

The Journal of Northwest Theological Seminary

---

Volume 23, Number 1

May 2008

---

*“vita vestra abscondita est cum Christo in Deo”—Col. 3:3*

**KERUX: THE JOURNAL**  
**OF**  
**NORTHWEST THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY**

For the Faculty: James T. Dennison, Jr. (Editor), Scott F. Sanborn, J. Peter Vosteen

Typing and formatting: Tin L. Harrell

1. The Earliest Hungarian Protestant Confessions: Nagyvárad (1544) and Erdőd (1545).....	4
James T. Dennison, Jr.	
2. A Greater than Solomon.....	26
3. The Glory of the Latter Temple: A Structural and Biblical-Theological Analysis of Haggai 2:1-9.....	28
Benjamin W. Swinburnson	
4. Past and Present.....	47
James T. Dennison, Jr.	
5. The Apocalypics of the Hungarian Puritans.....	48
Eve Alice Petrőczy	
6. Reviews.....	55

**KERUX** is a publication of Northwest Theological Seminary and appears three times each year (May, September, December). Editorial offices are located at 17711 Spruce Way, Lynnwood, WA 98037-7431. Correspondence should be directed to the editor at this address. Subscription rates for one year are: \$20.00 (U.S. and Canada); \$25.00 (Elsewhere). All remittances should be made payable in U. S. Funds. **KERUX** is: abstracted in **New Testament Abstracts**, Cambridge, MA, **Old Testament Abstracts**, Washington, DC and **Religious and Theological Abstracts**, Myerstown, PA; indexed in **ATLA Religion Database**, Chicago, IL and the **Elenchus of Biblica**, Rome, Italy.

Visit our Website: [kerux.com](http://kerux.com)

ISSN 0888-8513

May 2008

Vol. 23, No. 1

## Introduction

This issue features the Reformation in Hungary—16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> century. The earliest Protestant Confessions of Faith are translated into English for the first time here. The background of these documents is the emergence of the Reformation in Hungary and Transylvania (modern day Rumania). The cross-fertilization of English Puritanism in the Hungary of the 17<sup>th</sup> century is the focus of our second article on Magyar Protestantism. It is a privilege for us to feature Dr. Eve Petrőczy of Budapest as author of this study. To these, we have added a penetrating structural and biblical-theological examination of the prophet Haggai. We close with our usual selection of reviews of important new theological books. *Soli Deo Gloria!*

# **The Earliest Hungarian Protestant Confessions: Nagyvárad (1544) and Erdőd (1545)**

## **Introduction and Translation**

James T. Dennison, Jr.

It was inevitable that the Protestant Reformation would trickle into Eastern Europe. Traveling initially via the minds, hearts and (often) smuggled pamphlets carried by German merchants to Prussian or Saxon enclaves in Danzig (Gdansk), Vilnius, Sopron, Buda and Kassa, the *lues teutonica* (“German plague”) was welcomed in the Roman Catholic strongholds bordering the Baltic Sea and in mining centers along the northern Tisza River. Change was in the wind in Hungary bred and fed by Wittenberg as early as 1518. But there was an even more ominous change lurking at the nation’s southern border—the Islamic Ottoman Empire was pressing hard by 1521.

It was in the year after Luther’s fateful posting of his *Ninety-five Theses* that they were being read in German-speaking towns in Hungary. Tamás/Thomas Preisner, priest in Lubica (in the region of Szepes/Spiš near Kežmarok, modern Slovakia), read them from his pulpit in 1520. Already in 1519, Transylvanian merchants returning home from the Leipzig Fair had brought Lutheran literature with them to Hermannstadt (Nagyszeben/Szeben, Sibiu in modern Rumania). In other Saxon or German-speaking settlements—Odenburg (Sopron), Kaschau (Kassa, Košice in modern Slovakia), Ofen (Buda, Budapest)—Luther’s reforming doctrines spread quickly. While many were embracing the evangelical

teachings, others were condemning them. Archbishop Ladislau/László Szalkai (1475-1526) of Gran (Esztergom) ordered the Papal Bull of excommunication against Luther (*Decet Romanum pontificem* of Pope Leo X, January 3, 1521) to be read from every pulpit. Successor Hungarian Diets of 1523, 1524 and 1525 passed laws for the suppression of the “Lutheran contagion” including confiscation of property and even capital punishment (*Lutherani comburantur*, “Lutherans [may] be burned”). The latter does not appear to have been enforced, but some evangelicals were forced out of their homes and, in some locales, Luther’s books were consigned to the bonfire. The center of the early Reformation in Transylvania was the town of Szeben (Hermannstadt) where the town council endorsed the Lutheran spirit in 1522. In the same year, Hungarian students began drifting towards Wittenberg to study under the emerging antiestablishmentarians. Predictably these students originated in the German towns of Upper Hungary and Transylvania.

## **Aftereffects of Mohács**

Hungary was partitioned three ways following the disaster at Mohács (on the Danube River in southwestern Hungary) on August 29, 1526. Western Hungary (the Burgenland) was claimed by the Habsburgs of Vienna and dubbed Royal Hungary. Eastern (Southeastern) Hungary, called Siebenbürgen (Erdély) by the Germans, became Transylvania. In between—central Hungary—were the Ottoman Turks. On that day of national disgrace (Mohács), the brilliant Suleiman the Magnificent (1499-1566), ruler of the surging, imperialistic, caliphate envisioning Ottoman Turks, took up positions opposite young Jagiellon monarch, King Louis II (1506-1526). Louis’s royal entourage included 28 magnates, the *crème de la crème* of the Roman Catholic Church (two Archbishops—László Szalkai of Esztergom and Pál Tomori of Kalocsa; five Bishops—of Győr [Raab], Pécs [Fünfkirchen], Csanád, Nagyvárad [Großwardein] and Bosnia; and numerous priests) and allegedly an army of 50,000 Hungarian troops and German mercenaries. But, having bowed to Mecca, Suleiman’s 200,000 janissaries routed the Christian army in a day of infamy for all Hungary. Suleiman’s triumph left the field scattered with the bodies of leaders of every echelon of Hungarian society—church, state, education, nobility.

The bodies of Roman Catholic priests and bishops strewn upon the field at Mohács vividly paraded the impotence of that *ecclesia* before the Magyar masses. If the god of the priests carried upon the crucifixes at the head of Christian battle columns was trampled and decimated by the scimitar of the Turk, was it not evident that such a god was indeed no god and such a system of religious hocus pocus was vanity.

Into the vacuum rushed the house of Habsburg Ferdinand I (1503-1564) claiming regency over Hungary through his sister Mary (1505-1558), now widow of King Louis.<sup>1</sup> Hungarian nobles annulled three grandiose Viennese moves by crowning Transylvanian voivode, John Zápolya/Zapolyai I (1487-1540), king in November 1526. For ten years, John and Ferdinand struggled to dominate Hungary. Only when Suleiman conquered Buda in 1541 did the nation settle into a relative state of stability. The Magnificent positioned Royal Hungary on his left flank and Transylvania on his right.

## George of Brandenburg

The failure of the established Catholic Church at Mohács made the new learning blowing in from Lutheran universities and German merchants very attractive—even compelling. Creating a favorable climate for German Protestantism was George of Brandenburg-Ansbach (1484-1543) who possessed extensive estates in Bohemia, Silesia, Germany and Hungary—the latter via his marriage with Beatrix/Beatrice of Frangepán (ca. 1480-1510), widow of Johann/János Corvin (1473-1504).<sup>2</sup> George was nick-named “The Pious” (*Fromme*) and was Margrave of Brandenburg (House of Hohenzollern). When Martin Luther boldly declared “Here I stand” at Worms in 1521, George was stunned—not by Luther’s brashness, but by his fervor for *sola Christi*. When

---

<sup>1</sup> Ferdinand even had connections through his own wife, Anna (1503-1547), sister of Louis II.

<sup>2</sup> The young Corvin was the illegitimate son of Matthias/Mátyás Corvinus (1443-1490) and his liason, Barbara Edelpöck (†1495). Matthias married Beatrix/Beatrice of Aragón (Naples) (1457-1508) in 1476, but she gave him no children. On his death in 1490, she married Władysław Jagiello (1456-1516), King of Bohemia, but the match ended in divorce in 1499. For the complex history of this family, see Jörg K. Hoensch, *Matthias Corvinus: Diplomat, Feldherr und Mäzen* (1998) and Volker Honemann, “The Marriage of Matthias Corvinus to Beatrice of Aragón (1476) in Urban and Court Historiography,” in *Princes and Princely Culture 1450-1650*, ed. by M. Gosman, A. MacDonald and A. Vanderjagt (2005) 2:213-26.

the Diet met at Nuremberg (Nürnberg) in 1522, he was further stirred by the evangelical preaching of the Lutheran pulpiteers at St. Lawrence and St. Sebald. George began to study Luther's translation of the New Testament and inaugurated a personal correspondence with the translator himself. In 1524, he met Luther and was fully confirmed in his own conversion from Catholicism to Protestantism.

George was related (through his mother, Sophia/Zofia Jagiello [1464-1512]) to the royal house of Hungary. On account of his marriage to Beatrix (of Frangepán), he spent time at court in Buda. Given the lands of Upper Silesia and Franconia, he was also entrusted as tutor (*morum formator*, "fashioner of good morals") to the young king, Louis/Ludwig II Jagiellon, who in 1522 had taken as his Queen Mary of Habsburg, herself sister of Charles V (1500-1558) and Ferdinand I (1503-1564) of Vienna. The Queen was herself favorably disposed to the Reformation and encouraged George in the evangelical guidance of her son. She also favored Protestant-leaning humanists at her court, including her favorite preacher, Conrad Cordatus (ca. 1480-1546). In addition, Simon Grynaeus (1493-1541), later Reformed professor at the universities of Heidelberg (1524) and Basel (1529), was a teacher at Buda from 1521-1524. It was George who invited him to assume the chair after he was ejected from the University of Vienna on account of his sympathy for the Reformation. The papal ambassador to the court of Louis and Mary would report to the Vatican in 1524: "God forbid, the king and queen are Lutherans." Luther would dedicate four Psalm translations (*Vier tröstliche Psalmen an die Königin von Ungern*) to the Queen in 1526 in consolation for the death of her husband at Mohács. At the Diet of Augsburg in 1530, Mary attempted to persuade her brother, Charles V, to treat the advocates of the Augsburg Confession (Augustana or, in the *editio princeps*, so-called Invariata version) with tolerance ("to soften his attitude towards us," as Melancthon expressed it). George of Brandenburg would himself be a charter signatory of the Augsburg Confession.

German influence in Hungary, whether religious or socio-political, was resented by ethnic Hungarians, the Magyars. As the Protestant Reformation was associated initially with German Lutheranism, tensions between German/Saxon and Hungarian elements increased. Fed by a systemic disillusionment and discontent, the new doctrine was polarizing church and state. Thus the history of Hungary in the 16<sup>th</sup> century would be one of divisions over reli-

gion: Roman Catholic, Islam, Protestant (and to a lesser extent Orthodox). Royal Hungary would remain essentially Catholic; central Hungary would be nominally Muslim; north-central and eastern Hungary (including Transylvania) would gravitate towards Protestantism. Ironically, Protestantism was tolerated in central Hungary because of the iconoclasm endorsed by Islam.

## Matthias Biró

Mátyás Dévai Biró (Matthias Biró de Deva/Devai, ca.1500-1544/45) is nicknamed the ‘Hungarian Luther’ for good reason. Born in Transylvania, he enrolled as a student at the University of Kraków (Poland) in 1523 and emerged a Franciscan priest in 1526. On return to Hungary, he became chaplain in 1527 on the estate of nobleman and aristocrat Stephan Tomory (Istvan Tomori) where he gradually became exposed to Reformation doctrine from Germany. Some have suggested he was also influenced by Simon Grynaeus. Captivated by the Wittenberg don, Biró journeyed to that university city in 1529 in order to study under Luther, Melanchthon and others. Luther even invited him to room in his house. After three years of evangelical assimilation, Biró returned to Hungary in order to promote Protestant doctrine in northern and central Hungary. In the spring of 1531, he became pastor in Ofen-Buda (modern Budapest). It was here that he published his famous 52 Theses entitled *Rudimenta salutis* (“Rudiments of Salvation”; cf. the reply by Gregory Zegedi/Szegedy, *Censurae Fratris Gregorii Zegedini ex ordine diui Francisci, in propositiones erroneas Matthiae Deuai, sed ut ille vocat, rudimenta salutis continentes* [“Censures of Brother Gregory Zegedi of the order of the divine Francis, holding in check the erroneous propositions of Matthias Devai, but as he calls them, rudiments of salvation”] [Bécs, 1535]).

In this same year (1531), Biró went to Kaschau (Kassa, Košice) in order to preach there. However, he was arrested by the Bishop of Erlau (Eger), Thomas/Tamás Szalaházy, transported to and imprisoned in Vienna in a dungeon administered by Bishop Johann Fabri/Faber (1478-1541). He was released on November 6, 1533 through the influence of believers in Kaschau and returned (again) to Hungary in order to preach the gospel. He is next (1535) found on the estate of another patron of the Reformation, Tamás Nádasdy, in Sárvár. This is also the year of Gregory Szegedy’s (1511-1569) published counterat-



tack on his doctrine.

The following year (1536), Biró was forced to flee once more to his German refuge—Wittenberg—and the hospitality of Luther and Melanchthon. His *Disputatio de statu, in quo sint beatorum animae post hanc vitam, ante ultimi iudicij diem. Item de praecipuis articulis Christianae doctrinae, per Matthiam Devay Hungarum. His addita est expositio examinis, quomodo a Fabro in carcere sit examinatus* (“Disputation concerning the state in which the souls of the blessed will exist after this life, before the day of final judgment. Likewise concerning the principle articles of Christian doctrine, by Matthias Devay of Hungary. To these has been added an exposition of the examination, how he was examined by Faber in prison”) (1537) was published in Nürnberg and Basel, indicating brief sojourns in these Reformation cities during this phase of his exile from Hungary.<sup>3</sup>

On his return from Germany, he once again threw himself into the work of promoting the spread of the Reformation through preaching, establishing schools and Hungarian literature. His *Orthographia Vngarica* (published posthumously in Cracow in 1549) demonstrates the revolution he brought to Hungarian literary expression. This was a Hungarian grammar which Biró wrote in order to promote the reading and understanding of the Scriptures.

When the Turks finally succeeded in capturing Buda in 1541, Biró fled for his last visit to Wittenberg. But he also visited Swiss cities where he became convicted of the Helvetic Reformed theology of Ulrich Zwingli’s successor, Heinrich Bullinger, as well as John Calvin. This induced a shift from the Lutheran doctrine of the corporeal presence of Christ in the Lord’s Supper towards the Zwinglian/Calvinist/Helvetic concept of “to eat is to believe” (*edere est credere*). Modification of his earlier sympathy for the Lutheran doctrine is verified in two ways. First, Luther wrote a letter to the Protestant brothers in Prešov (Eperies/Eperjes) bemoaning the “sacramentarian” views of his former house guest and declaring that he had not learned it in Wittenberg. Second, and perhaps more decisively, is the statement of Article 22 of the *Propositiones* . . . adopted at Großwardein in 1544: “the bread and the wine

---

<sup>3</sup> The online database, Az Országos Széchényi Könyvtár adatbázisai, displays both the Basel and the Nürnberg imprints. The “Principle Articles of Christian Doctrine” should be compared with his 52 Theses (*Rudimenta salutis*).

are not simply perishable signs, but truly [signs] of that [which is] signified, i.e., communications and dispensers of the spiritual body and blood of Christ” (see the full translation below). This statement is certainly formulated with Biró’s approval. He may, in fact, have been the author of it. Further support for his shift in opinion comes from the Catechism he wrote in 1538.<sup>4</sup>

When he returned to Hungary in 1543, he labored first at Miskolc until he was forced to flee to the Erdőd estate of Gáspár Drágffy in 1544 (Drágffy had been the first Transylvanian nobleman to adopt the Protestant Reformation). Biró would end his career in Debrecen where he died in 1544 or 1545.

Biró’s influence and cooperation with the other pioneers of the Reformation in Hungary—Imre Ozorai (author of the first Hungarian Lutheran book, *De Christo, et eius ecclesia; item de Antichristo, eiusque ecclesia* [“Concerning Christ, and his church; likewise, concerning Antichrist and his church”] [Krakow, 1535]); Lukacs Thuri; István Gálszécsi (author of the first songbook to use Hungarian language notes with Gregorian hymns and German chorales in Hungarian); András Batizi (1510-1546/52); István Szegedi Kis (1505-1572); with many others—impacted Hungary and Transylvania so thoroughly that by mid-century Hungary possessed a Protestant majority. While the early years of Reformation were dominated by Lutheran theology, after the 1540s more and more students traveled to Swiss universities and more and more of the leadership of the Hungarian Protestant church was attracted to Calvinism, giving us the Hungarian Reformed Church beginning in the 1550s.

## Großwardein

It was Großwardein (Nagyvárad, modern Oradea Mare in Rumania), diocese of the Latin rite, which would generate the initial confessional document of the Protestant Reformation in Hungary. Composed of the counties of Bihar, Szilágy and parts of Békés and Szatmár, the diocese included the city of Debrecen. Biró’s influence in this region was considerable. By 1544, there

---

<sup>4</sup> Bucsay and Csepregi list two editions, both published in Krakau (1538 and 1549); cf. Mihály Bucsay and Zoltán Csepregi, “Einleitung,” *Thesen des Pfarrkonvents in Nagyvárad (Großwardein) 1544*, in Busch, *Reformierte Bekenntnisschriften*, 1/2, 1535-1549 (2006), 431, n. 4. Unglhvály suggests the title was *Explanation of the Ten Commandments* (p. 136).

were enough evangelical pastors in the area to summon a Protestant convention. At this gathering, July 20, 1544, the Nagyvárad Theses were proposed and adopted. This document appears to be the first recorded Confession of the Hungarian Reformation<sup>5</sup>. Though no author's name survives, the propositions bear the indelible stamp of Matthias Dévay Biró<sup>6</sup>.

Presiding over this diocese was Georg Utiessenovicz/Utjesenoviés-Martinuzzi (1482-1551). Martinuzzi was joined by the father superior of the Franciscans, Gergely/Georgius Szegedi, as defender of the Roman Catholic faith. (After writing in opposition to Biró, as noted above, Szegedi became a Protestant while attending Wittenberg University in 1556/57. He himself later became Reformed.) Martinuzzi was also the guardian of the young king, John Sigismund Szapolyai (1540-1571), son of Queen Isabella Jagiellon (1519-1559) and the late King John I (1487-1540). A clash between the old and the new faith was inevitable.

The match was lit by the Habsburg king, emperor Ferdinand I. On February 12, 1544, he directed a letter to the Chancellor of Hungary, Archbishop Paul/Pál Vardai (1483-1549) of Gran (Esztergom), demanding that the Archbishop together with András Báthory, his provincial prime minister, proceed against the "heretics", Matthias Dévay Biró and Gáspár Drágffy—*nec patiemur ut heresies hec [sic!] latus serpat* ("nor can we bear that these heresies slither forth more widely"). At the Diet of John Szapolyai's kingdom, meeting in Debrecen in June 1545, the nobles of his kingdom were ordered to suppress and arrest all Lutherans. Martinuzzi endorsed the threat, even asking King Ferdinand for authority to seize the widow of Gáspár Drágffy, powerful patron of Reform.

---

5 John Honter/Johann Honterus (1498-1549), so-called 'Luther of Transylvania', brought the Reformation to Siebenbürgen in the 1530s. He wrote a church order in 1542 entitled *Formula reformationis Coronensis ac Barcensis totius provinciae* ("Formula of Reformation for the whole Province of Corona [Kronstadt/Brassó, Brasov in modern Rumania] and Barcena [Barcaság in modern Rumania]"). The document was translated into German and published as *Kirchenordnung aller Deutschen in Siebenbürgen* ("Church Order for all Germans in Transylvania") in 1547. This publication was a Lutheran church polity in 19 articles and became known as "the catechism" of the Saxons in Transylvania. NB: it was not a Confession of Faith, nor a Catechism strictly so-called.

6 Cf. the full discussion in Mihály Bucsay and Zoltán Csepregi, "Einleitung," *Thesen das Pfarrkonvents in Nagyvárad (Großwardein) 1544*, in Busch, *Reformierte Bekenntnisschriften*, 1/2, 1535-1549 (2006), 428-32, esp. 431f.

## Erdőd

The threat from the Habsburg monarch and his papal lackey galvanized Peter Petrovics in reaction. As commander-in-chief of Temesvár (Temeschburg, Timișoara in modern Rumania) and friend of the Reformation, Petrovics supported the widow Drágffy in summoning the Protestant clergy from the counties of Szolnok, Szotmar, Bihar and parts of Ugocsa and Szabolcs to Erdőd (Ardud in modern Rumania). On September 20, 1545, twenty-nine evangelical pastors affixed their names to the second confession of the Protestant Reformation in Hungary. Among them were the noted Stephanus/István Kopácsi (†1562) and Andreas/András Batizi<sup>7</sup>.

It is clear that the Confession of Erdőd is anchored in the Theses of Nagyvárád (Großwardein) of 1544. No doubt, the Augsburg Confession (Variata) of 1540 has influenced the formulations. And yet, since Biró had visited Switzerland and since he had modified some of his opinions in a Helvetic direction (especially his view of the Lord's Supper), we may detect echoes of Reformed confessions of Switzerland *and* Germany in these articles.

Did the Nagyvárád Theses and its daughter, the Confession Erdőd, indicate the inception of the second wave of the Reformation in Hungary? The scholarly debate bandies back and forth on this point. Several studies have cited the letter of Leonhard Stöckel (1497-1560) to Ferenc Révai/Révai dated February 2, 1544: *Matthias videtur mediam quondam sententiam tueri* ("Matthias [Dévay Biró] seems to maintain a kind of middle opinion," i.e., on the Lord's Supper) (cited in Bucsay and Csepregi, op cit., p. 432, n. 10). Note also Luther's letter to the citizens in Prešov noted above. Later Lutheran critics of Dévay would accuse him of *cryptocalvinismus* ("crypto-Calvinism") as well as *errorem Zwingli* ("the error of Zwingli"). Is this just so much smoke, or did his detractors see the (Helvetic) heat reducing the Wittenberg Eucharistic doctrine to ashes in Hungary?

The statements at Nagyvárád and Erdőd were the beginning of numerous Hungarian Synods. At Eperjes (Eperies, Prešov in modern Slovakia) in 1546,

---

<sup>7</sup> The complete list is found in "Erdödi Első Zsinat," by Áron Kiss, *Magyar Református Zsinatok Végzése* (1881) 15. This portion of Kiss's volume also contains the text of the Erdőd Confession in Hungarian/Magyar (pp. 9-14).

a synod met to endorse the Augustana or Augsburg Confession and sixteen articles on liturgy and polity. In 1548, the Saxon cities of upper Hungary would adopt the *Confessio Heptapolitana*<sup>8</sup> (“Confession of the Seven Cities”, i.e., seven German mining towns of central upper Hungary—Banská Bystrica [Neusohl, Besztercebánya], Pukanec, Kremnica [Kremnitz, Körmöcbánya], Banská Štiavnica [Schemnitz, Selmečbánya in Slovakia], Nová Baňa, Lubi-etová, Banská Belá). This would be followed by Leonhard Stöckel’s *Confessio Pentapolitana* (or *Confessio fidei quinque liberarum regiarumque civitatem superioris Hungaricae* [“Confession of the five free and royal cities of upper Hungary”]) of 1549—also adopted by royal free Saxon cities in Upper Hungary (Bardejov [Bartfeld, Bártfa], Prešov [Eperies/Eperjes, Preschau], Košice [Kaschau, Kassa in Slovakia], Sabinov [Szeben, Kisszeben in Slovakia], Levoča [Leutschau, Lőcsa in Slovakia]). Stöckel’s text of twenty articles was actually based on the Augsburg Confession. It is likely that these strongly Lutheran documents were contextually generated, i.e., the inroads of Helvetic Reformed theology were polarizing evangelicalism as early as 1544/1545.

By the late 1550s, there was no doubt about the paradigm shift poised to capture the Hungarian evangelical church. Looming on the horizon was the man who would effectually transplant the Reformed faith to Magyar soil. Peter Melius Juhasz (1536-1572) would be converted from Lutheran to Calvinistic or Helvetic Protestantism in 1558. His pulpit in Debrecen would become the auditorium from which the clarion of Reformed theology would spread throughout Hungary. The ‘Geneva of Hungary’ (Debrecen) and the ‘Calvin of Hungary’ (Melius) would provoke a further Reformation. Tragically, a third wave would also spin forth from this vigorous Protestantism—the tritheism, Arianism and Unitarianism of the Transylvanian anti-Trinitarian movement.

---

<sup>8</sup> Also known as *Confessio Montana* of 1558 when it was republished and adopted by a Synod at Kremnitz (Körmöcbánya, Kremnica in modern Slovakia) in 1559. It was the work of Ulrich Cubicularius in response to the implementation of the Canons of the Counter-Reformation Council of Trent (1545-1563) by Archbishop Nicholas Oláh/Olahus (1493-1568) of Esztergom (Gran).

## NAGYVÁRAD THESES

### **Propositions of those who Preach the Gospel of Christ which will be Disputed at Varad on the Lord's Day following after the Holy Days of the Division of the Apostles, 1544<sup>9</sup>**

- 1.) Only faith through Christ justifies before God the Father, and love before men, that is we are justified doubly: by faith before God, by works of love before men. (All men have two judges, God and man, therefore we must be justified in two ways, by faith before God, by love before men.)
- 2.) The priesthood of Christ is eternal and perpetual. The priesthood of saints does not extend itself to another life. Chiefly Christ alone is now our priest, i.e., placater, reconciler, intercessor, before the Father for the whole church. Not dead saints.
- 3.) The one sacrifice of this same eternal priest, Christ, suffices (Heb. 10:12<sup>10</sup>), as (Nicholas of) Lyra says<sup>11</sup>, to blot out all sins which have been committed and will be committed, which Thomas (Aquinas) supports, Part 3, Question 3, Article 4, saying, “Christ not only came to blot out that sin, which has been handed down originally from our first parents to their posterity, but also to blot out all sins which have been added over and above it afterwards.”<sup>12</sup>
- 4.) Moreover what Paul says, “I fill up what is lacking of the suffering of Christ in my flesh” (Col. 1:24), is to be understood according to the analogy of Scripture, as it is by that “one oblation he has perfected the saints forever” (Heb. 10:14); likewise “Paul has not been crucified for you?” (1 Cor. 1:13).
- 5.) Our salvation, that is, remission of sins, the acceptance of our person, the

---

<sup>9</sup> The Latin text is printed in Busch, *Reformierte Bekenntnisschriften*, 1/2, 1535-1549 (2006), 435-38. See footnote 13 below for the parameters of my translation. My thanks to Dr. Frank Gumerlock for his helpful suggestions with the Latin translations.

<sup>10</sup> The citation provided in Busch's text (footnote 2, p. 435) indicates Heb. 10:14. This is clearly incorrect as the following note demonstrates.

<sup>11</sup> The gloss (b) above Heb. 10:12 (*hic autem unam pro peccatis offerens hostiam*, “but he offering one sacrifice for sins”) reads: *Christus cuius hostia sufficiens est* (“Christ whose sacrifice is sufficient”). Nicholas adds a note (<sup>9</sup>) *quae sufficit ad delendum omnem culpam commissam, & committendam* (“which suffices for blotting out all sin committed and to be committed”); cf. Nicholas of Lyra, *Biblia Sacra cum Glossa Ordinaria* (1617) 6:908. The Latin text cited by Nagyvárad reads: *ad delendam omnem culpam commissam et committendam*.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. St. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*, 3 a. 1, 4 (Blackfriars, 1976) 22-23.

gift of the Holy Spirit and life eternal, Scripture ties to no things except faith in Christ and the two symbols and signs: baptism and the Eucharist.

6.) The word “church” is understood properly and improperly. Properly “church” is said (to be) the assembly of all Christians reborn in Christ believing and trusting in the gospel of Christ and rightly using the sacraments instituted by Christ, and this (church) is universal and particular.

7.) But improperly the church is the assembly of all good and evil persons belonging to the external society holding the Word of God and rightly using the sacraments. Here also are contained hypocrites who even if they have not been reborn in Christ, nevertheless have not been defiled visibly by wickedness, nor have they been excommunicated. But those who persecute the gospel of Christ, are not even hypocritical members of the church, so far are they from the church.

8.) For the true church ought both to hear the voice of her Shepherd, according to that (passage), “my sheep hear my voice” (Jn. 10:17), and to bear witness of the whole Scripture, even as it is written: “And you will be my witnesses” (Acts 1:8). Therefore whoever does not hear the voice of Christ, but on the contrary persecutes him, and deforms his doctrine by their traditions, are witnesses neither to the church nor to Scripture.

9.) Moreover what is said, I would not have believed the gospel unless the authority of the church had influenced me, should be understood of the testimony of the true and pure church. For in the time of Augustine, the type of church, which is deformed by human traditions instituted for worship, merit and necessity, did not yet exist.

10.) But of human traditions, even if the church needs (them) for the preservation of the ministry, or that everything may be done in order in the church, nevertheless God is not worshipped by human traditions instituted for the worship of God, merit and necessity: “in vain do they worship me teaching the doctrines and commandments of men” (Mt. 15:9).

11.) Moreover the authority of the true church, which ought to be separated from the civil power which externally coerces criminals with bodily force, is great and consists in the power of order or ministry and jurisdiction, that is, in the power of excommunicating the openly shameful by the ministry of the

Word of God, and not bodily force, and in the power of receiving again those who are penitent.

12.) Therefore whoever says the power of the church (is) not in the use of the keys entrusted to Peter in the place of the whole church, but in the ordinary succession of popes and in their authority, which is extended to the living and the dead, and this without the use of the powers of true ministry, is mistaken.

13.) Whatever is required by necessity for our salvation and for good actions, all this is contained clearly, simply and exactly in sacred Scripture. Therefore we have no need for so many traditions necessary for salvation, as some would have.

14.) Repentance has three parts. Contrition, faith and good works. Contrition is not hypocritical humiliation of oneself, but rightly and from the heart becoming thoroughly terrified from a sense of sin and of the wrath of God and trembling (at) God's wrath against sin. This contrition does not so much alleviate or quiet the conscience, as it also truly drives (one) to desperation, unless he is saved by faith in the merit of the suffering of Christ. This faith exercises itself afterwards through good works of duty and mutual obedience, wherefore the division of repentance according to the papists is the repentance of Judas, not Peter.

15.) Confession is threefold: first of faith, second of love, third ecclesiastical. The confession of faith is that by which we mitigate and reconcile the wrath of God through the sacrifice of Christ. The confession of love is, that with living neighbors whom we offend either by example, or in esteem, affairs, (or) body, we should come back in grace and be reconciled to them. This twofold confession henceforth all the saints practiced from the beginning, apart from which no one at any time could be or will be saved, (and) has been commanded on both sides in sacred Scripture. Third ecclesiastical, which even if it has not been commanded in Scripture, but then for the sake of doctrine, counsel and consolation, should be received (and) retained by a pious and learned pastor, has been retained, without the scrupulous and impossible enumeration of sins.

16.) The worship of dead saints consists not in the adoration of *dulia* or *hyperdulia* or in invoking them, but in the imitation of their faith, love, duty, patience.



17.) Christian liberty has four forms. First is spiritual by which we are freed from the wrath of God, from sin, from the tyranny of Satan, from death and Hell by faith in Christ. Second, that we are consoled by the same Christ in the trials of this life. Third that we may be and may not be free from the three varieties of the Mosaic law. Fourth, that we may be and may not be free from human traditions.

18.) What should be known about true Christian fasting and the choice of foods; it can be added, namely that there should be much distinction between fasts of Christians according to those kinds commanded in Scripture and between the choice of foods not commanded in Scripture.

19.) Likewise monastic vows of celibacy, poverty and obedience, which are called “substantial vows”, can be censured here because things possible concerning matters of charity and nature, not impossibilities, should be vowed: furthermore celibacy is impossible to our powers without the grace of God, which although many have solemnly vowed in this matter, but whether they will abide by (it), they themselves will see.

20.) Wherefore it is wiser in similar conditions and states of men, who are not able to control themselves, that this impure vow of celibacy be repudiated, since it displeases God by a foolish and untrustworthy promise, (and) that they give themselves to marriage, lest they pay the penalties of their lust both here and in eternity, according to that (passage): the sexually immoral will not possess the kingdom of God (Eph. 5:5).

21.) There are two new sacraments instituted in the gospel, having the promise of the remission of sin, baptism and the Eucharist.

22.) Just as in baptism the water remains in its proper nature, through which, with the Word the Holy Spirit, is effectual for sanctification and blotting out all the guilt of the baptized, so in the Eucharist, with the bread and wine remaining in their substantial integrity, through them the Holy Spirit is effectual with the Word, so that the bread and wine are not simply bare signs, but truly (signs) of that which is signified, i.e., exhibits, communications and dispensers of the spiritual body and blood of Christ (*spiritualis corporis et sanguinis Christi*).

23.) But for the integrity of the sacrament three things are necessarily required: a promise instituted, the element and its action. And if one of these conditions

is wanting, there is no sacrament. The promise should be preached in a loud and intelligible voice. Both kinds of elements (bread and wine) ought to be present, finally the action itself, as the minister in the person of Christ hands out to the partakers, (and) the partakers eat and drink. For to eat and to drink itself is the true use of the Lord's Supper. According to that (passage): take, eat, take, drink (1 Cor. 11:24). Apart from this use when the bread and wine are secluded or when they are carried around, they should not be worshipped or be called a sacrament, but we say simply and openly (that) outside the aforementioned true use (that) is idolatrous worship of idols and the false worship of God.

24.) The sacraments are not to be worshipped, since God does not want any visible form of things to be worshipped; although by bowing down we are not worshipping the elements, but showing reverence for the Word of God.

25.) Finally because anyone at all under the peril of his salvation and the bond of eternal damnation ought to bear witness and acknowledge his faith before God to angels and men, therefore whoever either dissembles the recognized truth or is silent on whatever pretext, these also Christ himself denies in his judgment before his Father and his angels (Mt. 10:33); moreover those whom he himself will deny, are subjected to the tyranny of the Devil and will be liable to eternal damnation.

## ERDÓD CONFESSIO

### **The Articles of the Christian Confession of Erdőd drawn up in writing by the Pastors of the Hungarian Churches, September 20, 1545<sup>13</sup>**

God Most High willed that congresses of men be held in order that in their joining together he himself may be honored together with his only begotten Son and the Holy Spirit. Therefore since we have also assembled by the kindness of God, we desire, as much as is in us, to advance his glory before the eyes of the world.

<sup>13</sup> The Latin text is printed in Busch, *Reformierte Bekenntnisschriften*, 1/2, 1535-1549 (2006), 443-48. This is the text which I have translated below. I have not incorporated the variant readings found in the footnotes of this edition (except to render the alternative summaries of the Articles in parentheses at the opening of each); rather I have provided an English version of the text which the editors have featured.

## Article I

God is triune in unity (Concerning the Holy Trinity). Therefore, first of all, we confess “one God in Trinity and Trinity in unity”<sup>14</sup> according to the judgment of the orthodox fathers. But we condemn all other opinions and especially those who say that we fashion three gods out of one God. And indeed we long to hold in check such persons in order that the glory of the holy Trinity may steadfastly abide.

## Article II

Jesus (is) God, man, the one sole Mediator (Concerning the Son of God, the Sole Mediator). Likewise we confess the Lord Jesus to be true God and true man, true Priest and our sole Mediator between God the Father and us sinful men, and [we confess] him to be of a twofold nature. Therefore we condemn those who appoint as mediators saints departed from the flesh and transfer the glory of Christ the Mediator to the saints.

## Article III

Gratuitous Justification (Concerning the Justification of Sinful Man before God). We confess that justification, that is, both the remission of sins joined together with the gift of the Holy Spirit and the acceptance to eternal life, to freely belong to men by faith embracing the mercy of God on account of the merit of Christ. In fact, we condemn the self-righteous (*iustitiaros*), who ascribe justification to their works, fasts, pilgrimages, religious fraternities.

## Article IV

Faith Justifies (What and of what quality is justifying faith). We understand faith to be a gift of God, and since we declare a person to be justified by faith,

<sup>14</sup> The citation is from the Athanasian Creed; cf. lines 3 and 27 of the *Symbolum Quicumque vult* in J. N. D. Kelly, *The Athanasian Creed* (1964) 17, 19; also P. Schaff, *Creeds of Christendom*, 2:66, 68.

we understand faith not so much as historical knowledge (*notitiam*), but also as trust (*fiduciam*), by which we embrace the mercy of God and rest on the Son of God. We condemn those who say faith is acquired by human strength and understand it to be only historical knowledge.

## Article V

Good Works are Necessary (Concerning Three Reasons to what end and for what reason Good Works are to be done). Moreover although we do not ascribe justification, which is by faith alone, to good works, nevertheless we declare them to be necessary and required from the regenerated; for a good tree produces good fruits. In fact, good works are required for three reasons. First, by reason of the command and glory of God. Second, for the edification of our neighbor. Third, that we may bear witness to our faith by our good works, may keep busy and may make our calling sure. We condemn those who ascribe justification to good works, and hypocrites, who neither want to amend their life nor show their faith by good works, who only reckon themselves professors of Christ with regard to the name.

## Article VI

Baptism, the Lord's Supper takes away Sins (Two Sacred Rites: Baptism and the Lord's Supper and their Administration and Effect). In the administration of the sacraments of baptism and the Lord's Supper, we follow the institution of Christ and the early church and we confess all our sins to be taken away through baptism and the grace of God to be offered and in the Lord's Supper the body and blood of Christ to be truly exhibited beneath the bread and the wine. Moreover, we desire that the institution of Christ in both sacraments be celebrated and administered in the native language, in a manner which befits reverence, and in the same rite and form in all the churches. We condemn those who diminish original sin, and those who assert that infants are not to be baptized. Likewise we condemn the violators of the institution of Christ and the profaners of the Lord's Supper, and those who withdraw the other element (*speciem*) from the laity and the lawful use of the Lord's

Supper, and turn it into the dreadful buyings and sellings and abominations of the Mass. Likewise we condemn all blasphemers, who call this institution of Christ, which exists in our churches, a diabolical mass. Peter therefore commands that this blasphemy be addressed and that such blasphemers are to be punished (2 Pet. 2:12).

## Article VII

(Concerning the dead saints who are to be honored by the imitation of their good works, the duties of their calling and love, not by calling on them [*invocationis*]). We honor the saints departed from the flesh with the honor of imitation, that is, we do not put the confidence of our heart in them nor do we beseech their assistance; moreover we imitate their faith and the good works of their calling and love. We praise God in his saints and give thanks to him because he has set them forth as examples of mercy and faith. For we praise those saints, that they have dutifully employed the gifts of God for the edification of the church and have given forth light by their good works. We condemn those who transfer the trust owed to Christ to the saints and call on (*invocant*) them.

## Article VIII

We confess four degrees of Christian liberty (Degrees of Christian Liberty). First, that we may be free from the wrath of God, from the condemnation of the law, from (the penalty) of sin and eternal death on account of Christ. Second, (that we may be free) in the perils of the world by the Holy Spirit given to us and be sustained in all our trials, lest being overcome by the magnitude of affliction we forsake the gospel. Third, as it pertains to justification, that we are set free from all the works of the law; but as it pertains to obedience, we are not set free from morals. Fourth, we are free from all the traditions of the world, rituals and constitutions of bishops which they require as burdens of consciences, as if it is necessary for worship. The rest of their customs which are directly required as necessary to worship may be observed in Christian piety for the sake of good order. We approve observing these in Christian liberty.

## **Article IX**

(Concerning threefold Confession; and Why should Auricular Confession be retained in the Church? Regarding the three Reasons: [1] on account of Doctrine; [2] Consolation; [3] Absolution.) We assert a threefold confession, divine, fraternal and auricular. We say that the divine and fraternal are by divine right (*iuris divini*), not likewise the auricular. Moreover even if we do not require the enumeration of sins in auricular confession, partly because of the impossibility, partly because of the burden of consciences, nevertheless we think it is to be retained in the church on account of its threefold usefulness: doctrine, consolation and absolution, nor do we admit anyone to communion otherwise.

## **Article X**

(Concerning the Head of the Church, who is Christ, and the Ordinary Succession of Bishops.) Our adversaries slander us that we are without a head, leader and order. Truly we confess, Christ is in truth the head of the church, whose members we believe ourselves to be. Likewise we honor the rulers and political magistrates and from the Word of God we affectionately regard their duties and (render them) obedience in those things which do not injure the glory of God. Nor are we without order. For there is a certain order of pastors, ministers and hearers according to that (passage): he gave some apostles, pastors and teachers, lest they be carried about by every wind of doctrine (Eph. 4:11, 14). Moreover, even if we do not observe the same order everywhere in hymns and ecclesiastical songs, nevertheless in doctrine, by absolution and administration of the sacraments, we observe one order and the same rite. Nor do we differ much in celebrating festivals in this region; thus without reason are we condemned and slandered by our adversaries.

## **Article XI**

(Why do we depart from the Ordinary Succession of Bishops? From the Command of God.) Our adversaries slander us (that we) depart from the ordi-

nary succession of bishops. We do not do that without the command of God. For as often as the light of the gospel is extinguished in the ordinary succession, it is necessary to seek another doctrine, as it is said: “if anyone teaches another gospel, let him be anathema” (Gal. 1:9). Therefore we testify to God that we gladly desire to listen to bishops and to show obedience to them, provided that they do not depart from the gospel. But since they have both corrupted pure doctrine and profaned the legitimate administration of the sacraments, we must obey God rather than men (Acts 5:29). Thus we condemn those who bind the church to the ordinary succession of bishops, as if they themselves surpass by divine right (*iure divino*) other ministers of the gospel and as if the church were a human polity. Likewise we condemn those also who say that among those who have no ruling bishops by ordinary succession, ordination is null, the ministry is null, and public affairs are null, since the church has not been fixed to a certain place, or a certain succession of persons, just as Christ clearly says, when he declares: “behold here is Christ or there (he is), do not believe it” (Mt. 24:23). Likewise: “the kingdom of God does not come with observation” (Lk. 17:20), rather the church of God has been bound to the Word of God only.

## Article XII

(Consensus on the Articles of the Augustana Confession.) In the remaining articles, we agree with the true church, as it stands in the confession of faith of Augustana, presented to the most invincible ever august Emperor, Charles V.<sup>15</sup>

## Select List of Sources

Philip Benedict, *Christ's Churches Purely Reformed: A Social History of Calvinism* (2002) 271-80.

---

<sup>15</sup> This is the Augsburg Confession of 1530 as the Hungarian text indicates; cf. Kiss, *op. cit.*, 14.

Eberhard Busch et al, *Reformierte Bekenntnisschriften*. Bd. 1/2 1535-1549 (2006) 428-38 (Nagyvárad) and 439-48 (Erdőd).

David P. Daniel, "Hungary," in *The Early Reformation in Europe*, ed. by Andrew Pettegree (1992) 49-69.

"Calvinism in Hungary: the theological and ecclesiastical transition to the Reformed faith," in *Calvinism in Europe, 1540-1620* (1994) 205-30.

Denes Dienes, "Reformation in Hungary before Mohacs," in *Not Omitting the Weightier Matters*, ed. by Kent Matthews (2002) 174-91.

G. R. Elton, *The New Cambridge Modern History: The Reformation* (1958) 191-99.

R. J. W. Evans, "Calvinism in East Central Europe: Hungary and Her Neighbors," in *International Calvinism 1541-1715*, ed. by Menne Prestwich (1985) 167-86.

Hans J. Hillerbrand, ed., *The Oxford Encyclopedia of the Reformation* (1996), passim.

Peter Katalin, "Hungary," in *The Reformation in National Context*, ed. by Bob Scribner et al (1994) 155-67.

Graeme Murdock, "International Calvinism and inter-confessional relations in Transylvania," in *Proceedings of the Commission Internationale d'Histoire Ecclesiastique Comparee. Part 3: Churches and Confession in East Central Europe in Modern Times* (1999) 156-63.

"Calvinist catechizing and Hungarian Reformed identity," in *Confessional Identity in East-Central Europe*, ed. by Maria Crăciun et al (2002) 81-98.

*Calvinism on the Frontier 1600-1660: International Calvinism and the Reformed Church in Hungary and Transylvania* (2000).

B. J. Spruyt, "'En bruit d'estre bonne luteriene': Mary of Hungary (1505-58) and Religious Reform." *English Historical Review* 109 (1994): 275-307.



Istvávan György Tóth, "Old and New Faith in Hungary, Turkish Hungary, and Transylvania," in *A Companion to the Reformation World*, ed. by R. Pochia Hsia (2004) 205-20.

Kálmán D. Tóth, "The Helvetic Reformation in Hungary," in *John Calvin: His Influence in the Western World*, ed. by W. Stanford Reid (1982) 139-69.

William Toth, "Trinitarianism versus Antitrinitarianism in the Hungarian Reformation." *Church History* 13/4 (1944): 255-68.

"Highlights of the Hungarian Reformation." *Church History* 9/2 (1940): 141-56.

Alexander S. Unghváry. *The Hungarian Protestant Reformation in the Sixteenth Century under the Ottoman Impact* (1989).

George H. Williams, *The Radical Reformation* (3<sup>rd</sup> edition, 2000).

Krista Zach, "Protestant vernacular catechisms and religious reform in sixteenth-century east-central Europe," in *Confessional Identity in East-Central Europe*, ed. by Maria Crăciun et al (2002) 49-63.

## A Greater Than Solomon<sup>1</sup>

James Hamilton

It was autumn with the Hebrew commonwealth. Like withered leaves from the sapless tree, the Jews easily parted from the parent Palestine, and were blown about, adventurers in every land; and like that fungous vegetation which rushes up when nobler plants have faded, formalism and infidelity were rankly springing everywhere; and it was only a berry on the topmost bough—some mellow Simeon or Zacharias—that reminded you of the rich old piety. The sceptre had not quite departed from Judah, but he who held it was a puppet in the Gentiles' hand; and with shipless harbors, and silent oracles, with Roman sentinels on every public building, and Roman tax-gatherers in every town, patriotism felt too surely, that from the land of Joshua and Samuel, of Elijah and Isaiah, of David and Solomon, the glory was at last departing. The sky was lead, the air a winding-sheet; and every token told that a long winter was setting in. It was even then, amid the short days and sombre sunsets of the waning dynasty, when music filled the firmament, and in the city of David a mighty Prince was born. He grew in stature, and in due time was manifested to Israel. And what was the appearance of this greater than Solomon? What were his royal robes? The attire of a common Nazarene. What were his palaces? A carpenter's cottage, which He sometimes exchanged for a fisherman's hut. Who were his Ministers and his Court attendants? Twelve peasants. And what

---

<sup>1</sup> James Hamilton (1814-1867) was pastor of the Regent Square Presbyterian Church in London from 1841. A disciple of Thomas Chalmers (1780-1847), he brought this scintillating English style to his pulpit. These comments are from his book *The Royal Preacher: Lectures on Ecclesiastes* (1852) 42-44. I am indebted to Rev. Adam King for introducing me to Hamilton. Read the man for the 'King's English' as well as the grace of the King of kings. His use of language is superb!

was his state chariot? None could He afford; but in one special procession He rode on a borrowed ass. Ah! said we so? His royal robe was heaven's splendor, whenever He chose to let it through; and Solomon, in all his glory, was never arrayed like Jesus on Tabor. His palace was the heaven of heavens; and when a voluntary exile from it, little did it matter whether his occasional lodging were a rustic hovel, or Herod's halls. If fishermen were his friends, angels were his servants; and if the borrowed colt was his triumphal charger, the sea was proud when, from crest to crest of its foaming billows, it felt his majestic footsteps moving; and when the time had arrived for returning to his Father and his God, the clouds lent the chariot, and obsequious airs upbore Him in their reverent hands. Solomon's pulpit was a throne, and he had an audience of kings and queens. The Saviour's synagogue was a mountain-side—his pulpit was a grassy knoll or a fishing-boat—his audience were the boors of Galilee; and yet, in point of intrinsic greatness, Solomon did not more excel the children playing in the marketplace, than He who preached the Sermon on the Mount excelled King Solomon.

## **The Glory of the Latter Temple: A Structural and Biblical- Theological Analysis of Haggai 2:1-9**

Benjamin W. Swinburnson

The prophecies of Haggai have been recorded for us in the Bible. That may be a surprise to many pastors and scholars, for Haggai is easily overlooked. Nestled between two other obscure prophets with even more obscure names (Zephaniah and Zechariah), Haggai's prophecy appears to have been lost in the apocalyptic wilderness of the post-exilic minor prophets. It is not hard to understand why. We live in the age of the Crystal Cathedral—in a day when huge sports arenas are turned into magnificent, 30,000-seat worship centers with state of the art sound and light systems. To such a mentality, Haggai can be nothing but a miserable failure. The pagan worship centers of the sixth century B.C. undoubtedly boasted much more glorious appearances than the rearranged pile of rubble once known as the Temple of Jerusalem. How could Haggai expect to attract more exiles from Babylon when the Jews's place of worship lay in unsightly ruins? Surely post-exilic church growth suffered a death blow through Haggai's ministry! What possible relevance, therefore, could Haggai's person and ministry have for our own contemporary situation?

Indeed, Haggai's message is neglected in our day, even as the Lord's commandment to build the temple was in his own (Hag. 1:1-11). But however obscure and neglected Haggai's prophecy may be today, his message contin-

ues to have nothing less than cataclysmic relevance (Hag. 2:6, 21). All the nations of the earth, yea, even the heavens will tremble at God's theophanic presence. Though Haggai and his Israelite brothers find themselves in an age of discouragement, Haggai prophecies for them an age of abiding encouragement. Though the Temple appears to be permanent in its destruction, Haggai prophecies an age when it will be gloriously completed by means of eschatological construction. Haggai, riding upon the wings of the Spirit, flies with his fellow believing Israelites beyond the inglorious ugliness of the present temple, to the eternal glory of the latter temple.

This prophet's involvement in the careful rebuilding of Israel's temple appears to have had a profound effect upon him. Even as the bricklayers and masons carefully crafted the temple's materials into a beautiful structure, so also the prophet has carefully crafted his prophecy by means of an artistic literary arrangement. The same Spirit who gifted Bezalel and Oholiab with artistic skill and ability to build the tabernacle in the first Exodus now carries Haggai along—not only in the proclamation, but also in the orderly inscripturation of the *דְּבַר־יְהוָה* (word of the Lord).<sup>1</sup>

Anyone who has attempted a remodel knows the necessity of a thorough knowledge of a building's blueprints. While not always the most exciting kind of reading, architectural plans are crucial for understanding the basic layout of a building. The same is true of Haggai's prophecy. As we shall see, Haggai's prophesy evidences a carefully crafted literary and rhetorical structure that reinforces the theological content of his message.

## Macrostructure of Haggai's Prophecy

It is widely agreed that Haggai's prophesy is structured around four chronologically arranged dates (Hag. 1:1; 2:1; 2:10; 2:20). Each of these

---

<sup>1</sup> The text suggests an interesting antithesis between the Spirit-borne prophet and the defiled Israelites. Israel's *hands* are defiled (2:14), and apart from God's blessing and grace all of the works of her *hands* are cursed (2:17). Into this situation of hopelessness and sin comes the word of the Lord "by the *hand* of Haggai the Prophet" (1:1, 1:3, 2:1)—an expression that only appears in one other place (Mal. 1:1).

dates is accompanied with the revelatory preface: **הַנְּבִיאַ הַיְהוָה בְּיַדְהֶגַי הַנְּבִיאַ**.<sup>2</sup> Though other dates occur in the prophecy (Hag. 1:15), they lack this fairly uniform revelatory preface. The fourfold revelatory preface and date clearly suggest a fourfold macrostructure for Haggai’s prophecy.<sup>3</sup> So far our four-part structure looks like this:

1. First Date (1:1-15)
2. Second Date (2:1-9)
3. Third Date (2:10-19)
4. Fourth Date (2:20-23)

A further ABA’B’ parallel arrangement of these four parts is suggested by the following elements.<sup>4</sup> Let us examine the common elements in the AA’ section. First, each of these oracles are given a full date, while those in BB’ are abbreviated. Second, in the AA’ oracles the prophet makes allegations against “this people” (1:2; 2:14), a phrase that is absent from BB’. Third, the AA’ oracles each deal with economic distress—either drought (1:10-11) or blight, mildew, and hail (2:17, 19). In each instance, the result for the people is hard work with very little yield (1:6; 2:15). Fourth, in the AA’ oracles, the cause of this distress is the failure of the people to rebuild the temple (1:4, 8-11; 2:18-19). Fifth, each AA’ oracle uses the similar phrases **עַל־דִּרְכֵיכֶם לְבַבְכֶם** (1:5, 7) and **שִׁמּוֹנָא לְבַבְכֶם** (2:15, 18). Sixth, the parallelism between the AA’ oracles is chiasmatically reinforced by reversing the order of the dates. In the A section, the order is day-month-year (1:1), while in A’ the order reverses to year-month-day (2:10). Finally, each AA’ section is bracketed by an inclusio

<sup>2</sup> Only 2:20 lacks **הַנְּבִיאַ**

<sup>3</sup> Some have suggested a chiasmatic structure, e.g., M.H. Floyd, *Minor Prophets* (2000) 257-58. Baldwin (*Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi: And Introduction and Commentary* [1972] 35) and Peckham (*History and Prophecy: The Development of Late Judean Literary Traditions* [1993] 741) suggest a threefold structure. By contrast, Verhoef separates 1:13-15 from 1:1-12, resulting in a five-part structure (*The Books of Haggai and Malachi* [1989] 20-25).

<sup>4</sup> An ABA’B’ structure has been suggested by B.S. Childs (*Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture* [1979] 469-70), John Kessler (*The Book of Haggai: Prophecy and Society in Early Persian Yehud. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum* 91 [2002] 250-51), Eugene Merrill (*Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi—An Exegetical Commentary* [2003] 17, 19ff), and most recently Elie Assis (“Haggai: Structure and Meaning.” *Biblica* 87 [2006] 531-541). The following presentation of Haggai’s macrostructure leans heavily upon Assis, and is largely a summary of his work.

repetition of dates (1:1, 15; 2:10, 18). The parallel between the first and third oracles is clearly established by means of duplicated vocabulary, phrases, and themes, and is stylistically reinforced through the chiasmic reversal of dates.

When we examine the second and fourth oracles (BB'), a similar parallelism appears. First, the second and fourth oracles close with the phrase **נָאֵם יְהוָה יְהוּה צְבָאוֹת** (2:9; 2:23), while the first and third do not. In addition to this phraseological duplication, the rhetorical structure of each conclusion is strikingly parallel:

Haggai 2:9

גָּדוֹל יְהוָה כְּבוֹד הַבַּיִת הַזֶּה הָאֲחֵרֹן מִן־הַרְאשׁוֹן  
אָמַר יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת  
וּבְמָקוֹם הַזֶּה אֶתֵּן שְׁלוֹם  
נָאֵם יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת

Haggai 2:23

בְּיוֹם הַהוּא  
נֹאֲמֵי־יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת  
אֶקְחֶךָ זָרְבָבֶל בֶּן־שָׁאֲלֻימָל עַבְדִּי  
נֹאֲמֵי־יְהוָה  
וּשְׂמִתִּיךָ כְּחוֹתֶם כִּי־בָךְ בְּחִרְתִּי  
נָאֵם יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת

Each promise of exaltation is concluded with the phrase **נָאֵם יְהוָה** or **אָמַר יְהוָה**. In all but one instance the divine name **יְהוָה** appears in the expanded form **יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת**. Thirdly, in each of the BB' oracles, the prophet deals with the

problem of lowly status. In the second, the focus is upon the lackluster glory of the newly rebuilt temple (2:3). In the fourth, Zerubbabel's lower status is highlighted in comparison to the kings of the surrounding nations (2:21-23). Each of these oracles also speak of a transition from this lowly condition through an eschatological upheaval (2:7, 9; 2:23). In fact, each contains a clear duplicate reference to the final, cataclysmic "shaking" of the heavens and the earth (2:6 – וְאֲנִי מְרַעֵשׂ אֶת־הַשָּׁמַיִם וְאֶת־הָאָרֶץ).

We might chart the evidence supporting the ABA'B' arrangement of Haggai's prophecy as follows:

#### **A-A' (1:1-16; 2:10-19)**

1. Full dates in chiasmic order (1:1; 2:10), with inclusio bracket (1:1, 15; 2:10, 18)
2. "This people" is repeated (1:2; 2:14).
3. Economic distress (1:6; 2:15) produces little yield (1:10-11; 2:17, 19).
4. Cause: failure to rebuild the temple (1:4, 8-11; 2:18-19).
5. Repeated phrase: "give careful thought..." (1:5, 7; 2:15, 18).

#### **B-B' (2:1-9; 2:20-23)**

1. Abbreviated dates
2. Repeated conclusion: "says the LORD of Hosts" (2:9, 23)
3. Lowly condition temple/ Zerubbabel (2:3, 21-23)
4. Resolution: eschatological upheaval (2:6-7, 21-22)
5. Parallel rhetorical structure in oracle-closing (2:9, 23)

A further note must be added concerning the structural significance of the dates in Haggai's prophecy. When we examine the temporal headings to each of the four sections, a clear concentric pattern begins to emerge that appears



to reinforce our four part ABA'B' arrangement<sup>5</sup>:

A	1:1 In the second year of Darius the king	בִּשְׁנַת שְׁתַּיִם לְדַרְיוֹשׁ הַמֶּלֶךְ	A
B	in the sixth month	בְּחֹדֶשׁ הַשִּׁשִּׁי	B
C	on the first day of the month...	בְּיוֹם אֶחָד לַחֹדֶשׁ	C
C'	1:15 on the twenty-fourth day	בְּיוֹם עֲשָׂרִים וָאַרְבָּעָה	C'
B'	in the sixth month	לְחֹדֶשׁ בְּשֵׁשֶׁי	B'
A'	In the second year of Darius the King	בִּשְׁנַת שְׁתַּיִם לְדַרְיוֹשׁ הַמֶּלֶךְ:	A'
B''	2:1 In the seventh [month]	בְּשִׁבְעִי	B''
C''	On the twentieth day of the month	בְּעֶשְׂרִים נְאֻחַד לַחֹדֶשׁ	C''
C'''	2:10 In the twenty-fourth [day]	בְּעֶשְׂרִים וָאַרְבָּעָה	C'''
B'''	of the ninth [month]...	לְחֹשֶׁנִּי	B'''
A''	In the second year of Darius	בִּשְׁנַת שְׁתַּיִם לְדַרְיוֹשׁ	A''
C''''	2:20 ... In the twenty-fourth [day]	בְּעֶשְׂרִים וָאַרְבָּעָה	C''''
B''''	of the month...	לְחֹדֶשׁ	B''''

5 The chiastic-inclusio arrangement of the dates in 1:1 and 1:15 has been noted by a few scholars: Pieter Verhoef, "Notes on the Dates in the Book of Haggai," in *Text and context: Old Testament and Semitic Studies for F.C. Fensham* (1988), 262. C.L. Meyers & E.M. Meyers, *Haggai, Zechariah 1-8* (1987) 36. Frank Yeadon Patrick, *Haggai and the Return of YHWH* (Ph. D. Dissertation, Duke University, 2006), 107-108. To my knowledge, no one has argued for the more comprehensive chiastic patterning I am proposing here.

From 1:1-2:10, the first three headings are clearly arranged in a concentric pattern. The first concentric series (1:1, 15) duplicates itself almost exactly, giving a full description of each element of the date.<sup>6</sup> In 2:1, 10, the same concentric pattern of year-month-day-day-month-year continues, though some specific elements begin to drop out.<sup>7</sup> Furthermore, in 2:1, 10, the numerical balance characteristic of 1:1, 15 disappears.<sup>8</sup> However, in the final pericope, the pattern seems to dissolve. In fact, a gradual dissolution of the pattern can be discerned, which is illustrated in the following table:

	Concentric pattern to dates	Darius mentioned	Full Dates	Darius described as "king"	Full Dates with full description	Concentric inclusio delimiting section	Numerical balance in concentric parallelism
1:1, 15	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
2:1	X						
2:10	X	X	X				
2:20							

As the prophet moves from A (1:1-15) to A" (2:10-19) more than half the common elements drop out: the concentric parallelism begins to gradually unravel. When we come to the B (2:1-9) and B' (2:20-23), the concentric pattern breaks down completely. Not only does the concentric date-pattern fall out of synch, but the revelatory preface "the word of the Lord came...by the hand of Haggai" precedes the date, in contrast to 1:1; 2:1; 2:10, where the revelatory preface follows it. All that these two sections share in common is the mere date of the prophecy. Has the otherwise careful literary hand of Haggai the prophet slipped up here, or is there a deeper purpose behind this literary arrangement?

6 The one exception to this is 1:15a, where the  $\text{שְׁהַיְלֵי}$  of 1:1c drops out. However, this change is not without reason. When the day changes from first to the twenty-first, in order to maintain the numerical lexical balance of the first concentric series in 1:1, 15 (4 words [A], 2 words [B], 3 words [C])  $\text{שְׁהַיְלֵי}$  had to be dropped.

7 Note the absence of  $\text{לִיְהוָה}$  in B" and B'",  $\text{בְּיָמָיו}$  in C" and C'", as well as the description of Darius as  $\text{הַמֶּלֶךְ}$  in A".

8 Note how C" has only two words because of the absence of the  $\text{שְׁהַיְלֵי}$  found in C'. Furthermore, because of the absence of  $\text{הַמֶּלֶךְ}$ , A" has only three words, compared with the four words of A'.

In order to answer that question, we must first briefly note that Haggai's dates differ dramatically from those of the earlier prophets. Other prophets who provided dates for their prophecies (Isaiah, Jeremiah, Hosea, Amos, Micah, and Zephaniah) did so with reference to the reign of the kings of Judah and Israel. Haggai (and Zechariah, his contemporary) date their prophecies in terms of the regnal years of the Persian king, Darius. The shift in temporal markers is clearly indicative of a redemptive-historical shift from the era of the Monarchy to the era of the Exile. Even returned Israel is not yet fully delivered from her exile! She is still defined by the regnal year of the Persian kings!

Secondly, the progressive dissolution of Haggai's dating-pattern also seems indicative of another redemptive-historical shift. The prophesy begins with the regnal years of Darius the king chiastically bracketing the entire chapter. Even as Israel is surrounded by the rule of the Persians, so also the first chapter of Haggai's prophesy is surrounded by Darius. Darius defines and delimits Israel's present history in chapter 1. However, when we move to chapter 2:1-9, Darius' temporal bracket begins to break down. In the chapter in which Haggai begins his eschatological projection of Israel's glorious future, no mention is made of the regnal year of King Darius. The eschatological future of Israel transcends and surpasses Israel's temporal dilemma. As the light of the new age breaks forth upon Israel, Darius's dominance diminishes—he isn't even mentioned! However in 2:10, Darius's name returns as Haggai highlights Israel's present uncleanness. However, Darius does not occupy the comprehensive position he did in chapter 1. Moreover, he is no longer described as הַמֶּלֶךְ as he was in 1:1, 15. The ending of 2:10-19 does not remind us of Darius's present reign, but rather the hope of future blessing (2:19). Finally, in 2:20, "time is out of joint": the chiastic pattern is broken completely. Darius isn't even mentioned. In his place is a twofold reference to Zerubbabel, governor of Judah/my servant. In contrast to chapter 1 (where Darius's regnal year served as the literary bracket), Zerubbabel brackets the entire final pericope (2:21a, 23b). In Darius' place stands another ruler—Zerubbabel, governor of Judah, servant of the Lord—whom God will make his own signet ring. There will be no more rule of Darius the Persian in the eschatological age! God will overthrow him and his kingdom when he eschatologically shakes the heavens and the earth (2:21b-22).

To bring our discussion back to our broader macrostructure, Haggai's

dates not only reinforce our ABA'B' structural proposal, but also reinforce the theological significance of that structure. In the A section, Darius brackets Israel (1:1, 15). In the A' section, Darius is mentioned, but has begun to lose his prominence (2:10). But in the B (2:1) and B' (2:20) sections of eschatological projection, Darius is nowhere to be found! Hence Haggai's dates are not only structural markers, but a literary device reflective of the redemptive-historical progression of Israel's hope of freedom from temporal exilic slavery in the eschatological future. Their progressively unraveling concentric pattern points us to the eschatological thrust of Haggai's prophesy. Israel is moving from temporal crisis (1:1-15; 2:10-19) to eschatological renewal (2:1-9, 20-23); from the temporal reign of Darius the king (1:1, 15) to the eschatological reign of the Messianic servant of the Lord prefigured in Zerubbabel (2:10, 21, 23).

Far from evidencing the hand of a clumsy editor who mindlessly pasted together isolated prophetic units, this macrostructure beautifully reveals the magnificent literary genius of the inspired prophet. Drawing upon a multitude of rhetorical and literary devices and techniques, Haggai presents us with a tightly concatenated oracle of prophetic and artistic literary splendor.

## **Haggai 2:1-9**

Having established the broad contours of Haggai's superstructure, we now turn our attention specifically to Haggai 2:1-9. As we have seen in our study above, each B section is marked by the revelation of a cataclysmic eschatological upheaval in which the distress of the previous section finds its ultimate resolution. In the first AB section (1:1-15; 2:1-9), the distress is centered upon Israel's failure to rebuild the temple. Having responded positively to Haggai's initial prophetic discourse, the people now find themselves disappointed and dismayed over the lackluster character of their work. Haggai brings the word of the Lord to encourage them—a word that climaxes in the prophetic projection of an eschatological upheaval which will result in the construction of a temple far more glorious than they could have ever imagined!

Even as Haggai's prophesy as a whole evidences an artfully crafted macrostructure, so Haggai 2:1-9 demonstrates a carefully arranged rhetorical microstructure. The first half of Haggai's third oracle (2:1-4) is dominated by

a series of “threes.” We begin with a threefold imperative directed to the king, priests, and people of Israel (2:2—note the repetitive לְאֵל). This is followed by three rhetorical questions about the former splendor of the temple (2:3—marked by a threefold interrogative: מִי, וְגִוָּה, and הֲלֹא־). In verses 4-5 we have a threefold address to the threefold group, which is marked by the “strong” threefold repetition of an imperative (קַח־). When we add up the subunits, we are left with a total number (surprise!) of three! The threefold ternary pattern literally jumps off the revelatory page! The following arrangement of these verses in English makes this very clear:

Speak now

- (1) to Zerubbabel the son of Shealtiel, governor of Judah,
- (2) and to Joshua the son of Jehozadak, the high priest,
- (3) and to the remnant of the people saying,

- (1) Who is left among you who saw this temple in its former glory?
- (2) And how do you see it now?
- (3) Does it not seem to you like nothing in comparison?

- (1) ‘But now take courage, Zerubbabel,’ declares the Lord,
- (2) ‘take courage also, Joshua son of Jehozadak, the high priest,
- (3) and all you people of the land take courage,’ declares the Lord<sup>9</sup>

In addition to the general threefold pattern of Haggai 2:2-3, we also note the concentric orientation of the prophet’s rhetorical arrangement. This concentric orientation is most clearly seen in the way the prophet “sandwiches” the three rhetorical questions in verse 3 between the threefold mention of Zerubbabel, Jehozadak, and the people in verses 2 and 4. The prophet is artistically drawing our attention to the central focus of this oracle: the inglorious condition of the present temple. In addition, it is possible that these verses are organized in a more complex concentric arrangement<sup>10</sup>:

<sup>9</sup> Hag. 2:2-3 (NASB)

<sup>10</sup> We use the term “concentric arrangement” rather than “chiasm” because verses 2-3 lack the clear lexical duplications characteristic of true chiasms. Our concentric arrangement is based upon the following broad parallels. First, verses 2a and 4c both make mention of an ad-

Zerubbabel—governor of the land of Judah (2:2a)  
Joshua son of Jehozadek the high priest (2:2b)  
Remnant of people—no description (2:2c)

Question: comparison of former and latter temples (2:3a)  
Question: disappointment of the now (2:3b)  
Question: comparison of former and latter temples (2:3c)

Zerubbabel—no description (2:4a)  
Joshua son of Jehozadek the high priest (2:4b)  
People of the land (2:4c)

The purpose of such an organization is not difficult to see. By means of the concentric arrangement the reader is pressed down into the central concern of the governor, priest, and people: the present (עַתָּה) dilemma of the inglorious temple. In other words, Israel is faced with the dilemma of an apparently unrealized eschatology! The present temple, whose glory was expected to far surpass that of the former, now appears as nothing in their eyes. Israel's focus is on the visible and the seen. Notice the repetition of visual/optical terminology in 2:3: **רָאֵה, רֵאִים, בְּעֵינֵיכֶם**. While Israel's discouragement flows out of her focus on the visible, God's prophetic encouragement will come through directing them to the invisible: the Exodus-Spirit abiding in their midst, and the eschatological cataclysm to come.

When we come to verses 2:4bff, there is an apparent break in the previously established threefold pattern. The transition from 4 to 5 at first seems so difficult that some have argued that it is obvious evidence of editorial interpolation.<sup>11</sup> However, close analysis of the text reveals the same kind of nuanced patterning present in verses 1-4.

Haggai 2:4 contains two occurrences of the phrase **נְאֻם־יְהוָה**. Some crit-

---

dressee described in reference to his relationship to the land (governor/inhabitants). Second, 2b and 4b are exact duplicates in their description of the priest: **יְהוֹשֻׁעַ בֶּן־יְהוֹזָדָק הַכֹּהֵן הַגָּדוֹל**. Third, 2c and 4c are parallel in that they each mention an addressee without any expansive description (note the contrast between the description of Zerubbabel in 4a and 2a!). Fourth, 3a and 3c are parallel in that each question asks the hearer to compare the former and latter temples. In 3a, the comparison is explicit, in 3c it is implied.

11 Hans Walter Wolff, *Haggai: A Commentary* (1988) 72.

ics have argued that this is a clumsy arrangement, but it actually serves two important literary purposes: (1) to clearly delimit 2:4 as a subunit; (2) to draw the reader’s attention to the priest-figure of Joshua, Son of Jehozodak.<sup>12</sup> We might structure this subunit as follows:

- A – Zerubbabel + נְאֻם־יְהוָה
- B – Joshua the high priest
- A’ – All the people of the land + נְאֻם יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת

The high priest is thus enfolded between two explicit revelatory declarations. In a pericope and prophecy that is devoted to the cultic arena (temple), it is not surprising that Haggai chooses to centrally highlight Joshua the priest! Our apparent editorial klutz turns out to be a structural and literary genius! The absence of an explicit revelatory declaration with Joshua makes him the structural focus, reinforcing the prophet’s theological focus on the rebuilding of the temple.

Furthermore, the final revelatory declaration (נְאֻם יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת) serves as a hook to the final subunit in 2:6-9, which is structured by a recurring repetition of נְאֻם יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת followed by אָמַר יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת (2:7c; 2:8b; 2:9b; 2:9d). In other words, Haggai concludes the first half of this section with the structural marker that will dominate the second section, thus tightly binding them together as one holistic unit. Far from evidencing a clumsy editor, Haggai 2 presents the reader/listener with a finely tuned rhetorical and literary structure. Like any good piece of literature (or architecture!), its independent units are unique and distinct, yet are linked by clear structural markers.<sup>13</sup>

Finally, if we take 2:1-2 as an introductory formula, the message proper

---

12 Wolff actually argues that 2:4b “can certainly be assigned to the editorial additions of the Haggai Chronicler” (73), but this is entirely unnecessary. Wolff’s comment is very strange, in view of the fact that he otherwise accepts the literary integrity of Haggai 2:1-9. The myopic eyes of critical-liberal fundamentalism apparently cannot see beyond their own paradigm—it *must* be imposed *somewhere* on the text!

13 In addition to the fourfold revelatory declaration (“thus says the Lord”), we note further that this subunit is delimited by the strong כִּי עַתָּה (“for thus...”) of 2:6 which serves to introduce a new section. Furthermore, though the revelatory declaration occupies the final position in each verse (2:7, 8, 9b, 9d), it also opens the subunit (2:6a) and thus brackets the entire section.

of 2:3-9 may form a chiasm<sup>14</sup>:

A - 2:3 – Present glory of the temple compared with former glory  
of the temple (אֶת־הַבַּיִת הַזֶּה בְּכְבוֹדוֹ הַרְאִישׁוֹן)  
B – Israelites, Judah – (2:4)  
X – Presence of Glory-Spirit with Israel (2:4c-5)  
B' – Heavens, earth, all nations, all nations! – 2:5-7  
A' - 2:9 – Present and former glory of the temple compared with  
the latter glory (כְּבוֹד הַבַּיִת הַזֶּה הַאֲחֵרוֹן מִן־הַרְאִישׁוֹן)

A and A' provide clear semantic links. Yet they also indicate an expansion, enrichment, and growth.<sup>15</sup> Thus B and B', though lacking clear lexical connections, may nevertheless be coordinated by means of the expanded chiasmic paradigm: Israel, what is more all nations; Land of Judah, what is more the heavens and the earth! The Pneumato-centric hinge of the chiasm (X) is thus the abiding presence of the Spirit amongst God's people. The central focus on the Spirit's presence becomes the hinge of the transition reflected in Haggai's prophesy. 2:5 begins with a retrospective reflection upon the promise of God in the Exodus, moves to a reinforcement of the Spirit's present presence in Israel (2:5), and finally to an eschatological projection of the Glory-Spirit in the latter temple (2:6-7).

---

14 A similar chiasm based upon prosodic rhythmic structure has been proposed by Duane Christensen, "Impulse and Design in the Book of Haggai." *JETS* 35:4 (Dec. 1992): 454. Cf. J. Alec Motyer's proposal in *The Minor Prophets*, ed. McComiskey (1998) 986. Not surprisingly, David Dorsey has also suggested a chiasm here: *The Literary Structure of the Old Testament* (1999) 316.

15 As James Kugel, J.P. Fokkelman, and Robert Alter have shown, all Hebrew parallelism is characterized by expansion and growth rather than mere repetition (contra Lowth). They have formulated this principle in the following way: "A, what is more B." Let us take Is. 49:23b as an example:

A – With their faces to the ground they shall bow down to you  
B – They shall lick the dust of your feet

The B-colon doesn't simply duplicate the A-colon, but rather enriches it. The humiliation of Israel's enemies is deeply intensified as they "bow their faces to the ground" and "lick the dust of their feet." For further discussion see Kugel, *The Idea of Biblical Poetry* (1981). Alter, *The Art of Biblical Poetry* (1985) 3-26. Fokkelman, *Reading Biblical Poetry: An Introductory Guide* (2001) 24-30, 61-86. What they apply to parallelism between cola, I am applying to parallelism within chiasmus.



## Biblical-Theological Analysis

This prophetic projection of the eschatological glory of the final temple comes to a people who have re-experienced the thrill of freedom from bondage. Even as Israel was redeemed from the bondage of Egypt in the former era, she now finds herself in the midst of a new liberation. The reversal of slavery to freedom in the Exodus which had been reversed in the bondage of Babylonian exile has now been reversed once again in the post-exilic returns. Ever since the decree of Cyrus the Great in 538/7 B.C., a group of exiles were experiencing a new exodus—from bondage, from curse, and from sin—even as God had promised in the law (Lev. 26:40-45)<sup>16</sup> and in the early prophets (Is. 43:16ff; Hos. 2:14-15, etc.).

Upon their return, the first order of business was the reconstruction of the temple. In the seventh month, they first built an altar to the Lord and celebrated the Feast of Tabernacles (Ezra 3:1ff). By the second month of the second year, the reconstruction of the temple proper had begun (Ezra 3:8ff). Yet it was becoming evident (particularly to the older Israelites) that there remained something lackluster in this rearranged pile of rubble (Ezra 3:11-13). Indeed, there was something bittersweet about this new exodus—a mixture of joy *and* weeping (Ezra 3:12).

Yet more was added to this already displeasing mixture—the even bitterer oppression of the surrounding foreign nations (Ezra 4). Having been freed (twice over!) in Exodus-liberation from bondage to foreign oppressors, they appeared to be in bondage all over again to the manipulating “people of the land” who forcibly stopped the work on the new temple. Into this historical context come the prophetic messages of Zechariah and Haggai (Ezra 5:1; 6:14). Not surprisingly, each prophet deals extensively with the building of the temple.

---

<sup>16</sup> The promise of God in Leviticus 26:40-45 is evidence of the preeminently gracious character of the Mosaic administration. God doesn't simply bring Israel back from exile in spite of the principle of the Mosaic administration, but rather the promise of forgiveness and return is constitutive of it. The return is not grounded simply on the remembrance of God's covenant with Abraham (Lev. 26:42), but with the gracious covenant he made with the Israelites at Sinai (Lev. 26:45; cf. Hag. 2:4-5). For Haggai, the Exodus covenant does not stand in antithetical contrast to the eschatological future. Rather, it is protologically constitutive for the fullness of the grace of the Spirit's presence in the age to come.

One further note must be added concerning the historical context of Haggai's prophecy. As previously noted, his oracle comes during the Feast of Tabernacles (Hag 2:1; Lev. 23:34, 36; Num. 29:12).<sup>17</sup> This festival was a great reminder that Israel was always to be a congregation of pilgrims (Lev. 23:43)—sojourning in tabernacle-temples, even as God dwelt among them in the tent in the wilderness. The earth (particularly Canaan) was not their true home. By means of the feast, the Israelites would re-actualize the wilderness-experience in their midst. Though settled in the land, they were people longing for a better country—that is, a heavenly one (Heb. 11:16). They were people longing for a better temple—one not made with hands, established in the heavens. All of their dwelling places on earth, however permanent they may have seemed, were only temporary campsites. The Feast of Tabernacles thus provides a dramatic redemptive-historical backdrop reminding them of the impermanence of all earthly worship centers.

Indeed, as Israel works to build the Lord's house, constant reminders of impermanence and transience are all around them. Though Israel expected an abiding permanence as she returned from exile, all the provisionality of the former era comes sweeping down upon them. Into this arena of decay and dejection comes the prophecy of Haggai 2:1-9. This existential movement from dejection to prophetic hope is reinforced by the broad ABA'B' macro-structure of Haggai's prophecy. As noted above, the A sections set forth the people's present distress, and the B sections proclaim encouragement through eschatological resolution.

The temple stands at center stage in Haggai's prophecy as it is couched within a retrospective and prospective redemptive-historical dynamic.<sup>18</sup> Retrospectively, the prophecy reaches back to the first Exodus. The exhortation to be strong and work is grounded (יָסַד) in the promise of God in the first

---

17 Interestingly, during the time of Ezra-Nehemiah (of which the prophecy of Haggai is a part) the feast was observed in a way it had not been since the days of Joshua (Neh. 8:17). Though Neh. 8:18 seems to indicate that the feast had not been kept at all from Joshua to Nehemiah, we know from Chronicles that Solomon observed it (1 Kings 8:2; 2 Chron. 7:8; 8:13). In fact, Ezra 3:4 states that the returned exiles kept the Feast of Tabernacles upon their return in 538/7. The prophecy of Haggai 2:1-9 comes in 520, and would thus reflect the reestablished practice among the returned Israelites.

18 We do not intend in any way to impose this dynamic upon Haggai's prophesy. Indeed, Haggai's own terminology and vocabulary suggests it. Note especially the correlation of הָרָאִשׁוֹן (2:3, 9) and הָאֶרֶץ (2:9).

Exodus: “for (אֲנִי) I am with you... according to the covenant that I made with you when you came out of Egypt” (Hag. 2:4-5). The protological shaking of the earth at Sinai (Hag. 2:6) also provides the retrospective backdrop for Haggai’s projection of Israel’s future possession of the nations. Furthermore, the mention of the “former glory” of the temple (Hag. 2:3, 9) links the prophecy back to the “glory days” of David and Solomon, when the temple’s beauty and splendor were at their height.

All of this is brought to bear upon Israel’s existential present. As she contemplates her faded glory, the prophet addresses himself directly to Israel’s present situation (note the doubled emphasis on עַתָּה [“now”] in 2:3, 4). She is directed not only to her glorious past, but also to the semi-eschatological down-payment of the Glory-Spirit (2:5), which is structurally central to Haggai’s prophesy. In other words, as she despairingly compares the glory of the former and present temples, she is directed not only to what Yahweh will do in the future, but also to the present intrusion of that reality in her midst. Even as Israel is beckoned to continue work on the typological temple, she is also invited to look beyond its inglorious condition to the temple of the Glory-Spirit that is already invisibly present within her. Old Testament Israel already has vital contact with the life-giving Spirit of the age to come!

Against this retrospective redemptive-historical background, as well as the dilemma of Israel’s present situation, Haggai prospectively projects Israel’s eschatological future. If Israel was brought out of Egypt in ancient times, in the eschatological age there will be a new exodus in which Israel will be freed from foreign bondage.<sup>19</sup> If David and Solomon built a glorious temple that now lies in ruins and stripped of its treasure, God will build an eschatological temple with treasures from all nations. If God caused the earth to shake at Sinai when the final day intruded upon Israel in the wilderness, so in the final day God will shake not only the earth, but also the heavens in eschatological upheaval (cf. Heb. 12:25-29).<sup>20</sup> If Israel’s present is characterized by strife and battle with

19 The language of Hag. 2:21-22 is also indicative of a new exodus motif. The projected overthrow of “horse and rider” and “chariot” recalls the Song of Miriam and the Song of the Sea (Ex. 15:1, 21). The overturning of the royal thrones and power of the nations also recalls the overthrow of Pharaoh in the protological Exodus (cf. Ex. 15:4).

20 The typological connection between the Sinai theophany and the eschatological upheaval is explicit in Haggai—note the phrase “once more” (2:6). This is obviously an antecedent reference to the Exodus event mentioned in 2:5, thus clearly correlating the two events. Haggai’s theophanic eschatology is reinforced by the other prophets (Jer. 23:7-8; Is. 63:11-12; Mal. 4:1)

the foreign nations, there will come a day when there will be no more battle, but peace—through the bringer of Peace who is to come (Hag. 2:9).

This universalistic emphasis is further reinforced by the chiasmic hinge created by the BB' sections of Haggai's prophesy (2:4, 5-7). As Haggai's tripartite address to Israel's king, priest, and people turns upon the central hinge of the Spirit, the door of redemptive history becomes opened to the *nations*. Haggai's literary and rhetorical structure is reflective of the movement of redemptive history—from Israel, to the outpouring of the Spirit, to the inpouring of the nations! The Spirit, whose glory is at the center of the latter age, knows no distinction between Jew and Greek.

Yet not only the Spirit, but particularly the Christ will be found on center stage in this glory-arena. Even as Israel's king, priest, and people work to build the protological second temple, there will come an eschatologically Spirit-filled king, priest, and people who will work to build the semi-eschatological temple in the fullness of time. Jesus is the eschatological king—son of Zerubbabel (whose name means “seed of Babylon”) and son of the exile (Mt. 1:12-13, 16). Jesus, not Darius, is King of kings in the eschatological age!<sup>21</sup> Jesus-Joshua is the eschatological high priest who ministers in the heavenly temple (Zech. 3; Heb. 4:14-5:10; Heb. 7-9). Jesus is the eschatological people of God, who will inaugurate in himself a new exodus (Mt. 2:13-15; Lk. 9:31). Jesus is the eschatological temple-builder, who will raise up his temple-body three days after it has been destroyed (John 2:18-22).

But it does not stop there. For Jesus comes as the foundation of the eschatological temple (1 Cor. 3:11; Eph. 2:20-22), which will by no means remain bare, empty, and unfinished. Upon the foundation of Jesus is built the temple of the church, which is being made into a dwelling place of God by the Spirit (Eph. 2:25). The apostle Paul was very conscious of his own participation in this temple-building work. Even as the presence of God's Spirit among the

---

who speak of the future in terms of the Mosaic period. Psalm 68:8 and 77:16-17 both speak of the theopanic “shaking” of the earth at Sinai. The New Testament (Heb. 12:18-29) ties these prophetic strands together in drawing a parallel between Sinai/Zion, explicitly referencing Hag. 2:6-7, and making reference to God as a consuming fire (Heb. 12:29; Deut. 4:24). Cf. Geerhardus Vos, *The Eschatology of the Old Testament*, ed. James T. Dennison, Jr. (2001) 105-6.

21 Compare Haggai's prophesy with the famous Behistun inscription in which Darius explicitly uses this language (Column I, Line 1): “\ adam \ Dārayavauš \ xšāyathiya \ vazraka \ xšāyatha \ xšāyathiy” (I am Darius, the great king, king of kings).

protological temple-builders became the ground for Haggai's exhortation to work heartily, so also the Spirit's presence in the semi-eschatological temple becomes the ground for the Paul's exhortation to the church to be built up through faithful preaching and church discipline (1 Cor. 3:16; 6:19-20).

The apostle Peter also reflects this consciousness of being a participant in God's work of temple-building. He addresses the church as living stones of a spiritual house to be a holy priesthood to offer spiritual sacrifices to God through Christ (1 Pet. 2:4). This temple is built upon Jesus Christ as the foundation (2:6-8). In Christ Jesus, the eschatological Israel and priest-king, the church too becomes a royal priesthood and a holy nation to proclaim his praises for the new Exodus accomplished in him (2:9-10).

Haggai 2:1-9 proclaims new things to come: a new Exodus, a new Temple, a new return from exile, and a new age in which Christ and the Spirit alone occupy the central place. The apostles were conscious that even as these new things had broken in upon them in the semi-eschatological age, they would also be available to all those in the coming age who would be united to Christ by faith. As the faithful of God survey the apparently barren landscape of the modern Temple-Church and are tempted to shrink back in despair and dejection, they would do well to revisit Haggai's prophecy of the glory of the latter temple. For that temple is being built *now* upon the foundation of the collective witness of the apostles and prophets, with Christ Jesus himself as the chief cornerstone (Eph. 2:20). She may be afflicted, perplexed, persecuted, and struck down, but she will never be crushed, driven to despair, forsaken, or destroyed. Having been made to possess the semi-eschatological indicative of the Spirit's latter glory through union with Christ, she must heed the semi-eschatological imperative of Haggai to those who await the consummate perfection of God's glory-temple: "Work, for I am with you, declares the Lord of Hosts, according to the covenant that I made with you when you came out of Egypt. My Spirit remains in your midst. Fear not!" For how can they be afraid? God will build his temple-church—even the very gates of hell will not prevail against her! She only awaits the consummation of her already inaugurated hope—a hope projected in Haggai, and beautifully portrayed in its fulfillment by the apostle John:

And I saw no temple in the city, for its temple is the Lord

God the Almighty and the Lamb. And the city has no need of sun or moon to shine on it, for the glory of God gives it light, and its lamp is the Lamb. By its light will the nations walk, and the kings of the earth will bring their glory into it, and its gates will never be shut by day—and there will be no night there. They will bring into it the glory and the honor of the nations. (Revelation 21:21-26, ESV)

BWHEBB, BWHEBL, BWTRANSH [Hebrew]; BWGRKL, BWGRKN, and BWGRKI [Greek] Postscript® Type 1 and TrueTypeT fonts Copyright © 1994-2006 BibleWorks, LLC. All rights reserved. These Biblical Greek and Hebrew fonts are used with permission and are from BibleWorks, software for Biblical exegesis and research. This copyright must be displayed and preserved when distributing this article.

[K:NWTS 23/1 (May 2008) 47]

## Past and Present

James T. Dennison, Jr.

I came despoiled, dis-graced  
Marred, polluted, caked in dust.  
Inside earth-shackled; soiled with guilt;  
No sentence but—death!

You took from me what I could best relinquish:  
Chains—broken; filthiness—disrobed.  
Yes, take completely!

What mars Thee there? Nails and thorns.  
What rob(b)ed Thee there? Shroud and tomb.

Thou, Lamb—last of all—best of all!  
*Iesus pro me!*

What marks Thee there? Light and glory.  
What clothes Thee there? Life and resurrection.

You placed on me linen-white, radiant-light,  
Righteousness-ropes; guiltless.  
Yes, give completely!

I left restored, upright  
Molded, adorned, dust reborn.  
Outside new risen; draped with glory,  
No sentence but—life!

## The Apocalypics of the Hungarian Puritans

Eve Alice Petrőczy<sup>1</sup>

Following the era of Heidelberg orthodoxy, young Hungarians began to be interested in Puritan ideas; this led to a basic change in their mentality. Both the authors of the Catholic Baroque and Puritan writers were putting stress upon the fate of individuals, upon possible ways leading to redemption and upon the punishment of sins in Purgatory, instead of (with some exceptions) discussing the history of the nations and the apocalyptic last days of the world.

To concretize the matter: after the Thirty Years' War (1618-1648), Hungarian students visited the Dutch and English universities of Groeningen, Franeker, Utrecht, Hardervijk, Amsterdam and Cambridge. Their stay in England was usually much shorter than in the Netherlands.<sup>2</sup>

The historical, political and ecclesiastical evaluation of the Netherlands and England changed significantly in our country from the end of the 16th century. From a small country, we reached the happy status of stability on a torn and wounded continent. F. Ernest Stoeffler's basic work summarizes all of these

---

1 Eve Alice Petrőczy, Ph. D., Dr. Habil., is Associate Professor and Head of the Department of English Speaking Cultures at the Karoli Gaspar University of the Hungarian Reformed Church in Budapest. She is the author of more than 90 articles and books, as well as numerous Conference presentations.

2 For more about this phase of the Hungarian peregrination, see Joseph Bodonhelyi's basic work, *Az angol puritanizmus lelki élete és magyar hatásai* (Debrecen, 1942) (*English Puritanism, Its Spiritual Life and Influence Upon Hungary*); or Stephen Ágoston, *The Roots of Hungarian Puritanism* (Budapest: Kálvin Kiadó, 1997).



events brilliantly, if rather briefly. To Dutch or even English and German ears, the details of these events sound like evidences, but—as a sign of our homage after centuries to all the foreign nations which gave an intellectual shelter to our students—let me quote its most important passage concerning the local color of everyday religious life in the Low Countries. “The Union of Utrecht was established in 1579 and included the provinces of Geldern, Zuthpen, Holland, Zeeland, Utrecht, Friesland and Ommelanden. Catholics which had been living in these provinces now migrated to the south where the Duke of Parma had succeeded in welding together the political unity which is now Belgium. Protestants within the ten southern provinces migrated north. The result was an almost solidly Protestant and dominantly Calvinistic state which finally achieved complete autonomy at the end of the Thirty Years’ War.

After these struggles for freedom the enterprising Netherlanders forged ahead on every front. Their seamen traversed the oceans of the world. Along with England they established colonies in various sections of the globe. Relative stability at home and a flourishing trade in the world market brought increasing prosperity. During the seventeenth century while England was torn by internal strife and civil war and central Europe was devastated and depopulated by the Thirty Years’ War the Netherlanders lived in peace and prosperity. Feeling secure in their way of life they could afford the luxury of permitting occasional deviation, being sure of the strength of domestic Calvinism they could grant religious toleration without fear, being economically favored they could give themselves to the pleasure of intellectual and cultural pursuits. Under these favorable conditions the Netherlands of the seventeenth century developed rapidly into the intellectual center of the world.”<sup>3</sup>

This solidity and smoothness of Dutch life is reflected in the career of the number one tutor of our Hungarian students in theology. He was the Anglo-Dutchman, William Ames (1576-1633), an almost Melancthon-like spiritual father, a *magister perpetuus* of this scholarly circle.<sup>4</sup> Ames was born in Norfolk, England, and educated by William Perkins (1558-1602) at Christ’s College, Cambridge. His greatest enemy, Archbishop Richard Bancroft (1544-1610), forced him to leave his native country. He found shelter, a second home and a

---

3 F. Ernest Stoeffler, *The Rise of Evangelical Pietism* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1971) 111.

4 See my article “Some Features to the Portrait of William Ames,” in my book *Puritans and Puritanicals* (Budapest: Balassi Publishing House, 2005).

position at the University of Franeker. There he filled the chair of professor of divinity for twelve years (1622-1634) and wrote his famous, epoch-marking textbook, *The Marrow of Divinity* (*Medulla Sacrae Theologiae*). Its opening sentence reads: *Theologia est doctrina Deo vivendi* (“Theology is the doctrine of living to God”). Another oft-quoted sentence from this remarkable work is: *Fides est acquiescentia cordis in Deo* (“Faith is the resting of the heart in God”).<sup>5</sup>

Even these short Amesian fragments prove the truth of American church historian, William Haller, who called the Puritan writers the “physicians of the soul”.<sup>6</sup> In other words, the main purpose of the Puritan books of conduct (Dutch, English and Hungarian ones) was not to frighten, nor to shock the readers, but to tranquilize them with numerous instructions in the godly life. They wrote very systematically, dividing their material into logical chapters and sub-chapters. The hysterical tone of Melanchthonian apocalypticism seemed to have ceased forever. But the history of Hungary was apocalyptic enough to press out some quasi-apocalyptic themes even from the most calm, the most Amesian, the most physician-like authors of our 17th century.

It happened in this way in the case of the oeuvre of the leading author of the period, Pál Medgyesi. He was born ca. 1605; studied in Bártfa (now Bardejov, Slovakia), Debrecen, later in Frankfurt an der Oder and from 1629 (from the 13th of April exactly), in Leiden; he then spent half a year in Cambridge, returning again to Leiden. Medgyesi was not a scandal-monger among the Hungarian Puritans. He strengthened the calmer Amesian tone in our church life. This is found, for instance, in an extremely important handbook of homiletics published in 1650. Medgyesi paid homage with his *Doce nos orare* (“Teach us to pray”) to Ames’s *Marrow of Divinity* by transplanting the latter’s text and ideas into his own work.<sup>7</sup>

The very part in which Ames is mentioned openly (i.e., by name) is the one on the methodology of Sunday sermons in the chapter, *Doce praedicare*

---

5 William Ames, *Medulla Sacrae Theologiae* (Franeker, 1627) 7.

6 William Haller, *The Rise of Puritanism* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1947) 3-48.

7 Pál Medgyesi, *Doce nos orare, quin et praedicare* (Bártfa, 1650); cf. RMK (= Régi Magyar Könyvtár) I, 832—bibliographical data accessible online through the database, Az Országos Széchényi Könyvtár adatbázisai. Cf. my article “Some Features to the Portrait of William Ames.”

(“Teach [us] to preach”). At that time (partly due to Lutheran influence), the majority of the Hungarian Calvinist pastors used only some overburdened Biblical loci, the so-called “pericopes”. Medgyesi was totally opposed to this dull practice, which spoiled the dignity of the Lord’s day. He mentions the master as “that Amesius of great fame” who “blames those who are glued to certain parts of the Scriptures, therefore losing and hiding its real essence.” Even the majority of the other, non-Amesian works of Medgyesi, i.e., his extremely popular *Praxis pietatis* (“Practice of Piety”) or his *Dialogus politico ecclesiasticus* (Bártfa, 1650) (a dialogue on the synodical-presbyterian system) were very far from the apocalyptic way of thinking and arguing.<sup>8</sup>

A basic change in Medgyesi’s tone appears in 1648, the year of the death of George Rákóczi I (1591-1648), Prince of Transylvania. From this time, the government passed into the hands of George Rákóczi II (1621-1660), who was a fanatic and impatient hunter of titles and positions with no trace of political wisdom. This unquiet princely person dragged his country into a very unhappy military expedition, the purpose of which was that he become King of Poland. He expected continuous moral and practical Swedish support, but immediately after his arrival in Poland, the Swedish army simply left the stage. The prince himself was led, instead of back to Hungary, to the territory of one of our country’s most blood-thirsty enemies (the Tartars) and his army was captured by this legendary and barbarous nation as well. After his shameful arrival in Hungary (1657), Rákóczi was bereft of his throne by the enraged Sultan who wanted to punish the incredible disobedience of his vassal. The Turks destroyed the whole of Transylvania. Thousands of its inhabitants were unmercifully massacred; all of its towns turned into ruins. Even the ashes of long deceased Transylvanian princes were thrown into the air. Famine and plague also arrived; consequently the circumstances became really ‘apocalyptic’. On account of all these negative changes and tragic events, the earlier smooth and calm tone of Medgyesi changed greatly. After 1653, he published his six continual *Woes*, playing (and at the same time also painfully living) the role of a Hungarian Jeremiah.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> The details of his life and career can be found in Eugene Zoványi, *Encyclopaedia of the Protestant Churches in Hungary*, ed. by Alexander Ladányi (Budapest: Magyar Református Zsinati Sajtóosztály, 1977) 397-98. Cf also my study, “The Background Story of a Translation,” in Eva Petrőczy, *Puritans and Puritanicals*.

<sup>9</sup> See the 10th chapter of Charles Császár’s monograph on Medgyesi entitled *Pál Medgyesi, His Life and Age* (Budapest, 1911) 84-93.

One of these *Woës*—actually perhaps, the most prophetic one—has some modern editions as well. It was written at the very beginning of the tragic historical events in which Prince George Rákóczi II would hardly survive the fiasco of his Caesaromaniacal plans and dreams about becoming king of Poland. The exact date of the delivery of this pulpit oration at the Calvinist church of Sarospatak is the 2nd of September, 1657. When quoting the words of Jeremiah and the curses of Isaiah (originally dedicated to the sinful city of Jerusalem), Medgyesi seeks to warn his own people. After forty, peaceful “Solomonian” years of Transylvanian history, because of the misdeeds and unwise decisions of its head (Prince Rákóczi himself) and its people, we must expect the worst: a total decay of land and nation. The text (just like the 16th-century examples) is full of illustrations taken from the Old Testament. In this respect, Pál Medgyesi proved to be an absolute follower of the Wittenberg/Melanchthon school.

But there are some basic differences between Medgyesi and his preacher predecessors. First, in spite of his anger (sometimes rage and fury) against the sinful and greedy prince, and the almost equally sinful people, his main purpose is not frightening or shocking, but the typical Puritan attitude of prevention—of warning. He did not intend to increase the status of “mortification”, of slow agony, but wanted to offer—as a true-born ‘physician of the soul’—some healing herbs. Second, he did it also with characteristic Puritan precision and meticulousness, by pressing his passionate sentences into almost geometrical, well-ordered points or items. What he describes and puts down in a very disciplined form, reads like a pathological report in a post-mortem room written after an autopsy, the main purpose of which is to save some further patients from the clutches of the same mortal illness. This is sort of an apocalypse as well; yet the stress is not on the horrific details, but on the possibilities of avoiding them. This was quite natural. Our Puritans, just like their Dutch and English brethren, were utilitarian enough not to give up very easily. Medgyesi was not among the members of the “London League” (1632) in which János Tolnai and his fellow students signed a pact of mutual responsibility for each other’s deeds in the name of Jesus Christ. But his educational background (from Leiden to Cambridge) led him to a very similar pattern of religious argumentation and practice. Instead of the rather frightening role of a remote and revengeful *vates* (“prophet”), he played the role (and he did so

truthfully and convincingly!) of an exceptionally conscious and responsible member of a community in danger. This is the democratic, the presbyterian side of the Puritan way of thinking. Actually the best side (as Leland Ryken mentions in his excellent *Worldly Saints*) of the Puritans was that they were policemen of one another's hearts.<sup>10</sup>

This Puritan practice and soberness, this continuous search for preparation and prevention would have been a very hard task. Perhaps that is in part why the books of conduct, compilations and tracts written by 17th century authors are not as rich in theoretical and philosophical details as the earlier works of 16th century Protestant theology. Their spiritual side always had a secondary importance compared to their practical one. That is why so many of them—even the world famous Lewis Bayly (†1631) himself, in the pages of *The Practice of Piety* (1616)—can be considered as the forerunners of a “holistic medico-theology”. They dealt not only with spiritual and historical problems, but with such apocalyptic moments of human life as growing old, illness, death.

Actually, many of our Hungarian Puritan pastors studied medicine as well. Among others, were the younger Samuel Köleséri and Ferenc Pápai Páriz. The latter produced very popular “twin-books”, entitled *Pax corporis* (“Peace of the body”) and *Pax animae* (“Peace of the soul”). For instance, in *Pax corporis*, he explains the Black Death, not as a contagious illness, but as a direct result of human vices. At the Reformed College of Nagyenyed (today Aiud, Romania), Pápai Páriz studied the work of Henricus Regius (Henri LeRoy), a Cartesian professor at Leiden University. Regius's *Fundamenta Physices* (1646) became a basic element of Páriz's thinking. According to the sixth chapter of his *Pax corporis* (entitled “On the Plague”), this terrible illness frightens the nations not only because of the loss of the hot-cold balance and poisons circulating in the blood system, but because of the variety of human sins. The examples given by him could have appeared in any 16th century apocalyptic theory: the vices of Israel in King David's times led to the first “plague” of mankind, the real remedy of which is (as it says in the Book of Jeremiah) simply genuine penitence. A childish national pride also appears on the pages of this chapter on the plague, when the author proposes a highly poetical question: can we,

---

<sup>10</sup> Leland Ryken, *Worldly Saints: The Puritans As They Really Were* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1986).

Hungarians, run away from the coming plague? The answer is: the Germans can, but the Hungarians cannot, as we must by all means stick to the right order and *usus* of our lifestyle.<sup>11</sup>

This *Pax corporis* is a relatively late product of our Puritan literature; it only came out in 1690. But as such, it also proves the existence of the survival of a certain apocalyptic way of thinking, even into our late Puritan authors, though in a remarkably modified, simplified and utilitarianized form. In any event, modern readers can experience a continuity of these ideas and aspects in the second generation of the Hungarian Reformation as well. They present and enrich us with the experience of being members of an extremely strong and resilient community—as a compensation and consolation for the never-ending reappearance of apocalypses throughout our national history and our church history.

---

11 Ferenc Pápai Páriz, *Pax corporis* (Budapest: Magvető, 1984) 324-65.

## Reviews

[*K:NWTS* 23/1 (May 2008) 55-59]

James H. Charlesworth, ed., *Jesus and Archaeology*. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2006. 740 pp. Paper. ISBN: 0-8028-4880-X. \$50.00.

The amazing recent discoveries unearthed by archaeologists in Palestine enhance even the summaries presented in this superb collection and review of, especially, NT era excavations.<sup>1</sup> Last Fall, Eilat Mazar announced the identification of a wall in Jerusalem which she has assigned to the Persian era contemporary with Nehemiah (445 B.C.); her tentative suggestion that it may be a part of Nehemiah's wall (Neh. 6:15) is derived from the Persian period sherds which she discovered at the base of the structure. Last Summer, an Assyriologist working at the British Museum published the translation of a cuneiform clay tablet with the name Nebo-Sarsekim; compare the name in Jer. 39:3 of an official in Nebuchadnezzar's entourage during the final siege of Jerusalem (587/86 B.C.). In the Summer of 2004, even more of the Pool of Siloam (Jn. 9:7) was unearthed in a garden owned by the Greek Orthodox Church in Jerusalem (see our volume, pages 568-70). And Eilat Mazar suggested in 2005 that she had located the foundation stones of King David's palace in Jerusalem. Should the announcements be confirmed and established, these serendipitous discoveries will constitute a further amazing confirmation of the historicity of the Old and New Testament. Indeed, what hath God, in his on-going vindictory providence, wrought!!

---

<sup>1</sup> Charlesworth's "Preface" is dated January 2005; much of the data in his volume pre-dates 2004.

Charlesworth has assembled an accomplished collection of archaeological and NT scholars in order to provide an up-to-date review of the *status quaestionis*—Archaeology and the life of Jesus of Nazareth. At the outset, pride of place in this volume must go to Urban C. von Wahlde, for his “Archaeology and John’s Gospel” (523-86). This is an archaeological commentary on every potential site mentioned in the fourth gospel from Bethsaida (1:44) to the Tomb of Jesus (19:41-42). It is an absolutely essential guide to both archaeology and literary evidence in John’s gospel. What a difference a century makes! Remember, just over one hundred years ago, the gospel of John was, by the “assured results of scientific criticism”, regarded as a 2<sup>nd</sup> (even *late* 2<sup>nd</sup>) century product. This liberal fundamentalist idiocy is trashed royally by the details from the archaeologist’s spade—as von Wahlde’s narrative confirms.

Charlesworth sets the tone for this collection of essays with “Jesus Research and Archaeology: A New Perspective” (11-63). Here “Jesus Research” signifies “quest for the historical Jesus research.” At this point in the evolution of this issue, we have arrived at the so-called “Third Quest” for the historical Jesus. (The uninitiated reader should not naively think that this critical-liberal quest is searching for the Jesus that the Bible presents as a historical figure, i.e., that the Bible record of the life of Jesus is historically accurate. Rather, the historical Jesus questors are seeking for is a Jesus of their own reconstruction, i.e., a non-supernatural Jesus or the Jesus of fact [history without myth], not the Jesus of faith [myth=Bible].) Behind us is the “no quest” which ended with Albert Schweitzer’s magnum opus *The Quest for the Historical Jesus* (1910)—a book which wrote the obituary for the 19<sup>th</sup> century liberal quest for the Jesus of history as opposed to the Jesus of dogma. Dormant for about half a century, the ‘quest’ was resumed anew by Bultmanian and existentialist-oriented Ernst Käsemann, James Robinson and Co., ca. 1954-80. The telltale mention of existentialist guru, Martin Heidegger (14), is the ‘give away’ that philosophy reduces theology—Jesus, the 1<sup>st</sup> century existentialist, ‘discovered’ by the new questors. The current “Third Quest” regards Jesus as a marginal Jew from peasant stock. Thus, he is ‘re-imaged’ in Third World categories (demonstrating once more—was there ever any real doubt—that modern critical presuppositions read on to the Biblical portrait of Jesus the dominant philosophical ethos of the era in which the questor himself/herself lives. As Freyne points out, each of these quests for the Jesus without deity, miracles,



bodily resurrection, etc. (that is without “canon, creed and church” [66]) took little or no cognizance of archaeological data. (John Meier, leading Third Quest scholar, does not take account of “any recognition of the contribution that archaeology could make to the discussion,” 67.)

While Charlesworth’s post-Barthian dialecticism is occasionally evident (“sometimes archaeology reveals that a section of a [Biblical] text cannot be historical,” 27), nevertheless this volume assembles data which confirms the portrait of the places and times of Jesus of Nazareth as recorded in the gospels. This includes a zinger on what I regard as mythical Q: “Q is only a modern imagined source, as numerous scholars are now contending” (19). *Touché!*

In addition to the review contained in this volume, Charlesworth provides a list of summary overviews of modern Biblical archaeology (or, if you prefer, Ancient Near Eastern archaeology) which will provide a compendium of recent information: Ephraim Stern, *New Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavation in the Holy Land* (1993); Eric Meyers, *Oxford Encyclopedia of Archaeology in the Near East* (1997); Avraham Negev, *The Archaeological Encyclopedia of the Holy Land* (1990) as up-dated and revised by Negev and Shimon Gibson (2001). All of these tools may be further supplemented and up-dated by the “Archaeology” section of each issue of *Old Testament Abstracts* and *New Testament Abstracts*.

Our volume provides a review of recent excavations at: Nazareth (38); Cana (38-40); Bethesda (40-41, 145-66); the 1<sup>st</sup> century fisherman’s boat found cased in mud in the Sea of Galilee (41-42); Ramat Hanadiv or Mt. Carmel (42-44, 384-92); Caesarea Maritima (44); Jerusalem (44-46); The Herodium (46-48); Peter’s house in Capernaum (49-50); the Sepphoris Theater (51-55); and more. The volume is thoroughly accessible through Scripture (and other Ancient Texts) and Geographical Indexes (707-40). It even contains a glossary (696-701) of technical terms.

Dan Bahat reviews the excavations that have taken place on Temple Mount in Jerusalem since 1967 (the ‘Six Days’ War’). Bahat’s own superb volume, *Ancient Jerusalem Revealed* (1994), is up-dated with this article. The recent discovery of a stairway with the inscription *zeqenim* (“elders”) “south of the southern wall of the Temple Mount” (307) is identified with the place where Jesus talked to the rabbis about his “Father’s business” (Lk. 2:41-50).

John Welch cites Eric Eve's remark that "there is a growing consensus that . . . miraculous activity formed an integral part of Jesus' ministry, and should not be brushed aside to leave room for a Jesus who was almost entirely a teacher" (360).

Sean Freyne summarizes the work of Marianne Sawicki (*Crossing Galilee: Architecture of Contact in the Occupied Land of Jesus*, 2000) in which she charges (liberal) literary critics with "hypothesizing" on the basis of "no evidence" (69). These literary constructions need no "hard facts" data. Thus they reconstruct the texts as the proverbial wax nose, molded to the whim of the reconstructor. Did we ever think that literary critics were doing anything else but (to paraphrase Voltaire) playing tricks on the living by using the artifacts of the dead?

Of particular interest to this reviewer are the articles on eschatology, especially eschatology at Qumran. If Schweitzer assured us of the eschatological context of the kingdom proclamation of Jesus, Qumran has assured us of the eschatological atmosphere of Judaism in Jesus' era. The late David Flusser is cited as noting that Jesus "is the only Jew of ancient times known to us, who preached not only that people were on the threshold of the end of time, but that the new age of salvation had already begun" (57). For the inaugurated vector of the semi-eschatological era ('now'/'not yet'), this is an accurate and perceptive observation. But the nature of eschatology at Qumran remains controverted as the offerings in this volume demonstrate. Emile Peuch ("Jesus and Resurrection Faith in the Light of Jewish Texts," 639-59) acknowledges the future bodily resurrection of Daniel 12:2. But then he hangs this Jewish eschatological notion on imported Persian/Iranian mythology. How dearly the higher critics bend even desert documents in Israel to Iranian comparative religions methodology! In addition, Peuch is hopelessly confused about the difference between (Greek) immortality and (Christian) resurrection. Ah well, this too shall pass. Henry W. M. Rietz ("Reflections on Jesus' Eschatology in the Light of Qumran," 186-205) notes that Qumran was a sectarian, separatist movement. Its eschatology was flat and linear, i.e., attaining the 'new age' was just more of the same old same old 'present age'. Jesus is thus folded into this paradigm and becomes (surprise! surprise!) a proclaimer of transforming "social relationships". Here we have the higher critics making eschatology serve the political-social agenda of the 21<sup>st</sup> century critic himself. Jesus' notion

of eternal life with the Father in heaven just will not do!!!

The dust has yet to settle in this attempt to assess sectarian Qumran eschatology. The jury is still out on whether it is mainstream 2<sup>nd</sup> Temple eschatology or some aberration thereof. But our standard is not Qumran, regardless of the eventual conclusions; our standard remains the eschatology of the Old and New Testament—and that eschatology is wonderfully both present and future oriented through Jesus Christ, our Lord.

Craig Evans (338-40) has an excellent review of the Kidron Valley ossuaries, which may contain the remains of ‘Alexander son of Simon’ of Cyrene (Mk. 15:21). Discovered in 1941, these artifacts shed a measure of light on an early Christian family.

Charlesworth prioritizes seven of the most significant recent archaeological discoveries, including the excavation of the Pool of Bethesda (Jn. 5:2-9), the remains of the crucified man (Jehohanan) and the alleged rock on which Jesus may have been crucified. He concludes this volume with a ringing endorsement of the historicity of the gospels: “It would be foolish to continue to foster the illusion that the Gospels are merely fictional stories . . . The theologies in the New Testament are grounded in interpretations of real historical events” (694). Amen! And thank you, James Charlesworth, for this very helpful and edifying collection.

—James T. Dennison, Jr.

[*K:NWTS* 23/1 (May 2008) 59-61]

Adele Berlin, *The Dynamics of Biblical Parallelism*. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2008. 200 pp. Paper. ISBN: 978-0-8028-0397-9. \$21.00.

The cover of this book advertises “revised and expanded”. The “Foreword” by David Noel Freedman advertises a “new edition” (xi). From this, we are led to believe that we have a newly revised and expanded edition of a 1985 book first published by Indiana University Press. Or so we are led to believe

by the publisher and Prof. Freedman. That is, until we read the “Preface to the Revised and Expanded Edition” (xii) by Ms. Berlin (dated August 2006). She states: “It did not seem to me wise to rewrite any part of the book since that invariably leads to some unraveling of the original presentation, so I have simply corrected small errors. I have also added a new and very short introduction . . .” That “very short introduction” is a mere five pages (xv-xix) followed by a bibliography on parallelism since 1985 (xix-xxii).

Hence, the only thing new, revised or expanded by this work, apart from the paltry and unimpressive pages xv-xxii, is the author’s one-page “Preface” and Freedman’s dutiful “Foreword”. So much for the whole truth in advertising. Reader! if you own the 1985 edition of this book, do not waste your hard-earned ducats on this reprint. Libraries! even if you have shelf space *ad infinitum* (which virtually none of you have!), do not use shrinking acquisition budget funds to add this book next to the 1985 edition with a new date Cutter. Use your valuable shelving space for an authentically new book (or a truly and completely “revised and expanded” version of an older title). And finally, *tout le monde! Caveat emptor!!!*

Now, as if the publisher’s (and author’s) deception were not enough, J. P. Fokkelman puts his name to a blurb on the back cover in which he coos: “We are lucky now to have Berlin’s lucid language back in this revised edition.” One is curious as to how much Fokkelman was paid to write those disingenuous words. In fact, how could a man whose monumental work on Hebrew poetry (*Major Poems of the Hebrew Bible*, 4 vols. [1998-2004]; *The Psalms in Form* [2002]; *Reading Biblical Poetry* [2001])—work so penetrating and significant that it makes Berlin look like an amateur (as the omission of Fokkelman’s books from her “bibliographies” indicates [a 1977 “review” is listed on p. 162])—how could such a man read this manuscript and think that this paperback is a ‘revision and expansion’ (let alone a “revised edition”) of 20+ year-old scholarship as judged by the present *status quaestionis*?

Surely Fokkelman, Freedman, Michael Fox (another back-cover blurb) and Berlin herself are playing a shell game called royalties and ‘we belong to the professional in-crowd’ (you scratch my scholarly back and I’ll scratch yours—even for research 20 years old!). To which the publisher says, “The check’s in the mail.”

Well, this reviewer says again *caveat emptor*. I will not deny that a new generation of students may benefit from Berlin (Fokkelman is, in my opinion, better), but they should not do so by being hoodwinked via the unsubstantiated misrepresentations in the promotion of this book. Let's have truth in advertising. Call it a reprint with a few corrections, with a new introduction by the author and an updated bibliography on parallelism since 1985. For, in truth, that is what this book is, and nothing more.

—James T. Dennison, Jr.

[*K:NWTS* 23/1 (May 2008) 61-63]

Edmund P. Clowney with Rebecca Clowney Jones, *How Jesus Transforms The Ten Commandments*. Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R Publishing, 2007. 162 pp. Paper. ISBN: 978-1-59638-036-3. \$12.99.

Prof. Clowney passed away March 20, 2005 at the age of 87. At age 82, he was still serving a full-time position as Associate Pastor of Christ the King Presbyterian Church in Houston, Texas. During this pastorate, he taught an adult Sunday School class on the law. This book is the result of those lessons put into writing. He asked his daughter, Rebecca, to edit the book because his "write tight" style had gotten too tight. He asked her "to aerate this text, to smooth out transitions and to add some illustrations" (v). She did her work well, with his full approval before he died.

In the Preface of the book, he asks the question: "What role does the law play in the history of redemption?" (xiii). In chapter one, he attempts to answer this question. He begins by showing that the Ten Commandments are unlike any other moral code or legal document. Rather it is a treaty document which God made with his people and sealed by an oath. In the course of the history of Israel, the promises found in this treaty document were realized. However, at the same time there was continuous rebellion, disobedience, repentance, reform, and again falling into sin. Finally, there was exile and return. Beyond this there was expressed in the later prophets a change. There would be a resurrection to new life of dead bones; there would be a writing on the heart of the law. Thus

finally, this law's promises are fulfilled in the coming of Jesus Christ.

Jesus sees the law, therefore, as something to be fulfilled. It is fulfilled by him in his life, death, and resurrection. But more than that, Clowney says, "the law takes on a different meaning and function. Its role of prophecy ends, for Jesus is the end (the *telos*, the goal) of the law. For this reason, once Jesus has come, God's people will never think of the law in quite the same way" (8).

He goes on to say, "Jesus fulfilled the law, then, not simply by obeying it, but by transforming it. Matthew's gospel shows us how Jesus transformed the law in his teaching" (ibid.). He then illustrates what he means by 'transforming' through using the summary of the law. He states that Jesus not only taught us to love God with our whole being and to love our neighbor as ourselves (both of which are found in the Old Testament law), but also to love our enemy. This transformation is also illustrated in Christ's love when he was willing to die for sinners.

It is here that I have a problem with what he is saying when he uses the word "transformed". Surely, the Old Testament told us to love our enemy. This is not a new teaching with Jesus. "If you come across your enemy's ox or donkey wandering off, be sure to take it back to him. If you see the donkey of someone who hates you fallen down under its load, do not leave it there; be sure you help him with it" (Ex. 23:4, 5). Likewise, the love of God for his people is fully anticipated when Psalm 103 speaks of that love and it is prophesied of Jesus' death when Isaiah penned, "But he was pierced for our transgressions, he was crushed for our iniquities; the punishment that brought us peace was upon him, and by his wounds we are healed" (53:5).

I find the word "transformed", therefore, too strong. Rather, the word "fulfilled", with its background in Matthew 5:17, is just right. Yes, Jesus fulfilled the Law by his work on earth and entrance into heaven. But he also fulfilled it by interpreting the law correctly as opposed to the errors of the scribes and Pharisees. And furthermore, he fulfilled it by the sending of the Holy Spirit into his church so that by his power the hearts of men, women, and children are transformed to live according to the law.

As Francis Turretin states in his *Institutes of Elenctic Theology*, "It is one thing to correct the law itself; another to clear it of the false interpretation of

the scribes and Pharisees. One thing to introduce an entirely new sense in the law; another to introduce only a new light by unfolding what lay concealed in the law and was not attended to by teachers. Christ does the latter and not the former” (II: 21).

The rest of the book is an exposition of the Ten Commandments in the light of the fullness of the New Testament revelation; one chapter for each commandment. Rather than telling you what is in each chapter, I am going to suggest that you buy the book (it is not expensive) and read it for yourself. You will find it very suggestive, encouraging, and uplifting.

—J. Peter Vosteen

[*K:NWTS* 23/1 (May 2008) 63-67]

Richard A. Muller, *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics: The Rise and Development of Reformed Orthodoxy, ca. 1520 to ca. 1725, Volume One: Prolegomena to Theology*, second edition. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2003. 463 pp. Cloth. ISBN: 978-0-8010-2617-1. \$59.99.

Richard Muller has given us a monumental work in volume one of his four-part collection. This volume has been expanded and revised from its first publication in 1987. As he notes in the preface, it has been given a new subtitle “The Rise and Development of Reformed Orthodoxy, ca. 1520 to ca. 1725,” implying that it covers this development from the beginnings of the Reformation and not just from 1565 onward.

Dr. Muller has also added second and third level subheadings, rewritten and occasionally rearranged paragraphs, and moved one of the later chapters (“Theology as a Discipline”) earlier in the book, directly after the definitions of theology. He has also more finely focused the direction (or thesis) of the work to compliment the other three volumes. Finally, he has supplemented the work with the more recent secondary literature in both seventeenth century scholasticism and secondary figures in the history of seventeenth century philosophy. Most of this scholarship has flowered since the first publication of his work in 1987 and partially as a result of it.

The one editorial decision this reviewer regrets is that Dr. Muller chose to remove the list of Reformed theologians found in the first edition. This provided a brief bibliography of the important figures mentioned in his work and was a helpful tool for those not familiar with the subject. Dr. Muller promises us its inclusion in a future work, but we believe that many readers would have found it useful somewhere in their copy of this four-volume set.

Dr. Muller's work is set thoroughly within the context of previous scholarship on the subject. He is arguing, as is well known, against the older scholarship that pitted Calvin against the later Calvinists. He argues instead that there is great continuity between the Reformers and Protestant Scholasticism. As a result, Muller argues against numerous assumptions found in the older scholarship. Among these are: (1) Scholastic method is a departure from the Reformers, especially Calvin; (2) Scholastic theological systems are inherently Rationalistic and represent a return to the corruptions of Medieval theology, especially Thomism; (3) Reformed Scholasticism is a form of Rationalism that set the stage for eighteenth century Rationalism, especially as that is found in the writings of Christian Wolff and his disciples.

This book is expansive and deals with all the issues of prolegomena found in Reformed scholastic systems. Therefore the above descriptions do not do justice to its broad content. Dr. Muller deals with the nature of theology and religion, theology as a discipline, the relationship of natural theology and supernatural theology, the object and genus of theology (is it theoretical or practical or both?), the distinction between archetypal and ectypal theology, the use of philosophy in theology, fundamental articles to which all Christians must subscribe, and the basic principles of theology. One should read this book simply to get a more expansive (and diverse) treatment of these issues than one might find by reading a single theological work of the period. Nonetheless, most of the concerns we have noted in our previous paragraph run throughout the book and help us understand Muller's historical concerns in relationship to most of these issues.

Before we begin examining these issues, readers of this journal will find it noteworthy that Dr. Muller describes the Reformed as Christocentric. He distinguishes Reformed Christocentrism from Barthian Christocentrism, noting that Reformed Christocentrism operates in the arena of soteriology. In our



own words, it does not imply that union with Christ is an all-embracing doctrine so that even the reprobate may be viewed in Christ (Barth). At the same time, Muller notes that the Reformed did believe that all of Scripture points to Christ. He does not suggest (as one recent Reformed writer) that adopting a Christocentric understanding of Reformed theology is to unwittingly adopt a “Central Dogma” theory.

Readers will also find his section on the Theology of Union very helpful. This deals with Christ’s own knowledge. Muller shows that the Reformed believed (in contrast to the Lutheran ubiquitarians) that the finite cannot contain the infinite. Therefore, Christ’s human nature is incapable of infinite knowledge. At the same time, he articulates the unique way in which Christ in his human nature knows God by way of the hypostatic union.

Returning to Muller’s primary focus, in responding to ‘Calvin against the Calvinist’ views, Muller asks numerous questions. For instance, why should the Reformed be required to slavishly hold to Calvin’s views in all respects? And why should they be named after one of the Reformers, when there were many Reformed leaders during the Reformation? In this he points to the significance of other Reformers. Some of them used a more pronounced scholastic method which served as a precedent for later Reformed theologians. For instance, the use of scholastic method is found in the writings of Peter Martyr Vermigli, Wolfgang Musculus, and Jerome Zanchius. In fact, in some cases the Reformed generally followed the insights of some of these theologians where they differed from Calvin. For instance, in Muller’s opinion Calvin was uncomfortable with passive decrees, but the Reformed at large argued for passive decrees, following the scholastic distinctions of Vermigli.

Muller also shows that Luther’s rejection of Aristotle in theological education did not represent a rejection of Aristotle’s Logic and Rhetoric. When Luther reformed theological education with the help of the German nobility only Aristotle’s *Metaphysics* and *Ethics* were jettisoned. The Logic and Rhetoric were retained. However, at a later point Melancthon gave lectures on Aristotle’s *Nicomachean Ethics*. This use of the *Ethics* was also found among the Reformed, notably by Vermigli in England, who used it as a textbook in his ethics course. The Reformed also used the *Metaphysics* by the end of the sixteenth century.

The use of logic and rhetoric were not simply a return to Aristotle or his appropriation by Medieval scholastics. Instead, logic and rhetoric had been retooled by such thinkers as Agricola and Ramus, using the insights of the Renaissance. Thus, we find Melancton using Renaissance insights on the *topoi* in his *Loci Communes*, which formed the starting point for Calvin's *Institutes*. At the same time, there continued to be debate on the use of Ramus's modifications of logic among logicians. And the Reformed differed in some respects on their appropriation of Ramist logic. Thus, Reformed scholasticism was not simply a return to Medieval models (in spite of their use). It represented a concern for method that was in touch with the academic concerns of its day and in continuity with the Reformation, now seen in the context of the Renaissance.

In addition, Muller helps us to see some of the contextual issues (both theological and institutional) that lead to the more sophisticated use of scholastic method among the Reformed. For instance, the need to respond to the detailed arguments of Roman Catholic polemics (such as Cardinal Bellarmine) lead to the need for greater sophistication in theological method. Also, once the Reformation had established the legitimacy of Reformed churches, the need arose to formulate a theological curriculum well suited for Reformed universities. The scholastic method was appropriate for the give and take of classroom education.

Central to Dr. Muller's argument is the fact that scholasticism does not designate a particular theological perspective but a method of theological study and presentation. First, theologians with a wide range of views could be called scholastic. Thus, Reformed scholastics not only adapted methods from their own age, but freely picked and chose insights from a wide range of Medieval theology, sometime integrating perspectives from Thomists, Scotists, and occasionally Nominalists. Thus, Reformed scholasticism should not be viewed as a Reformed return to Thomism. It does not represent any particular theological or philosophical perspective. Secondly, the same theologian may use catechetical instruction in one of his writings, rhetorical method in his sermons, and scholastic method in a scholastic treatise. Thus, scholasticism is not to be equated with a particular theological content but with a method of theological discourse.

All of this helps us understand that scholasticism is not a form of Rationalism, but a particular theological method. When Dr. Muller uses the term Rationalism here it is important to recognize that he is using it in a specifically Christian way. He is not referring to Rationalists such as Descartes, Spinoza, Leibnitz and Wolff in opposition to Empiricists such as Bacon, Locke or Hume. He refers to Aristotle as a Rationalist even though Aristotle is usually contrasted (to some extent) with his more Rationalist teacher Plato. This and other points indicate that Muller uses the term Rationalism in his book to refer to anyone who uses reason to the exclusion of revelation. Thus, while he is constantly referring to Wolffian Rationalism it does not appear that his primary point is that Christian Wolff used *rational* criteria as opposed to *empirical* criteria as his first principles. Instead, the point is that Wolff used *natural* criteria as opposed to *Scripture* as his first principals of understanding.

Insofar as the rising tide of Enlightenment philosophy was a return to ancient philosophy with its general disregard for supernatural revelation, this is a salutary and important point. Reformed scholasticism did not present a system that exalted corrupt reason over supernatural revelation. Nor did it set the stage for such a development. In addition, as Dr. Muller notes, the Reformed opposed the Socinians, who exalted reason as the *principium cognoscendi* (“principle of understanding”) in the interpretation of Scripture. They would not accept the doctrine of the Trinity, for instance, because it was not fully comprehensible to reason. To support Muller’s point, we may note that Reformed scholastics like Francis Turretin rejected this principial use of reason in revealed theology, noting that while the doctrine of the Trinity may be incomprehensible, it is not impossible (incapable of being conceived). Scripture is the alone first principle for interpreting Scripture.

This work is well worth anyone’s time. It is a gold-mine of material. Read it and enjoy. Be strengthened and built-up. Learn from the riches of the Reformed tradition. Understand it in its historical context, and be aware of the debates surrounding it. You’re in for a workout, but one that is well-written and easier to digest than some of the sources from which it is drawn, especially since most of them are in Latin. This is your door of entry. Take advantage of it.

—Scott F. Sanborn

[K:NWTS 23/1 (May 2008) 68-69]

John Wolffe, *The Expansion of Evangelicalism: The Age of Wilberforce, More, Chalmers and Finney*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2007. 280 pp. Cloth. ISBN: 978-0-8308-2582-0. \$23.00.

*The Expansion of Evangelicalism: The Age of Wilberforce, More, Chalmers and Finney* by John Wolffe (2007) is one in a five volume series on the history of Evangelicalism being issued by Inter-Varsity Press (only the first three, to this point, have been published).

Although Wolffe's is unabashedly a work of historical scholarship (voluminous footnotes and a select bibliography of no less than twenty-four pages), it is well within the reach of the average interested layman, and not without its charms: the striking or touching anecdote from diary or correspondence (in particular the several first-person accounts of conversion or spiritual struggle); the humorous gloss ("In [1837] New South Wales Presbyterianism showed itself a true child of its Scottish parent by undergoing its first schism") or felicitously-turned phrase (the piety of the Clapham Sect was "deep-seated but not austere"; among the early Methodists the deathbed was perceived as "the ultimate class meeting"). This is no scintillating page-turner for the casual reader, but for anyone wanting a well-researched and perceptive accounting, deftly rendered, of Evangelicalism during the period of its world-wide expansion (1790-1850), it is worth the effort.

"The Age of Wilberforce, More, Chalmers and Finney" rather summarizes its scope, both chronologically and geographically: William Wilberforce, parliamentary father of the abolition of the slave trade in Britain in 1807 (he lived just long enough to see the repeal of the institution of slavery itself in the British colonies in 1833) and subject of the popular 2007 film *Amazing Grace*; Hannah More, influential poet, essayist, and activist evangelical woman, especially in the cause of education for girls; Thomas Chalmers, powerful preacher, writer, social planner, and leader in the Disruption (1843) in the Scottish church; Charles Grandison Finney, famous American revivalist of the 1820s and 30s, leader in "new measures" revivalism and arguably inventor of "planned and controlled" revivals, as well as early professor and president at Oberlin College.

The subtitle also fairly outlines the book's primary themes: revivalism's prominence in Evangelicalism; the movement's spiritual life and worship; its view of men, women, and the family; its activism—tract societies, city missions, parochial schools (in Scotland), and dozens of organizations for the suppression of vice or keeping the Sabbath or ending slavery (in the United States as well as the British Empire); and what Wolffe calls “the evolving sense of global vision and aspiration for unity” among the disparate denominations—and non-denominations—that comprised it.

As for Calvinism: the expansion of Evangelicalism may be interpreted as a softening or loosening—or, in its Arminian manifestations, a downright abandonment—of an earlier and stricter Calvinism. Evangelicalism's revivalism, for a start, almost in the nature of the case, “acknowledged and advocated a positive role for human agency in the work of conversion and moral reform,” as was said of the Yale theologian Nathaniel Taylor. This Evangelicalism was also remarkably broad theologically, incorporating, within Presbyterianism itself, not only the “theological ironclad” William Cunningham, but the liberal evangelical Henry Drummond and the proto-charismatic Edward Irving; and, more widely still, not only Church of England High Churchmen, but Primitive Methodist Ranters and, in America, Freewill Baptists. But all of this is simply to illustrate the amazing inclusiveness (within very definite biblical and crucicentrist limits) of the cause.

Indeed, the wild variety of individuals and groups that feature in the story, from (to extend the fascinating list) Lord Ashley, Earl of Shaftesbury to pioneer American Black female Methodist evangelist Zilpha Elaw; from establishment Anglicans to Magic Methodists in Cheshire and “Kirkgate Screammers” in Leeds; from (in the States) Northern to Southern Baptists, divided (as early as 1845) over the issue of slave-holding; and the doctrinal and other mutualities that held them together—or drove them apart—is perhaps the sub-plot of this engrossing, but not uncomplicated, tale, so pertinent not only to an understanding of the contemporary Christian Church but of the contemporary world.

—Richard A. Riesen

[K:NWTS 23/1 (May 2008) 70-82]

Roger Olson, *Arminian Theology: Myths and Realities*. Downer's Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity Press, 2006. 255 pp. Cloth. ISBN: 0-8308-2841-9. \$25.00.

Dr. Olson's obvious gifts for teaching and writing are evident throughout the book. Written in a clear and straightforward manner, the book will be accessible to laypeople, but it is substantial enough to keep the interest of a seminary student. Olson's thesis is to "explain classical Arminian theology as it really is" (that is, the theology of Arminius and his early followers), and to defend it as a valid trajectory of evangelical (and even "Reformed") theology (10). His interest is not primarily exegetical, nor is it really theological, but rather historical-ecclesiastical. According to Olson, many modern Calvinists (particularly those associated with the magazine, *Modern Reformation*) accuse Arminians of being outside the bounds of evangelical Christianity.<sup>1</sup> Against this thesis, Olson seeks to demonstrate that Arminianism ought to be considered a true and faithful branch of Protestant evangelicalism. To establish this thesis, Olson attempts to debunk ten so-called "myths" about Arminian theology, many of which have been manufactured by its Reformed critics.

- 1.) Arminian Theology is the Opposite of Calvinist/Reformed Theology
- 2.) A Hybrid of Calvinism and Arminianism is Possible
- 3.) Arminianism is Not an Orthodox Evangelical Option
- 4.) The Heart of Arminianism is Belief in Free Will
- 5.) Arminian Theology Denies the Sovereignty of God
- 6.) Arminianism is a Human-Centered Theology
- 7.) Arminianism is not a Theology of Grace
- 8.) Arminians do not Believe in Predestination
- 9.) Arminian Theology Denies Justification through Faith Alone
- 10.) All Arminians Believe in the Governmental View of the Atonement

For each of these ten myths, Olson provides a full analysis and refutation. Olson

<sup>1</sup> In fairness to Olson, we must admit that some modern Calvinists do not do careful research into the primary documents of Arminianism, and are guilty of not properly articulating the latter's position. But this was not true of the classic Calvinistic critiques of Arminianism noted below. Furthermore (as Olson admits), this same complaint can be leveled against many popular Arminian critiques of Calvinism.

thus hopes to show that Arminianism, though by no means in full agreement with Calvinism, is not as bad as many Calvinists have made it out to be.

Olson's work is dominated by a call to return to the original Arminian source (Arminianism *ad fontes!*). This Arminianism, he proposes, is the true Arminianism he seeks to defend: what he calls "Arminianism of the heart" not "Arminianism of the head." According to him, the later "Arminians" departed in many ways from Arminius's original positions, and developed them in a more semi-Pelagian and rationalistic direction. On the whole, Olson views Arminius and Simon Episcopius as the faithful proponents of true Arminianism, whereas Philip Von Limborch and Charles Finney, their later successors, significantly alter their system. It appears that we no longer have arguments in favor of "Calvin against the Calvinists," but also "Arminius against the Arminians!" John Wesley, however, in the 18<sup>th</sup> century returned to the Classical Arminianism of Arminius, who is then followed by Richard Watson, H. Orton Wiley and others (including Olson).

For Dr. Olson, modern Calvinists have too often mistaken the "Arminianism of the Head" advanced by Limborch, Charles Finney, and others after them for the true Arminianism of the heart advanced by the original Remonstrants. However, we must note at this point that while it is true that there is a significant difference between some of the earlier and later Arminians, it would be historically inaccurate to define "Classical Arminianism" *solely* in terms of either Arminius's or Episcopius's writings. If Olson wants to claim that only Arminius and Episcopius represent his own views on the disputed "five points," he is certainly allowed to. But the Remonstrants at the Synod of Dordt already included men who articulated a theology that much more closely resembled "the Arminianism of the head" from which Olson detaches himself.

For example, Stephen Curcellaeus (1586-1659), a contemporary of Episcopius, held to a modified governmental view of the atonement<sup>2</sup> as well as the subordination of the Son and the Holy Spirit to the Father.<sup>3</sup> Hugo Grotius himself (the father of the governmental view of the atonement) also consciously associated himself with the Remonstrants. Conrad Vorstius (who was associated with the Arminians) was also condemned by the Synod of Dordt, and spent

---

2 Stephanus Curcellaeus, *Stephani Curcellaei opera theologica. Quorum pars praecipua institutio religionis christianae* (1675) lib. v, chap. xviii, xix.

3 *Ibid.*, lib. ii, cap. xix

the rest of his life translating the works of the Socinians. When the Synod of Dordt examined the doctrines of the Remonstrants, it looked at them as a group inclusive of more than the statements of Episcopius and Arminius. It does not seem that there is as much historical distance between “Arminianism of the head” and “Arminianism of the heart” as Olson would believe. The former was already essentially present with some of the first generation Remonstrants. Olson’s “Arminius against the Arminians” model could be subject to the same kind of trenchant critique that the so-called “Calvin against the Calvinist” theses are. It seems possible that a coherent and clear development can be traced from the first generation Remonstrants to their later followers. After all, Arminius was the teacher of Episcopius, and Limborch was Episcopius’s biographer and student.

Space does not permit us to present a full rebuttal of each of Olson’s arguments against these ten “myths.” Indeed, to correct every disputed historical or theological point would require a book in itself. But this is not really necessary for a critique of Olson’s book. In my estimation, there are several more fundamental considerations that underlie *all* of them and strike right at the heart of Olson’s take on this perennial debate.

First of all, we note what we regard as a most significant admission on Olson’s part: “After twenty-five years of studying this subject, I have concluded that *appealing to Scripture alone cannot prove one side right and the other side wrong*” (Olson, 70). He continues: “Equally reasonable and spiritually mature Christians have scoured Scripture and come to radically different conclusions about the relationship of election and free will, and the resistibility of atonement and grace.” Olson’s conclusion is somewhat shocking: appeal to Scripture alone cannot settle the debate! For him, the debate cannot be settled “by argument or dialogue,” and that it is simply to be left “to a matter of that mystery called perspective” (70).

Some Christians are Calvinists because when they read Scripture (and perhaps examine their own experience) they see God as almighty, supremely glorious, absolutely sovereign and the all-determining reality...Other Christians are Arminians because when they read Scripture (and perhaps examine their own experience) they see God as supremely



good, loving, merciful, compassionate and the benevolent  
Father of all creation, who desires the best for everyone  
(72).

In fact, Olson seems to admit at one point that “clear and unequivocal exegetical proof for either system is lacking” (71). Apparently the Calvinism-Arminianism debate is simply a matter of man-made “bliks” or worldviews that “color” our reading of Scripture.

Olson’s epistemological analysis of the Calvinism-Arminianism debate betrays a more fundamental theological skepticism that lies at the heart of his approach. His thesis is that Arminianism should be considered a legitimate branch of Protestantism and a faithful member of the evangelical camp. Indeed, if there is no way to settle the debate by an appeal to *sola scriptura*, then what a superfluous and foolish debate it would be! To be sure, if Scripture did not speak clearly to these issues, we would most heartily agree. However, a quick glance at the writings of the Apostle shows that the issues of this perennial debate are developed by him at great length (Rom. 9; Eph. 1; etc). But if we follow Olson’s analysis, we have to argue that Paul’s writings (the Scriptures!) are essentially unclear on this issue. But this is really not anything new. Nay-sayers to classic Augustinianism in the Protestant tradition from Erasmus have always accused it of being an unclear speculation on subject matter that is essentially unbeneficial and unedifying for the church. Moreover, the history of the debate shows that it is not limited to one era of the church controlled by a particular historical-philosophical context, but has transcended the boundaries of all historical limitation. Indeed, from Paul, to Augustine, to Pelagius, to John Cassian, to Gottschalk, to the medieval scholastics, to the Protestant Reformation, to the Great Awakening (Wesley and Whitefield) and a whole host of others, this debate has preoccupied Christian theology. It seems strange, therefore, to reduce the Calvinism-Arminianism debate to philosophical-psychological predisposition. We don’t deny that presuppositions and psychological predisposition play a part in theology. But it is difficult for us to see how evangelical theology would not plunge itself into utter skepticism and subjectivism if we follow Olson in giving it what appears to be the ultimate place in theological analysis and formulation. The Scriptures, which are sharper than any two-edged sword, must still be able to penetrate within our self-constructed “bliks” and conform our philosophical-psychological

tendencies to the revealed word of God.

Furthermore, Olson's analysis of the debate does not really faithfully represent the classical Arminian views of Arminius and Episcopius. Both of them were certain that Calvinism of the Contra-remonstrants was unbiblical and harmful to religion. Indeed, Episcopius himself said in his address before the Synod of Dordt that the Calvinism had "deformed" "the purest and most beautiful face of the church."<sup>4</sup> Episcopius sounds fairly certain that the particular doctrines of Calvinism are downright ugly and unbiblical! Moreover, in his *Confession of Faith of Those Called Remonstrants*, Episcopius seems fairly convinced from Scripture that the Calvinists "...not only make God unwise...but also most unjust...[and] the alone cause of sin."<sup>5</sup> I think Olson would be hard pressed to convince Arminius or Episcopius that the whole debate cannot really be settled by Scripture, but is simple a matter of a philosophical "blik." That was not the view of the "classical Arminianism" that Olson seeks to represent.

In the final analysis, an objective historical, theological, and exegetical comparison of Calvinism and Arminianism is not Olson's chief concern. Indeed, the unspoken sub-text of his entire book is the need to develop what he elsewhere calls as "postconservative approach to evangelical theology."<sup>6</sup> In the final analysis this book tells us more about Olson's desire for a broad, unified, yet theologically undefined post-conservative evangelical church than it does about the real exegetical and theological issues at stake in the Calvinism-Arminianism debate.<sup>7</sup>

---

4 Geeraert Brandt and John Chamberlayne, *The History of the Reformation and Other Ecclesiastical Transactions in and About the Low-Countries* (1720) III:53.

5 *The Confession of Faith of Those Called Arminians, or, A Declaration of the Opinions and Doctrines of the Ministers and Pastors Which in the United Provinces Are Known by the Name of Remonstrants Concerning the Chief Points of Christian Religion* (1684) 104.

6 Roger E. Olson, *Reformed and Always Reforming: The Postconservative Approach to Evangelical Theology* (2007).

7 Let me at this point affirm my belief that my evangelical Arminian brothers do hold fast to many of the foundational doctrines of the Reformation, such as *sola Scriptura*. However, the debate is not simply whether there are certain "fundamental articles" Calvinists and Arminians agree upon. Indeed, the apostle Paul seems to suggest that there are those who err who nevertheless lay the foundation correctly (1 Cor. 3:15) and will thus themselves enter salvation. However, the apostle is equally emphatic that the structure of "wood, hay, and stubble" he sought to build will itself be "burned up" and he will "suffer loss." We rejoice in the Pauline teaching that belief in the fundamental articles are sufficient for salvation (for which we joyfully give our evangelical Arminian brothers the judgment of charity). But we also are sobered by his warning that errors

Second, Olson often decries Calvinists who misquote or misrepresent the Arminian position. One of the chief culprits (in his view) are the writers of *Modern Reformation*. In many of these instances, Olson is correct to point out some of the poor scholarship evident among many Reformed theologians. However, he would have been better served not only to speak of the “better way” of fairness of representation, but also to show it to us. In many places of his own work, he does not accurately represent the Reformed position. This quite often occurs in parenthetical statements as side jabs to his opponents. Some of them border on the ridiculous. What fair-minded human being (let alone one who is theologically trained) would accurately label Frederick Schleiermacher a “Calvinist” (242)? Such statements can only serve to prejudice the uninformed reader against the position the author is trying to critique.

However, the better Calvinistic treatments of classical Arminianism have not failed to quote from primary documents. In terms of 19<sup>th</sup> century Calvinists, one only need peruse Charles Hodge’s *Systematic Theology* or W. G. T. Shedd’s *History of Christian Doctrines* to see their familiarity with the Latin works of Arminius and Episcopius. Back in the 17<sup>th</sup> century, the works of John Owen and Pierre DuMoulin also contained substantial quotations from various Remonstrant theologians and their associates, including Conrad Vorstius, Johannes Arnoldus Corvinus, and others. While the Synod of Dordt is often vilified for dismissing the Remonstrants from the Synod before formulating its canons, it is often overlooked that they publicly read through nearly the entirety of the *Apology of the Remonstrants* while formulating their Canons (sometimes 50 pages a day). That in itself is quite an amazing feat. If anyone has read theology in the scholastic style of the period, they would know that it is no easy read! Olson seems bent on critiquing only the less nuanced popular presentations of Calvinism and Arminianism, and fails to interact with the more scholarly Calvinistic works upon which the former are built.

Third, Olson fails to deal in any substantial way with Richard Muller’s monumental study on Arminius’s theology, in which he argued in a programmatic way that “Arminius’ system...can only be interpreted as a full-scale alternative to Reformed theology.”<sup>8</sup> His only substantive comment concerning superimposed upon that foundation can be very harmful for the well-being, growth, and progress of the church.

8 Richard A. Muller, *God, Creation, and Providence in the Thought of Jacob Arminius: Sources and Directions of Scholastic Protestantism in the Era of Early Orthodoxy* (1991) 271.

ing Muller's thesis is the following: "So much depends upon how we define Reformed theology. Overall it seems valid to include Arminianism within the broad category of the Reformed family of faith" (47). This is Olson's tactic throughout—to redefine the terms of the debate to make them broad enough to accommodate both opinions. I don't believe that if we defined Reformed theology as "that branch of Christendom which broke from Roman Catholicism in the 16<sup>th</sup> century," anyone would disagree with it. However, the term "Reformed theology" has come to have a much more fixed meaning, quite often equivalent to "Calvinism" over against "Arminianism." This is recognized by a wide variety of secular and Christian scholars. To redefine the terms at this point in history is to produce more confusion than theological clarity. However, if your goal is to convince people that Arminians and Calvinists should cooperate together as broadly evangelical, this theological confusion would seem to be a welcome phenomenon.

To return to our main point, such redefinition of terms fails to deal with the substance of Muller's arguments—and I doubt Muller can be accused of failing to consult Arminius's primary documents. In fact, Muller takes pains to point out that Arminius's theology shared a great deal of affinity with the Roman Catholic and Jesuit theologians of his day: "Arminius, by moving away from this Reformed position toward the teaching of Suarez and Molina rejected the strict Augustinianism of Baius and the Augustinian language of grace resident in Banez' Thomism" (Muller, 273). However, Olson makes no substantive attempt to critique Muller's important work.

Likewise, no effort is made on Olson's part to deal with the connection between Molina's theory of "Middle Knowledge" and that of James Arminius. Eef Dekker has made a convincing argument that Arminius drew upon Molina's theology, even showing how Arminius lifted exact quotations from Molina's writings and incorporated them into his own.<sup>9</sup> The entire question of the dependence of Arminius's theology on developing Roman Catholicism goes almost entirely untouched by Olson. However, this is crucial for understanding the Reformed Church's heavy reaction to his proposals. Indeed, the fact that Molina's theology caused the same kind of stir in Roman Catholic circles helps us to understand the broader context in which Arminius was formulating his

---

<sup>9</sup> Eef Dekker, "Was Arminius a Molinist?" *Sixteenth Century Journal* 27/2 (Summer, 1996): 337-352.

theology. Arminians are certainly free to view their theology as a correction/modification of broader Protestantism. But if they do so, they must be willing to admit that those “corrective” elements arise not from the genius of the Magisterial Reformers, but have strong precedent in semi-Pelagian Roman Catholicism. Arminius’s contemporaries, who accuse him of borrowing from the Jesuits, appear to be justified in that assessment.

The truth is, even where we find Arminianism at its “best” (that is, the “Arminianism of the heart” that Olson propounds), it is still found wanting in its faithfulness to Scripture. We do not have the space to subject all the key tenets of Arminianism to thorough theological critique. We will have to focus our attention on the Arminian view of original sin and total depravity. Examination of this doctrine is an important test of Olson’s thesis, for there is no doctrine that Calvinists have accused Arminians of rejecting more than “total depravity.” Indeed, my own understanding of the classical Arminian view of original sin was greatly nuanced by my study of Olson’s book. However, after careful consideration, I am still convinced that Arminianism is perilously wrong on this subject. Even with all of his insistence that Arminians believe in the doctrine, Olson cannot escape the fact that Arminius and Episcopius define their version of it in a way quite different from classic Augustinianism and the Bible. Although he affirms that mankind has been deprived of their “original righteousness” through Adam’s fall, Arminius does not affirm that man’s nature is thereby “positively corrupt” from birth.

Must some contrary quality, beside the absence of original righteousness, be constituted as another part of original sin? Though we think it much more probable, that this absence of original righteousness, only, is original sin, itself, as being that which alone is sufficient to commit and produce any actual sins whatsoever.<sup>10</sup>

The difficulty with Arminius’s position is that if the privation of original righteousness is alone sufficient to commit and produce actual sin, then man must have had some natural propensity to sin prior to the fall. This may in fact have been his position. Indeed, one of the questions he thought worthy of consideration was the following:

---

10 Jacobus Arminius, *The Works of James Arminius* (1986) II:375.

Is original sin only the absence or want of original righteousness and of primeval holiness, with an inclination to commit sin, which likewise formerly existed in man, though it was not so vehement nor so inordinate as now it is, on account of the lost favour of God, his malediction, and the loss of that good by which that inclination was reduced to order?<sup>11</sup>

This move seems to make logical sense. If the privation of original righteousness is sufficient to leave man in a state that will eventually lead him to actual sin, then the positive inclination to sin must have been present with man in creation. Where else could it have come from?

Carl Bangs, a biographer of Arminius, insists that these statements were not contrary to the Dutch Confessions, and that only later did the Reformed develop a distinction between privation and depravation. He concludes: “Arminius should not be judged by these later dogmatic developments.”<sup>12</sup> However, the privation/depravation distinction was not simply a future development of the Reformed, but was in fact the view of many of the medieval Roman Catholics including Thomas Aquinas, Peter Lombard, and Henry of Ghent. Robert Bellarmine, however, the greatest of the papal polemicists of the Reformation age, explicitly taught the “privation-only” view of Arminius. It is no wonder that the Reformed began to question Arminius’s orthodoxy! He was taking clear sides in an old debate on which the Reformed had long before almost unanimously passed their judgment. Contrary to Bangs’s claims, Arminius’s view was flatly contrary to the Heidelberg Catechism, which Arminius always claimed to uphold: “Are we so corrupt that we are wholly incapable of doing any good, and *inclined to all evil*? Yes, indeed; unless we are born again by the Spirit of God” (Q & A #8).

Moreover, although the Arminians continued to use the *language* of original sin, they radically redefined it.

The Remonstrants do *not regard original sin as sin* properly so called, which renders the posterity of Adam deserving of the hatred of God; *nor as an evil which by the method of punishment* properly so called (per modum proprie dictae

---

11 Ibid., II:717

12 Carl Bangs, *Arminius: A Study in the Dutch Reformation* (1985) 340.

poenae) *passes from Adam to his posterity*; but as an evil, infirmity, injury (infirmitas, vitium), or by whatever other name it may be called, which is propagated to his posterity by Adam devoid of original righteousness... But that original sin (peccatum originis) is not evil in any other sense than this,—that it is not evil in the sense of implying guilt and desert of punishment (malum culpae, aut malum poenae),—is plain. It is not evil in the sense of implying guilt, because to be born is confessedly an involuntary thing, and therefore it is an involuntary thing to be born with this or that stain (labes), infirmity, injury, or evil. But if it is not an evil in the sense of implying guilt, then it cannot be an evil in the sense of desert of punishment; because guilt and punishment are correlated... So far, therefore, as original sin is an evil, it must be in the sense in which the Remonstrants define the term; and is called original sin by a misuse of the word ‘sin’ (*kataxrestikos*).<sup>13</sup>

Episcopius could not be clearer: “original sin” is not a sin properly so called. Nor is it a punishment for Adam’s first sin. It is merely an infirmity or injury upon man’s nature which makes him “wholly unfit for, and incapable of attaining eternal life.”

Several inconsistencies arise for Episcopius in this formulation. First of all, the Arminians do not really escape the problem they see in the Calvinistic view of original sin. For the Arminians, the Augustinian doctrine of original sin makes God unjust. In communicating the guilt and corruption resulting from Adam’s first sin to his descendants, God is holding men guilty of a crime they didn’t personally commit. However, Episcopius’s formulation leaves him in the same dilemma, if not a worse one. In Episcopius’s view, all men are born with an injury and infirmity that they did not themselves deserve. They are born into a situation in which they cannot produce the righteousness God requires of them. Indeed, there are infants who die in infancy from an injury and infirmity that they did not justly merit. How much more horrid does this

---

<sup>13</sup> The quotation is taken from Episcopius’s *Apology for the Remonstrants* (in his *Opera*, Book II, Cap. VII) as translated by W. G. T. Shedd, *A History of Christian Doctrine* (1875) 181-83.

make God than the Calvinist position! The Calvinist maintains that man is born wholly unable to attain to righteousness because he actually deserves to be born in such a condition. The Arminian maintains that man is born totally unable to please God even though he doesn't deserve such a condition as a punishment for sin! Indeed, on the Arminian position infants who die in infancy must die unjustly. If they are born with only an injury that is not in itself sinful or deserving of the punishment of sin, they receive the punishment for sin (death), without actually deserving it. Arminianism tries to protect God from being unjust by denying the guilt and punishment of original sin, but in so doing it makes God more unjust by allowing man to suffer the punishment of sin without actually partaking of its guilt or corruption.<sup>14</sup>

It is beyond dispute that the privation/depravation distinction does not appear explicitly in Scripture. The question then becomes whether or not the privation-only view of Arminius, Bellarmine, and others does full justice to Scripture. How does he account for Genesis 6:5: "...the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and...every intention of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually" (indeed, from "childhood," as Gen. 8:21 says)? Or what about Romans 7:13: "Did that which is good, then, bring death to me? By no means! It was sin, producing death in me through what was good, in order that sin might be shown to be sin, and through the commandment might become sinful beyond measure." Indeed, in these and other passages Paul never minimizes the effect of sin upon human nature, but rather maximizes the heinousness of the corrupt nature of man in his natural condition. In the Bible, sin is never merely a negative lack of righteousness, but also an utterly wicked positive power (depravation!) in the hearts of mankind (cf. Mark 7:20-21; Eph. 2:1-2; Jam. 1:14-15).

Many other points could be noted in criticism of this book. Our review to this point has been overwhelmingly negative. But there is at least one *very* good thing about this book. Olson continually calls Reformed Calvinists back to a study of the primary documents of classic Arminianism. He calls upon

<sup>14</sup> We leave to the side here the question of the salvation of infants dying in infancy. However, it would be helpful for the reader to have before him that actual decision of the Canons of Dordt on this matter: "Since we are to judge of the will of God from his Word, which testifies that the children of believers are holy, not by nature, but in virtue of the covenant of grace, in which they, together with the parents, are comprehended, godly parents have no reason to doubt of the election and salvation of their children, whom it pleaseth God to call out of this life in their infancy" (First Head, Article 17).



Calvinists, in fairness, to read Arminius for himself (as well as Episcopius, Limborch, Wesley and others). I for one have found this to be good advice. When these documents are weighed in the balance, Arminian theology is found to be what the Reformed church has always found it to be: Arminian, not Reformed. And a thorough theological and exegetical study of the classic critique of Arminianism, the Canons of Dordt, will find Arminianism to be what the Reformed church has always argued it was: unbiblical. In our opinion, Olson would have been better served to devote his time and obvious intellectual gifts to producing a serious exegetical and theological response to these works. This decisive judgment may be anathema to the post-foundationalist epistemology of the modern day, and unwelcome in the big-tent evangelicalism that Olson proposes, but it is the judgment of the classic, confessional, Reformed church. Yes! read Arminius, Episcopius, and Limborch for yourself. But then read the classic critiques of Arminianism from the 17<sup>th</sup> century period: the Canons of Dordt; Pierre DuMoulin's *Anatomy of Arminianism*; John Owen's *Display of Arminianism*; and Francis Turretin's *Institutes of Elenctic Theology*, to name a few. And if the reader has the time and intellectual patience, he can pick up Jonathan Edwards's greatest work, *The Freedom of the Will*, for a definitive critique of the Arminian view of the will. Olson fails to significantly interact with any of these *foundational* Reformed responses to classical Arminianism. We would ask Olson to do the same for Calvinists that he calls us to do for the Arminians: go back to the original sources and read the best proponents of Calvinism. And if he finds these lacking in places, he can always go pick up the men whom Calvinists have always regarded as the main source of their theology: the prophet Isaiah and the apostle Paul.

In spite of all these weaknesses, this book can still serve a useful purpose for a Reformed pastor. I myself have found it useful as I have been working on Sunday School lessons on the Canons of Dordt in that it provides a quick reference guide to many quotations from original Arminian sources which are otherwise very expensive (and/or) difficult to find. A Reformed pastor who is eager to "dig in" to many of the primary sources of Arminianism will find Olson's book to be a good starting point. In the interests of fairness and historical accuracy, Calvinists will be able to reestablish their rich tradition of accurately critiquing Arminian theology from the primary sources. I myself have had a few of my own misunderstandings of Arminianism corrected by

reading this book (particularly with reference to total depravity). Yet this has not drawn me away from Calvinism, but rather made me more firmly committed to it. An accurate knowledge of Arminianism will help the Reformed pastor to critique Arminianism at the actual points in dispute, and hopefully to silence some of Olson's objections about modern Calvinists misrepresenting Arminianism.

—Benjamin W. Swinburnson

[*K:NWTS* 23/1 (May 2008) 82-83]

David T. Tsumura, *The First Book of Samuel*. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2007. 698 pp. Cloth. ISBN: 978-0-8028-2359-5. \$50.00.

Tsumura has made a reputation among evangelical OT scholars for his linguistic studies. Notable in this regard is *The Earth and the Waters in Genesis 1 and 2: A Linguistic Investigation*, where he provides helpful lexical analysis from Eblaitic, Ugaritic, Sumerian, Akkadian and Hebrew lemmas. This commentary in the New International Commentary on the Old Testament series reflects that linguistic ability as well. In defending the integrity of the MT (Masoretic Text) as over against the longer LXX (Septuagint) recension, Tsumura eschews the slap-happy emendation of the original Hebrew version which is the pastime of liberal fundamentalist scholars. The reliability which he cedes to the Hebrew text is parallel to the reliability of the narrative reported in the text. Tsumura is an articulate defender of the historicity of 1 Samuel. And yet, Tsumura gives us little more than a rehash of P. Kyle McCarter's Anchor Bible commentary (the liberal fundamentalist standard), with a tip of the hat to Ralph Klein (Word Commentary) and Robert Gordon. His comments are predictably conservative, adequate, but not penetrating. His failure to interact with J. P. Fokkerman's magisterial work (*Narrative Art and Poetry in the Books of Samuel*, 4 vols.) is a disappointment to this reviewer, who has learned a great deal from the Professor at the University of Leiden (for all his theological liberalism, he is a superb Hebraist). Theology, let alone biblical theology, is not the forte of either Tsumura or Fokkerman. All the more reason for Tsumura to

have been stimulated by Fokkelman to think, dare we suggest, like Geerhardus Vos would have thought about this narrative of the dawn of Israel's monarchy. Surely the new age which dawns with David surpasses and displaces the theocratic age which passes away with Samuel. And if the (organic) progress of the history of redemption unfolds by 'better things to come,' even within the body of the OT revelation (monarchy better than theocracy), then we eagerly look for the eschatological displacement of the former era with the final age to come as it dawns in the eschatological David. In fact, we are increasingly impressed as we relate the two monarchical eras together (protological David and eschatological David) by the provisional embodiment of the latter in the former. May we be so bold as to suggest a provisional 'pre-incarnation' of the latter Kingdom of Heaven in the former. Older writers would have called this paradigm 'typology'; we prefer to describe it as anticipatory eschatological intrusion. This is the direction we seek from evangelical commentators on 1 Samuel. Sadly, Tsumura does not advance our journey in that direction.

—James T. Dennison, Jr.

[*K:NWTS* 23/1 (May 2008) 83-84]

Stephen Tompkins, *William Wilberforce: A Biography*. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2007. 238 pp. Paper. ISBN: 978-0-8028-2593-3. \$18.00.

The release, last spring, of the film "Amazing Grace" (starring Ioan Gruffudd and Ciarán Hinds) brought to the big screen the remarkable career of a no less remarkable Christian—William Wilberforce (1759-1833). The film was a gripping account of this devout friend of John Newton (former slave boat captain himself and, after his conversion, author of the hymn "Amazing Grace", which, in magnificent heart-stirring fashion, closes the film with pipe and drum corps in front of Westminster Abbey—a scene alone worth buying the DVD) and his stubborn, yet courageous battle to abolish the capturing, buying, selling and abusing of black men, women and children as slaves.

Stephen Tompkins now contributes a biography which narrates the frustrat-

ing campaign of Wilberforce, the pietistic Clapham Sect and, at the outset in 1787, a minority of a minority in the British Parliament. Fighting uphill all the way for twenty years, against British business interests (slave profiteering—profits garnered from the manufacture of sugar by slave labor), British political interests (the pro-slavery party in Parliament parading the canard that abolition would ‘bring down the nation’), and the British ecclesiastical interests (the mainline Anglican Church was the prop to the majority in Parliament, as well as in the corporate offices), Wilberforce and his tiny band managed, by the amazing grace of God, to alter public opinion by doggedly presenting the graphic horrors of slavery while offering a better moral alternative—the labor of free men, women and children and the dignity of enjoying the fruits of one’s own industry. Still, it would take Parliament twenty more years to declare slavery “morally repugnant”.

Wilberforce’s success involved incremental compromises along the way, yet no compromise in his overall strategy—to banish slavery from the British empire. Tomkins chronicles (often tediously) the vicissitudes of this ‘give and take’, with the pressure of caving-in always in the offing. This pressure even alienated, for a time, Wilberforce’s dear friend and ally in Parliament, the Prime Minister, William Pitt the Younger (1759-1806).

The story of Wilberforce contains some guidance for evangelicals in the current culture wars. The oppression of fetal persons by the abortion industry (protected by the vested interests of the political and even ecclesiastical establishment); the degradation of all persons by the pornography racket (also granted license by vested political and corporate deviance); the subjugation and humiliation of women, particularly in militant Islam; the genocidal elimination of masses of human beings by crazed totalitarians of the Left from Lenin to Stalin to Hitler to Mao Tse-tung to Ho Chi Minh to Saddam Hussein: all of these moral issues with their political and ecclesiastical ramifications, so apparently manipulated and dominated by the mainstream liberal establishment, may be transformed, may be reformed, may even be abolished by the insights of Wilberforce adapted to the current scene.

Hollywood’s superb film and Tomkins’s book remind us that the battle is not lost though our numbers be few.

—James T. Dennison, Jr.