An Answer to Andras Vaci Concerning the Debate about the Praying of the Our Father], Sárospatak.
Voetius, Gisbertus (1648–1649), Selectarum disputationum theologicarum partes I – V., Utrecht.

ISBN Print: 9783525550830 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647550831

Index of Geographical Names

ISBN Print: 9783525550830 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647550831

ISBN Print: 9783525550830 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647550831

ISBN Print: 9783525550830 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647550831

ISBN Print: 9783525550830 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647550831

Index of Persons

ISBN Print: 9783525550830 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647550831

ISBN Print: 9783525550830 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647550831

ISBN Print: 9783525550830 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647550831

ISBN Print: 9783525550830 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647550831

ISBN Print: 9783525550830 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647550831

ISBN Print: 9783525550830 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647550831

ISBN Print: 9783525550830 — ISBN E-Book: 9783647550831